

with Social Democrats. It has laid down with perfect exactness and clearness, what the slogan of the "workers government" is and what it cannot be for us. One can be in agreement with the standpoint of the V. World Congress or not in agreement. One cannot however agree with it "to a certain extent". There is no reason for the true followers of the Communist International in Czecho-Slovakia to demand now any kind of new formulations of these questions. Do you, comrade Kreibich and your friends, accept the formulations of the V. World Congress? Yes or no? But in this case without any new reservations, without any "on the one hand" and "on the other hand". And if not, then explain exactly, you have a right to do so, wherein the decisions of the V. World Congress are false and how they must be altered in order to be made correct.

What does the Communist International actually demand of the Czecho-Slovakian Party? What revolutionary actions does the Communist International place before us? Are we really asked, he says, to "make" the revolution now, when the pre-conditions for such do not exist?

It is once again the old method of "Communist" opportunists to misconstrue the tactics of the Communist International. You, comrade Kreibich, will not be able to find among the decisions of the Communist International passed during the last five years a single decision which could be construed in the sense of a bald demand to "make" the revolution. The only thing what the Communist International demands from its sections is that they shall remain revolutionary Communists also in the period of slackness, that under all circumstances they shall prepare the proletarian revolution, the commencement of which depends of course not upon our subjective efforts, but before all upon the objective conditions.

What, under the present conditions, does the Communist International demand from its Czecho-Slovakian section:

1. That the party be reorganised on the basis of factory nuclei. A Communist Party cannot be organised in any other manner. Other principles of organisations are social democratic and not communist principles.

2. That the whole propaganda and agitation of the Party be permeated by the revolutionary spirit, that means, that they actually correspond to the decisions of the V. World Congress.

3. That the Party devotes far greater attention to the factory councils movement than has hitherto been the case and in this respect gives heed to the experiences made in Germany.

4. That the Party conducts a systematic propaganda and organisatory activity regarding the creation of proletarian Defence-Units and fighting forces and thereby raises in a serious form the question of the fight against fascism.

5. That the agitation and entire policy of the Party in the national question shall be a real communist policy. Comrade Kreibich is aware that the II. World Congress of the Communist International adopted the theses of Comrade Lenin on the National question, which contain sufficient clear indications for every one who wishes to realise the policy of the Communist International regarding the national question and not to misconstrue it. And the Executive of the Communist International has, on the instructions of the Congress, recently put these decisions in a concrete form.

6. To organise appropriate propaganda work among the peasantry.

8. To advocate the tactics of the united front and the slogan of the workers government among the working masses of Czecho-Slovakia in the way decided at the V. World Congress and not in the way proposed by Brandler, Radek and Kreibich who is nine tenths in agreement with them.

9. Regarding the questions in dispute in the German, Russian and English Communist Parties, the Party shall in the spirit of the V. Congress of the C. I. adopt a clear revolutionary attitude and not support the right wings in these parties.

10. A Central Committee of the Czecho-Slovakian Party shall be created containing a great number of new members from the ranks of the workers, who are more active, more straight, less diplomatic, more in contact with the proletarian masses, and unconditionally follow the line of the Communist International.

These demands of ours are already contained in the 21 conditions adopted at the Second Congress of the Communist International.

It appears as if Comrade Kreibich is seeking in vain to frighten the Party with a crisis. In the first place there are

crises which are beneficial for the Party. This was shown recently by the crisis which Brandler created in the C. P. of Germany through his opportunist tactics. Secondly however we believe that the Czecho-Slovakian Communist workers have no reason whatever to share in that political despondency which is revealed in the article of Kreibich. The great majority of the Czecho-Slovakian Communist workers, will, we are convinced, as against Comrade Kreibich, adopt with full sincerity without any reservations the line of the V. World Congress of the Communist International.

We do not know whether Comrade Smeral has recently come forward with an exposition of his opinions over the present inner-party situation. We, at least, have found no such expressions on his part. In the article in question Comrade Kreibich attempts to speak at the same time in the name of Comrade Smeral. We do not know whether comrade Smeral has authorised Comrade Kreibich to make this declaration. As regards the opinion of the Executive of the Communist International, this, so far as we are aware, is as follows: We recognise the very good points of Comrade Smeral. We are of the opinion that he is absolutely necessary as one of the political leaders in the future central committee of the C. P. of Czecho-Slovakia. But we do not conceal the fact that he has his weak sides. We demand that Comrade Smeral shall adopt a definite standpoint regarding the questions raised and decided at the V. World Congress. We are convinced in any case that the Czecho-Slovakian Communist workers will find sufficient forces in their ranks in order to create a central committee which will be up to its tasks. It is in vain for Comrade Kreibich in his article to put the question: "Are we leaders alone guilty for the short-comings of the party or is the party itself guilty?" Every communist knows that every Communist Party has the central committee that it deserves. And we now believe that the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party, which in its composition is a pure workers party, is already ripe to become a true bolshevist party and therefore to have a completely bolshevist central committee.

THE WHITE TERROR

Murder of a Communist Fighter in Bulgaria.

The fury of the white terror in Bulgaria demands ever fresh victims. Comrade Michail Dachine, a brave and untiring stalwart of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, was murdered on the 18th August last in the open streets of Sofia.

The murderer was a member of a band which were organised by the Zankoff government in order to massacre the fighting workers and peasants. It is a matter of course that the perpetrator has remained unpunished. In Bulgaria the murder of persons who are Communists or who are considered to be such, is not only tolerated, but officially and legally organised; it is carried out by terrorist bands, which are in the pay of the government. It is a fact that any crowd of people, even if they have only gathered out of mere curiosity, are immediately fired upon.

The vile murder of comrade Dachine has even called forth the protest of the social democratic paper "Narod", which calls attention to the perfect integrity and the bravery of the murdered victim. It is true, however, that this paper, as well as the whole Bulgarian Social Democracy, is jointly responsible for the bloody deeds of the Zankoff regime, which they have helped to establish and which they still continue to defend.

The fate of Dachine constitutes a threat against a number of other Bulgarian comrades, as Christo Kabatchieff, Anton Ivanoff and Nikola Penel, who are still kept in prison, and also against Hadji Dimoff, who is being persecuted on account of his fearless attitude in the Sobranje (parliament), and against all those who stand for the fascist government of Zankoff. Only recently two members of parliament of the left peasant wing, Grentcharoff and Janeff, were arrested; another peasant member of parliament, Petrini, is being sought by the police.

Michail Dachine, who has fallen for the cause of the proletariat of Bulgaria and of the whole world, will, along with the many thousands of other martyrs of the revolutionary peasants and workers of Bulgaria, be enshrined in the hearts of the international working class.

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4. No. 67

25th September 1924

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: Inprecorr, Vienna.

The Sixtieth Anniversary of the First International. The First International.

By Theodor Rothstein (Moscow).

Ten years ago, when the socialist world, just on the eve of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the First International, flung itself into the blood and dust of imperialist war, we who witnessed this unheard-of débâcle hardly imagined that we should celebrate the Sixtieth Anniversary in a situation in any way similar to the present. All is lost, was the thought of most of us. The crushing of the Paris Commune had thrown back the revolutionary proletariat for many years; for how many decades would the socialist movement be thrown back by an event which constituted not a physical, but the most shameful, the most shattering moral defeat ever experienced by the working class? And in a certain and very important sense we were not mistaken. Only look at the present "socialist" movement, which appeared as the renaissance of the former, and which now, with unexampled hypocrisy, is preparing to make a solemn festival of the anniversary of that very International which it so brazenly betrayed on the eve of its anniversary ten years ago.

What does the Second International represent? A whitened sepulchre, even in comparison with that living corpse, which — as we now realise — constituted Social Democracy on the eve of the world war. Had there not been the October revolution, had there not been the foundation of the Third, of the Communist International, what would have become of the political movement of the working class? It would either not have existed at all, or it would, as a whole, have based itself on the bourgeois social order. The Third International, which sprang into being as a result of the dialectical antagonisms of History, as the offspring of that very war which engulfed its predecessor, constituted at the same time the unique factor which rescued the working class from the clutches of political death, and raised its organisation and its struggle to a level never attained before. And this is the reason why it is not the Second International — which is seeking to maintain the semblance of life in a form of the International Labour Movement which no longer exists — but we, the Third International, who are the spiritual successors and the heirs of that International, the anniversary of the foundation of which we are now commemorating.

This does not mean that the Second International did not occupy a legitimate place in the International expression of the Labour Movement. It constituted not only a legitimate, but an absolutely necessary stage of this development, corresponding to the given stage in the development of capitalism. It reflected the process of the rallying and organising of the forces of the proletariat in each country in an epoch when the powerful growth of industrial capital, on the one hand, destroyed the last remnants of artisanship and hand-manufacture, and, on the other

hand, created a powerful state organism which required both as a support and a tool. The lack of such concentrated and organised forces in all countries except England, constituted the chief cause of the decay of the First International. On the basis of nationally organised labour parties, there arose the Second International, as the form of their coordination on an International scale. It was rather a mechanical than an organic uniting of the international proletariat, because industrial capital was acting within the limits of states and nations, and the fight against it could only be conducted within the same limits. To the extent that the Second International was mainly a mere total of the movements of various sections of the international proletariat, it constituted the negation of the First International; but as far as it nevertheless moved and roused into consciousness real masses and not insignificant vanguards, it constituted the continuation of the First International at a higher stage.

Its mission was ended at the very moment when financial capital began to transcend the limits of states and nations, and when industrial capital, which became continually more closely allied to it, began to create a uniform world market. If one regards the period from 1890 to 1900 as the period of the highest prosperity of industrial capital, so the new century marked the commencement of the era of the expansion of financial-industrial capital beyond the limits of the individual states. The International ought therefore to have re-aligned its ranks, to have assumed new forms of organisation and created new methods for the fight, not only on an international, but even on a national scale. The fight against capital by single national sections could no longer meet with any success as soon as this capital no longer confined itself to the limits of one country. From this moment the fight ought to have been conducted on a united front with the whole world for arena. Along with this there ought to have been drawn into the fight the toiling masses of even the most backward countries. Finally, partial and local gains lost their importance when confronted with enormously developed and tremendously strengthened world capital.

