

V. b. b.

G. Zinoviev: On the Situation in the German Communist Party.

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 79

5th November 1925

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

## C O N T E N T S

Manifesto of the E. C. C. I. for the 7th November.  
Death of Comrade Frunse.

### Politics.

Karl Radek: The Guarantee Pact. I.

G. Iransky: The Struggle between the Monarchy and Republic in Persia.

Wilhelm Koenen: Communist Success at the Elections in Berlin and Baden.

### Hands off China

China on the Eve of Great Events.

### The Balkans.

Robert: The Armed Conflict between Bulgaria and Greece.

### Economics

J. Jacquemotte: The Poullét-Vandervelde Government in the Service of High Finance.

### The Labour Movement.

The Attitude of the Red International of Labour Unions to the Protest Strike in France.

The Struggle of the North Bohemian Textile Slaves.

### The White Terror.

Albin: Fresh Mass Arrests in Roumania.

Fresh Protest Declarations against the Persecution of Workers in Hungary.

### In the International.

G. Zinoviev: The Situation in the German Communist Party.

Resolution of the Conference of the Communist Party of Germany on the Situation of the Party.

The Meeting of the Enlarged Executive Postponed.

St.: The national Conference of the Communist Party of France.

## Manifesto of the E. C. C. I. for the 7th November.

To the Proletarian Men and Women, to the Toiling Masses of the Whole World!

The 7th November is for us this year a double anniversary day. We celebrate the eighth anniversary of the October Revolution of the workers and peasants of Russia and the twentieth anniversary of the Revolution of 1915.

The Russian proletariat has opened up a new epoch in the history of the international labour movement. In the year 1905 it attempted for the first time, by means of revolutionary struggles, to establish the foundation for its dictatorship: the Soviets; it attempted for the first time to unite with the peasantry in order to overthrow absolutism and to create that alliance of all workers which became in 1917 the basis of the victory of the proletarian dictatorship; it proved to the proletariat of the whole what an effective weapon is the general strike, and that the fight of the proletariat with weapons in hand is not a thing of the past. Already during and after the revolution Lenin, with his clear penetration, had drawn the theoretical and practical conclusions from the experiences and lessons of the historical events. An unbroken chain of development led from the revolution of 1905 to that of 1917, which realised those ideas the beginnings of which were to be seen in 1905.

Twelve years after the revolution of 1915 the Russian proletariat, under the leadership of Lenin, won its victory. In alliance with the peasantry it overthrew the power of the landowners and capitalists, nationalised the land, socialised the factories, workshops and banks and established the rule of the workers in the Soviets.

In October 1917 the Russian working class, as the advance-guard of the world proletariat, proceeded to the establishment of socialism. The international bourgeoisie replied with war and conspiracies, the leaders of the labour movement of the West, the petty-minded leaders and well-fed bureaucrats of the trade unions and socialist parties, replied with scorn and anger to this bold and powerful action. For years the Russian proletariat wrestled with famine, bore the severest privations and sacrifices in order, in unwearied creative work, to demonstrate to the international proletariat the necessity and the possibility of establishing socialism and to prove the fitness of the working class to be the leader of society.

**Proletarian men and women! Workers of the whole world!**  
In these years of the heroic struggle of the working class in

the Soviet Union you have followed with eager attention the struggles of your brothers and sisters. The victories of the heroic Red Army have inspired you with courage and confidence; you have felt the starvation in the Volga districts as if you were suffering it yourselves; the economic reconstruction of the Soviet Union has filled your hearts with new hope. Thousands of bourgeois and reformist newspapers have spread lies and deception regarding the Soviet Union and have heaped filth upon the tried, leading advance-guard of the Russian working class, on the Party of the Bolsheviks. Dozens of social-democratic "theoreticians" and "practical" politicians — Bauer and Kautsky, MacDonald and Vandervelde — "proved" the criminal utopianism of the Bolsheviks and predicted the collapse of the Soviet Union. But see! **In spite of all and everything, millions of exploited and enslaved workers outside the Soviet Union firmly believe in the victory of the Russian working class.**

The eighth anniversary of the October Revolution is, in truth, a festival for the workers of the whole world. It is devoted to the first period of the fight for socialism. On the eighth anniversary of the October Revolution the proletarians of the Soviet Union can proudly declare to the workers, the toilers of all countries: "Brothers and sisters! In eight years of our rule we have not only beaten back the counter-revolutionary offensive. We have achieved much more. We have already achieved tangible results in the way of the economic reconstruction of our country. We have with a firm hand guided our economy to the path of socialism. 90% of the big industry and of the transport system are socialised. Foreign Trade is in the hands of the State. The co-operatives embrace 30 millions of the population. We have a stable monetary system, a production which will shortly reach the level of the pre-war time. Millions of workers who have been drawn into the work in the Soviets and in the social organisations, the men together with the women, who only in the Soviet Union enjoy full equality and status in all spheres of social life, testify to the thorough-going character of the revolution. The youth, in fact the children, are eagerly flocking into the mass organisations of the Young Communist League and the Red Pioneers, in order by learning and working to promote the reconstruction and to secure its future. The national minorities, even the smallest groups of peoples, possess in the Soviet Union the right of free self-determination, and at the same time a free path for higher development while preserving their racial or national peculiarities. On the basis of a reviving and growing economy a social superstructure is rising which is inspired with the spirit of Communism. A new and higher culture is beginning to blossom, not as the privilege of small and isolated groups, but as the irrevocable right of the broad working masses. The dictatorship which we set up in Red October is the embodiment of the joyous will of millions. A brilliant ray is streaming from the life and tissue of the Soviet Union, which is awakening the exploited and enslaved peoples of the East and is inspiring them with the will to and the hope for freedom. The Soviet Union is the symbol and example of the emancipation of humanity.

Delegations which you have sent to us — working men and women from England, France, Belgium, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Sweden and Norway — have become convinced that "the Soviet Union is really the country of the dictatorship of the workers, the country which is undeviatingly following the road to socialism".

For this reason international capitalism, in the first place the English, is striving to create a "Holy alliance" in order to annihilate the Soviet Union. Against the Soviet Union there is being mobilised the deadly hostility of the international bourgeoisie. What is the reason for this?

The Soviet Union and its prosperity is kindling in the exploited and suppressed of the whole world the determination to struggle and confidence in victory. Its existence strengthens the energy of the fighting Chinese people which has risen against the foreign capitalists and the native militarists. Its proximity strengthens the position of the national governments in the countries of the Near East which are fighting for their national independence.

The Soviet Union is steadfastly conducting the struggle for peace. Its existence renders it more difficult to intoxicate the masses again with the poison of chauvinism.

English imperialism wishes to form an anti-Soviet League. It is systematically preparing for the fight against Soviet

Russia. An important link in its chain of preparations is the Guarantee Pact. The Guarantee Pact is especially aimed at preventing the co-operation of Germany and the Soviet Union, it is intended to forge a hostile ring round the latter and to create for the future war against it a united, firmly established front.

The Guarantee Treaty is the reply of international imperialism to the growing power of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, it is not only directed against the Soviet Union. Its point is at the same time turned against the international proletariat. The Guarantee Pact increases the power of reaction in Germany, strengthens British imperialism at home and abroad and is accompanied by an intensified terror in the countries of the white dictatorship, in Hungary, Italy, Bulgaria and Roumania, as well as in the States of "blessed democracy". The Guarantee Pact is intended to give Entente imperialism a free hand in Central Europe and enable it to attack with all its fury the rebellious peoples of North Africa and Asia.

The Guarantee Pact is presented to the masses as being the bringer of peace. In actual fact it is and will be: an instigator and harbinger of new wars, a new attack against the working class.

Brothers and sisters! Do not allow yourselves to be again deceived by lying talk of Peace and Democracy. Remember the bloody lessons of the war time! Remember the lessons of the Peace of Versailles! Remember the starvation wages and the unending working day! If Peace is dear to you, if you wish to defeat the attack of profit-greedy capital and the growing insolence of Fascism, then fight so that the Guarantee Treaty is annihilated by an **International Workers' Front.**

The anniversary of the October Revolution must unite all honest revolutionary proletarian men and women under the slogans:

**United front of the Proletarians, of the Workers.**

**Fight against the Guarantee Pact, that is, fight for Peace.**

**Defence of the Soviet Union.**

**Defence of the revolutionary peoples of the East, of all colonial and semi-colonial peoples.**

**Fight against the White Terror and Fascism.**

**Long live the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics!**

**Long live the International Proletarian Revolution!**

**The Executive Committee  
of the Communist International.**

## Death of Comrade Frunse.

Declaration of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the Death of Comrade Frunse.

With the passing away of Comrade Frunse the Executive Committee of the Communist International has lost one of its most prominent members. The name of Frunse was familiar to the advanced workers of the whole world as the name of an international proletarian revolutionary, who was ever prepared to yield up his life for the cause of the international working class. Hero and leader of the Red Army which arose in the struggles of the great Russian Revolution, he was a hero of the international proletarian struggle. The advance-guard of the international proletariat followed with bated breath every movement of the Red Army in the most critical moments of the Russian Revolution, and it saw comrade Frunse in the most dangerous positions and in the most critical moments. The workers of the whole world know and love the Communist, Michael Frunse. The working youth will set up as their example the heroic life of Frunse, who experienced all the sufferings of the Tsarist prisons and devoted all his forces to the cause of the emancipation of humanity from the capitalist yoke. The international proletariat will honour the memory of the true Bolshevik, of the true internationalist Michael Frunse.

**The Executive Committee of the  
Communist International.**

## POLITICS

### The Guarantee Pact.

By Karl Radek.

I.

#### From Versailles to Locarno.

The Guarantee Pact which has been concluded by Germany on the one side and by France, England and Belgium on the other side, constitutes a **stage in the liquidation of the Peace of Versailles regarded as an expression of the victory of France and England. The Guarantee Pact is a change to a new grouping of forces in which the United States and England are playing the leading role.** This significance of the Pact becomes especially clear when one calls to mind the chief stages in the development of the struggle for predominance on the Continent from Versailles to Locarno.

Germany emerged from the war a defeated power, and the task of the Peace Treaty of Versailles consisted in confirming the victory of the Allies. This victory had only been rendered possible by the participation of the United States in the war. But at the moment when Germany showed herself crushed the influence of the American giant upon the decisions of the Conference of Versailles proved to be exceedingly small. Its military force was no longer required and the material assistance which was rendered to the victorious countries was assured for the immediate future by the simple fact that the United States could not, immediately after the common struggle, raise the question of debts and adopt the attitude of a ruthless debtor to the allies. The fight at the Conference took place between England and France. Both England and France regarded prostrate Germany as their booty. But each State pursued its own special aims and therefore put forward its own special Peace Programme.

For England the dominating idea was to do away with Germany's sea power, to weaken her forces as an industrial competitor and to annihilate her as a colonial power. The leading idea with France was the disarmament of Germany and the creation of a strategical situation which, in the event of Germany's recovery, would not permit her to embark on a war of revenge. France strove therefore for the subjugation of the Rhine provinces, to push back the Western frontier of Germany to the Rhine and to fix the Eastern frontier of Germany in such a way as would compel Poland to live in constant enmity with her. The demand for the creation of a special Rhine State which would be in the hands of France, was in accordance with a definite strategical aim which had been clearly formulated in a series of memoranda by Marshal Foch. The Rhine constitutes a tremendous obstacle for German troops. The possession of the Rhine by France permits her to keep the Ruhr basin within the range of her guns, and in the event of a war with Germany would permit her to conduct this on German soil and, by occupying the Main line, to divide Germany by cutting off the South from the North.

But it was precisely for this reason that England opposed the plans of Marshal Foch with all her might. She concealed her resistance with the pacifist arguments which the support of President Wilson and war-weary public opinion had placed in her hand. She pointed to the fact that millions of German citizens would never become reconciled to this forcible occupation, and that this must inevitably lead to a future war. That these arguments did not reflect the real intentions of England is to be seen from the fact that she never once asked what would be the attitude of the Germans in Alsace-Lorraine towards annexation by France, and what results of a similar nature the annexation of the Saar District, which had been facilitated by the decisions of Versailles, would have. The actual reason for the resistance of England consisted in the fact that for the Rhine to be in the hands of France meant the complete domination of Germany by France alone. But the domination of Central Europe by France would mean the **hegemony of France over all Europe** and her domination over enormous economic resources which could be employed against England.

As a result of the pressure of England and America, Clemenceau refrained from supporting the demands of Marshal Foch and agreed to a compromise. He secured himself in the first place by a **Guarantee Treaty with England and America,**

which pledged these two powers to defend France by armed force in the event of her being attacked by Germany, and secondly by a whole number of points in the Treaty of Versailles which, if necessary, would enable France, to take up again the plans of Marshal Foch.

