

of thousands are to perish in unemployment or in the miseries of emigration, whilst the proletariat still engaged in production are to suffer the same fate in the midst of toil unworthy of human beings, and at starvation wages. This is the import of the imperialist "pacifism" whose praises are being sung in all flunkey newspapers. You are to be misused as robbers of work and undercutters of wages for your comrades in England, France, Belgium, and Holland.

Listen to the voices of your foreign comrades. They are fighting against the Dawes Plan, and they call upon you to hold fast to the seven hour shift underground and the eight hour shift for surface workers. They call upon you to fight for wages worthy of human beings, in your own interest and in the interest of the world proletariat. The reformist leaders in Germany are trying to prevent the international united front now forming among the miners all over the world; for the interests of the money bags, of their bourgeoisie, and the maintenance of their counter-revolutionary community of interests with the propertied classes, require that you are to be the coal coolies of the world. In the Ruhr valley they have already thrown eighty thousand miners into the streets, whilst the others have to work overtime to replace them.

The inter-parliamentary Conference notes with satisfaction your intention of holding a conference in collaboration with your comrades abroad, for the purpose of deciding common measures in the struggle. Be assured, comrades, that just as it is intended that you should become the object of exploitation for international capitalism, just as surely will your self-defensive struggle become the defence of the international mining proletariat. The miners of England have already issued an appeal, through their general secretary Cook, for the international struggle of all miners against the Dawes Plan, and for the reconquest of

### Against the White Terror.

To the Workers and small Peasants of all Countries!  
The bourgeoisie, which is not capable of providing work and bread for the working masses, is carrying on a brutal civil war against the working class in all countries. Revolutionary fighters are being cast in thousands into the dungeons of the bourgeoisie.

Counter-revolution is raging at its worst in Germany, Poland, and Bulgaria.

In Germany, in the period between January and May 1924 alone, 8980 persons were accused of "crimes" against the capitalist state of society; between July and the middle of September 1750 workers were sentenced. Sentences totally many thousands of years of deprivation of liberty were passed. In many prisons the revolutionists are martyred and ill-treated.

In Poland the revolutionary workers are subjected to the severest persecution. Communist workers are maltreated, or shot in the open street by the myrmidons of the Whites. Hundreds languish in the prisons into which they have been cast without a trial.

In Bulgaria the workers and peasants who resist the murderous terror of the Zankov government are imprisoned in thousands, in the prisons they are subjected to brutal ill-treatment.

The bourgeoisies of all countries find ready helpers in the exercise of their terror in the leaders of the II. International.

The social democrats, who take the part of the bourgeoisie in every struggle, do not come to the aid of these victims of shameful class justice, but even deride their sufferings: "You are being too mildly punished!" But on the other hand, Vandervelde, Jouhaux, Wels, Leparat, and their like, demand the liberation of those "revolutionists" who, acting in the service of petroleum and manganese capital, and being in the pay of Lloyd George, Poincaré, Zankov, or Pilsudski, have attempted to raise conspiracies against the Soviet power.

They dare to ask for an amnesty for the treacherous enemies of the first workers' and peasants' state. These socialists are fighting for the liberation of the servants of international imperialism, so that they may be able to renew their efforts against Soviet Russia and against socialism.

These socialists cry: Bravo! Bravo! Still more penal servitude, still more prison! when the bourgeoisie casts into prison the heroic revolutionary champions of socialism.

The bourgeois struggle is for the "to be or not to be" of its rule. It fears the fighting workers, it fears the rebellion of the starving masses.

the seven hour shift in Germany. For this they are decried by the German reformists as the agents of Russia. In these struggles you will recognise that capitalism must disappear, for it is no longer capable of securing a decent human existence for its most important group of slaves. The last attempt at patching up a capitalism which is falling to pieces at every joint this Dawes plan, will suffer shipwreck on your determination not to remain slaves, but to become free human beings. You know that from the very beginning the Communist International has fought against the Dawes Plan, and you may see from the persecution suffered by every section of the Comintern, in every capitalist country, that it has been fighting actively against the Dawes reaction. The Communist Party of Germany is your leader. Sever yourselves, once and for all, from your "tried and tested" leaders, who have betrayed you times out of number, and choose plain proletarians for your leaders.

At your conference on November 2, you must weld a firm fighting front of metal workers and miners, railwaymen and unemployed. Join those who are forced into the struggle. Do not permit the flunkeys of capital to scatter you, you hewers of lignite and coal, you railwaymen and officials! Fight determinedly and unitedly, and you will be victorious, though all the bloodhounds of capital be let loose upon you today. The European proletariat will break its chains, and wrest power from the criminal hands of capitalism. You are the strongest and the best tried army of the proletariat. The whole proletariat of the world looks towards you.

Long live the proletariat of the Rhine and Ruhr!

Long live the international struggle of the proletariat against the Dawes reaction.

Long live the struggle for the conquest of power!

It is trying to frighten you, you workers and poor peasants, so that you will endure starvation in patience. It wants to destroy your leaders. It wants to intimidate you, so that you do not follow the communists, or become communists yourselves.

It wants to weaken the fighting ranks of the communists to disintegrate and disperse them.

And it is trying to prepare the ground, by means of calumnious agitation against Moscow, for a fresh belligerent intervention against Soviet Russia.

The ruling class needs you, that you may starve for their profits; they need you, so that you may die heroically for their profits in the fresh wars which they are preparing. Twelve millions died in the great war.

Workers and peasants!

You are bound in the chains of the bourgeoisie. Tens of thousands of revolutionists are in their prisons. The class influenced courts of justice condemn you to starvation, to serfdom, to wholesale death.

The tens of thousands of revolutionary workers who fought for you are still defying the capitalist world from their prisons. The more they have to suffer, the higher rises the flame of their hate against the capitalists and their servants.

Follow their example! Recognise that every such class verdict increases and prolongs your misery! Fight for the liberation of the imprisoned revolutionists, fight for your own liberation!

The sufferings of the revolutionists are your affair.

Protest in meetings and demonstrations against the terror of class justice, against the terror of the prison! Turn your backs on the social democrats, help to break their influence so that they are no longer able to aid the executioners suppressing revolution!

Down with the hypocrites of the II. International, who support the world bourgeoisie in its fight against Soviet Russia and the working class of every country!

Down with all the enemies of the workers and peasants! Down with the enemies of the first workers' and peasants' state!

Down with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie! Long live the fraternal solidarity of the workers of the whole world!

Long live the revolutionary struggle for the emancipation of the working masses!

Long live the International Red Relief!

# - INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 75

23rd October 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.

## CONTENTS

Zinoviev: The Lessons of MacDonaldism.

Politics

J. T. Murphy: The English Elections in 1924.

Qu: Horthy Remains?

Zamfirescu: The Situation in Roumania.

Economics

Georgi: The Bad Harvest in Germany and its Consequences.

Labour Movement

Manifesto of the National Congress of Czecho-Slovakian Factory Councils.

A. Serechnikov: The Labour Movement in Japan.

Union of Soviet Republics

Kamenev: Our Immediate Tasks.

Z. Leder: The Problem of Wages and of Workers' Efficiency in Soviet Russia.

Fascism

Heinz Neumann: The Newest Form of Social Fascism in Germany.

Poemcs and Discussions

M. N. Roy: Election Policy of the British Communist Party.

In the Colonies

J. B.: King Hussein's Rise and Fall.

The White Terror

Harrison George: An Example of Yankee Justice.

Appeals

To the Suppressed Peoples.

Proletarian Art

To the Proletarian and Revolutionary Authors of All Countries.

## The Lessons of MacDonaldism.

Speech of Comrade Zinoviev at the Opening of the Course of Instruction for Party Functionaries.

I should like to make a few observations regarding the most important question of world politics — the Anglo-Russian relations.

"Democracy" and MacDonald.

The MacDonald government took office about nine months ago. It was the day of the death of Vladimir Ilych. The whole Second International endeavoured to characterise the taking over of the government by MacDonald as a tremendously important historical event. One of the so-called "socialists", the "democratic" president of the Czecho-Slovakian Republic, Masaryk, regarded it as symbolic that MacDonald entered office on the same day on which Vladimir Ilych died. He said:

"That is the replacement of one system by another." I noted in my diary on the 21st of January the news regarding the voting in the English Parliament, which decided the entry of MacDonald into office. On the 22nd of this month I noted the news of the death of Lenin. Lenin departed precisely on the day on which the vote took place in London over the new government. . . . In England, social democracy triumphed without a bloody revolution. In Russia it triumphed by means of bloody revolution. That is to say, in England Marxian tactics were victorious. But in England there triumphed the more mature Marx. The revolutionary job the "old tactics", the tactics of blood departed. The revolutionary of the "new" (bloodless) tactics arrived."

This idea is common to many statesmen of "democratic" Europe and of the whole II. International. They all believed that the entry of the Labour Party into office really opened up a new era, and that its rule would mean the greatest blow for the tactics of the Communist International. They wished clearly to demonstrate by the example of this event in England, the richest country in Europe, the advantages of the so-called peaceful democratic tactics of "constructive" socialism.

However the approaching elections may end, there is not the least doubt that they will mark a certain conclusion to the past nine months. MacDonald himself has for long been an apostle of petty-bourgeois, or, as he himself calls it, "constructive socialism". He was often ridiculed by Vladimir Ilych and subjected to a merciless and cutting criticism. The representatives of this "constructive socialism" have only overlooked a trifling thing, and that is, that MacDonald succeeded to power, not through the will of the working class, conscious of its interests and victorious over capitalism, but by the will of the bourgeoisie, and that therefore his rule could not be otherwise than extremely uncertain. Whenever Baldwin and Lloyd George seriously desired it, they only had to wink — and MacDonald was no more. Lloyd George and Baldwin have often attempted to beckon, not only with the eye, but also with money bags, warships and occupation troops in order to "remove", not a sham labour government, but the real workers' government of our country. They found it a more difficult job with us than with MacDonald.

The representatives of the H. International have not noticed this "mere bagatelle". They threw sand in the eyes of the workers and tried to hid them that the MacDonald government signified an actual seizure of power by the working class. They characterised a peculiar parliamentary combination, originating in the special English conditions, as the victory of a new peaceful tactic of "constructive socialism".

#### How the "Labour government" came into power.

Parliamentary elections have taken place rather frequently of late in England; in the years 1922, 1923 and now in 1924. In 1922 the Conservatives were victorious. In the elections in 1923 the Conservatives lost 89 seats. This was the direct consequence of the conflict which had arisen between them and the Liberals. The Conservatives obtained 257 seats, the Labour Party 192, the Liberals 156.

At this time the policy of the Conservative Party, the personification of which was the notorious Lord Curzon, began to create great indignation among the masses of English people. It was impossible to continue the policy of the brutal, arch-reactionary, big landowner Lord Curzon. In consequence of this the cleavage between the Conservatives and the Liberals increased. In consequence of the squabbles of these two chief parties, who for decades past, on the basis of the famous two-party system, have alternatively succeeded one another, it was decided to make a venture and give MacDonald a chance of governing, as both parties were firmly convinced that he would not betray them.

MacDonald received in the first place the support of the Liberals, as he had no majority in parliament and as he was not accustomed to revolutionary measures. This experiment lasted about nine months.

#### Why was MacDonald turned out?

The question now arises why the bourgeoisie turned MacDonald out at this juncture and what is the balance of these nine months.

As regards his home policy the most fault finding representatives of the bourgeoisie could not find cause for any quarrel with him. He carried on an open bourgeois policy, even in purely trade union questions, although he was dependent upon the trade unions. As regards the working class policy, he often represented the cause of the working class much worse than did the Liberals and Conservatives. Engels and also Lenin in a more concrete form often pointed out the fact that the English bourgeoisie, which in consequence of the enormous profits derived from the colonies, was in a more privileged position than that of other European countries and could allow itself the luxury of employing a few crumbs from these extra profits in order to bribe the higher strata of the working class. MacDonald did not even allow himself this luxury.

#### The Home Policy of the Labour Government.

As regards financial policy, MacDonald practically carried through the Curzon budget. He put forward the excuse to the workers that he had "no time" to prepare a budget for this year. The reformist leaders of the English trade unions who are not hard to satisfy accepted this excuse.

