

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 65

7th October 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

A. Kurella: After Thoiry.

### Hands off China.

M. Galkovitch: The Imperialist Antagonisms and the Prospects of Intervention in China.

### The Miners' Struggle in England.

R. Palme Dutt: The Miners' Fight in the Balance.

M. Tomsky: The British Strike and the Tasks of the International Labour Movement (Conclusion).

### Politics.

A. Kurella: "Pan-Europe" or the United States of Socialist Europe?

### Economics.

Günther Reimann: The International Iron Cartel.

Christiansen: The Unemployment Crisis in Denmark.

### The Labour Movement.

Paul Merker: The Hamburg Dockworkers' Strike.

B. Smolan: The Swedish Trade Union Congress.

Unzo Taguchi: The Most Recent Development of the Trade Union Movement in Japan.

### The Balkans.

The Stefanov Trial and National Slavery in Roumania.

### Union of Soviet Republics.

W. Milyutin: The Next Step in the Industrialisation of the Soviet Union.

G. Melnitchansky: How and by Whom Wages are fixed in the Soviet Union.

### In the International.

P. R. Dietrich: The Situation in the Communist Party of Germany.

Postponement of the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U. For the Unity of the C. P. S. U.

Our Difficulties and the Opposition.

Resolution of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. on the Recent Fractional Activity of the Opposition.

Comrade Stalin Exposes Social Democratic Forgery.

Resolution of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist League of Great Britain.

### The Youth Movement.

The Reasons for the Decisions of the E. C. Y. C. I. regarding the Case of Vouyovitch.

### The White Terror.

Against the Bulgarian White Terror!

### Book Reviews.

Bela Kun: Lenin: Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism.

## After Thoiry.

By A. Kurella (Moscow).

The foreign policy of the Poincaré government is following a logical course. Out of the confusion of connections and possibilities which existed at the time of the formation of the government, a definite line is beginning to emerge more and more clearly — that of Franco-German-co-operation.

This co-operation is closely connected with the plan of French finance capital which aims at stabilising the valuta. French heavy industry hopes to find in the iron cartel a firm support in the market crisis which is bound to come with the stabilisation, when the French manufacturing industry will have to restrict its production and to some extent its apparatus of production. The recently concluded provisional commercial treaty with Germany has similar aims in view.

But this co-operation with Germany is not only intended to serve as a support during the severe time of the coming stabilisation crisis. The meeting in Thoiry was also connected with the question of the active aid of Germany to France in the carrying out of the stabilisation of the valuta. Discussion took place over the conditions which France could fulfil in order to enable Germany to make prompter reparation payments.

As a result of this economic and financial co-operation of France and Germany which has become more and more firm,

the Locarno Pact and Germany' entry into the League of Nations have suddenly gained a quite different import.

Prepared and carried out by England with the object of weakening France's role on the Continent, the new tactics of the League of Nations are now becoming, in the hands of France, a weapon against their initiator, against England. Germany, whom England and America have set on her feet economically, and who has been politically rehabilitated and introduced into "good society" by England in order that she should form a counter-weight against the influence of France, is now siding with France. "This alliance, if it comes about", writes Sauerwein in the "Matin" "is of such a nature, that it would be difficult to overestimate its power... These two countries would create a new balance in the world. They could hold their own against any other States no matter how big they may be". And what is meant by "balance" is stated very clearly by Sauerwein in his description of the forces of these two countries: "a hundred million men who, as was to be seen during the last war, know how to fight!"

The "femps" is right: "It is a question here of the commencement of a plan of an ingenious and daring policy". The daring lies not so much in the attempt to reconcile the old "hereditary enemies", but in the fact that this alliance would break the

whole tradition of Anglo-French friendship. For this alliance can only exist if its point is directed against England.

One cannot deny that Poincaré has audacity and a certain amount of genius. The new plan — and it is more the plan of Poincaré than of Briand — is on no less a large scale than that which Poincaré sought to carry out from 1922—1924. Poincaré is not for nothing the representative of a powerful, striving, young big capital.

But these are only plans: the commercial treaty with Germany is only provisional and concluded for a short period. The conversations at Thoiry have not yet been ratified. The French government has decided not to continue negotiations for the time being. Audacity is good, it thinks, but caution is better.

For there is a host with whom France must reckon: it would be a very fine thing to have the free disposal of the German railway bonds. But the transfer Agent of the Dawes Plan Commission has the last word here. If he sticks to the principle that only the ordinary Dawes payments can be transferred from Germany, then the bonds can neither be sold nor pledged abroad. The debates which would arise over this question in the transfer committee (if France and Germany should attempt to realise their plan), could become one of the greatest political battles of recent times.

In addition to this there is the question, what market could take up the bonds if not the American? Will the American government be so simple as not to notice that France is seeking by this means to avoid the direct taking up of a loan, because she wants to avoid the condition attached to it, the ratification of the Washington agreement? It is hardly thinkable.

When, two years ago, similar projects were in the air and America showed herself inclined to support the Franco-German coal and iron bloc, England intervened with the checkmate of the occupation of Cologne, and sealed her victory with the London Conference and the Dawes Pact. France was weak at that time and the Anglo-American friendship was strong.

Will the Anglo-Saxon alliance now prove to be stronger than the inducements of the excellent business which America could do by a skillful support of the Franco-German alliance? The near future will decide this.

One thing is certain: The weakening of England by the coal dispute and the Chinese events on the one side, and the strengthening of French imperialism since the liquidation of the Left Bloc, have again rendered the relations of the European States very unstable.

## HANDS OFF CHINA

### The Imperialist Antagonisms and the Prospects of Intervention in China.

By M. Galkovitch (Moscow).

The victorious offensive of the Northern expedition of the revolutionary Canton Government and the successful manoeuvres of the First People's Army have created a favourable situation for the cause of the national emancipation of China. These events will clear the situation, as in China there are two opposing camps: on the one hand the entire people, and before all the working masses, who are striving for the final annihilation of imperialism, and on the other hand a small group of Generals who are supported by a portion of the big bourgeoisie of China, who are financially allied with them, and by foreign capitalists.

The successes of the Canton army in the Yangtse provinces are not only to be attributed to the support which this army receives from the peasant population, but are also due to the disintegration of a section of the troops of General Sun Chuan Lang.

The lack of a common united front of the reactionary forces against the revolution is not only due to the squabbles between certain Chinese Generals, but also to the lack of unity among the foreign Powers. We are witnessing a very singular phenomenon, the unco-ordinated approximation of the standpoints of Japan and the United States in regard to events in China. On the 11th of September, at an interview between the American

Ambassador in Japan, MacVeagh, with the foreign Minister, Schidehara, the following joint line of policy was laid down: a) Both States shall pursue in China a policy aiming at co-operation. b) The sending of fleets up the Yangtse river by foreigners does not mean interference in the affairs of China. The existing profound differences between Japan and the United States will hardly be overcome by the policy of co-operation proclaimed on the 11th of September. Nevertheless it is obvious that the Anglo-American Bloc with regard to Chinese affairs has been destroyed.

What were the reasons that compelled Japan and the United States to conduct a policy of non-intervention and to reject the attempts of England to carry out an intervention with combined forces? As far as Japan is concerned it can be said that, as her chief interests are concentrated in Manchuria, she is by no means interested in a repetition of the events of Tsingtau and Shanghai in 1915, when the boycott in China against Japan was in full swing. In addition to this the damaging of the commercial interests and the reduction of Britain's share in Chinese trade is of particular advantage for Japan. As the reports regarding the negotiations recently held between Great Britain and Japan show, Japan is demanding a very high price for her co-operation.

The United States on their side have even greater reason to adopt a negative attitude to the British proposals. The Anglo-Saxon Bloc in China has resulted in America, the "traditional Friend" of China, beginning to lose her popularity. Writing in the "New York Times", Anna Strong, who has spent some time in China, states that American influence is beginning to decline in that country. America, she says, is still popular in China but not to the extent she was five years ago; she now shares this popularity with two other States, with Russia and Germany, and while the popularity of these two States is increasing that of America is declining.

An article in the September number of "Current History" also records the decline of American influence in China and warns against the policy of sitting between two stools, of co-operating with the great powers on the one side and trying to be friendly with China on the other.

The attitude of the United States Ambassador in China, Mr. MacMurray, best reflects this double policy of America: on the one hand his coming forward at the Customs Conference in favour of co-operation with Great Britain and sending a sharp note to the Chinese government regarding the internal loan, and on the other hand his recent holiday trip to Shanghai and Canton with the clearly expressed purpose of demonstrating friendship to the Chinese people. Nevertheless it is clear that America, who in the last few years has strengthened her economic position in China at the cost of the decline of English trade, has no great desire to lose her reputation as the friend of China.

Great Britain is at present in a very awkward position. The cessation in the growth of British trade in the last few years is a fact which has compelled British business people to adopt decisive measures. The Conservative government has evidently come to the conclusion that the only means whereby it can preserve British trade from a further decline is to make use of direct threats. Threats which are not followed up by action can, however, scarcely have a very great effect; and the English Conservatives are striving in the first place to unite the interested Powers for the purpose of combined intervention in China and in the second place to rally the Chinese reaction to the fight against the "red danger". Neither the first nor the second of these plans of the English Conservatives can be realised. The first obviously runs counter to the intentions of Japan and America, and the second cannot be carried out owing to the differences among the reactionary militarists and also owing to the atrocities recently committed by the English in Wansien.

There have been and there will be attempts on the part of England to draw Chang Tso Lin into the fight against Canton. But many Generals who are nominally under the command of Chang Tso Lin show very little lust to help Sun Chuan Fang and Wu Pei Fu. In addition to this General Sun himself has hastened to declare that he would settle with the Canton army with his own forces and does not require any help for this purpose.

In view of such a state of affairs there remains nothing else for England to do but act on her own account. But for this purpose one requires a completely free hand. The economic situation of Great Britain, which has been rendered exceedingly serious by the enormous struggle of the miners, does not permit the English Conservatives to conduct a firm policy in China. The replacement of MacLay by the new diplomatic representative Lampson is direct evidence of those difficulties which the English Cabinet has encountered in its Chinese policy. It is possible that the Conservative government will make yet another attempt to unite the reaction and the Powers for a fight against the revolutionary movement. So long however as the struggle of the miners is not ended, British imperialism will not be in a position to embark on independent intervention, in spite of the innumerable threats which are appearing every day in the English Conservative press.

The development of the offensive operations of the Canton army and of the People's Army is taking place at a moment when no unity prevails among the Powers, when Great Britain is not capable of carrying on an intervention policy by herself without serious consequences, and the Chinese reaction itself is torn by a number of inner differences which weaken its fighting capacity. The sympathies of the Chinese people, however, are wholly and entirely on the side of Canton.

## THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

### The Miners' Fight in the Balance.

By R. Palme Dutt.

London, 1st October 1926.

The position confronting the miners is now very grave indeed. The Delegate Conference has remitted the negotiations and Government proposals to the district for the expression of their opinion, without any recommendation of either approval or disapproval, and without any lead for action. On October 7 the Delegate Conference meets again to receive the results from the Districts and to reach a decision.

What are the alternatives before the Delegate Conference on October 7?

The Government and the bourgeoisie are now openly set on the complete break up and disruption of the Miners' Federation. They no longer seek even a dictated peace with a defeated enemy; their calculations and hopes are fixed on the individual routing of the enemy; not merely on district, but on local settlements, separate pit settlements without the union machinery, and individual returns to work under the force of starvation. This aim is more and more openly proclaimed, in view of the complete treachery and inaction of the whole leadership of the labour movement, and the hesitations, surrenders and paralysis of the miners' leaders. Thus the "Times" declares its hope:

"By the time delegates return to London, the unofficial return of miners to the pits may have passed more definitely beyond the control of the leaders."

(Times, 1/10/26.)

And even the normally more moderate Government organ, the "Observer", which habitually preaches moderation in victory, is now in full war-cry, and pours scorn on the surrenders of the Miners' Federation:

"Now!" They could have had it for the asking seven months ago. Nothing on earth can get the miners, after more than twenty weeks of the struggle, the terms that were in their grasp six months ago. They will have to give way on hours. They will have to face district agreements."

The falsity of the hopes of a peaceful way out, of government intervention against the coalowners, etc., which the miners' leaders have been holding out as the principal hope during the past three months, is now completely exposed. The Government position was sufficiently revealed in the Parliament

debate on September 27, when there was no longer any need for concealment. The myth of a fundamental division of policy between Baldwin and Churchill, or between the Government and the coalowners, was blown to the winds. It was revealed that throughout the negotiations Baldwin and Churchill had been in daily, almost hourly, communication over every move, no less than the Government and the owners; and that the throwing over of the Churchill formula of September 8 (embodying a watered down national agreement) for the Baldwin terms of September 17 (District Agreements, Lower Wages, Longer Hours, and Compulsory Arbitration in special cases) represented, not a division of the bourgeois front, but on the contrary a conscious hardening of the bourgeois policy in relation to the strategy of the position. As for the supposed division between the Government and the coalowners, which had become the whole basis of reformist labour propaganda, its character was sufficiently shown in Baldwin's speech, when his sole and solemn answer to the owners' "defiance" of the Government on the question of a national agreement, was, after accepting their policy, to reprove them for being so "discourteous" to the Government. In face of this the Labour representatives could only declare, as MacDonald declared, that they had been "deceived". But this "deception" has cost the miners three months, during which the endurance power of the miners has been steadily eaten into, while their leaders, instead of strengthening the fight, have been pursuing these false hopes of peace, and thereby weakening the unity and confidence of the miners.

Nothing shows the position more clearly than the facts declared by the miners' leader in Parliament Hartshorn in the course of the debate, in reference to the Miners' Federation terms of a 10% reduction in wages. He showed that these terms, on a basis of pre-subsidy prices, would bring in a profit in every district except Northumberland of from 5d to 2s 7d a ton; actually the increase in prices would mean a much larger profit all round. Nevertheless these terms are rejected as out of the question. Nothing could show more clearly that the conflict is more than an economic conflict; the aim of the Government is a political class aim, to break the Miners' Federation as the remaining bulwark of fight in the working class movement.

On the other hand, if the policy of pacifist hopes, trust in the intervention of the Government as an impartial third party, etc., has been a failure, only strengthening the Government's hands and confusing the miners, no less has been the policy of reconciliation with the reformist leaders in the hope of securing their assistance.

The leaders of the Labour Party and the General Council have shown a hundredfold that their only policy is to strangle the miners' struggle, whether by their inaction or by their assistance. Nevertheless the miners' leaders have preferred to come to terms with them, and place themselves in their hands, rather than directly appeal to the aid of the working class, and stand out against the reformist traitors.

The intervention of MacDonald and the Labour Party produced the surrender formula of September 3rd — the acceptance of a "reduction of labour costs". This formula, MacDonald has since explained, was worked out by himself and Churchill, in order to cover both wages and hours. What have the miners received in return for these "friendly offices" of MacDonald, for which Cook publicly thanked MacDonald at Bournemouth? The immediate hardening of the Government terms to the destruction of a national settlement. MacDonald declares that they have been "deceived" — but makes no proposal to meet such deception by action.