The International ought to have turned to the example of the First International and have become one revolutionary party. This it failed to do, and was therefore bound to perish in the first conflict with this world capital in the world arena.

History repeats itself, but in a higher synthesis according to the laws of dialectics. The First International was a uniform, international, revolutionary organisation, but which did not yet have organised working masses behind it. Its successor was merely a loose federation of single national parties, which were

supported by the organised working masses. The historical development demanded that the organised mass movements of the various national parties should be welded together into one firm and indivisible world revolutionary organisation — which was the characteristic form of the First International — as a higher synthesis. This higher synthesis took shape in the form of the Communist International. We returned to the initial stage, but on a higher and improved basis. The continued existence, however, of the Second International in our epoch, constitutes an artificial attempt to dress up an anachronism in a modern garb.

It is for this reason that for us, the members of the Third International, the commemoration of that organisation which arose so modestly and so unnoticed out of a small meeting in St. Martin's Hall in London sixty years ago, constitutes something greater than a formal historical ceremony. We are the same First International, but in a far more highly developed form and which has become richer as the result of the experiences of the every-day class struggle of the epoch of the Second International on the one hand, and of the great October Revolution on the other. For us, the First International is a stage which has been outgrown, as can also be rightly said of the Second International. Or better said, the First International is to be found in ourselves like the germ of which we are the fruit; because in the First International there was already innate, not so much in material form as in the thought and genius of Marx, all that we represent to-day. Although Marx could only find objective support in the English working class and its experiences, he nevertheless was able to anticipate such an international organisation of the

working class as has been realised in our International, i. e. the organisation of all the forces of the international proletariat for the revolutionary fight immediately aiming at the realisation of socialism. It was through no fault of Marx that he did not succeed in realising it: even the greatest genius cannot leap beyond the bounds of the possibilities of the given epoch. But he anticipated it, he saw its historical inevitability, he demonstrated its inevitability and became the leader of that class which was destined to achieve it. Those who are familiar with the history of the First International know, that when Marx emphasised the importance of Trade Unions, of the reduction of working hours, of co-operative societies, of factory legislation, of the political struggle, of unrelaxed attention to the problems of foreign policy — know that he did all this in order to mobilise and organise the backward working masses of the Continent on the basis of their immediate needs, but at the same time he pointed out that the masses have to go far beyond the minor questions of the day and have the task of carrying out the social revolution.

Another generation, another guiding genius succeeded in realising for the first time, and on a gigantic scale, that which the First International only represented in rough outline, and in creating, in the shape of the new International, the instrument for mobilising and organising the most backward working masses. Between both generations, between both their leaders and between both Internationals, there exists a vital, ideological and material connection; and in devoting these days to the commemoration of one of them, we actually devote them to the contemplation of our own being, of our work and of our tasks.

Thesis of the Sixtieth Anniversary of the Foundation of the First International.

(International Workingmen's Association.)

A. The First International.

1. Who Has the Right to Celebrate?

1. In August 1914 a solemn congress of all the social democratic parties of the Second International was to have been held in Vienna, to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of the First International and the 25th anniversary of the Second International. Instead of the celebration of international socialism, and of the manifestation of the solidarity of the international proletariat, instead of the demonstration against imperialist war which had for years been foreshadowed, and under the threat of which the last Congresses of the Second International had taken place, the canons thundered, and the Second International hurried to the defence of the various fatherlands. The international proletariat was put into uniform and proceeded to murder, dismember and kill one another.

The Second International celebrated the anniversary of the First International on the battlefields of the imperialist slaughter and celebrated its own anniversary by its dissolution and with Kautsky's statement "the International is an instrument of peace" — and has no place in war.

2. Instead of the fiftieth we are celebrating the sixtieth anniversary. Who has the right to celebrate? Not those who helped to transform the international solidarity of the proletariat, whose symbol and instrument the First International was, (Marx said in a speech at the last Hague Congress of the First International, "the basic principle of the International is solidarity because the revolution must be the work of solidarity"), into the international massacre of 1914. Not those who, turning the revolutionary teachings and practice of the First International into their direct antitheses, placed the International proletariat in the service of international capitalism. Not those who misused the confidence of the masses of the people which they had gained in the 25 years of their existence and turned the stored-up energy and organisations created by the international labour movement in those 25 years against the working class itself, who, instead of realising the revolutionary aims of the workers, realise the international aims of capitalist exploitation, and who rendered service to the reaction of the capitalist class instead of serving the revolution of the working class.

The heroes of the Second International, the social democrats, the international marauders of the proletariat have no right to

celebrate the foundation of the First Internationale! They have not even a right to celebrate the foundation of their own, the Second International, for in 1914 they betrayed even their own past and what was good and useful therein.

3. Only those have a right to celebrate this anniversary who not only honoured the theories and practice of the First International but also transformed them into deeds. Only those who always remained true to the workers' revolutionary past and always fought against the opportunism and treason of international menshewism and who even at the very moment of the deepest debasement of the working class, during the imperialist war, raised the red banner of international indignation, of the revolution, that banner which had been deserted by the social democrats, trodden into the mire and exchanged for the different national colours, was the banner with which they placed themselves at the head of the working class!

Only those have a right to celebrate this anniversary who saved even the good and useful in the past, that was in the Second International, from betrayal and annihilation, and who had more respect for that past than the Second International leaders!

Only the communists, only the true heirs of Marx and Lenin have the right to celebrate the anniversary of the foundation of the First International, of the first international of revolutionary solidarity! It is they who continue the theory and practice of the First International; they are the pioneers of the international revolution. The Third International has fulfilled Engel's hopes, "I believe that the next International will be definitely communist".

II. The Significance of the First International.

4. The working class must know its history, must honour its own revolutionary past and must on the hard road to revolutionary victory collect everything that can render this victory easier. The First International was not an "honourable beginning", it was a revolutionary instrument shaped by the conditions of the life of the working class. At its head there stood the greatest thinkers of the working class — Marx and Engels. Their theory, further developed by Lenin, is to-day an efficient weapon in the hands of the revolutionary vanguard of the international proletariat, the world Communist Party. Their practice,

based on this theory, and embodied in the First International, their fight against the deviation to the "right" and to the "left" in the ranks of the working class at the time, and their principles of organisation are not dead, are not merely "the past"; but contain the germ of what was realised in the Third Communist International — a proof of their correctness and vitality.

5. Three great periods can be distinguished in the history of the international labour movement. The first period which reached its climax in the First International is described by Lenin as follows:

"The first period is the birth of socialist ideas and of the germs of the class struggle of the proletariat. It is the long and bitter fight amongst the numerous socialist theories and tendencies. Socialism seeks its path, seeks itself. The class struggle of the proletariat, which is just about to rise out from the mass of the petty-bourgeois 'people', is of the nature of individual violent uprisings such as that of the Lyons weavers. The working class itself is feeling its way.

"This is the period of the preparation and birth of Marxism, the only doctrine of socialism which has stood the test of history. This period comprises roughly the first two-thirds of the 19th century and ends with the complete victory of Marxism, with the bankruptcy of all pre-Marxist forms of socialism (principally after the revolution of 1848), with the separation of the working class from petty bourgeois democracy and its entrance upon its own historic path".

III. The foundation of the First International.

6. The revolutions of 1848 were belated bourgeois revolutions. They completed the work of the great bourgeois revolution, principally of the French Revolution. They were of a petty-bourgeois, pompous nature, and at the same time put the democratic state, which corresponded to the capitalist development of Europe, everywhere on its feet. At the same time they were a turning point for the proletariat. The proletariat, formerly an ally of the petty-bourgeoisie, appears as an independent factor in the field and frees itself from the petty-bourgeoisie, but not from the latter's illusions. It suffers bloody defeat on the 28th of June 1848 in Paris. It suffers defeat in English Chartism. And it is betrayed by the German Philistine bourgeoisie.

7. The causes of this defeat are clear. The proletariat is from the very beginning of its development to a class international and especially the conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat are international. This need of the working class made its way to the front in the different attempts at international organisation made by the working class, such as the "Union of the Outlawed", the "Union of the Just", which then was transformed by Marx and Engels into the "Union of Communists", whose manifesto, the "Communist Manifesto", they drew up. But the different countries of Europe were in different stages of development and consequently the proletariat at different stages of advancement. In England the working class won the 10 hour day and the right to organise trade unions, but fought politically together with the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie and was betrayed. In France it was forced into independent action, isolated and deserted, and was decimated. In Germany the working class only began to stir, but even these first movements were bloodily suppressed by the bourgeois classes.

8. At the time of the 1848 revolutions the foundations of Marxism had already been completed and Marx and Engels were on the side of the working class. They attempted to exploit the bourgeois revolution for their ends. The great goal for which they fought was the unification of Germany, the fight against Russian Tsarism and the support of all national revolution in Europe, in short, the creation of European democracy as a pre-requisite for the fight of the proletariat for emancipation.

9. After the defeat in 1848 reaction set in. In Bonapartist France, in Germany and in Austria the revolutionary fighters languished in dungeons — over all Europe the Russian gendarme stood watch.

None the less, what 1848—49 did not produce began to be realised at the end of the Fifties and the beginning of the sixties. In many respects these years, although less noisy and sonorous than '48, were of greater importance. The prediction of Marx that after the defeat of '48—'49 a new revolutionary wave would arise with the first economic crisis began to be fulfilled. The economic crisis broke out in 1857 and brought distress and misery to the working class. In 1859 (the year of

the publication of Marx's "Critique of Political Economy") an "amnesty" had to be granted simultaneously to the political prisoners under the pressure of the masses of the people in France and Germany. The four years' civil war broke out in America between the North and the South — the civil war from which Marx expected for the working class what the American War of Independence of the 18th century had been for the bourgeoisie. Then came Italy's fight for freedom and of greatest importance the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 in Russia, where from that time on revolutionary movements followed one another unceasingly until 1905 and 1917 and kept the Russian "gendarme" busy enough at home. All this showed that capitalism in Europe had finally conquered, that the bourgeoisie was establishing itself, the era of bourgeois revolutions had ended and that the preparation of the proletarian revolution had to begin. If then Marx had during these years "liquidated" his previous conviction that Europe faced a new uprising (this is maintained today in order to justify the "liquidation" of the revolution of today), he did so because that had been realised, though not as he had expected. The ground had been prepared for the proletarian class struggle; the conditions for the organisation of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat existed.

