

NO. 14 - NEW SERIES

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

WORKERS OF THE WORLD
UNITE!

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



NO.
14

6^d

Monthly Organ of the Executive Committee of the
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

THE COMMUNIST PARTY *of* G.T. BRITAIN
Publications Department

Now on Sale

THE ERRORS OF TROTSKYISM

A SYMPOSIUM



392 PAGES

Paper - 3s. 0d. Cloth - 5s. 0d. Postage extra

Contains, for the first time in English, the now famous Preface to Trotsky's book "1917" that started the recent controversy which has been so misrepresented by the capitalist press, together with the replies of the leaders of the Communist International.

Not merely a clash of brilliant personalities, but a permanent contribution to revolutionary theory. Not an intrigue for power, but the hammering-out of the tactics of the world revolution.

Get this book and get *all* the facts.

Order from the Communist Bookshop,
16 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C. 2

**WORKERS OF THE WORLD
UNITE!**

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



NO.

14

6^d

Monthly Organ of the Executive Committee of the
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

THE COMMUNIST PARTY of GT. BRITAIN
Publications Department

Now on Sale

THE ERRORS OF TROTSKYISM

A SYMPOSIUM



392 PAGES

Paper - 3s. 0d. Cloth - 5s. 0d. Postage extra

Contains, for the first time in English, the now famous Preface to Trotsky's book "1917" that started the recent controversy which has been so misrepresented by the capitalist press, together with the replies of the leaders of the Communist International.

Not merely a clash of brilliant personalities, but a permanent contribution to revolutionary theory. Not an intrigue for power, but the hammering-out of the tactics of the world revolution.

Get this book and get *all* the facts.

**Order from the Communist Bookshop,
16 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2**

The
**Communist
International**

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Appears simultaneously in
English, Russian, French
and German

Publishing Office:

Leningrad, Smolny, 63. Tel. 1.19.

Editor's Office:

Leningrad, Smolny, Zinoviev's Cabinet

Published at 16 King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.2

C O N T E N T S



American Imperialism—America To-Day. <i>Jay Lovestone</i>	- - - - -	3
The Social Basis of the Tsankoff Government. <i>V. Kolarov</i>	- - - - -	13
British Imperialist Plot Against the U.S.S.R. <i>A. Martynov</i>	- - - - -	31
The First Bolshevik Congress (For the 20th Anniversary) <i>N. Lenzner</i>	- - - - -	50
Letter from the E.C.C.I. to all Organisations and Members of the Communist Party of Germany		66
Rosa Luxemburg: Introduction to Political Economy <i>B. L.</i>	- - - - -	93

American Imperialism: America To-day

WHY have the American bourgeoisie proclaimed July 4th as the day on which to muster their military, naval and economic forces as a demonstration to the world of their prowess and lust for imperialist conquest? Why have the American capitalists chosen this day of the birth of the national independence of the Yankee bourgeois group as the day for flinging their political fists and flaunting their industrial resources in the face of the rest of the nations?

The choice by the American ruling class of July 4th as the day of their ostentatious display of their imperialist power is a logical historical consequence of a series of politico-economic events of primary importance. To the bourgeoisie of the United States, July 4th is no longer a symbol of the achievement of their national freedom from Great Britain. In 1925, July 4th symbolises in the arena of international politics the gravest menace of American imperialism to the national independence of many peoples and to the aspirations and struggles of the international proletariat for working class freedom.

Development of American Imperialism.

The story of the rise of American imperialism from a struggling group of thirteen British colonies to the dominant imperialist world power may be divided into three periods of economic development.

1. In the period 1763 to 1815 American capitalism was struggling for its right to exist as an independent national group.

2. From 1815 to 1893, the Yankee bourgeoisie consolidated their ranks and centralised their control of the means of production and exchange. In this stage of economic development there was laid the foundation for the present highly centralised form of government and the intense exploitation of the resources of the country on a more vast scale than has ever been known before.

3. From the economic point of view the year 1893 marks the beginning of the third—the present—the imperialist era, of American imperialism—the final stage of American capitalism. The American bourgeoisie to-day talk of “**spheres of influence**,” of the “**open door in the Far East**” and of the “**supremacy of the Pacific**.”

Politically speaking, America made its debut on the imperialist stage in 1898. This was the year of the successful war against Spain. Right after the victory over Spain, the Yankee bourgeoisie made the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean the sixth great American lake. Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, Guam and Hawaii soon fell under the sway of the Washington Wall Street Government. From this day, the United States has been accelerating the pace of its imperialist growth.

In Producing an Imperialist Giant.

The Yankee bourgeoisie to-day dominate an area of one hundred and fifty thousands square miles, inhabited by more than ten million people in Central America and in the Caribbean territory. The flag of Wall Street proudly waves in the Pacific over an island empire approximating an area of more than one hundred and twenty-five thousand square miles, populated by almost fifteen million people. **The area of this imperial domain is equivalent to the total combined area of England, France and Belgium.**

The declaration that America is the lending world power of capitalism is much more than a phrase. It is a fact of world wide significance. Imperialist America is no longer a country—gigantic as the stretch of land the United States proper and Alaska occupy. Imperialist America is to-day at least a continent. Imperialist America in reality is to-day more than a continent, more than two continents. **Imperialist America is, in some respects now, a world unto itself. The United States is at present the most self-supporting capitalist power.** The Yankee bourgeoisie have excellent, unexcelled harbours on the Atlantic and the Pacific. The Yankee imperialists dominate the railways spanning North, South and Central America.

The significance of this strategic location of American imperialism has thus been characterised with accuracy by Semple in his “**American History and Its Geographical Conditions** :”

“The most important geographical fact in the **past** history of the United States has been their location on the Atlantic, opposite Europe; the most important geographical fact in lending a distinctive character to the future history will probably be their location on the Pacific, opposite Asia.”

It has been said that the world war has made the United States the ruling imperialist power. At best such statements are only half truths. They are, therefore, doubly misleading and give one a wrong historical perspective. **It was only a matter of time for American imperialism to become the dominant power in international imperialist politics.** The magnificent, almost unlimited, resources in a contiguous vast stretch of land, the splendidly developed technique of the system of exploiting these resources, the excellent strategic geographical location—these have been only a few of the principle factors making for the swift development of the American national capitalist group.

The world war has only hastened the pace of this development. The world war with its years of intense destruction and uninterrupted self-impoverishment of America's European competitors, coupled with the stimulated, intensified economic development in the United States, has only brought nearer the inevitable supremacy of American imperialism.

America's Great Resources.

“We now hold three of the winning cards in the game for commercial greatness—iron, steel and coal. We have long been the granary of the world. We now aspire to be its workshop; then we want to be its clearing house.” These were the words uttered by the President of the American Bankers' Association as he opened its convention thirty years ago. But all of these aspirations have since then left the realm of desire. They are now realities. When one examines the extent of the control of the world's natural resources by the Yankee imperialists he finds that: America controls more than fifty per cent. of the world's monetary gold; forty-three per cent. of the world's output of coal; fifty-four per cent. of the iron and sixty-four per cent. of the steel; fifty-two per cent. of the world's timber; nearly seventy per cent. of the cotton produce; more than forty per cent. of the shoes manufactured, and well above ninety per cent. of the world's automobiles.

Within American boundaries there is found more than

half the world's total railway mileage. Out of every four telephones in the world, three are in the United States.

American workers are the most efficient in the world. They operate the best organised and most highly developed machinery of production and exchange. The productive efficiency of the American iron worker is to-day ten times what it was when the Declaration of Independence was signed on July 4, 1776. The steel worker in the United States is three times as efficient as his British brother. The American coal miner produces eight times as much to-day as he did when the United States constitution was adopted in 1787. The American coal miner digs two or three times the quantity of coal his British brother does in the same period of work.

Militarism and Navalism.

The American bourgeoisie are ever alert to maintain and to extend their imperialist domains. The Yankee capitalists never lose a moment to prevent the growth of sentiment at home opposed to their imperialist policies. In order to keep secure their present capitalist empire, their spheres of influence, their investments areas, and in order to extend their control over the resources and markets of the world, as well as to crush all opposition at home to their imperialist ventures, the Wall Street clique maintain a huge military machine and powerful naval armada.

Consequently the **cost of American imperialist defence has more than doubled in the last ten years.** The American Army has grown from about two hundred to nearly four hundred thousand in this decade. During this period the number of citizens under military training has more than doubled, having risen from 243,865 to 504,010.

Under the provisions of the National Defence Act of 1920 all American military sub-divisions have been centralised and unified. **The basis has been laid for a grand national army.** The United States is now partitioned into nine military districts. **The Assistant Chief of Staff has boasted that this plan "will provide a force of about three million men."** It is interesting to note that last year there were spent by the United States Government more than three million dollars for schools and colleges training Officers Reserve Corps. This is done in order to build up a permanent and powerful military caste.

It is axiomatic in modern warfare that a swift effective mobilisation of the industrial resources is essential to and an integral part of defence and offence. The insurance of such successes is the purpose of Coolidge's Defence Day and Muster Days. In 1924 more than sixteen million participated in some form or other in Defence Day rehearsals. Sixty-five hundred local demonstrations were then held throughout the country. 93,581 officers and men of the Regular Army, 167,633 of the National Guard, and 59,168 of the Organised Reserves participated in the 1924 Defence Day demonstrations. Present indications show that both in magnitude and display of military power and pomp, the 1925 demonstrations will exceed those of last year.

American imperialist, that is foreign, policy to-day is based on the navy. The American Navy is the corner-stone of the diplomacy of the United States. Washington heartily embraces the doctrine of the well-known naval authority, Admiral Mahan, who said: "**He who controls the seas controls the world.**" Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Roosevelt, has put this even more frankly and clearly when he said: "**Behind all the pronouncements of our State Department rests the power of our navy. It is the navy that turns these pronouncements from simple, unsupported statements into matter that must be given the gravest consideration by all nations.**"

Yankee naval fever rages to-day around submarines, fast cruisers and seaplanes. More than three billion dollars are now invested in the American Navy. In 1924, American naval manœuvres were held in the Caribbean. In 1925 similar manœuvres were held in the Pacific. In 1926, when the Dawes Plan will begin to strike its numerous unavoidable difficulties, the American naval manœuvres will very likely be held far out in the Atlantic.

In the words of Coolidge, it is also the aim of the American imperialists "**to keep abreast of other nations,**" in military and naval aviation. Hence the United States already has an aerial armada with a personnel of more than thirteen thousand men. Nor is the American General Staff neglecting the development of the technique of infernal chemical warfare.

The Yankee Octopus.

In various degrees, with the exception of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the world is virtually in bondage to American imperialism. Great Britain, a country which

but yesterday was at the top of the world financially, is now paying scores of millions of dollars annually to the American bourgeoisie and will continue to do so for sixty years longer. In 1924 the American capitalists increased their foreign holdings by more than a billion dollars.