The second most important question of English home policy and which concerns all members of trade unions is that of unemployment. It was expected that the MacDonald government would help the unemployed. MacDonald greatly disappointed the workers in this respect. He has even denounced "poplarism", that is, the policy in practice in one of the suburbs of London where the administration is in the hands of trade unionists and where the trade union functionaries, along with George Lansbury, carried through the policy of granting benefits to the workers and especially supporting the unemployed. MacDonald declared that "public doles, poplarism, strikes for increased wages, limitation of output, not only are not socialism, but may mislead the spirit and the policy of the socialist movement". This shows that he was also against industrial strikes in order that he might help the English bourgeoisie as much as possible.

He granted money for the building of five dreadnoughts, he continued the policy of militarism, instead of making an end of it as he promised before the elections. And when he was reproached with this at the Conference of the Labour Party he sheltered himself behind the unemployed and declared, he sanctioned the building of five dreadnoughts because that provided work for 2000 workers. Whereupon an old worker, the secre-

tary of a trade union, asked whether he would perhaps declare a little war in order to employ a further number of unemployed.

#### The Prognostication of the Comintern has Proved to be Correct.

How do things stand with regard to foreign politics? In this connection I will quote from an article I wrote on the 23rd of February 1924 entitled "Five Years of the Comintern". With reference to the fate of the MacDonald government I indicated four possibilities:

1. The MacDonald government will only remain for a short period, and will be overthrown in a short time by a simple adverse vote, leaving noticeable traces however behind it.

2. MacDonald and Co. may adapt themselves to such an extent to the decisive groups of English imperialists, that the latter may deem it advisable to let them remain longer in office in order to carry on imperialist policy, and at the same time thoroughly to discredit the present "labour" party in the eyes of the English working class and thereby to cause disappointment and confusion in its ranks.

3. A process of differentiation can also set in within the working class itself. The left wing will become gradually stronger, the working masses will exert pressure upon the "labour" government and enforce effective measures for the alleviation of the life of the workers. MacDonald, Clemens and Henderson will of course offer resistance to the demands of the workers. All this will create the prerequisites for the formation of a communist mass party in England.

4. The "labour" government, in spite of the incapability and the counter-revolutionary character of its members will, under the pressure of the masses, to a certain extent express the mood of the lower strata of the workers. A struggle arising between the labour government of MacDonald and the bourgeoisie which can in a relatively short time mark the beginning of the sharpening of the crisis in England in a revolutionary crisis.

In so far as it is possible to predict the development of events, it is highly improbable that the first and fourth perspective will be realised. It is more probable that the second and third prospective will be realised. We have come very near to truth.

If you follow the foreign policy of MacDonald you will see that the result of the first nine months of his government fulfil the two possibilities predicted by us.

#### The English Bourgeoisie wanted, by means of MacDonald, compromise the Labour Party in the Eyes of the Colonial Peoples.

There is not the least doubt that the bourgeoisie throughout played with MacDonald as a cat with a mouse, and is particularly the case with regard to foreign policy.

In 1923 Curzon made himself impossible, chiefly because he conducted a too open and brutal foreign policy, especially towards the Soviet Republic and the English colonies. In the English colonies, especially in India, upon which the fate of England depends, great hopes have been set for many years upon the Labour Party. The masses of the Indian people say "when the Labour Party comes into power they will carry another policy in India. Then India will be able to breathe freely."

I have not the least doubt that it was one of the chief aims of the far-seeing representatives of the English bourgeoisie to compromise the Labour Party in the eyes of the English colonies, in the first place in India, Egypt, Iraq and now also in China. Has the bourgeoisie achieved this aim? Yes, to a considerable extent. The MacDonald government is seriously compromised in the eyes of colonial peoples. As regards India, and particularly Ireland and now also China, it has carried on the old policy, the same predatory, imperialist, slave-holding policy as was carried on by Curzon. How pathetically MacDonald expressed himself over his own policy in his speech in Delhi on the 27th of September, when he declared that not a single Tory or Liberal can prove to the intelligent electors of this country, that the name, the respect, the stability, the position of our country have suffered in the least in the eyes of the world under the Labour government.

This was as much as to say: I am no worse than Curzon or Lloyd George, what more do you expect from me? The import of the speech of MacDonald.

#### For what Purpose did the English Bourgeoisie Need the "Labour Government"?

If anybody had asked us for what purpose the English bourgeoisie had ventured on so hazardous a game as to let MacDonald take office, — which it is true is a first class men-berist government but still connected with the working class — we already see that the game was worth the candle. To compromise the increasing power of the working class, the only power in which the suppressed colonial peoples believed, — this was something worth while to Curzon and Lloyd George. Paris was worth a mass. In this respect they have achieved serious results. And when the English working class will have settled with the traitors, when they have not a royal labour government, not a sham labour government, but a real proletarian workers government, then they will have considerable pains in wiping out from the consciousness of millions of colonial slaves of England the impression left behind by MacDonald.

The English bourgeoisie considered it necessary to meddle in Chinese politics. They were far better able to carry this out under MacDonald than they would have under Curzon. You could see that the English working class hardly reacted at all to the imperialist policy of MacDonald in China. The proletariat of our Soviet Union formed a "Hands off China" League; in Germany this organisation met with great sympathy among the working masses. The English working class hardly raised a finger against MacDonald's policy in China.

If Curzon had done the same as MacDonald it would have been easier to rouse a protest among the working class against his policy.

Finally, you are familiar with the notorious Dawes Plan. This plan was almost hailed as a victory for "constructive socialism"; at any rate as a victory for pacifism. As a matter of fact, it is becoming continually clearer that it is a noose round the neck of the workers of Germany and of a number of other countries. It was more convenient for the capitalists to have this "work" carried out by MacDonald than by Curzon. In this question England outwardly played the first fiddle. It was not without reason that the leader of the Conservatives, Baldwin, at the annual Conference of the Party in Newcastle, fully approved of the policy of MacDonald in this question and disclosed the true reason for the necessity for carrying through the Dawes Plan. This is what he said regarding it:

"The Dawes Report has shown clearly that the first preliminary step is in the negotiation of a loan for Germany. What kind of a loan is that? I shall speak presently of the proposed loan to Russia, and I want you to be very clear in your minds what the essential difference is between those two loans. The loan proposed to Germany is a loan to be raised by private subscription, with no form of Government guarantee. That means that the liability for loss, if any, will fall on those alone who subscribe to that loan.

But all the same, there is a real risk to our trade in this country that Germany, relieved as she has been of all her mortgaged debts and prior charges, may have such an advantage in competition that we may find that her exports may do us serious damage.

But there are opponents to the carrying out of the Dawes Report. There are opponents to a loan to Germany. There are opponents to the rehabilitation of German trade. Now this has not been pointed out before, but it is a matter of very great importance. Who are the opponents to that arrangement, negotiated by the Labour Party, supported by us, and supported — I have no reason to think otherwise — by the Liberals? The opponents to the Dawes Report are the Communist Party. Two days ago there was a whole column in the daily Press reporting a meeting of that party, full of objections to the carrying out of this Report on the ground that it made Germany a servile State. But why do the Communist Party in England object to it? Because they have their orders from Moscow. Why does Moscow object to it? Because Moscow has never repudiated the ideal for which she has stood for the last few years, to cause world revolution, and she knows that a settled Germany and a contented Germany will be a barrier to her ambitions, that a Germany in its present condition cannot be feared.

Western Europe has a civilization to preserve, and it is our duty to do all we can to preserve it in these days. The barrier of Western European civilization must be made strong and firm against any subversive on-

slaughts that may come from the East, and there is no surer and no better way of doing that than to begin by carrying out the terms of the Dawes Report and bringing once more that great German market into contact with the markets of the world. No one knows better than I do the cheap and easy argument that may be used against doing this, but I ask you to think seriously and deeply on this subject as to whether our plain duty to Europe and to the world is not to strengthen that common civilization to which all of us belong in the West of Europe". ("Times", October 3rd, 1924.)

The Dawes Plan which was held up before the working masses of Europe as a triumph for democracy and pacifism, this robber plan, which was chiefly dictated by the English imperialists, could most conveniently be carried out through the mediumship of MacDonald. In a number of fundamental foreign political questions therefore, the Menshevik Labour government was the tool of the English bourgeoisie.

#### The Attitude of the English Workers towards us.

But there was one question regarding which the English bourgeoisie was not quite satisfied, that is the question of the relations between England and the Soviet Union. We have learnt something of this questions to our own cost. We still remember all the interventions in which England took such an active part.

The Russian revolution was so big a factor that it even stirred the heart of the most backward, petrified, the most moderate English worker. This was especially to be seen from the reception accorded our trade union representatives in Hull. Even the most moderate English trade unionists have been speaking lately to the following effect: The Russian Bolsheviki may be as bad as you please, they may have destroyed a good deal, they have often called us social traitors, but one cannot deny that they have overthrown the bourgeoisie, they have created something new, they have settled with the tsar, they have not dealt with him so politely as MacDonald and his ministers have dealt with their king. The English workers have perceived this.

#### Why do the English Bourgeoisie wish to prevent our Loan?

MacDonald's allies in the camp of the Conservatives and Liberals are crying out on account of the Treaty with the Soviet Union and proceed to wreck it in parliament. Discussion was particularly heated regarding the loan question. Why? There is a good deal of nonsense talked about it. It is claimed that it is a loan for the Comintern. The Liberals and Conservatives know perfectly well that it is a question of a loan for the reconstruction of our national economy and not for the Comintern.

Why then did they wish to prevent the loan? Perchance on account of the 30 or 40 million pound sterling which they are to give? Nothing of the kind. These people know quite well that the Treaty signed by MacDonald and Rakovsky is not without advantages for them. We had to make large concessions. It created a certain amount of opposition within our own ranks, because we have been too indulgent towards the English. But taken as a whole it was and remains acceptable for both countries. From a purely business and commercial standpoint it is perfectly acceptable for the English capitalists. The assertion that it would be dangerous to invest a sum of 30 to 40 million pounds in a loan for Soviet Russia is absurd. Our regime is more stable than any other, and the obligations entered into by our government are more secure than the obligations of many other powers. Europe grants loans to Poland, Roumania etc. although it is clearly seen that the days of the Polish bourgeoisie and of the Roumanian landowners are numbered. Why then this opposition to the Treaty? In the first place I believe that here the consolidation of the interests of the English and American imperialists is making itself felt. Pressure has been exercised here by the American imperialists. Pressure was certainly exercised on the part of Mr. Hughes. Only today we received telegrams from America, according to which all the most influential New York newspapers, even such an ultra-conservative paper as the "Sun", characterised the activity of the first labour government in England as being very successful. The American press in the leading articles devoted to the English crisis, speaks of the "great services" rendered by the English labour government regarding the questions of home



is no longer any magic in the idea of the left block, which a few months ago quite turned the heads of the population. During the election campaign Herriot, in order to gain the votes of the civil servants, promised them an increase of salary of 150 Francs a month. Now he is at the head of the government and the position of the civil servants has not improved. The electors remember this promise and say: Now you are in the government, therefore pay up this 1800 Francs. This figure of 1800 Francs is now the most popular slogan. Just imagine how a mere trifle such as an increase of salaries to 1800 Francs can shake the whole left block, with Herriot, and the whole democratic-pacifist era.

This is an interesting historical episode. The under-lying class antagonisms are growing more acute. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat are facing one another in sharply divided fronts.

#### We have no Cause to be Despondent.

The course of events is not so tardy as it seems. If you consider the events before the war, there did not occur in the course of 10 years so many important events as now occur in the course of 10 days. In England, in the main stronghold of capitalism, the most important Party of the II. International, in response to the pressure of their own workers, will "shed blood" for us the Bolsheviks. How has this unexpected circumstance arisen? In the last resort the course of events is not determined by our clever "diplomacy", but by such simple facts as the course of the class struggle, upon which is based Marxism, Leninism and the Comintern. The course of history determines that the working class of England, with a rich upper strata, with a strong labour aristocracy, regardless of the prejudices against bolshevism, perceives and feels the correctness of our standpoint and cannot be deceived by Georgian fairy tales.

A differentiation has set in in the English working class, and this is a world-historical event. Marx once said that a revolution without England would only be a storm in a tea cup. For the world power of England rests upon India, Egypt, etc.

What shall we wish as a result of the approaching elections? We desire from the bottom of our hearts a victory for MacDonald. MacDonald recently announced before the whole world that he is no communist. Love's labour lost! Who could charge MacDonald with having anything in common with communism? We know this quite well, and in spite of it we whole-heartedly wish MacDonald a victory in the elections and desire that he will enjoy his victory not only for nine months, but for eighteen or more months. But we confess that we will not weep if he suffers a defeat. In either case the English labour movement will go forward.

