

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

---

Official Organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International



## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

### Leaders in Opposition

An account of the "crises"  
inside the Russian Com-  
munist Party

### Notes of a Trade Unionist

A. Lozovsky

### The German Ultra-Left

Clara Zetkin

### Stabilising the Franc

### An Illegal Periodical

15th November, 1926  
Vol iii. No. 3.

3d.

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

English Edition Published at 16 King Street, London, WC2

## C O N T E N T S

AGENTS OF THE SECOND REVOLUTION	Editorial	2	INTERNATIONAL REFORMISM IN ITS TRUE		
LEADERS IN OPPOSITION	Anonymous	5	COLOURS	A. Lozovsky	16
STABILISING THE FRANC	Jean Chavaroche	9	TASKS OF THE PARTY SCHOOLS	A. Kurella	19
CHANGES IN THE AUSTRIAN SOCIAL-DEMO-			GLOSSARY OF THE PAN-EUROPEAN CONGRESS		
CRATS	J. Strasser	11	H. Gunter		21
THE GERMAN ULTRA-LEFT	Clara Zetkin	12	AN ILLEGAL PERIODICAL	A. B.	23
			SET THEM FREE	J. Schlawer	24

## Agents of the Second Revolution

**T**HERE is a new flood of incitement against Moscow throughout the capitalist world. It began after the victory of the British Government over the General Strike in May, the victory of Fascism in Poland, and the occupation of Peking by reactionary troops.

This international anti-Soviet campaign is now assuming large proportions. It is very much of the nature of a political preparation ("popularisation") for eventual future intervention. This is particularly evident when the forces are reviewed which have mainly contributed to the development of this campaign: the British and Polish Governments, the German Social-Democrats and the Russian White *émigrés*.

Every one of these agencies of the international counter-revolution has its own troubles, which are so many reasons for active participation in any crime against the revolutionary Labour movement in general and against its strongest bulwark—the Russian Revolution—in particular.

A welcome pretext for the campaign against Moscow has been, during the last few months, the attitude of the new Opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Our class enemies have used this in every shape and form. Foolish blockheads continue to manufacture fairy tales for the capitalist and Social-Democratic press about rebellions in the Red Army, the arrest of Opposition leaders, and attempts on the life of responsible Party leaders, etc. On the other hand, the stranded *émigrés* welcome the Opposition. Miliukov, for instance, writes:

"The action of the Opposition is certainly an event of enormous political importance for Russia: open propaganda and agitation against the Government."

The Mensheviks proceed in a much more cunning manner: To begin with, they criticise very gently the "ideologies and subjective intentions" of the various groups of the Russian Opposition, then they extol "the criticism of the existing system by the Opposition" ("which repeats almost word for word the criticism of the Social-Democrats") and praise the "objective, historically progressive role of the Opposition in the process of grouping the classes and liquidating the dictatorship." —(F. Dan.)

In this gypsy band "Communist" instruments are not lacking!

They are "made in Germany." In the other capitalist countries only a few strains of this kind have been heard, but in Germany one can hear them performed everywhere by a beautiful ensemble of "ultra-Left" chorus leaders, who delight their audiences with every variety of anti-Moscovite tunes.

The Communist Party of Germany is certainly not to blame for this. Like all the other Communist Parties, it condemned without hesitation or any reservation whatsoever the new Opposition in the Soviet C.P., and fought with truly Bolshevik acumen and determination against the machinations of the ultra-Left fraction on the "Russian question." Moreover, the liquidation of this dirty business within the Party will not take more than a few weeks. The worst free lances, such as Ivan Katz, Korsch, Maslov and similar people are no longer in the Communist Party. But all of them have still in the ranks of the Party—up to the end of the Party discussion at the next Party Congress—a certain number of followers.

A characteristic feature of the campaign against Moscow of this crew is a strict division of labour between the various "Departments" and departmental chiefs.

**I**VAN KATZ raves like a mad dog against the "Moscow seducers," against "the Russian capitalist State," against the Russian "system of Jesuitism and Machiavellism exalted to be the basis of the State," against the "prostitute Comintern," etc. But please note: he does not rave against the new Opposition of the C.P.S.U. On the contrary, he shouts with joy because Urbahns, Weber and Co. (who are members of the Communist Party of Germany) are supporting the Russian Opposition and attacking the "Stalin crowd."

Korsch does not mince matters and demands—why not go the whole hog?—a "Second Revolution in Soviet Russia." But being a professor, he is fond of accompanying such slogans with wearisome "scientific" (and, of course, "very Left") comments to justify them.

Ruth Fischer, who together with Maslov is busy carrying on secret negotiations with Korsch on the one

**Agents of the Second Revolution**—continued

hand, and with Urbahns and Weber on the other hand, in favour of the Russian Opposition, does not express herself openly for or against Korsch's main slogan. In public she speaks, as one who knows Russia well, about the "oppression of the workers" and the "growing reaction in the Soviet Union." The "information" on which she bases these foolish calumnies is drawn from "the criticisms made by the Russian Opposition." But to produce a greater effect she thinks it necessary to "improve" this material by downright lies of her own fabrication. In this form the material has proved very useful to the "Vorwaerts" as "objective material" with which to prove the incorrectness of the statements of the second German Workers' Delegation to Soviet Russia as to the conditions there.

Nor are Urbahns, Scholem and Weber (who are members of the Communist Party) in favour of the slogan of a "Second Revolution in Russia," but they are certainly at all times ready to protect the people who want to make propaganda, as Party members, for this slogan (they are against "all organisational measures" with respect to such people).

Why should one not, as a member of the Communist Party, be allowed to agitate in favour of rebellion against the Soviet Power? That much "freedom of opinion" should—so they think—certainly be allowed in the ranks of the Communist International! They say: "We demand the withdrawal of all strictures against, and of all expulsions for political reasons of, honest revolutionary comrades in the Communist Party of Germany, [i.e., the honest Katz, Korsch, Maslov and Co.] We also demand that the victimisation of Zinoviev, Lashevitch, etc., should cease in the Soviet C.P.," etc.

Arkadi Maslov has chosen for himself the role of manipulator behind the scenes of all these little groups of the ultra-Left on the Russian question. He performs this role very cleverly.

With the agility of a fully qualified conjuror he converts by a slight exaggeration, simplification or generalisation, or by the addition of a "tiny comment," every false assertion of the Russian Opposition into suitable material for more refined "diplomatic" agitation against Moscow.\*

Then these semi-manufactured goods of Maslov undergo further manipulation by the Korsch crowd and such-like; they are still more distorted and provided with "more telling" comments. In this form they are good enough for the Social-Democratic and Fascist press to use as "sensational disclosures," now accompanied by comments of an openly counter-revolutionary nature.

**H**ERE are a few examples: the Weber resolution contains the statement: "In this struggle the Leningrad Opposition refuses to accept as a possibility the building up of Socialism in one country alone." It also expresses itself "against idealising the present position of Russian State industry."

The "Wedding Memorandum" asserted that the

\* See, for instance, the Memorandum "Material on the Russian Question" published in the name of the Wedding Opposition and the Urbahns group, the "Resolution on the Russian Question" signed by Weber and the "Declaration on the Russian Question" signed by Urbahns, Scholem, Weber and many others.

majority of the Central Committee of the Soviet C.P. had advanced the theory "that Russian State industry is already Socialist industry, i.e., that the State capitalism in Soviet Russia, which Lenin called progress in comparison with unco-ordinated petty bourgeois production, is free from capitalist elements."

Then comes the turn of Mr. Korsch, who bases himself on the minority in the Central Committee of the Soviet C.P. (who, according to him, "without indulging in any illusions, call Russian State industry State capitalism"). He says this State industry must be called "entirely capitalist."

The "declaration" signed by Urbahns, Weber and Co., contains the following statement:

"We most emphatically draw attention to the great 'kulak' peril, the existence of which was confirmed during the recent Soviet elections."

Then they begin to sing in chorus about "the victory of reaction during the last Soviet elections," about the "kulakised Russian Party" and the "kulakised Comintern."

Here is another example: it is said in the Weber resolution that the Russian Opposition fights among other things, "against the exaggeration of the N.E.P. so vividly signalised in the catchword 'enrich yourselves' and expressed in practice in the new land laws, in freedom for trade, etc."

"For the limitation of the N.E.P. to the tasks allotted to it by Lenin; against any relaxation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a concession to the urban and rural bourgeoisie, through the extension of Soviet democracy."

"For the preservation or development of the privileged position of the industrial proletariat and the poorer peasantry in the proletarian State."

Well, the German Opposition thought that if the Russian Opposition was carrying on such a struggle, why should not we propagate the struggle even a trifle more "determinedly"? Consequently, Giwan, a follower of Korsch, proposed at a Berlin Party nucleus meeting a resolution which, among other things, contains the following statement:

"The nucleus also declares that the whole of the State and social order in Russia has already become avowedly reactionary and that the Proletarian Dictatorship is being openly liquidated. It is as clear as daylight that the re-organisation carried out in Russia is almost entirely carried out at the expense of the proletariat, and that all the defensive measures of the proletariat are suppressed by all the means at the disposal of the State."

This resolution also invited "the proletarian masses who have been deprived of their political and economic rights to initiate a more energetic class struggle in town and country, as a preliminary to the Second Revolution for the overthrow of the power of 'kulakism' and of the N.E.P. bourgeoisie!"

**T**HE next aim of these honest and dishonest agents of the "Second Revolution" is expressed in a very characteristic manner. The "declaration" signed by Maslov, Weber and Co., says that "the new organisational measures against the various Opposition leaders have already brought the Soviet C.P. to the brink of disruption"; also that "the campaign carried on at present against Zinoviev and others is interpreted by every politically-minded worker as an attempt to liquidate the

**Agents of the Second Revolution**—continued

Communist International as the revolutionary organisation of the world proletariat."

According to this variation of the theme, then, it is the Central Committee of the Soviet C.P. with all its followers which is determined to disrupt its own Party and to liquidate the Comintern. Korsch, however, who works hand in hand with Maslov, urges "that we should put forward the slogan of the disruption of the Comintern and the establishment of a new truly Communistic International." At the same time he writes:

"This implies that the present Left Opposition in the Soviet C.P. is confronted with a very responsible historical task, which it must not shirk, but must accept without hesitation or vacillation, and carry through with the support and encouragement of the Left in all the non-Russian sections of the Comintern."

"It is in duty bound to carry out the tasks of the entire Soviet C.P. without allowing any one or anything to interfere; it must in all consciousness and in an organised manner proceed to carry out this class task against the Party as a whole. It must also not shrink from the disruption which is forced on it, if the liquidators of Communism really crown their work by this crime."

Ivan Katz advocates again quite openly—the truly shameless are devoid of shame by daylight also—the "liquidation of the Comintern."

That is the next aim of these political bandits (if only their arms were not too short!). It is with this aim that Maslov took upon himself, at the beginning of September, through the "declaration" signed by Urbahns, Weber and Co. "the initiative for a campaign of solidarity on behalf of the Russian Opposition."

**I**N order that the disorganising effect of this "campaign" may embrace as many vacillating Communists as possible, all the demands in this "declaration" were condensed into a single modest main slogan (on the model of the Russian Opposition): "Discussion on the Widest Possible Scale!"

An additional demand was: "Give publicity to all resolutions, articles, etc., brought forward by the (Russian) Opposition! The discussion has only commenced!"

As one can see, they went about it cleverly. This brought them 700 signatures in the Communist Party of Germany, which is not exactly a big number. But this "solidarity campaign" received all the more support from the German Social-Democratic Party fakirs and the Russian Mensheviks abroad.

Paul Levi declared briefly and concisely: "We are with the Opposition." F. Dan declared that the "objectively progressive role" of the Russian Opposition consists precisely of the fact that criticism of the Party regime and the Party apparatus is the only thing which these oppositional elements of all shades of opinion have in common among their "platform." Even the old fox, Miliukov, sent his approval from Paris:

"The political feature of the struggle—for free criticism—is at the present juncture more important than the disparity of the social programmes of the Opposition."

Not less significant is the form in which the "Allgemeine Zeitung," the organ of the "Steel Helmet" (Fascist) organisation of Central Germany, and German Trust capital's own paper, identifies itself with the "solidarity campaign" initiated by Maslov. This paper wrote among other things as follows:

"The opposition rejects any revision of Leninism, as advocated by Stalin in Moscow and slavishly repeated by Thaelmann in Berlin."

"The German Communists will not for any length of time allow themselves to be led by the nose by the Russian renegades from Communism, for they are not Russian illiterates and simpletons, but know very well themselves what they want (no matter how erroneous and impossible of fulfilment this may be)."

"They are not mere cattle, in a word they are not proletarian."

Such is the success so far achieved by this "solidarity campaign on behalf of the Russian Opposition."

**B**UT one should not run away with the idea that the chief directors of this action, Maslov and Korsch, will keep quiet or that they do not know what they are doing. These people are in full consciousness already on the other side of the barricades. That they are still endeavouring to attack us "from the Left," that Maslov speaks in the name of "unadulterated Leninism," and Korsch in the name of the "proletarian revolution"—this is merely provocation and nothing else.

Both of them have entirely lost all revolutionary perspective. Maslov said so himself before the bourgeois court, and Korsch has constructed a whole theory out of it. Maslov, who at one time wanted to take out a patent for the initiation of the struggle against Trotsky's opportunism, has nothing to say now against Trotskyism, nor against the unashamed liquidatorship of Medvediev or Ossovsky. These no longer appear to him as something which one should condemn, but rather as something which one can utilise.