10. Thus the "International Workingmen's Association", i. e. the First International was founded on September 28, 1864. The leaders of the English trade unions were the most vigorous champions of an international organisation of workers since just then the English bourgeoisie began to cast about on the Continent for strike breakers and cheap foreign labour in order to break the power of the trade unions. The revolutionary awakening all over Europe and the bloody Polish rebellion, crushed by Tsarism with unprecedented brutality, drew the attention of the workers of the principal European countries to foreign affairs, to the idea of international solidarity which was instinctive in the working class, and which sought tangible form and found it in the First International.

Thus two fundamental conditions of the proletarian class struggle were actual at the very inauguration of the International:

1. The purely trade union problems were a driving force towards an international organisation of solidarity;

2. This international organisation immediately took the form of a political organisation as well as of a political general staff of the working class.

IV. The Basic Problems and the Policy of the First International.

11. The ideological and theoretical leadership of the First International was in the hands of Marx and Engels. The first problem was to make the First International a communist-Marxist International — in other words breaking with the old ideas and tactics of the working class and acquainting it with the only correct theory, policy and tactics of Marxism. It was just during the period of the First International that Marx wrote his fundamental economic works, "Critique of Political Economy" (1859) and "Capital" (1867) and in the first one he formulated clearly and in a masterly manner his new theory of society, "Historical Materialism". The working class thus had a theory meeting the needs of its situation and the condition of struggle as well as two brilliant leaders who had tested their theory in the battles of the revolution of 1848 and were trained tacticians.

However, this theory and practice were opposed by other theories, partly petty-bourgeois reformist and partly revolutionary but adventurous fighting tactics — Proudhonism and Blanquism in France and later Bakunism in Italy, Spain and Switzerland. These countries, whose industry was still to a large degree small industry, and whose proletariat was still largely petty-bourgeois, were again and again the breeding places of theories and practices hostile to the class war theory and practice of the big industrial proletariat, and to Marxism. Thus the tasks of the First International was from the very beginning a two-fold one:

1. The organisation and leadership of the fight of the working class against the bourgeoisie;

2. The fight against the half-reactionary, half-adventurous tendencies within the working class — against sects and for an active fighting workers Party.

12. The organisation of the fight against the bourgeoisie was — and still is — of two kinds: the theory teaching us the course of society and what the working class should fight for; and the practice, the immediate problems of the "broad" as well

as the "narrower" policies of the working class, both of which are closely connected with each other. The theory was then Marxism; today it is Marxism-Leninism. The practice had to agree with this theory, because just that characterises the greatness of Marxism and Leninism, that they are the theoretical expression only of the living conditions of the modern proletariat, are not isolated from practice, but both got their being from practice and serve the needs of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

13. The first proclamation, the first decision of the First International, the so-called Inaugural Address, was based upon the "Communist Manifesto", even though certain general meaningless phrases found their way therein under the pressure of the petty-bourgeois sentimental representatives of the French workers. But the fundamental principle of the working class was printed on the back of every membership card as the gospel of the workers:

"The emancipation of the working class must be carried out by the workers themselves. The fight for the emancipation of the working class is no fight for new class privileges but for the destruction of all class rules. The economic subjection of the worker to the expropriator of the means of labour, i. e. of the sources of life, is the root of serfdom in all its forms, of social misery, of intellectual stunting and of political dependence. The economic emancipation of the working class is therefore a great goal which all political movements, must serve. All attempts to reach this goal have hitherto failed because of the lack of unity among the different branches of labour in each country and among the working class of all countries. The emancipation of the workers is neither a local nor a national task. It concerns all countries where modern society exists. It can only be obtained through the methodical coordination of these countries. Therefore "Workers of the world, unite!"

14. This was the formulation of the great task of the "great profession" of the working class — "the conquest of political power" for the reorganisation of society on the basis of general cooperation, of socialism. Therefore the working class must keep abreast of the foreign policy of the ruling classes and their governments — and must confront it with its own policy.

15. This foreign policy, however, was a policy of war. War is no "accident", but the inevitable consequence of the capitalistic economic system. It was so then, it is so now, and will remain so as long as capitalism exists. The Austro-Prussian and the Franco-Prussian Wars took place at that time, and the congresses of the First International often considered this question which is a vital problem of the working class, which is in some ways the philosophers stone of workers' organisations, whether they side with the working class against the bourgeoisie or with the bourgeoisie against the working class.

16. In 1867, at the Congress of Lausanne, the International adopted the first detailed resolution on war and its attitude to war. It is pointed out in this that for the prevention of war it is not sufficient to abolish the army but that a change of the social system is necessary.

In 1868 the International Brussels Congress recommended "that the workers down tools in case of war breaking out in their own countries". "For war is today a civil war" — workers fighting against workers. Fifty years later — that was forgotten.

The General Council (led by Marx) adopted in 1866 at the beginning of the Austro-Prussian War a resolution in which this war is branded as the quarrel of two despots, and the proletariat is advised to utilise the given situation for its own emancipation.

In July 1868, the General Council wrote to the trade unions as follows:

"The fundaments of society must be the brotherhood of the toilers freed from petty nationalism. Labour has no fatherland."

And in the address of the General Council on the Franco-Prussian War the following appears:

"While official France and official Germany plunge into a fratricidal struggle, the workers send each other messages of friendship and peace. This one great fact, without precedent in the history of the past, unfolds the prospect of a better future. It proves that, contrary to the old society with its economic distress and its political insanity, a new order arises whose international principle will be peace, because the same principle — labour — will rule every nation."

The spirit of the First International was true internationalism, which set the international interests of the workers, the interests of the international revolution, higher than those of the "fatherland". And this spirit flamed up brighter than ever, when ever a "national" war threatened to involve the workers. "Against chauvinism" was the slogan of the First International. And that at a period when national wars were comparatively justified, as Marx and Engels recognised, and not at a time, as in 1914, when national wars were only an exception and imperialist wars of plunder were the rule!

And the young German working class was true to this international duty! Liebknecht and Bebel did not vote war credits as later Scheidemann and Haase, but went to jail rather.

V. The Conquest of Power, the Role of Force, and the Role of the Party.

17. True internationalism was the internationalism of the revolution. "There are wars and wars; there are unjust and bad wars and there is the war for one's own rights — the revolution. The revolution is violent — The workers must one fine day seize the political upper hand and must build up the new organisation of labour. They must overthrow the old politics . . . If, however, that is the case, we must recognise that in most of the continental countries force must be the lever of our revolution. For the final establishment of the rule of labour, we must at a given moment appeal to force" (Marx).

Marx therefore saw in the Franco-Prussian war a step forward in the light of the proletariat for emancipation. "Whatever the outcome of the war, it has taught the workers to handle arms and that is the best guarantee for the future".

18. A theoretically trained, powerful centralised party, and allies amongst the toilers are essential to the proletariat for the realisation of the revolution.

Marx attempted to secure this by proposing the expropriation of the landowners and thus winning over the peasantry. "I am convinced that the social revolution must start from the foundation; must begin with the ownership of land". Numerous resolutions of the congresses of the First International confirm this view.

19. The establishment of an efficient party served in the fight against the sects. "The International was founded in order to establish the real organisation of the working class for struggle in the place of the socialist or half-socialist sects. The original statutes as well as the Inaugural Address show this at a glance. On the other hand the International would not have been able to hold its own if history had not already killed sectarianism. The development of socialist sectarianism and of the real labour movement are always inversely proportional to each other. As long as the sects are justified, (historically speaking) the working class is not ripe for independent historical action. As soon as it reaches this maturity, all sects become basically reactionary. In the meantime, the history of the International repeated what had everywhere taken place in the past. Out of date practices endeavour to reform and maintain themselves within the newly established body.

"The history of the International was a continuous struggle of the General Council against the sects and amateur attempts which tried to maintain themselves within the International itself against the real movement of the working class. This fight was carried on in the congresses and even more in the private negotiations of the General Council with the various sections".

20. The creation of the Party firstly served the subordination of all the phases of the labour movement to the Party, and secondly the organisation of the International.

In principle at least, the International itself directed the trade union movement, strikes, etc. The necessity of trade union struggle helped the birth of the First International. Marx and the First International considered the trade unions as an important part of the labour movement, as "the school of socialism", but subordinated to the Party. "The workers must not . . . exaggerate the final result of their daily struggle. They must not forget that they are fighting against the effects and not against the causes . . . that they are employing palliatives but are not curing the disease. They should inscribe on their banner the revolutionary slogan: 'Abolition of the Wage System'". The trade union movement must therefore develop into the political struggle; the pure economic defensive fight must be turned into the fight of one class against another. "But the fight of class against class is a political fight".

21. The creation of a centralised efficient party was the object of the statutes of the International. Its basis was the section; its head the General Council. And, according to Bakunin, this General Council was dictatorial. In reality this "dictatorship" was the principle of centralisation as against the loose federative endeavours of the anarchists. The First International wanted to be a Party of the class struggle. The Bakuninists fought against its becoming a real party. They fought most bitterly against the incorporation of the following passage in the Statutes of the International:

"In its fight against the collective power of the possessing classes, the proletariat can act as a class when it organises its own political party, opposed to all parties founded by the owning classes. Such an organisation of the proletariat in political parties is absolutely necessary for the assurance of the victory of the social revolution and of the attainment of its final goal, — the abolition of classes. The uniting of the forces of labour, already attained in economic struggle, must also serve in the hands of this class as a lever in the fight against the political power of its exploiters. In view of the fact that the owners of the land and of capital always use their political privileges for the protection and perpetuation of their economic monopoly and for the enslavement of labour, the conquest of political power becomes the great task of the proletariat".

If the principle of centralisation today, in the period of revolution itself has become a daily necessity of the struggle, but — since mass parties are fighting this struggle in the four corners of the earth — its organisational form must necessarily be another, the bitter struggle carried on then as now against "centralisation" by all those who oppose any revolutionary party at all, proves that this heritage of the First International the "centralised" party and international are one of the most important weapons of the revolutionary struggle. A fight without organisation is impossible, Organisation without a central head, a central organ drawing up a unified plan and supervising its execution, is a chimerical organisation.