#### The Popularity of the Soviet Union among the Workers of the West is Growing

Never before were our Soviets so popular in the eyes of the working masses — even of the reformist workers — as at present. In the years 1920—22, the years of hunger and disaster, the idea of the soviet power was not so attractive among this section of the workers. But now all workers know, even the reformist workers, that our cause is advancing. They say: even if wages with you are lower we see that things with you are on the up-grade, but with us in Europe they are on the down-grade. It is now perfectly clear that in one or two years the question of workers' efficiency, say for instance, in the Kolonna factory, will be of international importance. The workers of the whole world will pass judgment upon us. Comrade Fimmen when he was in Moscow related the following interesting episode: He had received a letter from the chairman of the reformist Seamen's Union of a certain country. This individual was a hopeless reformist and a hater of Moscow. And this trade union leader had received a pamphlet published by our Seamen's Union, which contained particulars as to the conditions of work and terms of engagement of seamen in the Soviet Union. He read this brochure and now writes to Fimmen: I have read the particulars regarding the conditions of work of the seamen in the Soviet Union; if these are true, it means that we have been shamefully deceived.

You see what enormous propagandist importance is possessed by such a minor thing as the working day in the socialist republic. Workers always remain workers, even if they are reformists. When they were told that with us starvation, and cannibalism prevails, and that the workers are living in slavery etc., these reformist workers did not understand the Russian

revolution. But now when they see the reverse side of the medal — that the workers are free, that the efficiency of labour is increasing, that the situation is improving — then the Soviet power and its ideas become the greatest propagandist force in the whole world, and begin to sound like a tocsin as they never sounded before.

We have every reason to be satisfied with the experience of the last nine months. We will, of course, follow the election campaign in England with the greatest interest. It is said of us that we are sending communist agitators there. "Wise" bourgeois gentry of the type of Hughes claim that I have a hundred agitators up my sleeve whom I can dispatch to any desired country. I am sorry to say I am not endowed with such a capacity. We hope that even the leaders of the Labour Party while agitating for themselves, will be compelled to tell the truth regarding the Soviet Union. And the working class of England will see that our Soviet Union will point out the way to the whole world, for the truth is on our side. For throughout the whole world it is not the ideas of petty-bourgeois, menshevik "constructive" pseudo-socialism which are proceeding to victory, but the ideas of Leninism.

## POLITICS

### The English Elections in 1924.

By J. T. Murphy (London).

This whirligig of elections is making parliamentary democracy look silly. This is the third election inside two years and promises to be as indecisive as the last. In 1923 unemployment was the theme of the day. Each Party came along with its special nostrums. The Conservatives said Tariff Reform will do the trick and build up a fine Empire. Imperial preference for the Empire and general tariffs for the Foreigner. The Liberal Party was stung to the quick and rallied from the middle of the old coalition and shouted "Free Trade Forever". The Labour Party dashed into the fray with the Capital Levy (the soft pedal on Free Trade so that no one would think they were renouncing Liberalism). Recognition of Russia etc. etc.

There were many liberals who voted Labour. There were many Labourites who voted liberal where they had to choose on the Tariff question against the Tories. The Tories came back having lost many seats and the Liberals and the Labour Party secured many gains. The feelings were very acute between the Liberals and the Tories and they could not combine again and make a new coalition yet awhile, so the only choice left for them was to hand on the government as a gift to Labour, and keep good look out to make quite sure that the working class element in the Labour Party did not make the pace too hot for the middle class leaders.

The initial steps were quite satisfactory. The Labour Government said the right thing about the Empire. Mr. MacDonald's message to India was thoroughly approved, even by the Tories. The recognition of Russia was quite proper and the manners of the Government on this question even pleased the Liberals. The opening speech of Mr. MacDonald to the Bolsheviks "put the matter in their proper place", and Tories and Liberals alike thought after all, the situation was very satisfactory. The experiment was working very well. The Labour Movement was jubilant about coming into office, but the workers were perturbed at the turn of events. There seemed so little of what they had expected in the pronouncements that were being made, they many began to wonder what was taking place. Still the opposition parties were satisfied. The Budget came along and everybody cheered. The Liberals because it was good liberalism, the Labour people because it brought some immediate relief to the workers and would stand them in good stead when the appeal came along for more votes. Then came the Dawes Report and MacDonald, Baldwin and Asquith sang the doxology together in the name of the "people". And everything was all right until the working class issue began to gather strength. The Russian Treaty came to the front. The prosecution of Campbell set the ball rolling. If the Labour Government had got away with these things, the left of the Labour Party, the working class elements, would have become too strong. So down went the Government.

Now, within nine months of the liberal labour combination for downing the Tories, we have got the liberal tory combination once again to down the Labour Party. Both are accusing the

Labour Party of class warfare and the Labour Party is just as much denying it. Mr. Wheatley of course says not. He declares that it is class warfare, but has nothing better to say about it than to justify the liberalism of the Labour Government. In fact one of all of the Labour Party leaders are not fighting, in even working class issues, on class lines at all, but simply campaigning against the opposition from the same angle as the opposition. If the opposition argues that wages can't be raised, then the Labour men make out a case to prove that wages can be raised without hurting capitalism and indeed, that it would be good for the capitalists to raise wages. The same line is pursued with the Russian Treaty and every other question. It is all done in the name of socialism but the argument is usually good liberalism. But that is by the way. The principal thing to observe is that the Liberal Party has discovered another ally and the tune has changed in order to teach the Labour leaders that they must clean the Labour Party of its "extremists". Have we any reason therefore to anticipate that this effort is to bring any more stability into the situation? Does this election mark the end of a period wherein the Labour Party has been used for specific purposes and committed to capitalist plans in the name of the workers, and is now to be discarded as of no further use in the next stages of the Imperialist plans?

That the Conservatives are making a bid for a working majority is certain. That the Labour Government is doomed seems as equally certain. For the Labour Party to have a working majority it would need to win more than a hundred seats and hold all that it has got — a prospect which is very remote at present. The Tory Party is united again. The Tories and the Liberals are coming to arrangements in the various localities to ensure that no three cornered seat fall into the hands of the Labour Party. But this is countered by the remarkable enthusiasm in the ranks of Labour and the influence created by the Labour Government. That an awakening has been going on is evident everywhere and not one can tell how great an influence this may have in increasing the polls.

A comparison of the votes of the various parties in the last election goes to show that unless there is an extraordinary swing over one way or another, and nobody seems to anticipate this, there will again be a minority government with the situation as unstable as ever. Last year 5,359,690 votes were cast for the Conservatives which secured them 258 seats. This total vote was only 24,000 less than they received in 1922, when they had 350 seats, a fact which in itself reveals what a gamble is involved in attempting to predict or estimate the results of the peculiar election apparatus in this country. Labour polled in 1923 3,483,379 votes and secured 191 seats, an increase of 110,000 votes and 47 seats. The Liberals polled 4,251,673 votes in 1923, an increase of 100,000, and forty seats. 74% of the electorate voted last year. It is probable that more depends upon the awakening of the remaining 26% than upon the change over in voting that will take place. It is expected by many that the Liberal Party will lose ground. But it will not lose sufficient to become an unimportant factor in the new political situation created by the election. A combination of Labour and Liberals will number more than the Conservatives, even though the Conservative Party may be the largest in the House of Commons.

Yet the Liberals have committed themselves so much to co-operation with the Conservatives against the Labour Government, and would have to repudiate the election statements of its leader Mr. Lloyd George, who has declared "that Labour would get no more of his support", along with its opposition to the Russian Treaty, for it to place the Labour Party in office again. There appears no other prospect before us than a Conservative Government with the co-operation of the Liberals and the opposition of the Labour Party. We shall therefore still be operating in the midst of an unstable equilibrium, with the Conservative Party prevented from applying any of its tariff remedies, which it claims will alone meet the question of unemployment and restore trade. It will be an untenable situation which cannot last long. Some more crises and then another election.

Meanwhile so long as the Parliamentary business is taken seriously what is the fate of the Communists in the 1924 election? With the passing of Newbold from Motherwell, which everybody knows he "won for Communism" in 1922, lost in 1923 and in 1924, we tried to get Comrade Gallacher in his stead as a candidate for the local labour organisation. In this the Party was defeated. In Kelvingrove the Party was again defeated by a combination of the Boilermakers Union Executive and the L. P., who were thoroughly annoyed because of Ferguson's

Communism in the bye-election of this year. At the moment the Communist Party has therefore the following candidates adopted. Comrade Bob Stewart is the Party candidate for Dundee. Last year Comrade Gallacher was the candidate in this constituency and polled 10,380 votes.

In Battersea the Local Labour Party has disregarded the Labour Party Conference decision and retained Comrade Saklatvala as candidate.

Comrade J. J. Vaughan will contest the seat in North Bethnal Green on behalf of the local Labour Party who also have disregarded the Labour Conference decision.

The Rusholme Labour Party has refused to put into operation the Labour Conference decision and Comrade Paul is their adopted candidate. Paul was heavily defeated last year. This is mainly a middle class constituency and it would be an election miracle if Paul was elected.

In East Nottingham, Comrade Tom Mann has been adopted as Communist candidate and the Local Labour organisation have pledged themselves to support him. Last year there was no labour candidate whatever. It was fought between Liberal and Conservative and the Liberal had a majority of 1436. But it is certain that if in the course of the campaign that Tom gets either side scared there will be a coalition to keep him out. The rest of our candidates appear to be fighting propaganda fights with only small chances of victory at the polls. But it will be some campaign from which the Party should gain many members. With the Russian Treaty, the Dawes Report, the anti-militarist prosecution, and the full blast attack of all the reactionary forces on the boards, the campaign will be a real one and as before the Communist Party has nothing to lose, but stands to gain all along the route.

### Horthy Remains?

By Qu. (Budapest).

Everywhere fascism is beginning to totter. How is it that the position of Horthy still remains unshaken?

The reason for the decline of fascism on an international scale is easily to be seen. The bourgeoisie no longer has any need for it. It has served its purpose, it can go. The post-war period brought such serious labour unrest and revolutionary movements, that the bourgeoisie could not deal with it alone, merely with the help of the administrative state apparatus. It had to abandon the appearance of liberalism, and in its place to make use of open military dictatorship, which does not make much fuss when it is a question of "settling" a movement of the working class.

The open military dictatorship, however, has its dangers for the capitalist class. When it makes use of the open dictatorship it is not so easy to induce the working class to continue its respect for "democracy" and thus it cuts the ground from under its own feet.

That is the reason why fascism is everywhere tottering. But does this apply for Hungary?

Thousands of examples could be adduced to show that fascism in Hungary is just as intact as it was at the time when it first arose. It is true there are no longer mass murders, but this is only because the blood-thirsty sadists are apparently satisfied for the time being. Otherwise everything remains as before, in spite of everything that Count Bethlen proclaims to the world in Geneva and elsewhere. In many respects things have become still worse, as fascism has in the meantime been legalised and everything is now done in the name of the "law", which formerly was only done in secret.

For example, there has taken place the trial of Strehm, an officer who served in the Red Army during the time of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, and who at that time caused a counter-revolutionary to be shot. After the overthrow of the Soviet regime he became a white guardist, and behaved as such so "excellently" that he was promoted. There has now taken place the proceedings regarding his earlier deeds and he has been set free on the ground that he then considered himself to be acting as a patriot. The common soldiers, however, who obeyed his commands — the commands of their officer — and carried out the death sentence, were each condemned to ten years hard labour. They of course had not become white guardists after the overthrow of the Soviet regime.

Then there was the trial in Csongrad where people threw bombs into a dancing hall, presuming that they could kill Jews

there, and in fact killed and wounded many persons (the greater portion of whom by the way were not Jews). The accused were set free although they had confessed...

Why does fascism in Hungary still remain intact? History will place the responsibility for this solely upon the Hungarian Socialist Democratic Party! It is true capitalism does not voluntarily discard its saviour, even when it could easily do so. It will only do so as a result of pressure. And the Socialist Party of Hungary has not exercised the slightest pressure upon the Horthy-Bethlen regime.