It is also very significant that Korsch becomes literally enraged when he sees in the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany a warning against the approaching peril of war with Soviet Russia.

He raves: "Thereby the C.P.G. prepares for active participation in another 1914."

Thereby this fellow reveals himself unmistakably as an agent of the imperialist war plans against the Socialist Soviet Union.

**FOR THE AGENTS OF THE "SECOND REVOLUTION" ARE DISGUISED AGENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COUNTER-REVOLUTION.**

The task of every Communist Party is to unmask them before the toiling masses. Once they are unmasked they will be perfectly harmless, and will also soon lose the pay they are receiving from the bourgeoisie.

Well, well, Mr. Korsch and Mr. Maslov, you should have borne in mind that the "second revolution" has already been tried several times in Soviet Russia, by your present allies, the Russian counter-revolutionaries. This happened from 1918 to 1921. These "campaigns" ended every time in shame and chagrin for their originators, didn't they?

The Soviet power came out of these campaigns, stronger than ever before—isn't that so? Well, then, Mr. Maslov and Mr. Korsch, if your present high protectors, Chamberlain, Pilsudsky, Miliukov and others, are blind enough to undertake once more a similar "solidarity campaign," we will see to it that this adventure results for them in a still richer crop of shame and chagrin. We say that in all earnest. Please convey it confidentially to your high protectors!

# Leaders in Opposition

ALL the old opposition groupings in the Soviet C.P., defeated at one time or another, have now united into one opposition alliance under the leadership of several of the old leaders, Comrades Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others. By way of an artillery preparation for the coming Party Conference they have made a raid on various Party organisations, going in groups to meetings of the nuclei, and have tried to drag them into a discussion. This despite the fact that both the Congress and the Central Committee of the Party have decisively rejected dragging the Party into a new discussion of questions which have been discussed over a long period of time, and those on which decisions were taken at the XIV Party Congress and the Enlarged Sessions of the Central Committee.

The Party members among the working masses adopted a very hostile attitude towards this flagrant breach of Party discipline. But with certain wavering intellectual groups in the Party this state of affairs caused consternation. Remarks could sometimes be heard such as: "How ever can it have happened that the 'elite' of the Party intelligentsia, practically the majority of the old Party leaders, have gone into opposition? And how can it be permitted that such comrades should be told to keep quiet, when they want to show up what is wrong with the Party?"

The open enemies of the Party, for their part, displayed malicious joy and satisfaction: "The backbone of the Party is broken: this is the beginning of the end."

## Lenin on the Marsh-Dwellers

The wavering intellectual elements were indignant, and the open enemies of the Party triumphed, because they do not properly understand the history of the Bolshevik Party, because they do not understand the specific nature of this Party and the conditions of its struggle, because they do not take into account the evolution that the Party has passed through.

Beside the cradle of the Bolshevik Party, on the eve of its formation, there arose the question of "freedom of criticism"—a formula behind which the demand for freedom of fractions and groupings in the Party was hidden. Comrade Lenin wrote on this question in his book "What is to be done?" ". . . . Those who now shout 'long live freedom of criticism' are too much like the fable of the empty barrel."

"We, a small handful of people, are marching hand in hand along a winding and difficult path. We are surrounded on all sides by enemies, and we have practically always got to march under their fire. We have united on a decision taken freely just in order to fight these enemies and not to retreat into the neighbouring marshes, whose inhabitants from the very start have censured us for forming ourselves into a special group and choosing the path of conciliation. And now some of our members have taken to crying: 'Come into the marsh.' And when we begin to put them to shame, they reply: 'What backward people you are! How can you be so unprincipled as to deny us the liberty of calling you on to a better path?' Oh, yes, gentlemen,

you are at liberty not only to call us, but also to go where you like, even into the marsh; we even find that your real place is actually in this marsh, and we are ready to render you every assistance in your removal thither. But then leave go our hands, do not clutch hold of us and do not besmirch the great word 'freedom' because we are also 'free' to go where we like, free to fight not only against the marsh, but also against those who turn towards it."

In these famous lines of Lenin's, written as long ago as 1902, we have a brief formulation of the specific conditions of the struggle of our Party and the internal Party policy arising therefrom. The Bolshevik Party was the first, was the only Party in the Socialist International which set itself the direct task of conquering power by means of a revolution brought about by the hegemony of the proletariat. It was just because of this that it was faced with tremendous difficulties which the other Parties of the Second International did not come across. They were marching at a steady pace on a level road, while the Bolshevik Party had to go up steep winding paths, and make sharp dangerous turns, during which it was inevitable that one Party leader or another would lose his head.

## What Discipline Means

The Party was working in a petty-bourgeois environment and it was enough for a leader to make a false step to the Right or to the Left, or lose his equilibrium for a moment, for him to slide down into the marsh of opportunism. Therefore, Lenin demanded iron discipline from the Party, and fought ruthlessly against the slightest vacillations, no matter what were the Party services of those who were guilty.

From the very first formation of the Bolshevik Party and to the end of his days Comrade Lenin made very strict demands upon his comrades, and came down furiously on the vacillations of those who only yesterday had occupied the most prominent places in the Party and who had been his colleagues. This caused frequent crises in the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, which the Social Democratic Philistines explained as due to Lenin's malicious nature.

In 1903 Comrade Lenin broke with Plekhanov and Martov over the formulation of the first point in the Party statutes, the question of whether every Party member should enter an organisation and submit to its discipline or whether it was sufficient for him to recognise the Party programme and support it.

This caused great consternation in the ranks of the "Iskra"-ites, future Bolsheviks, a much greater consternation than it aroused amongst the present conciliators by the Central Committee's difference of opinions with Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky. Comrade Krizhanovsky in his reminiscences "On Vladimir Ilyitch" wrote of this first split: "The thought that despite all our failures the brilliant group of six comprised of Plekhanov, Axelrod, Zassulitch, Lenin, Martov and Potressov were working together . . . kept us going during the most difficult moments. Judge for yourselves what a grave impression was pro-

**Leaders in Opposition**—continued

duced on us by the announcement that the first result of the 1903 Party Congress had proved to be a decisive scission within this group of six."

Comrade Krizhanovsky, who came from abroad to conciliate the disgruntled leaders, said to Lenin: "Consider, Vladimir Ilyitch, what a situation will result; for as a matter of fact they are absolutely all against you; even those few persons who are voting with you in my opinion do this not so much because of their convictions as because of their personal devotion to you. The result is that you are one against the lot of them."

Comrade Lenin in defending the principle of iron discipline in the Party declared war in 1903 on all those who only a day before had been the recognised leaders of the Russian Revolutionary Social Democracy, those who had belonged to the "brilliant group of six." During the first moments he was a solitary figure, but only amongst the intellectual elite of the Party; the majority of the Party came over to his side. We know that Party history has justified this, and that behind the dispute about the first paragraph of the statutes and Party discipline was hidden a dispute between revolutionary Socialism and reformism.

**At a Turning Point**

The same thing was repeated at another turning point, after the defeat of the 1905 revolution. At that time the Tsarist Government, after publishing the law of August 6th on the State Duma, tried to turn the movement from the revolutionary path on to a path of a constitutional monarchy. The Bolsheviks had to choose the path of the future development of the revolution. They correctly put forward the slogan of boycotting the Bulygin Duma. When in 1907 it became clear that the situation had changed, that the revolution had suffered defeat in its first encounter, that the monarchist-constitutional "zig-zag" was pre-determined for the immediate future, Comrade Lenin opposed the boycott of the Duma. (See N. Lenin "On the Boycott of the III Duma.")

The majority of the Bolsheviks headed by Bogdanov, a member of the Central Committee, yielding to the forces of inertia, did not understand the need to change tactics, to utilise the platform of the State in the new situation, and Lenin remained in the minority at the Bolshevik Conference. The Party, however, soon became convinced of the correctness of Lenin's policy.

Bogdanov entrenched himself in the position of "Otzovism"\* ignoring the will of the Party. What did Comrade Lenin do? He declared ruthless war on "the Otzovists" and their leader Bogdanov, as a "hero of revolutionary phraseology," not deterred by the fact that Bogdanov had recently been after Lenin the biggest figure in the Bolshevik fraction and the most faithful brother in arms, not even deterred by the fact that on Bogdanov's side there stood a whole number of Bolshevik leaders.

Here also on the one side there stood Lenin with the Bolshevik Party and on the other a number of opposition leaders. And this time again history justified Comrade Lenin.

The "Otzovists" ended by entering into an alliance with those who wanted to dissolve the Party, with the Right Wing and the Mensheviks, and only left the scene after having become a small negligible sect following Bogdanov, or else openly migrating into the camp of counter-revolution, as Alexinsky did.

Later during the period of the February and October revolutions the Bolshevik Party went through acute crises of Party leadership at each sharp turn and at every difficult upward march. We may recall what resistance Lenin encountered from Comrade Kamenev and others when in 1917 he published his famous April theses. At first they did not even want to publish them in "Pravda."

**Crises in the Party**

We may recall the opposition he encountered on the part of Comrades Zivoviev and Kamenev, and what a furious retort he made to the "pair of comrades" when he issued in October the slogan "Take Power!"

It is sufficient to enumerate the subsequent crises; the opposition of the "Left Communists" at the time of the Brest Litovsk Peace, the acute crisis in the Party on the eve of the transition to the N.E.P. during the trade union discussion, then the crisis in connection with the "scissors," and afterwards in connection with Comrade Trotsky's "Lessons of October," and finally the latest crisis in connection with the new Opposition, which has arisen because of the long drawn out nature of the revolution and because of the transition from the restoration of production to the re-equipment of production.

The transition from merely restoring industry to the introduction of a new technical basis for production is extremely difficult. This transition to the present building up of Socialism can be compared for difficulty almost only with the period of taking power in October, 1917. Both the Party and the working class have become used to a breathless rate of restoration of industry and a rapid increase of wages. Now when we have to scrape up the crumbs to form our basic capital we must become reconciled to a slower rate of growth; last year production increased by 45 per cent., next year it can only increase by 14 per cent. and wages can at the moment only be increased in backward industries and amongst the worst paid categories of workers. This difficult transition period, which may last from 3 to 5 years, has caused a relapse into mistrust and pessimism on the part of certain leaders who wavered at the time of October. It forms a basis for a united opposition under the hegemony of Comrade Trotsky, who from the very first did not believe in the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country alone.

**Nothing New**

For comrades who know the history of the Bolshevik Party well, the existence of a crisis in the Party leadership, the existence of a struggle between the Central Committee and men who only yesterday were recognised leaders of the Party is in itself nothing new, and should not cause any alarm as to the fate of the Party; the Social Democratic Parties do not experience such acute crises for the simple reason that they have not got to make any dangerous and difficult upward marches; the basis of their tactics consists not in a revolutionary struggle, but in capitulation to the bourgeoisie, in oppor-

\* From the Russian word "otzovat" to call back, "otzovism" being the policy of those advocating withdrawal of the Bolshevik Fraction from the III Duma.

**Leaders in Opposition**—continued

tunist adaptation to any vileness. But that is not the position of the Bolshevik Party, which is storming the very heavens, conducting a desperate struggle with a whole world of enemies armed to the teeth. In this struggle it is inevitable that one leader or another should lose his head at a critical moment.

Especially there should be nothing unexpected or surprising for the Party in the fact that Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky, who only recently stood at the head of the Party, now find themselves in Opposition. Comrade Lenin taught the Party that it should carefully study the biography of every Party member, above all of those occupying responsible posts, and the Party knows the biography of the above-mentioned comrades. We know what vacillations were made by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev in the October days when they, to use the words of Comrade Trotsky, "funked" at the time of taking power. We ought not therefore to be surprised that they once more reveal uncertainty and doubts, under cover of Left revolutionary phraseology, when the Party is up against the extremely difficult task of building up Socialism in a single country encircled by capitalism, and with the world revolution only coming slowly.

**"Lessons of October"**

When Comrade Trotsky in his "Lessons of October" magnified the errors made by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev into a complete Menshevik tendency he was not right. Still less right was he when he attributed those errors to the Central Committee of the Party. But these errors were actually made, as every Party member knows, and they might have had fatal results if they had not been countered in time by the energetic opposition of Comrade Lenin, supported by the majority of the Central Committee and the majority of the Party.

By reversing the position we may say the same thing of Comrade Trotsky. We know that Comrade Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution," which is in contradiction to Leninism, and the under-estimation of the peasantry connected therewith, if it were to find support amongst the proletariat, would condemn it to serious defeats. Comrade Trotsky to this very day has not renounced this theory. We know moreover that Comrade Trotsky, unlike Kamenev and Zinoviev, at the time when the revolutionary wave was at its height was always equal to the situation and did not "funk." But when the revolutionary wave ebbed he slid over to the side of opportunism.

This was the case after the defeat of the 1905 revolution, when as against the revolutionary "irreducible slogans" of the Bolsheviks he put forward his "petition campaign" and the slogan of struggle for the right to form unions; afterwards he acted as organiser of the "August alliance" of those who wanted to dissolve the Party.

A similar situation arose after the Civil War, when he raised the panic about the "scissors" and afterwards about the "kulak danger."

Finally, we know that Comrade Trotsky, who was always with the masses during the time of their spontaneous enthusiasm, never organically merged himself in the Party and always under-estimated the role of the Party, taking up a position "between the parties" at

the time of the first Russian Revolution and the Stolypin reaction, during recent years coming out against the Party "bureaucrats," against strict Party discipline and in favour of freedom for grouping within the Party, *i.e.*, actually against the fundamental basis of the Bolshevik Party.