The General Council, to whom Cook bound himself anew by his pact before the Trades Union Congress to make no criticism of them, and actually intervened to save them, have returned this service by banning even the raising of the question of the levy or the embargo at the Congress, and have continued to stifle any action or even organised material assistance of the working class movement, despite the universal demand at every district trades council conference, as well as by wholesale branch resolutions.

The hypocrisy of the International Miners Committee at its meeting at Ostend on September 30, when it was confronted again with its pledges of international strike action and took no action, is no less clear.

The steps of reconciliation of the miners' leaders to MacDonald, to the Parliamentary Labour Party, to the General Council, to the whole reformist leadership, have brought not one atom of support or gain to the miners. On the other hand, they have confused the fight, disheartened the miners, created division between the miners' leaders and the left wing in the miners who gave them their strength, and paralysed the fight of the other workers against the reformist leadership and to come to the assistance of the miners in spite of their leaders.

What, then, is to be done? The path of pacifism and appeals to the Government is vain. The path of reconciliation with the reformist leadership is vain. These have prolonged and weakened the miners' fight to a dangerous and desperate point.

But equally vain is the path of inaction, of dragging on and waiting, on the present passive basis, for a settlement to come. This can only mean eventually, on the physical compulsion of starvation, a sporadic drifting back and disorganisation of the ranks. Cook himself has said, speaking in London on September 29:

"I could go down to-morrow to Notts and Derby coal-fields and get the men who have gone back to come out again, but you cannot keep men out when they have not the means to live."

But what does this mean? Cook states it to justify his policy of compromise and vainly protracted negotiations. On the contrary. The very urgency of the position means that the path of protracted negotiations merely plays into the enemy's hands, and that, if disorganisation is not to set in, either every resource of action must be brought into play at once, or, if all action has been tried and failed, then and then only, a clear and conscious retreat must be carried through, promptly, decisively, and directly led, such as will not disorganise but leave the movement all the stronger for a future struggle.

But has all action been taken? Again on the contrary. The path of pacifist negotiation, and of reconciliation with the reformist leadership, has led to neglect to concentrate on the one fundamental thing — the strengthening of the fight, and the direct appeal to the working class.

The proposals of the Miners' Minority Movement, consistently put forward at every conference in opposition to the compromise policy of Cook, have never yet been attempted to be carried out.

First, the Miners should bring out the safety men in every pit where coal is being raised. Cook himself has stated that the demand for the withdrawal of the safety men is universal from every part of the country. The Federation officials have sometimes dallied with the threat. The Lancashire Executive has passed a resolution calling for a National Conference to decide on the question. Yet nothing has been done, save in a few localities by rank and file initiative.

Second, the Miners' Federation should appeal over the heads of the General Council, on whom it is useless to waste time, to every Union, every District Committee and Trades Council for the levy and the embargo; and should send personal deputations to the Executive of every Union, forcing the issue to the front, and at the same time calling for a Special Trades Union Congress.

Third, the Miners should appeal directly to the I. L. P. and to the Labour Party to fight for the levy and the embargo.

Fourth, the Miners should appeal straight to the workers in the docks, ships and railways against blackleg coal, sending delegations of miners to organise mass demonstrations and agitate in every port, docks and railway centre.

These and other measures of immediate action are measures to awaken the response of the whole British working class, which has invariably shown itself ready to respond to every sign of strong, determined and militant leadership — witness the response to International Unity and to the General Strike — to meet and drive back even at the last hour the attack of the Government on the whole working class through the miners. Delay means, not the "organised retreat" of which Cook has spoken, but disorganisation, drifting back and the break-up of the Federation.

## The British Strike and the Tasks of the International Labour Movement.

By M. Tomsky.

II.

### Our Proposals for the Support of the Miners.

Our representatives met the representatives of the General Council at the Paris Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee and demanded that the support of the miners should be placed on the agenda as the first and most important point. The English demanded that our representatives should decline to join in the declaration which had been passed by the A. U. C. T. U., as they considered it an insult to the General Council. The representatives of the British General Council rejected our proposal. Our representatives on the other hand declined — and they were right in doing so — to discuss the declaration of the A. U. C. T. U.

In this, the representatives of the General Council exhibited a strange logic. If we accept a declaration which condemns their concrete mistakes, they regard it as interfering in their internal affairs, but when they demand that a resolution framed by the supreme body of our trade union movement be revoked, it is no interference in our affairs. In our opinion however, just this is an interference in our affairs, an attempt to force their conditions on us. We were right in rejecting this proposal, for we cannot and will not renounce our right to criticism.

The consequence of this was that the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee dispersed without having passed any resolutions. Shortly afterwards a second conference took place in Berlin at which our representatives again insisted on the question of the support of the miners being made the first point on the agenda. The English disputed for a day and a half the necessity of bringing up this question, until our representatives induced them to accept our proposal. When the question of the support of the miners was finally put on the agenda and our representative made a number of — in our opinion very practical — proposals, they replied very diplomatically that in the first place these proposals were impracticable, and in the second place that all these proposals had already been discussed and to a large extent carried through. Is there any logic in this? I cannot find it. Finally, the English rejected the proposals of our delegation without discussing them point by point.

As the Committee has no executive, but only advisory rights, and as in the Committee the separate questions are not decided by a majority but by mutual understanding, our proposals were not realised. I ask: did the General Council and its representatives act rightly when they rejected our proposals at the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee? In my opinion, the Congress at Bourne-mouth should at least have said a few words on the subject; the question however is not on the agenda of the Congress, although these "unpractical" suggestions deal with so important a question as, for instance, calling upon all workers to contribute 1% of their wages to help the miners for the whole duration of the strike. Had this proposal been carried through, we might have awaited the issue of the fight with calm confidence; for, although some vacillation is seen in the ranks of the miners in consequence of their extreme exhaustion, the situation of the mineowners and of the Government is by no means enviable. The month of September is the most important month in the coal-market; in this month stores of coal are laid in for the whole winter. It is not difficult to understand what this means; furthermore every day of such a strike costs many millions. And, if the English workers, could in such circumstances rely on really firm international support, would they find themselves in the position in which they now are? Has our support on the other hand no influence on the situation of the miners? Is, in the given circumstances, our proposal for a one per cent levy on the wages of all workers for the duration of the strike a bad, impracticable suggestion? After our proposal had been rejected, we made the same suggestion to the workers of the Soviet Union and received telegrams from all parts of our country to the effect that the workers were prepared to contribute 1% of their wages to the support of the fighting miners for the duration of the strike. There will of course be individual voices of opposition, possibly a few backward members of our trade unions, a few employees who lack class-consciousness, or persons who have taken refuge

with us from the old apparatus of State while preserving their old ideology. We have not the slightest doubt: however that our trade unions and our trade union members as a whole will give a positive answer to this question; they will say that this is the most practical and the only right attitude (ap-  
plause).

Voices will perhaps be raised maintaining, according to the old stock phrase, that what is good for Russia is not suitable for the English. Why should the method of brotherly help which the workers of the Soviet Union practise be the right thing in Russia and not in England or Germany? Why? Is it because the workers in England earn better wages or are better educated than ours? Why do these methods not apply over there? I believe it is because they have corrupt leaders (applause) whose actions are not guided by the will to unite the workers and to develop class solidarity, but whose policy is directed towards dividing the workers according to nations, unions, occupations etc. and because they all cast sheep's eyes at the employers. This is why our methods do not suit them.

Another way in which the Russian workers "interfered" with the trade unions, was a proposal on the carrying through of which the fate of the strike largely depends. We proposed to discuss the question of an **embargo**, of preventing the loading and transport of strike-breaking coal.

#### The Attitude of the General Council to the Miners' Struggle.

The miners are locked out, and what is the attitude of the General Council? Is it for or against the miners fight? We have received no clear answer to this question. I have carefully studied the speech of the chairman of the congress. He says:

"If, on the principle stated, it is right that the whole Movement may be required to rally to the defence of any part, if a common effort, a common sacrifice is required (this is absolutely true; in our opinion, a repetition of the action — which failed the first time — is now necessary), it must also be accepted as equally fundamental that the interest of no part of the Movement is superior to the interest of the whole."

According to our view this sentence is true in an absolute sense. The point however is that the miners are now defending the interests of the movement as a whole, that the interests of the whole movement are being decided on the miners' front. This is why the movement as a whole must hasten to the help of this section. The trend of Pugh's formula on the other hand seems to be that the miners should sacrifice themselves in the interests of the other workers, that the interests of the British workers would benefit if the miners were to yield. Were the miners to yield up their positions and, according to all the rules of democracy and of the Constitution, to accept the eight hours' day instead of the seven hours' day, were they to renounce the claim to a national wages agreement and to accept district agreements (i. e. finally to disintegrate their federation), were they to accept a reduction of wages, this apparently would serve the interests of the whole labour movement of England. This sophism is dished up without any connection with the chief tasks of the whole labour movement in Britain, and the result is an extremely doubtful diplomatic turn of speech: "on the one hand — on the other hand". Plainly stated however, the question is: Are you in favour of the miners or not? If you are for the miners, how have you supported them? Are the interests of the British labour movement being decided on this section of the front or are they not? I maintain that they are, and no one dare dispute it.

#### What is the Significance of the Refusal of Permits of Entry to the Representatives of the Soviet Trade Unions?

It is said that the refusal of permits of entry to Tomsky and Melnitschanky is a trifle, a minor question. On the one hand it is indeed a trifle, for we have often been refused a permit of entry. What is its significance however in connection with the fact that the Americans and the Amsterdamites have at the same time been allowed to enter the country? It means that the control of the international policy of the British trade unions is exclusively in the hands of His Majesty's Conser-

vative Government. How else can we interpret the fact that the General Council is not allowed to send its delegates to such countries as it considers desirable and is not allowed to invite those persons whom it wishes to invite but only such as are approved of by the Government?

They wish to dispose of this fact by a phrase such as that used by Clynes and others, saying: "That is not liberal procedure, it is dishonest policy on the part of the Minister for Home Affairs." They look for honesty in the class politics of the bourgeoisie.

The refusal of the permits of entry is a new blow aimed by the Government at the Trades Union Congress. What is the answer of the General Council? "We protest! Protesting is easy enough; but what is the value of a passive protest? It is a scrap of paper. You are indignant; but what have you demanded from the Government? What have you **done** to free yourselves from this control, to force the Government to withdraw the prohibition of entry? This is the actual question, and it is a question which cannot be avoided. We can nevertheless understand this difference of attitude towards the representatives of the American and to those of the Soviet trade unions.

#### The Fight between two Tendencies in the Labour Movement.

In the international labour movement a struggle between two tendencies, two courses, can be clearly observed: the tendency of the American trade union movement and the tendency of the trade union movement in the Soviet Union. The line of the American trade union movement is that of ultra-Reformism, of Reformism, of opportunism such as has not hitherto been practised in Europe and is only now reaching us from America.

The second line is the line of our revolutionary class movement. These two lines are now confronting one another in Western Europe and the workers of Western Europe must choose: Are they for the American methods of fighting and working or for those of the Soviet Union?

The American method is based on the theory that the working class can be emancipated by means of economic co-operation with the capitalist class, especially by means of the realisation of Socialism, through Labour Banks which are to be established with the money of the trade unions, with the savings of the workers.

They say that the working class will arrive at Socialism by means of the influence of these Labour Banks on industry. For the time being however, the trade union leaders are elected as directors and members of the supervising boards of these banks with corresponding salaries, they buy shares and speculate on the Stock Exchange. In practice the result is that the bank is not influenced by the trade unions but the trade unions by the bank. Commissions for the rationalisation of production are set up similar to our conferences on production. They are composed of equal numbers of representatives of the workers and of the administration; they meet and discuss how the productivity of labour of the concern in question can be increased in the interest of its capability of competing with other undertakings. What an idyll! Just as with us but the other way round. According to our method the undertaking must first be taken out of the hands of the capitalists and only then can conferences take place. They however have outrun us; first conferences on production and then, with the help of the banks, in about 300 years, the purchase of the concerns. The American trade unions are often found to be taking orders for their employers. We know of examples of this. In the opinion of the English bourgeoisie this is a good trade union movement. It is actually the fact that if the employer has no money, he gets money from the Labour Bank; the trade union helps the employer to increase the competitive power of the concern, and if he lacks orders, it helps him to get orders. The Russians work on somewhat different lines; they say that the trade union movement is a class movement, that the trade union movement is not separated from the political movement by a Chinese wall, that at a certain stage of the movement, politics and economics fuse.

They go even further; they say that the task of the trade union movement and of the working class as a whole is to wrest the means of oppression, the whole machinery of State from the hands of the capitalist class and to take the factories and the land from the banks.

These are the two tendencies which confront one another in the international labour movement. It is not a matter of indifference to the capitalists which of these two tendencies carries off the victory in the international labour movement. The refusal of the permits of entry is actually equivalent to a support of the Reformist movement on the part of the bourgeois Government of England. The English working class should understand this.

### The Embargo the Last Battle.

Since all the problems of the struggle between the working class and the capitalists are being decided on the front of the miners' fight, the chief question is that of the support of the miners. The first step in this support should be to protect the miners against the import and transport of strike-breaking coal. We raised this question in our proposals to the Anglo-Russian Committee, but received the answer that it was impossible, as 50% of the English workers are in a very serious situation owing to the miners' struggle. We however are of the opinion that they will be in a still more serious situation if the miners suffer a defeat. Do you believe that after a defeat of the miners, after the capitalists have got in a blow at the whole British labour movement by prolonging the hours of work, they will care a rap for the working class, for the trade unions? After such a defeat, will any single group of the capitalists stand in awe of the trade unions? Of course not. It is nonsense to deny this. A defeat of the miners would inevitably lead to a loss of political and economic weight on the part of the trade unions.

The labour movement of Great Britain is faced by a clear and urgent question: — Are they to take up the last fight or not? The decisive moment of the fight has come, and the British trade unions must now decide whether they will carry on the fight to the last positions.

If the leaders wish to correct their mistakes, which they probably acknowledge to a certain extent, it is their duty to summon the working class to this last fight. However difficult this may be, the last battle must be fought in serried ranks, — by the proclamation of an embargo. This might be an actual and decisive form of help to the miners on strike. Is the Congress capable of this? We shall see.

### What is the Substance of Mr Pugh's Speech?

The chairman's speech at the Congress was a programmatical speech which gave the tone to the whole congress. Mr Pugh first of all stated, as we have said, that the strike was not a general strike, but a "national" strike. He further said that the question must be dealt with quite calmly, that the workers should remember the lesson which the Conservative Government had given them. He then stated that this lesson should be "taken to heart" at the next parliamentary election. These words are criminal. The only lesson which the English workers should learn is that they will never achieve much as long as the power is in the hands of the capitalists, as long as the bourgeois democracy with its parliamentarism, with its constitution, created to deceive the workers, with its "free", venal Press, exists. Every form of parliamentarism, every constitution is an instrument for betraying and suppressing the workers, is an instrument for ensuring the rule and the dictatorship of the capitalist class. This is the lesson which, in our opinion, the English workers should deduce from the events.