Within the last decade the American bourgeoisie have augmented their foreign investments by more than seven billion dollars. Prior to the great World War the foreign holdings of the Yankee bourgeoisie totalled, at most, only two billion dollars. This sum was far less than the investments of the European capitalists in the United States at that time. But to-day the imprint of the American dollar has been etched on the coat of arms of practically every government of the world. American bankers have lent nearly ten billion dollars to the rest of the world. If we include the United States Government loans to foreign states, we find that **American imperialist investments have reached the fabulous figure of more than twenty billion dollars.**

There are at present invested more than two and a half billion American dollars in Canada.

The Latin-American countries owe the American capitalists more than four billion dollars.

Europe owes the Yankee bourgeoisie at least two billion dollars. This debt is growing and growing rapidly. The Dawes Plan has paved the way for a veritable avalanche of American investments in Europe. The United States and Great Britain are now engaged in fierce competition to secure the dominant hold on German industries. American bankers are privately financing Norwegian nitrate companies, Italian water power concerns, French railways, German municipalities, and electric firms. The Aluminium Company of America, controlled by Andrew W. Mellen, Secretary of the United States Treasury, owns at least one-third of the capital stock, five million kronen, of the Norwegian Nitrogen Company. The Westinghouse Company is likewise making appreciable investments in Norwegian concerns manufacturing telephone equipment. Recently the Standard Oil interests contracted for a thirty-five million dollar loan to Poland which bore an unusual feature in the contract, saying **“That in the event that any interruption of the service of the loan occur, the representative of the bondholders may administer the railroads in their interests.”** Little imagination is necessary to picture definitely what this would mean in the event of a general strike or revolution in Poland.

Asia and Africa pay interest to the Wall Street kings on an ever-growing sum. This has already reached a figure in the neighbourhood of one billion dollars invested by American capitalists in this part of the world. The American bourgeoisie are to-day manœuvring to get control of the Japanese concessions in China—the South Manchurian Railway and the Fushun colliery territory. Wall Street has its heart set on abolishing the British control of the Kailan mining administration in Chili—the largest coal producer in China.

The Yankee Financial Dictatorship.

The tentacles of the Yankee imperialist octopus have been fastened on many countries. The sun never sets on the American flag because the **sun never sets on the American dollar whose eagle's claws have been sunk into almost every country.**

By means of a swarm of so-called unofficial observers, American imperialism is dominating the international political chess board of capitalism.

Jeremiah W. Smith, a Boston corporation lawyer, is now serving as financial dictator over Hungary.

Gates W. McGarrah, the New York banker, and S. Parker Gilbert, Jnr., the New York corporation tool, are the virtual rulers of Germany to-day.

Persia is blessed with an American financial overseer, whose latest plans are to extend and strengthen the financial grip of Wall Street in this section of Asia. Bolivia, Haiti, Salvador and Nicaragua are afflicted with Yankee tax and customs collectors. At the time of writing, the former comptroller of the United States Treasury is a financial "adviser" of Panama. J. S. Hord, the notorious Yankee imperialist agent, is to-day serving as a "fiscal expert" for Ecuador.

Wall Street at Work.

The all-powerful American imperialist edifice rests on force and violence—against the weaker, the colonial peoples abroad and the working class at home.

In one year, ending June 30th, 1923, the American National Guard (that is the State militia) served on the firing line against striking workers in twenty-one States. Textile workers, coal miners and railway workers were the hardest hit by these legalised legions of force and violence employed by the capitalists to help lower wages and raise profits.

Admiral R. E. Coontz, who, until the June, 1925 naval

re-appointments, was serving as Commander-in-Chief of the Fleet, has very plainly characterised the mission of the American Navy in the following enlightening words: "**Naval forces are maintained throughout the Caribbean Sea for the purpose of keeping down revolution, protecting life and protecting our commerce.**"

The American Navy has been very busy, energetically protecting Yankee tobacco companies in the Near East. It is not an accident that an American naval officer of such high rank as Admiral Chester should be so keenly involved as the principal figure in the renowned Chester concession in Turkey.

In the Far East American marines and destroyers are defending Standard Oil interest at Hsingho and other capitalist interests in the very heart of China at the cost of many million dollars annually. American "soldiers of the sea," as the marines are lovingly called by Wall Street, form a big part of the international imperialist contingent to-day attempting to terrorise China. The Yankee marines have won their spurs as international strike-breakers. The Union of Banana Plantation workers, at Ceiba, Honduras, have had their strike broken by American marines. To-day these workers are forced to slave for sixteen hours a day at fifteen cents per day, because of the strike breaking prowess of Wall Street's "soldiers of the sea," who were landed from the United States battleship, Galveston.

Judge George Washington Williams, of Baltimore, is intimidating the defenceless population of the Virgin Islands and filling the natives with American democracy at the point of cold steel and by means of hot lead.

In Hawaii, the United States turnover, one John Farrington, a notorious sugar baron, is guilty of hounding and massacring thousands of striking Filipino sugar workers on the Islands.

On South America there has been forced by the Yankee imperialists the curse of national hatreds, jealousies and rivalries. American imperialists are responsible for fostering and maintaining bloody puppet governments in South America. Without the support of the Washington administration and without access to Wall Street's vaults, the Fascist Chile government wouldn't and couldn't ever have dared to drown in blood the revolt of the Chilean nitrate workers against the unbearable conditions in the nitrate fields dominated by New York banking interests.

Even in Europe the White Terrorists and Fascists owe a debt of thanks and exist and flourish primarily through the

grace of the almighty "Eagle" whose talons are dipped in oil and whose stomach is filled with gold.

The New America.

This is the American imperialist empire. Once America was the veritable **Pantry** of the world. Then it became the **manufacturer** and the banker of the world. To-day America is also the **policeman** of world bourgeois politics.

The fate of practically every capitalist government in the world is to-day in the hollow of the palm of Yankee imperialism. The dollar is to-day the basis of international capitalist exchange and credit. To-day the dollar has veto power over the basic legislation of every country where capitalism is supreme. The currency of every capitalist country rolls and rings within the line and to the tune of the Yankee gold dollar.

The Federal Reserve System of the United States has become the Federal Reserve of the world. Last year one of America's leading bankers stated: "We must look on our gold as the reserve, not only of the United States, but of virtually the whole world." There is more truth than rhetoric in this declaration. This is not a boast. This is not a threat. This is a gravely significant reality.

Last year when the French was on the toboggan, it was a hundred million dollar loan that, temporarily at least, slackened the pace of the slipping French currency. It was the huge Dawes dollar loan that gave German imperialism another lease of life. Recently the House of Morgan came to the rescue of Mussolini with a fifty million dollar loan to save the political necks of Fascism and the financial legs of the lira. **Only the establishment of a joint three hundred million dollar credit fund of the United States Federal Reserve Board and J. P. Morgan and Company could put Great Britain back on the gold standard.**

The Federal Reserve System of the United States has, since its inception, been the fountain source of the basic American foreign and domestic political policies. Having assumed world-wide character, the United States Federal Reserve System virtually determines and decrees the broad financial policies of the Yankee imperialist investors. No capitalist countries to-day legislate on important matters without openly or secretly consulting the American imperialist clique. The dread of American imperialist prowess has struck deep into the hearts of the weaker peoples and capitalist governments throughout the world. The slightest disregard of the welfare of American capitalist investors is a signal

for action or interference in one form or another by the Washington State Department.

The Yankee imperialist empire is a youthful, a vigorous and growing capitalist domain.

In America monopolists and financiers dominate every walk of economic political and social life.

The continuous outward flow, the increasing export of American finance capital, is now a veritable black thread running through the industrial and financial destinies, and the political development of every bourgeois country.

American trusts are vanquishing the trusts of other national capitalist groups in every trade lane of the world, in every market, on every stock exchange.

Let no one burden himself with the illusion that the present territorial boundaries of the Yankee imperialist empire are final. It is true the biggest capitalist powers have already divided the territory of the entire earth. Yet, **American imperialists are working overtime, quietly laying their plans to challenge and to change many of these boundaries.**

The Class Struggle in America.

Thus, the basis for the class struggle in the United States has been internationalised. Imperialism has supplied a further new condition for the class conflicts in America. The Yankee capitalists, through their ability to maintain high monopolistic profits, have seized upon the opportunity, have utilised the economic possibility, to win over to their fold, for the present at least, certain sections of the working class and to turn these sections away from the ranks of the proletarian struggle and to the virtual role of the defenders of the bourgeoisie and the capitalist system.

This explains the highly opportunistic character of the American Labour movement. This explains the great influence of the Labour aristocracy in America. This great influence and power of the bourgeoisified strata of the American working class is the basis out of which there has developed and there is spreading the movement for labour banking and numerous other intricate forms of class collaboration.

This opportunism has infiltrated the ranks of and manifests itself in countless ways in the activities of nearly every section of the American working class.

To give adequate, effective leadership to the class struggle in the United States is a task realisable only by a powerful, a highly centralised mass Communist Party, functioning as a well disciplined organic unity of the International Communist Party, the Comintern. **JAY LOVESTONE.**

The Social Basis of the Tsankoff Government

I. The Economic and Social Structure of the Country.

BULGARIA has a population of approximately 5 millions, 80 per cent. of which is in the villages and only 20 per cent. in the towns. The density of the population is 74 to the square mile. The peasant population is divided amongst 5,560 districts, the average number in each district being 700. There are 92 towns, of these only the capital, Sofia, has over 200,000 inhabitants. Two other towns have from 50-100,000 inhabitants, and six further towns from 20-50,000 inhabitants. These figures prove that Bulgaria is preponderatingly a peasant country.

A considerable section of the population in some of the peasant districts, such as Perschin, Gorna Oryechoviza, etc., works in the mines and in the industrial undertakings there, and a smaller section of the town population is engaged in agriculture. In 1910, 81 per cent. of the active population was engaged in agriculture and its allied occupations. The present situation is not considerably different to that before the war, for in this period industry has made no particular progress.

In 1908, the total area of land under cultivation amounted to 19,716,653 acres; of these 11,436,305 acres were in private hands divided between 705,820 owners. According to the area of land owned, the owners were made up as follows:

Smallest landowners with an area				up to	7½ acres	41.00 p.c.
Small	“	“	“	from 3½	up to 24½	“ 40.00 p.c.
Middle	“	“	“	“ 24½	“ 49	“ 14.35 p.c.
Larger	“	“	“	“ 49	“ 245	“ 4.20 p.c.
Large	“	“	“	over	245	“ 0.15 p.c.

The land areas owned were made up as follows (1910):

Smallest areas of land				up to	3 acres	16.10 p.c.
Small	“	“	“	from 3	“ 24½	“ 64.60 p.c.
Middle	“	“	“	“ 24½	“ 73½	“ 18.20 p.c.
Larger	“	“	“	“ 73½	“ 245	“ 1.00 p.c.
Large	“	“	“	over	245	“ 0.10 p.c.