**Intellectuals Only**

The Party knows both the very strong and the very weak sides of these leaders, and the fact that they have made big errors in such a complicated and difficult situation as that in which our Party is now struggling does not mean that the Party ought to dispense with them. Comrade Lenin in his book "Left Wing Communism" correctly wrote "What concerns separate individuals is applicable—with the respective modifications—to the policy of the Party. It is not the person who never makes mistakes who is wise, there are no such people and cannot be; the wise person is he who does not make very substantial errors and is able easily and quickly to correct them."

The pity of it is that the comrades mentioned only "quickly corrected their mistakes" while they were working side by side with Lenin, who enjoyed unassailable authority in the Party. When Comrade Lenin died they began to reveal their specifically intellectual failings, their intellectual individualism and conceit.

Past revolutionary services and long direct collaboration with Vladimir Ilyitch have imbued each one of them with the conviction that he was the lawful heir of Lenin ("la partie—c'est moi") and that the Party has absolute power only in so far as it fulfils their will. When they found themselves in the minority they actually declared war on the Party, began to threaten it with a split, began to organise an illegal fraction within it, and finally concocted an unprincipled alliance of all those who have ever been offended by the Party or discontented with it, no matter how divergent were their views in the immediate past, including even Medvediev and Shliapnikov, who have an advanced Menshevik platform.

In fact Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev went so far in their lack of principle that for the sake of a concerted attack on the central institutions of the Party they have stated that all their former struggles against Trotskyism and for Leninism—a struggle which they waged fiercely for a number of years—was a misunderstanding.

Against such "errors" as this, which shake the whole foundations of the proletarian dictatorship, the Party will of course struggle in the most decisive manner, in a Leninist manner.

**What if they are Right?**

"Well, and what if these opposition leaders, though formally breaking Party discipline, are nevertheless right in substance?" ask timid and sceptically inclined people, without sufficient independence of thought and blinded by brilliant names. "Where," they ask, "is the criterion of truth? After all, Marxism, Leninism is not a collection of sermons which everyone must learn by heart, it is a method which we must be able to apply. How do we know that this method is being correctly applied by the majority of the Central Committee and not by Comrades Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Piatakov, Radek and others?"

**Leaders in Opposition**—continued

In order to disperse the doubts of these Party Hamlets, we must of course above all, help them to analyse the views expressed by the opposition representatives. And this has been done: the arguments of Comrades Trotsky and later Zinoviev and Kamenev, Sokolnikov and the rest, have been duly examined piece by piece and duly rejected. The Central Committee at the present is against opening a discussion with the opposition; the overwhelming majority of the Party, and particularly the Party workers, support the Central Committee on this point. This is to be explained by the fact that the discussion between the Central Committee and Trotsky, and later with Zinoviev and Kamenev ended in defeat of the members of the opposition. Since this discussion was held, nothing new has happened either in the country or in the Party, except that Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev have succeeded in concluding an alliance with Comrade Trotsky, and in the interest of this alliance have renounced everything that they said so vehemently against Trotskyism some time ago, that they have had to retreat and also that Comrade Radek (who had been suffering from a Right Wing deviation) succeeded in jumping over on to the side of the "regenerated" Comrade Zinoviev who planks on "Leftism"—in alliance with Medvediev!

**Not Worth It**

It is clear that it is not worth opening up a discussion and working the Party up into a fever, distracting it from the fulfilment of current vital tasks, in order merely to prove once more that certain comrades have lost their principles.

The wavering and doubting people are not governed by conviction but by belief. They frequently ask "Why should I believe Comrade Stalin, Bukharin and Rykov any more than Comrades Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Radek and Piatakov?" It is difficult to convince anyone of a belief by an argument. But if put to it we can even reply to this: We have no grounds for "believing" Comrades Trotsky, Zinoviev and those with them, because the new opposition has been carefully heard and unanimously condemned by the Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission in which are gathered the best forces of our Party, because the Opposition has unanimously been condemned by this Plenum of 264 comrades, which is the best expression of the whole of our Party's experience and of the whole of Leninism in practice, because the social composition of these higher Party organs is a better guarantee of agreement with the spirit of Leninism than the formal talents of certain Opposition leaders.

Those who judge the Party leadership only by the brilliancy and talent of their speeches, and by their level of erudition, have slept through the revolution that our Party and the working class have undergone during the last ten years. They under-estimate the way in which the vanguard of the working class has grown in the revolutionary fights and the work of building Socialism, and how, in accordance with this, the nature of our Party leadership has also changed.

In 1917 there were 23,000 members in our Party; in 1926 our Party numbers 592,000 with 410,000 candidates; in 1917 the percentage of workers (excluding office staffs, clerks, etc.) in the Party was 60.2 per cent. ;

in 1926 the percentage of workers remains practically the same: workers now comprise 62.6 per cent. of Party members and 51.5 per cent. of the Party candidates. The social composition of our Party leadership shows quite another picture. In 1917 out of 25 members and candidates of the Central Committee 12 per cent. were workers, while now in 1926 out of 104 members and candidates of the Central Committee the workers comprise 56.6 per cent. And in the Central Control Commission the percentage of workers amounts to 67.9 per cent. of the 266 members.

**Workers as Leaders**

These figures show eloquently how much the consciousness of our advanced workers has grown, how rapidly a proletarian leadership is growing in our Party in place of the intellectuals.

There is no doubt that this working class 63 per cent. in our central institutions cannot speak so well and write so nicely, and do not wield such literary erudition as the intellectual leaders of the Party. But on the other hand they wield tremendous and many-sided Party experience, both in the field of civil war and also in the field of Socialist construction; they are undoubtedly more closely connected with the working masses; they do not suffer from intellectual individualism; they are the best defenders of Party discipline and Party solidarity.

Since the death of Vladimir Ilyitch our Party has more than once been faced with great difficulties, and more than once Comrade Trotsky, claiming the role of the Party's saviour, has raised the cry: You are standing on the verge of destruction, you are slipping into the abyss! On all these occasions the Central Committee has repulsed the panic-mongers, definitely rejecting their hastily formulated "plans" and itineraries, and has steered the Party and the Soviet ship with a firm hand out of the dangerous channels. The Party in its overwhelming majority has seen this and appreciated this. That is why the new attack of the Opposition was so quickly liquidated.

**Enough Bletcher!**

The Opposition, speculating on the economic difficulties, began undermining the Central Committee, accusing it of conducting an anti-proletarian policy. They put forward demagogic slogans, promising the proletariat a rapid rise in wages and still more rapid industrialisation of the country by raising retail prices and by withdrawing capital from co-operation and imposing new taxes on the peasantry. These recipes, which in reality would lead to increasing the cost of living for the working masses, to a fall in the value of the chervonetz and to a schism between the proletariat and the peasantry, were hastily hashed up in the fractional kitchen for manifestly demagogic purposes. And on these questions the Opposition demanded the opening of a discussion, and attempted to force it on the workers' nuclei. But the workers' nuclei did not yield to this demagoguery. Like one man they replied: "We know your recipes for salvation. We don't want to listen to you. Enough of the fractional bletcher! We demand punishment for the splitters, we demand that they keep discipline and do not hinder the Party from working!"

That is how the Party, grown in strength and consciousness, has repulsed its mutinous leaders and marched forward along its road.

# Stabilising the Franc

Jean Chavaroche

ON July 21st, a large crowd besieged the Chamber with cries of "Down with Herriot!" "Dissolve!" "Long live Poincaré!" The day after this demonstration the "Temps," exulting over it, apologised for the "resort to force" as the "sole means" the bourgeoisie could use to get rid of ministers and parliaments unpleasant to them who dare not resign of their own accord.

At this moment the pound sterling was worth 246 francs and the public was seized by a panic. A greater panic prevailed in circles directly interested in the State revenue, bondholders and the hoarders of paper francs. On July 25th, the "Ministry of the six Premiers" came into power, headed by Poincaré, and since then the franc has risen more than 70 points\* and except for a few relatively insignificant fluctuations shows a tendency towards stability, or at worst, nervousness. "Confidence" seems to be restored amongst the "holders."

The Ministry is already being called "The Ministry of Stabilisation." The present Government has more chance of stabilising the franc than the Left bloc governments had, although the latter perhaps had a stronger desire to do so. This is because the present Government enjoys the effective support of the big bourgeoisie, whereas the "Left bloc" governments were always subjected to the terror of the bankers and had to "rule" under the imperious whip of sharp demands for mass redemption of "Bons de la Défense" (War Bonds). The present Government, being an expression of the political victory of big French capital over the petty bourgeoisie, can only execute the policy of big capital.

This determines the actual nature of the financial stabilisation which it is endeavouring to apply. There is no longer any question of discussing the necessity of stabilisation; inflation long ago became not only onerous for certain export industries and a nuisance to business, but also as a result of the ever-increasing discontent of the masses of the people a danger to the very existence of the bourgeois regime. This quite apart from the pressure on the part of foreign creditors.

## Depreciation Still Possible

The present Government is not gifted with magic powers, and further depreciation of the franc cannot be completely excluded from future possibilities. The "practice" of inflation, although solemnly condemned, will remain for some time to come supreme as a remedy against pressing financial difficulties. Has not the Bank of France been authorised, for example, to print special banknotes with which to purchase gold and stable foreign currencies? Does not the report of the financial experts, in view of last year's expired term of payments, propose the opening of a special credit of three milliards by the Bank of France? Is not a special inflation also proposed, reserved for the needs of trade? Finally, the rise in the cost of living, the purchase of foreign currencies by individuals, the scarcity of floating capital, etc., is not all this capable of violating the

\* Now (Nov. 6) more than 100 points.

solemn promises and of imposing new emissions of paper money? All the more so as the famous "mass of manœuvre" the dollars of the last Morgan loan, have already been expended, swallowed up by the current needs of the Treasury.

Need one recall once more that foreign creditors, according to official declarations, retain more than fifteen milliards of French paper money?

It may also be that the French Government will not abjure the use of inflation as a means of pressure, a diplomatic threat, against the U.S.A. and against Great Britain, who are the principal French creditors.

All this is quite possible. However, as we have already said, the French bourgeoisie and its Government are obliged in their own interests, under the threat of very considerable danger, to pursue a policy of financial stabilisation. In the analysis of the present economic situation, we should consequently judge things from this point of view, in the light of a future stabilisation of the franc.

Before examining closely the various reforms adopted or to be adopted, the particular interests that these reforms are out to protect, the conditions and the consequences of the stabilisation of the franc, we must stop a moment to see what is happening in the different industries. Perhaps we shall find there certain elements which will make things clearer than all arguments about the birth pangs of stabilisation, and also we may find the main traits of the crises which this stabilisation will inevitably beget.

## Attitude of Industrialists

Everyone is in agreement in affirming that the stabilisation of the franc will beget a more or less profound economic crisis, of longer or shorter duration.

Phenomena such as the restriction of production, bankruptcy, unemployment, new investment of wealth, acceleration of the concentration of production, as well as centralisation of capital and a greater dependence on the capital of the creditor countries—all these factors are no secret to anyone. The big capitalist groupings are hastening to prepare the necessary measures to withstand the crisis. But they are in no way able to carry these out.

The iron and steel industries (cast-iron, steel, rails, etc.), occupy a privileged position. They get supplies of raw material relatively easily and cheaply. In France, the State, the railway administrations and the big firms of the metal working industry are their clients. Outlets for realisations on the world markets are not decreasing very rapidly or very perceptibly. Moreover these industries have already taken and are about to take precautionary measures against international competition, in particular by entering into international trusts. They are powerfully centralised.

However, the capacity for the production of cast-iron has practically doubled, whereas the home market has only increased very slightly. The situation of the manufacturing industries is more difficult, particularly the engineering industry proper. With the exception of the automobile, aviation and precision trades, the

### Stabilising the Franc—continued

other engineering industries (tool making, agricultural machinery, dynamos, ship-building, etc.), appear to be unable to compete with similar industries abroad.

These industries also depend to a large extent on foreign countries for such products as copper, lead, tin, coal, oil, paraffin, petrol, etc. On the other hand, they have to submit to the prices and conditions of the iron and steel industry. Finally, they are experiencing great difficulties on the national and world market. On the questions of prices of raw materials, tariff protection and banking credits, these industries are often at the mercy of the iron and steel magnates.

### Where are the Markets?

The textile and chemical industries have also seen an increase in their equipment and productive capacity without a corresponding growth of markets. With but few exceptions the majority of the French industries have up to now been working at full pressure. Now they are experiencing difficulties. Since the end of September, a slowing down is to be noticed in the factories. They are above all complaining of the scarcity of money, the difficulties of floating loans, the restrictions of credits.

The French economic press is full of lamentations of this kind. The industrialists are looking for credits abroad. They maintain that they cannot get on without such credits, but the more they feel this need, the more indignant are they at the conditions imposed upon them by the foreign banks. The railways have been obliged to contract loans in Switzerland (60 million Swiss francs) and in Holland (30 million florins). Other large firms are preparing to follow suit. Attempts are being made to introduce the system of privileged shares. The general meeting of the Kuhlmann establishments (a chemical trust) on September 8th, voted an augmentation of the company's capital (190 millions) by issuing a hundred thousand nominal privileged shares (each with 10 votes).