We will not deal with the fact that in the report of the Socialist Party of Hungary regarding the Vienna Trade Union Congress, not a word was mentioned regarding the work and the success of the opposition, not a word was mentioned as to the followers of the R. I. L. U. being ultimately accepted and that unity was to be restored and that therefore the Hungarian trade unions must adopt an attitude with reference thereto. We will not enlarge upon the fact that in the report regarding the English Trade Union Congress in Hull, the "Nepszava" wrote the following: "It is true one heard radical phrases. Thus the delegate Purcell demanded international unity. But it was mere words. The leadership of the trade unions still remains in the hands of the old and tried trade union leaders."

It is interesting to note, however, that the Party executive recently decided to ask for a special contribution from the more prosperous party members (progressive party levy) in order to appoint a paid secretary in every district of Budapest, as the opposition is growing continually stronger and already threatens the power of the present party executive. They are not ashamed of calling upon the bourgeois members of the social democratic party to subscribe money for the purpose of fighting the workers' opposition. And the appeal did not remain without effect. They have already collected so much money that they have been able to appoint several secretaries. The workers have, however, already seized some of these officials and flung them out neck and crop. A very characteristic example is the following: A short while ago there was a meeting of functionaries of Ujpest, a suburb of Budapest. Ujpest is a factory district and therefore the party central laid special stress upon gaining a victory here after experiencing many a fiasco. The almighty central secretary, Büchler, himself, attended. The first time he spoke for two hours, the second time (the sitting had to be continued the next day) for two and half hours. The vote was taken as to whether the Central committee had the confidence of the meeting. Result: 16 votes out of 135 for the Central Committee. Of the 16, six were trade union employees. Among the adverse votes there were more than six given by employees of trade unions, which is extremely significant.

How is the opposition combated? An example: One takes up the "Nepszava" any day and reads the following appeal: Young workers, take care, adult workers also take care, that young workers are not invited to certain meetings by persons whose tendency is not identical with that of the Trade Union leader ship. What is this if not the basest denunciation? The Socialist Party of Hungary will not be able to avoid its fate.

## The Situation in Roumania.

By Zamfirescu (Bucarest).

Roumania is in the midst of a "financial crisis".

The stores of goods imported in the years 1919-1922 are exhausted. The government has not succeeded in getting rid of the unfavourable foreign trade balance, continuous since the end of the war. In addition to this, those in power contrived to line their pockets between 1919-1922 by means of legal or illegal requisitions in the annexed areas — the so-called "voluntary sales". In this manner a regime was inaugurated in the occupied territories for the systematic pillage of the propertied resident population. It is owing to this, and to the policy pursued by the feudal and financial oligarchy, represented most conspicuously by the Liberal Party, and aiming at seizing upon the national capital incorporated in industrial undertakings for the purpose of exercising a monopoly of exploitation of the natural wealth of the country, that production in these newly gained areas has fallen completely into decay. To all these phenomena we must also add the "agrarian reform", which is based on a system calculated to disorganise the most important of all branches of production — agriculture. The real object of this reform is to transform the peasant, who has hitherto been the serf of the

feudal large landowner, into a serf of the financial oligarchy and its banks. The ground rents of the large landowners are considerably increased, and the peasants are burdened with a load of direct and indirect taxation completely annihilating a working and consuming agricultural population. Besides this, only the poorest land is distributed, and the amount allotted is even far less than that provided by the "agrarian reform".

The state has become a tool for ruthless exploitation in the hands of a group of big financiers and big boyars, who for their part, toady to imperialist Entente capital. It is evident that a state with diminished production and enormously increased debts, without foreign loans or support of any description, thrown entirely upon its own resources, is bound to sink into a state of want and misery far exceeding that of the present crisis.

This year's crops have been a failure. The government is endeavouring to collect the taxes and the ground levies by force. Negotiations have only now been commenced over the old private and national debts owed by Roumania to the states of the West and Belgium among others. The unsettled position of Roumania's foreign debts contributes greatly to the disinclination shown in foreign financial circles to granting credits to the Roumanian government. Roumanian industry, which was carrying on a parasitic existence even before the war, cannot maintain itself in foreign markets against its foreign competitors (French, English, American, and Czecho-Slov.). And on the other hand the impoverishment of the enslaved peasantry renders the improvement of the home market impossible.

The whole of the Roumanian political parties consider a foreign loan to be the sole possible hope of salvation, and this would naturally imply a further surrender of national wealth to foreign capital, a further burdening of the working class with fresh taxes, and an unbearable aggravation of the present relentless exploitation. And as the Liberals are aware of this, and know that such a system will raise to boiling point the dissatisfaction and indignation of the working masses against the present regime, they resort to "preventive measures", they place the country under martial law, terrorise the labour movement, and thus intimidate the peasantry at the same time.

The left wing of the peasant's party, supposed to defend the interests of the peasantry, but up to the present too vacillating and hesitating to pursue a policy really representing the interests of the peasantry, has now arrived at the parting of the ways. The peasantry itself, though very backward from the cultural point of view, in part under the influence of the bourgeois press, is now showing unconcealed sympathy for the Socialist Union, and looks to this to help it in its emancipation. Not only the peasant masses of the suppressed national minorities are awakening into political activity, but also the Roumanian peasantry of Old Roumania; this contributes greatly to the strengthening of the left wing of the peasant's party.

The task incumbent upon the C.P. of Roumania is now to enter into close connection with these left elements, in order to form with their aid the connection with the peasantry now becoming politically active. Only in this way is it possible to set up a successful struggle for the daily interests of the whole working class.

## ECONOMICS

### The Bad Harvest in Germany and its Consequences.

By Georgi.

#### I. The bad Harvest.

The prospects of the harvest for the year 1924 were considered to be the very best. And in the plains of North Germany where the big land owners have their estates, the rye crop had already been garnered in, when there set in a severe spell of weather, which before all visited the mountain districts of Central and Southern Germany and was partly accompanied with hail storms and cloud-bursts. The official Commission which visited Prussia at the end of September announces that in the districts affected, 50 to 80% of the crops have been destroyed.

Central, West and South Germany are for the greatest part peopled by small peasants. The small peasant in Germany, as a result of the agrarian crisis in 1923/24 and still more as a result of the tremendous pressure of taxation, was already on the

of economic ruin. As early as last spring the Prussian tax officers before all proceeded with ruthless enforced sales against small peasants who were unable to pay their taxes; but also in Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg, Hessen and Thuringia many small peasants had been compelled, long before the harvest, to mortgage their standing crops of corn in order to meet the most necessary expenditure. After six weeks of uninterrupted rain, these masses of small peasants were faced with nothing else but complete ruin.

At present it is impossible to gauge the full extent of the catastrophe. The officials have long tried to conceal it. It is known for a fact that almost all the central mountain districts of Germany have been hit, as well as certain low-lying districts of East Prussia, which are lying under water. The corn, so far as it had been out, rotted on the fields, the ears began to sprout again and in place of heaps of corn and sheaves there grew fresh green hillocks of young shoots. At the end of September almost half of the harvest still remained to be cut and was likewise black and beginning to germinate. The leguminous crops were also spoiled. The potatoe crop was greatly endangered, the potatoes showing a strong tendency to rot. One would not be far wrong if one said that at least 2 to 3 million small and medium peasant undertakings, along with a population of about 10 million, will be exposed to economic ruin and actual starvation if help is not speedily forthcoming.

#### II. High Prices and Scarcity of Food.

The bad harvest in Germany has of course, along with the general prospects of the world's wheat crop, produced a big increase of prices on the market. Whilst up to July 1924 German prices for wheat and meat stood considerably lower than the world market prices, they stand today — in spite of the increase in world market prices — considerably higher than the latter. In Berlin in the beginning of July a ton of wheat cost 139 Marks, a ton of rye 127 Marks; at the end of September wheat cost 166 Marks and rye 244 Marks. Rye has therefore increased more rapidly than wheat. The prices of cattle and meat, and the already high prices of milk, eggs and butter, are of course showing a corresponding increase.

The high prices of wheat have not yet taken full effect in the retail trade, as the big mills had previously been well supplied with corn and the government has exerted pressure upon the master bakers in order not to allow unrest to increase too rapidly among the working population. Of course these attempts to keep down the price of bread are doomed to failure, while the bakers are having recourse to reducing the weight of the loaves.

The enormous increase in the price of corn is, of course, by means entirely due to the bad harvest. Ever since last winter the big organisations of the Junkers and big peasants have been continually calling for protective tariffs and restoration of free exportation for agrarian products. They published long tables of statistics in the endeavour to point out that the prices for corn and cattle are far below world market prices, whilst on the other hand the prices for industrial products are above world market prices. They declared in hundreds of resolutions and peasant meetings that only high protective tariffs, along with free exportation, could place their undertakings on a profitable basis. They openly threatened to introduce extensive cultivation, to let the land lie fallow, to take up with sheep farming and afforestation. In this they appealed to the example of big industry, which already since 1922, with the assistance of the social democrats, has enjoyed protective tariffs. The Junkers succeeded very well in also winning over the masses of small peasants for their demands. For the masses of the city petty bourgeois and intellectuals they issued the catch-word "let the country feed itself". This alone, they claim, will make the German people independent of foreign supplies, render possible a favourable trade balance, and assure an economic revival.

After some hesitation the industrial federations and the German Industrial and Commercial Congress have declared themselves in agreement with protective tariffs for agrarian products and have issued the slogan of "an all-around tariff". In the social democracy, which first posed as a bitter opponent of protective tariffs, gradually began to acquiesce. Prominent representatives as Cohen, a member of the National Economic Council, declared themselves in favour of protective tariffs, whilst the Committee of the Prussian Diet, Heilmann it is true spoke against a tariff on corn, but in favour of a tariff on imported meat. The example of the Austrian social democrats, who have announced themselves in favour of "sliding protective tariffs",

was expressly defended in the "Vorwärts". At present, social democracy is for the greater part in favour of moderate protective tariffs as the basis of commercial treaties. It has simply taken over the arguments of the bourgeois-liberal parties.

Already at the beginning of July the government had given way to the pressure for protective tariffs and partly allowed the free exportation of corn. Taking advantage of this freedom of export, and in sure expectation of the coming agrarian tariffs, the speculators have bought up the stocks of corn from the last harvest and already despatched them abroad. As this year's harvest has been destroyed by about 50%, enormous quantities will have to be imported. In spite of this the campaign for protective tariffs is still going on.

The worse the harvest prospects appear, the more insane becomes the speculation. Alarming reports regarding the harvest in Canada and Argentine are made to figure in the press, and the bad harvest in parts of Russia is enormously exaggerated. In consequence of this, and of the effects of the Dawes Plan, the working masses in the towns are faced with a hungry winter of the most severe kind.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### Manifesto of the National Congress of Czecho-Slovakian Factory Councils.

On the 4th and 5th of October there was held in Prague a National Factory Councils Congress for Czecho-Slovakia, at which 1600 factory councils of all nationalities comprised in the Republic were represented. The main questions the Congress had to deal with were the organising of the fight against high prices, defence against the attacks upon the eight hour day, the struggle for higher wages, and the control of production. The speakers consisted entirely of workers from the factories. The speeches and decisions of the congress were of a revolutionary character. During the proceedings of the Congress 30,000 workers demonstrated in the streets of Prague on behalf of its demands. We publish below the manifesto of the Congress. Ed.

We hand and brain workers, members of the Factory councils and committees, without distinction of political conviction or membership of trade union, have met at this our first national congress to erect a barrier against the attacks upon the standard of living of the workers, and to decide upon the means which we will employ in the struggle for the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capitalism. Against united capital we will set up the united proletariat and establish the united front of the working class of Czecho-Slovakia.

The situation of the working class grows worse every day. We are threatened in the near future with still greater misery, even greater slavery than exists today. In this terrible situation the working class is divided into a multitude of trade union organisations and subjected to nationalist incitement. We must create the basis upon which the representatives of all workers can meet together in order to arrive at definite and binding decisions. We are subjected by the laws of the capitalist state. Today we wish to create such an organ of the working class as could give us our laws, which we would gladly and willingly obey. The only way in which we can create such an organ today is by making use of the factory councils and control committees elected by the whole working class, and by combining at national congresses or individual industrial districts and localities, and placing at the head the workers committees elected by them. We have been elected by the workers who have thereby charged us to act on our own initiative in these most difficult times, and to indicate the way whereby we can improve our position. We are aware that this first Congress is only the commencement of the action and not its consummation. We will not immediately after this Congress have such a firm organised unity of the workers as exists among the capitalists organised against us. What we desire, however, is that the Congress and the Committee elected by it, as well as the entire movement of factory committees and factory councils, shall become a bridge connecting all sections of the working class.