In 1910, there were 160,256 wage-workers, together with their families, making a total of 267,000 people employed in agriculture and its allied occupations.

The alterations which have taken place since the war are not possible to determine with accuracy. But without doubt the process of proletarianisation has been strengthened. The general decay of agriculture and the derangement of peasant economy have both contributed to this. The relation between the large landowners and the other social groups in the village was altered to the disadvantage of the former by the loss of the Dobrudja, where at least one-sixth of the large landed estates were concentrated. The land reform of the Peasant Government brought no important alterations with it. Up to the end of 1923, 120,985 acres of private land were expropriated and 80,430 acres of public land. The right upon this land was recognised in the case of 79,527 landless and poor peasants, but only 780 persons finally received a total of 34,217 acres, or 43.14 acres each. After the overthrow of 9th June, the expropriation ceased and a part of the re-distribution was annulled.

The economy of the small owner is very primitive. The machine and even the plough have not yet made their way into the Bulgarian villages. To each 49 acres there is one iron plough. The greater part of the small proprietors possess no working animals. In 1920, from a total of 641,744 peasant undertakings, one-fourth possessed no working animals, and only one-third possessed carts, etc. This parcel of economy can only exist by the cultivation of tobacco, which is possible on a small area of land, but which demands a great expenditure of labour power. In 1923, 191,800 undertakings cultivated tobacco, that is, 30 per cent.

The Bulgarian bourgeois economists point out that a welcome transition is taking place from extensive agriculture (cereals) to intensive (tobacco, etc.) But they overlook, naturally, the derangement of the small peasant economy, the increasing exploitation of women and child labour and the overloading of the small undertakings with mortgages held by commercial capital. Whilst in 1924 the wholesale price for bread cereals had reached to 38 times its pre-war level, in the same period the price of tobacco has risen only around 6 or 7 times its pre-war level. It is clear that the small peasants in consequences of their lack of land and working animals have gone over to the production of tobacco, despite the fact that this latter is less advantageous. This dis-

tressed situation is utilised by the tobacco exporters, who have become one of the most powerful group of capitalists in the country. According to an approximate calculation, in the last five years they have enriched themselves at the cost of the poor tobacco producer to the extent of three milliards of Bulgarian levs.

Industry is still in its nucleus stage. With very few exceptions it is concentrated in the towns: the textile industry in Sliven and Gabrov, the sugar industry in Sofia and Philipopol, Ruschuk and Gorna Oryechoviza; the tobacco industry in Philipopol, Chaskov, Dubnitsa, etc. Before the war industry developed rather quickly, since then, however, it has come to a complete standstill. The census of 1922 showed that there were 1,541 industrial undertakings using over 10-horse power, in which 55,380 workers were permanently employed. A sum amounting to 5,758 million Bulgarian levs was invested in them. The tobacco industry employed 19,815 workers or 35.8 per cent. The mines 9,642 workers or 17.4 per cent. The food industry 7,543 or 13.6 per cent. The metal industry 4,482 or 8.1 per cent. Practically, the industrial army including its reserves totalled around 80,000 men. It must be pointed out that since the war the national industry is going over more and more into the hands of foreign capital, which enters the country, not to develop the productive forces, but to carry out unlimited exploitation. The Bulgarian industrialists, who enjoy no credit, have either sold their factories or turned their businesses into joint stock companies; in one form or another they have come under the control of foreign capital. The anxiety of the Bulgarian industrialists for the revolutionary movement also contributes to this process, for in order to avoid the risk, the capitalists invest their money under a false flag. The chief national industrial branches are already completely in the hands of foreign capital—the milling and tobacco industries, and soon the leather, textile and spirit industries, etc., will follow them.

The war furthered the concentration of large capital, which however was not invested in an industry in the throes of a crisis, but in speculation which opened up undreamt of possibilities. Both the external and internal commerce is composed of banking and company businesses. At the end of 1922 there were 531 such undertakings, with a total capital of 1,395 million levs. From the joint stock capital, 58.7 per cent. was invested in commerce (bank, credit and currency institutions, etc.); 2.6 per cent. in mining; 36 per cent. in

industry; 2.3 per cent. in agriculture and cattle breeding; and 0.4 per cent. in transport.

In 1924, foreign capital was represented in Bulgaria in 51 joint stock companies, with a total capital of 410 million levs. Of this, the eight banks accounted for 182 million levs; the 19 industrial companies 135 millions; and the 19 commercial companies 82 millions. The origin of this capital is as follows: 110 million levs; Franco-Belgian, 70 millions; Germany, 52 millions; Czecho-Slovakia, 50 millions; Italy, 44 millions, etc. The entrance of foreign capital after the war also takes the form of conquering the internal commerce. A great part of the imports and exports goes through foreign firms, which have set up their agencies in the country. The total foreign trade in 1923, both export and import, reached 8,650.8 million levs. The imports for 1924 divide themselves as follows: 78.2 per cent. factory products and 14.7 per cent. raw materials and half-manufactured articles. The exports: 56.1 bread cereals and food, and 34.8 for raw materials and half-manufactured products.

In consequence of the weak development of industry, handicraft still occupies a large place in the national economy. The handicraftsmen form a rather numerically strong class, chiefly in the towns. But the general crisis of industry and the lack of credit—in 1922 from the total sum discounted by the Bulgarian National Bank, only 1.4 per cent. fell to the share of handicraft—resulted in the speedy ruin of the handicraftsmen. Nevertheless, a great number of wage workers are engaged in handicraft.

Reliable figures upon the class formations in Bulgaria are not available. The figures given in the "Yearbook" of Varga are, it is true, taken from the official Bulgarian statistics, but they give a false picture of the social groupings in the country.

The following figures are approximately correct concerning the social groupings:

Proletarians	29	per cent.
Semi-proletarians	12	per cent.
Petty Bourgeoisie	40	per cent.
Middle Bourgeoisie	16	per cent.
Large Bourgeoisie	3.5	per cent.

From what has been previously said the following conclusions may be drawn:

(1) Bulgaria is preponderatingly a peasant country, an agricultural country with small property owners. Nevertheless, the towns, although small, play a comparatively great role as centres where the economic, political and cultural life concentrates.

In consequence, the organised State power, despite its low numerical strength, has a comparatively great significance.

(2) The diffusion of the small producers in small groups and their economic independence of one another, considerably reduces, despite their numerical strength, their influence upon the economic and political life of the country.

(3) The proletariat, concentrated chiefly in the towns, has, although it is not numerically strong, a great significance as the leader and the advance guard of the semi-proletarian small property-owning masses. Its division amongst comparatively small industrial and handicraft undertakings is to a certain extent compensated for by the existence of solid and active trade union and political organisations.

(4) Large land ownership is insignificant, and the large landowners play no independent and leading role.

(5) The town bourgeoisie, despite its numerical weakness, has often a comparatively great economic and political power. The chief role is played by bank and commercial capital.

(6) From its relations to foreign capital, Bulgaria is a colony. Despite this however, the Bulgarian capitalists use the foreign control in order to strengthen their position against the toiling masses.

II. The Forces which Carried Out the Coup d'Etat.

Stambulisky came to power after the elections of the 17th August, 1919, which gave the Peasant League a relative majority in the parliament. For the formation of the government he was compelled to seek support from other parties. A coalition with the Communist Party, the second strongest party in the country, was at that time out of the question. But from a number of reasons, a coalition with the Menshevists also did not take place. Stambulisky preferred a combination with the considerably weakened and less exacting progressives and narodniki. The first-named entered the Peasant Government in their capacity as agents of the capitalist class.

After the suppression of the transport workers' strike (December, 1919 to February, 1920), Stambulisky believed that he had weakened the Communist Party, and so he dissolved parliament, and set the new elections for the 28th March, 1920, in the expectation of gaining an absolute majority. But this expectation came to nought; the Communist Party increased the number of its representatives from 47 to 50, and in order to maintain itself in power and to continue governing the country, the Peasant Government was compelled to resort to machinations with a certain number of the oppositional representatives.

Some time later a Right Wing formed itself within the Peasant League, and called for a co-operation with the bourgeois parties, and threatened to break up the Peasant Government from within. In order to save the situation Stambulisky once again dissolved parliament, and after a previous alteration of the electoral system, he set the new elections for April, 1923. This time the Peasant League received a crushing majority in parliament and its parliamentary situation was consolidated. But only a month and a half later followed the White Guardist coup d'etat.

The influence of the Peasant League upon the masses of the peasantry was incontestably greater, and the number of votes cast for it rose from 203,773 in 1919, to 346,949 in 1920, and in 1923 reached 437,000. Despite this, however, it did not receive an absolute majority of the votes cast. It was therefore compelled to seek for support either from the town capitalist bourgeoisie, *i.e.*, from the Right, or from the working class, that is, from the Left. But the unequal social composition of the Peasant League made it impossible for Stambulisky to declare definitely either for the bourgeoisie or for the proletariat. Instead he manœuvred and changed his front from one position to another. In this way, dissatisfaction with the Peasant Government grew both from the Right and from the Left, and at the same time the Government also failed to satisfy the masses of the peasantry which supported it.

The capitalist bourgeoisie was used to the command of the State and to work with State means. Under the government of Stambulisky, however, it was compelled to suffer its humiliation and to content itself with crumbs tossed to it by the State, and very often it had to make real sacrifices in order to save its vital interests at all. The interests of all capitalist groups were threatened. The land reform per-

National Bank went to the credit of the merchants, banks and commercial companies, and only 7 per cent. to the peasants. In 1922, however, the proportion was reversed, and the former received only 20 per cent. of the total bank credit, whilst the latter received a full 52 per cent. In the same period the credit of the industrialist rose from 11.6 per cent. to 12.5. The Peasant Government had, however, by cutting off the bankers and large commercialists so ruthlessly from their gold supply, made these latter into its sworn enemies.

And in fact, the bank and export capital stood at the head of the struggle against the Peasant Government. It mobilised the rest of the dissatisfied capitalist groups around it, and the whole capitalist bourgeoisie strengthened by the large landowners and the owners of house property, took up the struggle against Stambulisky. That was very much, but not yet all. It was necessary to draw still other social groups into the fight and to work out the necessary programme to make the struggle into a struggle of the "whole nation"—and what was most important, to organise a sufficient armed power and to win over the army. The large bourgeoisie quickly closed its ranks under the hegemony of bank and commercial capital and went to work. It proclaimed itself as the "Bulgarian people," declared its interests to be the "interests of the people," and raised the banner of the "People's Alliance," to which it called all Bulgarians and all parties, with the exception of the members of the Peasant League and the Communists. A conspirative political organisation, the "People's Alliance" was led and financed by the bankers and large merchants. The military organisation of the overthrow was placed in the hands of the Officers' League.