The disarming of Germany, the limitation of her army to 100,000 men, without heavy artillery, the occupation of the Ruhr area for 15 years, the realisation of the independence of Poland within those frontiers demanded by France — all this rendered Germany completely helpless and left open the possibility of again taking up the plan of Marshal Foch should Germany not fulfil her reparation obligations. These reparation obligations were so excessive, that Germany was absolutely incapable of carrying them out. Thus the compromise of Versailles did not solve the question of hegemony on the Continent, while it gave France the possibility of carrying on a struggle for hegemony in the future. It is this struggle that constitutes the history of Europe from 1914 to 1924.

The defeat of France in this struggle begins from the moment when the United States of America refuse to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and along with it also the Guarantee Pact with France. England considers herself not strong enough or justified in taking over this guarantee alone. English policy deliberately turns against France. This was especially the case after the commencement of the great economic crisis of the year 1921 — a crisis which demonstrated to England that her chief task must be to restore European economy. The existence of a million unemployed brought home to the English bourgeoisie that the conditions for realising a victory in capitalist society are quite different from those in the epoch of feudalism. The bourgeoisie perceived that one cannot destroy an industrial competitor without at the same time destroying a great market for one's own products.

Lloyd George endeavoured to induce France to abandon the ridiculous reparation demands which had been imposed upon Germany by France and England in the May ultimatum of 1921. As recompense therefor, he promised a ten years' guarantee of the French frontiers. Imperialist France rejected the proposal of Lloyd George, for it is obvious that a real danger would arise immediately after the expiration of ten years, when Germany recovers from the most disastrous consequences of her defeat, when a new generation has grown up which has not experienced the debacle. In addition to this, the English guarantees were of a somewhat platonic nature; England refused to enter into concrete military agreements which would have stipulated the means for the defence of the frontiers.

The years 1922 and 1923 mark the highest point of the struggle between England and France. The failure of the Conference of Genoa, which represented an attempt to carry out the comprehensive plan of Lloyd George for the restoration of capitalism by a bargain with Germany and by the subordination of the Soviet Union to European capitalism, the failure of the Paris negotiations of Bonar Law regarding the reparations, the collapse of the German Mark which had commenced in the autumn 1923 — all this caused French imperialism to make convulsive attempts to save its position. The occupation of the Ruhr, which went hand in hand with the support and even with the direct creation of a separatist movement in Pfalz, was intended to compel the German capitalists seriously to consider the payment of tribute or to **rendre possible the realisation of the military programme of Foch: to take possession of the Rhine provinces by the creation of an independent Rhine State under French protection.**

Germany, in which a portion of the bourgeoisie had consciously facilitated the French Ruhr adventure in the hope that this adventure would prove a failure, cannot stand the economic consequences of this Ruhr adventure and capitulates to France. But the victory does not yet give France the possibility of carrying out her programme, **for France proves herself far too weak to meet the expenses of this struggle.**

In addition to this American capitalism again appears in the European arena, but this time with a definite economic programme. The collapse of the German monetary system and the disorganisation create the conditions under which American capitalism, with the aid of the English banks and of English diplomacy, can obtain possession at a very low price of the economic key positions of Germany.

At the same time France experiences tremendous financial difficulties which compel her to apply for help to the American money market. She cannot reckon upon further payments from

Germany. She has to rescue the Franc and to conclude an agreement regarding her debts with England and America, who hold many milliards of paper francs in their hands which they throw upon the money market and can thereby bring about the complete destruction of the French monetary system. France agrees to the proposals of the Experts, which are in the nature of an internationalising of the German reparation obligations and an international seizure of the pledges which ensure the fulfillment of these obligations.

France yields up the means for carrying out the programme of Marshal Foch; she can no longer take advantage of Germany's reparation difficulties for this purpose. As a means, of placing the programme of Foch upon the agenda there only remain the demands for the disarming of Germany. But France can no longer reckon upon a loyal attitude on the part of England towards these provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, for English imperialism shows more and more every day that it is not only not interested in the further disarmament of Germany, but that it is by no means opposed, in the course of time, to raising the question of permitting an increase of German armaments.

The question of the security of France, which hitherto had only been a cloak for the efforts of French imperialism to dismember Germany, now proves to be a very real question to the French petty bourgeoisie which came to power after the overthrow of the Poincaré government, the government of the National Bloc. The French petty bourgeois is haunted by the terrifying spectre of — the German children. France, with her stationary population, looks with growing anxiety to the increasing birth rate of Germany, and asks herself what position she will be in twenty or thirty years time if she does not succeed in escaping from her political isolation.

The only prospect for the future is that relations between England and America will become more strained and will thereby compel the United States to seek an ally in Europe. But in spite of the increasing rivalry between England and America in the Far East and in South America, the new centre of antagonism is being slowly formed, and therefore there is growing up in France the fear of isolation and a feeling of uncertainty regarding the future.

In 1924 France endeavoured to take advantage of the brief existence of a pacifistically inclined Labour Government, which, in spite of all its desires, was not capable of really carrying out the foreign political policy of English imperialism, to obtain a guarantee for its security by means of the Geneva Protocol, by improving the clauses of the covenant of the League of Nations, which would have placed the English fleet and all the means of warfare of England at the disposal of France against Germany. The Conservative government which followed the Labour Government in England refuses to ratify the Geneva Protocol and begins fresh negotiations regarding a Guarantee Pact with France and Germany. These negotiations ended with the Conference of Locarno.

What are the results of this Conference?

Its first result is the entry of Germany into the League of Nations. What is the meaning of this decision? The League of Nations was created by the Treaty of Versailles, but in spite of this, Germany, of whom it is now demanded that she shall enter the League of Nations, was not permitted to enter it in the year 1919. The League of Nations was created as an organ of the victors and of those States coming within their sphere of influence. The present inclusion of Germany in the League of Nations is intended as a symbolical expression of the fact that Germany is no longer regarded as an enemy. As far as England is concerned, she no longer regards Germany as an enemy but sees in her a future instrument of her policy. France demands the entry of Germany into the League of Nations in order to fetter the coming expansion of Germany by means of a network of obligations which her membership of the League of Nations will involve.

The second decision of the Conference of Locarno consists in a certain covering of the obligations which Germany takes upon herself immediately before her entry into the League of Nations towards States which do not belong to the League of Nations and which can lead to a collision with it. The covering, by elastic diplomatic formulas, of the obligations undertaken by Germany is simply intended to facilitate Germany's entry into the League of Nations.

The most important political fact is not the political form, but the fact that Germany accepts these obligations.

The third decision of the Conference of Locarno consists in the fact that England undertakes to guarantee the inviolability of the Franco-German-Belgium frontier. But she appears as a different kind of guarantor to that which France had formerly intended. She comes forward as a guarantor not only as regards France and Belgium, but also as regards Germany. England comes forward as the world judge by pledging herself to oppose the attempts to carry out the old plans of French imperialism, as well as the efforts of the German bourgeoisie in regard to Alsace-Lorraine.

The fourth decision compels Germany to conclude a number of arbitration treaties with her neighbours in the East — Poland and Czechoslovakia. This means that England, by refusing to guarantee the frontiers of Poland and of Czechoslovakia, indicates to Germany the possibility of their being altered.

The fifth decision provides that France, in the event of an attempt on the part of Germany to alter the Polish-German frontiers, cannot act independently from the League of Nations in order to protect her allies. The Polish-French and Franco-Czechish alliance, placed under the control of the League of Nations, loses a portion of its strength. In this manner France's domination on the Continent is considerably weakened.

But what is the meaning of Locarno as regards its general and final results? Does it mean a liquidation of the Treaty of Versailles?

The territorial solutions of the Treaty of Versailles regarding the Western frontiers are confirmed, but at the same time they are altered; they are in a certain sense internationalised and made dependent upon special guarantees on the part of England. The solutions of the Treaty of Versailles which permit France to hope for the carrying out of the programme of French imperialism, of the programme of Marshal Foch, lose all their validity. France does not abandon the solutions regarding the occupation of the Rhine province and of the Saar district. France will endeavour to retain these rights granted by the Versailles Treaty in order with their help to fight against the complete subordination of Germany by England. England has not insisted upon their abolition, as she prefers to possess a means for driving a bargain with Germany in the future and a means of embittering relations between France and Germany. But the object for the sake of which France accepted these solutions in the Treaty of Versailles, i. e. to use them as a spring-board for a further advance into Germany — this object is unattainable.

The Eastern solutions of the Conference of Locarno provide in the shape of Poland a new object of changes in the foreign political situation. The subordination of Germany under the League of Nations constitutes a step on the road to the creation of an alliance of capitalist powers which is directed against the Soviet Union and against the East.

This brief survey of the history of political conditions after the war and of the decisions of Locarno suffice to show that these solutions signalise important political regroupings, and that these decisions, while they do not abolish the Treaty of Versailles, bring about new relations of forces — relations of forces in which Germany will play a different role to that which she has played in the last few years, even if it is not the role of an equal partner which the German bourgeois politicians are striving for.

## The Struggle between the Monarchy and Republic in Persia.

By G. Iransky.

The following article was written shortly before the overthrow of the Persian dynasty by the parliament which was reported on 31st of October. Ed.

The Monarchist demonstrations in Teheran, the capital of Persia, were followed shortly after by counter-demonstrations of a strong anti-monarchist movement. Whilst at the former the crowd mishandled members of parliament and abused the right of asylum of the Soviet Embassy, and at the same time demanded the return of the Shah who is at present residing abroad, the demonstrators in such big towns as Tabris and Isfahan are now protesting against the return of the Shah and are proclaiming a general strike to give force to their protest.

At the monarchist demonstrations the instigators of the movement did not venture to come forward openly, and had recourse to methods of provocation; at the anti-monarchist demonstrations the movement was led by the committees of the **nationalists**, who sent telegrams to the government and published appeals in the press. The monarchist movement did not extend beyond the main streets of Teheran and rapidly exhausted itself in a few riots; the great anti-monarchist movement, however, which has set in in the great trading cities of Northern and Southern Persia, seems likely to spread over the whole country.

There can be little doubt that the new outbreak of the anti-monarchist movement is attributable, to some extent, to the monarchist outbreak which immediately preceded it. These two outbreaks are symptomatic of those processes which commenced in the second half of the last century under the influence of the penetration into Persia of European capital, and which made unsuccessful attempts to find a solution in the Persian revolution of 1905—1909. These processes have, since the upheaval of 26th February 1921, assumed the form of a **struggle of the semi-feudal monarchy with the bourgeois dictatorship of Resa Khan.**

From the moment of the **October Revolution in the Soviet Union**, and, of course, especially from the moment of the **conclusion of the Treaty between the Soviet Union and Persia** of 26th February 1921, there arose those favourable conditions for the national emancipation movement in Persia which had formerly been lacking when Tsarist Russia had been the Northern neighbour of Persia. The national emancipation movement of Persia has now obtained a support.

But to the same extent as the **military dictatorship grew stronger and Persia became modernised**, the counter-actions of the Shah's court against all progressive measures of Resa Khan also became stronger and more impudent. This led in October 1923 to a violent collision between Resa Khan and the Shah, as a result of which the Shah was compelled to leave Persia and Resa Khan, in addition to the armed forces, took over the control of all State affairs as Prime Minister. In the place of the Shah there remained in Persia the heir to the throne, who was bound by the pledge to refrain from any interference in the affairs of the State.

The bourgeoisie which had become stronger, saw in this the guarantee of its triumph over the old order, and in the **Spring of 1924** raised the question of confirming its achievements by proclaiming the **Republic**. As is known, the Republican movement ended in a failure. The main reason for this failure was the ambiguous attitude of **England** who warned Resa Khan of the serious results for Persia this step would involve. English diplomacy recommended "lawful" means. It threatened with foreign intervention and the secession of Southern Persia, which prepared itself to become the place of refuge of the "lawful" power.

The question of the Republic was postponed, but its mere preparation had so terrified the Court, the upper clergy, the leading feudal landowners and also England, that in the **Autumn of 1924** they made an attempt to overthrow the military dictatorship. The only result of this **insurrection** was that Parliament placed Resa Khan in supreme command of all the armed forces of the country, and in this manner the power of the Shah was deprived of the fundamental privilege which was granted him in accordance with the Persian Constitution.

The **government of Resa Khan** which had sufficiently consolidated its position, undertook the carrying out of those most important reforms without which there can be no development of the productive forces in the backward countries of the East. Resa Khan submitted to parliament a number of bills regarding the **reform of the system of taxation and the collection of taxes from the peasants.**

Resa Khan, however, was intimidated by English diplomacy and, as a result, attempted in the **Summer of 1925** to carry out the above-mentioned reforms by means of a temporary **compromise with the Court and the clergy**. An agreement was concluded with the leader of the groups opposed to him — with **Moderres**, a member of parliament. The main concessions of Resa Khan were: permission for the Shah to return to Persia, and acceptance into the Cabinet of three ministers to be nominated by Moderres, in return for this Moderres abandoned his struggle against Resa Khan and promised the support of his group for all bills introduced into parliament by Resa Khan.