While we seek to create the unity of the working class in the factories for the purpose of common action, we do not forget

for a moment that the trade union organisations, which are and must remain a reliable instrument of the working class against the capitalist offensive, must also be united. We therefore desire the unity of the trade union organisations and work with all means to this end, in order that by working together with each other they will approach nearer to the setting up of a united fighting front of the trade union organisations according to industry upon an international basis.

But the factory committees, as the natural organ of the proletarian united front and its movement, cannot be contented with a mere task of mediating between the trade union organisations. History has, apart from this, imposed upon them several great tasks. These involve the direct struggle of the workers within the various factories for the purpose of changing the worker from a slave into a controller of production.

The first stage upon this road is the proletarian control of production, which the factory committees and councils can only reach by a bitter struggle for increasing their power in the factories. In order that the factory committees and councils shall be able to fulfil these great tasks we consider the following to be necessary:

This National Congress of Factory Committees and Councils will be convened at least once a year, and whenever the conditions and the interests of the working class demand it. In order to conduct and prepare its work and in order to lead the whole movement, this congress elects 36 members of the national committee and its chairman.

As the various big industrial districts require a firm leadership, the national council will convene congresses in the various districts.

At these district congresses there will be elected district workers' committees.

In this way we shall mould the movement of the factory committees and councils in definite forms in order to develop it further. We are conscious of the fact that we thereby not only work for the present time, but create an instrument by means of which the proletariat can rule the economic life and state administration after its revolutionary victory. We know that our economic struggles merge into the great struggle for political power between capital and labour. We must and will fight for the workers' and peasants' government, and in creating the organ of the factory committee and councils movement, we at the same time establish the basis of the new state organisation which this government of the working class will bring.

In establishing the united front of the working class in Czecho-Slovakia, we do not cherish any beautiful dreams that we shall be in a position, without allying ourselves with the workers of other states, to fulfil the great task which history has laid upon the working class.

The co-operation of the workers of the whole world is the indispensable pre-requisite for the emancipation of the working class. We will at any moment when called upon by the workers of other states, support their interests with all our powers. We are conscious of the heavy sacrifices which we must yet undergo for the idea of the emancipation of the working class. In united ranks we shall persevere until the final victory.

Regulär

## The Labour Movement in Japan.

By A. Serechnikov (Moscow).

The Japanese working class can be divided into four groups: 1. workers in the metal industry, in the railways workshops, in the mines, and docks, the chemical industry etc.; 2. workers in such undertakings where the so-called sweating system prevails: the cotton, textile and match industry, mat-making etc.; 3. peasants who between the agricultural seasons are engaged with their whole family on the tea plantations, in the silk factories etc.; butchers, tanners, leather workers etc. Finally, there is quite a special group, the immigrants. Although according to law immigration is forbidden, nevertheless the capitalists very eagerly employ skilled Korean and Chinese workers who, as a rule, work 20% cheaper than the Japanese.

The first and fourth group play the most active role in the labour movement. The first group is somewhat better off. They have attained a higher stage of development and are therefore better organised. They work from eight to eleven hours a day.

The fourth group is cruelly treated and there was a time when they were compelled by law to live in special villages. These workers now belong to the most active wing of the labour movement.

The second group consists mainly of women and young people. Taken as a whole, 60% of the workers employed in Japanese industry are women and children. The whole of this category of workers is placed on starvation rations. They subsist solely on rice mixed with barley, they live under extremely insanitary conditions. Women and children are herded together in dark hovels. Although since 1911 a law has existed for the protection of women and children's labour, nevertheless the employers in these undertakings on the strength of various supplemental paragraphs, have introduced the 16 hour day. It is not to be wondered therefore that the mortality figures among this group are enormous. It is equally natural that this category is extremely apathetic and passive. In point of fact they take no part whatever in the labour movement.

The workers belonging to the third category were considered by the government to be peasants and are robbed of all rights of participating in labour organisations. It is true that as a result of the ruthless exploitation of the peasants, chiefly of the small tenants by the big land owners, the movement for peasants' unions is developing. The peasants' unions are endeavouring to affiliate to the workers' unions, which fact is of enormous importance for the development of the labour movement, as only about 30% of the Japanese population live in the towns.

Up to the time of the world war there were no workers' unions in Japan; only "friendly" societies and similar organisations. It was only during the war and the boom of Japanese industry that the workers first gained the right to strike. A number of successful strikes stimulated the formation of actual workers' unions and popularised the idea of unions. It is true that all strikes turned upon questions for increase of wages. To the offensive of Japanese capital, which chiefly expressed itself in the effort to destroy the workers' unions, the workers replied with a whole number of strikes, the majority of which were suppressed by the police and ended with the defeat of the workers. As a result of these defeats the unions have lost many members, although in their most prosperous time they did not include more than 10% of the workers.

In spite of all these difficulties and hindrances, the Japanese workers have nevertheless succeeded by means of tenacious work not only to maintain their position, but also to achieve great successes. Although the workers' unions of Japan only include a relatively limited number of workers, they can nevertheless count upon the sympathy and the support of the absolute majority of the Japanese proletariat. In addition to this the rapid development of the movement of the peasants' unions on the road to uniting with the workers' unions is a great political factor in the life of present-day Japan. The capitalists and the government were compelled, in spite of the bitter struggle which they conducted against this phenomenon, to realise that the aggressive policy against the workers' movement only resulted in the growth of the "spectre of socialism", and to the development of "dangerous ideas" in general, and this compelled them to make concessions. The permission to send delegates to the recent international congresses means the official recognition of the existence of the workers' unions. The largest labour organisation in Japan at present is the General Federation of Labour, to which the miners and seamen are also affiliated.

## UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

### Our Immediate Tasks.

From a speech delivered by Comrade Kamenev at the Sverdlov University.

The Recognition of the Soviet Union — one of our Greatest Achievements.

We are aware that the recognition of the Soviet, having taken place under the pressure of the proletarian masses, is antagonistic to the leading interests of the world bourgeoisie, and we should not be revolutionists if we were not able to recognise clearly that the bourgeoisie is exerting its utmost endeavours to withdraw this recognition, in order to break at the last moment the agreements which it has already signed.

We see that at the precise moment when our relations with France, England, and other bourgeois countries, are assuming a settled form, English and American diplomacy think fit to take measures against such countries of the East — as China, Afghanistan, Persia, Turkey — as are turning with sympathy to the Soviet Union, and are calculating upon our sympathy in their struggle against West European imperialism. These imperialist intrigues are undoubtedly closely bound up with the collective policy of the world bourgeoisie, which is adopting the tactics of throwing as many external and internal difficulties as possible in the way of the Soviet Union, and of destroying the economic conditions, the financial and economic bases, which we have gained as result of the victories of our Red Army and the constructive activity of our economists.

### The II. International an Organ of Capitalist Dictatorship.

The picture of the Georgian rising is clearly unfolded before us. We know that this insurrection did not originate in the country itself, that its origin is not to be found in the discontent of any mass of people, however insignificant in number. We know that this whole rising was simply a well thought out offensive, organised abroad, and pursuing one aim only. The blood of the workers and peasants in Georgia was to flow, in order that the English, American, and French capitalists might be supplied with thread-bare arguments against the recognition of the Soviet Union. It is obvious that at the present juncture it is not possible to rule with sword and cudgel in Europe, as in the days of Curzon and Poincaré. The sword must be concealed with paper flowers. And as is invariably the case in such emergencies, specialists have to be called upon to aid in the work of misleading the masses of the people. These specialists, these last defenders of the bourgeois state of society — are supplied by the II. International. The II. International is the organ of capitalist dictatorship in Europe.

### The Bolshevism of the Communist Parties of Europe.

If we accord a careful consideration to the history of the communist movement in Europe, we see what elements contributed to originate these communist parties in the years 1918 and 1919. These parties were formed of social democratic elements who felt that they could no longer be a party to the all too obvious treachery practised by social democracy in the European war; but these elements did not yet participate in really revolutionary struggles, and they brought many of their old social democratic ideas with them.

We are now able to state that the crystallisation of these parties is making progress. The revolutionary wings of the communist parties are everywhere victorious over the opportunist wings. Here the Russian party discussion played a very important role. Everything happening in our Party is of international significance. This discussion had also the effect of inducing the Communist Parties to exercise self criticism. This process has proved a process of convalescence. For us, who have already experienced splits and discussions in our Party, the process was painful, but familiar. For the West European Communist Parties, who had not yet undergone this schooling, this was the first convulsion they had experienced, and their attention was drawn for the first time to the problem: what is Bolshevism actually? How is it to be grasped?

We want an Alliance with the Working Masses of the whole World.

We must never forget that in the consciousness of the whole capitalist world we are and remain their bitterest enemy. No number of treaties must induce us to forget for a moment that such agreements are mere temporary armistices between two absolutely antagonistic systems. And on the other hand we must not lose sight of the fact that these treaties can only be maintained so long as the really revolutionary proletarian masses of Europe are backing them up. Therefore our first task is to win over the working masses still under the influence of the London and Amsterdam Internationals.

We criticise the leaders, but are endeavouring to gain the friendship and alliance of the real working masses, and therefore we welcome every group representing workers who have already grasped the fact that the road to true labour solidarity, the road to the realisation of the aims of the working people, does

not lead in the direction indicated by MacDonald and his like, not in the direction of coalitions between the working class and the bourgeois, but to Moscow. These masses of workers must join with us in their struggle against capitalism. There is only one banner under which they can conquer capitalism and war, and that is the banner of constant and determined struggle against the dictatorship of capital. We can go forward together beneath this banner, and if we join forces with the real working masses of Europe, if we unite in the trade unions, then our cause and the cause of these workers is irrevocably gained. Our Gains in our Economic Campaign involve Fresh Difficulties.

We have increased our area under cultivation, and are thus in a position to overcome the effect of bad crops with greater ease. Industry has attained the degree of production required, and has even exceeded this in part. The money reform has not only been decreed, but has been carried through, and will be maintained. This year our trade balance is active. We have undoubtedly improved the material position of the workers and peasants.

The advantages thus gained bring with them their attendant difficulties. We have no less grain than we had last year, but the price of grain has risen by 100%; this threatens increased prices for all goods, and increase of all state expenditure, especially an increase of state expenditure for wages. The production of fuel (coal and naphtha), although it has not reached pre-war level, has still increased to an extent involving difficulty in finding markets — other branches of production not having kept pace with this, and the metal industry in particular being very much behindhand. The high prices for corn enrich the well-off strata of the rural population, and render the poorer strata, who are lacking in cattle and implements, economically more dependent upon the richer.

We have not, as was the case last year, to combat a crisis arising from difficulty in finding markets, but we have to calculate with a 20% to 30% increase in the purchasing power of the market, in consequence of the increased price of grain — for though the increase in price will not be 100%, it will be 40% to 50% higher than last year. It is thus incumbent upon us to supply as many products as possible at the lowest possible prices, in order to insure full turnover between agriculture and industry.

The differences between wholesale and retail prices are very great, wholesale trade being in our own hands, whilst retail trade is in the hands of a number of private middlemen: a state of affairs naturally implying higher retail prices. The more the peasantry is able to purchase, the greater the returns and gains of retail trade, and the greater the danger that these elements gain economic and even political significance.

### The Party must keep a Firm Hand on the Economic Lever.

It is our task to observe these new difficulties before they have time to become a source of danger, to grasp their significance, and to combat them with all means at our disposal. We have enough levers at hand for this purpose: The nationalised industry, the grain monopoly, the foreign trade monopoly, and our control of finance through the banks and credit grants. But we have to learn how to manipulate these levers properly.

Thanks to the fact that the working class has swelled our Party ranks by 250,000 real representatives of the working masses in the Lenin recruitment we are now in possession of transmission belting keeping us in working communication, not only with the broad masses of non-partisan workers, but with the peasantry as well. When we, in co-operation with and under the leadership of our Party, have learnt to join with these broad masses of the working classes in manipulating the levers, and when the mechanism of our leadership has become clear to all, then no difficulties which may arise can have any terrors for us.

And we require still something more: besides the confidence of the broad masses, besides Party discipline and unity, there is one other absolute necessity: a correct and unwavering outlook. This can only be obtained through the theory and science of socialism. Here we have a great teacher and a great teaching: Lenin and Leninism. Lenin is no more. It must be our aim to replace him by a profounder study of Leninism.