There are, it is true, among the English trade union functionaries, many persons who think as follows: Yes, of course, the Russians have their own methods; they live on the border between Europe and Asia. They have methods of their own; we however must lead the workers to victory through parliamentary democracy. There are people who actually believe that with the present bourgeois election apparatus, with the prevailing system of corruption in elections, at which the electors are dragged to the poll in motors, at which votes are paid for, at which the electors are treated etc. — people who believe that some fine day the workers will carry off the victory at the elections and will have a majority in Parliament. They would then resolve by simple voting that all banks, factories and works and all houses should become common property and that private ownership of the means of production should come to an end. The capitalists will then propose amendments which will be "rejected". After the law has been passed, the capitalists will

leave the factories and Socialism will be complete. In practice however we see how well the bourgeoisie knows how to fight during a strike. We have seen how much energy the petted sons of the bourgeoisie can display and we know from the experience of the Russian revolution that the bourgeoisie do not yield up their stolen booty with such idyllic serenity; we have seen in our country during the revolution that not bulletins but machine-guns had to be put in action. Even when we had taken away the means of production, the bourgeoisie tried more than once to win them back, and mobilised half the world against us with this object in view. Can then anyone imagine that bulletins will accomplish anything? If any representative of the English trade unions likes to ask any worker, male or female of Moscow or Ivanovo-Vosnessensk etc. how the factories can be taken from the capitalists, he will receive the answer that it can certainly not be done through parliamentarism, by means of voting.

The chairman then continued his pitiful doddering as to whether any attempt was made during the strike to paralyse the life of the country. He said that no such attempt had been made, that it was purely a "national" strike.

They bring the railways and motor traffic and the electric power works to a standstill, saying to the Conservatives at the same time: "Pray, do not imagine that we wish to paralyse the life of the country; all this just happens. And what you Conservatives do just happens too. It is not a political but an economic fight.

Is this tone worthy of a leader of the labour movement? Can such leaders lead the working class to victory? No, the English worker must draw the conclusion that they are incapable of it. "Follow our traditions", said the chairman of the Congress, explaining that the first congress 58 years ago "in an equally difficult position preserved the greatest calm and common-sense." This means that in order to preserve the traditions you must act as calmly and sensibly as they did 58 years ago. This means: — Forget the imperialist war, forget that capital is attacking you and is trying to shift the burden of the costs of the criminal, predatory war on to your shoulders, forget that there has been a general strike during which the police attacked the workers with truncheons, forget that the miners are starving, that the children of the miners, suffering from under-nourishment in consequence of the four and a half months' strike, are on the brink of the grave, forget all of this and concern yourselves "calmly and sensibly" with the petty questions on the agenda, as was done 58 years ago.

Can such leaders lead the workers to victory? No, they are incapable of it.

They are afraid that the British worker is beginning to understand where his class interests lie, that he will begin to take an interest in the bourgeois offensive. This is no joke. The British worker is really beginning to understand — not yet sufficiently clearly perhaps — that, as long as power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie, as long as there is a government of mineowners, shipowners, landowners and bankers, there will also be war, oppression of the working class and endeavours to reduce their standard of living. We see to-day how the British capitalists are trying to bring down the standard of living of the English worker to the level of the standard of living of the German worker; and, if the leaders of the labour movement of Western Europe continue to behave as they are doing at present, we shall soon see the capitalists beginning to reduce the standard of living of the German and French workers to that of the least organised and most exploited Chinese and Indian workers. That is the ideal of capital.

The English bourgeoisie very well understands how to guard its own interests. On the occasion of a conflict of the English navy in American waters, when the question was raised as to whether the English were in the right, the famous Pitt, if my memory serves me, said "Right or wrong, my country." And now, when it is a question of whether the miners are right or wrong, we must say: They belong to our class and that is all that matters. Wherever workers are fighting, it is the duty of the leaders to place themselves at the head of the fight and to defend the class interests of the workers with might and main. This is what the General Council ought to do; instead of which it joins with the clergy as a mediator, and a mediator in what kind of affair? In a fight between miners and mineowners, at a time when the miners are right in every respect; for they are carrying on a fight for the whole English



working-class against the general tendency to reduce the standard of living of the workers. The leaders of the General Council state that they acted as mediators to ensure decent conditions of peace for the workers. The workers will only get decent conditions when they seize the capitalists by the throat and force them to their knees.

Pugh warns the Conservatives against making fresh attacks on the trade unions and declares that the trade unions must continue to exist because, with the Courts and the Parliament, they form integral parts of the order of modern society. This indeed is the ideal of the bourgeoisie, to turn the trade unions into equally obedient instruments of the bourgeois power as are the Courts and Parliament. Is it conceivable that Parliament will ever oppose the interests of the capitalists? Never. Do you then wish to make the trade unions obedient instruments of the capitalist class? Such leaders are incapable of leading the working class to victory.

Finally, one passage in his speech has caused me great uneasiness; that is the passage about the "national index" and about the necessity of the policy of the question of wages being on a scientific basis. He stated:

"Has not the time come to consider how we can apply the principle of a living wage, or basic wage, corresponding to the index of national production and aiming at the equitable distribution and spending power in relation to family needs and the cost of living?"

As regards spending power, it is immaterial in this speech; but as regards the index and the proposal that wages should be brought into harmony with the index of national production, I maintain that this is exactly what the German capitalists are doing by bringing the index of wages into harmony with the level of production in their country, and that the English mineowners are doing nothing more nor less than adapting the index of wages to the level of their somewhat backward production. What does this mean? It means the workers sharing the losses of the employers, the reconstruction of production at the workers' expense.

A few words on the question of unity which was also touched upon by Mr Pugh. Pugh states that he is opposed to mechanical unity, but is in favour of a unity which represents the unity of mind and heart. As regards the mind, we should of course prefer a unity based on the unity of minds. The idea which should lie at the base of such unity, should be the idea of the necessity of revolutionary class war for the final emancipation of the working class. But for us it is not only ideas which are important, but unity of action of workers' unions in the fight against capital. We are in favour of an International which is prepared at any moment, if a fight breaks out between labour and capital on any section of the front, to mobilise millions and millions of workers and to call upon them to make sacrifices and to act in solidarity for the moral and material support of their fighting comrades.

We are in favour of an International of this kind and not for an International which, at the moment when a serious fight is taking place on a decisive sector of the world front, at the time of the general strike in England, meets together, is photographed and separates, which discusses for four months how the miners can be helped and what interest can be demanded for such help. We are opposed to an International of this kind, for with such an International, the workers fighting on the separate sections of the front are doomed to defeat.

The Amsterdam International is a sham international labour organisation; the workers have no real international labour organisation. The Amsterdam International which exists in the heart, in the centre of Europe and extends to the most important European countries, is a fiction, a deception; the Red International of Labour Unions on the other hand, is still weak in Europe. We are in favour of an International of deeds, for an International of solidarity in action.

We hope that the Congress will have a word to say on unity from the point of view of the vital interests of the working class. What has the English strike shown? It has shown that the offensive of capital is not only lowering in the distance, but that it exists in full activity, as an active attack of the capitalist class on the working class. The English strike represents a

real conflict between the two classes which draws tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands and millions of workers into the fight; and the attack of the capitalists will become more and more concentrated.

In a strike of this nature the existence of millions of workers is at stake. A strike of this kind demands solidarity and unity from the working class; a strike like this should be supported by the workers in all countries.

#### What has been Proved by the English Strike?

The English strike has proved the necessity of a more centralised movement of national and international dimensions, of a centralised movement on an international scale and of the necessity of organisations with fighting power. It has been the best illustration not only of the incapability of action, but also of the treacherous character of the Amsterdam International. As far as I know, as far as can be judged by the bulletins of the Amsterdam International, it is at last beginning to develop a campaign for the support of the English miners — whether at a rate of interest or not is still unknown. In the fifth month of the fight Amsterdam is beginning to stir. It apparently hopes that the strike is nearing its end, that it will soon suffer defeat. Where was Amsterdam during the first five months? I do not for a moment believe that the Amsterdam International is really thinking of help, as anyone who does not help in the first moment of the fight and who, at the decisive moment of the fight, chaffers about rates of interest, will not and is also incapable of helping the workers in their fight; he is much more concerned with directors jobs in the banks and with guiding the fight of the workers on to bank lines; he is much more anxious not to fan the anger of the bourgeois Press into flame.

#### The Anglo-Russian Committee Must Continue to Exist.

Is the alliance between the workers of the Soviet Union and the workers of England, which was called into being in the form of the Anglo-Russian Committee, to continue to exist? We consider that it is necessary, that the alliance has proved its viability. We have sometimes called a spade a spade instead of disguising it under a more pleasing name. We called treachery treachery and not "an unfortunate mistake", we called cowards cowards and not "persons lacking decision of character." Perhaps this is one of our faults; but the alliance between the proletariat of the two countries has shown that the workers of the Soviet Union can be relied upon to help in a fight and, if anyone is capable of fighting and fighting ruthlessly, it is the Russian worker.

We know that we may often need the help of the proletarians of Western Europe in the future, and we count with full confidence on their help (applause). We on our part, shall always reply to an appeal for help and rush to the aid of our class brothers wherever a fight may break out between labour and capital. (Applause).

Our whole history is a proof that the workers of the Soviet Union have always been the first to help their class brothers, wherever workers were threatened — whether it was a case of Japanese capitalists torturing Chinese workers in the modern textile factories by corporal punishment, or highly educated Conservatives or Liberals who throttled the English miners. We have proved the viability of this alliance; it would be a sad outlook if the alliance between the 8½ million workers of the trade unions of the Soviet Union and the British trade union movement which represents 5½ million workers were to depend on whether Tomsky quarreled with Purcell or anyone else. What are the leaders? They are persons commissioned and authorised by the working class, persons who enjoy their confidence; and if they prove incapable, the workers will chose other representatives. The working class has plenty of elements at its disposal to enable it to replace incapable leaders by new and better ones. Is it then admissible for a fraternal alliance between the workers of two countries to be dissolved merely because the leaders have offended one another? No, it would be nonsense. I am convinced that the English workers would not permit it any more than we would, and that, if the leaders do not understand this, they will find other leaders.

We are in favour of a fraternal alliance with the English workers. We are in favour of preserving the Anglo-Russian Committee and of making it more active. We will not attempt to conceal the fact that there are in our circles individual comrades who have said that, since the leaders of the General Council have betrayed the English strike — which is a true statement — we ought to break up the Anglo-Russian Committee, as we ought no longer to sit in the same organisation with the leaders of the General Council. Our alliance with the English workers should not, however, depend on the personality or the conduct of the leaders of the General Council.

No, it is no alliance of the leaders, but an alliance of the workers of the Soviet Union with the workers of Great Britain. The workers of the Soviet Union have proved this by their relief work for the English workers, and the English workers, more especially the English miners, have also given expression to their fraternal solidarity by sending out the fraternal delegation which is present in the hall. (Tempestuous applause.)

The workers of the Soviet Union and their trade unions are in favour of a close fraternal alliance with the British workers, in favour of maintaining the Anglo-Russian Committee as a personification of that alliance. We may have differences with the leaders, we may criticise one another, we grant everyone the right to criticise us and claim that right for ourselves; we make no secret of our dissensions; we extend the warmest welcome to the delegates of the English miners, but this does not mean that differences may not exist between us and the representatives of the miners; their political view of life is quite unknown to us, but the fact that delegates have been sent is in itself a pledge of the alliance between the workers of the Soviet Union and the English workers. We are in favour of the Anglo-Russian Committee being granted far more independence. We would wish that the Congress at Bournemouth would give expression to a desire for greater activity on the part of the Anglo-Russian Committee, not only in the question of negotiations between the Amsterdammers and the Russian trade unions and the Profintern, but also in the extremely important questions of the international trade union movement, in the questions of the danger of war and the offensive of capital, in the question of the harmonizing of all necessary action on all the battle-fronts of the working class. I believe that the workers of Great Britain have sufficiently grasped the importance and the necessity of the alliance with our workers; it represents a pledge of the unity of the international labour movement, a real fighting unity based on mutual help, on a common struggle, on mutual solidarity.

#### The Fraternal Alliance is no Empty Phrase.

I believe, comrades, that the English miners and the German women workers who are present in this hall will be convinced, quite independently of the political differences which may possibly exist between us, that for our workers, for the workers of the Soviet Union, to whatever nation they may belong, the cause of the fraternal alliance is no plaything, no empty phrase. The fraternal alliance is a proletarian fighting alliance, the fraternal alliance is — preparedness to make sacrifices, preparedness to fight, preparedness for mutual support. I am convinced that the delegates here present regardless of their political differences of opinion, will return to their own countries convinced that an alliance of this kind, if it embraced the workers of all countries, would guarantee a victory over the offensive of capital. They will return to their homes with the conviction that our workers will stand up for a unity of this kind; that our workers have not carried out a national revolution, that they regard their work as the beginning of the emancipation of the whole international proletariat, that the Russian workers are prepared for every sacrifice in order to bring about a real and complete emancipation of their class brothers, not in 300 years and not through ballot papers, but by active revolutionary class struggle. Of this we are convinced, for this we fight, for this we make sacrifices and we are always prepared to hasten to the succour of our class brothers wherever there is a fight between labour and capital. (Loud applause.)

## POLITICS

### “Pan-Europe” or the United States of Socialist Europe?

By A. Kurella (Moscow).

Anyone who has watched the Press of Western Europe in the last few months, may have observed that it has discussed more and more frequently the question that the European States could and ought to join in common action against the rival countries — America and Japan — which have developed since the great war. Views of this kind are to be found in all imaginable papers, from the “Secolo” to the “Vorwärts”. It would seem that it is really a case of a serious growth of endeavours towards European unity against America. This impression is intensified when we read the Republican Press of America, when we observe the long delay in negotiations concerning France's debt to America and — when we read some of the writings of Comrade Trotsky.

If we observe more closely, we find that the papers which are conducting this campaign very systematically are either those which give expression to the views of certain petty bourgeois circles or those which appeal to readers of that class. The Pan-Europe movement, started by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, recruits its adherents exclusively from the strata of the intelligentsia or from those capitalists to whom it seems important that the intellectual petty bourgeoisie should be neutralised.

This whole campaign for the establishment of the United States of Europe (united capitalist states, of course) which is said to be possible and necessary, has two sides: either the reflection of illusions as to the return of the good old times in the fight against America among the annuity holders and taxpayers who have been cheated of their foreign securities by inflation, or a systematic policy of the large bourgeoisie in the different countries of Europe to distract attention from the preparations for war which are actually taking place.