Two big French raw metal firms, Pennarroya (lead) and Pechiney (aluminium) have also created privileged shares reserved for French people "with full confidence" chosen by the administrative board. Furthermore, there is a bill put forward by François Marsal in the Senate actually demanding that this system should be made compulsory.

### When Loans Fall Due

The finance of the French State does not yet seem to have experienced any amelioration whatsoever. Quite recently Tardieu, Minister of Public Works, literally declared:

"It is something anyhow to have been able to purchase in six weeks sufficient banknotes to cover our foreign exchanges until November."

Therefore, the State only feels itself more or less assured up to November. But the foreign loans to be repaid come precisely after November. By the month of March, 1927, several milliards will have to be found. The renewal of the bonds may not come off, and demands for mass redemption may be forthcoming. This situation may also become worse owing to the harvest failure, to compensate for which France will be obliged to import about 15 million quintals (certain sources say

even 20 million of foreign corn. At the same time an uninterrupted progressive increase in the cost of living may be observed, in spite of the Government's measures aimed at normalising prices. This is nothing to be surprised at when the Government declares that it counts on the support of the traders to combat the profiteers (what a godsend!). The railways have raised their tariffs from 28 to 30 per cent. and every day the tax assessors turn up with new sheets and fiscal impositions grow.

The "sinking fund" of the Defence Bonds, having the tobacco monopoly as a guarantee, has decided to issue its first loan of three milliard francs.

The industrial campaign against the eight-hour day and against any idea of raising wages becomes more extensive and intensive every day. Certain industries of the Paris district have already decided on how to profit by the unemployment which they consider imminent, so as to be able to select their workers and only retain those whom they think suitable.

"There will be a period of social difficulties here," write the papers, while adding that the officials and workers must understand the "national" necessity of the sacrifices that will be asked of them.

### Sacrifices—from the Workers

To sum up we may say that there is a slowing down in certain industries, a lack of floating capital, a rise of discount rates from 6 to 7½ per cent. (therefore credit restrictions) an adverse trade balance for the first seven months (2½ milliards), a progressive increase in the cost of living, and at the same time no decrease but rather an increase in the floating State debt—such are the fundamental factors of the economic life of France.

On the other hand, we see a campaign for the suppression of the eight-hour day, for "social sacrifices," and national and international capitalist agreements. The campaign to lease out the State monopolies, to reduce the municipal funds and to hand over the exploitation of State railways to private enterprise, is becoming almost violent. Certain circles are again talking of the advantage of selling or leasing certain colonies to America or even to Germany.

The rivalry in which antagonisms between certain groups of capitalist interests make themselves felt, in respect to the stabilisation of the franc, is revealed in the various stabilisation plans. One group, the export industries are against "legal" i.e., forced and obligatory stabilisation; they would like to see an actual stabilisation arising "normally" by the simple play of economic laws. On the contrary the representatives of the agricultural associations seem to be pleading for a "legal" stabilisation. The petty bourgeois and peasant circles, and in general the holders of certain stocks or quantities of paper francs, would like a complete revaluation.

Naturally, the economic and social crisis which the stabilisation of the franc is heralding will complicate the financial situation of the State. It will help to create a new expenditure of wealth and capital, and will cause a new political re-classification of parties and groups because it will establish new relations of class forces. This will not happen without serious and tena-

(Continued at foot of p. 11.)

# Changes in the Austrian Social Democrats

J. Strasser

THE Vienna International was organisationally disposed of at the Hamburg Congress. But its spirit lived on, that is to say, the Centrists wriggled timorously in the rough fists of reformism, and true to their fundamental conviction, considered: "I wriggle, so I must exist," as a real sign of life. They even pretended to be very confident and declared that the entire Second International must be imbued with the spirit of the Vienna Two and a Half International. They even say so now.

Thus the Centrist leaders who only recently returned at Hamburg into the fold of the Second International, have greeted the Swiss Centrists, who are also beginning to think of the home journey, as dear comrades in the struggle for the sublime ideas of Centrism. By this they would like to conceal that to-day they have even ceased to wriggle.

The severest blow was dealt by Otto Bauer, in the draft programme which the Austrian Social-Democrats will make law for all their future action at their coming Party Congress. This programme shows clearly that the Second International intends to become a band of mercenaries of the League of Nations! In this programme Centrism has arrived (by a certainly rather belated self-analysis) at a full recognition of its reformist nature.

Bukharin has already said in these pages everything that can be said on this subject from our viewpoint. Nevertheless, his criticism needs supplementing on a small but not unimportant point. When he wrote, he did not know that the Austrian Social-Democrats want to change radically not only their programme, but also their organisational rules.

Bukharin pointed out that the draft programme has not a word to say about various new phenomena, for instance Soviet Russia. Well, the Executive Committee of the Austrian Social Democratic Party has done with its amendments to the organisational rules what Otto Bauer failed to do in the draft programme. For among the paragraphs which the Executive Committee of the Party wants to alter is paragraph 2, the wording of which runs as follows:

"Anyone who has been guilty of a gross offence

against the principles of the Party programme or the interests of the Social-Democratic Party, who belongs to another Party, is active for another Party, or has committed a dishonourable action, cannot be a member of the Party."

The addendum proposed by the Executive Committee of the Party to paragraph 2 is to be as follows:

"Anyone who works for another Party or who works on the political field together with members of other parties or with organisations not belonging to the Party without the consent of the competent Party organs cannot belong to the Party."

This new paragraph 2 does not mention the Soviet Union, but it refers to it. The Austrian Social-Democrats are rather annoyed with the Social-Democratic members of the workers' delegation who came to Russia and now, having returned to Austria, are telling the Austrian workers what they have seen there.

## What it Means

To begin with, the Social-Democratic fakirs did their utmost to dissuade Social-Democratic members of the delegation from this visit to Russia. Subsequently when the troublesome delegates came home, the first thing that greeted them was Otto Bauer's complaint that they had not behaved as they should have done. Bauer added, however, that there was no idea of organisational measures against the Social-Democratic delegates to Soviet Russia.

This was followed by sabotage, which even degenerated into violence, on the part of the minor fakirs who attempted to disturb the meetings held to report on Soviet Russia. Finally, one organisation proposed that three of the delegates be expelled from the Party.

Although from the Social-Democratic viewpoint these expulsions are probably necessary, they are nevertheless very unpleasant. The new paragraph 2 will spare the Social-Democratic Party such unpleasantness: it empowers it to expel people who want to go to Russia before they have even carried out their criminal intention.

But the new paragraph 2 has also other charms. The united front tactic of our Austrian comrades has not been without results. It has aroused many Social-Democratic workers to opposition against the policy of the fakirs. The amended paragraph 2 will teach these rebels a lesson. The loose wording of the paragraph enables the Party Executive to expel a Party member for the simple reason that he associates with Communists.

Karl Renner, the lawyer-philosopher of Austro-Marxism, can now begin to investigate the changes in the functions of Social-Democratic rules and statutes. By means of the old paragraph 2, the Social-Democratic Party wanted to dissociate itself from its neighbours, the Right; in the new paragraph 2, it draws a line between itself and everything which stands on its Left!

(Continued from p. 10.)

cious struggles. The examples of Germany and England are highly instructive.

The material existence of the working class and the political liberties it has won are directly threatened. It is just possible that the aspirations of the Poincaré Government, though everything that is reactionary and brutal is united in it, will be thwarted by events.

In face of such perspectives, without talking of growing prospects of war, besides the wars in Syria and Morocco, our French Communist Party will not fail to fulfil the tasks which face it. It will not fail immediately to establish a political line corresponding with these perspectives, and at the same time to find appropriate slogans comprehensible to the masses.

# The German Ultra-Left

By Clara Zetkin

*Continued from the issue of October 30.*

ON the fundamental question of the Russian Revolution—the direction which economic development is taking in the U.S.S.R.—the “Memorandum”\* does not say straight away “In the Soviet Union economic development is going steadily towards Socialism under the leadership of the Communist Party.” Its attitude to this question is the reverse of straightforward; it proceeds by allusions, by touching on questions without bringing them to a logical conclusion, rather than by the much lauded “brutal outspokenness about what in the opinion of the authors constitutes the most serious and most recent cause of the political strife in the Soviet C.P.”

These outpourings should be really headed: “Ye that have placed your hopes in the Comintern for the liberation of the working class, abandon these hopes—unless it be really possible, with the help of the Left fractions and the opposition in the Soviet C.P., to overcome the revolution-tired ‘Stalin majority.’”

According to the “Memorandum” the majority represents “the theory that Socialism in Russia can be fully accomplished within ‘national limits’ without the help of the proletarian revolution in the advanced countries to guarantee this victory. Given such a conception it cannot be expected that the liquidatory tendencies which are becoming stronger and stronger in all Parties of the Comintern can be stemmed by the majority of the Soviet C.P. On the contrary the actions and theories of the majority of the Soviet C.P. only strengthen all the liquidatory tendencies in the Comintern.”

## Just Lies

All this is nothing but a mass of lies. What really matters is that the authors do not let the reader, who is to be supplied with material and theoretical guidance, know what will be the nature of the “Socialism built within national limits” by the “Soviet C.P. Majority.”

Between the lines of the “Memorandum” there peeps out a fantastic picture of Socialism “within national limits” in the Soviet Union. It is a picture of the “kulak” State in a democratic guise, the work of the one-time revolutionary Soviet C.P. which, under Stalin’s and Bukharin’s leadership, has developed, via several bourgeois stages, into a “petty bourgeois reformist party,” something after the Right Social Revolutionary style. However, the authors of the “Memorandum” are cautious Falstaffs. “Discretion is the better part of valour.” What Katz, Korsch and Mrs. Fischer shout “brutally” to the world, in unison with the leading Left and Right Social Democrats, the authors of the “Memorandum” hiss and whisper in allusions and deductions.

The opposition theory of the alleged “national-self-limitation” of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union,

\* The reference is to a Memorandum in which certain ultra-Left groups in Germany have published “Material on the Russian Question.”

of desertion by the Soviet C.P. from the army of the International revolutionary proletariat, is an infamous libel pure and simple. It heaps ignominy on the Party which clearly and surely pointed and is still pointing the way to the Russian and also the world proletariat—on the Party which despite the storm and stress of revolutionary struggles, the problems and difficulties of Socialist construction, and a world of enemies surrounding it, has never deserted international proletarian solidarity—on the Party which has been always mindful of the ties which bind the Russian Revolution and the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union with the revolutionary struggle and triumph of the exploited classes in other countries.

## Insult to Russian Workers

The ultra-Left “theory” insults the Russian workers who, full of self-sacrifice, have shown and are still showing their international solidarity by their magnificent support of the locked-out miners in Great Britain, thereby setting a shining example to the working class of the world. These workers, who are imbued with the strongest possible feeling of international solidarity, are supposed to be allowing their leading class party to rest content with “national self-limitation,” and to bury the proletarian world revolution. You lily-livered professors of ultra-Left wisdom, why are you so faint-hearted?

The ultra-Left prophecy concerning the development of the Party in the Soviet Union has for its only support an alleged fundamental conception of the majority, and even this support is more in the nature of a prop. So the “Memorandum” declares very cautiously that this fundamental conception “is naturally not admitted in so many words” but is put forward “with loud and would-be Left phraseology, filled with abuse of opposition pessimism.”

## Limiting the Revolution

What is this fundamental conception of the majority which is so carefully withheld? It “considers that revolution outside Russia has come to an end, *i.e.*,” it accepts the possibility in the near future of another prosperous period for European capitalism in this or that form (for instance in a form dictated by America) and endeavours therefore to build up Soviet Russia separately, while the more sensible leaders of this tendency must surely realise that “national self-limitation” cannot lead to the complete building up of Socialism.” In this assertion we see once more a swindle and theoretical confusion intertwined. The Bukharins, Stalins and their followers do not imagine that a revolution so far-reaching and important as the proletarian Socialist revolution can be “completed” by means of the social revolution in the Soviet Union alone, and that it can be shut up within the frontiers of one country. This is the idea held by those who have learned nothing from history, which among other things shows that a bour-

### The German Ultra-Left—continued

geois revolution such as the great French revolution spread over the whole of Europe and took about a century before it was "completed."

Although history no longer travels in the old-fashioned post-chaise, but dashes along on a racing motor car, one must still take into consideration that the proletarian revolution is a much deeper and more far-reaching historical process than a bourgeois revolution. Satisfaction with "national self-limitation" of the proletarian revolution is impossible. It is out of the question, because of the ever-growing economic and political inter-dependence of the world.

### The Party's Supreme Aim

Contrary to Social Democratic expectations, the proletarian revolution was able to start first of all in Russia. But it will not be "completed" until it has taken its stormy course through every country, and its creative power has been spent internationally.

The comrades "around Stalin" have learned from Engels that they can make history as it should be made. They see and know the threads which openly and secretly connect the Soviet Union with world economy and world politics. Not for a single moment have they indulged in the illusion that the final victory of Socialism can be achieved on the territory of the first Socialist Soviet State. The policy of the Central Committee of the Soviet C.P. is firmly and without vacillation directed towards the proletarian world revolution. International revolutionary solidarity is its supreme law.

That law determines the relations with the workers in the non-Soviet States, with the Comintern and all its Parties.