What social groups responded to the appeal to found the "People's Alliance"?

First of all—the **bourgeois intellectuals**. The winning over of this group was of particular importance, as a great section had served during the war as reserve officers. The rule of the Peasant League, which pushed the peasant semi-intelligentsia into the foreground, had abolished the educational conditions for the holding of most of the civil service and institutional positions, and in this way it had laid hands on the privileges which guarantee the existence of the educated intelligentsia. Naturally, this latter group was indignant at the advance of "ignorance" and "peasant lack of culture," and set all its hopes upon a restoration of bourgeois government. In 1922, a conflict took place

ceptibly disturbed the "holy rights of property" of the large landowners, that is those owners who did not work their land themselves. Only the overthrow of the Peasant Government could restore their threatened property. The house-owners had also suffered. A not inconsiderable number of buildings was expropriated for the use of the State and public societies with only a minimal compensation. Those who were not expropriated could not exploit their property according to the bourgeois law of supply and demand, for the tenants enjoyed the protection of a special law. For this category of capitalists also, the salvation lay in the overthrow of the "peasant tyranny." The Peasant Government declared that it did not persecute industrial capital, nevertheless, the industrialists also felt themselves to be in danger, first of all because the Peasant League, conscious of its power, cast its eyes upon the milling industry and declared that it must belong to the peasantry, and secondly, because industry received an insufficient amount of credit from the national bank. And finally, because industry was practically in the hands of the banks, which dictated the attitude of the industrialists.

Naturally, the most perceptibly hit was bank and commercial capital. Stambulsky inflamed the hatred of the peasant masses against the speculators and the bankers and prepared the moral preliminary conditions for a penetrating action against the latter. But apart from this, the Peasant Government threw down the gauntlet also to large commercial capital by a number of State measures. In 1919, for instance, it founded a consortium consisting of agricultural co-operatives and State banks, to which it gave the commercial monopoly for bread cereals. That was a terrible blow for the large bread cereal exporters, who previously had formed the strongest capitalist group in the country. Two years later, however, they were successful in abolishing this monopoly by the intervention of interested foreign firms, and by the action of the Reparations Commission. But after this defeat, the Peasant League did not give up the fight: the Government attempted to form a consortium which would, in fact, have the monopoly in virtue of the unlimited credits issued by the State banks.

Under the Peasant Government the policy of the banks became ever more and more fatal to the interests of private commercial capital. The latter was clearly unable to carry out its gigantic operations in the purchase and in the export of cereals, tobacco crop, etc., without far reaching credits from the financial institutions of the State. In 1911, for instance, 73 per cent. of the total amount discounted by the Bulgarian

between the Government and the professors of Sofia University. The latter had received support from the banks for the previous six months and sought to influence the students. The alliance of capital with "science" was completed. The Peasant League regarded the legal profession, from which the majority of all party leaders had come, as the source of all evil. And upon its accession to power it commenced to fight the latter systematically; it abolished the institute of lawyers in the civil courts, it limited their right to appear before military courts, etc. The lawyers, hit so keenly, placed themselves in the front ranks of the struggle against the Peasant Government. At the same time, the Government threatened a section of the doctors with distribution to the villages in order to supply medical aid to the peasants. In this way it brought the doctors into the ranks of its enemies.

The attitude of the officers, both on the active list and on the reserve, was of special importance. Before the war, the sons of Mars had enjoyed exclusive privileges which no one had dared to touch. The peace treaty, however, which disarmed Bulgaria, was a catastrophe for the Officers' Corps. The greater portion was on the streets, and the defeat and the coming of the general crisis influenced the privileges and the prestige of those officers still in the service. In consequence the dissatisfaction amongst the officers was very great, and upon this basis there were serious conflicts between the Government and the Officers' Corps. In order to guarantee the safety of the Gendarmerie, Stambulisky began to make supporters of the Peasant League, ex-sergeant majors, etc., into officers. In the army he utilised the non-commissioned officers. A great section of the active Officers' Corps maintained its enmity towards the Government to the end. With regard to the dismissed officers and non-commissioned officers, they were compelled to rely upon State posts which they could only hope to secure after the overthrow of the Peasant Government. With this the **Federation of Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers** was practically an organisation which prepared the overthrow, and it, therefore, formed a support of the **Officers' League**.

A second support of the League was the **Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation**. The peasant masses were the least nationalist, and after the defeat, the least inclined for war. In consequence it was easy for Stambulisky to declare that the "National Ideals" of the Bulgarian people were buried, and therefore to give up all claims upon Macedonia, and to pursue a policy of reconciliation towards Yugo-Slavia.

But just this policy put the Nationalist elements against him and they sought to maintain Bulgarian Nationalism under the cloak of the Macedonian organisation. It was not difficult for them to confuse the mass of conscripts in the Macedonian organisation and to mobilise them in the name of "Macedonian autonomy" against the Peasant Government.

The petty bourgeois, workers, employees and working intelligentsia of the towns in the main, did not support the overthrow. A section of handicraftsmen was even sympathetic towards the Peasant League. Those of them who belonged to bourgeois parties strengthened their passivity. It was, however, a different matter when the overthrow was an achieved fact. A great section of the handicraftsmen and the small dealers, oppressed by the heavy taxes, believed in fact that the overthrow would really bring their "freedom" and so they greeted it with joy and hope. But this illusion lasted but a very short time. The reality quickly opened their eyes. The same was true of a section of the State officials. Pauperised and the object of continuous attacks and injustices on the part of the Government, which also limited their right of coalition, they set all their hopes upon the overthrow, but their disappointment followed still quicker. Amongst the working class, naturally, the overthrow produced no particularly cheerful spirit. The terror of the Peasant Government against the workers had been hard. Despite this, however, the latter grasped the fact that the overthrow had given back the power into the hands of their most deadly class enemies, the capitalist bourgeoisie, and in their great majority they were prepared to fight to the death against the overthrow. Unfortunately the Party, surprised and disorganised by the unexpectedness of the overthrow, did not come forward actively enough and failed to lead the masses in the struggle.

The bourgeoisie could win neither the petty bourgeoisie nor the working class to an active participation in the overthrow. And apart from this, it needed neither of them. Its programme of a "People's Alliance" was only a mask. It did not need the masses of the people, but well-organised conspirative groups and fighting units. And when it was successful in creating these and in being able to rely upon the support of the army, the Macedonian revolutionary organisation and the Russian monarchists, then the coup d'etat itself was a detail. With regard to King Boris, he was a sympathising prisoner in its hands. In this it received the active *diplomatic support of Italy and England.*

III. The Constitutional Parties and the Coup d'Etat.

The bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties took, as such, no direct part in the overthrow.

Not because the leaders of all parties—with the exception of the Social-Democrats—were at that time either already sentenced or were under detention; no, the reasons for this lay deeper.

These parties—even the most open defenders of capitalist interests, amongst them the National Liberals and the People's Progressives—had a considerable number of the petty bourgeoisie and a great number of job-hunters in their following. The latter formed usually their most active groups. And this circumstance inevitably stamped its mark upon their politics and tactics.

The capitalist elements in them were clearly body and soul for the overthrow, but not in a position to draw their parties with them, the organisations of which were now in no way suited for a forcible seizure of power, they were suitable only for throwing sand into the eyes of the petty bourgeoisie. The latter willingly followed the large bourgeoisie when it talked of "law and order," "freedom and democracy," and other beautiful things, but could not make up its mind to start with it on the dangerous road of the coup d'etat.

An overthrow brought about with the assistance of the Military League had also nothing particularly attractive about it for the job-hunting element. The latter knew that its worth to the parties depended upon its service, and it was therefore particularly active at elections, meetings and political demonstrations; should however the overthrow come about, then the military would play the chief role in it, and then naturally occupy all the more important posts. And so this rather influential group, which often paralysed party connections and coalitions in its group interests, was also not particularly in favour of the agitation for the overthrow.

But also the general staffs of the parties could not decide to draw their parties into a support of the military overthrow. For they stand upon the basis of "legality" and upon the "constitution" and oppose their "evolutionary theory" and "peaceful methods" to the "fatal" theories and methods of the revolutionary parties. What would remain of their "constitutionalism" and their "legality" if they themselves were

to raise the banner of "revolution"? This applied most of all to the parties of the radicals and the social patriots who preached "democracy" and "reformism" of the first water. Apart from this, the overthrow brings with it a certain risk for the parties engaged in it; in case of a failure they are then subject to the reprisals of the Governmental power. If, on the other hand, the undertaking is successful, then the parties can attach themselves to it without in the least injuring their "constitutional principles," and can proclaim once again the era of "law and order" to calm the frightened petty bourgeoisie.

And so the constitutional parties remained outside the conspiracy, also for strategical reasons. But the special organisation which prepared the overthrow—the "People's Alliance"—contained the individual leaders of all parties, including the social democracy. The plans of the adventure from the "People's Alliance" and the Military League went, however, further; by isolating the old, and in the eyes of the masses of the people, strongly compromised party leaders, they hoped not only to gain these masses, but also to replace the "old statesmen" of the opposition by new men more agreeable to the bourgeoisie.

But the idea of the coup d'état first arose when it became clear that the bourgeois parties and their petty bourgeois following were unable to overthrow Stambulisky. The whole time they had conducted an energetic struggle, they had reorganised, united and consolidated themselves and adopted new programmes. For instance, all the Liberal Parties, there were three, had amalgamated into one *National Liberal Party*; the People's Party and Progressive Liberal Party had united into a Progressive People's Party. The attempt to extend this amalgamation over to the Radical and the Democratic Party was unsuccessful, but nevertheless, these three parties formed the so-called *Oppositional Bloc*, which in practice, also included the Mensheviki. The "Oppositional Bloc" adopted the programme of the National Party as its own, and stood at the head of the struggle for the overthrow of the Peasant Government by "constitutional methods." For this purpose it called meetings, organised demonstrations, issued declarations, and called upon the king to exercise his "constitutional prerogatives" and dismiss Stambulisky. The Republican Menshevist jurists "proved" convincingly that King Boris had this "Right."

With all this, however, the oppositional party leaderships

did not boycott the conspiracy. They entered willingly into negotiations with the Wrangel monarchists to ensure the co-operation of the latter in case of necessity. The connections between the Russian White Guardists and the Bulgarian bourgeoisie date from this time, connections which were later strengthened by the martial law which was held over the heads of both the Bulgarian working class and the peasantry. The bourgeoisie was particularly intimate with the Macedonian "revolutionaries," whom it later used as the hangmen of the Bulgarian people. The bourgeoisie set the greatest hopes upon them as an armed power. With unconcealed pleasure they received the news of the taking of the town of Nevrokop by the Macedonian organisations, and later also the occupation of the town of Kustendil, which was actually to form the signal for the insurrection against the Peasant Government.