In reality, a union of the capitalist States of Europe is today less possible than ever. If the whole capitalist world consisted of nothing but debtors and creditors, if nothing linked the European States with one another and with the rest of the world but war and post-war debts, then indeed the formation of a “union of debtors” against the creditors or creditor (America) would be simple and feasible. But it is not for nothing that the European States were, before the war, the “smithy” of the world, it is not for nothing that they held the hegemony in world industry. To-day, it is true, that hegemony is destroyed. America and Japan have grown into rivals of equal rank. For many years the relations of the world market (the international credit system, shipping, international division of labour, world trade) have been quite paralysed and the European States to a large extent isolated. This lowest point of the crisis has however now been overcome. Capitalism as a world system is passing through an epoch of relative stabilisation. Just those relations of world industry have been, in a large measure, restored — although on a different basis. This restoration, however, is accompanied by the restoration of the deep-rooted contradictions which are intimately connected with the imperialist character of the States in question; indeed the contradictions between the European States are more intense than before the war.

An almost infinite series of events are evidence of this thesis: the obstinate dispute between England and France in the question of the Rhine and the Ruhr; the alternating struggle for the Balkan and Border States; the Tangiers question which has become a burning one and which was raised through the Abyssinia Agreement between England and Italy; the fight for predominance in the League of Nations and for the political course it should take; the new French policy of alliance — all these show that beneath the surface of the Pan-European drama unsurmountable contradictions between the European States face one another with an extreme degree of tension.

Is there then no bond of union between the European States?

It would be wrong to assert this; — an alliance between the capitalist States is possible for one definite purpose; it is not only possible indeed, but already developing; it is an alliance



for common action against the Soviet Union. In this respect common interests of the capitalist States exist in such strength that by contrast with them the contradictions within Europe may and do at times fall into the background. Just now we are in a period when the endeavours to encircle the Soviet Union are assuming particularly large proportions.

The Pan-Europe policy is intended to distract the attention of the masses and above all of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia from these preparations. Anyone who still fails to see that the chief tendency of European development to-day is the formation of an anti-Soviet and not of an anti-American block in Europe, is an accomplice in this camouflage manoeuvre!

The campaign of the bourgeoisie, the true character and aim of which we have depicted, has already been opposed by the **Communist International** at the 6th. Enlarged Plenum of its Executive with the slogan: "United States of Socialist Europe." The essence of the slogan is in the word "socialist", which expresses the following ideas:

1. The chief feature of the union of the European States must be an **alliance with the first Union of Socialist Republics in Eastern Europe**. This idea is diametrically opposed to the aims of the capitalist Governments.

2. The development which has again placed the old imperialist contradictions in Europe on the agenda in even greater intensity, has at the same time created the conditions which make it essential that they should unite in a socialist spirit. Further development of the productive forces in the leading countries of Europe is only possible on a socialist foundation, unless it is bought at the price of wholesale misery and thus made questionable in its very inception. This has been demonstrated as plainly as possible by the recent great class conflicts in Europe.

3. A further co-existence of the European States is only possible (unless there are to be fresh sanguinary conflicts) under the condition of real economic and political co-operation. This is only possible on a socialist basis, i. e. if it is begun in the form of an alliance and of systematic co-operation between the nationalised industries etc. of all European countries.

4. In view of the further restriction of the European agrarian basis, the further development of all the countries of Europe depends on the States of Western Europe entering into peaceful and systematic co-operation with a large agrarian country. Experience has shown that a division of labour between the capitalist industrial States of Western Europe and the Soviet Union with its export of agrarian products is not possible in a form which would exhaust all existing possibilities. Here also the preliminary condition for real co-operation is a conversion of the capitalist States to socialism.

This ambitious programme is involved in the slogan of the United States of **Socialist Europe**. In contrast to all the other programmes for a united Europe, this programme is at the same time a **peaceful one**.

The United States of capitalist Europe mean war; — war with the Soviet Union in the first place or, if the anti-American dreams of the petty bourgeoisie are fulfilled, war with America.

The United States of Socialist Europe are however a **slogan of peace**. Their object is to continue in the widest measure the peaceful work of socialist construction which has been begun in the U. S. S. R. and which would be carried through by Socialist Europe in agreement with the peoples of the imperialist colonies who would share in the work.

The petty bourgeois masses of Europe and with them millions of workers are under the illusion that a union of the European States would be a way of salvation from their difficult situation. The large bourgeoisie turns this point of view to account by pretending to support their endeavours, while it uses all this talk as a cover for preparing a murderous alliance of Europe against the U. S. S. R.

The Comintern addresses itself to the masses with the appeal: A union of European States — yes! But on a socialist basis and with peaceful socialist construction in common as its aim. Let anyone who strives towards this aim join in the work for the victory of socialism in his own country and for an alliance with the U. S. S. R.

## ECONOMICS

### The International Iron Cartel.

By Günther Reimann (Berlin).

The negotiations for the formation of a European Iron Cartel were concluded on the 30th September in Brussels. The international negotiations of the iron magnates formed in every respect a parallel to the negotiations of the League of Nations at Geneva.

It is extremely characteristic of the new activity of German capitalism and its desire for imperialist activity that at Geneva the representatives of German capitalism had to behave very modestly in order to be admitted, but that, on the other hand, at the international iron negotiations, it was the German iron magnates who made the first suggestions for the formation of an International Cartel, who were most active in promoting it and who finally have a considerable influence within the cartel.

This is due to the fact that the German iron magnates were already at the end of 1924 firmly united in national cartels and syndicates. The German iron industry, during the war and the inflation time experienced a relative over-development along with a narrowing of the market owing to the decreased consumption in the country and the strengthening of foreign industry. In order to avoid a competitive struggle which would reduce prices and profits, the German iron cartels and syndicates endeavoured to maintain inland prices at a high level by means of heavy tariff duties. But the German iron magnates felt very severely the French inflation competition in West Germany itself which reduced home prices, while at the same time they experienced the sharp competition abroad, so that prices on the world market fell considerably. The high profits gained by the profitable home market were, to a great extent, lost by the less profitable dumping abroad.

For these reasons the German iron industrialists, already in the past year, entered into negotiations with the French, in which however the Luxemburg and Belgian iron industrialists also took part, because without the latter the competitive struggle could not have been greatly reduced even in Germany and France.

The agreement which has been concluded dealt with two things:

1. A **Franco-German agreement** regarding the import of French steel into Germany permitted by the German industrialists. This French steel, however, is taken over and sold by the German syndicates, so that the absolute monopoly of the German iron magnates in Germany itself is preserved, while in addition to this they pocket high middlemen's profits by purchasing at world market prices and selling at the higher German inland prices. When this agreement will come into force depends, however, upon the conclusion of a Franco-German commercial treaty.

2. The real **International Cartel Agreement** for the purpose of limiting international production and keeping up prices.

A definite total amount of production shall be fixed for every quarter. This will correspond to the definite quota allotted to the industrialists in the various countries in the Cartel Treaty, who, again, must combine in national cartels for the purpose of a further division of the allotted production.

The Brussels agreement has laid down the following figures:

Germany . . . . .	43.18%	of the total production
France . . . . .	31.19%	" " " "
Belgium . . . . .	12.62%	" " " "
Luxemburg . . . . .	8.12%	" " " "
Saar district . . . . .	5.25%	" " " "

These figures were based on the production for the first quarter of 1926. For the German industrialists this basis is unfavourable, for in the Winter of 1925/26 the German iron and steel production was considerably restricted, while the French production reached very high figures owing to inflation. Thus the production on which the allotment was based allowed for a 95 to 100% exploitation of the capacity of the French and Belgian iron industry, but only a 75 to 80% exploitation of the German iron producing capacity. In order to arrive at an agreement the German iron industrialists consented to this arrangement.

In order to guarantee a strict carrying out of the limitation of production and increase of prices, a balancing fund is to be set up. For every ton produced within the quota a dollar must be paid into a common fund, and for every ton which goes beyond the quota the concern in question has to pay four dollars.

The conclusion of the agreement has been delayed owing to the resistance of the Belgian iron industrialists. This was not only owing of their not being satisfied with the quota already granted them. In this there is to be seen the influence of English finance capital upon Belgian industry, and the influence of the English iron industrialists who wish to prevent as far as possible a continental iron bloc which would be directed against them. It is characteristic that Vandervelde, the social-democratic Foreign Minister of Belgium, as the mediator between the iron industrialists, has tried to persuade the Belgian industrialists to include the English iron capitalists in the agreement even if it should not include the English.

It is very probable that the English industrialists will enter the cartel later on. For in the first place a sharp competitive struggle would involve very heavy losses for the English industrialists, the more so as they would find it very difficult to compete on the world market against American competition, and secondly, the entry of the English iron industrialists would guarantee that prices would be maintained in Europe itself. It is unthinkable that a state of affairs could last long in which the English iron industry would not be hit as an outsider by the limitations of the cartel, but would make use of the advantages of the cartel.

In connection with the German-Franco iron cartel, negotiations have taken place in Vienna between the iron industrialists of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Roumania. A provisional agreement has already been arrived at for the purpose of limiting production and exports. It is true the Polish iron industrialists did not take part in the recent negotiations, but it is expected that they will come in later. This International Iron Cartel will not compete with the Franco-German-Belgian cartel but will work with it. This is evident from the participation of the Austrian industry in which the Alpine Montan Gesellschaft plays the most prominent role. This concern is the property of the German Steel Trust, the most powerful German iron concern, the representative of which played a leading role at the Paris iron negotiations. Thus the German Steel Trust immediately took part in the negotiations at Paris and Vienna.

Not only the Belgian, but also the German iron industrialists advocate the entry of their English colleagues. This could mean a united front of almost all European iron capitalists which would be directed against the Soviet Union and also against American competition. Against the Soviet Union in order to exclude all competition in cases of orders from the Soviet Union and to extort usurious prices; in which connection there also exists the increased danger that new plans will be worked out in order, by means of imperialist attacks, to "secure" the Soviet Union as a market. Against America, in order to be able to oust American competition from the world market.

In Germany, France etc. the maintenance of high prices at home would lead to a further increase in the prices of manufactured goods at the cost of the masses of consumers, and in particular of the working class. At the same time the international co-operation of the iron magnates would be directed in the first place against the working class, as the former would endeavour to reduce wages and to lengthen the working day on an international scale. In the event of a defensive strike of the workers in one country the iron concerns would be able to render each other mutual support.

If the Social Democrats are in favour of the international iron cartel and only demand a harmless State control on the part of the government which is under the influence of the heavy industrialists, it is not only because they wish to create fresh illusions regarding the possibility of overcoming the crisis by capitalism, but they also expect that the cartel will result in gigantic profits for the iron industrialists and in relatively permanent employment for a section — even if it be a limited section — of the workers, and whereby the iron industrialists would eventually be in a position to pay slightly higher wages to a new labour aristocracy. On the other hand, there is the fact that the iron industrialists will likewise make use of mass unemployment in order to depress wages and worsen working conditions, and that by the policy of the international iron profiteers' cartel the class antagonisms, along with increased imperialist dangers, will grow again.

## The Unemployment Crisis in Denmark.

By E. Christiansen (Copenhagen).

In the summer which is now coming to an end, unemployment in Denmark has assumed unusual dimensions. In July and August — in the best season of the year for work — unemployment amounted to 17.4% and 17% respectively, a higher figure than has ever been recorded in those months. Even 1921, the year of crisis did not show such high figures. About one out of every six Danish workers — about 50,000 out of 300,000 — was out of work in the summer months of 1926, and that after a winter of unemployment.

The crisis set in as early as the late autumn of the previous year, and last winter the number of unemployed rose to almost 100,000. The Government anticipates that in the coming winter the number of unemployed will rise to 82,000. All the figures quoted here are official figures. In reality, however, unemployment is still higher, as not all the unemployed are registered.

This crisis is partly connected with the general economic crisis within capitalism, but partly it is the result of the policy adopted by the Social Democratic Government with regard to currency. In April 1924, the Government of the large agrarians which had up to that time been at the helm, found itself in the minority through the elections for the People's Chamber (2nd Chamber). Thereupon Social Democracy formed a government with Stauning as Prime Minister and Borgbjerg as Minister for Social Affairs. The Government majority was composed of 55 Social Democrats and 20 Left Radicals, there being 149 members of the People's Chamber.

The question of currency was in the foreground. The Danish crown was at that time worth about 60 gold oere. Social Democracy had carried on its election campaign with the slogan that the crown was to be stabilised by a tax on capital. The costs were to be paid by the rich; for, as the Social Democrats alleged, the crown had only fallen as the result of speculation.

In spite of this however, Social Democracy in common with the bourgeois parties had buried the Bill for a tax on capital. Thereupon the Government issued a regulation regarding currency which, by means of a general income tax and by new indirect taxes, for instance on oil, caused the crown to rise. This currency regulation was of such a nature that it offered great possibilities of speculation on the Exchange on an upward tendency of the market. And indeed, Danish and foreign capital — i. e. American — then embarked on enormous speculation and made large sums. At the same time the crown was in this way quickly brought to par, which meant a great increase of wealth for those members of the capitalist class who owned bonds and similar claims in crowns. It was acknowledged on all sides, even by the Social Democrats, that in this way large sums were played into the hands of the capitalist class.

The rise of the crown, however, caused crises in several industries so that unemployment has increased greatly since last autumn.

The Social Democratic Government did not undertake any effectual measures to prevent the growth of unemployment. Even then it omitted to fulfill its promise of a new law concerning unemployment which it had made before the election of 1924. It did not even introduce a bill, although it had had a great following from the ranks of the working class, owing to their indignation at the bad legislation of the agrarian Government.

The existing law concerning unemployment indeed, which was far from satisfactory, was not even applied to its full extent by the Government. This law provided that the unemployed should receive a special allowance for a few weeks after the lapse of the normal benefit.

In the last few months a strong communist agitation has set in with regard to the question of unemployment. Furthermore a demand for complete support of the unemployed was made not only at several trade union congresses but also at the plenary session of the trade union executives in Copenhagen. Under this strong pressure and with the fear lest the trade unions should approach the municipalities with their threats if the benefits were not increased, Borgbjerg, the Minister for Social Welfare, at last decided to let the unemployed have that to which they were entitled. A short time previously he had declared

that he could not do so lest the Government should lose its parliamentary majority.

This is however not the only cause for the Government crisis which has set in. It is also to be explained by the whole vacillating policy of the Government which on the one hand strengthens the bourgeoisie and on the other hand causes resentment among large numbers of the working class.

In working class circles, including even those organised in trade unions, the inclination to support the Government is on the decline. The Communist Party and the Left groups in the trade unions are, of course, not satisfied to have forced the Government to do its duty in so small a field. They are raising much wider claims both as regards work and as regards support for the unemployed. They are agitating for a fight against unemployment being used as a means for reducing wages, as the capitalists have succeeded in doing in the course of the year. The employers have, as a matter of fact, succeeded in reducing wages by 17% this year on the basis of the Reformist trade union policy.