By this agreement the question of the Republic was more or less buried. But this was only the case at the first glance. As a matter of fact, in entering into the agreement both sides reckoned upon obtaining certain advantages for themselves and strengthening their positions in the struggle. As regards Resa Khan, his aim in entering into this agreement was to enlarge the social basis of the regime set up by him and to facilitate the carrying out of the social reforms which he had in view. But at the very moment the agreement was concluded it was clear that something false was concealed in it and that the struggle between the two parties would be continued.

As a matter of fact only a few months had passed when Moderres, speculating upon the famine which had arisen as a result of a **bad harvest**, commenced a **campaign against Resa Khan** and in **favour of the restoration of full powers to the Shah**. This immediately aroused those circles who had supported Resa Khan and who did not wish any return to the old order. These circles rightly saw in the return of the Shah the beginning of the restoration and the loss of all the achievements of the years 1921—1925. It is precisely for this reason that in the great trading and industrial centres of Persia, the anti-monarchist movement has broken out afresh and **strikes have been proclaimed under the slogan of prohibiting the return of the Shah to Persia.**

The masses are warning their leaders. It is now quite obvious that Resa Khan made a mistake in entering into an agreement with Moderres and the Court, and it is probable that he will not fail to retrieve his error. For in spite of all its difficulties, another way must be sought for the solution of the tasks confronting the national government of Persia than that of compromise with reaction.

## Communist Success at the Elections in Berlin and Baden.

By Wilhelm Koenen (Berlin)

The victory of the communists at the elections in **Berlin** and their great success in **Baden** were a complete surprise not only to the bourgeoisie but also to the SP. of Germany. A good election result in a small country town in **Brandenburg, Landsberg a. Warthe**, is an effective completion of the election successes of October 25th. The great increase of communist votes in three such different districts of Germany thus proves to be a phenomenon of **general significance**. Even the proportion of the increase is fairly equal in all three places. Both in Berlin and in Baden the CP. of Germany has, in comparison to the last Reichsrat election, maintained its number of votes better than any other party, and in both cases the **increase in the number of mandates exceeds that of any other list.**

In **Berlin** we have increased our number of mandates from 20 to 43, i. e. more than doubled it and in **Baden** we have risen from 3 to 5. In Berlin the proportion of communists in the total number of votes polled is now about 20% as compared with 9.5% at the last City Council elections in 1921. Moreover, in Berlin, we have not only exceeded our proportion of votes of Dec. 7th, but have actually reached that of May 4th 1924. At that time when 76.6% of the registered voters polled, the CP. of Germany had 396,000 votes, whereas this time it had 347,000 votes with about 65% polling. In Baden, where, with the exception of the People's party, all parties suffered a decrease in votes (the Social Democrats and the Centre by one fifth, the German National, the National and the Land League Parties by one third), our Party had an increase of from 35,000 to 47,000 as compared with the last Landtag elections, i. e. of more than a third, an increase such as not even the Stinnes party, the only bourgeois party which gained, experienced.

The parties which suffered the chief loss were, in Baden, the German Nationalists and the Nationalists, and in Berlin, the Nationalists and the German People's Party. In Berlin, the loss of these Right groups and the **gain of the communists** was so strong that it broke the majority of the **bourgeois Bloc**. Up to the present, 110 Communists, Social Democrats and Independents were in opposition to a total of 115 representatives of other, bourgeois parties. Now, owing to the communist victory, the picture has so changed that, in spite of the **mandates lost** by the SP. of Germany, 120 Communists, Social Democrats and Independents are opposed by only 105 re-

representatives of the other, bourgeois parties. As compared with the last City Council election, the Social Democrats lost one sixth of their votes, and their mandates are reduced from 90 to 75. Compared with the Reichstag election of December 1924 also, they maintained their position less well than the Communists. The Democrats, the close allies of the SP. of Germany, who, at previous elections were badly chopped up, made a slight recovery both in Baden and in Berlin. Thus the shift towards the Left is to be attributed, in the bourgeoisie, to the Democrats, and in the proletariat exclusively to the CP. of Germany.

The election results prove convincingly that the pessimism which held sway in our Party, not only among the narrow circle of those who were up to now the leaders but also among some functionaries, was by no means justified. The election results also prove the error of the supposition that the Party dissensions with regard to the Open Letter might injure us in the election work and in the eyes of the proletariat. Some opponents of the Open Letter had even, in connection with this argument, already declared that, in view of the nature of the discussion about the Open Letter, they declined any responsibility for the result of the election. It has become evident that, on the one hand, the unflinching openness in the discussion of the mistakes we have made hitherto and our sharp swing to a new course, has been very well understood by the proletarian masses as far as it affected them and, on the other hand, the weight of facts has forced its way through in spite of all pessimism.

The reactionary economic policy, the shameless swindle in connection with the revolution, the mad usurious increase in rents, the monstrous taxation raid running into millions and the brutal policy of usurious customs duty have shown their first rousing effect on the masses of the people. All the communist-baiting of class justice and all the Bolshevik-baiting of the leaders of the SP. of Germany and their Press could not mitigate the irritating effects of the cruel policy of pauperization. Great economic fights about wages and hours of work had shown clearly enough, even before the elections, that the fighting spirit of the German proletariat is once more awake and that it is pulling itself together to resist the offensive of capital.

These economic fights had had a rousing effect, especially in Berlin. The work of our comrades in the trade unions, under the slogan of trade union unity, which set in at the same time with renewed energy, and the effect of the propaganda resulting from the workers' delegation to Soviet Russia and finally the turn which was achieved in good time and with a different note in the agitation, under the slogan "Nearer to the masses!", have given the CP. of Germany the possibility of using exhaustively for their propaganda work the objectively more favourable situation in the recent election campaign. In this way the result of the election has also relaxed the tension which existed in the Party in some districts, and has driven back the sceptics, so that we can record as an election result within the Party a still more unanimous march in closed ranks along the new lines and a joyous revival of the collective spirit of work.

By this new formation of a majority in Berlin, we are now in the favourable position of being able to place the SP. of Germany constantly before critical decisions concerning the demands of the day of the proletariat. The threatened strike of the municipal workers, whose trade union demands we shall have to put to the vote, will be the first test.

Such disputes before the eyes of the proletarian masses of the capital will, as can be clearly read between the lines in the "Vorwärts", be all the more painful and tormenting to the SP. of Germany, because it is not only anxious to extend the coalition in the Prussian Government towards the Right, but is, just at the present moment, on the point of accepting, on the invitation of the Stinnes Party, the seats in the Government, vacated by the German National Ministers who came to grief over Locarno. It is an almost break-neck situation for the leaders of the SP. of Germany to endeavour to form a great coalition in Prussia and in the Republic and to form with the communists a majority in the capital, from which even the social democratic workers will now at last demand a real proletarian policy. It will depend on the skilful work of our comrades whether we make the best of all the advantages of this present situation.

## HANDS OFF CHINA

### China on the Eve of Great Events.

Leading article of the "Pravda" of 23rd October 1925.

China once again stands on the eve of great events which can have very serious consequences.

The first skirmishes have already taken place, the first clash of military collisions have been heard. A great civil war is commencing which can thoroughly change the roles in China.

Roughly speaking, we have in China three main forces, upon the mutual effects of which will depend this or that situation in China. These forces are: English and American influence, the Japanese influence and the forces of national emancipation. The first two forces have, as a result of the defeat last year of the Chili group and of the victory of Chang-Tso-Lin, arrived at a sort of balance with the result that the national emancipation struggle was able to enter the open arena of the whole of China and to gain in strength and influence to an extent hitherto unknown.

In the period following, the influence of Japan grew and developed more and more by means of Chang-Tso-Lin.

Along with this there also grew and developed the Chinese national emancipation movement, especially in Shanghai, Tientsin, Hankow and other great industrial centres. This revolutionary movement, which was mainly directed against the English and then against Japanese influence in China, naturally called forth the greatest uneasiness on the part of English capital, and the latter soon began to grow fearful of losing hold of its main position in China and realised the necessity of adopting energetic measures.

It is only natural that English capital did not venture, immediately after the events experienced in Shanghai, to make use of its own forces; it preferred, therefore, to push forward against revolutionary Canton its creature and hireling, General Tchong-Tsu-Min. At the same time English capital set Chang-Tso-Lin to work and its old friends, the Chili group with Wu-Pei-Fu at the head, who had succeeded under the peaceful conditions of Central China in recovering from the defeats he had sustained and in rallying his forces somewhat.

At this time Chang-Tso-Lin — who thanks to his growing military power and with the tacit approval of Japan and of other imperialist States had occupied Shanghai, where the growing revolutionary movement threatened to abolish all foreign privileges and "gains" —, so far as his forces and capacities allowed him, already played the role imposed upon him of Chinese gendarme: he dissolved the trade unions, endeavoured to crush strikes by armed force and such like things. Having done his work, Chang-Tso-Lin could go. His role as a gendarme for England was at an end, as his influence, and through him also the influence of Japan, was becoming too strong.

There begins the movement of Sun-Tchuan-Fan against the Mukden troops, and Jan-Jui-Tin hastily abandons along with his troops, at first Shanghai and then Nanking, the latter being a strategic point of the greatest importance which offers the possibility of dominating the whole Yang-tse-kiang valley.

The result is that Chang-Tso-Lin's present position is as unfavourable as his position last year was favourable. With the advance of his troops to the South, his generals, who had occupied the Southern provinces, naturally began to desert him, as the whole economy of the occupied areas and all their political traditions were entirely different from those of Manchuria, which was already closely connected with the power of Chang-Tso-Lin and the economic influence of Japan.

The refusal of three local divisions to advance against Sun-Tchuan-Fan, and their occupation of Nanking, create an insecure situation on Chang-Tso-Lin's Southern front, and compel him to remove the centre of the struggle to the North. The result is that the troops of Chang-Tso-Lin are hastily withdrawing towards Pukou (in the North of Nanking) and, apparently, will retreat still further.

It is possible that the peoples armies will very soon take part in the fight against Chang-Tso-Lin, but of course from quite other reasons than those of Wu-Pei-Fu and his generals. The role of Chang-Tso-Lin as Chinese gendarme has become

quite obvious during the recent revolutionary events in Shanghai, Tientsin and other towns. Any further growth of the power of Chang-Tso-Lin immediately threatens not only the development of the national emancipation movement in China, but also every possibility of this movement. The existence of the People's armies would very soon be threatened with an enormous danger, for the next task of Chang-Tso-Lin was the liquidation of these armies and the seizure of all the territory occupied them. All this is compelling the latter to be on the alert and to help to beat him at all costs.

Such a situation renders the position of Chang-Tso-Lin in the North still worse, and it is therefore not surprising that he is insisting on his love of peace and his lack of desire to fight. As a matter of fact he would like to fight, but he would prefer to defeat his opponents one after the other and not to have them all against him at the same time.

It is very difficult to predict the further development of events in China, especially when one remembers that the Central Government in Peking has set up a very strict telegraphic censorship. One can however say one thing, and that is that the situation is very grave and that China is faced with fresh disturbances and a fresh civil war.

But this fresh civil war has its new peculiarities. This civil war will be participated in by real forces with national emancipation slogans, which slogans have already obtained the general acceptance and support of the best portion of the people of China.

The people's armies, which have behind them the support of the entire population of China, possess that moral basis which is so necessary for victory. The fact alone that Chang-Tso-Lin has been driven back again behind the great Chinese wall, will be of enormous importance for the further development of the revolution in China. It is true that the people's armies will, in the course of time, of course have to fight against the Chili group, but in this case it is possible for some sort of agreement to be arrived at, which is quite impossible in the case of Chang-Tso-Lin.

Should, however, the people's armies suffer a defeat in this struggle, then China will experience an epoch of the sharpest reaction, of which we have already had a foretaste in the attitude of general Chang-Tso-Lin in Shanghai, in the shooting of workers in Swatau by Tcheng-Tsu-Min etc.

The international working class must therefore carefully follow the events in China, and by their sympathy provide moral authority for the people's armies who are fighting for the national emancipation of China. For if at the present moment the fight has commenced between two anti-national groups, i. e. the Chili group and the Mukden group, this fight can in the very shortest time develop into an encounter between the forces of national emancipation and those of Chinese reaction, and then the fate of the one or the other will be decided.

## THE BALKANS

### The Armed Conflict between Bulgaria and Greece.

By Robert.