VI. The First International and the Paris Commune.

The Destruction of the Old State Power.

22. The Paris Commune of 1871 was a turning point in the modern labour movement, and was an important step forward in the theory of Marxism. The Third Address of the General Council of the First International ("The Civil War in France") is the last great deed of the First International. In the glorious uprising of the Paris workers of 1871 the last of the old illusions and methods of struggle of the working class were buried. On the other hand this fight of the exploited revealed the peculiarity of the revolutionary struggle and the basic forms of the new proletarian State power. The internationalists took active part in the Paris Commune and their influence was strong. Engels said: "The influence of the Proudhonists and Blanquists was however overwhelming". Now both of these sacrificed themselves; both of them assisted in helping the uprising to victory, and on the other hand used the power of the working class for social reforms in the interest of the workers. None the less the Paris Commune on the whole was a defeat both for the petty bourgeois reformism as well as for sectarian conspiracy. But since the Paris Commune was a real people's movement in which the proletariat played the leading role, it revealed the peculiarities of the social revolution. The destruction of the old State power and the creation of a new one, in the service of the fight of the working class — the dictatorship of the proletariat — this was attempted for the first time and Marx incorporated the great lesson of this heroic fight of the workers into the theory of Marxism.

23. Marx, who was against the uprising because he foresaw its defeat, did not complain, did not say "I told you so", — he studied its lessons. — He and the members of the first International took part in the fight, the internationalists actively on the battle field and Marx theoretically, with advice and theory. His action was a model example of what the attitude of the theoretician and leader should be to the fight of the working class. His example was soon forgotten, together with the lessons he learnt, to be rediscovered by the modern communists under Lenin's leadership.

24. Among the lessons of the Paris Commune, not those should be emphasised which explain its defeat, which was due to the prevailing historical circumstances and which only had

limited temporary and local importance, but those which are of a fundamental nature. Among them we have already mentioned the destruction of the old State apparatus. Three other questions which must here be mentioned because they were closely connected with the activity of the First International, are of almost as great fundamental importance; the question of the transformation of national war into a civil war against the exploiters; the question of the allies the proletariat requires; and the question of the Party.

The Paris Commune arose after the defeat of the French by the Germans, and turned this booty campaign of the French Emperor into an armed uprising of the Paris proletariat against its exploiters. The slogan later proclaimed by Lenin, "Transform the imperialist war into civil war", was not then consciously formulated, and it was precisely the revolutionary wing of the proletariat, under the leadership of Blanqui, which hesitated for a moment and wanted to employ all its forces for the "defence" of the "fatherland" against the German "invasion". But because this wing was sincerely revolutionary, this period of hesitation was only of short duration, and what was not formulated was none the less carried out. An example was given here for all later proletarian revolutions — an example from which something could be learned. The only ones who wanted to learn this lesson during the imperialist war were Lenin and his comrades.

The principal mistake of the Paris Commune was that it remained isolated. We have seen that the First International considered the fundamental task of the revolution the expropriation of the large landowners. The Paris Commune instinctively sought the methods through which it could assure the support of the peasants. It did not find them and remained isolated.

All these questions brought up by the progress of the revolution — the conquest of State power — the organisation of the civil war, and the relations of the proletariat to the other oppressed classes — were not answered decisively because the proletariat itself was not organised; there was no trained, conscious, disciplined party. Without this latter — no victory. Therefore the Commune was only the spiritual child of the First International, as Engels said, but not its real child. For all these questions were precisely those for the realisation of which, under the given circumstances, the First International fought under Marx's leadership. They could not then be solved. Only by Lenin, by the Communist Party, by the Third International could they be taken up again, newly formulated according to new conditions and solved in a revolutionary manner.

25. The Paris Commune broke the labour movement. The centre of gravity was transferred to Germany. What was the First International? Engels described it as follows:

"... The old International is completely finished with. That is good. It belonged to the period . . . when the oppression ruling Europe and the beginning of the re-awakening of the labour movement prescribed unity and abstention from all internal polemics. It was the moment when the common cosmopolitan interests of the proletariat could come to the fore.

The theoretical character of the movement was in reality very unclear in 1864 all over Europe, i. e. amongst the masses . . .

The first great victory had to shatter the naive collaboration of all the groups. When the International became a moral power in Europe through the Commune, the squabble immediately began. Each tendency wanted to exploit the victory for its own ends. The inevitable decay set in . . . The International dominated ten years of European history in the direction in which the future lies, and can look back upon its work with pride.

"But it had outlived itself in its old forms . . . I believe that the next International — after the writings of Marx have operated for a few years — will be directly communist and will unhesitatingly raise the standard of our principles."

B. The Second International.

25. "The First International (1864—1872) laid the foundation for the international organisation of the workers in preparation for their revolutionary onslaught against capital. The Second International (1889—1914) was the international organisation of the proletarian movement, which grew in expanse while sustaining a temporary drop in the height of its revolutionary level, accompanied by a temporary strengthening of opportunism, which led in the end to the collapse of this International." (Lenin)

1. Three Types of Labour Movements.

26. What did the Second International do with the great legacy it had inherited? What became of the revolutionary theory of Marxism? What shape did it assume in practice, did it remain revolutionary? Did it serve the cause of the revolutionary struggle, did it correspond with the spirit of the First International?

The second International was impregnated with opportunism and reformism from the very start; slowly but surely the revolutionary elements eliminated from its theory; the revolutionary practice of the First International was "forgotten" in the reformist practice of the Second; the militant revolutionary organisation of the First gave place to a "democratic" one in the Second.

27. The labour movement of this period was of three types. The leadership in the Second International belonged to the German Party, to the German social democrats. After the fusion of the two groups (the followers of Lassalle and Eisenach respectively), the German Party — with a brief interruption during the time of the anti-socialist laws — entered upon the broad path of legal development with more than a million members in the Party, four million votes in the Reichstag elections, 35 deputies elected in spite of the anti-socialist law, several hundred thousand members in the trade unions; with a central organ, "Vorwärts", with a circulation equal to that of the big capitalist newspapers, — the Party was indeed, the mightiest, and leading Party of the Second International. Nevertheless the handicap of opportunism was soon to reveal itself. The splendid growth of the German Party, corresponding to the growth of the German proletariat, in its turn kept pace with the great growth of German capitalism, which was rapidly turning Germany into a big capitalist State after the termination of the Franco-German war. This growth of capitalism brought in its train a change in the structure of capitalism, in the shape of imperialism; at the same time, there arose a section of the proletariat which was to be the support and basis of the opportunist and reformist practices of the Second International — the Labour Democracy.

28. Most overwhelming and characteristic was the growth of this section in England, where the second type of labour movements came into being. The mighty colonial empire of Great Britain, thanks to the infamous exploitation of the colonies, had placed the British capitalists in an exceptional position. Extra profits and monopolies enabled the British capitalists to pay higher wages to the skilled workers in the heavy industries, thus causing the latter to feel interested in the "development" of capitalism in "their country". English workers paid little attention to the general international interests of the proletariat; the influence of socialism was weak; the working class of England aided and abetted in the oppression of the colonies, in the subjugation of Ireland, and so on. Through its mighty trade unions the English working class secured to itself a share of the spoils; the trade unions became imbued with a narrow-minded and cramped spirit. Not only the international interests of the working class failed to meet with a response on the part of the English working class but even the unskilled workers and agricultural labourers of Great Britain were handed over defenceless to the capitalist exploiters.

29. The third type was evolved by the labour movement in France. After the suppression of the Commune, the French labour movement broke up into sects. Even after the subsequent fusions of these sects into a party, this party was and continued to be weak. The revolutionary past of this country, and particularly of the proletariat, coupled with the great lessons of the Commune, failed to put the French proletariat on the road towards organisation: the Party as well as the trade unions remained organisationally weak. The theory of Marxism did not strike deep roots: phrasemongering reigned supreme. The weakness of the labour movement was the next result of the economic development of France, which was half agrarian, and in comparison with England and Germany rather of a rural, petty-bourgeois nature.

30. Thus we find that in the three leading countries of Europe, where the three principal parties of the Second International were formed, it was the advanced section of the proletariat which imposed the petty-bourgeois mentality upon the workers organised in the trade unions and in the Party. This was effected in different ways. In England and in Germany, it led to a community of interests with the bourgeoisie, while in France the whole of the working class became imbued with the petty-bourgeois nature. Substantially, of course, it amounted to one and the same thing.

2. The Dissipation of the Labour Movement.

31. The results of this development were twofold:

1. the independence of the separate branches of the labour movement in regard to the Party;
2. the independence of the Parties in regard to the International.

One of the substantial features of the First International was the subordination of the whole labour movement to the only real goal: the revolution. All the various questions of the day were subordinated to this goal; all the organisation questions were examined from the standpoint of the revolution.

In the Parties of the Second International, the revolution was in theory partially recognised, but it did not constitute the desirable "ultimate aim". Since the individual parties relied chiefly upon the organised workers, i. e. upon the labour aristocracy, the interests of these elements determined the policies of the Second International.

32. First of all, the trade unions in Germany became more independent and reformist. Instead of becoming "schools for socialism", the mighty font whence the revolutionary movement was to draw its soldiers who had been trained in the economic struggle, the trade unions steadily drifted away from the revolution and from socialism. This was particularly noticeable about 1895, when the trade unions, having a membership of 260,000, felt themselves strong enough to start an "independent" policy of their own. Their membership had increased to nearly 700,000 in 1900, and to 1,340,000 in 1905. The "General Commission" became master of the situation; it deliberately withdrew the trade unions from under the control of the Party, transforming the revolutionary trade unions into craft unions. Legal actions, "solemn battles", "sobriety and self-criticism" and finally "preservation of the State in the real sense", these became the avowed aims and the language used by the trade union bureaucracy. The greater the class antagonisms grew both nationally and internationally in consequence of imperialism, the greater the strain among the different classes, the more anxious were the trade unions to maintain the peace. They consistently opposed the use of the strike as a political weapon, they were opposed to "politics" to the extent in which it spelled "revolution", and in the debate on the mass strike at the Cologne trade union congress they openly declared that "such irresponsible mass risings cannot be prepared, but they arise spontaneously out of the strained relations and that the labour movement would only render them futile. To prepare them would mean to prepare the revolution". They urged as more important the strengthening of the political and economic organisations of the proletariat, because the latter offered the best bulwark against violence.