The present situation is for the Danish working class a good object lesson on the blessings of the parliamentary methods of Social Democracy. The Social Democratic Government has, in the course of two years, greatly enriched and thus strengthened the capitalists, whereas the situation of the workers has been rendered much worse owing to the serious unemployment and reduced wages.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Hamburg Dockworkers' Strike.

By Paul Merker (Hamburg).

The strike of 18,000 Hamburg dock-workers is of extraordinary importance in two respects. It broke out precisely at the moment when the English miners, in spite of 5 months of struggle and in spite of the sharpest attacks of the English bourgeoisie, have again decided to hold out. It is at the same time a blow against the German bourgeoisie, who, supported by the treacherous passivity of the reformist trade union leaders, were able to hasten to the aid of the English exploiters by sending huge supplies of blackleg coal and thereby made enormous profits. There is no doubt that the dockworkers strike will strengthen and consolidate the front of the English miners.

The fight, which has been taken up for higher wages and against longer working hours, is however the first mass movement against the capitalist rationalisation in Germany. The dock-workers are the first to rebel against the State arbitration system, with the help of which the employers, with the benevolent toleration of the trade union leaders, have for long strangled the movements of the workers in all industries, including in recent times the miners in the Ruhr and in Upper Silesia and the metal workers. The government, employers and reformist trade union leaders stand in one front against the strikers. They recognise the great importance of the struggle for the whole working class of Germany.

The dock-workers demanded the abolition of the double shift, the restoration of the eight hour working time, holidays for the casual dock-workers, and 20% additional pay for the second and 30% for the third shift. The bosses replied to these demands with the threat of a 10% wage reduction. As a result of the attitude of the employers the negotiations failed. Thereupon there took place on the 5th of September a national Conference of the dock-workers and also a conference of the dock-workers' delegates from the North Sea ports in order to consider the situation.

The delegates to the National Conference demanded from the Transport Workers' Union the setting up a minimum demand of a 30% increase in wages, the commencement of an intensive mobilisation work among the dock-workers, and the formation of a common fighting front along with the miners who are likewise engaged in a wage dispute.

The delegates of the dock-workers in the North Sea ports, on the other hand, decided to terminate the wages agreement in all North Sea ports and to put in a demand for a 20%

increase in wages in addition to the demands already put forward within the terms of the tariff.

A mass meeting which was held on the 24th September rejected the award of the arbitrators (which did not grant any increase in basic wages and attempted by roundabout means to abolish even the formal eight hour day) and decided to submit the question to a ballot vote. The ballot vote resulted in a majority of four fifths for the rejection of the arbitration award. Many of the engineers and firemen who belong to the engineers and firemen union also took part in the vote. The decision meant the commencement of the struggle on October 1st, the day of the expiration of the tariff.

The Ministry for Labour now intervened and attempted by a representative to bring about an agreement in the negotiations on 29th September. On the same day a Conference of trade union functionaries unanimously rejected the award without discussion. The representative of the Ministry for Labour demanded the decision of both parties by 10 o'clock, in order to be able in the course of the next day, to obtain the decision of the Minister for Labour, Braun. This meant nothing else than, in the event of the rejection of the arbitration award by the workers, that the Minister for Labour would immediately declare this award to be binding.

On the 30th September the functionaries of the dock-workers' Union again met together in order to decide on further measures. During this meeting thousands of dock-workers assembled before the trade union premises in Hamburg and gave clear expression to their fighting will. The conference of functionaries again unanimously decided for the strike on October 1st, and elected a strike committee consisting of ten social-democratic and six communist members of the German Transport Federation, which was supplemented by a representative of the unemployed.

Already in the early morning hours of the 1st of October the call to strike was followed by over 90% of the staffs. At mass meetings convened by the German Transport Federation the dock-workers considered the strike. When it became known that the Minister for Labour had declared the arbitration award binding, an eager discussion arose which the leaders of the Union in vain endeavoured to stop. As all the speakers in the discussion demanded a clear statement by the leaders of the Union whether, in spite of the declaration of the Minister for Labour they intended to carry on the fight, the leaders fled from the meeting headed by the reformist leader Hildebrand. The strike committee continued the meeting and all the decisions necessary for the struggle were unanimously adopted. Even after their flight from the workers the reformist clique of leaders endeavoured by every means to prevent the dock-workers from entering on the struggle. They distributed a leaflet which stated:

"As a result of the declaration making the award of the arbitrators binding, the organisation is deprived of every possibility of carrying out the decision for a strike arrived at by a ballot vote."

In spite of the sabotage of the reformist leaders, the fight is being carried on unitedly. Communist and social-democratic workers are standing firmly together. The workers in the other dockyard towns are also calling for a strike. The working class is permeated with the feeling that, under these circumstances, it is necessary to support the strikers who have been left in the lurch by the leaders of their trade union organisation, to link up the struggle with the movement of the transport workers and other categories of workers and to make it the cause of the entire proletariat of Germany.

### The Swedish Trade Union Congress.

By Smolan (Göteborg).

The Congress of the Swedish Trade Union Federation took place in Stockholm at the beginning of September. At this Congress the Social Democratic trade union bureaucrats were in the minority several times; they succeeded however by the skin of their teeth in scraping together a majority in the decisive questions. In consequence, the questions of the organisation of industry, of national and international trade union unity and of unemployment remained unsolved.

Although the last congress in 1922 had resolved that the craft or occupational unions belonging to the federation should be reorganised into industrial unions before the close of 1925, the Executive of the Federation had "investigated" and "dealt with" this question for two years, only to come to the conclusion that the number of trade unions should be reduced from 34 to — 33, that two of the smaller unions were to be dissolved and incorporated in other so-called "industrial unions", but that, taken on the whole, everything was to remain in status quo, as the time was not yet "ripe" for thorough-going reorganisation. The majority of the congress took the same attitude as the Executive of the Federation and resolved that any unions which should refuse to comply with the "plan of reorganisation", should in no way be forced to observe discipline, or be excluded. Thus, according to this resolution, every union can do as it likes.

The Swedish Trade Union Federation is only organised for defence; thus it only pays out allowances in cases of large lock-outs and not in case of strikes. Many of the local unions therefore moved that the Federation should be altered and reorganised into a real fighting organisation. A heated debate arose on this question, in which not only the Communists but numbers of Social Democrats, among them leading personalities, spoke in favour of the suggested reconstruction. In spite of violent opposition on the part of the leaders of the Federation, a resolution to this effect was passed by 131 votes against 127; the chairman however, a former adherent of the renegade Höglund, was clever enough to arrange the matter in such a way that the working out of the plan of reorganisation was entrusted to the Executive of the Federation. The resolution is at any rate evidence of the deep process of fermentation within the Labour movement of Sweden which is under the control of the Reformists. The question of the unemployed was only dealt with briefly and superficially, the debate on the subject being throttled by the Social Democratic bureaucrats. A deputation of the unemployed of Stockholm was received and heard by the Congress, although the chairman of the Federation had spoken against this. This deputation proposed that a compulsory unemployment insurance be carried through, the municipality and employers alone being responsible for the contributions. The majority supported the Federation Executive who consider the Ghent system ideal. Apart from this, 100,000 crowns were granted on the suggestion of the Communists, to be distributed amongst the unemployed by the trades councils. The Social Democrats had only suggested 50,000.

With these exceptions, the Congress adhered to the old regulations, which can only be regarded as practically an emergency law against the unemployed. The unions affiliated to the Federation are under the obligation of contributing full affiliation fees to the Federation for their unemployed members; this circumstance results in every union trying to get rid of the unemployed as far as possible and having no interest in organising the unemployed in their own domain. From the point of view of the Reformist leaders who regard the organisation exclusively as a form of insurance, the unemployed who represent no money are of no value. For the individual unions which are entirely self-dependent, these exactions are a serious burden. Thus the union of raftsmen and lumbermen has to hand over 25% of its income to the Federation as contributions for the unemployed. Conditions were still worse for the union of saw-mill workers which, while 52% of its members were out of work last winter, had to contribute to the usual amount. These regulations were passed in pre-war times when there was no permanent unemployment, and now the Social Democrats are much too conservative to revoke a resolution once passed.

The Reformists lightly touched upon the question of international unity. They expressed their confidence in the international leadership and pronounced themselves in favour of maintaining the resolutions passed at the Congress of the Amsterdam International at Vienna. Submission and unconditional affiliation to the Federation is demanded of the independent unions and of the Syndicalists. This resolution was passed with a majority of 155 votes. While 97 delegates voted for the communist motion which demanded reciprocal negotiations with a view to an amalgamation with the Syndicalists. The latter — whose leaders long ago arrived at the point of view of Reformism — number about 35,000 members, whereas the Trade Union Federation numbers not quite 400,000. As things are at present, it would be quite possible to come to an understanding if only the leaders of the Trade Union Federation would not take up an attitude of victors, and if they were prepared to parley instead of demanding submission.

Up to the present the trade union bigwigs have always tried to preserve an appearance of political neutrality, although more than 150,000 workers organised in trade unions are collectively affiliated to the Social Democratic party through the trade unions. The majority of the Congress abandoned this pose by resolving to make a present of 25,000 crowns to a Social Democratic newspaper in North Sweden so that it might "preserve the interests of the Federation" and might continue to exist at all. This paper was founded as a rival organ to the much older "Norrskensflamman", which is now in the hands of the communists, but it cannot get a hold among the revolutionary workers of North Sweden. The trade unions decline to regard it as their organ, as they consider that its work is directly injurious to the trade unions. Thus, for instance, as the result of its action, about 30 social democratic workers caused a split in a large local group of the miners' union and formed a syndicalist organisation, because the overwhelming majority of the local group had granted a loan without interest to the "Norrskensflamman" which has a large circulation in that province. This sort of thing has been going on for 30 years in South and Central Sweden where the Reformists are in the majority; nevertheless action of the kind is regarded as "communist terror" both by the bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats when it takes place in North Sweden for the benefit of a communist paper. The Trade Union Federation has now openly taken its stand on the side of the Social Democrats; but the resolution to give 25,000 crowns to those who had caused the split in Norrbotten was passed by 131 against 105 votes which is evidence of how strong was the opposition in various questions.

The Social Democrats only had about 100 reliable adherents from the workshops, and but for the bureaucrats employed by the trade unions, they would inevitably have been in the minority. It is a remarkable fact that the majority in this strong opposition consisted of Social Democratic and non-party workers, as there were only 32 organised communists present at the Congress. Thus the victory of the Reformists was by no means imposing and it is not out of the question that it will be the last congress to sail under social democratic colours.

## The Most Recent Development of the Trade Union Movement in Japan.

By Unzo Taguchi.

At the end of 1925 the number of trade unions in Japan amounted to 209 with 240,400 members. Of these, 94% had been organised during the period of the rapid growth of Japanese capitalism since 1918, of these again 58% in the last two years 1924 and 1925.

The whole working population of Japan amounts to 9,880,000, of whom the workers in industrial occupations, mines, transport etc., who might be organised in trade unions, are estimated at 4,348,000. This shows that only 5.5% of those who might be organised in trade unions in Japan, are actually organised. The percentage of the working population amounts to rather more than 18% of the whole population of Japan, the percentage of workers who could be organised, to about 7% of the whole population.

The rapid growth of trade union organisation in the last few years, has brought with it various defects.

The first defect which must be mentioned, is that the organisation of the trade unions has up to now proceeded by chance and **without any clearly outlined programme**. This has resulted among other things, in the relations between the leading elements of the labour movement and the rank and file being too loose. The whole movement therefore lacks organic unity, and the organised minority finds itself in opposition to an unorganised majority of the working class in Japan.

The second defect is a consequence of the **decentralised condition of the labour organisations**. The existing 209 trade unions with roughly 250,000 members are distributed among 18 federated groups and 108 individual trade unions. Thus the average number of members of the individual trade union does not amount to more than 800. Furthermore these trade unions are associated in various federations, which are at logger-heads.

The most prominent of these federations are **Nippon Roda Kumiai Hyogikai** (Trade Union Council of Japan) and **Nippon Roda Sodomai** (General Workers' Union of Japan), both of which take a leading part among the trade unions and are of course in consequence permanently in a state of competition.

The third defect is the **insufficient fighting power of the trade unions**, 76% of all the Japanese workers organised in trade unions belong to two branches of occupation, i. e. **transport and the metal industry**. The organised workers in transport, most of whom are seamen, amount to 41% of the category of workers in question, in the metal industry to 28%, in the printing trade to 21% and in the other occupations less than 10%.

Special emphasis should be laid on the fact that the number of those organised in the spinning-mills, on the railways, in the electrical industry, in mining and other important branches of industry only amounts to 1-3%.

The fourth defect is that the workers employed in **large works** are still only organised to a comparatively small extent, and most of those who are organised, belong to the small or medium works. The number of industrial concerns with more than 100 workers amounts to 2,359 with 1,055,000 workers altogether, which represents about 60% of the whole of the industrial workers of Japan. Among these works 490 employ more than 500 workers each; they employ altogether 865,000 workers, which represents about 38,7% of the whole of the industrial workers.

The number of organised **peasants** amounts to about 306,000 i. e. about 8,6% of the 3,803,341 families of tenant farmers in the country. If we assume that 40% of the whole peasant population might be organised, the number of those actually organised, amounts to about 21%.

Amongst the **peasant organisations** the most prominent is **Nippon Nomin Kumiai** (Peasant Union of Japan), consisting of 961 local peasant unions with a total of 73,000 members. This large organisation has only existed for five years. The other peasant unions have, it is true, altogether about 220,000 members, but they are much dispersed and weak. **Chubu Nomin Kumiai** (Central Federation of Peasant Unions), **Kita Nippon Nomin Kumiai** (Federation of Peasant Unions of North Japan), **Nippon Nomin Kumiai Rengor** (League of Peasant Unions of Japan) are the three largest federations, but apart from them there are about 3000 individual local unions.

**Nippon Nomin Kumiai** made, in concrete form, the proposal to form a political party of the proletariat and has contributed more than anyone else, both materially and morally, to the foundation of **Rodo Nomin To** (Worker and Peasant Party), the first political party of the proletariat, which, having come into being after great sacrifices, was dissolved by the Government last year on the very first day of its existence. The foundation of **Rodo Nomin To** in March 1926 was rendered possible by the great sacrifices made by this peasant organisation, which undertook the preparatory work of organisation on the very day after the suppression of the first political party of the Japanese proletariat.

The first attempt to organise **office employees** was made last year, first of all in **Osaka** and **Kobe**, later in **Kioto** and **Tokio**. These local organisations were subsequently federated on a national scale in **Nippon Hoku Seikatsasha Remmai** (National League of Employees in Japan). About 10,000 employees are organised in trade unions altogether.