In the last few days we have witnessed the armed conflict between Bulgaria and Greece which has "unexpectedly" and "suddenly" turned into a genuine war. The advance is taking place on a front 30 km long and 10 deep. Numerous villages, as well as the town of Petritsch, the centre of the district, have already been taken.

The best hated government in the world, the bloody Zankoff Government, is trying in vain to deny any responsibility for this armed conflict. No one on the other hand, will believe the statement of General Pangalos, the dictator, who declares in the traditional way that he has been "attacked" and is only acting in "self-defence".

The true causes are deeply rooted in the internal crises in both countries and in the plans for conquest of the imperialist great Powers, especially England.

Greece is passing through incessant severe economic and political crises — especially since its defeat in Asia Minor in 1922 — which find their expression in the rapid succession of changes of government. In the last year and a half alone,

six Governments have been overthrown, their bankruptcy being due to the fact that they could not efficiently deal with the severe crisis in the country. The Government of the dictator, General Pangalos, who only took the helm in July of this year as the result of a military putsch, is already faced by a bankruptcy of this kind. In order to distract their attention, their indignation and their opposition from his own regime, he is setting them against the "external enemy". In doing so, Pangalos has made a good choice — the completely disarmed Bulgaria with its hated and heavily compromised Zankoff Government which up to now has been at war with its own people. Not the last of the causes of the present conflict however are the efforts of the Greek monarchists to restore the fallen monarchy. An evidence of this is the recent appointment of Roufos, one of the most intimate friends of the dethroned King Constantine, as Minister for Religion and Education in the Pangalos Cabinet.

The outbreak of the Greco-Bulgarian conflict a week after the conclusion of the "glorious act of peace" of the Conference of Locarno, at the same time lifts the veil which concealed the real intentions of the imperialist Great Powers, especially England.

In this respect, the Greco-Bulgarian conflict is clear evidence of the feverish preparations for creating a Bloc to make war against Soviet Russia under the aegis of England.

The Greco-Bulgarian conflict further throws light on the permanent danger of a new Balkan war. The contrasts which have been intensified by the situation created after the world war, are so unbearable, that the slightest pretext is quite sufficient to cause the outbreak of a war. Since 1912, a permanent condition of war has existed among all the Balkan States in turn. Last year it almost came to a Turco-Greek war. Shortly after that, war threatened to break out between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Quite lately, the relations between Greece and Yugoslavia in the question of the port of Saloniki, have been extremely acute. Now the Greco-Bulgarian dissensions have broken out in the form of an armed conflict.

The fundamental cause of all these conflicts and the key to all these Balkan problems is the question of the control of the coast of the Aegean Sea. Another important cause of this conflict is the policy of denationalisation in Yugoslavia and Greece (the Macedonian question) and finally the problem of "the exchange of national minorities" (the refugee question).

The present conflict between Greece and Bulgaria in consequence of the occupation of the Struma valley (Petritsch) by Greek troops, can also be regarded as the outcome of the anxiety of the Greeks about Saloniki. For, if the Yugoslavs were to attack from Saloniki, the Struma valley would certainly be the battlefield. By the occupation of Petritsch however, Greece holds the approach to the Struma valley in its own hands.

Bulgaria also is striving with all its might to reach the Aegean Sea (Dedeagatsch and Cavalla). The reciprocal national persecutions and the present Greco-Bulgarian conflict also have their roots in the fight for the control of the Aegean coast. The Macedonian question too — Macedonia represents a corridor to the Aegean Sea — is linked up with the question of the Aegean Sea. This fight for the Aegean coast further prevents the establishment of normal relations between Bulgaria and Turkey, as the latter absolutely refuses to hand over West Thrace to Bulgaria.

Roumania also has no less interest in this question. This interest finds expression in the efforts to establish a railway connection with the Aegean Sea (Turnu-Severin-Saloniki), in order, in this way, to be independent of the straits of the Sea of Marmora. A treaty has actually been concluded between Greece and Roumania, according to which part of the port of Saloniki is put at Roumania's disposal, doubtless in return for her promise of military support for Greece.

Thus, all the Balkan States are striving for an outlet to the Aegean Sea which is at present in the hands of Greece, so that Greece is exposed to pressure from all the Balkan States, most of all from Yugoslavia. This explains the suggestion of Rentis, the Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs, that a binding arbitration treaty be concluded between the Balkan States, and later on a guarantee pact for the Balkans — on the basis, it is true, of the existing peace treaties.

The Macedonian question. A further source of the constant conflicts and of the danger of a new war in the Balkans is the policy of denationalisation of Yugoslavia and Greece towards Macedonia, as well as Bulgaria's desire for conquest. After the

world war, Macedonia was divided up afresh, in that Jugoslavia helped itself to half the country, whilst four fifths of Macedonia were given to Greece and a tenth (the Petritsch district) to Bulgaria. The Jugoslavian and Greek Governments began with a strict policy of denationalisation as regards the Macedonian population, combined with unprecedented cruelties and terror. This policy reached its zenith in the insane cruelty of the treaty with regard to the "exchange of national minorities" which was concluded under the worthy patronage of the "humane" Council of the League of Nations. Chiefly as the result of this treaty, the refugee problem has become one of the most acute and principal problems, especially for Greece and Bulgaria. The enormous masses of refugees in Bulgaria and Greece are in indescribable distress and misery and represent a permanent reservoir for the nationalist and belligerent desires of the Greek and Bulgarian bourgeoisie.

The present Greco-Bulgarian conflict was preceded by an intense campaign of the bourgeois Press of Bulgaria against the latest methods of denationalisation of the Greek Government in Greek Macedonia; thus for instance, the Greek Government issued a new obligatory school-book for the Macedonian children in Greece, which is printed in Latin letters and intended as a means of the most radical denationalisation.

The Bulgarian bourgeoisie on the other hand is also practising political jobbery with the Macedonian cause. In this respect, Zankoff is the most shameless jobber. It is a known fact that Bulgaria is trying to approach Jugoslavia, in order, with its help, to obtain access to the Aegæan Sea. Such an approach between Bulgaria and Jugoslavia however is only possible if Bulgaria gives up its claim to Macedonia, i. e. if the Bulgarian bourgeoisie buries its own "national ideals". Since the Zankoff Government, last year, destroyed the "Inner Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation" and, through its leaders, with Protogeroff at their head, turned it into executioners and torturers of the struggling Bulgarian workers, peasants and intelligentsia of the people, the Bulgarian Nationalists, in case they capitulate, will no longer meet with any serious obstacles. Bulgaria hopes, through this bargaining at the expense of Macedonia, to gain access to the Aegæan Sea.

The armed conflict between Bulgaria and Greece shows that war may at any moment break out "unexpectedly" and that, under the cover of the "Peace Conference" of Locarno, armaments for a Bloc and war against the Soviet Union under the aegis of England are going ahead at full speed, that the new world war is approaching with giant strides. A new Balkan war threatens to follow the present colonial wars in Morocco, Syria and China, and once more to set light to a world conflagration, as was the case in 1914.

## ECONOMICS

### The Poulet-Vandervelde Government in the Service of High Finance.

By J. Jacquemotte (Brussels).

The Parliamentary elections of April 5th showed that the great mass of electors among the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie decidedly condemned the policy of the Theunis' Catholic Liberal Coalition Government. The victory of the "Democratic" party, i. e. of the social democrats and Christian democrats, had led to the formation of a Catholic-Socialist Coalition Cabinet, which disposed of a parliamentary majority consisting of 78 social democrats and about 30 Christian democrats, thus of about 110 of the 187 deputies of the Belgian Chamber.

The social democrats have, in the meantime, though in vain, tried to split the Catholic Bloc by seeking an alliance with the Christian socialists (Christian democrats). The formation of the "Democratic Bloc" is in reality only an illusion, for the "Christian democrats" of the Catholic party are strictly watched by the Conservatives with whom they form a single political party under the leadership and compulsion of the Apostolic and Roman Catholic Church.

Under the mask of "democracy", the Poulet-Vandervelde Government is carrying on the policy of the Theunis' Government. It is anxious to carry through the "reconstruction of the country", its first aim being to put financial matters on a "sound basis".

The "plan of reconstruction", with regard to which there is complete unanimity in the bosom of the Government, and which was drawn up under the influence of Anglo-Saxon finance, shows in the clearest way, that the "democratic" Government is only a cover under which the bankers wish to hide their unlimited predominance in the whole economic activities of the country and in the whole policy of the Government.

In order completely to understand this policy, it is necessary to bear in mind some historical and comparative data as to the financial situation of the Belgian State. In 1914, the national debt had amounted to 5040 million francs, i. e. more than 5 milliards. In the beginning of 1925, it already exceeded 43 milliards! The peace Government which was formed immediately after the armistice, had hastened to call in the paper marks which were in circulation in the country at the price of 1.25 francs, the rate which was enforced by the German Government. At that time the mark was estimated in the international market at about 0.60 francs, for which reason speculators speedily imported large sums of marks, especially from Holland. The total sum resulting from these dealings of the Government represented 5800 million Belgian francs. The National Bank put into circulation paper money to this value and deposited the marks received in this way in their safes. In a very short time they had fallen to zero!

Now, in 1925, the financial position has grown still worse. The financial magnates in New-York presented the account for the French debt to America. The "democratic" government MM. Poulet and Vandervelde sent to New York their predecessor, M. Theunis, the reactionary Minister, who was defeated on April 5th, accompanied by M. Franqui of the Société Générale Belgique and M. Cattier of the Banque de Bruxelles, the two most powerful banking establishments in the country. On its return, the delegation was received by Vandervelde, the Minister for Foreign Affairs with congratulations, and it reported on the following plan for paying off the debts:

	Dollars
First year (1926) . . . . .	3,840,000
Second year . . . . .	4,100,000
Third year . . . . .	9,050,000
Fourth year . . . . .	5,450,000
Fifth year . . . . .	6,200,000
Sixth year . . . . .	7,300,000
Seventh year . . . . .	7,950,000
Eighth year . . . . .	8,450,000
Ninth year . . . . .	9,050,000
Tenth year . . . . .	9,550,000
Eleventh year . . . . .	12,762,500

During the 52 subsequent years, the annual payment will amount to 12,672,000 Dollars!

The recognition of the war debt to America means of course an enormous increase in the national debt which in this way reaches more than 54 milliard Belgian francs, i. e. more than ten times the national debt before the war.

But international finance could not be contented with an obligation to pay back, it needed guarantees beyond this. The first guarantee is the working out of a balanced budget, founded on the stabilisation of the Belgian franc, thus a return to the gold standard. M. Janssen, the Finance Minister in the new democratic Cabinet who, until recently, was director of the National Bank of Belgium and has not yet been replaced in this post, immediately concerned himself with financial measures for carrying out the plan of stabilisation. After the Belgian financial syndicate, in which all the large banks will take, part, has been formed, loans will immediately be contracted in all countries the currency of which is not depreciated: the United States, England, Holland, Switzerland and Sweden. These loans to the amount of 150 milliard dollars are raised with the object of repaying 3 milliard of francs as a first instalment on the amount owed for the receipt of the marks.

In order to balance the budget, the "democratic" Government announces that new taxes to the amount of about 500 million francs will have to be included in the budget for 1923.

The consequences of carrying out the financial plan of restoration are easy to understand; — the return to the gold standard will inevitably involve a severe and immediate increase in the cost of foodstuffs and an enormous degree of unemployment in industry.



It is the fear of this unemployment which induces even industrialists to oppose this plan for bringing finances on to a sound basis. The newspapers which represent this stratum of the bourgeoisie warn the Government against a "brusque" stabilisation which would only be the first step to re-valorisation of the franc. The answer of the representative of finance of the Government is that there is no alternative than a period of industrial crisis, unemployment and increase in the cost of living or — bankruptcy.

One thing is certain, that the social democratic-bourgeois Coalition Government is absolutely **betraying** all the promises which social democracy and Christian democracy have made to the mass of workers. Instead of a policy directed against the bourgeoisie, the Government is carrying on a policy of guarding the interests of **high finance!**

Increase in the price of food! At least half a milliard of new taxes! Unemployment! These are the immediate prospects for the proletariat. And on the other hand, the strengthening and concentration of the power of finance capital!

M. Vandervelde, leader of the 2nd International and Minister for Foreign Affairs in the new Cabinet, announced on the day after the elections of April 5th, that Belgium requires a strong and stable government, backed by a large majority. This majority for carrying out the plans of Belgian and international finance has been found: the bourgeois parties and social democracy.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Attitude of the Red International of Labour Unions to the Protest Strike in France.

Paris, Oct. 26th, 1925.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions has sent the following telegram of greeting to the C. G. T. U. (Revolutionary Trade Union Federation of France):

"The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions sends enthusiastic fraternal greetings to all the workers of France who have taken part in the protest strike against the war in Morocco and Syria.