## The Problem of Wages and of Workers' Efficiency in Soviet Russia.

By Z. Leder. (Moscow.)

Vladimir Hyitch said: "The efficiency of the workers — that is, in the last resort, the most important, the most decisive thing for the victory of the new social order. Capitalism can only be finally vanquished if socialism creates a new efficiency of labour. And although it is a long and difficult task — it is nevertheless indispensable."

The Communist Party of Russia has already for some time devoted its attention to the question of increasing the efficiency of labour. This was the more necessary when, with the introduction of the new economic policy and of the revival of industry resulting therefrom, wages increased at a relatively rapid rate, particularly in the months of January to March 1923, when they increased 22% in comparison with the previous quarter, and in the months of October to December 1923, when they increased 14% in comparison with the third quarter of 1923. In consequence of this upward movement, which only experienced an interruption from April to October 1923, the average wage of industrial workers increased from 42% of pre-war wages in the period from October to December 1922, or from 38.2% in October 1922 to 59.9% of the pre-war level in the period from October to December 1923. Also the quarter from January to March 1924 shows an increase of wages of 6% in comparison with the last quarter of 1923 — that is about 65 to 66% of pre-war wages. This increase of wages, which in itself is of course a necessary and welcome phenomenon, has nevertheless its social and economic aspects which have to be taken into consideration. From the economic standpoint, because it was not accompanied by any increase of labour efficiency, but also because it did not proceed at the same rate in the various branches of industry, and there are therefore groups of workers who are relatively better paid although their work from the point of view of national economy cannot be regarded as of greater value. This refers especially to the so-called light and heavy industry. Taking the average wage of the industrial workers in 1913 as 100, the wages of the metal workers were 140, the textile workers 68, the miners 132, and food provision workers 72; whilst in the last quarter of 1923 relations were as follows:

wages of metal workers equal	107%	of average wage
" " textiles workers equal	91.3%	" " "
" " miners equal	89.9%	" " "
" " food workers equal	121.4%	" " "

It can be seen from these figures that the change in the relation of wages of individual groups of workers depends much more upon the conditions of the market than upon systematic regulation. But in a workers' state which aims at communist construction it is the latter which must be striven after.

Of greatest economic importance, however, is the fact that the increase of wages is not accompanied by a corresponding increase of labour productivity. Under these conditions it is a matter of course that Russian industry is not in a position to create the necessary means to pay wages at the proper time and to fulfil other obligations, as it lacks the means to make the most necessary improvements which could result in raising production. In the period from October 1922 to January 1924, when wages increased considerably, the product of labour increased at a much lower rate. And as the state had to put an end, once and for all, to the earlier system of subsidising state industry, every effort must be made to raise the efficiency of labour to a level corresponding to the increase of wages.

After long endeavours in order to arrive at a correct judgment regarding the development of wages and of the efficiency of labour in Soviet Russia, the plenary sitting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Russia on the 19th of August arrived at its decision. It was recognised that wages, as we mentioned above, have increased more rapidly than efficiency of labour, and it is therefore the urgent task of the Party, of the economic organs, of the trade unions and all other organs, to increase the efficiency of labour. The Central Committee came to the conclusion: Without raising the efficiency of labour there can be no general increase of normal wages. It resolved a number of concrete measures which are calculated to bring about this result. But in order to avoid any reduction in real wages which, especially in view of the bad harvest in a portion of Soviet Russia, could come

about, the Central Committee issued instructions in accordance with which the systematic reduction of prices of industrial products is to be continued, and an additional reduction of at least 10% is to be aimed at. The prices of textile and leather goods, coal, petroleum, metals and of articles consumed by the workers are especially to be reduced.

The measures decided on by the Central Committee in order to raise the efficiency of labour are as follows: 1. a rational organisation of work and production, in particular a full utilisation of the working day, 2. increase of output everywhere where the highest possible maximum has not been reached, 3. abolition of restrictions regarding piece-work (in cases of introductions of technical and organisational improvements the output demanded must be subject to a further revision), 4. the numerical relationship between workers actually engaged in production on the one hand the unskilled workers and clerks on the other hand must be properly adjusted, 5. the technical equipment must be improved, the workers and technical employees shall be encouraged by special bonuses to suggest technical and organisational improvements in the process of production. In close connection with these measures, aiming partly at the intensification of labour and partly at the technical improvement of the process of production, there shall be a further concentration of production for the purpose of taking full advantage of the technical outfit of the factories, a simultaneous extension of production, a simplification and standardisation of production, especially of articles of mass production, a further reduction of all unnecessary expenses in production and trade, a much more economical management of raw materials, fuel etc.

At the present time there is being conducted a large-scale agitation and organisation campaign with the object of raising the efficiency of labour, which has succeeded in attracting the leading elements and also the masses. As a means of educating the masses in this work the so-called production conferences, which take place in the workshops, and where, in the presence of hundred and thousands of workers on the one hand and of the factory management on the other hand, all the short-comings in the daily work of the factory are dealt with, are of special service in stimulating the working masses to increase the output of the factories.

## FASCISM

### The Newest Form of Social Fascism in Germany.

By Heinz Neumann (Berlin).

A new factor has begun to play an important part in the political life of Germany, the social democratic fighting-organisation, "Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold" (National Flag, Black-Red-Gold). German Social-Democracy having passed through its deepest crisis in the autumn of 1923, is now attempting to consolidate itself by new methods. Whilst formerly it stood defenceless between the attacks of the fascist petty bourgeoisie on the one hand, and of the communist workers on the other, it is seeking now to create a military fighting organisation. What is the organisation of workers? That would be a suicidal act on the part of the social democratic leaders. They are setting up a mixed military organisation of petty bourgeois, clerks, ex-officers, well-paid workers, and finally actual proletarians. Whilst the ranks of this organisation consist of petty bourgeois-proletarian elements, the leadership consists entirely of outspoken representatives of German capitalism, of the bourgeois state apparatus and of the social democratic bureaucracy. According to its membership therefore it has a petty bourgeois-proletarian character, but as regards its class role and leadership it bears a counter-revolutionary character.

The "Reichsbanner" is not only of immediate political importance for the class struggle in Germany, but it is a factor of the very highest importance for the whole analysis of the class forces and of the form of the class struggle on an international scale. It represents in a concrete form the unity between fascism and social democracy.

The reasons for the appearance of this new organisation are: 1. the defeat of German fascism in the form hitherto assumed, 2. the transformation of German social democracy into an active fighting troop of the counter-revolution; 3. the restoration of the

front of the decisive groups of the German bourgeoisie under the pressure of foreign imperialism.

The collapse in Germany of the old and 'purely military' fascism is proceeding visibly and at a rapid rate: the old fascist movement is in its death throes. Its moderate wing excludes the advocates of purely military methods in the class war, and is capturing the leadership. With the political change of front of the German bourgeoisie, the fascists are losing the sources of finance upon which they lived. At the same time fascism is losing its basis of operation in Bavaria — the only state power in Germany upon which it could rely. The stabilisation of the German mark suddenly pacified the broad middle classes, who took an active part in the fascist movement during the period of inflation. The ranks of the fascist organisations no longer consist of broad petty bourgeois masses, but only of a privileged counter-revolutionary section of the middle class: officers, students, a portion of the officials and clerks, as well as the slum proletariat. The political leadership is being transferred from the petty bourgeoisie (Hitler, Esser) to the great agrarians (Ludendorff, Gräfe). As the big agrarians as well as the heavy industrials have a class interest in the carrying out of the Experts Report, the nationalist ideology is being annihilated. Old fascism is dying. Its new form is characterised by a moderation of its programme, a reduction of its organisational basis, and a specialising upon direct civil war against the proletariat.

Whilst the counter revolution is by this means reducing its heavy special troops, the artillery, so to speak, against the proletariat, it is creating at the other wing the social democratic "Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold". Already the statutes of this "Reichsbanner", which normally appears as a "Union of Republican Ex-Service Men", reveal its counter-revolutionary aim. It is created in order to place itself at the disposal of the Republican governments in case of need. It will co-operate in the "economic and social reconstruction of Germany"; that is in the enforced carrying out of the Experts Report. The precursors of the "Reichsbanner" are the social democratic defence units, which were directed against the communists, and the Hamburg "Union for the Republic", which participated in the crushing of the Communist uprising in Hamburg in October last. The leader of the Reichsbanner is the president of a Prussian province, Hoersing, the butcher in the March action 1921. Ostensibly the "Reichsbanner" will fight against the monarchist, but actually against the communist opponents of the Republic with the same means which they adopt.

The genuine fascist organisations to some extent welcome the formation of the "Reichsbanner". The "Stahlhelm", the organ of the central German fascists, in its issue of 22nd of June welcomes the "Reichsbanner" as comrades in arms against bolshevism and declared: "The Stahlhelm hopes, when the hour calls, to be able to enter the field alongside of the "Reichsbanner" against these enemies of the Republic and of the German fatherland."

On the other hand the left (!) social democrat Loebe declared a week or two ago in the Reichstag: "A republican organisation of "Stahlhelmen" (steelhelms) and "Werwölfen" (Werewolves) will be set up within a few weeks."

The social democrats of the "Reichsbanner" are in some places having encounters with the genuine fascists, but the political development is inevitably welding both bodies of troops into an alliance against the proletariat.

A powerful means to this end are the bourgeois parties and the bourgeois state apparatus.

The national leadership and almost all district commands of the "Reichsbanner" consist not only of social democrats, but of democrats and centre people, that is of the parties of the bourgeois block, who maintain immediate technical connections with the fascist fighting organisation.

The "Reichsbanner", just as the social democracy itself, is connected by numerous threads with the capitalist governmental apparatus. Reich President Ebert exchanges dozens of telegrams with the "Reichsbanner". Hoersing is a representative of the Prussian government; behind him stands Severing. The Hamburg Senate has taken over the protectorate of the "Reichsbanner". The French generals of the occupation troops in the Ruhr district remain "neutral" to it. On the 11th of August there took place in the Lustgarten in Berlin a joint parade of the uniformed "Reichsbanner" people with the uniformed police forces. On the 10th of August the "Reichsbanner", headed by a brass band of the police, marched to the celebrations of the

anniversary of the constitution. Its legality is based upon an order issued by general Seeckt in August 1923. Physical training is given by police officers, its musketry exercises are held at the shooting ranges of the Reichswehr, whose ranks it will reinforce in the event of civil war.

This is the character of the "Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold". On paper the membership of the "Reichsbanner" amounts to 2 million, but actually it numbers only half a million. As the majority of its members consist of proletarians, the "Reichsbanner" bears within itself the seed of its own destruction. The "Red Front Fighters Union", which is supported by the Communists, will use all its endeavours to promote this development.

For Germany itself the "Reichsbanner" embodies and guarantees the continuation of the bitterest class struggle, and the impossibility under the Dawes Plan of avoiding civil war.

The "Reichsbanner" is the classic form of social fascism, the new fighting method of the bourgeoisie in the "era of pacifism".

## POLEMICS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Election-Policy of the British Communist Party.

By M. N. Roy.

In view of the finding of the Fifth Congress that the activities of the Communist International should be concentrated on the necessity of building a mass party in Great Britain, the present election campaign in that country assumes extraordinary importance. The election campaign provides our Party with a splendid opportunity for agitation. In proportion as the British comrades will be able to avail themselves of this opportunity, the task of building the much-needed mass party will be accomplished.

There cannot be much controversy as to what should be the election-policy of the British Party. The general lines have been laid down already by several Congresses. But the resolution of the Labour Party Conference not to endorse any Communist candidate has slightly changed the situation. The change is slight, because by no means does it warrant any essential modification of the general lines of our policy. What will be required is tactical elasticity. Nevertheless, one or two suggestions have been made which practically mean the repudiation of the lines laid down by Lenin in "Left Communism", and subsequently ratified on several occasions. It is true that the tactical lines determined in the light of the situation in 1920 may not be applicable with equal correctness after the lapse of four years. The British Party is expected to have passed its "infantile" period in the meantime. But before recommending any far-reaching alternation of the old line of tactics, it is necessary to examine whether a corresponding change of situation has taken place. No doubt Britain of today is not the same as the Britain of 1920. It cannot, however, be asserted that the political outlook of the proletariat as a class has undergone any appreciable change. In general the working class still has faith in and follows the Labour Party. The short experience of Labour Government has not altered this state of affairs, although it has given a few jolts here and there. Today we have a Communist Party, while there was none in 1920. The influence of our Party is steadily growing; but the fact remains that not even an appreciable minority of the working class can be called to follow the Communist lead. This being the case, in broad outlines the situation continues to be the same as calls for the application of the policy formulated by Lenin in 1920.