33. The trade unions became entirely independent of the Party, they even became the masters of the Party. The same thing happened with another organ of the labour movement in Germany: the parliamentary faction. We have seen that the First International urged the formation of independent labour parties "for the purpose of the fight against the organised power of the exploiters". The Party outside of parliament and the Party inside of parliament, were to be the Party of the proletariat, for the fight against the exploiters, and for the leadership of this revolutionary fight. Yet we find that the social democratic factions in the bourgeois parliaments became like the other parties, with the only difference that they were less class-conscious than the parties of the bourgeoisie. They made use of their parliamentary privileges not for the fight against the bourgeoisie, but against the masses of the proletariat and against the Party, in as far as the Party sought in any way to influence the reformist policies of the faction.

34. On the other hand, the individual parties of the Second International were complete. For a long time the Second International had not even a central organ; it was only in 1900, at the Paris Congress, that the International Socialist Bureau was formed, on each Party it had 1 or 2 delegates. But the influence of this Bureau upon the Parties remained extremely theoretical. There was no trace of centralisation, which constituted the substance of the First International. The Bureau had no power whatsoever and in case of conflict among the Parties, or within the Party, it could do no more than offer its advice. The president of the Bureau was Vandervelde.

3. The Opportunism of the Second International.

35. The result was that the Congresses of the Second International formed the battleground between reformism and the revolutionary left wing of the labour movement. At the Paris

Congress of 1889 the resolution was passed to celebrate the First of May as the day of international proletarian solidarity, on which day the workers in all countries were to unite in the common fight for the eight hour day.

The Brussels Congress of 1891 and the Zurich Congress of 1893 laid emphasis on the importance of the political struggle, and all organisations which did not recognise the political struggle were expelled from the International. Thus the anarchists were debarred.

Socialist Parties grew up everywhere, and the International steadily increased its scope. At the London Congress of 1896 the representatives of the illegal organisations of Russia made their first appearance.

36. Opportunism at the same time raised its head. Already the Paris Congress, which was attended by 700 delegates, had to deal with the Millerand case, i. e. with the question whether a member of the social democratic party should join a bourgeois government. Upon this question a compromise was reached. It was decided that "the class struggle forbids the alliance with any faction of the capitalist class," but "there may be exceptional circumstances rendering such alliance unavoidable". Under such "exceptional circumstances" subject to decision and control by the Party, socialists may be permitted to join bourgeois governments. The question of cooperation with bourgeois parties did not come up again for discussion. At Amsterdam in 1904, at Stuttgart in 1907, and at Copenhagen in 1910, the difference between the opportunists and the left wing of social democracy became more pronounced, on this question as well as on the question of colonial policy and war. The direction to which the right wing was steering became manifest at the Stuttgart Congress, when the opportunists demanded the complete independence of the trade unions in respect of the Party. And it was characteristic of the long drift of opportunism away from the spirit of the First International whose aim had been to unite the labour movement for the ultimate goal of revolution, that also upon this question of all questions, upon the question of the unity of the labour movement, a compromise was struck; the demand for independence of the trade unions from the Party was rejected, but the influence of the Party was restricted to mere ideology. And even this soppy compromise was effected under pressure from the left wing.

37. Thus we may distinguish two periods in the history of the Second International: the first period from the Paris Congress (1889) to the Amsterdam Congress (1904), the second period from Stuttgart to Basle. "Against tsarism", was the slogan of the first period; "against imperialism", was the slogan of the second period.

Already the Zurich congress of 1893 dealt exclusively with the question of war, and since that time this question was not removed from the agenda. At the Stuttgart Congress (1907), at the Basle Congress (1912), everywhere we find this question in the centre of the discussion.

The founding of the Second International in the 80's coincided with the transition period of capitalism to imperialism. The Franco-Russian alliance had been formed, in opposition to the Triple Alliance.

4. The Second International and the War.

38. The Franco-Russian Alliance was quite openly directed against Germany, and it greatly strengthened the power of tsarism. "Against tsarism!" became the slogan of the Second International, as it had once been the slogan of the First International. It had been a revolutionary slogan then: according to Marx, the war against Russia was a revolutionary war against the strongest counter-revolutionary power in Europe, to remove the obstacles in the path of the proletarian revolution. The slogan: "against tsarism" would have continued to be a revolutionary slogan, had it not been converted into a slogan of the national defence by the German Social Democrats, against whose "fatherland" the Franco-Russian Alliance was directed. This became clear the moment the spectre of the war drew near and it was no longer to be a war between France and Germany, but an imperialist world war. At the International congresses the imperialist war was "unanimously" condemned, in words, in resolutions. It became increasingly evident that the coming war would find the leaders of the Second International ranged on the side of their respective fatherlands, and that the opportunist, social-chauvinist leaders would have smashed the Second Inter-

national into pieces long before the war, had they not been united on the platform of phrasology in order to conceal their real plans and designs.

39. Whereas the First International was a revolutionary though preparatory organisation of the international proletariat, the Second International was an organisation of mass parties, which implied the disappearance of the revolutionary spirit and the stifling of the revolutionary solidarity of the proletariat in the individual countries. A total of 25 million organised socialists, and in reality a retrogression from the revolutionary spirit, organisation and tactics of the First International. This retrogression revealed itself also in the theory of the Second International.

5. The Theory of the Second International.

International Menshevism.

40. The theory of the Second International was "formally" that of "revolutionary Marxism". "Formally" this theory was represented by the best Marxists, like Kautsky etc. In reality, the lead was in the hands of the opportunists and the "orthodox" Marxists trimmed also their theories to suit the opportunists, in order not to endanger the "unity of the Party". Thus the revolutionary theory of Marxism was converted into a collection of dogmas, which would no longer keep pace with the revolutionary situation. The following are the chief points on which the Marxian theory was adulterated:

1. The First International had a revolutionary theory and endeavoured to revolutionise the practice in accordance with the theory.

The Second International had a reformist practice and it wanted to reform the Marxian theory to suit the reformist practice (Bernstein, Revisionism).

2. This was first of all revealed in the basis of Marxism, in the theory of the class struggle. Instead of the revolutionary doctrine that modern society consists of antagonistic classes (bourgeois and proletariat), among which the antagonism is bound to grow in acuteness, the opposite theory was evolved to the effect that this antagonism becomes gradually mitigated.

3. Next, as to the theory of the State. The class society has its counter part in the class State; the whole struggle of the classes revolves around the possession of the State as the instrument of class-subjection. This revolutionary theory was converted into the theory that the State is a neutral organisation which stands above the classes of society, thus a tool of common organisation, rather than an instrument of subjection. Thus the ground was prepared for the idea of the "State under Socialist Rule".

4. The theory of the seizure of power by the proletariat underwent a reformist change, and was transformed from this revolutionary process into the peaceful reformist "evolution towards socialism". The theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat was dropped and "forgotten"; the destruction of the old capitalist machinery of the State, this great doctrine of communism, was substituted by the capturing of the majority in the bourgeois parliaments. The proletariat was told that the only way to gain power was by constituting a majority in the country and by developing all the administrative organs etc. already before the revolution. In short, the revolution was substituted by a democratic system with ballots and majority votes.

5. The theory of the role of the Party which Marx, in his debates with Bakunin and the anarchists, defined in general theoretical outline as the leader and guide of the revolutionary movement, as the gatherer of the militant and class conscious elements, of the proletarian vanguard, — this theory was entirely forgotten, and instead of a disciplined and active Party it became a loose democratic conglomeration of voters, whose activity consisted in voting at elections.

6. The great doctrine of the alliance of all the toilers was not applied, although the preliminary work in this direction had been done by Marx. On the contrary, the boundaries between the proletariat and the petty-bourgeoisie were obliterated.

7. The revolutionary kernel was removed from the Marxian philosophy which was converted into a peaceful theory of evolution.

The so-called "orthodox" tendency (Kautsky) defended the Marxian theory against the theory of "evolutionary growth towards socialism" (Bernstein) in such a manner that they denuded the Marxian theory of its revolutionary content. The revolution, the essence of Marxism, was buried once and for all, while the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, as the transition

period between capitalism and socialism, was eventually substituted by the period of coalition governments.

8. Thus the work of the Second International respecting the negation of the Marxian theory was accomplished. All the theories produced by the First International were thrown overboard. Instead of Marxism, the new theories of Hilferding (Society) and the so-called Guild Socialism constitute the theoretical content of international Menshevism, which wavers between social-fascism and social-pacifism.

THE DAY OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL IS A DAY OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

1. The sole heir to the First International is the Communist International. It is not only the sole guardian of the traditions of the First International in the domain of theory and practice but it is the executor.

2. Leninism is the continuation of Marxian theory and practice in the epoch of imperialism and of social revolution. The Communist International is the realisation of the world Party which the First International was intended to be according to the conception of Marx and Engels, of course upon an enlarged scale. The fight of the Communist International against international Menshevism is the continuation of the fight against the various forms of petty-bourgeois socialism in the First International. The fight against sectarianism is continued in the shape of the fight against the "ultra-left" deviations which do not understand the importance of the mass organisations of the proletariat.

3. The circumstances of the struggle have naturally changed considerably. The First International was active in the heyday of capitalism, and free competition, devoid of strong labour organisations. The Communist International is fighting in the epoch of imperialism, the last stage of capitalism. Behind the Communist International are not only mass parties which carry on their revolutionary struggles and the leadership of the Communist International, but also the first proletarian State, the U.S.S.R. It is now a question of realising the slogans of the First International: "The capture of political power is the supreme duty of the working class."

4. In order to realise this, the Communist Parties themselves must organise in conformity with the slogans of the Inaugural Address: "The masses will only throw their weight into the scales when there is an organisation to hold them together and knowledge guides them." In order to win the victory against the armed forces of the bourgeoisie and of their henchmen, the social democrats, we must so mould our organisations, in order to enable them to mobilise for the struggle the majority of the socially important elements of the proletariat, and meet armed violence with armed violence. The factory nuclei are the form of organisation most likely to ensure the permanent contact with the working masses, while the tactic of the united front is at this stage the best method of stirring up the masses for the fight.