The hands of the bourgeois and Menshevik "constitutionalists" were by no means free from conspiracy, also not at that time when *they* still led the struggle. Even the well-known "Tyrnover events" in 1922, which turned out so sadly for the leaders of the oppositional bloc, were in close connection with the preparations for the insurrection.

After a series of failures, after the arrest of the oppositional leaders, and particularly after the heavy defeat of the "bloc" in the elections of April, 1923, the party leaderships finally made room for the men of action, the people from the "Alliance." After the coup d'état was an achieved fact they attached themselves to it.

IV. The Grouping of Forces and the Perspectives.

It is perfectly understandable that the large landowners and large capital to-day inspire the policy of the White Guardist Government. The first task of the latter was to abolish the "anti-constitutional" laws. Under this ambiguous term, which the June conspirators presented as the liquidation of the constitution, were all laws passed by the Peasant Government which directly or indirectly laid hands on the rights of property "laid down" in the constitution. The agrarian law, which affected the rights of private property owners was declared "anti-constitutional" in every paragraph by the bourgeois jurists; further, the law upon the expropriation of private buildings for the good of the State; the law which limited the "freedom" of the house owner to exploit his tenants, etc. A tax reform law was carried through which considerably reduced the direct taxation of large capital and unbearably increased the taxation of the peasantry, and also the indirect taxes.

The government paid particular attention to the interests of commercial capital. The consortium for dealing with bread cereals was completely abolished and the peasant syndicate which went with it was liquidated. The credits for the peasant co-operatives were cut off and the means of the National Bank were placed exclusively at the disposal of large capital. Speculation was declared a normal phenomenon, and the struggle against it as dangerous demagogy. When under the pressure of the suffering masses a law was passed allegedly against the increase in the cost of living, the leader of the governmental fraction in the parliament, Liaptchev, declared that the law was a "law for the fools." Under such conditions speculation naturally flourished and prices rose immeasurably. The cost of living index rose from 3.187 in August, 1923, to 4.039 in August, 1924. At the present time it is over 5.000. Added to this, in the last two years the Bulgarian lev has only sunk 25 per cent. In consequence of their tremendous profits, which called forth the dissatisfaction of the masses of the people, the speculators were dubbed "rebels without weapons." To all this, the Government naturally remained indifferent.

The Government also attended eagerly to the interests of the *industrialists*. They also received large credits from the State banks. In all strikes the Government naturally stands upon the side of the employers and when necessary sends armed forces into action. When the laws for the protection of the workers are violated however the Government is blind, and the trade unions of the workers have been disbanded. In the conflicts between the sugar and tobacco exporters on the one hand and the peasant producers on the other, the Government stands upon the side of the first-named.

It is clear that such a policy of the White Guardist Government provides no occasion for a break between it and the large bourgeoisie, and a cessation of the furious struggle which the Government has now carried on for two years against the *Bolshevist danger* and the *United Front of the Communists and the members of the Peasant League*. On the other hand the failures of Tsankoff's foreign policy which endanger the hopes of the bourgeoisie to carry out an economic and financial stabilisation through a revision of the peace treaty and the conclusion of a foreign loan, cause the bourgeoisie to consider seriously a possible change of ministers. This question is also connected with the bloody deeds of heroism of the Government which have opened up a chasm between it and the masses of the people. In bourgeois circles there are voices in favour

of a change in persons and methods which will consolidate the gains of the Tsankoff Government and ensure the continued dominance of their class interests in the administration of the country. The handing over of power to the "Left" parties would however, by no means appear as a desirable change to the bourgeoisie.

The White Guardist Government has succeeded neither in winning the sympathies of the town and country petty bourgeoisie nor at least in pacifying them. About the masses of the peasantry there is nothing to be said. They have not merely not reconciled themselves to the new power but they are full of bitterness against it. The bourgeois parties accuse the Peasant Government of having incited the peasants against the towns. But no one has done so much towards deepening the chasm which now lies between a powerful section of the peasantry and the bourgeoisie of the town, as the government of the generals and professors. And this has been done not only by the terrorising of the peasantry, but also by the economic tax policy of the Government, which makes the working peasant the object of exploitation of a predatory capitalism, and loads him with taxes. The handicraftsmen and the small dealers in the towns have also clearly expressed their dissatisfaction with the new government by arranging, for the first time in Bulgaria, a protest strike. The strongest argument of the opposition again Tsankoff is that his government is driving the petty bourgeoisie into the arms of the "destructive elements," and in this way creates a danger for the State. In the meantime it is more than doubtful whether the legal opposition exactly will be able to raise the sinking prestige of the bourgeois power in the eyes of the peasant masses. The responsibility for the bloody deeds of Tsankoff lies also upon its shoulders.

A representative of the Social-Democratic Party was also taken into the Cabinet by Tsankoff above all in order to win the workers for the party of the overthrow. But the calculation proved to be false. The influence of the Mensheviks upon the masses was very weak. At the same time the Government proclaimed itself as the "protector of labour" and even introduced a little later a "labour law," which earned for it the praise of Mr. Albert Thomas. But all these beautiful words and laws remain a mockery when compared with the inexpressible suffering of the working class. Capitalism and the Government had declared war from the first day with hunger and bullets against the working class.

The indignation of the workers against the Government was so great that even the corrupt Social-Democratic Party felt itself compelled to leave it. The proletariat was and remains the deadly enemy of the White Guardist society, and not even the Social-Democratic syrens are able to win the sympathy of the working class for the Government. The hopes which they put upon the dissolution of the Communist Party and the trade unions, and the physical rooting out of the active Communist members—in this latter respect they heartily did their share—have not been justified. The workers have remained far from their party and nourish a revulsion towards the Menshevik marauders which is not to be overcome.

How are the relations between the heroes of the 9th July and the "constitutional" parties?

The latter triumphantly greeted the coup d'état, called it the "greatest date" in the modern history of Bulgaria, and afforded the Government their full support in the suppression of the insurrection of the people which flamed up. But immediately afterwards the conflict began. The old party leaders and their staffs considered the Government of Tsankoff a *temporary revolutionary government*, and hoped after the consolidation of the situation for the formation of a *legal government* from the bourgeois parties. The military junta, however, which had the actual power in its hands, did not even consider surrendering it to the anæmic bourgeois parties. As nevertheless they were needed to maintain the appearance of constitutionalism, it was decided simply to *requisition* them in the interests of the State. Two months after the overthrow the Progressive People's Party, the Democratic and Radical Party joined the "People's Alliance" under the pressure of the bourgeois elements in them and under the energetic urge of the Macedonian organisation. A new governmental party was formed, the "Democratic Alliance," under the nominal leadership of Tsankoff. The National Liberal and the Social-Democratic Parties remained as independent parties within the Government coalition.

That was the culminating point of the amalgamation of bourgeois forces which was necessary in order to set the crusade against the Communist Party into action and to ensure the success of the Government at the elections.

Hereupon the process of disruption commenced. First of all, the coalition collapsed: the National Liberals left the

Government and later the Social-Democrats; the Radical Party left the "Democratic Alliance" almost completely and the Democratic Party in its petty bourgeois section. Over and above this, the considerably reduced "great public power," upon which the "unity" of the people and the "renewal" of the State are based, is torn with internal rivalry and dissension, and Tsankoff, the "arbiter of fate," may at any moment find himself alone with his fifty accomplices from the old "People's Alliance." The White Guardist Government has destroyed the organisation of the workers and peasants, but in the ultimate the bourgeoisie is also politically disorganised. In the place of the five legal parties which existed before the coup d'etat there are now ten legal bourgeois and petty bourgeois groupings (without the members of the Peasants' League and the Communists).

. What is the condition of the military forces of Tsankoff?

The Military League continues to exist. As recent events proved it is still all-powerful. Its members occupy the most important State posts. But the alterations and re-groupings which have taken place in the country have not passed over the League without leaving traces behind. One section of the Reserve Officers' Corps remained discontented. The split of the "Democratic Alliance" weakened also the internal solidity of the League itself. It is also threatened with a split. The powerful Macedonian Organisation of the year 1923 is to-day little more than a ruin. After the events of September, 1924, it is no longer in a position to place itself at the disposal of the Government as a united band of cut-throats. The army remains: with whom does the army go, that is the officers' groups? The decomposition and disruption all around weakens unceasingly the unity of the Officers' Corps also. Tsankoff can no longer reckon upon the devotion of Wolkov, but the latter can also no longer under all circumstances reckon upon the certain carrying out of his own orders. Under these circumstances, the son of the Coburger Ferdinand is in a situation to pluck up his courage and to exercise his "ruling prerogatives."

Abroad, the Government of Tsankoff has succeeded in winning no new friends, it has even lost the sympathy of the English Conservatives.

The social basis of the White Guardist Government has thus become narrower and its credit even with the big bourgeoisie has been shaken. The old political parties which

led the struggle against Stambulisky, are almost completely in the opposition. And the groups which formally belong to the Government, in secret fight against it. The military groups have similarly lost very much of their original consolidation. At present Tsankoff enjoys more fear than respect. His political game is played out. He will, however, not give up the power which he holds. Who will drive him out?

The "Left" legal opposition, to which also the Social-Democrats belong, represents no decisive social power. It is not in a position to mobilise a mass movement under its banner, but fights still against the banner under which the workers and peasants are fighting to the death. It has not even the courage to demand the dissolution of parliament, for new elections under the present circumstances would bring for it a fatal defeat. Its struggle against Tsankoff limits itself to solemn exorcisations and hysterical appeals directed to Tsankoff. And it is quite sufficient for this latter to hang the spook of "Bolshevist danger" before their eyes, or to threaten them with a dissolution of parliament in order to dampen their oppositional enthusiasm. The stubbornness with which the masses of the people defend their lives and freedom against the raging of the white terror is without doubt the only real factor from below which will force a change in the government of the country.

V. KOLAROV.



British Imperialist Plot Against the U.S.S.R.

1. The Onslaught Postponed.

DURING the first two weeks of July, the chronic hostility of the British Government towards the Soviets in connection with the events in China attained extreme intensity. Not only the Conservative press, but members of the Ministry also—Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Home Secretary, and Secretary of State for India—adopted a definite course aimed at a rupture of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government. In this respect the Association of British Creditors had a long time ago exerted pressure on the Government, demanding from the latter in its memorandum more decisive action, not stopping short at a rupture of diplomatic relations. The big shareholders, the representatives of the "Baku Consolidated Oil-fields," and other oil proprietors adopted a particularly irreconcilable attitude. The matter did not stop at threats. According to rumours, the British Government entered into negotiations with the Quai d'Orsay concerning the drafting of a joint ultimatum to the Soviet Government demanding the liquidation of the Comintern, or at any rate complete separation of the Comintern from the Soviet Government and that it be sent out of Moscow to some other town; also the prohibition of Comintern employees from making speeches on the foreign policy of the Soviet Government. It is said that Briand was favourably inclined towards this ultimatum. However, no subsequent action was taken in this matter. The gentlemen are evidently deliberating.