A special form of organisation in Japan is the **Suiheisha Musansha Domei** (League of Suiheisha Proletarians), composed of members of a pariah class, with the object of liberating them from their oppressed social position which dates from the prejudices of feudal times. The word Suihei itself means equality of position. The League has more than 50,000 members. Thanks to its special position, this organisation has the greatest fighting power in the social struggle against the bourgeoisie and its influence extends to more than one million persons in the whole country.

The proletarian movement has naturally, in the course of its development, divided into two definite and distinct tendencies of which one aims at **Marxism** and the other leans towards **opportunism**. It is however a strange and at the same time interesting phenomenon that the split took place in Japan just at the most reactionary period.

The tendency to divide showed itself already very plainly by the end of 1922, but the real split in the movement did not occur till February 1925, when the powerful federation **Nippon Rodo Sodomai** excluded the Left elements from its ranks, thus calling into being the federation **Rodo Kumiai Hyogikai**. Thus, in addition to the few syndicalist groups which are still found in the ranks of the Japanese workers, two clearly distinguished camps have arisen in the Japanese labour movement.

Since the division, the two trade union federations, **Hyogikai** (Marxist) and **Sodomai** (Opportunist) have developed as regards their number of members, as follows:

	1924	1925	1926
Hyogikai . . . . .	9,000	18,700	34,000
Sodomai . . . . .	19,000	23,000	43,000

Thus the federation **Hyogikai** has increased three-and-a-half times since the split, the federation **Sodomai** two-and-a-half times, whilst the other 18 federations and the numerous local trade unions have only increased to an inconsiderable extent in the same period. This gives us evidence of the increasing influence of the two said federations within the trade union movement.

The two federations, however, are in violent opposition and at times of strikes even serious conflicts occur, as for instance recently in the strike of the **Kawasaki cotton factory**, during which the two groups encountered one another in the midst of violent strike fighting.

The Government deliberately and systematically promotes the division in the united front of the workers and is now trying, in co-operation with the Opportunist labour leaders, to destroy the organisation of the Left trade unions.

The negative attitude taken by the **Sodomai** with regard to the question of the organisation of a proletarian party, led to the dissolution of the first proletarian party in December 1925. And when attempts were again made to create a political party of the proletariat, to found a worker and peasant party, the **Sodomai** announced its intention at the last moment of withdrawing from the party, should the **Hyogikai** join the same organisation.

In these circumstances the **Hyogikai** and the other revolutionary proletarian elements of the labour movement were compelled to refrain from joining the new political party in order to allow of the undisturbed and complete development of a united proletarian political organisation. The existence of which is of the utmost importance for the whole proletarian movement in Japan in its present position. When however the **Worker and Peasant Party**, which owes its existence in a great degree to the stimulation of the peasant federation **Nippon Nomin Kumiai**, stated in a resolution in March 1926 that it would open its doors to the proletarian masses without distinction of trade union membership, the **Sodomai** again begun its sabotage by repeatedly expressing its intention to secede from the party, since the resolution was too Left in its tenor.

Thanks to the efforts of the Marxist labour leaders, a movement has recently set in for the amalgamation of the local "labour councils" (trade union councils) which already exist in various industrial districts of the country, such as **Tokio**, **Osaka**, **Kobe**, **Kioto** etc. In June 1926 a conference was held in **Osaka**, summoned by the Trade Union Cartel of Osaka, in which delegates of various trades councils took part and the object of which was to create a **national trade union council** which would embrace the whole proletarian peasant and worker population. As was to be expected, the delegates of the Opportunist **Sodomai** obstinately opposed the formation of an organisation of the kind, declaring that the time was not yet ripe and that they could not take the responsibility in common with the **Hyogikai**. The result of this opposition of one of the largest labour federations was the complete failure of the conference which was postponed without having achieved any concrete result.

The **Rodo Kumiai Hyogikai** cannot yet boast of a large membership and is only supported from without by a few influential trade unions; it is nevertheless a leading element in almost all the district trade union councils throughout the country. In spite of all obstacles it is working indefatigably at the creation of a united front of the workers and a united proletarian party.



## THE BALKANS

### The Stefanov Trial and National Slavery in Roumania.

The wild hate of the Roumanian oligarchy against Boris Stefanov, as the class champion and leader of the enslaved peasantry of all parts of Roumania, assumes the sharpest form, and this because Stefanov belongs to one of the national minorities.

The bad conscience of the oligarchy on account of all the shameful deeds committed against the various national minorities in Roumania, drives it to persecute, to imprison and, as far as possible, to exterminate all champions of the liberties and rights of the classes and nations.

A plain example of the suppression of the national minorities of Roumania is the national enslavement of the Ukrainians in Bukovina and Bessarabia. "Borotba" ("Struggle"), the Ukrainian organ of the social democracy of Roumania which appears in Cernauti (Czernovitz) describes this suppression as follows:

"The Secretary of State for the Interior, Buscan, has today issued a decree forbidding the introduction into Roumania of Ukrainian books, music, and pictures — in one word all Ukrainian printed matter.

The government has placed the Ukrainian people in Roumania outside the domain of civil rights, of cultural activity and humanity."

The same fight has for long been carried on against the Bulgarian, Magyar, German, Russian and Jewish population of Roumania.

In Dobruja, the home of Boris Stefanov, under a special law regarding the "control of titles to property", nearly 60% of all the Bulgarian peasants were driven from house and home and Macedonian-Roumanians settled in their place.

Under the pretext of the inhabitants having taken part in banditry, entire Bulgarian villages are burnt to the ground and their population slaughtered. The recent conflict with Bulgaria has been made use of in the first place in order to introduce an even more severe regime in Dobruja.

As the "Monitorul Oficial" reports, General Vladescu, the Commander of the Constanza division, has been appointed military commander of Dobruja, whereby the entire military and civil administration has been placed in his hands. At the same time the nationalist press of Roumania is carrying on an increased campaign for the Roumanising of Dobruja.

Thus the "Lupta", the organ of the National Party, states:

"Dobruja lacks in the first place the iron hand of a higher will, which could bring the administrative interests of this province under a central control... Kadriator (a part of Dobruja) needs at least for a decade a military governor with administrative powers..."

To what extent the Averescu government wishes to introduce a regime of the "Black Hundreds" against all national minorities is shown by an election Manifesto of the government Party during the last election in the district of Roman (Moldavia). This manifesto states:

"And now Averescu has been placed at the head of the State in order to fight against the most dangerous enemies within the country.

Who are these enemies? In the first place the Jews. What have they done? They have enriched themselves at the expense of the poor Roumanians; they have robbed and spied and stolen the wealth of the country. Now they wish to rob us the faith of our fathers. Rally round the great Roumanian and Christian, General Averescu!"

This manifesto provides the best means of judging the nationality policy of the Roumanian oligarchy. It also shows into what a state of barbarism the same government has fallen which places Stefanov in the dock because he fights against this insane policy.

## UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

### The Next Step in the Industrialisation of the Soviet Union,

By W. Milyutin, Moscow.

We can now form a judgement concerning the extent and the rate of further development of industrialisation in the approaching economic year. In this regard, the control figures of the State Planning Commission are of great interest. On the one hand, they permit us to survey the experience of last year and to judge whether and in what degree our estimates of last year concerning the extent and the rate of industrialisation were correct. On the other hand, they afford us a computation for the next economic year, the first year in which our economy in its totality shows an increase of production as compared with the pre-war level, and in which the reorganisation of our technical basis gains predominant significance.

These computations are, however, not final ones and call for critical remarks on many points. It suffices to refer to the resolution of the Council of People's Commissaries and of the Council for Labour and Defense of September 8th, which contains, besides other suggestions, instructions to the State Planning Commission, calculated to further augment the allotments for capital investments and for the promotion of productive capacity. Nevertheless, on the basis of control figures to hand, we can arrive at a number of conclusions respecting the present and also the coming period.

Industrialisation consists, in the general sense of this word, in the modification of the technical basis and of the working organisation in the whole of the national economy, through the transition to big machine production both in industry and in agriculture. Under the conditions obtaining in the Soviet Union, industrialisation in the immediate future will find expression particularly in the augmentation of the specific gravity of industry in our national economy (overcoming of the mal-proportion) and in the technical development of industry: in renovation of plant and in the construction of new works and factories.

The concrete data prove that in this sense industrialisation has achieved indubitable successes. According to the reports of the State Planning Commission, the accretion of the quantities of agricultural and industrial products placed on the market appears in percentages as follows (1923/24 equalling 100%):

	1924/25	1925/26	1926/27
Agricultural production (Excepting State and co-operative society production) . . . . .	117.2	139.8	150.9
Production of Census Industry*) . . . . .	173.3	236.1	270.3

It will be observed that the increase in the quantities of industrial products reaching the market is much more rapid than that of the quantities of agricultural products brought to market. The percentages in regard to the total quantities of products reaching the market have varied as follows:

	1923/24	1924/25	1925/26	1926/27
Agricultural products . . . . .	54.7	45.0	41.7	40.3
Industrial products . . . . .	45.3	55.0	58.3	59.7

These figures show how misleading and inaccurate are the statement of those who depreciate by every means at their disposal the industrialisation process which is being carried out in our country. It must, of course, be remarked that in the approaching economic year the effective demand of the peasantry will greatly increase in relation to last year, and will be of proportion to the quantities of goods which we shall have

\*) Factories with at least 16 workers in the case of machine work and 30 workers in the case of hand work. Ed.



ready to offer. In the execution of our policy on the home market we shall have to take this circumstance into serious consideration.

Other reports of interest are those which also give the rate of augmentation in the number of those employed on the one hand, in industry, transport, trade and building, and, on the other hand, in agriculture. If we take 100 as the figure for the year 1913, the total of workers engaged in agriculture during the year 1923/24 is 102.3, and in the coming year 1926/27 it will reach 110.3, making an advance on the year 1923/24 representing 8%. The total number engaged in industry, transport, commerce and building figured at 60.9%, as compared with 1913, and in the economic year 1926/27 will reach 83.3%, making an increase of 22.4%, which means a greater rate of progress than in agriculture; however, the absolute number of people employed in this province still remains under the pre-war level. This is the state of things in relation to the advance in the specific gravity of industry.

And how is the technical reorganisation proceeding in our country? Our expenditure last year totalled 750 to 780 million roubles. It should be remarked that the execution of the improvement of plant called for a considerable financial and technical effort, but, at the same time, last year's experience has proved completely the exactitude of the calculations; and despite the immense expenditure on plant-improvement work, which, as we see, reached practically 800 million roubles, on the whole, we completed our economic year without stoppages or delays.

For the coming year, the State Planning Commission propose plant-improvement work to cost 845 million roubles, and according to the calculations of the Supreme Economic Council an expenditure of 910 millions will be necessary. These figures are arrived at by means of an analysis and an exact computation of the materials on hand and, above all, of the importation possibilities. But, in spite of this, several factors have to be decided upon and given thorough consideration when this or that variant is assumed.

In our opinion, the experience gained in the economic year 1925/26 teach us the necessity of leaving to the Presidium of the Supreme Economic Council a reserve of 25 to 30 million roubles to permit the Presidium to manoeuvre more freely in executing the campaign of plant-improvement work. In the second place, special attention must be devoted to the necessity of the normal course of the new constructive work. The new construction work in our country is still of very modest compass, but the reorganisation of our technical capacity will find proper expression chiefly in fresh construction.

There can be no doubt that the specific gravity of the means spent on fresh construction must **grow from year to year** within the total sum of the expenditure on plant improvement. In this case alone shall we bring new life into our technical departments.

In this matter a highly important question is involved, viz., the quality of our industry and work. Unfortunately, we find in the book issued by the State Planning Commission no analysis of the quality of our industrialisation, although this is a question of vital moment. The sums spent by us on plant improvement, and, more especially, on fresh plant, must decide for a number of years to come the **character** of the development of our productive powers. It is not only the measure of our technical capacity that we are changing, it is also its quality, whereby we shall make use of the latest achievements of international science. The problem of electrification and the practical realisation of electrification which was brought forward by Comrade Lenin, is of immense significance from this point of view. The analysis of the quality of our plant-improvement work in all branches of our economy must, therefore, be executed with especially strict attention.

In the approaching economic year we shall take a very momentous step towards industrialisation in carrying out the instructions decided upon at our last Congress.

## How and by whom Wages are Fixed in the Soviet Union.

By G. Melnitschansky, Moscow.

In the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics a sharp distinction is made between the functions of managing industry and the functions of organising and defending the interests of the workers and employees in industry.

The former function is in the hands of the National Economic Authorities of the Trust and Industry Managements and the latter function in the hands of the workers' organisations and the trade unions.

As, therefore, two bodies exist, both of them concerned with questions of wages and conditions of labour, all questions of this kind are settled by mutual agreement. These agreements usually take the form of collective contracts of definite duration — six months or a year — and are sanctioned by law.

The existing necessity for agreement between these two parties on any and every question, leads to the possibility of differences of opinion whereby occasionally an agreement cannot be arrived at.

For the solution of such difficulties, there exists in this country the institute of the "Arbitration Chamber" and "Arbitration Court", which is subjoined to the courts of the People's Commissariat for Labour.

In case of differences of opinion between a trade-union and an economic organ, the two parties pass the matter in dispute over to the Arbitration Chamber, the task of which body is to try to bring the two parties to an amicable settlement. The Arbitration Chamber cannot pass binding judgements.

When the Arbitration Chamber, too, fails to move the two parties to an agreement and the question is still unsettled, a Court of Arbitration is convoked. The court of arbitration consists of an equal number of persons chosen by each of the two parties and a chairman or chief arbitrator elected by these persons.

According to the law of our country, the judgement of a court of arbitration is final and is binding upon both parties. Our legislation also provides for other cases which occasionally occur, when the two parties cannot come to agreement concerning the candidature for chairmanship or post of chief arbitrator. In this case, on application from one of the two parties, the People's Commissariat for Labour, or its provincial organ, is obliged to intervene in the conflict and itself elect a chairman to act as chief arbitrator. Experience has shown that the disputing parties usually endeavour to pass the individual cases direct over to the courts of arbitration in order to avoid approaching the Settlement Chambers, with which some delay might be entailed.

This system is in use throughout industry in general as well as in individual branches of production for fixing general rates of wages as well as conditions of labour.

Within industry itself there is, however, a special commission made up of equal numbers of representatives of industrial managements and of the trade unions (factory councils), namely, the "Standardisation and Conflict Commission", which supervises the carrying out of the collective agreements and decides upon the individual questions of wages and conditions of labour arising out of the application of the collective contracts. It deals with the disputes in connection with the establishing of standards, the regulation of qualifications, delay in the payment of wages, etc. Decision is given on the basis of mutual agreement and the issue is valid, provided it does not conflict with the code of law regarding Labour.

Great significance is attached by us to the negotiations of the trade unions with the representatives of the economic organs in relation to the conclusion of collective agreement, as well as to the collective agreement itself.