5. The Communist Parties in order to be able to lead effectively, must be in possession of the whole arsenal of Marxian and Leninist theory. The problems confronting us at this stage in the development of the international revolution are far too complex to be understood without a thorough knowledge of theory. The theory cannot be the privilege of a group of leaders in the Party, every member of the Party must possess a certain minimum of political knowledge. The Communist Party is the leader of the proletariat, and every member must be a leader in his circle of activity. In order to exercise this duty of leadership, every member of the Party must at least familiarise himself with the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

6. The chief slogan of the fifth Congress of the Communist International: "To the masses, through the bolshevisation of the Parties", is in this sense the realisation of the traditions of the First International. The fight against any form of reformism, the strong militant organisation in the shape of factory nuclei working in close contact with the masses, in every factory nucleus a circle for the study of Marxism-Leninism: this is the way which leads to the bolshevisation of the Communist Parties, towards the realisation of the heritage of the First International. Only in this way can the Communist International accomplish the tasks of becoming a real world party and the leader of the working class in the international revolutionary struggle.

The Agitation and Propaganda Department of the Communist International.

The Founding of the First International.

By N. Rjasanow.

After the defeat of the revolution in 1848, a defeat involving the suppression of all movements of the working class on the continent and in England, ten years passed before the labour movement began to rise again, and the International Labour Association emerged from the rising waves. During this decade of political reaction, and of hitherto unexampled economic prosperity, scarcely impeded by the Crimean war and participated in by the whole of the countries of Europe, Russia not excluded, a new generation grew up, and this generation did not awaken from its political indifference until the world-wide crisis of 1857—1858. The political revival beginning in 1859, and again raising many of the national and political questions which had been put before the revolution of 1848, but never answered, again filled the democratic movement everywhere with fresh life. And from 1858 onwards the abolition of slavery in the United States and in Russia became practical questions of the day.

The English Labour Movement in the Fifties and Sixties.

In England, where Chartism had lost its last organ in 1858, after Ernest Jones had failed in the attempt to impart to Chartism the character of a class movement, and it had ceased to exist as united political organisation, the labour movement split up entirely. Its old tendency of dissolving into separate sectional movements with different aims, and into various organisations all competing with one another for the attainment of the same object — a tendency to which Chartism had also been liable — now gained the upper hand again. There was not a trace to be found of a united labour movement with united leadership.

Political conditions most favoured the development of those forms of the labour movement which did not run directly counter to the ruling reaction, and thus enjoyed the patronage of bour-

geois philanthropists. Headed by the honest pioneers of Rochdale, the co-operative societies gained firm ground in the fifties, and played a leading role among the forms of activity taken by the labour movement at that time.

The fifties were however not very favorable for the trade union movement. Except for a few exceptional cases, the trade unions kept going with the greatest difficulty. The tendency gaining the upper hand was that which regarded any political action as a disturbing element.

But the situation was changed at one blow after the crisis of 1857. "The era of strikes" — say the Webbs — "which began in 1857 with the decline of business, proved how deceitful these hopes had been."

The most important strike of this period was however the strike in the London building trade.

The whole of the English trade unions supported the building workers of London. For the period of half a year (from 21st July 1859 till 6th February 1860) this strike kept the English working class in a state of excitement. The workers' representatives and members of the committee (formed of delegates from different trades) — especially G. Odger, the future chairman, and W. R. Cremer, secretary of the general council of the International Labour Association — explained the demands of the workers at the meetings. "If political economy is against us" cried Cremer at a meeting in Hyde Park: "then we shall fight against it." The whole struggle was regarded as a fight between the political economy of the working class and the political economy of the capitalist class.

The first building workers' strike ended with a compromise. The workers abandoned their main demands for the time being. Despite this, this strike formed a turning point in the history of

the English labour movement. The struggle for the right of coalition induced even the most peacefully inclined trade unions to take part. The trades committees formed during these strikes for the purpose of organising the collection resulted in many places in the formation of Trades Councils, amongst others the London Trades Council (July 1860), which now undertook the task of defending the common interests of the workers in the struggle against the capitalists.

And when the next great building strike broke out in the spring of 1861, the building workers were backed up from the beginning by all the London trade unions. The newly formed London Trades Council exerted its utmost forces in support of the building workers' demands. It was this Council which organised the whole action against the employment of soldiery as strikebreakers. The deputation sent to the government in accordance with the resolution passed by a delegates meeting of all London trade unions, convened by the Trades Council, consisted of the following: S. Coulson, W. Cremer, G. Howell, Henry Martin, John Hieasz, G. Odger — all members of the future General Council of the International.

The second strike brought the building workers not only the same security for their coalition rights which the first had brought, but at the same time shorter working hours. A standard working day of 9½ hours was fixed.

But the strike movement of 1859 till 1861 not only brought about a closer feeling between the local trade unions, and an awakening of class solidarity among the English workers, but it had another important result. The employers, who always brought up foreign competition when resisting the trade unions, now threatened to import cheap foreign labour. This threat was no empty one, as the increasing competition of Germany in the tailoring and baking trades speedily showed. The struggle for equal working conditions had to be extended to the continent. Thus the international propaganda of the trade union organisation became a matter of vital importance for the English workers, and they became conscious of the need of establishing connections with continental workers, especially in France, Belgium, and Germany.

The many fugitives living in London offered excellent opportunity for entering into such communication. At this time, after a large number of the French workers had either emigrated to America or returned to France after the amnesties of 1856, the central resort of proletarian emigrés was the "Communist Workers' Educational Union", whose members were actually recruited mainly from the handicraft class (tailors, painters, watch-makers), and, like Eccarius and Lessner, both members of the old "Union of Communists", were at the same time active members of the English trade unions.

There was speedy opportunity of entering into immediate communication with workers on the continent, through the intermediation of various refugees. The third World Exhibition was opened in London in May 1862, and was attended by labour delegations from various countries. The French delegations were the most numerous.

French Workmen in England.

The defeat of the revolution of 1848 was felt more severely by the French proletariat than by any other. The government which had seized power by a coup d'état now ruthlessly suppressed any independent movement in the working class. Various police measures and prohibitions were combined with endeavours on the part of the Empire to reconcile the workers with the new regime by means of improvements in the material situation of the working class, a kind of "imperial socialism".

But the crisis of 1857—58 brought about a change in France, as in England. All delusions on "imperial socialism" were abruptly dispelled. Despite the anti-combination-law, the crisis was immediately followed by a strike movement in defence of the old wages. The excitement among the working population was very great. The Italian war, which had been undertaken in order to provide a safety valve for the discontent prevailing within the country itself, called forth much enthusiasm among the working population, but this changed to a storm of indignation as soon as the conditions of the peace of Villa Franca were made known. It now became evident that there was no turning back. But on the other hand it was equally evident that the further development of the Italian question would further increase the dissatisfaction of the clergy. A counter-weight could only be formed by the working class, and by the liberty-loving bourgeoisie and petty citizen class. Therefore the first steps were taken towards a "liberal

empire", and towards the rapprochement to England which was expressed in the trade agreement of 1860.

In the imperial family Prince Napoleon was the chief representative of the liberal and anti-clerical tendencies. His confidant was Armand Levy, who had been active in the revolution of 1848, and had been tutor to the children of Mickiewicz, the great Polish writer. He succeeded in gaining the collaboration of many representatives of various associations for his newspaper, which defended the cause of all suppressed nationalities, and devoted much space to the labour question. He was successful in forming a group among the Parisian workers, and this supplied him regularly with correspondence. In collaboration with these correspondents Levy published a series of pamphlets formulating the demands of the workers — in the spirit of imperialist socialism.

It was with this group that the idea originated of forming an own labour delegation for the London World Exhibition. This same Levy acted as chief intermediary between the workers and Prince Napoleon, who was chairman of the imperial exhibition committee. It was this circumstance, the alleged semi-official character of the labour delegation, which was utilised later on various sides against the French members of the International.

In reality the matter was very different. Among the Parisian workers there was another group, mostly followers of Proudhon, willing to take part in the delegation under certain conditions only. This group was headed by Tolain. It was successful in having the election of the delegates carried out by the workers themselves.

But how little the meeting held on 5. August 1862, at which the French labour delegation was ceremoniously welcomed, can be regarded as starting point of the International Labour Association, is demonstrated by the fact that the leaders of the English trade unions had nothing whatever to do with the whole matter.

Those arranging the meeting emphasised from the beginning that the reception was not prepared by the English workers alone, but by the English employers as well. The meeting was arranged under the aegis of those same exploiters who, a few months before, had fought the English workers with all the means at their disposal. Thus no definite propositions were made for bringing about a permanent connection between French and English workers. The addresses held by French and English alike did not place the interests of the working class in the foreground, but those of industry, and the necessity of an understanding between workers and employers was emphasised as sole means of improving the unfavourable position of the working class. No word was uttered on the necessity of the working classes of different countries combining with one another in their struggle for emancipation. And yet the visit made by the French to the London world's exhibition was indirectly of great significance, for it proved a very important stage on the road to an understanding between English and French workmen. The contact with English comrades, and the becoming personally acquainted with English conditions, have borne fruit.

One of the most important results was the separation of the workers following in the track of "imperial socialism" from those who, under the leadership of Tolain and his friends, wished to be free from any official control.

There is no doubt but that the French delegates entered into communication with English trade union leaders, perhaps through the intermediation of some of the French emigrés. The connections thus formed were then maintained by the members of the French labour delegation, who found headquarters in London and settled there permanently — for instance E. Dupont, the future secretary of the International for France.

But these connections between English and French workers, made during the visit of the delegation, would have been speedily dissolved had not two events — the cotton famine and the Polish insurrection — called forth parallel movements on both sides of the Channel.

The cotton famine, a consequence of the civil war in North America, became exceedingly acute in the years 1862 and 1863. The situation of the workers in Lancashire was frightful. And the French textile workers suffered equally.

In London a workers' committee was formed, headed by Odger and Cremer, and in Paris a similar committee was formed almost simultaneously, under the leadership of Tolain, Perrachon, Kin, and others, for the purpose of organising collections for the suffering workers.