The entire band of White Guard emigrés, seeing an approaching rupture of diplomatic relations in Soviet Russia, became quite active and commenced preparing for an attack. The Russian Monarchists met at a congress and conferred as to who should be given the crown and who should be appointed commander-in-chief. The Petlurists also began to stir. The representatives of the so-called "Ukrainian People's Republic" on the one hand arrived at an agreement with Wrangel concerning military collaboration, and on the other hand—in order to attract the sympathy of Poland—agreed to give Rome the right to carry on catholic propaganda in

the Ukraine. Even the "ex-S.D. deputy" (and now black-guard) Mr. Alexinsky, joined the campaign and began negotiations with the Monarchists.

The campaign, however, did not come off. The more reasonable and prudent elements in the British Cabinet got the upper hand. The internal situation in England and the international situation as a whole showed that the moment for an attack was unfavourable. The reason why Chamberlain refused to head for a rupture with Russia at the present moment has been let out of the bag by the "Manchester Guardian" in an article entitled "No Steps to be Taken other than in Agreement with the other States." "The Government," says the author of this article, "is ready to take part in an international intervention in China on condition that the United States and France together with the other States display readiness to join in. **The government policy with regard to Russia is dependent on the same condition . . .** It would be unjust to suppose that the Government intends launching out into a rash and premature attack against the Soviet Government. On the contrary, it is inspired with the intention of postponing any action whatever of this kind, in the hope that they may cease to be necessary."* The phrase about "the hope that the attack may cease to be necessary" is certainly a hypocritical phrase; but it is true that the British Government did not decide to break off diplomatic relations until they were able to weld together a united front against the U.S.S.R.

In this way the onslaught just as after the Curzon ultimatum has collapsed. The only **direct** results of this campaign commenced against the U.S.S.R. so far have been expressed in a tightening up of credits for Russia. Under the pressure of the "Foreign Office" the British banks have begun to cease granting credits to the U.S.S.R. Meanwhile the Equitable Trust Company Bank decided to stop further extension of credits to the U.S.S.R. As this bank is an American one, it may thereby be presumed that American **finance capital** (the Morgan group) is also participating in the financial pressure on the U.S.S.R. in agreement with Great Britain. The British bourgeoisie also try to draw Germany into the financial blockade. With this aim in view, the British banks began to refuse to discount the bills of Soviet Institutions, even if they were endorsed by large German firms.

* This quotation from the "Manchester Guardian" is re-translated from the Russian.

In this manner the open attack has for the time being failed and has amounted to nothing more than financial pressure. But there is no doubt that the British Government has not relinquished its advance; it has only postponed it until a more favourable moment.

II. The Crisis of the British Empire and Two Class Estimates of It.

The main reason for the wild attack which the British Conservative Government has been carrying on against the U.S.S.R. from the very commencement of its existence is to be found in the crisis of the British Empire.

The destruction of the European market for British industry caused by the war, the growth of independent capitalist industry in the British colonies and Dominions, the transference of world economic hegemony to the United States of America, is more and more increasing the gravitation of the British Dominions towards the latter, while their secession from Great Britain is only a matter of time, the liberation movement in the Colonies which has received a new and strong stimulus from the revolutionary movement in China, all these things taken together have created an acute and irremediable crisis in the British Empire.

Production of heavy industry in Great Britain is being reduced, the production of cast iron during May, 1925, has been reduced by 80,000 tons as compared with May, 1924. Production of steel was reduced by 150,000 tons. The construction of merchant ships has almost completely ceased: according to the information of the "Economist" (July, 1925) the tonnage of the merchant ships during 1925 as compared with 1924 stands at about the same level (19.2 million tons in 1925 as against 18.8 million tons in 1924), while the tonnage of the U.S. merchant fleet has been increased by more than sixfold; that of France twofold, Japan twofold, and even the British Dominions more than one and a half times. The shares in large railway, mining, engineering and shipbuilding enterprises have fallen. The debit side of the British trading balance is growing larger and larger. The "Times" in the July 6th number writes:

"While the average margin yearly available for foreign investment before the war was £180,000,000, the balance in 1924 was only £29,000,000, and so for this year on the assumption that the estimate of invisible ex-

ports prepared by the Board of Trade for 1924 remains substantially the same, there is an actual adverse balance against this country. There is no escape from the conclusion that if this tendency continues the country will be living on the capital it has invested abroad."

On the same day, the President of the Board of Trade, Sir Philip Cunliffe Lister, speaking in Parliament on the condition of British trade, announced that the deficit in the British trading balance is progressively increasing: in 1913 it amounted to 150 millions, in 1921, 203 millions, in 1924, 341 millions, while during the past 12 months, from May, 1924 to May, 1925, we have already a deficit of 395 millions. From these facts the President of the Board of Trade makes the following remarkable conclusion: "Although I cannot agree that throughout the present time we are living on our reserves, nevertheless our new investments in capital are undoubtedly not taken from income, but from money which we receive on loan." (Translated from the Russian.)

Parallel with the decline in industry unemployment is increasing, the number of unemployed in Great Britain at the present moment amounts to 1,300,000. This is nearly 300,000 more than in the corresponding week of 1924. During two weeks alone, from May 25th to June 6th, the number of unemployed increased by 105,000.

In order to struggle against the industrial crisis the Conservative Government is endeavouring to place all the heavy burdens resulting therefrom upon the shoulders of the working class. While the industrialists are endeavouring to lower wages, the Government is making attacks on the present social legislation of the Empire. It has recently introduced a Bill into Parliament, according to which the unemployment grant should be reduced by 6½ million pounds sterling per year. As a result of this bill a considerable section of the unemployed will again be compelled to have recourse to seek relief from the "Boards of Guardians" so hated by the working class. The Conservative Government is beginning to treat workers with developed trade union consciousness as beggars and tramps. All this is causing strong resentment among the working class, produces a rapid move to the Left which makes the old reactionary leaders of the Labour Party tremble with terror. The dockers' leader, Sexton, a true adherent of MacDonald, said the following words in connection with the new Bill: "The new Bill on Unemployment is by no means a barrier against revolution. On the contrary, it only increases the widespread tendencies which are abandoning all support of faith in constitutional action. I regret

this, for such bills greatly complicate the work of those who stand out against anti-constitutional tendencies. This law is rotten to the very core. If it is carried into effect 30 per cent. of the dockers will be deprived of the possibility of enjoying unemployment insurance." One can judge as to the acuteness of the crisis in the British industry by the fact that the "Nation" in an article in the 18th July number devoted to an account of the Federation of British Industries, headed the article "The S.O.S. of the F.B.I."

Is this crisis of the British Empire a misfortune for the British proletariat? By no means! When comrade Lenin during the world war drew up for Russia defeatist slogans and when it was pointed out to him that the military collapse of Great Russia which he was trying to bring about with his slogans would lead to the economic decline of the country, and the splitting up of the proletarian army, Lenin replied to this: "I love our great Russian people. But this is just the reason why I must endeavour to destroy the great Tsarist monarchy based on enslavement and oppression of nationalities, for a people cannot be free which holds others in slavery. And we must by no means be afraid that our slogan—the Right of Nations for Self-Determination—will lead to the disintegration of Russia. The oppressed peoples of the great Russian nation having thrown off their chains with the support of the great Russian revolution will themselves **voluntarily** unite on new lines of a labour union." Lenin's prediction has been fully confirmed in real life. It is just because the Russian workers under the guidance of Lenin put forward in time the slogan for complete self-determination of the oppressed nations and the right of separation from Great Russia, that the Ukraine, White Russia, the Caucasian Republic, the Tartar Republic and other autonomous republics are now united in a compact alliance with great Russia which is growing stronger every day.

The British proletariat must courageously follow the same path. If the British proletariat gives active support to the liberation of the colonial peoples from the oppression of British imperialism, it will, by hastening the downfall of the present British Empire which is based on oppression and exploitation, create a basis for the return of this Empire in a new form, for the creation of a mighty union of the British proletariat with the hundreds of millions of peasants of the former colonies. But, of course, it is not so easy to get the British workers to assimilate this truth, who, during many decades have been accustomed to occupying a privileged position among the world proletariat, who have been accustomed

to live on the crumbs from the surplus profits squeezed out by the British imperialists. And we see that even the Left leaders of the British Labour Party are now hesitating on the colonial question. But the hopeless position of the British Empire and the inevitability of the liberation of millions of British colonial slaves—whose national and class-consciousness has already been awakened—from the imperialist oppression, will soon convince, and has already begun to convince the British working masses that their only and true salvation lies in a close alliance with these colonial slaves.

We repeat the British proletariat has nothing to fear in the downfall of the British Empire. With its support this Empire may be reborn in a form of a mighty League of Soviet Republics of workers and peasants. But for the British lords and for the British capitalist magnates, the downfall of the British Empire means death. That is just why, smelling disaster in the air, they are so nervy at the present time and are appealing to all the powers of heaven and hell against Soviet Russia which is a model of the future State of the British proletariat, and against the Comintern, which is the truest friend of the hundreds of millions of peasants in China, India and other countries with which the British imperialist thieves are playing havoc.

III. The Schematic Preparation of the Attack and its Destructive Aims.

One of the main component parts of the British plan of attack on the U.S.S.R. is, as everyone knows, the conclusion of the Guarantee Pact. In endeavouring to conclude this Treaty, which is the political crowning of the edifice of the Dawes Plan, Great Britain is coming out officially as a defender of Germany. Indeed capitalist England is very far from concluding a pact of "eternal friendship" with Germany. For Great Britain the aim of the Pact is to bind up Germany with the West only for the time being, until such a moment when Great Britain will be able to bring pressure on its most dangerous enemy—the Soviet Republic. If she succeeded in doing this she would have to strangle her rival as before. The German bourgeoisie is taking full account of the true motives of the conduct of Great Britain who has suddenly become so loving to her. For instance, Paul Lentch writes on this subject in the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung": "It is quite easy to understand why the Entente, and particularly Great Britain, has been seized by a passionate desire for Germany to enter into the League of Nations. They desire to abolish the favourable situation which politically and geo-

graphically Germany occupies between the East and West, they desire to pull Germany over to the side of the West, of course, not as an independent power with equal rights, but as a domestic slave of the Entente . . . They desire to create a united front against Russia and to realise now what they were unable to do during the war. . . ." "This situation of the Western Powers," continues Lentch, "must be utilised in the interests of Germany with energy, wisdom and courage. The difficulties of the Entente will increase still more, and we will more and more enter into acute contrast with the whole of Europe in so far as she is represented by the victorious powers."

Great Britain is endeavouring to turn Germany into a weapon of struggle against Soviet Russia, into an extensive rear for the bands destined to attack Soviet Russia. With this aim she has to compensate Germany at the expense of Poland, and support the aspirations of Germany for the abolition of the Dantzig corridor. But for an attack on Soviet Russia, Great Britain also needs the support of Poland, so now the ground is being felt to see whether Poland will agree to be rewarded for the loss of Dantzig at the expense of Lithuania, and be willing to find another outlet to the sea through Memel.