Although they have no real talent for poetry, the authors of the "Memorandum" are indulging in fantastic ravings when they try to make the "Left elements" believe that the majority is relegating the world revolution to a museum of antiquities because they imagine that a "prosperous period for European capitalism is probable." The Soviet C.P. certainly appreciates at its full value the great influence which periods of prosperity or crisis can exercise under capitalism on the trend of history. But a crisis, like a wave of prosperity, is only one factor in the trend of history. Objective as well as subjective forces of many shapes and forms must collaborate in order to call to life the proletarian revolution. The imperialist world war, the victorious revolution in Russia, the miserable crippled revolution in Germany—the whole post-war period confirms this.

### Stabilisation—with Crises.

It is rank un-Communist pessimism and fatalism to imagine that whenever it is confronted by a new period of relative stabilisation of European capitalism, the revolutionary proletarian class struggle must inevitably be transformed into a peaceful *pastorale*. A period of stabilisation intensifies the objective differences between the classes, and multiplies internationally the cause of conflict between States. It is fraught with crises and wars.

World capitalism no longer has the possibilities of development which British capital once had. A period of stabilisation can pave the way for the progress of the

proletarian world revolution, and it must do so provided the Communist Parties fulfil their historic task. No armistice and no class truce, no disarmament, a steady struggle until the great decisive battle is won—such is their slogan.

The effect of a proletarian revolution in the more developed capitalist States on the Soviet Union would probably be quite different from that represented in the "Memorandum." In the latter, the world revolution is at one moment the whipping boy, who has committed the crime of being late and who alone is to blame for the continued existence of the N.E.P. in the Soviet Union and for the fact that capitalist forces and relics still live, and at another the *deus ex machina* who, "his hands full of fruit and garlands, brings to the earth the gifts of Olympus," solving the most difficult problems with the greatest ease—"as you like it."

No Marxist doubts that the proletarian revolution in countries with advanced capitalist development will considerably facilitate and accelerate Socialist construction in the Soviet Union. The latter, which is in the midst of Socialist construction, is no doubt one of the main props of the advancing world revolution and will continue to be so in the future. The proletarian revolution is not, as the reformists imagine, a democratic act of parliament. . . . [Several lines omitted owing to the exigencies of "British freedom."]

The country where a revolution is going on can at first give no economic assistance to the Soviet Union. The latter on the contrary will not only support the former morally. . . . [More lines omitted.]

### No Miracles

Apart from these hard facts, the victoriously advancing proletarian world revolution will be unable to work the miracle of changing the social structure of a gigantic agrarian State in the twinkling of an eye, and solve all the problems connected therewith as if it were a morning wind dispersing the night mist.

Here is yet another "pearl" from the ultra-Left treasure chest of the "Memorandum." In order to prove the "liquidatory" character of the crisis in the Soviet C.P. and the Comintern, it foists on the leaders of the majority the theory "that the N.E.P. is the direct and the only correct way for the victory of Socialism over all non-Socialist forms of economy."

This theory is—probably to the chagrin of the ultra-Left—Lenin's theory. This past master of revolutionary thought and revolutionary deed considered the N.E.P. not only a bitter necessity in Russia, in order to secure the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry—he even counted the N.E.P. as the only way to connect the millions of peasant farms with the centralised and planned-out economy of the Socialist State and to incorporate them in it!

To-day, through the market and its exchange of goods (this market, however, to be eliminated as Socialist State industry and the network of co-operatives rapidly develop) a higher standard of culture and purposeful economic and political actions on the part of the Soviet State are gradually converting the small peasant enterprises into modern mechanised co-operative enterprises.

This implies that the N.E.P. cannot be a "nationally limited" Russian transition phase. It will be an international transitional form of economy, in all

**The German Ultra-Left**—continued

countries where the world revolution encounters a considerable number of small peasant farms, for the immediate socialisation of which objective and subjective premises are still lacking.

It goes without saying that during the revolution in every country of this kind the N.E.P. will assume the shape necessitated by the given historical milieu, just as the N.E.P. in the Soviet Union has its specific "national traits."

Further, it is a foregone conclusion that under certain circumstances, the discipline of "Military Communism" will be inevitable. Sane judgment of concrete conditions in their entirety makes the Soviet Union the conscious driving power of the proletarian world revolution, a power which supports the latter by precept and deeds, by example and brotherly help. What the authors of the "Memorandum" deride as "national self-limitation" and brand as heresy is the recognition that it is an international and revolutionary duty to build up the Soviet Union as rapidly as possible on a truly Socialist basis.

The will of the Soviet C.P. to Socialist construction shows that it is now, as before, imbued with the Leninist spirit. It will give life and breath to the precept of the master "that the task of the victorious revolution consists in carrying out to the greatest extent allowed by the conditions prevailing in the country, the development, support and encouragement of revolution in all countries."

**A Gruesome Story**

The "Memorandum" must have its say about the revolt of the Opposition in the Soviet C.P. against the theory and practice of "national self-limitation" supported by the overwhelming majority of the Party. The gruesome story of "national self-limitation" is necessary to make the impending liquidation of all Communist Parties and the Comintern plausible, a liquidation which is to be the last word in the "Right development" of the Soviet C.P., in which the "Left elements" believe and which they dread.

For nothing less than this liquidation is, according to the "Memorandum" one of the objects of the struggle between the majority and minority. Let us see what the ultra-Left pamphlet has to say against the "fraction" majority re this "objectively" planned crime.

"The Stalin policy on an international scale brings forward more and more formless alliances, wings, delegations, and similar formations, whilst the Communist Parties are made to take a back seat, ideologically at first, all of which must naturally have organisational consequences (liquidation) . . . If the nationally-limited tendency is served with palatable theoretical sauce, the danger of the obliteration of the role of the Communist world Party becomes very great, and it will be impossible to stem the growth of liquidatory tendencies, particularly if the prospect held out by the Stalin majority were to be correct. . . . If Russia goes in for national limitation and can develop towards complete Socialism, all the international Labour movement will have to do is to protect Soviet Russia against imperialist military attacks, and this task can be perhaps best performed by Centrist, pacifist, broad

Parties, alliances, wings, groups, etc., even if their fighting capacity be not very great."

On the other hand, the "question of power" recedes more and more into the background as far as the Communist Parties are concerned, hypnotised as they are by the alliance and "wing" theory. An example and warning is given by the C.P. of Germany, which has been nothing but a heap of ruins since the talented leadership of the Fischer group came to an end. Then there is the Communist Party of France, which is no longer of any account, because it is beginning to recover from the blessings of ultra-Left foolishness.

**A Hobby-horse**

There are, above all, the warning lessons of the General Strike in Great Britain, which illustrated more vividly than anything else the intensity of the tactical differences, as well as differences of principle, between the overwhelming majority and the Opposition bloc in the Soviet C.P. The General Strike in Great Britain is degraded by the German ultra-Left to a wooden hobby-horse, on which they gallop up and down beside the Opposition in the Soviet C.P., in the campaign against the dragon of the Stalin majority.

But what makes the "Memorandum" fulminate against the "alliances," "Left Wings" and workers' delegations, and groan and sigh about the dissolution of the Comintern? This is the old rejection of united front tactics, the profound hatred for it on the part of those who would be Left at all costs. Since Lenin, at the Third World Congress of the Communist International, determinedly directed the course of the proletarian world Party into the channel of stubborn struggle for the capture of the masses, the open or hypocritically disguised hatred of the ultra-Left of all Communist Parties for the united front tactics has marked the history of the Comintern.

This ultra-Left rejection of the Red United Front would separate the Communist Parties from the sources of revolutionary power, the proletarian masses. This kind of "splendid isolation" means capitulation to the Right, capitulation to the treacherous reformist leaders, that is, capitulation to the bourgeoisie.

**"Left Wings"**

The "Memorandum" cannot call as witness comrade Zinoviev in connection with its fulminations against the "alliances," "Left Wings," and similar formations. As one of the leaders in the Soviet C.P. and as President of the Communist International, he has been an eloquent advocate of their formation and crystallisation. As if "alliances," "Left Wings," workers' delegations could mean the death and not more life, strength and greater power for the Communist Parties and their leading world organisation!

All this is done at a time when the offensive of the world bourgeoisie and the shameful treachery of the reformists cry out for energetic militant action by revolutionary proletarian Parties and for the leadership of the masses! If no Communist Parties existed, they would have to be formed, The "formless" Left groupings of the proletarian masses can become effective, i.e., can justify their historical existence, only under the leadership of the Communist Parties. The formation of such organisations is another incentive to the crystallisation of Communist Parties, ideologically and organisationally

**The German Ultra-Left**—continued

welded together, because only such Parties can lead these organisations. For such Communist Parties the proletarian united front tactics are effective preparation for the conquest of State Power, an advance of millions towards the revolution.

**Alliance—with the Devil**

With regard to both theory and practice the "Memorandum" endeavours to utilise the conflict in the Soviet C.P. as a sort of jugglers' trick, creating the illusion of anti-Leninist Right development which appears every now and then. However, facts destroy with relentless vigour this juggling of the ultra-Left. A particularly objective and instructive fact is the conclusion of peace and a fighting alliance between the "new Opposition" and comrade Trotsky, I say and write deliberately "and comrade Trotsky," who was looked upon by the ultra-Left in the Comintern as a sort of anti-Christ of Leninism.

"Anathema est!" The flood of eloquence has hardly subsided, the streams of printers' ink are hardly dry, which were let loose to fight against Trotsky's "Menshevism." Comrade Trotsky has not revised nor retracted his views on "fundamental questions of the Russian Revolution," on the "world revolution," and the "Bolshevik conception of democracy, Party discipline and Party Unity." But—"Right about turn!"

I must say that the "Memorandum" is rather perplexed how to deal with this event, and finds nothing better to say than: "this is not—as asserted for very obvious purposes—a question of the reversion of the old Bolsheviks to the positions of Trotskyism, but rather a question of a coalition against a certain course, the course of the Stalin majority, which these Opposition comrades consider fatal."

It is no secret to anyone that comrade Zinoviev was an indefatigable driving force in the national and international campaign against comrade Trotsky. Arm in arm with him, comrade Zinoviev is now fighting for the demands which only a little while ago stamped Trotsky in his eyes as one who is demoralising and destroying the Party. He marches side by side with him, although only a little while ago he wanted to insist not only on reprimanding Trotsky but on expelling him from the Party.

**To Expel Trotsky**

The conflict between comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev and the Party and its policy was only in its initial stage when the majority of the Central Committee, appreciating Trotsky's great merits and talents, shielded him and prevented his expulsion from the Party. Comrade Zinoviev declared at the Plenum and also elsewhere that his campaign against Trotsky was one of the greatest political mistakes of his life. It is not Trotsky who appeared as a penitent before the Plenum—it was comrade Zinoviev who went to Canossa to him.

The opposition groups which are forming themselves into an alliance led by comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky include others beside the "Trotskyites." These are so much to the Right that the "Memorandum" only mentions them shamefacedly as "other former opposition groupings." First and foremost must be considered the remnants of the old so-called "Labour Opposition," which was at one time led by comrade

Shliapnikov. To-day its prophet and chief is Medvediev.

In a letter to the Party organisations in Baku, he put forward among other things the following aims: the transfer of industry to foreign capitalists by means of concessions (i.e., to deliver up the Soviet industry to them); the dissolution of the R.I.L.U. and the Communist International, a return to the fold of the Second International, a reform of the Party and the State on the basis of bourgeois democracy. The President of the Communist International has been repeatedly but vainly asked by the Political Bureau to take action against this avowed liquidatorship. He failed to do so, on the plea brought forward at the session of the Central Committee of the Central Control Committee. "As you are directing the attack towards the Left, I thought it inexpedient to attack the Left comrade Medvediev." His struggle against the policy of the Party made it impossible for him to wield the pen in this direction.

Fractional hatred against "Bukharin and his Red Professors" and against the "Stalin majority" keeps together in a brotherly union Trotskyites, followers of Zinoviev, and liquidators of the type of Medvediev, i.e., champions of diametrically opposed conceptions, and gives the present Opposition the same "motley" stamp which the "Memorandum" assigns to the Opposition around Trotsky (1923). Motley and devoid of principles—thy name is Opposition!

**Lack of Principle**

Certainly, lack of principle makes the Opposition shrink away timidly and vacillate hither and thither when confronted by new social phenomena and the problems resulting therefrom. Failure to understand the trend of the development of Socialism in the extremely strange historical conditions of the Soviet Union, as well as the historical development in the world outside the Soviet Union, is the very root of this lack of principle. Hence the disbelief in the strength and capacity of the proletariat in the Soviet Union to lead its ally, the peasantry, along the path of Socialist development. This disbelief leads to the denial of the possibility of society evolving into Socialism by means of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union.

The "kulak State" is the bogey which frightens the timorous as an irrevocable fate. From the Oppositional trend of thought, there grins triumphantly the Menshevik, reformist theory that the October revolution was a premature confinement which brought a deformed being into the world. The Oppositional elements in the Soviet C.P. have very nearly reached the limit where Bolshevism ceases and Menshevism begins—ideologically through their attitude to the economic and political questions and the tasks of Socialist construction, organisationally through their fraction-building and disruptive activity. Whatever their decision may be—some of them acting consciously and others being "objectively" driven—the Soviet C.P., the Party created by Lenin and imbued with his spirit, will continue its progress on Bolshevik lines.

The "Memorandum" takes care not to take into account the consequences of the theory and practice of the Opposition in the Soviet C.P., for these consequences might perplex the "Left elements." They must not see whither the road of hyper-radicalism leads. This is probably not seen even by the authors of the pam-

**The German Ultra-Left—continued**

phlet themselves. They are like the "Sunday horse-man" who, when asked by a friend he met on the way what was his destination, said: "Ask my nag."