Some German comrades put forth a new election-policy for the British Party. They suggest that where Communist candidates get the endorsement of local organisations in spite of the resolution of the Labour Party, the old policy will be followed: that is, the proletariat will be asked to vote for the Communist candidate of the Labour Party. But where there will be no Communist candidate, the Communists should abstain from voting and exhort the proletariat to the same. This is nothing but the revival of the policy which Lenin combated. It is obvious that at best only a few Communists will get the necessary endorsement. In the large majority of the constituencies, our Party will have three alternatives: namely, to support the Labour Party (non-communist) candidate, to put up its own candidate in opposition to the Labour Party candidate, or to follow the advice of the German comrades, that is to abstain and to preach abstention. If it be held that the

situation has altered so much as to warrant the abandonment of the policy to support the Labour Party, our course obviously should be to put up independent Communist candidates. When we ask the proletariat not to vote for the Labour Party candidate, we can contemplate either to ask them to vote for the Communist candidate or to lead them further than the parliamentary election, — to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Neither one nor the other is as yet within the bounds of practical politics in Britain. The consciousness of this fact obviously gives origin to the theory of abstention. But this will be nothing but smarting under our own inability.

As against this point of view, we have the theses of the French Party which admits the necessity of supporting the Labour Party candidates, but stipulate conditions, one of which is "to demand a rupture with the MacDonald Government". While the other conditions are very necessary and our British comrades should put them forward energetically, the slogan, "Down with MacDonald Government", is tactically untenable, and is bound to create confusion. If by this is meant a demand for the repudiation of the policy of the MacDonald Government, it becomes intelligible. In that case, the slogan should be the demand for a really working class government instead of a willing tool of the bourgeoisie, which the MacDonald Cabinet is and will be if it is returned to office.

Some German comrade dubbed the French theses "Menshevik". In reality, however, it is unconsciously "leftist". Because, by demanding a rupture with the MacDonald Government, it commits itself against the necessity of a Labour Government. To the British proletariat MacDonald Government is analogous with Labour Government. We can criticise it with all our force, we must make all kinds of stipulations to our support to it; but we cannot demand its overthrow without declaring war upon Labour Government as such. And we can declare war upon Labour Government only when the situation will be considered fit for launching the slogan of "Soviet building" instead of parliamentary election, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, instead of a parliamentary government.

Now, the question which should be answered is: Must we still work for a Labour Government in Britain or must we begin the preparations for the dictatorship? It will be simply absurd to decide in favour of the latter alternative, in view of the fact that we are not even in a position to run a sufficient number of our own independent candidates. The experience of Labour Government is still required to dispel the illusion of the British proletariat. Therefore it is all the more necessary for the Communists to help the accession of a Labour Government now, when the bourgeoisie is making a concerted effort to defeat the Labour Party in the elections. The formation of the bourgeoisie block makes the return of a Labour Government out of the question; the elimination of a large number of three-cornered fights by mutual agreement between the Tories and Liberals, even threatens to reduce the present number of Labour members in the parliament. If at this juncture, the Communists preach abstentionism or give out any ambiguous slogan which may be interpreted as against Labour Government as such, we will only defeat our own end. It will be giving a handle to the leaders of the Labour Party, who will throw on the Communists the responsibility for their possible defeat. Given the faith of the large majority of the rank and file in the leaders, the Communists should act very cautiously, if they are to win over the masses.

All these tactical considerations need not in the least weaken the position of the Communist Party. The short experience of Labour Government corroborates its contention that a working class government cannot function within the bounds of parliamentary democracy. It justifies all our criticism of the Labour Party. But what is convincing for the Communists and, perhaps for a small advanced minority, does not yet convince the masses. They still believe that the Labour Government has not had a fair chance. They still labour under the illusion of returning a parliamentary majority. They must have this painful experience, and we must go with them, if we want to gain their confidence in the end.

So, the general lines of our election-policy remain the same. In view of the refusal of the Labour Party to endorse Communist candidates, we must endeavour to secure the support of local organisations, and run independent candidates wherever it can be done without splitting the labour vote. But our support should be by no means unconditional. This election is fought clearly on the basis of class-struggle. The Labour Party leaders are endeavouring to obscure this essential feature of the situation.

The Communists must make this clear to the rank and file. To catch the petty bourgeois votes, the Labour Party has watered down its programme to such an extent, that its election manifesto is composed of meaningless sentences. The Communists must supply the slogans voicing the demands of the working class. In short, as long as it is kept in mind that for the Communists the election campaign is only an opportunity to mobilize the masses and stimulate their revolutionary ardour, there cannot be any room for such suggestion as to abstain from voting, nor does the possibility of unconditional support to the Labour Party arise. It was a pungent criticism when comrade Fischer said that our British comrades are members of the Labour Party 6 days a week and of the Communist Party one day a week. But to reverse the ratio will be equally reprehensible under the present conditions. It will be bending the stick the other way.

## IN THE COLONIES

### King Hussein's Rise and Fall.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The attack of the Wahabites upon the capital of Hedjaz has resulted in a thorough change, the effects of which will be of very great importance for Arabia and the Near East. Threatened by his enemies, left in the lurch by his friends, cold-shouldered by England, there has been nothing left for the chief of this erstwhile powerful Haschimit family, but to attempt by abdicating the throne and the dignity of Caliph to save for his eldest son and successor what there was left to save.

Hussein had risen very rapidly in the course of the last few years. One of the numerous princes of the Arabian Peninsula, one of the most greedy and unpopular, he had the fortune as he held in his hand as sheriff of Mecca the key to the Islamic world, and as he was more easily susceptible to bribes than the other princes — to be selected as a tool of England. In 1915 the sheriff of Mecca became king of Hedjaz. In 1916 his son Feisal assembled an auxiliary army of Bedouins for the Entente troops, which contributed very greatly to the defeat of the Turks. In the year 1918 Hussein became certain that he had sold himself to the right party; the victory of the Entente afforded him the possibility of insisting on the fulfilment of the promises given to him by England and he looked forward to their realisation. In 1920 his son Feisal, with English help became king of Damascus; driven out by the French, Feisal received from the English the throne of Mesopotamia. In 1922 his son Abdullah Ibn Hussein became prince of Transjordan and the eldest son of Hussein, Ali, was seriously put forward as candidate for the ruler of Palestine. Finally, in 1924 the power of Hussein reached its zenith: in March of this year king Hussein, in the presence of his two sons, was, as the most powerful and "only independent" ruler of the Mohammedan world, crowned Caliph of Islam.

The crowning of Hussein as Caliph was undoubtedly a serious political blunder on the part of England. Instead of raising the prestige of Hussein, England only succeeded in completely discrediting him in the eyes of the Mohammedan world. "The unbelievers", that is the majority of the inhabitants of Egypt and of Turkey, and those sects who do not recognise the Caliphate, did not take any notice of the crowning of the Caliph, while the "believers", that is the Mohammedans of India, Syria and Arabia would not recognise any Caliph by the grace of England, and were stirred up to furious hate against the usurper. England now sought ways and means in order to retrieve its error. After the establishment of English power in Palestine and Mesopotamia the importance of Hussein for England fell to a minimum. He rather prevented England from looking round for another more suitable instrument in the Arabian Peninsula. The discredited Hussein had become superfluous ballast for the English policy in Arabia.

Hussein himself facilitated England in making a break with him. The Treaty concerning the Anglo-Arabian federation, which was to form the basis for an alliance between Hussein and MacDonald, contained clauses which England under other circumstances would have very easily given up, but which rendered it impossible for Hussein to sign the treaty. Hussein would have been expressly compelled to recognise that Palestine had to remain an independent Arabian State, and would have been compelled in this or that form to give his consent to the

Balfour Declaration. But he would thereby have lost all support in the only country which he still possessed, in Palestine itself. Hussein sought a way out. He came forward with counter proposals and endeavoured to find a compromise. In vain. In August last his English ambassador, Dr. Naji el Asil, came to Hedjaz with a draft treaty which was regarded on the part of England as final.

Hussein, who had to choose either to become completely discredited as a Mohammedan ruler and enslaved by England on the one hand, and the loss of British friendship on the other, hesitated what to do. But this hesitation led to his complete downfall. The English, even under the rule of the Christian peace-loving MacDonald, are not sentimental. And the policy of His British Majesty in Arabia could not wait until His Excellency, the Caliph by the grace of His Majesty, decided to sign the Treaty. He hesitated, it was decided therefore to employ the whip to help him to arrive at a decision. The scourge of the Islamic despots in Arabia are the Wahabites. Without themselves being bound to any government, these desert Bedouins, owing to their lack of weapons could only engage in war against those tribes who receive no help from any European power. For many years king Hussein was defended from the fanatical hate of the Wahabites against the "old robber" by the friendship of England. It was now intimated to the Wahabites that England would remain neutral in the event of a war against Hedjaz.

This sealed the fate of Hussein. In their first attack the Wahabites captured El Taif, a few days later they repulsed a relief army of Hussein and opened the way to Mecca.

The fight against the Wahabites, who were bringing 25,000 men into the field against the army of Hedjaz which numbers only 1500 soldiers, was hopeless. The only hope for Hussein was England. Naji el Asil journeyed to London and submitted the Treaty duly signed to His Majesty's Government. He begged for immediate help — at least a few aeroplanes. In vain. The English press which only a few months previously had lauded Hussein to the skies, now ridiculed the "helpless old man". The "Morning Post" admitted quite openly: that Hussein had estranged English public opinion. He ought to have signed the Treaty at once.

There was nothing left for Hussein but to abdicate. His son Ali declared beforehand that he made no claim to the Caliphate. In spite of this the Wahabites continued their advance on Mecca so that Ali was compelled to flee and Mecca was easily taken. They will perhaps, after having succeeded in overthrowing their hereditary enemy, conclude a peace with Ali. With the collapse of the Hussein dynasty a new chapter opens in the history of Arabia.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### An Example of Yankee Justice

By Harrison George (Chicago).

The United States has a strange and wonderful government, especially in its execution of laws against workers. And especially workers who bring their brains along with them, tariff free, from other lands. This is a story of one case which workers of other lands are asked to read and over which they should let their voice be heard.

Here is a bit of background: American entered the World War on April 6th, 1917. Reaction attacked labour organisations. On September 28th, 1917, a terrorist nation-wide raid was made upon the syndicalist unions of the I. W. W. (Industrial Workers of the World), and 106 workers imprisoned on charges of violation of certain war time laws. Remember these laws were passed during the war. That is important in this story. On August 17th, 1918, these workers were convicted en masse and sent to the Federal prison at Leavenworth, Kansas. Among them, sentenced to five years, were the four citizens of other countries who are the illustration of this story. There were others, but these workers are made a "test case". They were:

Pietro Nigra—an Italian,  
Herbert Mahler—a Canadian,  
Joseph Oates—an Englishman,  
William Moran—an Australian.

These workers were in the United States, supposedly under such protection as is given them by international treaty between

their home countries and the United States. Labour organisations of the countries from which these workers came are, however, asked to observe what happened. Then they should interpellate their governments on the issue of treaty rights of their nationals. Observe:

The Constitution of the United States, Article One, Section Nine, Paragraph Three, says — "No bill of attainder or ex-post-facto law shall be passed".

Nevertheless, in clear defiance of its own basic and organic law, the United States Congress on May 10th, 1920 did pass an ex-post-facto law providing in part that:

"All aliens who, since August 1, 1914, have been or may hereafter be convicted of any violation of conspiracy to violate any of the following acts or parts of acts", etc. This is quoted from Sections "A" and "E", Paragraph Two, Section One of the law known as the "Act of May 10, 1920, Ch. 174,41 Stat. L. 593, Amendment to the Immigration Law". And why was this specifically unconstitutional retroactive law passed?