As Germany is disarmed and France is in every possible way opposing her armaments, the plots against the U.S.S.R. give her only a passive role in the plan of attack: Germany must allow the transportation of troops and war ammunition through her territory in the event of a war with the U.S.S.R. and must serve as a deep-seated rear for the attackers. Great Britain is preparing live forces for a direct attack on two sectors of the front—on the north and the south. On the northern front, Great Britain is organising a Baltic alliance consisting of Finland, Esthonia and Latvia, who during their attack on the U.S.S.R. should be supported by the Scandinavian bloc. Of course, Finland, Latvia and Esthonia are not in the least way interested in a war with the U.S.S.R., just in the same way as the U.S.S.R. is not interested in a war with the Baltic States and desires to live with them in peace. Moreover, Finland is displaying an attitude of great caution towards the ally which has been thrust on her—Sweden. But Great Britain takes very little heed as to whether these small States are interested and as to what they desire. In exactly the same way as before the imperialist war Great Britain under pretext of defending Belgium, despite the will of the Belgian Government, and despite the strategic defensive plans of its General Staff insisted on the landing of

an expeditionary force on Belgian territory, and drawing Belgium into a war which sooner or later had to break out between Great Britain and Germany—at the present time, under the pretext of defending Finland, Latvia, Esthonia from the Soviet Republic which has no designs on these latter States, Great Britain is organising in these countries, according to a definite plan, a military force to be used against the Soviet Republic, relying on the strength of her purse, her fleet, and her political specific gravity in Europe. At the same time Great Britain is organising a warlike Balkan-Danube alliance against the U.S.S.R., the vanguard of which is to be Rumania. In order to create the second attacking force, she is on the one hand actively supporting all counter-revolutionary movements in Hungary and the Balkans, and on the other hand by promising credits and by means of corruption is endeavouring to bind these countries to joint action against the U.S.S.R.

There is no unprincipled design in this part of Europe in which the hand of Great Britain cannot be traced.

Under the pressure of Great Britain, Hungary is refusing to ratify the agreement with the U.S.S.R. Great Britain is promising Hungary to restore her military power if she will agree to becoming a member of the anti-Soviet Danube Federation which is being organised by Great Britain. In Albania, the counter-revolutionary coup d'état of Akhmed-Soglu was carried out with the support and forces of Yugoslavia, but at the present moment the main support of Akhmed-Soglu is again Great Britain, who in view of the growing revolutionary movement in that country against the Albanian beys and foreign agents is concluding an agreement with Akhmed-Soglu so that in case he is faced with a serious threat of revolution, Great Britain will effect a temporary occupation of Albania. In Bulgaria, Great Britain is supporting the bloody Tsankoff regime. It was indeed Great Britain who allowed the hangman Tsankoff to increase his army to 10,000 men in order that he might take vengeance on the Bulgarian masses, despite the opposition of Yugoslavia against an increase of Bulgarian military forces. Now, when Tsankoff is crowning his bloody work, which has evoked intense hatred on the part of the workers and peasant masses and intellectuals, Great Britain is endeavouring to save him, advising him to make peace with the constitutional parties and form a coalition government. For these services rendered Tsankoff and for the financial aid promised to him, Great Britain on the one hand is demanding that he should agree to the establishment of a control over Bulgarian finance, and on the other

hand demands that Bulgaria should participate, together with Yugo-Slavia, Czecho-Slovakia, and Rumania, in an offensive alliance against the U.S.S.R. Great Britain is also endeavouring to draw Turkey into this alliance and with this aim in view she is preparing to make concessions to Turkey on the Mosul question.

While organising an armed offensive on the U.S.S.R. from the North and South-West, Great Britain is at the same time attempting to erect a barrier against the Soviet Republic, also in the East. With this object she is promising Persia in every possible way to aid her economic regeneration by freeing her from the "economic violation" of the U.S.S.R. Up to now by the way, this aid has only been expressed by Great Britain succeeding in getting a sugar and tea monopolistic concession in Persia. Great Britain is also trying to gain Afghanistan over to her side, for which object she is on the one hand making plots against the Afghanistan Government and organising bands there, and subsequently offering the Government her services for the suppression of this movement in return for the requisite compensation.

If we take a glance at those regions where Great Britain is now recruiting soldiers for an attack against revolutionary Moscow, we may be convinced that she is organising a typical Vendee campaign. She is looking for live forces for this attack in the economically backward and financially dependent peasant countries. The British bourgeoisie cannot find the means to assist unemployed proletarians in England, but it does not grudge any money in supporting all and sundry counter revolutionary movements in these peasant countries, in order to support there the destruction of those proletarian organisations which awaken the political consciousness of the peasants. After this counter-revolutionary preparation the British bourgeoisie intends turning the peasant masses, who have been deprived of their leaders, into cannon-fodder and under the command of capitalists and landowners, driving them into an attack against the country where the obnoxious Comintern has its headquarters, against that country which is pictured as a hell, where the atheists burn down the churches, where they nationalise women and take the last scrap of ground away from the moujik.

The task of the Vendee being organised by the British Government is to realise in the Soviet Republic on a stupendous scale the same bloody revenge on the proletariat which the Tsankoff hangmen committed and are committing now in Bulgaria with the support of Great Britain. This blow

at the heart, at the only proletarian detachment which has been able so far to seize power into its own hands should be, according to the plans of the plotters, the commencement of an unprecedented reactionary offensive of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat of the whole world, and above all against the British proletariat, which is commencing to become refractory.

This, however, is not the only aim of the campaign organised against the U.S.S.R. The responsible leaders of contemporary British policy have frequently stated their ultimate aim to be the dismemberment of Russia, taking away from her White Russia, Ukraine, and the Caucasus and turning her into an impotent Asiatic Empire. Great Britain in this way now endeavours not only to abolish the Soviet system in Russia, but also to abolish **Russia itself** on the basis of the rule that roaring lions rule in the desert, and in the hope that British imperialism will be re-born in its former greatness if it succeeds in destroying economically regenerating Russia, the connecting link between Europe and Asia. Is it not irony of fate that Great Britain, a first-class capitalist power, armed with all the perfections of modern technique, is setting itself the same task which at one time Tamerlane and Chenghis-Khan were faced with? Is this not a testimony that capitalism is dying and developing into a fetid corpse?

IV. Greed of British Imperialism Hinders the Formation of a United Front against the U.S.S.R.

The fact that Great Britain is endeavouring not only to do away with the Soviet system in Russia, but also with the Russian Government itself, which lies on the land route from Europe to India, shows that her counter-revolutionary plans (in the narrow sense of the word) underly the plan to bring all her present future imperialist rivals in Europe to their knees. This two-sided policy of Great Britain is particularly vividly expressed in her present attitude toward her "ally" France. In gaining fresh collaboration in the campaign against the U.S.S.R., Great Britain is simultaneously everywhere undermining France, endeavouring to snatch out of her hands the hegemony in Europe which France acquired directly after the war; in this respect one must admit that she has been able to achieve great successes in a short time, making use of France's complicated financial situation, and also the aid of American capital which for the time being is competing with Great Britain, not only in Europe, but on the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

It is no secret to anyone that Great Britain is striving by all manner of means to increase French complications in Morocco, that she is even openly supplying arms to the Riffis who are struggling against France. According to Great Britain's plan the Guarantee Pact also has the object not only of drawing Germany into an anti-Soviet bloc, but at the same time of weakening the position of France on the Continent. Even in Persia, Great Britain is economically collaborating with Germany. Even there she is employing German technique, not only for bringing about a rupture between Persia and the U.S.S.R., but also in order to weaken French influence in the East. She is successfully pursuing the same policy in the Balkans.

Great Britain monopolised all Albanian oil and did not allow France to have a look in. France protested against the agreement between the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, and the Albanian Oil Company, pointing out that this agreement contradicts the policy of the "open door" and the St. Remo Treaty, concluded with the aim of establishing Franco-British collaboration on all questions. The British Government, however, has completely ignored this protest: the British Government, after all, "does not interfere in the private affairs of an oil company"! Yugo-Slavia used to be one of France's main points of resistance in the Balkans. Now Great Britain is ousting out her influence. The Armstrong financial group have floated a loan there. This group agreed to grant Yugo-Slavia a loan for industrial purposes and for railways in return for which Yugo-Slavia must support the military designs of Great Britain against the U.S.S.R. France is watching the penetration of British capital into Yugo-Slavia with great alarm, but thanks to the muddled state of its finances it is incapable of interfering.

This Anglo-French antagonism, this systematic struggle for the hegemony of Europe between British and French imperialism, of course, complicates to a certain extent their friendly collaboration in the struggle against the Soviet Republic. This Anglo-French antagonism particularly hinders the drawing into the anti-Soviet bloc of those European States, who although playing the role of second and third fiddle in the European concert, nevertheless have something to lose, and who have their own heavy industry which needs the Russian market for the disposal of their goods, which have their advanced proletariat capable of attacking the native bourgeoisie in the rear in the case of an attack on the U.S.S.R. The attack on the U.S.S.R. is so much the more dangerous

for these States in so far as Great Britain and France are apt to use them as a battering ram, pushing them forward into the front line of attack while they themselves hold the reins behind the scenes. This is the same with respect to Germany, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia.

Bourgeois Germany, naturally, hates and fears the Soviet Republic, just as much as Great Britain and France do. But bourgeois Germany takes into consideration the fact that, being disarmed, if she is drawn into military action against the U.S.S.R. she might be in a considerably more dangerous position than in 1923, for this time, the German revolutionary proletariat will receive support on the part of the Russian Red Army, which even Kautsky in his provocateur's pamphlet termed the **most disciplined army in the world**. On the other hand, bourgeois Germany knows how short-lived and false is Great Britain's friendship, and understands what economic advantages she can gain from the buffer condition between the Entente and the Soviet Republic. It is true that German **trading** capital and its petty agents are howling and whining against the monopoly of foreign trade in the U.S.S.R., and for the abolition of this monopoly were prepared to utilise the first appropriate pretexts for a rupture of diplomatic relations with Russia. It is true that the cowardly and blind renegade malice of the leaders of German Social-democracy, who are grovelling before Great Britain, are now singing in unison with the German unemployed commercial travellers and are also brandishing arms against the U.S.S.R. But the industrial and ruling classes of Germany having agreed to submit to the noose of the Guarantee Pact are by no means enraptured by this, and are carefully endeavouring to maintain a loophole for themselves, so that this noose is not transformed into a cul de sac. Therefore, the German "People's Party" during the negotiations on the Guarantee Pact drew up a platform, probably agreed upon with Stresemann, in which among other things, it is stated that everything concerning Germany in the famous paragraph 16 in the Constitution of the League of Nations, which treats of the obligation of joint action against "disturbers of the peace" should be eliminated, which might embroil her in the danger of war, and further that the Rapallo Treaty should stand, and finally that the treaty with the West should not lead to a policy towards Russia detrimental to German interests. The Chancellor, Luther, also made statements on the same lines, although in a more guarded form. "As far as Article 16 of the League of Nations Constitution is concerned, Germany as a matter of fact is in such a different position compared with other countries, that it has substantial

right in demanding recognition of this circumstance, and the conditions for regulations of the question arising therefrom. . . . Germany should receive a lawful guarantee that its territory will not become a gangway for foreign troops and a cockpit for those military collisions, which, during the general rivalry in the increase in armaments, might break out indeed just as a result of this decision of the League of Nations." Of course we know that all these conditions simply have the significance of shrewdness in bargaining. It is more than probable that Germany and the Entente will finally come to an agreement with regard to the Guarantee Pact. But it is more than doubtful that the German Government would not leave itself any loophole by signing the Guarantee Pact, in that the German bourgeoisie would not utilise the complications now being experienced in Great Britain and France, and in the same way also the irreconcilable antagonism between them: remember Lench's words.