The action taken in aid of the Polish insurgents was equally

parallel. The English workmen, despite the want and misery caused them by the civil war in North America, held great meetings for carrying on an energetic campaign against the government, which was inclined to take the part of the slave-holders. They also held a number of meetings expressing their sympathy with the Polish insurrection, which began at the beginning of 1863, and exerted every endeavour to exercise such pressure on the government as would induce it to act in a friendly manner towards the Poles. A delegation elected by one of the meetings in St. James Hall (held on 28th April 1863, under the chairmanship of Professor Beesly) was received by Palmerston, but received an evasive reply. In order to put greater pressure on the government, it was decided to convene another meeting, participated in this time by the representatives of the French workers.

Tolain and his friends accepted the invitation of the English workers. The meeting was held in St. James' Hall on 22. July 1863. Cremer spoke for the English workers, and subjected the whole of Palmerston's foreign policy to a severe criticism. Odger also spoke on behalf of the English workers, and demanded war against Russia. Tolain spoke on the same lines, eloquently describing the sufferings of the Poles, and emphasising the necessity of putting a stop to Russian barbarism.

Immediately after the meeting, the English and French workers held consultations, discussing the necessity of closer and more permanent connection.

And now it was the London Trades Council which grasped the initiative as fully authorised representative of the workers of London. On 23rd July the Council arranged a festive reception for the French workers. The secretary, Odger, welcomed the French workers, and expressed the hope that the day was not far distant when the workers of all countries would join together, when war and slavery would disappear, and their place be filled by liberty and universal welfare. A Polish delegation was also present. A German worker, a weaver, spoke of the advantageous effects of co-operation between the workers of different countries.

Preparations for an International Labour Association.

It was unanimously resolved to appoint a committee commissioned to draw up an address to the French workers. But more than three months passed before the committee had completed this task, and the draft of the address was submitted to a new meeting. (10. November 1863.) The address was supported by Odger, Cremer, and Applegarth (who died recently), and was unanimously approved.

In the second half of November the address was translated into French by Professor Beesly, sent to the Paris workers, and eagerly read in all the suburbs of Paris.

This address of sympathy expresses the idea that solidarity among the nations is best furthered by the union of the workers of all countries. An international congress is proposed as intermediary.

"Let us convene a meeting of representatives from France, England, Italy, Poland, and all the countries possessing the will to mutual work for humanity. Let us hold our congresses, let us discuss the great questions upon which the peace of the peoples depends.

The fraternisation of the peoples is the first necessity for the cause of labour. For whenever we attempt to improve our social position by shorter working hours or increased wages, our employers threaten to bring over Frenchmen, Germans, or Belgians, who will do our work for lower wages. We are unfortunately obliged to admit that this has already been done, though not through any intention on the part of our brothers on the continent, out through lack of a regular and systematic connection among the working slaves of all countries. We hope that this connection will be actualised, for our principle of raising the wages of badly paid workers as far as possible to the level of the better paid workers is one which puts an end to the employers' device of playing us off one against the other, and thus lowering our standard of living to suit their mercenary spirit."

More than eight months passed before an address in reply to this was received in London from the French workers. This delay is to be explained by the fact that the Parisian workers were preparing for the second ballot elections held in March 1864. It was the first attempt at separation from the bourgeois opposition. In a manifesto (Manifest des soixante), drawn up by Tolain and signed by sixty workers, including Caléinat, the present treasurer of our French sister party, the necessity of independent political activity on the part of the working class is

explained. The fundamental principles of the manifesto were Proudhon's, but with the difference that the "sixty" declared themselves in favour of active participation in the elections, whilst Proudhon was opposed to this.

It was not until after these elections that negotiations with the English workers were renewed. The intermediaries were Henri Lefort, who is still alive, and his friends among the French refugees. Lefort had also lent his aid in the elections. It was decided that the address replying to the English workers should be carried to London by a delegation elected for the purpose. On the 17th September 1864 the English labour paper, the "Beehive" published the announcement that on Wednesday 23th September, 1864, a meeting would be held in St. Martin's Hall, Longacre, at which a labour deputation from Paris would read their address in reply to the English workers, and submit a plan for the attainment of a better understanding among the peoples.

The Meeting at which the International was Founded.

At the meeting, which Marx described in a letter to Engels as "crowded to suffocation", the chair was occupied by the same Prof. Beesly who had conducted the great Poland meeting the year before. His speech, in which he emphasised the necessity of an alliance between England and France, and expressed the hope that the result of the meeting would be co-operation and brotherly feeling between the workers of England and those of all other countries, was followed by the reading, by Odger, of the address sent by the English workers to the French, Tolain replied on behalf of the French delegation:

"Workers of all countries, if you want to be free, it is now our turn to hold congresses; the people, now awakened to the consciousness of their power, are rising against the tyranny of the political system, against the monopoly in social economy; for industry is developing its productive forces day by day, thanks to the advances of scientific discovery; the employment of machinery facilitates the division of labour and further enhances the power of industry; and the trading agreements realising the free trade idea open out new field for industry everywhere.

Industrial progress, division of labour, free trade, these are the three new objects which must chain our attention, for they are going essentially to alter the economic conditions of society. Urged by the might of facts, and by the needs of the times, the capitalists have combined together in mighty financial and industrial companies, and if we do not take up measures in defence, the pressure of this preponderance will not be counteracted by any counterweight, and will speedily rule us despotically. We workers of all countries must unite to throw impassable barrier before this disastrous system, which will otherwise divide humanity into two different classes, into a mass of starved and brutalised beings on the one hand, and a clique of overfed snobs and mandarins on the other. Let us help one another by solidarity, that our goal may be reached. This is what our French brothers have to propose to our English brothers."

Le Lubez, who translated Tolain's speech into English, then submitted to the meeting the plan of action proposed by the French workers: a central commission, formed of workers from all countries, was to be established in London, whilst sub-commissions were to be appointed in all the capital cities of Europe, and to correspond with the central commission in London. The central commission was to submit questions for discussion, which were then to be simultaneously discussed by all sub-commissions, and the result communicated to the central commission.

A congress was to be held in Belgium in the course of the following year, attended by representatives of all the working classes of the different countries. This congress would arrange the final form of the organisation. After an address of Lefort's had been read, Wheeler proposed the following resolution:

"The meeting, having heard the reply sent by our French brothers to our address, once more welcomes the French delegation, and as their plan is calculated to further unity among the workers, the meeting accepts the draft just read as the basis for an International Association. At the same time it appoints a committee, authorised to increase its membership, commissioned to draw up the statutes and regulations of the proposed association." The resolution was seconded by Eccarius on behalf of the Germans, by Major Wolff for the Italians, by Bosquet

for the French, by Forbes for the Irish, and was passed with acclamation.

This is all we know about this historical meeting. The members of the provisional central council were commissioned to work out the statutes, but no definite lines were prescribed for this. Even the name of the newly founded association was not decided upon. The committee was left to pour basis principles into the new mould of an international association as best they could. The formulation of this declaration of principles was thus left to the varying opinions obtaining in the committee itself.

Marx and the International.

It is to the German communist Karl Marx that thanks are mainly due for the program drawn up and the statutes drafted for the International Association thus created by the English and French workers.

In the official report his name is first mentioned among the members of the elected committee, where it takes the last place. This circumstance alone proves that his name was known to the conveners of the meeting. He himself writes as follows on the subject:

"A certain Le Lubez was sent to me, asking if I would participate on behalf of the German workers, and especially if I would send a German speaker for the meeting, etc. I sent Eccarius, who managed splendidly, whilst I assisted him as dumb figure on the platform. I knew that on this occasion real "powers" both from London and Paris would be figuring, and thus decided to depart from my otherwise fixed rule of declining all such invitations."

W. C. Cremer, a carpenter, had invited him to the meeting in a letter, which reads as follows:

Dear Sir,

The committee organising the meeting announced in the enclosed invitation begs respectfully for the honour of your presence. The production of this letter will gain you entrance to the room in which the committee meets at half past 7.

Yours truly,

W. R. Cremer.

To Dr. Marx.

Karl Marx to Frederick Engels on the Founding of the I. International.

4th November 1864.

Dear Frederick,

Some time ago the London workers sent an address to the Paris workers with reference to Poland, calling upon them to take common action in this matter.

The Parisians for their part sent a deputation over here, headed by a workman called Tolain, who was actually labour candidate at the last election in Paris, and who is a very nice fellow. (His companions were very good fellows too.) A public meeting was convened in St. Martin's Hall for 28th September by Odger (Shoemaker, chairman of the local London Trades Council the council of all London trade unions, and especially of the Suffrage Propaganda Society of the London trade unions, connected with Bright) and Cremer, a stone-mason and secretary of the stone masons trade union. (These two men brought about the great meeting of the trade unions for North America, under Bright, at the St James' Hall, as also the Garibaldi manifestation). A certain Le Lubez was sent to me, asking if I would participate on the part of the German workers' and especially if I would send a German speaker for the meeting, etc. I sent Eccarius, who managed splendidly, whilst I assisted him as dumb figure on the platform. I knew that on this occasion real "powers" both from London and Paris would be figuring, and thus decided to depart from my otherwise fixed rule of declining all such invitations.

Le Lubez is a young Frenchman, that is, he is in the thirties, but he was brought up in Jersey and London, speaks splendid English, and is an excellent intermediary between the French and English workers. He is a music teacher, and has given French lessons as well.

Thus, though it is scarcely possible to designate Marx as the founder of the International Labour Association, still there is no doubt but he was its intellectual leader from the time of the first session of the provisional general council. With the help of Eccarius he opposed every attempt towards transforming the new association into a new variation of the former "International Association", or to amalgamate it with another, as for instance the "Universal League", on whose premises the provisional council held its first meetings.

At the second session (12th October 1864) a resolution was passed, proposed by Eccarius and Whitlok, giving the new society the name of "International Labour Association".

In the subcommission, commissioned to draft the statutes, Marx succeeded in securing victory for the fundamental ideas of scientific socialism. He was obliged to grant some concessions in the debate with French and Italian revolutionists, but on the whole the "Inaugural Address" proposed by him, as also his declaration of principles, were approved as best expression of the demands of the working class by almost all the workers in the General Council. At the fourth session of the provisional General Council, on 1st November 1864, Marx read his work, which, with a few alterations in the style, was unanimously accepted.