This protest strike is a serious warning for the ruling classes in both France and other countries. It shows that the year 1914 has gone never to return. The broad masses of the French proletariat have, thanks to the Communist Party and the unitarian (revolutionary) trade unions grasped the character and the significance of the military attacks of the third republic. On October 12th they freely and publicly made this understood. This protest strike, which was met by the most indignant resistance of all strata of the bourgeoisie, is a significant milestone in the development of the French Labour movement.

During this strike bourgeois democracy has shown its nationalist-Fascist aspect and has given an object lesson to those workers who have still preserved their faith in the Left Bloc and in bourgeois democracy. During this period the Socialist Party and the reformist C. G. T. have played a particularly disgraceful part. Their attitude was equivalent to a shameless, open breaking of the strike. It is difficult to say which of the two, the Fascists or the Reformists behaved more infamously in their attacks on the revolutionary workers. One thing however is clear, that the Communist Party and the C. G. T. U. were faced by a united front, from the monarchist Leon Daudet to the reformist Leon Jouhaux.

Breaking a strike has always been regarded as the vilest and meanest act of treachery. The strike breakers knew this well enough, but they pocketed their money and did their dirty business secretly as they did not dare to do it openly, trying to support their action on a basis of principles. But the French reformists, led by Leon Jouhaux, the first Vice-President of the Amsterdam International, have changed all this, they appear quite openly as strike-breakers and sabotage the protest strike side by side with the police and the Fascist gangs. While intending to pursue reformist tactics, they gradually fell into playing the part of open strike-breakers.

In spite of the violent campaign of calumny developed by the bourgeois, Fascist and Reformist Press, in spite of these organised efforts to break the strike, hundreds of thousands of

proletarians had the courage openly to oppose their indignation, their protest and their contempt to the bourgeois-Fascist-reformist Bloc. The French bourgeoisie may fly into a rage, the reformists who are entirely discredited, may calumniate you, but nothing and no one can deny the historic fact that the Communist Party and the C. G. T. U. have raised their voice in protest against the predatory colonial war, and that honest workers, who still belong to the reformist organisations, took part in the strike contrary to the instructions of their leaders.

The French section of the International of Labour Unions is acting in accordance with the principles of its International, and is doing its duty. Is it possible that the reformist C. G. T., in breaking the strike, was acting in accordance with the principles of its International? It would be very interesting to know the attitude of the Amsterdam Trade Union International with regard to the attitude of its French section towards the war in Morocco and Syria.

All honour to the strikers!

Shame on the strike-breakers!

### The Struggle of the North Bohemian Textile Slaves.

In Northern Bohemia a tremendous struggle has broken out in the Textile industry. The textile workers of the districts of Warnsdorf, Rumburg and Zwickau have been on strike for three weeks. With the locking out of the workers in a great hosiery factory who had not participated in the strike, the industry throughout the whole district has been brought to a complete standstill. At present about 15,000 textile workers are involved in this strike. Whilst the textile barons as a result of the favourable market conditions have been able to pocket enormous profits, the textile workers have had to be satisfied with starvation wages. The average wage of a textile worker varies from 90 to 150 Czechisch crowns (11/- to 18/4) a week! The "greed" of these wage slaves is expressed in their demand for a 10% increase in wages.

Immediately before the outbreak of the struggle the social-democratic leaders arranged that odious display of sham unity in the so-called national school question, in which these leaders took part along with the German Bohemian factory owners and all the bourgeois parties in a "protest movement". All our leading articles and speeches at meetings could never have so clearly exposed to the social-democratic and non-party workers the counter-revolutionary character of this united front of the exploiters with the social-democratic leaders as has been done by the present struggle of the textile workers. The social-democratic, christian socialist and non-party workers in the Northern Bohemian textile industry now see how the textile barons, who are the same nationality as themselves, behave when it is a question not of a nationalist-chauvinist show, but of granting these wage slaves a few extra crowns weekly from the fat profits of the capitalists. To the social demand of the textile proletariat their kinsmen, the textile barons, reply with a blunt refusal and by locking out those workers who were not immediately participating in the struggle. But the textile workers are having a still more effective object lesson. Social-democratic, christian socialist and unorganised workers who are standing in one common front and who are showing themselves ready to continue the struggle, now see how the textile barons, who only recently "protested" along with the social-democratic leaders against the government, have now at their disposal all the forcers of the State in the fight against their wage workers.

It is probable that the textile barons, now they realise the complete solidarity of the working class, would already give way, did not the capitalists and the bourgeois parties, as well as the social-democratic leaders, speculate on making use of this struggle in order to carry out an election manoeuvre against the C. P. of Czechoslovakia. The demands of the textile workers of Warnsdorf, Rumburg and Zwickau were rejected, and all textile workers not engaged in the strike were locked out. Shortly after this the Central Executive of the German Bohemian Textile Manufacturers called upon the textile barons of the Reichenberg-Friedland district to commence an offensive. The factory owners in this area have delivered to the working class through their trade union organisation an in-

solent ultimatum, the term of which expires on the 4th of November. During the whole course of the struggle the most important functionaries of the Amsterdam trade union have done their utmost to destroy the fighting spirit of the textile workers. In a very crowded meeting the secretary of the Amsterdam textile trade union, **Ziemer**, quite openly stated that in the name of his organisation he could hold out no hopes to the strikers, as the entire affair was nothing else but a "communist putch". This open piece of treachery did not fail to have its effects: the social-democratic, christian socialist and unorganised workers showed themselves more determined than ever to continue the struggle under the leadership of the section of the International General Trade Union Federation. The section of the IGTFU, has undertaken the support of a considerable number of unorganised textile workers in the Warnsdorf district.

The game of the exploiters and their confederates is perfectly clear. After the speech of the above-mentioned social-democrat and secretary, the attitude of the bourgeois press, the measures of the Central Executive of the Textile Manufacturers Federation, the ultimatum of the employers in the Reichenberg and Friedland district, it is perfectly clear what is aimed at. It was intended to extend the fight along the whole front as rapidly as possible. The strike is being participated in not only by a great number of unorganised workers, but also by the members of the christian socialist trade union, who have relatively very little means at their disposal. It is the intention of the employers to exhaust as soon as possible the section of the IGTFU, which is supporting the unorganised strikers, and for the rest it will be the job of the social-democratic leaders to demoralise the striking workers. Of course, the working class in the Reichenberg district would have been prepared, in spite of the counter-agitation of the Amsterdam trade union leaders, to enter immediately into the struggle. The Amsterdamers have already prepared the demoralisation of the struggle by sending out circulars instructing all their functionaries in the workshops to oppose the strike where a secret ballot does not result in a two-thirds majority for the strike.

The section of the IGTFU, has thwarted all these plans. In close consultation with all the functionaries, it was decided to continue the fight in Warnsdorf, Rumburg and Zwickau with all forces and to bring the textile workers of the Friedland-Reichenberg district into the struggle at the moment which best suited the strike leadership, and not the employers. It was the intention of the employers and their lackeys to bring about the collapse of the strike before the elections, and then to represent this result as an unsuccessful "communist putch". The fight is being continued and there is no talk of a collapse. The working class is standing firmly and resolutely behind the strike leadership. The meetings are all overcrowded. Every attempt of the social-democratic leaders to shake the firm front meets with the unanimous repudiation of the strikers.

It is possible that the Employers' Federation will instruct the capitalists to proceed to lock out the workers in the Reichenberg-Friedland district after the 4th of November. This will mean that 40,000 textile workers will be engaged in the struggle.

The section of the IGTFU, is carrying on this struggle without any regard to the elections, which do not play any part in the conduct of the strike. In this fight a far more important issue is at stake. It is the first time for many years that many thousands of exploited workers, under the lead of our textile section, have set up their united front against the will of the Amsterdamers in order at the same time to carry out an offensive against the insolent Employers' Federation. The demand of the Northern Bohemian textile workers is very modest, but its realisation will mean two things: 1. that an important section of the Czechoslovakian working class has checked the offensive of the employers and 2. that this success is attributable to the determination of the working class to set up the trade union united front regardless of political tendencies.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### Fresh Mass Arrests in Roumania.

By Albin.

Only a few months have passed since the monster trial of the Communist movement in Roumania took place in Bukarest, and which resulted in very severe sentences; the trial in Kishinev against 486 revolutionary peasants is still proceeding; the whole of the working population of Roumania is still profoundly stirred by the heroic death of Max Goldstein — and already fresh news arrives regarding the wholesale arrest of young and adult workers which took place in the last few weeks. Up to now the Siguranza have arrested about 100 youths and 50 adults in Bucharest, Galatz, Turnu-Severin, Barlag, Jassy, Kichinev, Targu-Mures, Timisoara, Brasov and Cluj, who were conveyed to the Siguranza in Galatz for "examination" and then, although the majority of the arrested do not reside in those districts which are under martial law, were handed over to the military court of the III. Army corps of Kishinev.

The Roumanian oligarchy is feverishly preparing for the elections, which take place in a few weeks, by suppressing all the movements of the working class. The pretext for these new arrests are the actions of the Young Communist League of Roumania on the occasion of the International Youth Day and the appeal of the same body on the occasion of the trial of the 486 revolutionary peasants of Tatar-Bunar. The Roumanian oligarchy will not permit one word to reach the public regarding its cruelties in Bessarabia, and has therefore, after this energetic protest of the Young Communist League against these shameful proceedings, had arrests carried out in all corners of the country.

Boys and girls of 14 and 15, functionaries of unitarian trade unions, well-known journalists, simple working men and women were tortured until, in order to escape further tortures, they "confessed" to having participated in the distribution of the appeals or in the illegal communist movement.

J. Palada, a leather worker from Galatz, was tortured until he committed suicide in order to escape further torment. Josef Mihaly, functionary of the unitarian trade unions of Targu-Mures, was arrested along with his 14 years old child and conveyed to Galatz. There he was constantly beaten for days with rubber sticks until he was quite unrecognisable. One night he was dragged to the Danube and threatened that if he did not make statements desired by the Siguranza, he would be bound and thrown into the river. Julius Kessler a metalworker of 21 years of age, was placed over a fire and his fingers were jammed in a door. B. Zabarescu, student, was beaten until he became insensible in order to extract confessions from him as to the whereabouts of his comrades. Stephan Dan, the central secretary of the Unitarian woodworkers' union, who only, two days before his arrest had been released from prison after 16 days hunger strike, was beaten while he still lay ill in bed until blood flowed.

These are only a few examples of the indescribable horrors which are being enacted in the hell of the Siguranza in Galatz. In these new cruelties of the Siguranza the greatest role is being played by T. Munteanu, an agent provocateur, who engineered this fresh "plot".

The Kishinev military court will, after conclusion of the trial of the 486 peasants, commence a new communist trial. The international proletariat must, by means of energetic action, succeed in preventing this new crime of the Roumanian oligarchy.

### Fresh Protest Declarations against the Persecution of Workers in Hungary.

Telegram from Party Conference of CP. of Germany to Comrade Rákosi.

The Party Conference of the C. P. of Germany sends brotherly greetings to the heroic revolutionary Rákosi and the Hungarian revolutionary and socialist workers arrested along with him and who have been severely mishandled.

The Plan of the Hungarian government to have Rákosi condemned to death by a Special Court must be frustrated by the proletarian solidarity of the international working class.

The Party Conference of the C. P. of Germany pledges itself to exert all its forces in order to obtain the release of the Hungarian revolutionaries.

\* \* \*

The Association of the social democratic Lawyers in Vienna sent on the 31st of October the following telegram to the Hungarian Prime Minister:

"Protest along with the whole world of culture against Rákosi being tried by Special Court and demand for him and those accused along with him an ordinary Court!"

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### The Situation in the German Communist Party.

Extract from the Report given on the Situation in the Sections of the C. I. at the Plenary Session of the C. C. of the Russian C. P. on 10. October 1925.

By G. Zinoviev.

The letter from the E. C. C. I. to the Communist Party of Germany has aroused the profoundest interest also in Russia. Here and there it has been read and re-read until it has become quite worn out.

The Communist International has come to a decision of the utmost importance with reference to the C. P. of Germany and this decision requires to be substantiated and explained to our Party, and to all the Sections of the Communist International. There are some questions in which we now observe diametrical differences between what is going on in the C. P. of England and in the German Party. In England a numerically small but united and determined Party, working efficiently, is striding forward, despite its total of only 6000 members, and has gained great influence over the masses, and is rising on the crest of the billow. In Germany our Party, which, in spite of the unemployment of tens of thousands of Party members, and despite the persecutions, the sentences to penal servitude, etc. has about 150,000 members, is passing through a severe crisis in the leadership, and has forfeited much of its influence over the masses of late.