The nag of phrasology drives the ultra-Left onwards in a haphazard fashion until it deposits them finally in the bourgeois stable. The "Memorandum" calls the crisis in the Soviet C.P. a crisis in the Comintern. Even if it be so, the crisis here as well as there has reached the stage of convalescence. In the Soviet C.P. it is helping to preserve and consolidate the powerful political class organisation of the proletariat, the leader in revolutionary battles and in the building up of Socialism. In the national sections of the Comintern the crisis is connected with the ideological and organisational growth of the revolutionary proletarian mass parties, parties which will be able to solve the same task victoriously.

The "Memorandum" does not contribute to the Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties. On the contrary it puts obstacles in its way by presenting the conflict in the Soviet C.P. in an erroneous, nay false light. It would be wrong and unjust to place the responsibility for the "Memorandum" on the shoulders of the proletarians who, because of confused impetuosity, have joined the "Wedding Opposition" and the "Urbahn's group." The responsibility rests with those who would like to persuade themselves and the workers that they are leaders, because they can make as much din as possible with an ultra-Left trumpet.

It is, therefore, not a timorous conjuring up of ghosts when one sees the spectres of the expelled Katz, Korsch and Fischer, and other important ultra-Left personalities stalk in the columns of the "Memorandum."

# International Reformism in its True Colours

(NOTES OF A TRADE UNIONIST)

By A. Lozovsky

## The Amsterdam Suitor and his American Fiancee

**D**URING the last two years the Amsterdamites have been making desperate efforts to get a firm foothold in America, and to bring under their influence all the diehard trade union bureaucrats of that country whose value is quoted very highly on the Amsterdam exchange. They have showered their attentions particularly lavishly on the American Federation of Labour, whose dollars would considerably replenish the disordered state of the finances of the Amsterdam business men.

But the American fiancee is a practical woman, and, therefore, takes up a more than coldblooded attitude towards the fascinating and sweet-sounding serenades of these Amsterdam wooers, guided by the home truth that marital co-habitation should be based on careful account-keeping. And what kind of accountancy is it to exchange the full value and full weight of dollars for the problematic and harried joys of the Amsterdam love-makers? The marriage did not come off, for there was neither love nor a balance sheet.

But the Amsterdamites never say die, and, therefore, they have decided to begin the conquest of America through Mexico. For this purpose a whole delegation was sent there composed of the cream of Amsterdam (Purcell, Brown, Jouhaux, Mertens, Dissmann, Buoizzi, Duhr, Zhulavsky, Lindiey, Fimmen, Ben Smith and Largo-Caballero), which offered the hand and heart of the Amsterdam International to the Mexican trade unions. We do not know how this premarital journey will finish, but we are compelled to note one more than strange circumstance. When the Bureau of the Amsterdam International at its last meeting on September 21st, began to examine the question of the composition of the delegation, the following transpired:

"Taking into consideration," reads the official decision, "the circumstances in which the delegation to Mexico was appointed, the Executive Committees states that it takes no responsibility whatever for it, either on its own behalf or on that of the I.F.T.U. ("Bulletin

of the International Federation of Trade Unions," September 28th).

There's a fine story! The delegation comprises the most prominent leaders of the Amsterdam International and suddenly the Bureau does not assume responsibility! In that case who sends the delegation? Who will bear the expenditure? If the delegation was sent by Amsterdam, why does it refuse responsibility? If Amsterdam pays the expenses—then why waste money on an irresponsible delegation?

One can only draw the following conclusions from the decision of the Bureau of the Amsterdam International: (1) the delegation or part of the delegation was elected not by Amsterdam, but by someone else; (2) the money is given not by Amsterdam, but by someone else. But who is this mysterious stranger? None other than the Mexican Gompers, the Minister of Labour in the Calles Government, leader of the Mexican trade unions, Senor Morones. The Mexican fiancee organises a visit of the bridegrooms, and pays the expenses of their transportation, while Amsterdam sends its leaders and does not take responsibility for them!

## The Happy Argonauts

There were four of them: Dissmann, Ilg, Labet and Brownlie. They were sent to the United States from the Metal Workers' International in order to beseech the American metal workers to affiliate on any conditions whatsoever to the organisation which by tradition bears the name of the International. One of these four, by way of a little variety, bears the name of a "Left Winger," but this pseudonym does not in the slightest degree hide his reformist finger-nails, and he is just as independent of Socialism as his honourable colleagues. The only reason for their being in the service of Labour organisations is to fulfil—some for conscience sake, others for money—the pre-conceived plans of the bosses.

The Argonauts being thus constituted, the success of the expedition was assured in advance, for the

nearer a trade union leader is to the employer, the more honour and respect he encounters among his American colleagues. The emissaries of the Berne Metal Workers' International exceeded themselves in pleasing eloquence and—oh, joy!—the Congress of the American Metal Workers' Union decided to affiliate to the Berne International, but on one little condition. "The Union reserves itself the right (so reads the resolution) not to take part in activities of the International contrary to the policy of the American Federation of Labour." That is what 100 per cent. American internationalism looks like!

Do you think the Argonauts reacted in any way to this conditional affiliation? Do you think that with the statutes in their hands they even attempted to object to this disgraceful behaviour? Do you think that these gentlemen remembered their negotiations with the Metal Workers' Union of the U.S.S.R., to which they presented all kinds of conditions, shielding themselves behind the "dignity and prestige" of their International? Not a bit of it! These gentlemen are ready to submit to any humiliating conditions from the American union, if only they can receive support in their struggle against the growing influence of Communism.

But will the American uncle help? It would be interesting to know what Robert Dissmann, the professor of "chatterology," the "Left Wing" ventriloquist of Right Wing policy, thinks about this.

#### The Miners' International "Helps" British Miners

Two weeks before the beginning of the coal lock-out, on April 16th, the Executive Committee of the Miners' International met in Brussels and passed a high-sounding resolution about its readiness, in case of need, to declare an international strike in support of the British miners. It is worth reading this resolution through over and over again. It is as follows:

"The international mining crisis will lead in an increasing degree to grave social conflicts. Alleviation of the crisis can only be brought about by

means of international regulation of the production and distribution of coal. The Executive Committee of the International Miners' Federation is in favour of complete support of the British miners in their struggle against extension of working hours, decrease of wages, and the abolition of the national wage scale. The Executive Committee is ready in case of necessity to take the necessary steps to obstruct the importation of coal to Great Britain from abroad. If, after discussion with the respective national miners' unions, these measures also include the decision to declare an international miners' strike, the Executive Committee of the International Miners' Federation will decide to compel every national organisation not to stop the strike until a sound basis for resumption of work be found in all countries. In the event of an international strike breaking out, the Executive Committee of the International Miners' Federation will be looked upon as a Strike Committee whose instructions are obligatory for all countries."

When this resolution was passed we remarked that this decision of the E.C. of the Miners' International was nothing more than a gesture, that the Amsterdamites would not move a finger to give real help to the miners. Six months have passed. During this long period the Miners' International has had sufficient time to fulfil its promise. But this International has done nothing, absolutely nothing to aid the miners, though it has done a great deal against them.

Why, look at the conduct of the Secretary of this International, Hodges, alone! This blackleg from day to day was engaged in England in disorganising the miners' ranks, while the E.C. of the Miners' International generously and sympathetically looked on at his strike-breaking work.

The German, Belgian and French Amsterdamites circulated reports that an international strike had not taken place because the British had not asked their colleagues to fulfil the obligation they had taken upon themselves on April 16th. In reply to this vile demagoguery the British Miners' Federation raised the question of an international strike. What did the Amsterdamites who were pinned to the wall reply? The following is the official decision of the Executive of the Miners' International on September 1st—at the beginning of the sixth month of the miners' lock-out.

"The request of the British miners concerning the declaration of an international miners' strike has been thoroughly examined. The majority of the national organisations affiliated to the Federation, not being able to satisfy this request, have nevertheless given the assurance that they will continue financial support to the British miners on an increased scale. The national organisations comprising the Federation will, as before (!) apply the maximum efforts to prevent the importation of coal to England."

Compare this resolution with the resolution of April 16th and you will say: Surely this is open and cynical blacklegging! And the British miners are still putting some kind of hopes in this band of blacklegs, and giving their money to support the thrice-branded agent of capitalism—Hodges!

---



---

The Review that all serious  
students of the Working-  
Class Movement  
should read  
is the

## Communist Review

MONTHLY . . . . . FOURPENCE

**International Reformism—continued**

Take three of four hundred fat, pudding-faced, smooth-shaven people, adorn each of them with three or four gold rings, gold watches with massive gold chains, gather them all together into one hall decorated with national flags, scat them in strong armchairs (remembering that a real leader weighs not less than a couple of hundredweight) shove a thick expensive cigar into each of their mouths, put a flask of strong anti-Communist perfume of the Ku-Klux-Klan brand into their hands, and finally stir up all this mixture of heavy-weights in the holy water of popish eloquence, and you will get the Congress of the American Federation of Labour. This Congress is now in session at Detroit, and it is difficult even for an experienced eye to distinguish whether this is a Labour congress or the congress of the Anti-Communist League.

**The Soviet Rock in the American Bog**

At this Congress an unusual event took place. An officially-invited speaker, Mr. Sherwood Eddy, a missionary who has recently returned from the U.S.S.R., took the liberty of saying that in the U.S.S.R. people walk on their feet and not on their heads, that there is an economic revival there, that the Soviet country is developing, and that it would not be a bad thing to send a delegation to the U.S.S.R., etc. This was unexpected, and what is more, unpleasant.

If Mr. Sherwood Eddy had come on to the platform clothed only in a top hat, without the remaining attributes of civilisation, it would have perplexed those present less than a favourable opinion on the U.S.S.R. It badly jarred the nerves of all the trade union bureaucrats, and the chairman, William Green, hastened to make a "denial." He, of course, knows that things are bad in the U.S.S.R., better than anyone else does, for how could the workers obtain anything if they preached terrible Bolshevik doctrines?

Mr. Green maintained the honour of the old firm and the Detroit Congress remained in its old position. One may see how reactionary was this conclave of corrupt and perverted trade union bureaucrats from the fact that even Bromley—to whose visiting card the miners have added a well-merited epithet—even Bromley appeared to be frightfully "Left" in this American Zoo. How could they not fear Bolshevism, how could they not wax furious, when in this terrible wild country of Russia, we can get along without the bourgeoisie! Have you ever heard of such a thing—living without millionaires! Whom would they pray for every day, whom would they bow to, whose boots would they lick? Hence the anti-Soviet speeches of William Green. What these Mr. Greens mean is that lackeys must have bosses.

**The United Front of Amsterdam and the Bosses**

It was at Hamburg, during the time of the strike at the docks. The Social-Democratic Transport Workers' Union did not want to allow a strike at all costs, but the workers, as will be remembered, would not agree to the proposals of the arbitration court. The strike began unanimously despite the will of the trade union leaders.

On the second day of the strike, the Minister of Labour declared the decision of the arbitration court to

be binding for the workers and bosses. When the decision of the Ministry of Labour was announced, two appeals appeared in a Social-Democratic paper, the "Hamburger Echo," of October 2nd, of identical length and identical nature: one appeal was from the Transport Union, the other from the employers' association with a summons to return to work.

We give below side by side both these appeals to strikers, printed in the very thick of the strike:

"In view of the fact that the Minister of Labour has declared the arbitration decisions binding for the port enterprises, the movement for improving wages and labour conditions undertaken by the German Transport Workers' Union and the Central Union of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen and also consequently by the port sections of both organisations, has finished. Therefore no kind of support whatsoever should be expected from the organisations mentioned. Payment of strike pay cannot take place even in a covert form. The rumours spread among the port workers by irresponsible elements that the port workers will be rendered some kind of financial aid—even in the event of the impossibility of the said organisations recognising the strike—are unfounded."

**District Administration of the Greater Hamburg Union of Transport Workers, Hamburg Committee of Engineers and Firemen's Union.**

"By a decision of Herr Minister of Labour, the ruling of the Arbitration Court of September 29th is proclaimed binding on workers and employers: work in the port should not be stopped and the improved wages contemplated by the arbitration award should be paid to the workers. The wage scales for loading and unloading concerns for shore warehouses, etc., equal: 7.20 marks for the first shift, 8.20 marks for the second and 8.64 marks for the third shift. For the so-called overtime shift, a special addition of 20 per cent. will be paid. Supplementary wage scales are also extended, and in a considerable number of cases increased. The workers will be taken on in the usual employment bureaux and receive wages in the usual way."

**Union of Port Employers, Hamburg.**

Of these two proclamations the Social-Democratic, we should say, is the more succulent. The Amsterdamites, like the employers, declare the decision of the arbitration court to be sacred, but threaten to deprive the strikers of financial aid if the latter take heed of "irresponsible elements."

We are faced with a united front of the Amsterdamites and the bosses in order to smash the movement. The Amsterdamites are against the united front when they have the task of rallying the workers of various tendencies against the employers; but when it is a question of the united front against the workers' interests, then they are in the front ranks. The strike at the Hamburg docks was smashed, thanks to the united front of the Amsterdamites and the employers. Let the German workers remember what the united front à la Amsterdam looks like!

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES.**

The subscription rate for the new edition of the "Communist International" is 8s. 6d. per year, post free.