From this day onwards the First International had its program, and on this day the young organisation could begin its work of propaganda.

The "Inaugural Address" of the International Labour Association closed with that same appeal of: "workers of the world, unite", which had formed the closing words of the Inaugural Address of the first International Workers' Union, the Communist Manifesto, the first to proclaim united action among the workers of all countries as one of the most important conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat.

But that which had been the appeal of a tiny minority, of a small group whose internationality lay mostly in its programme, had now become transformed into an appeal sent forth by a labour organisation international in its membership and its programme alike. Thousands and thousands of workers gathered together for self-emancipation in the sections and groups of the First International. The alliance of the workers of all countries which it founded now celebrates its renaissance in the new International with its millions of proletarians.

At the meeting, which was packed to suffocation (for there is obviously a revival in the working class at the present time) the London union of Italian workers was represented by Major Wolff (Thurn-Taxis, Garibaldi's adjutant). It was resolved to found an International Labour Association, whose General Council is to have its headquarters in London, and to act as intermediary between the labour unions of Germany, Italy, France, and England. It was further resolved to convocate a general labour congress in Belgium in 1865. A provisional committee was nominated at the meeting, Odger, Cremer, and many others, in part old Chartists, old Owenites, etc., for England. Major Wolff, Fontana, and other Italians for Italy; Le Lubez, etc., for France; Eccarius and I for Germany. The committee was authorised to add as many members as it thought necessary.

So far good. I attended the first meeting of the committee. A subcommittee was nominated (including me), commissioned to draw up a declaration of principles and provisional articles. I was prevented by illness from attending the session of the subcommittee, and the session of the whole committee following this.

At these two meetings — the one held by the subcommittee, followed by that of the whole committee — at which I was not present, the following had occurred:

Major Wolff had submitted his statutes of the Italian Labour Unions (which possess a central organisation, but, as turned out later, consist essentially of associated auxiliary unions) to be utilised by the new association. I saw the stuff later. It was obviously a piece of Mazzini's handiwork, so you can imagine for yourself in what spirit and in what phraseology the real

question, the labour question, was dealt with. And how the nationality matters were edged in.

Besides this, a program had been drawn up by an old Owenite — Weston, now himself a manufacturer, a most agreeable and well meaning man full of the utmost confusion and of unspeakable breadth.

The general committee session following this had commissioned the subcommittee to remodel Weston's program and Wolf's statutes. Wolf himself left for Naples, to attend the conference of the London union of Italian workers there, and to induce this union to join the London Labour Association.

The subcommittee held another meeting, at which I was again not present, as I got to know of the rendezvous too late. Here Le Lubez had submitted a declaration of principles and a revision of the Wolf statutes; these had been accepted by the subcommittee for submitting to the general committee. The general committee met on 18th October. As Eccarius had written me that danger was to be expected, I attended, and was truly horrified to hear the good Le Lubez read an introduction, in frightful phraseology, badly written, and entirely immature, claiming to be a declaration of principles. Mazzini peeped through everywhere, overlaid with the vaguest shreds of French socialism. Besides this, the Italian statutes had been almost completely accepted, although, apart from their other faults, they actually aim at something entirely impossible, a sort of central government (with Mazzini in the background of course) of the European working classes. I opposed mildly, and after much discussion Eccarius proposed that the subcommittee should once more submit the matter to a fresh "editing" contained in the Lubez declaration were however accepted.

Two days later, on 20th October, there was a meeting at my house; Cremer for the English, Fontana (Italy), and Le Lubez. (Weston was unable to come). I had not had the papers in my hands up to then (Wolf's and Le Lubez's) and was unable to prepare anything, but was fully determined that not one line of the stuff was to be allowed to stand. In order to gain time, I suggested that we should discuss the "statutes" before beginning to "edit". This was done. It was one o'clock in the morning before the first of 40 statutes was accepted. Cremer said (and

this is what I had been aiming at): we have nothing to submit to the committee meeting on 25th October. We must postpone this meeting until 1st November. The subcommittee, on the other hand, can meet on 27th October, and try to come to a definite result. This was agreed to, and the "papers" left behind with me for me to look through.

I saw that it was impossible to make anything of the stuff. In order to justify the extremely peculiar way in which I intended to "edit" the "accepted principles", I wrote an address to the working class (though this was not in the original plan): a sort of review of the development of the working class since 1845. On the pretext that all essentials were contained in this address, and that we must not repeat the same things three times, I altered the whole introduction, threw out the declaration of principles, and finally replaced the 40 statutes by 10. In so far as international politics are mentioned in the address, I speak of countries, not of nationalities, and denounce Russia, not the smaller states. My proposals were all accepted by the subcommittee. I was however obliged to take up two "duty" and "right" phrases, and one on "truth, morality, and justice" in the introduction to the statutes, but they are so placed that they cannot do any damage.

My address, etc. was accepted with great enthusiasm (unanimously) at the session of the general committee. The debate on the manner in which it is to be printed, etc., takes place on Tuesday. Le Lubez has received a copy for translation into French, Fontana one for translation into Italian. I myself have to translate the stuff into English.

It has been very difficult to manage the matter so that our views can appear in a form acceptable to the present standpoint of the labour movement. These same people will be holding meetings within a few weeks for suffrage, with Bright and Cobden. It will take time before the reawakened movement permits of the old boldness of speech. We must hold firmly to the cause itself, but be moderate in form. As soon as the thing is printed you shall have it.

Salut.

Yours,
K. M.

(Correspondence. Vol. III p. 186.)

"The working class can only carry on its struggle for emancipation by constituting itself as a political party, which differs from all parties of the possessing classes and adopts a hostile attitude to them. This constitution of the working class into a political class is unavoidable in order to bring about the triumph of the social revolution. The rallying of the forces which the working class already possesses for its economic struggles, shall also serve as a lever against the political power of the landowners and capitalists. In the condition of war in which the working class finds itself, the economic movement and political action are inseparably united."

Resolution of the Hague Congress of the I. International 1872.

Workers of the World, unite!
(Inaugural Address.)

Proprietor, Publisher and responsible Editor: Eduard Stegbauer, Vienna, X., Pernerstorfergasse 64.
Printers: "Elbemühl", Vienna, IX., Berggasse 31.

MAY 26 '420

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 68

25th September 1924

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

CONTENTS

Politics

I. Amter: Leave it to the Americans.
Nguyen-ai-Quac: The Imperialist Powers and China.
P. Kitaigorodsky: Egypt and the Sudan.
R. A.: The Defeat of Primo de Rivera in Morocco.

Economics

Eugen Varga: Economics and Economic Policy in the first Half year of 1924. IV.

The Labour Movement

Karl Frank: The Results of the Austrian Metal Workers Strike.
The Miners Strike in Belgium.

Sixtieth Anniversary of the First International
W. N. Clark: Reflections of a Second Internationalist on the Sixtieth Anniversary.
For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement
Declaration of British Minority Movement.
Edo Fimmen Exposes Anti-Soviet Lies.
In the Camp of our Enemies
The Liquidation of Menshevism in Georgia.
Union of Soviet Republics.
Ludwig Magyar: Solovetsk, the "Red Hell".
Red Relief.
Protest against the Brutal Acts of the White Dictatorship in Bulgaria.

POLITICS

Leave it to the Americans.

By I. Amter.

The United States Government has invented a new term in diplomacy: the "unofficial observer." This unofficial observer binds nobody, merely expresses opinions and good wishes. Nobody is compromised if nothing is attained — and above all, the people at home, the good American people, do not believe that America is getting mixed up in "European entanglements". The American people has expressly stated that it will have nothing to do with European affairs, having enough of its own to take care of. So the "unofficial observer" goes to all international conferences, does the bidding of his masters in Wall Street, and everything is correct, as it should be, in international diplomacy.

The election campaign is on in the United States, and the Manchester Guardian reports that it has "developed neither incident nor interest". In fact, the Guardian declares that in many ways "there has never been a more apathetic campaign". The only topic of interest to the three parties — the Republican, Democratic and La Follette's party — is the Ku Klux Klan, which is practically the "only issue". The Berliner Tageblatt on September 18, reported something more of interest than even the Ku Klux Klan. Coolidge has suddenly discovered that "economy" is the watchword of the hour. He had been accused of effecting a curtailment in the budget only at the expense of minor items and of the workers. Now Coolidge intends to make a further cut, this time at the expense of the navy. He is being attacked by Secretary of the Navy Wilbur, but declares with all insistence that he will not relent. Fifty million dollars are to

come off the naval budget, if Coolidge has his way and is supported by the "people" at the coming election. This will tickle the "little man", who does not want the government to spend so much money; and it will cut into the support that La Follette might get from the pacifists and all "peace-loving" people. Coolidge is assailed as the agent of Wall Street, which is openly waging imperialist campaigns, which must result in imperialist wars. Coolidge, the agent of Wall Street, is now trying to prove the contrary. Fifty millions from the marine budget at one strike — when the world is peppered with wars; when the Dawes reparation plan threatens new complications; when China and Morocco are ablaze; when revolution menaces in Bulgaria; when Mussolini is falling; de Rivera about to be succeeded; Ireland flaring up; strikes in every country. Yes, Coolidge, the peace-loving agent of Wall Street, will have peace at any price — even at the price of fifty millions.

But let us examine this a little closer. In 1922, at the Disarmament Conference in Washington, the ratio of 5:5:3 was fixed for battleships. Both England and America knew that if one country began the race for the erection of battleships, it would be answered by the other. Hence there was a restriction in the building of this type of man-killer. This was accomplished with no chagrin, but with loud hurrahs as the dawning of a "new era" of peace. Armaments were limited: this would lead — eventually, but not now — to complete disarmament. The Washington Conference was another of the farces and lies that the international imperialists foist on the workers, diverting them away from the main issue. Of course, the building of battleships was limited. It paid the governments to arrange the conference for that purpose, for battleships were obsolete, as the last war demonstrated and the experiments with aeroplanes and aerial bombs showed quite conclusively. At any rate the Republican administration of the United States had a feather in its cap: it had brought about and carried to a successful conclusion the farcical "disarmament" conference.