The causes of this are, of course, not of a personal or accidental nature. What is the reason of the success of the small English Party, and of the failures of the great German Party? It need not be emphasised that the main reasons lie in the **great economic and international political factors**. I cannot deal in detail with these factors here. But when I speak of certain groups and fractions, and even of individual persons, in the further course of this address, you must invariably bear in mind the **general background of the picture, that is, the main political and economic factors** which essentially determine the present course of development taken by the German C. P.

The defeat at the end of 1923 was bound to have the effect of damping the collective action of the revolutionary labour movement in Germany for a comparatively lengthy period. The partial stabilisation of capitalism in Germany plays an important part, the more so that in Germany we had had a revolutionary situation just before the stabilisation. The masses were terribly exhausted. The Dawes plan was therefore received at first either with apathy or with illusions, and false hopes were cherished that now Germany was "saved for ever". The social-democratic leaders deliberately encouraged these delusions. It was solely the vanguard of the working class which foresaw the future effects of the Dawes plan.

The German working class entered on one of the most unhappy eras of its existence, resembling in many points its history during the years between 1909 and 1912. The more powerful social-democracy is in Germany, the more painful is the crisis in the German labour movement.

The German C. P. is a young Party, not yet thoroughly steeled to battle. After the events in Halle a large number of social-democratic elements joined the German C. P. The young Party has to act in a most complicated and difficult situation, but has no tried and tested staff of leaders. A crisis in the Party was inevitable after the defeat of 1923, and after the bankruptcy of "Brandlerism".

It must be admitted that the question of leadership, of the staff of leaders heading our Parties, is one of the most difficult

questions with which the C. I. has to deal. The choice of leaders for the Communist Parties is an extremely difficult and tortuous process, and one which cannot always be easily accomplished.

I have received a number of letters from our Party comrades, asking for an explanation of the meaning of the latest decision of the Comintern in the German question. In one letter, written by several comrades, a number of those questions were set which are probably occupying you all. I believe that a reply to these questions will cast the clearest light upon our tactics with reference to the German Party.

The first question is as follows:

"Does the E. C. C. I. letter signify any change in the tactics of the Communist International, or is it merely a correction of those deviations from the tactics laid down by the III. and V. World Congresses, which have occurred in the German Party?"

The reply is: "Of course there is no change in the tactics of the Comintern; it is solely the opponents of the line taken by the V. Congress and the Enlarged E. C. C. I. who are trying to cast this suspicion upon us. We are pursuing exactly the same line as before.

The second question is:

"If the letter is to be taken in this second sense, that is, as a mere correction of the deviations from the right line of the Comintern, the question arises, whether these deviations have only come about recently (since about the time of the German Presidential Election campaign), or whether they represent an uninterrupted chain of errors since the Frankfort Party Conference?"

The Frankfort Party Conference was the conference at which the Left gained the majority in 1924. The comrades ask whether we are correcting errors committed since the Presidential Election (Hindenburg), or since the Frankfort Party Conference.

Our reply is that we are **correcting errors which have been committed by the German C. C. ever since the Frankfort Party Conference**, but which became especially conspicuous at the time of the Presidential Election.

At the Frankfort Party Conference the Left won the first organisational victory on a national scale over the Brandler group. The Brandler group had committed so many errors that it was not able to obtain a single delegate for the Frankfort Party Conference. The case is unique in history: A central committee, at the head of the Party for years, comes to a Party Conference at which it finds scarcely a single delegate supporting it. This circumstance alone shows how many errors the Right have committed.

At the Frankfort Party Conference the Left gained the majority, but they immediately committed a number of errors. We were uncertain for a long time whether we should place the leadership in the hands of the Left or not. Why? Because we saw that the Left consists of two parts: On the one hand of revolutionary minded workers, sympathising with us, desirous of becoming Bolsheviks, and entirely opposed to Brandler. On the other hand an upper stratum of intelligentsia, consisting of comrades of the type of Maslow and Ruth Fischer, lacking in adequate political experience, and only right in so far as they condemned Brandler, since Brandler was altogether too bad, but themselves immediately committing the greatest blunders. These "ultra Left" intellectuals of the type of Maslow and Ruth Fischer, Scholem and Rosenberg, aroused no great feeling of confidence in us. As early as during Lenin's lifetime we held some serious consultations with the German delegation in this room. We all saw clearly that Brandler was wrong, and that the workers, with Thälmann at their head, were right. But the political "line" adopted by Maslow, Ruth Fischer, Scholem, and others ran counter to ours. In spite of this, we subsequently decided to aid the Left to take over the position of leaders of the Party, though Maslow and Ruth Fischer were in their ranks. There was nothing else left for us to do.

The German C. P. plays an exceedingly important rôle in the Communist International. It is thus natural that every step regarding the German C. P. is accorded the most careful consideration among us.

We saw clearly that the Frankfort Party Conference, at which the Left carried off their first victory, committed a number of errors. It will suffice to mention the fact that the resolution on the necessity of the participation of communists in social-

democratic trade unions was passed solely as a result of the ultimatum sent by the E. C. C. I.; Maslow and his friends were already opposed at that time to work in the trade unions. Maslow proclaimed that we were under no obligation whatever to cling to the trade unions, and that we should create a "new type", a mass organisation. When our delegates arrived at the Frankfort Party Conference, they came into severe conflict with Maslow and Ruth Fischer, and it was only by means of an ultimatum that they succeeded in passing the resolution on the participation in social-democratic trade unions. The Party Conference, however, accepted this resolution merely formally. In reality the ultra-Left continued its policy of abstention from work in the trade unions. It issued the slogan: Let us return to the trade unions, but in the expectation of being speedily thrown out again. They entered the trade unions under the pressure exercised by the C. I. Everybody can see that work entered into in this spirit cannot yield any great positive result.

We must thus answer the second question as follows: In the letter from the E. C. C. I. errors are corrected which the ultra-Left have been committing since the Frankfort Party Conference, since that Conference at which Brandler was completely set aside, and his place taken by the Left — by that Left which consists of the best of communist workers, but which is headed even today by leaders of the type of Maslow and Ruth Fischer, who have committed enormous political errors.

The third question:

**"Does the letter of the E. C. C. I. signify that the whole policy of the 'Left' has been wrong since the Left victory, or have there been positive and negative factors in the policy of this group, the latter being predominant?"**

This question must also receive due attention. It is true that the whole line pursued by the Left has been wrong from the beginning? This is of course not the case. At bottom, those workers of Hamburg, Berlin, Saxony, and the Ruhr, who sent Left delegates to the Frankfort Party Conference, were honestly and sincerely anxious to become a Bolshevik Party, and these have in actual fact gradually become Bolsheviks. At bottom, a sound and correct current has made itself apparent in the German Party, and it is only the wrong course held by the upper stratum which has obscured this correct line. This fact proves that a Party develops in itself but slowly to a Bolshevik Party, and that the process of Bolshevisation is a gradual one.

The X. Party Conference of the German C. P. — the first since Frankfort — was recently held in Berlin. This Party Conference drew a certain balance, and showed that the most influential group of leaders, headed by Ruth Fischer and Maslow, was not leading forward from Frankfort, but in a backward direction. We were endeavouring to take at least one step forward, if gradually, but in actual practice they take two steps back. They have been under the impression that "Bolshevism" signifies mechanical "centralism". In their opinion Bolshevism consists almost solely in forbidding anybody to utter even a word against the C. C. All that is most important in Bolshevism, the right way of approaching the masses, the real capacity to lead the masses, has remained beyond their comprehension. They have not been able to see the wood for the trees.

At the X. Party Conference the representative of the E. C. C. I., as also other comrades, saw plainly that the excessive amount of power held by the group of ultra-Left leaders, tending to the extremist "centralism", was leading to a personal dictatorship on the part of Ruth Fischer. They saw that the Party could easily be pushed to the verge of a precipice. Too many comrades were beginning to be expelled from the Party for the slightest word of criticism. In consequence of this policy, the Right began to raise its head again, and within the Party itself ultra-Left tendencies were becoming stronger.

The group around Ruth Fischer adopted a diplomatic attitude with reference to the decisions of the E. C. C. I. They have not followed the real advice given by the E. C. C. I., but have merely followed it on paper. The Party Conference mirrored the difficult position thus created in the Party. The representatives of the E. C. C. I. have had the courage to state the question clearly and unequivocally, and raised the German question in its full extent immediately after the Party Conference. The result has been that it has become necessary, immediately after a Party Conference at which unanimous decisions were accepted, to revise these decisions. It need not be said that this is very unpleasant. But there has been no means of escaping from it.

This Party Conference drew a balance with a deficit. It became apparent that we have greatly lost influence in the trade unions. At the last trade union congress we had only three delegates. It is true that we received 28% of the original votes at the election of delegates to this conference, and that it was only by means of election geography and other manipulations that the social-democrats contrived to reduce the number of our delegates to three. But we must none the less openly admit that we have lost influence in the trade unions. Quite a number of election campaigns have proved a decrease of our influence over the masses. The membership has remained stable; it has not gone back, but neither has it increased. The bonds connecting the Party with the non-party masses have not grown stronger.

But the greatest evil of all is one which has been recognised even by Ruth Fischer, that a wall has arisen between our workers and the social-democratic workers, and this wall is becoming continually higher. Those workers' delegations which have visited us, including those from Germany, have shown us that it is possible to approach the social-democratic workers. And yet the tremendous tactical errors committed by the Ruth Fischer-Maslow group have caused this wall between the communist and the social-democratic workers to become steadily thicker instead of thinner. The ultra-Left has resorted to a desperate fanfare of self-praise for communism. At every street corner they have shrieked: "We are the only real workers' party in Germany!" But they have not shown themselves capable of carrying on real agitation. They have not proved capable of drawing a line between Scheidemann, etc., and the actual mass of social-democratic workers.

In the course of our interview with the German delegation we heard various reproaches of this kind from the social-democratic workers: your communists declared that they did not want to speak to us. A German communist organisation adopted a decision to the effect that our Party members were not to enter into conversation with the social-democratic workers! And this is supposed to be a "Left" attitude! And when the communists do enter into conversation, then they do not know how to carry it on. One social-democratic worker told us about a communist wall newspaper. The wall newspapers have obtained a firm foothold in the German works and factories, and are doing successful work. This, of course is, a very good thing. But our communists do not always know how to edit these papers. The above-mentioned social-democratic worker complained as follows: A number of a wall newspaper was posted up in a factory, but the first caricature in it did not represent a bourgeois, but me, a social-democratic shop steward. I was drawn as a bourgeois, and the accompanying slogan was: Not a single social-democratic worker, not even in an elected position! They confuse me, a worker, with Noske; they confuse me with Scheidemann, although I am perfectly aware that neither Scheidemann nor Noske deserve the slightest confidence, and that we merely tolerate them amongst us. Instead of debating with me as between comrades, the communists treat me as if I were one of the bourgeoisie.

This gives an idea of the relations frequently existing between our comrades and the social-democratic workers. It need not be said that this social-democratic workman was exaggerating, but we must admit that he was right to a certain extent. And these are sins committed not only by the uppermost strata, but also by the middle functionaries under the influence of the upper. All this combines to form a barrier between our workers and the social-democratic workers.

We were obliged to face the German Party question in a definite manner on the very day following the X. Party Conference. Comrades belonging to the German C. C. visited us in Moscow before the Party Conference. We discussed with them the membership of the new C. C., and co-operated with them in finding the right way to correct the line taken by the Party, to obtain new functionaries, etc. At the Party Conference Ruth Fischer reversed even these decisions. We finally recognised that she is pulling the Party backwards, that her group neither will nor can approach the social-democratic workers, that she is not capable of dealing with the everyday questions of the labour movement under the present conditions of partial stabilisation and partial standstill. Our communist workers — so said Ruth Fischer recently — neither will nor can carry on everyday work. What they like is to "play at soldiers", to take part in demonstrations. They collect money for the main-

tenance of the Red Front Fighters' League (which has a membership of 200,000).

Ruth Fischer calls this Red Front Fighters' League "playing at soldiers". The working class gives money for this league. The workers are ready to face danger, ready to demonstrate; they collect money enabling them to drive out into the country in motor lorries on Sundays and to agitate among the peasantry. This is the "Sunday walk" which they choose. But now listen! The workers do not understand everyday work! They do not care for everyday tasks! This is Ruth Fischer's opinion.