The reason is that, prior to the war, deportation of aliens under the Immigration Law was provided for only in case they were convicted of crimes involving "moral turpitude" like murder or rape. Yet here were a new kind of alien prisoners for "free America". Here were political prisoners, criminals of opinion, whose crime involved no moral turpitude, but, on the contrary, was but an expression of the noble effort to emancipate the proletariat. But on that very account the capitalist class of America hated them the more and wished to deport them. So, in the ex-post-facto law quoted above, violations or conspiracies to violate a certain Military Act of May 18, 1917 (the Conscription Law) and, in Section "A", similar offenses against the infamous "Espionage Act" were made into deportable offenses because these were the laws the four aliens in question had been convicted of "conspiring to violate".

Take note of the fact that the U. S. Constitution forbids retroactive laws; that these men were convicted on August 17, 1918; that on that date their offense was not deportable; that on May 10, 1920, an amendment to the Immigration Act was passed making such offenses deportable; that this was made retroactive to August 1, 1914.

The above is enough to make any subsequent deportation a very questionable proceeding. But here is another and more. These workers remained in prison after their conviction on August 17, 1918, until May 1922. While they were still in prison, on March 3, 1921, both of the war laws under which they were convicted were repealed. Ordinarily, in any civilized country, if a prisoner is imprisoned under a certain law, and that law is repealed, the prisoner is released. Not so in "free America". Not only were all political prisoners held in prison regardless of the repeal, but two months after the repeal the four workers in question were served with deportation warrants while in Leavenworth Prison, citing as reason for deportation their conviction under the repealed laws.

One might think that, at least, this deportation warrant would relieve these workers from further imprisonment. But the government of the United States defies understanding. No. It held these workers in prison until they had served their full sentences. Then, when it released them from prison on May 14, 1922, it seized them at once under the year-old deportation order and was rushing them to the seaboard when stopped by habeas Corpus writs it Ellis Island.

The whole matter has since been threshed out in capitalist courts and taken clear up to the United States Supreme Court and argued before no less an authority on capitalist law than Chief Justice William (The Fat) Taft. William the Fat was the Last Word. He upheld Federal Judge Page of Chicago in his ruling — setting the strange precedent — that the ex-post-facto clause of the United States Constitution, and, by inference, the whole Constitution or any other law, does not apply to aliens!

Now you have a picture of Yankee Justice. It remains to be seen what the protest will be against this flouting of justice by the United States government in order to deport workers who are revolutionary labour agitators. Also the treaty rights of citizens of Italy, Canada, England and Australia, are ignored and violated by the United States government. But the League of Nations Assembly, at Geneva raised no fuss over this phase of American Immigration laws. It remains for the workers to protest, in print and parliament, in union hall or on the streets, against this Yankee Justice.

Especially are the Italian workers asked to protest against the deportation of Pietro Nigra into the hands of Mussolini's



murder bands. The wastrel and idler spawn of the British king is allowed, even invited to defile the land of Coolidge's "democracy" with his presence. Fascist officers are feted and dined and congratulated by American bourgeois upon the murder of nine thousands workers of Italy, but these workers who went to prison for the labour movement are "undesirable" to the capitalist government of the United States. This is Yankee Justice under the Dictatorship of Capitalism. Only under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat will "justice" mean anything to the workers.

## APPEALS

### To the Suppressed Peoples.

The following Appeal was issued by the recent Inter-Parliamentary Communist Conference held at Cologne.

The united representatives of the Communist Parties and of the R. I. L. U. organisation of Germany, France, Belgium, England, Italy, Poland, Holland, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans, met together in Cologne on 9. October, send to the colonial peoples, exploited and oppressed by imperialism, the assurance of their complete solidarity with the national emancipatory struggles of these peoples.

At this moment, when imperialism is carrying on wars of colonisation in China, in Morocco, in the Sudan, in Syria, in India, etc., at this moment, when the suppressed colonial peoples are beginning to rise up against this enhancement of their slavery, the Communist Parties and trade union organisations represented at the Cologne Conference step forward as the sole defenders of the free right of self-determination of the peoples, as the sole organisations stretching out a fraternal hand to the oppressed of the earth, as the sole organisations resolved to come to the aid, by means of revolution, of the colonial peoples fighting for their freedom.

They make use of this Conference as an opportunity of congratulating the natives of French and Spanish Morocco on their fight for emancipation from the rule of dictatorial and murderous generals; the Negroes of Guadeloupe on their struggle against their oppressors; the oppressed masses of the people in China on their struggle against the generals serving the interests of the Japanese, French, and Anglo American imperialists, and of calling upon all these to carry on their struggles until they have completely freed themselves from the yoke of the white imperialists and of the native imperialists.

Long live the national emancipation of the colonial peoples, the first and necessary stage on the road to their complete emancipation!

## PROLETARIAN ART

### To the Proletarian and Revolutionary Authors of all Countries.

Comrades!

In the furious class war which is unfolding itself in the whole world, no one is or can be neutral. Art which is and always has been a powerful means of organising the feelings of the masses in conformity with the tasks and condition of a certain class, cannot abstain from taking part in this great historical battle of world-wide significance.

The heralds of those who are "above class" of "non-political" art, the apostles of "pure beauty" only conceal with such fig leaves their decadent civic class-nakedness.

A true artist has in our epoch no alternative but deliberately to join in the proletariat's fight for freedom, for capitalism brings mankind under the sway of depravity and degeneration, whereas the proletarian revolution leads to a social system which guarantees that creative force shall flourish to its greatest possible extent, and that all the forces of the individual and of the collective body shall develop harmoniously.

There are in every land poets, authors, dramatists who have taken an active stand under the red banner of the proletarian revolution. A still larger number of artists of the pen sympathise with this revolution. All these artists of the proletarian revolution

are at present acting individually, with no connecting link. Their voices do not sound in harmony, their works perish without reaching the proletarian reader. And the Labour Press which is not well enough informed on this important question, increases in many cases this want of harmony and offers its readers artistic food which is decadent and quite alien to them.

On July 10th. the conference of the Proletarian Writers of the Soviet Union in common with the delegates of the V. Congress of the C. I. took place in red Moscow, the centre of the world revolution. This conference was unanimously agreed as to the necessity of uniting the proletarian writers of all lands into associations for the separate countries, and these into an International of Proletarian Literature. The conference established a bureau for the purpose of preparing the way for an association of this kind.

The first essential for such an association, such a bond of unity of the literary creative forces of the revolutionary proletariat is that they should get to know one another.

We appeal to you to send us detailed information as to all groups, circles, unions etc., of proletarian and revolutionary writers and their works.

Yours in comradeship

on behalf of The International Bureau for Establishing Connections between Proletarian Writers:

Demjan Bjedny, Etienne Lacoste, Lupion, I. Mutevsky, F. Peluso, F. F. Raskolnikov, Semjon Rodby, A. Besimensky, S. W. Iaitis, Heinz Cagan, G. Lelevitsch, A. W. Lunatscharsky

Address for written communications:  
Russia, Moscow, Corner of Sofijka and Roschdestvenska, State Publishing Office, International Bureau.

### Resolution of the Delegates' Conference of the V. Congress on the Question of Artistic Literature.

The Conference of Delegates of the V. Congress of the C. I. organised in common with the international group of proletarian authors in Moscow and representatives of the Executive Committee of the Association of Proletarian Authors of the Soviet Union recognises that artistic literature, being a powerful means of influencing the mentality and consciousness of the masses, plays an important part in the struggle of the working class for liberty. The working classes can only get the full rational benefit of this if the literary and artistic forces of the proletariat are united so as to form an international standard. The first aim should be to establish in every country uniform associations of proletarian authors (i. e. of those authors who by their work organise the feelings and thoughts of their readers in the direction of communism) similar to the centralised association which embraces the proletarian authors of the Soviet Union. Absolute freedom of creative quest, unconditional participation through their individual creative work in the proletarian fight for liberty, are the fundamental slogans of the association. Its principle of organisation and its task is to attract all poetically creative members of the proletariat and to develop all these creative forces of the lower ranks. The aim should be to make these associations centres of attraction for all writers who sympathise with the fight for communism. The conference institutes an International Bureau for establishing connections between Proletarian Writers which is commissioned to do the preparatory work for the creation of such associations and to prepare the creation of an International of Proletarian Literature. Its first duties are:

1. To start regular connections with the proletarian and revolutionary artists of the pen and the Literary Associations of all countries.

2. To lead the way to mutual information and to gather exhaustive material as to the situation of the proletarian and revolutionary literature in all countries.

3. To co-ordinate the work which aims at the creation of associations of proletarian writers in the various countries.

4. To organize the translation of international proletarian literature into various languages.

5. Starting from the artistic and ideological platform and the statutes of organization of the Association of the Proletarian Writers of the Soviet Union, and taking into consideration the special characteristics of each country, to elaborate a draft platform and constitution of the International Association of Proletarian Literature.

6. To make preparations for convening the foundation congress of the International of Proletarian Literature.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 76

29th October 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.

## CONTENTS

The Anniversary of the October Revolution

Politics

G. Zinoviev: The Anniversary of the Hamburg Revolt.  
W. N. Clark: MacDonald the Dupe.  
J. I. Murphy: Ploughing the Ground for Bolshevism.  
Paul Schwenck: The dissolution of the Reichstag and the C.P. of Germany.  
Rodolfo Ghioldi: The Military Coup d'Etat in Chile.  
J. B. (Jerusalem): The Persecution of Egyptian Communists.

The Labour Movement

J. Jacquemotte: The Defeat of the Belgian Miners.

Seventh Anniversary of the October Revolution.

Theses for Agitators.

Supplementary Theses for Propagandist Work within the Party.

In the International

D. Manuilsky: The Import of the Discussion in the Czechoslovakian Party.  
Reply of the C. P. of Great Britain to the Labour Party's Expulsion Move.  
The Joint Committee of Action of the C. P. of France and of the C. G. T. U. for the Fight against the Dawes Plan.

In the Soviet Union

N. Krasikov: Solovki.

The White Terror

Against the Persecution of the C. P. of Germany.

H. Tittel: The Hamburg October Fighters in the Hands of Class Justice.

## The Anniversary of the October Revolution.

### To the Workers of all Countries!

Seven years ago the Russian working class, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, laid the foundation stone of the mighty structure of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. Seven years of the most bloody civil war, of armed intervention on the part of the most powerful capitalist class against the Russian revolution. Seven years of unexampled heroism and unbounded self-sacrifice of the best portion of the Russian proletariat. Years of gigantic socialist constructive work in the country which had been plunged into the abyss of economic ruin through the imperialist and civil war.

All capitalist expectations have been wrecked upon Soviet Russia. The proletarian dictatorship is embracing every widening section of the working people, the spirit of socialism is marching on the advance of the construction of the socialist economic basis. The conditions of living of the Russian proletariat are visibly improving. Slowly but steadily wages are increasing. The Soviet government is able to satisfy to an ever increasing extent the cultural requirements of the working class.

The Soviet Republic is increasing in strength both within and without. It is not only the government of the Russian proletariat: the international significance of the Russian revolution created a government which has its basis in the proletariat of the whole world. This is the reason for the irreconcilable hate of all capitalists and imperialists.

You have protected Soviet Russia, the stronghold of the international struggle of the proletariat, from the armed intervention of the imperialists of all countries. You have broken down the blockade of the capitalists. But your work is not yet ended. The international band of exploiters is arming for a new struggle.

Protect Soviet Russia from the intervention policy of the imperialist powers which is still being carried on. Prevent the encirclement of the Union of Socialist Republics by democratic pacifist diplomacy.

But you cannot better conduct the struggle against a new capitalist attack upon Soviet Russia than by preparing, organising and conducting your own revolutionary struggles and, in alliance with the broad masses, leading them to victory.

The chief object of the capitalist offensive at present is the German proletariat which, through the Experts' Report of the American bankers, is to be plunged into the deepest abyss of political and social slavery. Support the German workers in their hard fight against concentrated force of the most powerful financial capitalists in the world.

The imperialists are attacking Soviet Russia not only on her European frontiers, but also through Asia. The campaign of intervention of the French, English and American military cliques in China is intended to be a new basis of attack against Soviet Russia.

Defend the Chinese working masses in their fight against the imperialist blood-suckers masquerading as democratic-pacifists — a fight which is not only for the most elementary rights of these masses but also a struggle for the fraternisation of the suppressed peoples of the East with the revolutionary Russian proletariat.

On the left wing of world imperialism there still stands the II. International, which actively assists in the strangling of every attempt at self-help on the part of the proletariat. It is just in the present era of "democratic-pacifism", which after the overthrow of the MacDonald government is again reverting to