In accordance with our working regulations, the executive of the trade union has to prepare, long before the commencement of the negotiations with the economic organs, the draft of the collective agreement, or, in case an agreement already exists,

the draft of the new proposals as well as the modifications which are to be laid before the economic organs.

This draft is sent to the factory councils, who must discuss the fresh proposals and then pass the draft over for discussion by the delegates' meeting and also by the general meeting of the workers in the factory or industry. The factory council, the delegates' meeting and the general meeting of the workers concerned all have the right to reject the draft after they have discussed it, to change any particular point in it and to add new points or otherwise supplement it, etc.

All such supplements and fresh proposals are recorded in a protocol, which is passed to the executive of the trade union. If supplements and fresh proposals are received from all the factories interested, the executive of the trade union co-ordinates the whole of the material and presents it to a special conference of all the industrial councils of the factories concerned for discussion. At the same time it adds its own judgement concerning all the proposals received, a judgement which establishes finally which demands are to be put before the individual economic organ for the purpose of altering the old collective agreement. The demands which are confirmed by the conference of factory councils then constitute the basis of the negotiations with the economic organs.

While the negotiations with the economic organs are in progress, the trade union executive must keep the factory councils constantly informed as to the course of the negotiations and their prospects.

Wages and conditions of labour in private enterprises are regulated in the same way as are those of the State enterprises, i. e. a collective agreement is concluded on the basis of mutual agreement, whereby appeal is made to the Arbitration Chamber or to arbitrators, if necessity arise. In regard to private employers however, the People's Commissariat for Labour has not the right to nominate a chief arbitrator. If the private employer cannot or will not come to an agreement with the trade union then recourse is had to the strike weapon as a means of struggle.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### The Situation in the Communist Party of Germany

By P. R. Dietrich (Berlin).

#### The "Death Crisis" in the C. P. of Germany.

The Communist Party of Germany is once again the object of the special attention of the Social-Democratic and bourgeois press. Almost every day the "Vorwärts" publishes in long articles the "evidence" it has in its hands regarding the "serious crisis" in which the C. P. G., according to the opinion of its enemies, is involved. The bourgeois press at home and abroad eagerly seizes on these "revelations" of the "Vorwärts" in order to create confusion among the international working class.

It is not the first time that the Social Democratic and bourgeois press, both at home and abroad, has announced the complete collapse of the C. P. G. But the hostile press has always proved to be a very bad prophet, for from such "crisis" the Party has always emerged inwardly strengthened.

In the present discussion, in the centre of which stands the question of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the whole Party has gained immensely in ideological clarity. In this discussion, which has been carried on the broadest basis, in the factory and street nuclei, it has become evident that the overwhelming majority of the Party membership is more and more learning to understand the difficult problems of the victorious revolution, of the Dictatorship of the proletariat, of socialist construction and know to guard against all degenerations, no matter whether they appear in an ultra-left or opportunist guise. The overwhelming majority of the Party stands firmly and unshakably by the leading Party of the world organisation created by Lenin, of the Communist International, — the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and is prepared, in an unbroken front, to repel all attacks of the open and concealed enemies of the C. P. S. U. and with them of the Soviet Union.

#### The Opposition "Block".

The ultra-left Opposition, against which the C. P. G., particularly since the VI. Enlarged Executive, has conducted an incessant ideological struggle, has in the course of the discussion split up into a number of groups, some of which have already sunk into complete insignificance. In the course of this discussion the Party had to expel from its ranks some leaders of this Opposition, after these leaders had not only advocated views that were no longer compatible with the principles of the Communist International, but in addition deliberately and openly set out to split and destroy the Communist Party and allied themselves against the Party with the very worst enemies of the revolutionary Labour Movement. For such elements there could no longer be any place in a Communist Party. These "leaders" are now endeavouring to bring together the various groups and grouplets which stand in opposition to the Communist International, the C. P. S. U. and the C. P. G. for a general attack upon the C. P. G. There is no doubt that there is very little distinction to be drawn between the various groupings so far as their anti-Bolshevism is concerned. In their efforts to destroy the unity of the Communist Party, and thereby to shatter the strongest bulwark which the revolutionary working class of Germany possesses, they are all united. The only difference between them is that while Korsch and Schwarz, who stand on the extreme left wing of the ultra-Lefts, openly announce their intentions, Maslow and Ruth Fischer, who have now been joined by Weber, use more diplomatic language, but in practice seek to achieve by means of their agents who are still in the Party, that for which Korsch and Schwarz are working for openly. The best proof of the co-operation of Korsch, Maslow, Fischer, Weber, Urbans is their common action, "the declaration of the 700", which the Social Democratic press makes such a fuss about and which deliberately aims at splitting the Party.

What the "opposition block" really is can be seen from the following: Schwarz, who has been expelled from the Party along with Korsch, and is already openly intriguing with the "anti-parliamentary" and anti-socialist K. A. P. (Communist Labour Party) and is also working hand in glove with Katz, who sought to obtain a post from the municipal authorities of Hanover, represents the most Left wing of the opposition. Schwarz, this "anti-parliamentarian" who, in spite of the urgings of his comrades, cannot be induced to give up his seat in parliament, accuses his former comrade in arms, Korsch, of treachery, of being a political careerist, because he has allied himself with Maslow and Ruth Fischer. Korsch, on the other hand, defends his position, which is becoming continually weaker, in the group of the "decided Left" by declaring that it is not he, Korsch, who has gone over to Maslow and Ruth Fischer, but vice versa, that Maslow and Ruth Fischer have surrendered to him, because in the negotiations over the notorious "declaration of the 700" they in many points accepted sharper formulations insisted upon by him. Our organisation in the strong working class quarter of Wedding in Berlin, which was formerly a stronghold of Ruth Fischer-Maslow, but has repudiated the latter, still shows sympathy for the Russian opposition. In the meantime a rift has made its appearance in this group. Weber, the former leader of the Wedding opposition, has joined forces with Maslow and Ruth Fischer, and thereby also with Korsch.

Weber has been deserted by the followers of the "Wedding Opposition" in the No. 6 administrative district of Berlin, in the Leipzig organisation and in a local group in the district of Lower Saxony. Kötter, the leader of this split-off group, accuses Weber of apostasy, while Weber declares Kötter to be a renegade. The attitude of the various groupings at the last Conference of Berlin Delegates was specially characteristic of the position in the ultra-Left opposition Bloc. At this Conference every group brought forward its own resolution; Weber dissociated himself from Kötter, and Kötter in turn from Weber and Urbans. The "decided-Left" Givan brought forward a resolution calling for a second revolution in Soviet Russia: a resolution which draws the logical consequence of the views of the "decided-Left".

#### The "Saviours" of Leninism.

Korsch, Maslow, Ruth Fischer and their agents in the Party, together with Schwarz and Katz, proclaim it to be their chief task to save the world Party of Lenin from reformism.

to prevent the falsification of Leninism by the C. P. S. U. and by the present Central Committee of the C. P. G. They wish to achieve this end, just as did Paul Levi and others, by attempting to set up against Russian, Leninist Communism an alleged much more revolutionary and more Left wing, German, West-European Communism. These attempts are not new. Already in 1920 Lenin attacked this "radical" sickness, the ideological bearers of which at that time were Pfemfert, Pannekoek, Gorter, whose Party was the Communist Labour Party and in whose footsteps Ruth Fischer and Maslow are now following. As is known, at that time this whole tendency collapsed miserably. There has nothing positive remained of it except the magnificent book of Lenin on "Infantile Sickness of Left Wing Communism". In this manner the Communist Labour Party has been rendered immortal like the insects embedded in amber. And it is just these insects who are now trying to pose as saviours of Leninism.

That Maslow would sooner or later follow the path of the Communist Labour Party as a transition stage to social democracy was already shown by his attitude to the reasons which led Lenin to write his book on "Infantile Sickness of Left Wing Communism". In the preface which Maslow wrote to a new edition of the Lenin brochure, he endeavoured to represent the ultra-Left errors which Lenin sharply opposed in 1920, as a reaction against the opportunism of the Communist Party of Germany at that time: whereby Maslow not only distorted the history of the German Party, but turned the whole work of Lenin upside down.

Lenin, already in 1921, on the occasion of the Jena Party Conference of the German Party, pointed out how dangerous for the German movement such people of the type of Maslow could become. In his letter to the Jena Party Conference Lenin wrote:

"The unreasonableness (to put it mildly) of the attitude of this Maslow was to be seen in Moscow. The Communist Party of Germany ought to have sent this Maslow and two or three of his supporters (who did not wish to keep to the peace agreement and who get into a very stupid passion) to North Russia for a few years. We should have been able to find useful employment for them there. We would have digested them. This would have been of great advantage for the international and the German movement."

A further important document for judging Ruth Fischer and Maslow's claim to be saviours of the world Party of Lenin from reformism is the letter that Comrade Zinoviev wrote to the Frankfurt Party Congress, at which Maslow and Ruth Fischer took over the leadership of the German Party. He declared:

"Either the German Left will not repeat the errors which Brandler made and which led his group to a crash. The malady of "Leftism" will be cured. A decisive war will be declared on revolutionary phraseology, on Left "whining" and on Left Wing "childishness"... Or the Left Wing leaders will regard the Left victory only from the aspect of fractional strategy. The Lefts will fall into the same error against which Comrade Lenin always specially forewarned: **The error of becoming arrogant at a time of success.** The fractional struggle will continue. The Lefts will bring out a platform against the united front tactics in general and will dub as "reformism" and "liquidationism" what really is the tactics of Comrade Lenin and the entire Comintern..."

The development of the Party under Maslow and Ruth Fischer's leadership led to the second perspective. The policy of this group not only disturbed the relations of the Party to the masses, but at the same time led the Party to a position hostile to the Comintern, and which has now developed to open anti-bolshevism in the ultra-Left groups.

As the last document in this connection there should be mentioned the Open Letter of the Executive which contained a final warning to these comrades. They would not hear this warning. They proclaimed the struggle and have proceeded further along that way which was bound to end outside of the ranks of the C. P. G. and into the camp of the enemies of the world Party of Lenin. And these people, who are deliberately working to distort Leninism are proclaiming today with great gestures that their chief task is to rescue the world Party of Lenin. Their most eager ally in this struggle is the central organ of the Party of Noske, Wels and Müller, the "Vorwärts", which on the day of the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg

wrote: "Proletarian, there are many hundreds of dead in one row. Karl, Rosa, Radek and consorts -- are not among them, not one of them is there! Proletarian!"

### The Political Content of the Opposition.

It would occupy too much space to quote all the political arguments of the oppositional groupings. It is characteristic that the criticism and attacks of the opposition groups are confined almost exclusively to the "Russian question" and the action of the C. P. G. against the anti-bolshevist attitude of the opposition. The "declaration of the 700" can be regarded as a summary of their arguments against the Comintern, against the C. P. of Russia and against the C. P. G. In this shameful document it is stated that

"the atmosphere in the Comintern is poisoned". The authors of this document thereby place themselves on the same level as Kautsky who, in his "The International and Soviet Russia", said the same thing when he wrote:

"The leadership of the III. International sitting in Moscow is only a tool of the Soviet government, and only lives from the money the latter supplies it; and with the money it pays out considers itself to be absolute master of the Communist Parties which are maintained by it."

The most serious charges are raised against the Bolshevik Party of the Soviet Union. Korsch, Maslow and Ruth Fischer and their agents in the C. P. G., Urbans and Weber, maintain that the C. P. S. U. is faced with a split. The Majority of the Bolshevik Party have, "before the eyes of a delighted bourgeoisie and amidst the yells of joy of all menshevists in and outside the Comintern, dragged Comrade Zinoviev through the gutter and, through the columns of the press of all communist parties, heaped mud on him?"

But there is better still to come. This shameful document states that the Bolshevik Party of the Soviet Union "idealises and paints in glowing colours the socialist construction and demoralises the working class of the whole world". Kautsky has said the same thing only in somewhat different words.

Where this alliance with Kautsky will lead to is declared more openly and definitely than by Korsch, Urbans and Ruth Fischer by one of their most eager followers, Givan, in a resolution which he submitted to the vote of his factory nucleus (but which was rejected by the nucleus). This resolution openly announces for the first time the only possible consequences which can be drawn from the estimate of the Ultra-Lefts on the proletarian dictatorship in Soviet Russia. In this resolution the "Decided Lefts" call upon the Russian proletariat to begin the severest class struggle, in town and country, against the reactionary Soviet Power. When, as the case is here, the proletarian dictatorship is regarded as a deceitful cloak for the power of the kulaks and the N. E. P. bourgeoisie, then there remains nothing else than the "second revolution" for the overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship proclaimed by Korsch, Schwarz and Givan. Everybody knows what forces today are working for the overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia. Every worker in the world knows that the imperialists of all countries are united in the fight against Soviet Russia. Thus the "Decided Lefts" and their allies end openly on the side of the imperialists of the whole world who are making all military preparations for the violent subjugation of Soviet Russia.

## Postponement of the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 2nd October 1926.

According to a decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the 15th Party Conference which was arranged to commence on the 15th October has been postponed until the 25th October.

## FOR THE UNITY OF THE C. P. S. U.

### Our Difficulties and the Opposition.

(Leading article of the "Pravda".)

Moscow, 2nd October 1926.

To day's leading article in the "Pravda" declares: "Compared with the last few years, the characteristic of the present period of our development is the speed with which our work proceeds. The new tasks in relation to the improvement and the reform of the commodity turn-over and to the inclusion of the small and smallest peasant economies in socialist channels, cannot be so quickly performed as the tasks in relation to the work of reconstruction itself. The new tasks demand persistence and the exertion of all our forces. We must not allow ourselves to be dragged forward, we must not permit our work of socialist re-construction to be damaged by premature leaps.

"Those loud-mouthed elements in our Party who cannot grasp the fact that a different tempo for our work is now necessary, if we are not to suffer a collapse, never think about this peculiarity. We must either perform our gigantic tasks with the necessary care, slowly but surely and thus strengthen the proletariat, or we must go with the opposition and attempt to increase the tempo at the cost of an immoderate pressure upon the peasantry and thus go downhill at breakneck speed, drive a wedge between the proletariat and the peasantry and break the back of the proletarian dictatorship.

At this moment when we are experiencing a new and bitter discussion we are going through a very difficult time. It is the beginning of the new economic year which demands united, careful and systematic work. On the other side of the frontier the imperialist enemy is on the watch and openly calculating upon a disruption in our ranks. In this moment when on account of the difficulty of the work, every atom of energy counts, the petty-bourgeois opposition is engaged in underground work against the unity of the Party and threatens to undermine the practical work of the Party and the Party itself by a new and embittered discussion. The Party will not permit this. The Party is sufficiently strong to expose the opposition and to prove that it is not assisting in the work of socialist reconstruction, but that it is hindering it, to prove that the opposition is not proletarian but petty-bourgeois and that it is serving a class foreign to the proletariat. Our slogan is "Down with the shouters!" (Lenin.)