# Tasks of the Party Schools

By A. Kurella

**R**ECENTLY the largest Parties of our International have shown an increasing desire to organise regular Party schools. These schools have not yet been in existence for long.

The opportunity to tackle the tasks connected with these schools is provided by the period of relative stabilisation of capitalism, during which no acute revolutionary struggles take place and the Party membership evinces a growing desire to learn. As a necessary preparation for the new period of struggle to come, a thorough and more intensive theoretical education of the Party cadres is made necessary by the relatively low theoretical level of the Party membership which is apparent, and the need to permeate the entire Party with the principles of real Leninist tactics in this period of relative stabilisation, pregnant with ultra-Left and Right dangers.

Hence the building of Central Party schools is an important task for all parties. During the past two years the first attempts in this direction have been made in France, two central Party schools have been started; in Czecho-Slovakia one such school; in England a short time ago a similar school began to function; in Germany work has been done to prepare for such a school in the coming year.\*

The Central Party Schools ought now to have a different character from that which they had in the old Social-Democratic parties. Not only from the point of view of their ideological content, their curriculum—that is a matter of course—but also in regard to the immediate tasks which confront these schools as part of the entire activity of the Parties. The majority of

\* The Central School organised by the American Workers' Party does not belong to the type here discussed.

our Parties are at present in an exceptional or transitional stage, and the Party schools must be so organised as to serve the special necessities of this stage.

As a result of the re-organisation on the basis of factory groups during the last two years, an entire change of structure has taken place in our Parties. This transformation has not only considerably increased the need for capable Party officials (secretaries, group leaders, organisers, etc., as well as paid officials), but has completely changed the nature of the life of the lower Party organs and consequently the task which confronts the officials. Activity in the Party has become more extended and more specialised, with the result that these various tasks in new spheres (in the factories, in the trade unions, in the country, amongst women, in the municipalities and in the numerous mass non-Party organisations) demand increased general political education from the officials.

At the same time the Parties have lost a large number of their old officials. Some, the one-time heroes of the old local groups, have been laid on one side by the change-over to the basis of factory groups, since they have no foothold in the factories, being petty bourgeois elements. Others have deserted the Party policy, or the Party altogether, in the course of internal struggles about policy. Then again, there are others who, because of the checks which have been suffered, have become confused about Communism and inactive.

Those that have remained are for the most part tough, practical local workers, who for years have been up to their ears in petty organisational and agitational tasks and have never had time to think of their theoretical development.

During the same period a more or less large stratum

## Books YOU Must Read!

### On The Road To Insurrection —N. Lenin

140 pages  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free, 1/8]

**I**N the pages of this brilliant book we follow the mighty genius of Lenin through that intense period in Russia following the "July Days" until the final seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in November, 1917. The problems that the Russian working class met with, and, under the guidance of Lenin, solved during these months, are akin to the problems that the working class in every other country has also to prepare to face.

### The Political Meaning of The Great Strike

—J. T. Murphy

138 pages  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free 1/8]

**T**HE only book on the General Strike. A convincing explanation of the reasons for the Strike, of its "failure" and of the changes it must bring in the whole of the Labour Movement in this country.

### Ten Days That Shook The World —John Reed

368 pages  
Paper covers, 2/6 [post free, 2/9]  
Cloth covers, 4/6 [post free, 4/10½]

**T**HE book which Lenin read three times and of which he said: "Unreservedly do I recommend 'Ten Days That Shook the World' to the workers of the

world. Here is a book which I should like to see published in millions of copies and translated into all languages . . ."

### The State and Revolution —N. Lenin

Second Edition  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free 1/7½]

**T**HE book that more than any other gives the essence of Lenin's theory of the transition to Socialism. Lenin finished the book a few weeks before the October Revolution of 1917 confirmed the correctness of his analysis.

Order your copies from the  
**Communist Bookshop**  
16 King Street WC2

**Tasks of the Party Schools—continued**

of new, active forces has developed everywhere, and these are mainly, or you might say entirely, from the ranks of the working class. These are the elements who for the most part are filled with this desire to learn.

These young officials and group leaders from the ranks of the workers must constitute the material for the intensive theoretical work of the Party. The most advanced elements from this stratum of active Party workers provide most of the pupils for the Central Party schools.

We find the almost purely proletarian composition of these cadres reflected also in the students at the central schools. In the first central school held by the Communist Party of France, the students were as follows: 47 factory workers and seven office employees. Amongst these there were 20 local secretaries, six group secretaries and seven active workers of the Y.C.L.; the others worked in the various mass organisations (all these offices are unpaid). In the second French school there were 31 factory workers (including 17 engineers), five employees and two housewives.

In the Czecho-Slovakian schools there were 43 factory workers, two poor peasants, eight employees in Labour organisations (trade unions, etc.), and one housewife. These pupils have certain outstanding traits, which must be taken into consideration when the curriculum and methods in the schools are being decided.

**Youth is Learning**

At the present moment, they are mostly young people between 25 and 30.

In both the French Central Schools and in the Czecho-Slovakian Central Schools the ages of the students were as follows:

(First French School, Bobigny, Nov., 1924;  
Second ditto, Clichy, Nov., 1925; Czecho-Slovak School, Prague, March, 1926.)

Age	1st French School	2nd French School
18	1	—
20	4	—
21	2	—
22	2	—
23	3	2
24	2	6
25	5	7
26	2	3
27	9	6
28	6	3
29	5	3
30	2	3
31	2	2
32	3	1
34	1	1
36	—	1
39	1	—

The Czecho-Slovakian School had two under 20, 47 between 20 and 30, and only five over 30.

The majority of these comrades are comparatively new to the Party. In the two French schools, nine were in the Party in 1918 or before, 31 joined in 1919 and 1920, 28 in 1921 and 1922, and 27 between 1922 and 1925. In the Czecho-Slovakian School 24 were in the Party before it split off from the Social-Democrats, 23 joined from 1921 to 1923 inclusive, eight in 1924 and two in 1925.

These comrades mainly got their ideological and practical education during the war and in the struggles about policy during the post-war period. This has the advantage that they are but little burdened by Social-Democratic and Syndicalist tendencies, but the drawback that they are practically without contact with the past of the revolutionary Labour movement of their country, and possess an almost negligible Marxist education.

The majority of these comrades have read more of Lenin's writings than of those of Marx and Engels, while as a result of the slight attention which the Party has paid to the theoretical foundation of the daily problems in the modern Labour movement this Leninist education has remained to a large extent abstract and has not been linked up with our daily policy.

The theoretical education which these comrades possess has been gained by chance. It consists of fragments which are devoid of any real contact. All these facts point to the tasks which face our central Party schools.

They cannot at present be centres for deep and thorough study of the scientific fundamental facts of our policy. Rather they must bear the stamp of schools for an extended political basic education. Their task is to accustom scholars to systematic, regulated theoretical study and to develop in them the first habits of scientific political work.

It must be the task of these schools to knit together the fragmentary knowledge and experiences of these working class officials, so that they can understand how they are to approach all questions of Party work from the Marxist-Leninist theoretical point of view.

At the same time, these schools must impart to the young Party functionaries an increased knowledge of the analysis of classic capitalism (including its latest forms) and serve as an introduction to the concrete Marxist-Leninist analysis of the modern revolutionary Labour movement, in the first instance in their own country.

**Practical Work**

The Central Party Schools at the present time should not be of too long a duration since, as we already remarked, they will be mainly for the use of young working class elements, not accustomed to devote any length of time to purely intellectual work. Our experience has shown that present-day students grow tired and cease to be receptive after about two or three months. It would be absurd to teach these students longer than the period in which they are able to participate in the school work with full freshness and vigour. After two or three months, the students should return to practical Party work.

In this respect it is advisable not to entrust them with tasks of a too complicated nature, but to let them return to their old work, and after they have applied what they have learned to their old sphere of work, then to entrust them with functions of a higher order.

To avoid the danger of these students becoming too attracted to purely theoretical, abstract treatment of Marxist-Leninist problems, and thereby becoming estranged from practical Party work (we have had examples of students becoming regular bookworms because of the incorrect policy of Party schools), more time must

**International Reformism**—continued

be devoted in the curriculum of Central Party Schools to the treatment of practical, organisational Party questions. The best practical manner of attaining this is for the students in the central schools to be closely connected with the practical work of the Party organisations at the centre.

This also has the advantage of giving those students who come from the provinces an opportunity to become acquainted with the activity of Party organisations in the capital, directly under the leadership of the

Party centre; they can thereby learn very much that will improve the work in their own provincial organisations.

Both central schools organised by the French Party and the Czecho-Slovakian school have been carried on on these principles. A new type of Party school has thereby been created which may well serve as an example to the other sections of the Communist International. New methods of teaching have been developed in this new type of Party school, which are also of great importance. The school itself and these methods will form the basis for a later more detailed article.

# Glossary of the Pan-European Congress

By H. Gunter

ON October 3rd the adherents of the Pan-European idea assembled in Vienna. The founder of the movement, Herr von Coudenhove-Calergi (declared by his supporters to be specially predestined as the unifier of Europe by virtue of his relationship with five nations including Japan) marshalled a stately army of famous names. Among the list of speakers there are names such as those of the prelate Dr. Ignatz Seipel, the last Minister of King Karl the Last of Austria and "Saviour" of the Austrian bourgeoisie; Paul Loebe, President of the German Reichstag, and George von Lukacs, one-time Hungarian Finance Minister and organiser of corruption. Then some pacifists, like Goldschied, a reformist jingo; like Father Goehre and George Bernard, foes of the eight-hour day; Max Cohen, and two well-known bourgeois political economists, Francois Delaisi and Julius Wolff.

This gay-coloured scratch society, supplemented by councillors of literary confusion from all lands, felt itself called upon to save Europe; they met under the benevolent patronage of the Austrian Government which granted these gentlemen admission—thank you!—without passport visas.

To be sure the salvation of Europe is no monopoly of the Pan-Europeanites. Simultaneously other "Internationalists" and friends of the League of Nations foregathered in Salzburg, not so far from Vienna. They were likewise under the chairmanship of a Minister of the Old Austria, Herr Dumba. These gentry, who a few years ago raised (comparatively) a lot of dust under the name of the "Völkerbundsliga" (League for the League of Nations), to-day meet with doors closed against the public—perhaps this indicates the way that Pan-Europe will also go!

Since the Pan-European idea is beginning to muddle many heads we will, before giving any general appraisal of this Congress, characterise if possible, the attitude of the various elements interested in the Congress.

## England and Russia Excluded

Wherever Löbe and Herriot are at the head of things, the "Vorwaerts" must fiddle the tune. So long as Hilferding's super-imperialist world empire, headed by America, does not yet exist, one simply has to support the amalgamation of Continental Europe.

"To-day the dismemberment of the Continent of Europe has become a universal menace, just

as was formerly the national dismemberment of Germany or Italy. The progressive approach of the European peoples to one another, the breaking down of the barriers, aimed at a United States of Europe, has, therefore, become a question of life or death for all.

"Europe can no longer afford the luxury of war under penalty of ruin—neither military nor economic warfare. Faced with the tremendous economic areas of America and Asia, it is ridiculous for every country in Europe of 60, 40, 15 or even only 2 million inhabitants to be encircled by its own protective tariff walls. Economic development itself collides with these walls and must tear them down. The German-French-Belgian Steel Trust is a beginning. A European customs union is the end."

The parallel of the unification of Germany, which was carried out by the Prussian bayonets, is characteristic of the transition of German Social-Democracy to "Bismarckism." The name of the German Social-Democrats' man for foreign affairs to-day is—Stresemann:

"Not only does the international steel trust lie on this road, but also Locarno, Geneva and Thoiry. If Germany and France mean business they can pledge not only themselves, but also the remaining European States—in so far as these are not yet ready of their own accord—to dispense with weapons in case of conflict and to seek a settlement in a Court of Arbitration.

"Frontiers thereby lose their military significance; though they still retain their economic and national meaning. There remains the roping in of the productive forces by the many-meshed net of the protective tariff, and there remains the problematic situation of the national minorities. A movement that has set itself the goal of Pan-Europe must constantly concern itself with the removal of economic traffic barriers, and with the protection of the national minorities. Only when Europeans are at home throughout Europe, at least as far as the Geneva citizen is in Zurich or the Berliner in Munich, will Pan-Europe be a reality."

If a certain uneasiness still burdens the German worker, as to the attitude of the non-European countries, the worthy "Vorwaerts" re-assures its readers:

**The Pan-European Congress**—continued

"The Coudenhove idea excludes England and Russia from the structural plan of united Europe. But this exclusion does not proceed from hostile intentions, but from practical considerations. England is an empire that is at home not only in Europe, but also in America, Asia, Africa and Australia. Russia spanning the land bridge from Central Europe to the Far East would extend it into a world league embracing all continents, and this world league would, therefore, be dragged into every conflict that might break out in any corner of the earth.

"In this there is undoubtedly a danger, even if it is difficult to conceive of the British Islander or the European Russian as 'Foreigners in Europe.' In any event the Pan-European Union has at all times decisively defended itself against the suspicion that it was swayed by anything resembling the Napoleonic Continental policy directed against England or any other power."

What sort of a conflict in "any corner of the earth"? The pacifism of the Pan-Europeanites does not seem to be quite weatherproof after all.

"European peace in its present form possesses very materialistic guardian angels. The steely fight of some of these angels of peace became audible when, in the League of Nations at Geneva, M. Loucheur was followed by the German delegate, von Rheinbaden, who greeted the promising reconciliation of the peoples as a sign of the collaboration of the 'practical economists.'