It is perfectly evident that she has lost the key to the comprehension of the real trend of feeling among the workers. It is Ruth Fischer who does not know how to accomplish the everyday tasks; the workers understand it excellently! The working masses live in this everyday life. The social-democrats have been enabled to gain their hold upon the workers by precisely the fact that the communists, under Ruth Fischer's leadership, have proved incapable of efficiently defending the daily interests of the workers in those questions which comprise the everyday life of the workers — questions of taxation, prices, housing, etc. And Ruth Fischer even adds that the communist workers are merely wanting to "play at soldiers" in their Red Front Fighters' League. What is the essential significance of such views being held by a comrade laying claim to leadership in the Party? It shows mistrust in the creative powers of the masses and of the Party, lack of faith in the revolution, want of comprehension of the innermost character of the labour movement.

When Ruth Fischer maintains that the masses take no interest in the questions of everyday life, in the trade unions, etc., this shows that she has lost the key enabling her really to comprehend the masses, and that she is incapable of leading the masses. Her train of thought is similar to that of the pro-S. R. Professor Engelhardt, who declared, after the defeat of our first revolution in 1905, that the Russian workers were incapable of fighting, and that the Russian people were "simple-minded".

This state of affairs has forced us to take serious measures. And now we can venture to do this, for the workers' group, the workers' kernel, is now strengthened and united, though still to an insufficient degree. We have often asked ourselves, in the Executive of the Comintern: if there is really a workers' group in the German C. C.? We knew that there is a **Thälmann** in the German C. C., and that he has some friends in the C. C. who are good revolutionists, but we have asked ourselves if these would prove capable of carrying on an independent policy against the "policy" of Ruth Fischer. And now, in the summer of 1925, we came to the conclusion that this workers' group can and must be placed at the head. I cannot yet state that this group has already the whole leadership of the Party in its hands, but it will have it.

The fourth question put me is to the effect:

**Whether we had already made earlier attempts to correct the line taken by the leading group.**

I have already answered this question superficially. I must reply that there have already been not only attempts, but actual struggles for the correction of the line towards Bolshevism. Even at the time of the Frankfurt Party Conference, the delegation of the E. C. C. I. was obliged to contend energetically against the attempts made by the Maslow group, who tried to lay down anti-bolshevist theses at the Party Conference on "the situation, perspectives, and tactics". These theses drawn up by the Maslow group contained an incorrect interpretation of a number of questions. The delegation of the E. C. C. I. enumerated 13 points in which they were not in agreement with these theses, and under the pressure of the delegation the theses were thoroughly remodelled. But the Right was bankrupt to such an extent, and the indignation against it so great after the defeat of 1923, that for a considerable period the whole Party was overwhelmed by "Left" trends.

During the one and a half years in which Ruth Fischer and Maslow headed the Party we have frequently been obliged not only to draw personal attention to faults in their work and to impart instruction, but we have had to point out in the press the possible negative consequences of their leadership (see the article: "The Bolshevisation of the Parties of the C. I." published in No. 1, vol. 1925, of the "Kommunistischen Internationale").

Immediately before the crisis the E. C. C. I. sent a letter to the Tenth Party Conference, containing a number of measures calculated to promote the correction of the line adopted by the German leading group. The Executive is not to blame if Ruth

Fischer preferred to ignore this advice, and to form a bloc with those ultra-Left elements whose attitude is no longer consistent with membership of the Party.

It will be seen from the above that attempts have already been made at correcting the Ruth Fischer-Maslow line, but that these have now been able to take the correct form of the decision already known to you.

The fifth question is as follows:

**"Is the letter of the E. C. C. I. to be taken as an admission that the E. C. C. I. was entirely in error in its orientation towards the Ruth Fischer group at the end of 1923, or merely as an admission of partial errors, consisting in the fact that certain persons incapable of leadership were placed in the foreground?"**

I believe, comrades, that I have already replied superficially to this question as well. We are, of course, not of the opinion that we committed an error in our fundamental orientation. We supported the leadership of the "Left" despite the dangers of Maslow and Ruth Fischer because we had no other choice. We awaited the maturity of our workers' group. And at one time it appeared to us that Ruth Fischer and Maslow were learning something, as there is no doubt they are gifted persons. We supported them, hoping to help them to become Bolsheviks. Must this hope be finally abandoned? I fear that it must. Ruth Fischer signed the E. C. C. I. letter only out of "discipline". When she was here she declared that she would support this decision, but as soon as she returned to Germany she recommenced her former politising.

The sixth question:

**"Does the letter of the E. C. C. I. signify any step towards reconciliation with the Radek Brandler group?"**

Here, before the C. C. of our Party, it is of course entirely superfluous to prove in detail that the decision of the E. C. C. I. does not in the least mean a reconciliation with the political line of Radek and Brandler. Brandler's latest appearance before the Enlarged Executive, and the reply given by the political bureau of our C. C. and approved by the Comintern, are known to you. There are persons in the Right group who have abandoned Radek and Brandler, and we insist energetically upon their being induced to take part in our work. We are winning their participation. Many of them are already working for us. We insist on the return to the Party of all who are willing to work in the spirit of Bolshevism. We demand from the German Party that it corrects the errors committed by the Ruth Fischer group in expelling right and left from the Party, comrades who did not deserve such treatment. We demand that those comrades of the Right group who have recognised the actual tasks of the Communist Party be induced to participate in our work. But we combat the Right deviation, which is naturally raising its head again, and shall continue to combat it with the utmost energy.

The last question:

**"Did the members of the German Party know of the differences between the E. C. C. I. and the Ruth Fischer group before the letter was published?"**

I believe that this question is also of great interest. Did the members of the German Party know of our differences of opinion with their C. C.? They knew very little about them. Their leaders tacked about very skillfully between the E. C. C. I. and their own Party. When we on one occasion forwarded a number of instructions (in the question of participation in trade union work, and in other matters) Ruth Fischer said to the "left" workers: It cannot be helped. The Comintern demands that we work in the trade unions, and we shall have to submit.

You will comprehend, comrades, that it is quite impossible to educate workers in this manner. At the same time the Ruth Fischer group did not hesitate to exploit any "anti-Russian" or "anti-Moscow" currents. The causes of these currents have been explained in the E. C. C. I. letter. We need not repeat this explanation here. They are currents which arise out of German foreign policy, out of the orientation of the German bourgeoisie, and with it German social democracy, towards the "West". At the Marseilles Congress of the II. International the delegates behaved like second rate diplomatists, each serving his "own" government. (It suffices to mention that "our" Menshevist Dan was nearly the most "Left" delegate there.)

The German social-democrats were especially zealous for "their" State. The German bourgeoisie is turning to the West, and hence also a certain growth of anti-Moscow currents among them. Hence the fresh orientation on the part of social democracy, the social-democratic workers. At the same time however we can record an increase in the currents favouring us, among many sincere social democratic workers. This situation has been expressed in the inner-Parliamentary structure of our German brother Party. The upper stratum, led by Ruth Fischer, has not hesitated to utilise these currents among the workers against Moscow. It was for this reason that all advice sent by us was interpreted in the sense that Moscow intended a "turn to the Right". This dishonest game created a barrier between us and some circles in the German Party. It was of the utmost importance to break down this barrier.

These are the answers to the questions put to me. I trust that they will throw light upon the situation. I should however like in conclusion to indicate the position now actually existing in the German Party. I have already stated that the German C. P. is undergoing a leadership crisis.

The German C. C. has a number of excellent functionaries at its disposal, but many of them display a great proletarian modesty. This modesty frequently prevents them from taking matters into their own hands. Many of them say: "I am capable of leading a district. But how could I lead the whole Party, when even Ruth Fischer and Maslov have proved incapable of doing so, and have committed errors which you have been forced to correct afterwards?" This proletarian diffidence, I repeat, prevents them from taking matters into their own hands with sufficient courage. At the same time they fear more and more that the Right may come into power in the Party again, and they have had enough of this.

Both groups, Right and ultra-Left alike, are raising their heads. Both groups are headed by leaders thoroughly versed in every description of fraction struggle. All this has led to the leadership crisis.

The situation has however greatly improved of late. The overwhelming majority of the Party has expressed itself in favour of the E. C. C. I. letter. The majority of the communist workers breathed more freely after the E. C. C. I. letter was published. And even in Berlin, the sole centre in which the opposition is still strong, we have no doubt of gaining the organisation. It will follow us. There is no doubt that sympathy for our line is growing and strengthening among the masses — our line of serious endeavour to approach the social-democratic workers and to oppose the social-democratic leaders. The masses sympathise more and more with the earnest and energetic carrying out of the united front policy. A revival of self-activity is observable among the masses; the masses are in favour of earnest endeavour for the Bolshevisation of the Party.

However great the difficulties may be in Germany, they should not be over-estimated. The German C. P. is composed almost exclusively of workers in shops and factories. The core of the Party is sound. Even at the most difficult moments, despite the errors of its leaders, and despite strong and clever opponents, the German C. P. has still two and a half million proletarians behind it. The errors can be completely done away with. The sympathy of the working masses towards Communism grows with absolute certainty. The revival of the labour movement in Germany is inevitably bound to be a revival of the communist labour movement. The process of degeneration and decay in German social-democracy goes forward with increasing rapidity. Given correct tactics the German communists will win over the whole working class of Germany. The crisis has been overcome, as crises have often been overcome in our Parties (for instance in France, England, Czechoslovakia and Italy, where the cause is advancing). It is to be hoped that the Reichs Conference of the German C. P. meeting on 31. October will give fresh impetus in this direction. The central core of the German Communist Party looks courageously into the future, and is working on untiringly. The delay in the international revolution is bound to lead to crises and difficulties. But real revolutionists do not lose their courage on this account.

I am confident that we shall overcome all difficulties. There is no doubt that the greatest have already been overcome. We shall find the way to the workers. The workers' group in the C. C. will be created and strengthened. We shall lend it every possible support. And the whole Communist International will aid it in its work.

## Resolution of the Conference of the Communist Party of Germany on the Situation of the Party.

On the 31st October last there took place a National Conference of the C. P. of Germany at which the following resolution was adopted, which lays down the attitude of the Party regarding the letter from the E. C. C. I. and the results of the discussion in the Party regarding the same. Ed.

1. The realignment of the Party introduced by the Open Letter of the E. C. C. I. is one of the most important events in the history of the C. P. of Germany. It is by no means a mere question of a change of the leading groups and persons, but an alteration of the political line, of the structure, of the tactics and the entire revolutionary work of the Party. The Party in changing itself, alters its relations to the whole of the working class. By overcoming a number of serious faults by its own forces, the Party at the same time approaches nearer to the non-Party and social democratic working masses, connects itself more firmly with them and more definitely works out the role of the Communists in the proletarian class struggle.

2. The Maslov-Ruth Fischer group at the head of the old Party leadership introduced after the Frankfurt Party Congress an incorrect political line, the chief faults of which were:

a) false sectarian attitude to the working masses,  
b) neglect of trade union work,  
c) concealed fight against the Comintern, which is based on the one hand on Western European provincialism and on the other hand on the pretence of altering the course of the policy of the Comintern. The lack of faith of this group in the revolutionary development in the West European labour movement had its roots in the lack of understanding of the socialist development of the Soviet Union and its effects upon the West European proletariat.

d) False inner Party course, abrogation of Party democracy, too little and faulty educational work and its replacement by mechanical measures.

e) Indifference regarding the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei.

f) Theoretical deviations from Leninism (Maslov's writings).

The three inevitable results of this false line of policy were: isolation of the Party from the broad masses of the workers, and in particular the loss of its most important positions in the trade unions, petrification of inner Party life and estrangement of the Party from the Comintern. These three effects of the false system are closely connected with one another.

3. There exist within the Party at present three deviating groups which are in opposition to the policy of the Central Committee and of the Comintern.

a) **The Ultra-Left Dangers:**

After overcoming and removing the opportunist Brandler group, the ultra-Left group which had already been previously formed, gained the leading influence in the leadership and policy of the Party. The nature of the ultra-Left deviation consists in the actual repudiation of the united front tactics, in petty bourgeois self-limitation of the Party, in the hostile attitude to the Comintern and in the "antimoscowite" anti-soviet tendencies. In order to conceal this policy, the Ultra-left continually issued exaggerated, demagogic warnings regarding the dangers to the Party from the Right and spread assertions of a threatening Right deviation on the part of the Comintern.

The intellectual basis of the ultra-Left tendencies is petty bourgeois radicalism; its social root is the philistine-grown-frantic, which was several times pointed out by Lenin.

There exists a profound difference between the small ultra-Left group of leaders and the majority of the workers who still follow them, who are dubious towards the new course of the Party out of revolutionary impatience, tactical rigidity and exaggerated fear of Right dangers. While the Scholem group continues its fight against the Comintern, these still doubting working class elements will become convinced of the correctness of the new course to the extent to which they realise that the Party is not conducting a Right but a bolshevik policy, and by this means is achieving practical results.