The whole Party warns those who do not or will not understand the peculiarity of the present stage of development expressed in Lenin's words. **Do not interfere with us in our work!**"

### Resolution of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. on the Recent Fractional Activity of the Opposition.

Moscow, 4th October 1926.

The Moscow Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has published the following Resolution on the recent fractional activity of the opposition:

The Bureau of the Moscow Committee points out that in recent times there have been monstrous facts with regard to the Party-splitting policy of the oppositional groups which have gathered round bankrupt political leaders. The fact of the spread of illegal literature, which is difficult to distinguish from Menshevik literature, of illegal meetings and even illegal membership contributions proves that the opposition leaders have gone beyond all bounds of permissible methods of fighting.

On the 1st of October an oppositional group, headed by Comrade Saprionov, attempted in a discussion in Podmoskovnaya to open an attack against the Party decisions; but the nucleus unanimously repelled this attempt at a fractional proceeding and did not admit Comrade Saprionov to the meeting. On the same day the members of the Central Committee, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Patakov and Smilga, as well as Comrades Radek and Saprionov and other comrades of the above-mentioned group appeared

at a factory nucleus and attacked in the fiercest manner the decisions of the Party. In spite of the presence and of the active participation of all the opposition leaders, they suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the workers belonging to the Party. Their action infringed in the most flagrant manner the decision of the Plenum of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. regarding the impermissibility of a discussion and regarding the discipline of the members of the C. C. Under the cloak of hypocritical phrases regarding unity, they openly showed that their policy is a policy of disruption.

The Bureau of the Moscow Committee considers the actual preparation of a split by a handful of opposition leaders, as well as the attempt to undermine the work of the Party, as a direct crime against the Party. The Bureau of the Moscow Committee regards such behaviour as a scorning of the decisions of the Party, of its Congresses, its Central Committee and its Central Control Commission. The Bureau, while calling upon all members of the Moscow organisation to repel energetically the disruptive elements who, in a very difficult period, are injuring the unity of the Party, requests the Central Committee of the Party to call to order those members of the C. C. who flout the will of the Party.

The concrete work of the Party, which is particularly difficult at the commencement of the economic year and is being carried on under conditions of strained international relations, must not be undermined by a handful of persons who believe that their past services and their high position within the Party permit them to flout the collective will of the Party. The Party will, without regard to persons, energetically combat such fractional activity as its leader Lenin taught it.

The Moscow Committee calls upon all Party nuclei to carry out the Party decisions regarding the impermissibility of a Party discussion and not to permit the opposition leaders to drive the Party into an opposition fever. The Moscow Committee believes that the nuclei are bound to follow the example of the Bolshevik workers of the station Podmoskovnaya and of the Depot "Ilytch" who rendered bolshevik resistance to the malicious violators of Party decisions.

### Comrade Stalin Exposes Social Democratic Forgery.

We publish below a telegram which Comrade Stalin has addressed to the Daily Worker, the organ of our brother Party in America.

"To the Editorial Board of the Central Organ of the Workers' Party of America, The Daily Worker.

Dear Comrade Editor,

Kindly insert the following statement in your paper:

On August 14th the New York quasi socialist weekly, the "New Leader" printed, without indicating the source, falsified concluding remarks from an alleged and falsified version of a speech of mine at the Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

I have neither the possibility nor the desire to read all the inventions of the bourgeois and semi-bourgeois papers concerning the Soviet public men, and would not have paid attention to this usual falsehood of the capitalist press and of their underlings. However, a month after printing these falsified remarks, the "New Leader" sent me a telegram in which it asked me to "affirm or deny authenticity of severe criticisms of Zinoviev attributed to you in American press reports of the proceedings of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee". Not considering it possible to enter into correspondence with an organ which itself forged in a swindling manner "remarks" from my speech and now has the audacity to ask me with an appearance of innocence about the genuineness of these "remarks", I ask you to allow me to state through your paper that the report of the "remarks of Stalin" published in the "New Leader" of August 14th 1926, has absolutely nothing in common with my speech at the Plenum of the C. C. either in contents or in form or in tone, and that this report is thus a most complete and ignorant forgery.

With Communist greetings

J. Stalin.

September 21st.

## Resolution of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist League of Great Britain.

(1) The C. C. of Y. C. L. of G. B. expresses full agreement with the political decisions and organisational measures of the Plenary Session of the C. P. S. U.

(2) These decisions are the guarantee of the successful carrying through of the historical tasks of the C. P. S. U. viz: The Building of Socialism in the Soviet Republic, through industrialisation by means of the closest co-operation between workers and peasantry, which alone can ensure the successful continuation of the Proletarian Dictatorship.

(3) The pre-condition for the carrying out of these tasks is the iron unity of the A. U. C. P. For this reason those who attempt to organise secret factions inside the Leninist Party are undermining the Proletarian Dictatorship itself. Lenin fought with all energy against all elements which endeavoured to organise factions within the Party.

(4) It is the immediate duty of all actions of the Comintern therefore to render the utmost assistance to the C. C. in its fight against the Opposition which is now demanding the right to form factions within the Party.

(5) The preservation of the Unity of the Leninist Party is not only a struggle in the interests of the Russian Party — but the whole Comintern. This is especially necessary in view of the illegal use of the apparatus of the Comintern by Comrade Zinovieff for factional purpose, even after he had been given the fullest possible opportunity of advocating his programme openly in the Party C. C. and P. B.

(6) The C. C. of Y. C. L. therefore supports the resolution of the P. B. of C. P. G. B. in the matter of Com. Zinovieff's position, and the request for an immediate summoning of a special Plenary session to consider the question.

## THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

### The Reasons for the Decision of the E. C. Y. C. I. regarding the Case of Vouyovitch.

Moscow, 27th September 1926.

The Secretariat of the E. C. of the Y. C. I. has issued the following declaration signed by the secretary of the E. C. comrade Chitarov, in the matter of comrade Vouyovitch:

"Immediately after the XIV party congress of the C. P. of the U.S.S.R. comrade Vouyovitch who flung in his lot with the opposition at this congress, attempted together with the member of the Comintern comrade Guralski to organise fractional activity on an international scale in favour of the opposition. These comrades tried chiefly through their position in the Comintern to take up fractional connections with the sections of the Comintern and to prevent the leading organs of the European Communist Parties from declaring themselves in favour of the Central Committee of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

To this end, comrades Guralski and Vouyovitch acting, without a doubt, upon "a hint from above" attempted to come to an understanding with a member of the C. P. of France whom they wished to send as a fractional plenipotentiary to various western European countries. His route and a telegram code were arranged. The chosen "plenipotentiary" refused however to have anything to do with this fractional conspiracy and gave information to the Party concerning it. The inquiry which was instituted corroborated all the statements which this comrade made, even comrades Guralski and Vouyovitch were compelled to admit the truth of the accusations. The Party authorities then decided to suspend comrade Guralski from his Comintern work and to reprimand comrade Vouyovitch severely. The extremely mild treatment of comrade Vouyovitch was based on the assumption that he would not continue his fractional activity in the Comintern, that he would recognise his error and make amends. This assumption however, proved itself to be without basis. Comrade Vouyovitch attempted to carry on fractional work in

the Y. C. I. against which the delegation of the Y. C. I. of the U. S. S. R. had warned him. The warning was fruitless. Comrade Vouyovitch proved his fractional opinions by the fact that as a member of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. and the representative of the Y. C. I. in the E. C. C. I., he refused after a unanimous decision of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. in the matter of the expulsion of Ruth Fischer and Maslov, to lay this decision before the Presidium of the Y. C. I. This demonstrative attitude of comrade Vouyovitch against the Comintern and his indirect support of the renegades Fischer and Maslov are only to be explained by fractional motives.

In consequence of these facts and <sup>4th</sup> On the July plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Commission of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. had placed comrade Vouyovitch's fractional activities upon record. The plenum of the Y. C. I. considered it necessary to question comrade Vouyovitch concerning his standpoint and concerning his work in the Y. C. I. Comrade Vouyovitch defended himself and completely maintained his standpoint in a session of the plenum and declared that he would also in the future ever at all times propagate his fractional standpoint.

The E. C. of the Y. C. I. <sup>Vienna IX</sup> has no objection to the fact that members are of another <sup>opinion</sup> from that of the majority, but it can nevertheless not permit comrades to utilise their position in the executive to destroy the unity of the Comintern. Comrade Vouyovitch has however utilised the responsible position of secretary to the E. C. of the Y. C. I. for fractional purposes and thus rendered his further activity in the Y. C. I. impossible. The E. C. was therefore compelled to pass a decision dismissing comrade Vouyovitch from his position as the secretary of the E. C. and suspending his work in the Y. C. I.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### Against the Bulgarian White Terror!

Moscow, 2nd October 1926.

The E. C. C. I. and the E. C. of the Y. C. I. have issued the following appeal to the working men and women and to the working class youth of the world:

The blood-stained government of Bulgaria has added another crime to its account. On the eve of the 12th International Youth Day hundreds of young workers and peasants were arrested by the Bulgarian gendarmerie and flung into prison. This blow had been prepared by the government a long time ago. Its aim is to destroy the Young Communist League of Bulgaria by mass arrests and executions. Despite the mediaeval terror however, the Y. C. L. of Bulgaria has never ceased its struggle for the emancipation of the enslaved proletarian youth of Bulgaria.

Comrades! Bulgarian prisons are resounding to the groans of the tortured victims of the Bulgarian capitalists and landlords. Hundreds of young workers and peasants are calling to you for assistance. Hundreds of young workers have only death to expect unless the workers of the world stay the hand of the hangman.

Down with the blood-stained ruling class of Bulgaria!

Fight for the right to organise the Young Communist League of Bulgaria!

## BOOK REVIEWS

### Lenin: "Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism."

(On the Appearance of a New German Edition.)

By Bela Kun.

"Imperialism is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat. This has had world-wide confirmation since 1917." Thus wrote Lenin in July 1920 in his preface to the German

5) N. Lenin: Der Imperialismus als jüngste Etappe des Kapitalismus. New, revised, completed and corrected edition. Published by the "Verlag für Literatur und Politik", Vienna and Berlin 1926.

and French edition of his brochure on imperialism. For a long time this preface was locked up in the writing-desk of some comrade, until at last, after Lenin's death — some years after the manuscript was written — it was published in the journal "The Communist International" and has now found its right place at the beginning of the German edition of the book.

This new translation cannot be too warmly welcomed.

At the time when the fight entered on a more prosaic phase, and also today when the bulk of party work consists of communist "detail work" every Communist Party is exposed to two dangers. The first is that their broad outlook should be lost in "detail work" in which it should be lost in narrow-minded practicalism reminiscent of "reformism", the consequence of which is that the individual peasant economy of the Party and of the working class remain disorganised and disintegrate, and a definite action does not become itself. The second danger is that of another form of the loss of a broad outlook, i. e. the danger that activity, the achievements in organisation of which are possible in the present present moment might be paralysed and ousted by revolutionary phrases, and that the Communist Party should be forced into an attitude of passive expectation instead of carrying on activities for winning over the majority of the masses until a new acute revolutionary situation arises.

A careful study of Lenin's "Imperialism" is the best safeguard against these two dangers. There is hardly any other work of Lenin's in which the objective necessity of the social revolution is more clearly proved and the revolutionary outlook more clearly outlined. His teaching on the subject of the impossibility of the theories on ultra-imperialism as well as his teaching regarding the labour aristocracy, link the subjective factor of the revolution, the Communist Party, with the objective necessity of the revolution. Imperialism, which is nothing more nor less than capitalism which has changed its structure, a new stage of capitalism, capitalism developed to the utmost and already beginning to decay, forms the economic basis of the theory of revolution and of the strategy of the subjective factor of the Communist Party.

The doctrine of the structural changes within the working class under imperialism, the doctrine of the segregation of the aristocracy of labour is precisely that doctrine which we must on no account forget if we would preserve the tactics of the united front — the only possible and correct tactics for the Bolshevik party for a long time to come — from becoming the source of an erroneous, incorrect conception of the part which the Party should play. This doctrine is the foundation of the left in Socialism, of the organisatory severance of the revolutionary school from the socialist chauvinist Reformist school. Whereas Marx and Engels discovered the working class as the bearer of the development towards Socialism and associated Socialism with class-war, Lenin discovered the stratification of the working class and the significance of this stratification and carried it through consistently in his theory of revolution. With the aid of the Marxist method and on the basis of the doctrines of Marxism he thus created for the class-war, which Social Democracy was endeavouring to transform and to a certain extent succeeded in transforming into class collaboration, an ideology raised to a suitable scale of development and parties capable of leadership.

"It is impossible", writes Lenin in the above-mentioned preface, "to advance a single step towards the solution of the practical tasks of the communist movement and of the

\*) In the meantime an English edition of this work of Lenin's has been published by the Communist Party of Great Britain and is obtainable from the Communist Bookshop, King Street, London W.C. 2.

approaching social revolution without having understood the economic roots of these phenomena, without having sufficiently appreciated their political and social significance.

This is the chief reason why this book should be made accessible to all party members with any degree of training, and not only to the functionaries. There never was a time as at the present stage of partial and relative stabilisation when it was so necessary to form groups of party members in every party nucleus for the careful study of this book which, if read, marked and inwardly digested, will act as a protection against the loss of the revolutionary outlook — a loss which threatens us in various forms. For this reason it is, in our opinion, imperative that in every party nucleus special attention should be called to the publication of the translation of this book.

## Support the Striking Hamburg Dockworkers!

Just before going to press we have received the following appeal of the International Propaganda-Committee of the Transport Workers addressed to the Seamen and Dockworkers of all countries:

In Hamburg docks, on the 1st of Oktober, a strike of the dockworkers broke out owing to the refusal of the employers to increase their miserable wages. The wages are too low even to permit a worker's family to continue their miserable existence.

This strike is also of the greatest importance as a solidarity strike in support of the English Miners, who have now been locked out for over five months. Over 30,000 tons of coal were exported daily from Hamburg harbour. The strike means a blow against the English mineowners, strengthens the resisting power of the English Miners and increases their prospects of victory.

The reformist leaders of the German Transport Workers' Federation are ready to come to an understanding with the bourgeoisie against the striking dockworkers.

The seamen and the dockworkers of all countries must therefore realise that the victory of the German transport workers means the victory of the transport workers of all countries, and that their defeat is our defeat.

**Boycott the transport and loading of cargoes to Hamburg!**

**Down with the reconciliation policy towards the bourgeoisie!**

**Long live international solidarity with the Transport Workers!**

**Long live the victory of the German Transport Workers!**

## To our Readers!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England . . . . .	2 sh.
America . . . . .	50 cents
Germany . . . . .	1,50 marks
Austria . . . . .	2 (Austrian) Schillings
Norway . . . . .	2 crowns
Sweden . . . . .	1,50 crowns
Denmark . . . . .	2 crowns

The subscription rate for other countries is three dollars (or equivalent in local currency) for six months.

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers besides the Regular Number.