"This is already true: the name of the Franco-German angel of peace is Ore, that of the Anglo-Italian is Oil. And the United States of Europe are for the time being the united iron-containing States of Western Europe.

"Under such conditions the good folks and bad musicians who to-day assemble in Vienna at the Pan-European Congress assume a somewhat peculiar savour. The capitalist press triumphantly greets the formation of the Steel Trust as a step towards Pan-Europe, it is true enough, but is this the Pan-Europe that they have in mind? Very motley-coloured guests are met at the Pan-European Congress, but what unites them is a ringing slogan behind which very widely differing political concepts take refuge, an idea for the realisation of which each has a different plan. The Pan-Europeans mean well; only each one means something different."

These are the words of greeting devoted to the Congress by the Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung." Forced into an unpleasant position by these welcome guests of the Vienna press gang, the "tried and true Party comrades" and friends of Otto Bauer try a bit of whitewash.

**Support all the Same**

But the full story is still to come: despite the "steely fight," the Austro-Marxists are nevertheless in favour of capitalist pacifism. We read:

"But these resistances within the German bourgeoisie, which find their expression in clashes between the German Peoples' Party and the Nationalists, and in France are represented by

Poincaré championing the national Steel Trust against Loucheur, the international Cartel's man—above and beyond these resistances capitalism goes on its way. There can be no question but that at the moment this way is towards peace. But perhaps (perhaps?) only for the purpose of opposing the coalesced economic forces of one continent, extending their organisation far beyond national boundaries, in more terrible rivalry against the similarly coalesced power of the other. Powerful industrial cartels which regulate and distribute the production of European countries in order to be able to counter balance American competition; powerful organisations which dictate prices across all national and customs barriers, assuring peace and profit—this is the Pan-Europe of the capitalists."

Thus to a certain degree the Austro-Marxists recognise that the pacification of Europe is to take place according to the venerable proverb of the Austrian peasant: "Heiliger Florian, hoer mich an, bewahr mein Haus und zuend' andere an!" ("Saint Florian, hear me; protect my house and set fire to the others!"). But what can they say to excuse their comrades Loebe, Blum and Goehre, who are taking part in this performance?

The explanation is rather tortuous and betrays a Freudian touch:

"Thus especially in the Western countries every thought of a European unification becomes a protest, of import to Socialists, against the bigotted nationalism of exclusion. Thus the idea of opposing at least the combined power of a united Europe to the might of gigantic American capitalism, that soulless machine whose films and loans rise up with terrible precision against European culture—this is a prospect that can seize upon Socialists also."

Wilhelm the Last said this much more clearly and simply: "Peoples of Europe, guard your holiest treasures." The difference between him and the adherents of Herr Coudenhove is merely that Wilhelm conceived of the salvation of Europe through its Prussianisation, while before Herren Coudenhove and Seipel there floats the vista of Europe's Austrianisation.

**A Little Episode**

One little episode deserves notice. The "Deutsch-Oesterreichische Volksbund" (German-Austrian People's League), an organisation counting among its founders the "Pan-European" Loebe, which has for its goal the affiliation of Austria to Germany, appealed to the Congress to consider this question. The Secretariat however, rejected this somewhat ticklish question in a letter in which it states:

"Our Congress, which unlike the League of Nations is an organisation not of governments but of private societies, cannot undertake the task of solving single European questions, but for the present works to create an atmosphere which will prepare the way for and make possible the future settlement of all European questions in a spirit of peace, justice and collaboration."

To use the words of the "Neue Freie Presse," the organ of the Austrian Pan-Europeanites: "The first step towards Pan-Europe is the international iron pact—an extremely tranquil atmosphere."

It is worthy of note that the governments, which

### The Pan-European Congress—continued

have hitherto shown themselves very friendly towards Pan-Europe, remained completely estranged from the Vienna Congress. In the list of participants we find neither Herriot nor Benes, and among active politicians of major importance in their own countries, there are only Seipel and the Hungarian monarchist, Gratz.

In a definite letter of refusal the Czech "Pan-European," Benes clearly said why he did not come to Vienna: he recognised the great moral and political value of the idea, but at the same time remarked that "such ideas are never carried into effect in their original form." "The Pan-European movement will not alter the world, but it will become one of the major collaborators in the new Europe."

The answer is clear: the Hon. Pan-Europeanists can claim the continued support of the Governments only if they eschew everything that can in any way clash with the will of the mighty in the various States, and confine themselves to maturing the sentimental pacifism of certain strata harassed by the fear of American competition.

### The U.S.S.R.

The only question that raised something of a storm at the Congress was the attitude to be taken up towards Russia. Here there exists a vast difference between the various "Pan-Europeanites." While Coudenhove rejects the admission of England and Russia into his Pan-Europe, the Menshevik, W. Voitinski, who has recently become known in Germany for his statistical works, favoured the admission of Russia because he insists upon the European character of Russia, and because he has not yet abandoned all hopes of making Russia democratic.

This idea was fought by Kerensky, who has likewise joined with the Pan-Europeanites, among whom he desires to preach war against Soviet Russia. For him the exclusion of Russia from the Pan-European State is a matter of course.

That this Pan-Europe is intended as a good battering-ram against the Soviet power is also clear. This is expressed with especial frankness by the Dutch Social-Democratic "Het Volk":

"Russia is a great menace to all Europe. It is, with the exception of Turkey, the only not altogether European State bordering on Europe. An organised and industrialised Russia will not be equalled in military strength by any single European power. By its very existence Russia exerts a constant pressure on the European States."

While the Left Social-Democrats thus half-heartedly welcome Pan-Europeanism as a weapon in the struggle against America, thereby making the fears of the European capitalists their own, the Right Social-Democrats see in the Pan-European idea a means for unity against Russia, whose development now threatens to become dangerous to them.

Herr Coudenhove has tried, to be sure, to argue so as to satisfy all tendencies, and especially to deny the hostile intentions of Pan-Europe. But he will have very little success in this. All these Pan-European strivings, in the last analysis, are nothing but the expressions of the endeavours of the Continental bourgeoisie to unite into definite groupings governed by common interests. Pan-Europe is the music of the Franco-German rapprochement.

BOOK

REVIEWS



## An Illegal Periodical

KOMMUNISTITCHESKO ISDANYA, a periodical of the C.P. of Bulgaria, Nos. 1 to 14.

POST-WAR reaction in the Balkans, which frequently takes the form of sanguinary terrorism (as in Bulgaria and Roumania) has driven all the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries into a state of complete illegality. The only insignificant exception is Greece, where the political life of the bourgeoisie is less "stabilised" and the struggle between the big imperialist powers finds expression in the armed struggle of the various sections of the Greek bourgeoisie. Owing to these circumstances, the Communist Party of Greece is occasionally given a breathing space in a state of semi-legality. This semi-legality does not, however, obscure the fundamental policy of the Party, and thus we have throughout the Balkans illegal periodicals of the Communist Parties, which in spite of the terror will help the vanguard of the proletariat to be always ready for participation in armed struggle.

The founding of a periodical for the C.P. of Bulgaria was first discussed in January, 1926. It was to appear as a fortnightly publication. But the fierce terrorism, which not only exacts many human victims but also impedes enormously the technical work of an illegal Party, has prevented its publication of the periodical twice a month. It appears monthly as "double numbers" of about 70 pages. Editorially as well as technically the periodical is steadily improving.

In the preface which appeared as "national programme" in the first number, it is emphasised that this journal does not require a programme of its own, since it looks upon itself as the natural successor to the "Novo Vremya" (New Times), the five year old theoretical organ of the C.P. of Bulgaria, and also because the periodical belongs to a Party with a programme and must consequently have the same programme.

### Everyday Questions

The periodical sets out to give an opportunity to solve everyday questions—political questions as well as those connected with the internal life of the Party. In this respect we may reiterate what we have already said: the contents of the periodical have greatly improved. In the first numbers very little space was allotted to the economic and political life of Bulgaria. In recent numbers there are entire articles, and very good ones, dealing with these questions. The titles of some of them run: (1) The economic crisis; (2) The Concession policy of the Bulgarian government compared with the Concession policy of the U.S.S.R.; (3) What have the municipal elections shown? (4) The refugee question; (5) Bulgarian Communists and the Macedonian question.

There have been far fewer articles about the internal life of the Party and the burning question of the trade unions. Only in number 13-14 (July, 1926), do we say much too little has been written about inner Party questions, that is to say the Party crises of the last few years. Thus, for instance, apart from the articles by comrade K. Wedjen, "The Renegade," in No. 3-4 and "The Natural Way of a Renegade," in No. 9-12, we find only one other article: "Disguised Liquidatorship." We believe that the Bulgarian comrades who went through bitter Party strife for their C.P., who a long time before the war had to face splits and did not shrink from them, must now again tread openly

**An Illegal Periodical.**—continued.

the difficult and at the same time inevitable path which leads to a correct Party policy.

It is no secret that the C.P. of Bulgaria has gone through several crises (I have in mind particularly the period after June 9th, 1923), and no one will be inclined to believe that in this period of "stabilisation," which effects even Bulgaria, all can be well with the C.P. of Bulgaria, particularly after the Tsankoff terror.

The periodical of the Party, which is published under great difficulties, and is circulated throughout the country under still greater difficulties and even at the price of human lives, should reflect the inner life of the Party better than is actually the case. Excellent articles by comrade K. Wedjen on "The Fate of Communism in Bulgaria" have appeared in the periodical, but for the time being these articles deal only with the historical side of this problem. Thus, for instance, the articles which have hitherto appeared are as follows: (a) "The Paris Commune in the Light of Marxist Criticism"; (b) "The Decembrists' Rising and Leninism"; (c) "The Struggle for Socialist Ideology and the Proletarian Party"; (d) "The Beginning of the Socialist Movement in Bulgaria"; (e) "The Marxist Explanation of the Social Development of Bulgaria"; (f) "The Struggle of Marxism against Bourgeois and Petty Bourgeois Ideology"; (h) "The First Stage and the Way to Proletarian Socialism"; (i) "The Period of 'Narrow' Socialism"; (k) "The Role of the 'Narrow' Socialists and the Trade Union Movement of Bulgaria," etc.

These form a real history of the C.P. of Bulgaria, of the modern Labour movement in Bulgaria . . . which, however, cannot be easily digested in the present epoch of class struggles. As to the article on "Diplomatic Preludes of the Balkan War of 1912," it could have been very well left out, or published in a legal periodical or newspaper.

We must not overlook an important article by comrade W. Kolarov on "Blagow as Founder and Leader of the C.P. of Bulgaria."

The periodical gives much interesting material on the everyday White Terror in the country and also plenty of material on international political life and on Party life.

On the whole it must be said that this journal carries on to a certain extent the traditions, the good old traditions of the C.P. of Bulgaria. Before and after the war the C.P. of Bulgaria had a very efficient Marxist or Leninist publishing department (in this respect the C.P. of Bulgaria came next to Russia and Germany) and now, too, the illegal periodical certainly provides excellent material. The Bulgarian comrades are voracious readers, a thing which is always good.

A.B.

**Set Them Free**

**JUSTICE FOR MAX HOELZ.** By Erich Muehsam. (The "Rote Hilfe," Berlin, 1926.)

**F**OR over five years comrade Max Hoelz, the "Red General" of Central Germany, has been tortured in the prisons of the Ebert-Hindenburg Republic. His name is a shining symbol of the proletarian class war. The demand for an amnesty for him has become the fighting slogan in Germany, for the release of all the working class revolutionaries in jail.

This in itself justifies the publication of a new pamphlet by the "Rote Hilfe" of Germany (the German section of the International Class War Prisoners' Aid) which pays special attention to the "Hoelz case."

But this pamphlet, passionately and vividly written, pursues and fulfils another aim as well; it brings forward the need for an amnesty as a big political question. Even in Labour circles one used to come across the opinion that in sentencing Hoelz the bourgeoisie was not merely actuated by its naked brutal thirst for vengeance and violence, but was actually right from the purely legal standpoint when it condemned "the criminal Hoelz" to lifelong imprisonment. Every unprejudiced reader of Erich Muehsam's work "the only aim of which"—according to the author—"is to prove that the sentence of lifelong imprisonment is untenable on legal and moral grounds," must realise the decidedly class character of the trial, and must recognise that for Max Hoelz—as a proletarian revolutionary—not one voice from the "civilised" world was raised, outside the ranks of the conscious proletariat (the Social-Democracy stood and still stands in this case on the other side of the barricades).

A few words on the weak points of the pamphlet. Where Muehsam philosophises he is crude. In the pamphlet (and not only in the title) "justice" is considered as a thing in itself. To the Anarchist "justice" appears as a non-class idea. Side by side with sayings from Bakunin, Novalis, and Voltaire, Muehsam quotes Karl Marx's words: "The civilisation and justice of the bourgeois order becomes unvarnished savagery and lawless revenge as soon as the slaves of this order rise against their masters." But Marx places "bourgeois justice" on a par with "lawless revenge," while Muehsam uses the word justice—not in inverted commas—naively and in a non-class sense. He even appeals in the end to the national government to do "justice" to Max Hoelz.

Apart from these weak points, Muehsam's work is a valuable, an indispensable weapon in the every-day struggle for the release of Max Hoelz, for the release of all political prisoners. Therefore, this new "Rote Hilfe," pamphlet must be given mass circulation in the widest sense of the word, beyond the purely proletarian and national limits.

J. SCHLAFFER.