As the history of the C. P. of Germany shows, after every defeat of the proletariat ultra-Left sham-radical tendencies make their appearance in the Party, which conceal their disappointment under "revolutionary" phrases. After the defeats of the

year 1919 there arose the Communist Labour Party of Germany. After the October defeat of 1923 there arose the Ultra-Left. It is a product of the mood of defeat, of revolutionary defeatism.

**b) The Maslov-Ruth Fischer Group.**

The Maslov-Ruth Fischer group continually vacillated between the Ultra-Left and the Comintern; it attempted to "manoeuvre" between both standpoints. The lack of faith in the power of the working class on the one hand and the over-estimation of parliamentarism on the other hand caused this group to abandon all principles. It disturbed the inner Party development by a ridiculous exaggeration of centralism, personal dictatorship and keeping back of the best working class elements. Finally, this group concluded a bloc with the Ultra-Left at the 10th Party Conference against the Comintern, but which did not hinder it from committing at the same time Right parliamentary errors. It continued its double game with the Communist International even after the publication of the Open Letter.

This group must in no case be allowed to retain the leadership of the Party and of the Berlin organisation.

**c) Right Dangers.**

The sources of right dangers are firstly, the bourgeois influence upon the proletariat and the social-democratic traditions of the Party in general; secondly, the necessity of a broad and flexible mass policy in order to create a bloc with the social-democratic workers; thirdly, the continued existence of fractional Right groupings.

These dangers cannot be avoided but will only be increased by demagogic cries of warning and concessions to the Ultra-Left groups. The Party must clearly perceive the sources of possible Right dangers. It will overcome these dangers with the help of a correct Leninist mass policy, a determined liquidation of all fractions and by raising the theoretical level of the Party.

In the face of the unceasing talk of the Ultra-Left regarding the Right dangers, the Party must not for a moment forget that the membership has already been through the struggle against Brandlerism, and has therefore passed through an essential stage of bolshevisation. It is the greatest merit of the Left wing of the Party (the present Party leadership by the Left working class elements) that it led the Party away from Right Brandlerism, just as it is now leading the Party out of the Ultra-Left danger zone. Now, for the first time since the formation of the Communist Labour Party of Germany, the Party is conducting a serious struggle against Ultra-Left ideology. In this struggle the Party will not make the least concession to the Right policy and will not even discuss the possibility of a Bloc with Brandlerism.

**d) The Common Basis of the Right and Left Liquidators.**

In the Russian Labour Movement the Left Otsovists and the Right Mensheviks found themselves after some time engaged together in the "August Bloc" in a common struggle against the Bolsheviks. Similar tendencies also exist with us. The common ground between Schönlink and the Scholem group is their mistrust in the Comintern, their hostility towards the Executive, their belittling of the influence of the Party over the working masses, the actual liquidation of Communist trade union work, the hindering of the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei and the revision of Leninism. A proof of the spiritual relationship of some Ultra-Left comrades with the liquidators is offered by comrade Scholem, who withheld his vote in the Central Committee on the occasion of the expulsion of Schönlink.

The leadership of the Party must ruthlessly continue the fight against the liquidators from the Left and the Right. It must at the same time attract into the work of the Party all those sound elements of the present and former opposition, under the condition that these comrades unreservedly support the Central Committee, admit their errors and dissolve all their fractional connections.

4. Immediately after the publication of the Letter of the E. C. C. I. a broad discussion was opened by the Central Committee in all organisations of the Party, in which all Party members could participate. The organisations of the Party, after thoroughly dealing with all the disputed questions, have with an overwhelming majority condemned the standpoints of the Ultra-Lefts and of the Maslov Ruth Fischer group, and unreservedly placed themselves on the line of the Comintern and of the Central Committee. The Party discussion was the

freest and most deep-going since the existence of the Party. It led to the following positive results:

a) victory of the standpoint of the Comintern over all hostile groupings;

b) welding together of the proletarian bolshevik elements in the Party and their leadership;

c) directing of the Party to the great practical tasks of the present, especially to the united front tactics and trade union work;

d) strong development of the inner-Party life by the introduction of a far-reaching Party democracy;

e) thorough clarification and expedition of the reorganisation of the Party on factory nuclei basis, which for the first time has been grasped by the Party members in its political connections;

f) creation of firm relations of trust between the Party membership and the Party leadership and the Comintern;

g) introduction of the first step to approaching the broad working masses outside the Party and which has already led to successes in the Berlin and Baden elections.

5. A negative aspect in the Party discussion was the continuation and revival of the fraction spirit. Comrades Scholem, Thiede and Weber, in particular, conducted an unscrupulous fractional activity against the Central Committee which is injurious to the Party. Comrade Ruth Fischer made similar attempts in Berlin. In Halle and Chemnitz attempts were made to form a Right fraction. Various comrades of the deviating groups confused Bolshevist Party democracy with the right to conduct fraction work and commit breaches of discipline. The Party Conference considers it necessary to state clearly that Party democracy is absolutely confined within the limits of Party discipline. The Party Conference summons all Party members to liquidate completely the fraction spirit. It instructs the Central Committee to crush with an iron hand every attempt at fraction work and strictly apply the appropriate provisions of the Party statutes. Without the complete unity of the Party there can be no Bolshevism.

6. The Berlin organisation is of special importance for the future development of the Party. Only after long and heated debates has the Central Committee succeeded in Berlin in breaking the resistance of the leading bodies to the policy of the Comintern and in winning the overwhelming majority of the Berlin members for the change of the political course. The former majority of the Berlin district Committee and of the Central Council committed under the influence of Ruth Fischer a number of serious mistakes (continued vacillation regarding the Open Letter, publication of a special number of the Berlin "Funken" (The Spark) against the line of the C. C., opposition to the completely correct proposal of the C. C. to offer the Social Democratic Party of Germany, on the occasion of the municipal elections, to come to an agreement regarding the disposal of the surplus votes of both Parties, concealed fight against the reorganisation of the Berlin Party membership on the basis of factory nuclei, attempt to cast suspicion on the Central Committee of Right deviations and Brandlerism).

The Berlin members, in the first place the workers in the factories entirely supported the Central Committee in all the above mentioned questions and condemned the vacillating, ambiguous attitude of the leading bodies. As a result of this in the District leadership a number of leading comrades have broken away from the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group and adopted the standpoint of the C. C. The Party Conference welcomes this development and appeals to all the Berlin Party members finally to break with the Ultra Left and the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group and under all circumstances and against every attack to remain true to the Comintern. That is the prerequisite for the development of a sound proletarian Party organisation in Berlin, which is firmly rooted in the factories and trade unions, is marching in line with the Central Committee and is capturing the majority of the Berlin workers. The Party Conference expects that the approaching Berlin District Party Conference will pronounce its decisions clearly and unambiguously in this sense.

7. In the course of the discussion the Central Committee of the Young Communist League has been charged with Brandlerism and Right errors. The Party Conference emphatically rejects these unfounded accusations, as this has also been done by the overwhelming majority of the IX. Conference of the Young Communist League of Germany. The Party Con-

ference records the existence of complete political agreement between the leadership of the Youth League and the C. C. of the Party.

8. The first Party Conference of the Communist Party of Germany constitutes the conclusion of the inner Party discussion. The questions raised in the E. C. C. I. Letter have, after two months discussion been correctly answered by the membership. The results of the Party discussion are ascertained. The Party must now, by continuing a broad inner work of enlightenment, concentrate its main force in fulfilling the new great tasks in the class struggle. The positive work among the working masses must be carried on with redoubled energy.

\* \* \*

The above resolution was adopted by 217 votes against 30, with one abstention.

## The Meeting of the Enlarged Executive Postponed.

Moscow, 2nd November 1925.

The meeting of the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International intended to be held at the end of November has been indefinitely postponed. Notification as to the date of the meeting will be given later.

## The National Conference of the Communist Party of France.

By St.

In the small communist town of Ivry near Paris, there took place from the 15th to 20th October the **National Conference of the C.P. of France**. The economic and political situation in France, the increase in prices caused by the inflation and the taxes, the colonial wars in Morocco and Syria, have called forth in France a similar, even if not so strongly marked Left development as in England. This tendency is revealed in a **radicalising** of the proletarian members of the Socialist Party of France, which, among other things, found expression, for example, at the last national Conference of the Socialist Party, and is also revealed in a **swing to the Left** in the French reformist trade unions.

Thus the national Conference of the C.P. of France met under favourable conditions. By its definite support of proletarian interests, by its energetic fight against the colonial war in Morocco and by a wise employment of the **united front tactics** the C.P. of France has recently succeeded in rallying round it broad sections of the workers and peasants and in gaining their sympathy and confidence. The workers and peasants' Congresses which have been held throughout the whole of France and which adopted a fighting attitude against the taxation policy of Caillaux and against the colonial policy, clearly demonstrated the growth of the influence of the C.P. of France. The 24 hours **demonstration strike** on the 12th of October against the Moroccan robber-campaign was a great success. It is true that the majority of the working class did not participate in this strike; but when it is remembered that it is the first purely political strike in France which was not led by the trade unions, but in the first place by the Communist Party, then there is not the least doubt that this strike was a great step forwards. It has promoted to an extraordinary extent the confidence of the working masses in the Communist Party. A proof of this is the fact that the circulation of the "Humanité" increased during the week of the general strike from about 175,000 to over 250,000. The enormous attendance of the Paris working masses at the funeral of comrade Sabatier, who was shot during the demonstration strike, likewise shows the great influence of the Communists among the Paris working class. Finally, the various by-elections to the municipal councils of Paris and the neighbourhood, where a great increase in communist votes has been recorded, is a clear indication that the Party is proceeding on the right way to rallying the working masses to it.

The National Conference dealt with all the most important questions. Comrade Semard reported on the political situation, Treint on the fight against the war, Torrez on the work of the communists in the committees of actions against the war, com-

rade Suzanne Girault spoke on the colonial and national question, Monmousseau on the trade union question, Sauvage on the organisatory tasks and Renard Jean on the peasant question.

The overwhelming majority of the Party Conference approved the policy of the Central Committee. The political situation, the fight against war, the trade union question and the problem of winning the peasant masses were discussed in detail. With regard to the employment of the **united front tactics**, it is characteristic that there was no debate, as the French Communist Party is quite unanimous with regard to this question. All the more serious, therefore, were the discussions with the Right elements. As is known, after the Frossard crisis the Party expelled Souvarine, Monatte and Rosmer, who are now conducting a systematic fight against the Party in a weekly organ of their own. But there are still a number of Right elements in the Party grouped round Loriot, who are carrying on an obstinate fight against the present Central Committee and its political line. This group which is acting openly as a fraction, is opposing practically everything: it is against the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei, against entering on a demonstration strike, against the tactics employed in the fight against the colonial war, for example, against the slogan of the evacuation of Morocco, against the slogan of fraternising of the troops etc. Fortunately this group has very little influence in the Party. This was the reason why it ostentatiously refused to take part in the debates at the National Conference (giving as a reason that this was not a legal conference). The Party Conference expressed itself almost unanimously in the **sharpest manner** against this Right group, approved the fight of the Central Committee against this group and called for energetic disciplinary measures.

The organisatory report was very seriously discussed. It is this which constitutes the weakest point of the Party. The reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei has had very favourable results in Paris, but in the provinces, where the Party is for the most part still somewhat weak, the result has been otherwise. The old strong petty bourgeois organisation-apparatus has been destroyed, but without a new circle of functionaries being everywhere set up. But these difficulties will certainly be overcome. The statistics as to membership of the whole Party show a steady increase, so that the number of members of the C.P. of France in the last eighteen months has increased from 70,000 to 90,000. Although the Party is fairly strong in Paris, it is unfortunately still weak in the provinces. Fortunately, however, it shows signs of growth in the industrial centres of the provinces as well as in the strong peasant districts.

The relations of the Party to the revolutionary trade unions have greatly improved in the course of time. A complete approachment of the C.G.T.U. to the Party however has not yet been achieved, because neither the syndicalist tendencies, which have for long been so strong in the French working class, have been overcome nor does there yet exist among the broad masses of the C.G.T.U. a thoroughly clear conception of the role of the Communist Party and the tasks of the trade unions. But the process of enlightenment in the trade unions is, however, going steadily forwards.

Thus the National Conference, taken as a whole, showed a great consolidation of the Party and also a great extension of the influence of the Party. The Communist Party of France is on the right road to develop into a Bolshevik mass Party.

### To our Readers!

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

England . . . . .	2 sh.
America . . . . .	50 cents
Germany . . . . .	1.50 marks
Austria . . . . .	2 (Austrian) Schillings
Norway . . . . .	2 crowns
Sweden . . . . .	1.50 crowns
Denmark . . . . .	2 crowns

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

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers besides the Regular Number.

Readers in England can also obtain the "Inprecorr" from the Communist Bookshop, 16, King Street, London W. C. 2.