Great Britain finds it difficult to harness Poland to her chariot. At the head of Poland stands a reactionary government carrying on a merciless struggle with Communism in her own home. At the same time both the Polish military clique and the "Pilsudskyites" are as ready as ever to engage on any military adventure. But the Polish industrialists are extremely interested, and will be still more interested after the free import of Polish goods into Germany, in establishing close contact with the Russian market. The Conservative "National Democracy," dreaming of a consolidation of the Polish National State, looks on the revival of German capitalism with ever-growing alarm. In order to strengthen the Polish State this Party is not only not in favour of renouncing the Dantzic corridor to the advantage of British political combinations, but is not averse from grabbing still more of East Prussia in the gift. And even the compensation offered her in the form of Memel corridor and a Federation with Lithuania by no means makes her smile, for this would definitely turn Poland into a State in which the Poles were a minority of the population. It is characteristic that even the Pilsudskyite, Srokovsky, is now changing his attitude in this question, and has written in the Pilsudsky organ "Droga": "Do not let the vast dimensions of the East, the various Polesias, Novogrudki and Volkynias lead us into transgression. What makes us approach the position of a power is the thickly populated centre of the State, its most deeply-rooted Polish section—Posnania, the Danzig corridor and Eastern Silesia." Of course, in spite of all this Germanophobia, in the event of a war with the U.S.S.R. Poland would not remain a passive onlooker, but she is not at all willing

to take upon herself the active initiative role which the Entente and particularly England are apt to allot her.

It is the same thing with Czecho-Slovakia, whose leaders look askance at Moscow.

If the greed of British imperialism and the Anglo-French antagonism to a certain degree complicate or postpone the formation of an extensive united front against the Soviet Republic in Europe, Anglo-American antagonism in exactly the same manner weakens the counter-revolutionary offensive of Great Britain in the Far East. Of course, the North American States are also endeavouring to affect a capitalist penetration in China and to exploit her just the same as Great Britain in Japan. But the better technique of the U.S.A., her inexhaustible financial resources, and her great proximity to China as compared with Great Britain, render it possible for her to conquer China by means of less thieving and more "pacifist" methods than Great Britain uses. Therefore, the U.S.A. is at the present time observing, not without malicious joy, how British predatory imperialism is calling forth the rebellion of the whole Chinese nation, and is not loth to act even as a mediator who eventually would secure the ousting of England from China and the conquest of her positions on the part of the U.S.A. The American Senator, Borah, by the way, whose influence has greatly increased since the death of La Follette, is energetically agitating for this more conciliatory policy in China. We give the following curious quotation from the "Washington Post," as being characteristic of the attitude of the American bourgeoisie towards the present events in China: "The defence of British, French or other interests in China is not the affair of the United States. The American Government is not bound to collaborate in the establishment of a stable government in China (Chang-tso-Ling—A.M.) neither from the moral nor any other point of view, nor for the suppression of Communist propaganda. The Conference which it was supposed to convene met with very little opposition in America, on the contrary has found great support in the country and is a new testimony of the dominating role of the United States in international affairs." (Translated from the Russian.)

America's position with regard to China has found sympathetic repercussions also in the British Dominions. Look what the "Daily Express" for instance writes on the Chinese question, whose proprietor is Lord Beaverbrook, a Canadian by origin and who entirely reflects the Canadian point of view :

“It is absolutely absurd to respond to the Chinese protests by cries of ‘Bolshevism.’ It is very easy to learn that bad habit of putting down everything bad in the world to Moscow conspirators. But it dulls the intellect. Besides, it prevents a real investigation of the causes of disturbance, an investigation which might lead to the cure . . . It is absolutely ridiculous to suppose that nationalist risings in many respects similar to the Boxer rising which occurred 25 years ago, when no one yet had heard anything about Lenin and Co. could be caused by outside influence.” (Re-translated from the Russian.) Of course, the analogy between the modern revolutionary-liberation movement in China and the old anti-European Boxer rebellion is senseless. But the warnings of the “Daily Express” are very significant. The speech of the ex-Australian Premier, Hughes, in Parliament is still more remarkable: “I fully approve,” he said, “the speeches of the leaders of the Labour Party (who sharply condemned the British policy). If the shooting of the Chinese nationalists on the territory of their own country is not military action, what then are we to call military action? If at the present time hooligans attack the Chinese workers in Melbourne, China can send its fleet against Australia, explaining this by the fact that it protects the lives and property of Chinese workers. We have not the right to interfere in Chinese affairs. They have no right to send the cruiser ‘Brisbane’ to Chinese waters if this was not specially demanded by Australia.” (Re-translated from the Russian.)

All the facts cited above show that the formation of a wide united front against the Soviet Republics and against the revolutionary East is complicated by the international contradictions between the imperialist powers. However, it would be extremely foolish to conclude therefrom, that there are no dangers of an intervention against the U.S.S.R. On the contrary, one can say with assurance that if an imperialist war on some other question does not break out beforehand, then a war against the Soviet Republic will sooner or later be inevitable, because the hatred against her and the fear of her on the part of the bourgeoisie are so great. And this hate and fear might push towards war in the event of the British Government not being able previously to weld a united front of **all** large imperialist powers. We can only say that at the present time we have been allowed a certain breathing space, whose duration we cannot foresee.

The only real guarantee that intervention will be put off for the longest possible period and that it will end in failure therefore, is not to be found in the contradictions between the

imperialisms of the various countries, but in the creation of a united front of the proletarians of all countries and in extension of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry in these countries.

V. The United Front of the Proletariat against the United Front of the Bourgeoisie.

The offensive of British imperialists against the U.S.S.R. which threatens to be transformed sooner or later into an armed clash, does not only herald in all this danger for the Soviet Republic, but also for the proletariat and peasantry of the whole world. In view of this danger, the formation of a united proletarian front is a question of the hour which can be put off, neither for a single day nor even an hour.

Fortunately, this united front has already begun to be formed. The British workers have been the first to make a breach in the stronghold of the Second International which has split the proletariat in the interests of saving capitalism, and this has at once produced the greatest alarm on the part of the British bourgeoisie and their lackeys. The reactionary leader of the British workers, Snowden, already in the month of June began sounding the alarm in the Liberal "Daily News." "The aim of the British Communists," he wrote, foaming at the mouth, "which they do not hide, is to destroy everything: both the capitalist system and parliament, the Labour Party and the British Empire; recently they even set themselves the tasks of overthrowing the Irish Free State, and forming an Irish Revolutionary Republic. . . The struggle against the Labour Party is becoming more intensive than it has ever been. Following the advice of Lenin, the Communists have for a number of years tried to penetrate into the Labour Party in order to destroy it from within." Further on, Snowden remarks that in spite of the modest numbers of the Communist Party it alas meets with response among the masses: "For instance, during recent weeks, local organisations passed censure on three Labour members for refusing to speak at workers' demonstrations on the same platforms as Communists. The General Council of Trade Unions is forming a united front with Russian Bolsheviks . . . One Labour M.P. in Glasgow recently addressed the annual conference of British Communists. Despite the resolutions of the Labour Party Congresses, one member of Parliament spoke in favour of the parliamentary candidature of Communists." (Translated from the Russian.) The Home Secretary, Joynson-Hicks, spoke in exactly the same tone at the Conference of the Conservative Party: "The Red Inter-

national," he said, "the huge Moscow organisation, knows that Great Britain is the concentration point of individualism, and that if it does not conquer the British Trade Unions, it will die out within a few years. For this reason it has transferred its activity to London in order to rally the various working class organisations into one compact arm." At the risk of angering Mr. Hicks, the Red International not only transferred its activity to London, but is also beginning to conquer the trade unions. It is characteristic of the present day humour of the British working masses that the conflicts on the industrial field now looming up in Great Britain are being accompanied by the demand for the establishment of friendly relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Republic. As soon as negotiations commenced for breaking off diplomatic relations with Russia, the General Council of Trade Unions in their name very decisively warned Chamberlain against taking any such step. This act of solidarity with the Russian proletariat found wider reflection in the hearts of British working masses. It is significant that even Bernard Shaw, pandering to the mood of the British workers, was compelled to make a statement in the "Daily News" concerning the attack of Snowden whom he considers his fellow thinker: "The Labour Party is acting correctly in defending its stronghold, but it should not hold up a white flag to the bourgeoisie, for such a flag on a Labour stronghold means capitulation. This is all the more important to remember at the present time, when certain forces are at work in order to ensure that the workers are taken away from Socialism (including Communism) and so that they be led once more into the channel of pure trade unionism, i.e., into a capitalist or Liberal-democratic channel." (Translated from the Russian.) John Bromley, who spoke at a meeting of railwaymen in Chester, came out much more decidedly and more sincerely against the attempt to turn the workers against the Communists: "Although I am not a Communist," he said, "and largely disagree with what the Communists teach, I nevertheless know one thing, and that is that Communists are fighting against the same people as those we are fighting against. The Communists also criticise me, but I know however, that the Communists will always be on our side when we enter the struggle. I hope that we will not follow the advice of Joynson-Hicks. We will not be so silly as to wound our own bodies. The Minority Movement is striving for the abolition of the capitalist system, and that also is our aim. Capitalism is the curse of our country; if the Conservatives tell us that the interests of capitalism and labour are identical, that is a miserable lie (approval). We should not abolish this system by force, we should abolish it by other methods, but the abolition of this

system is inevitable for it is a system which is non-Christian, non-human, which is unreasonable and brutal. We must put an end to this system, and we are working for the hastening of this end." (Translated from the Russian.) Bromley, as will be seen from his speech has not yet freed himself from the illusion that capitalism can be abolished by peaceful methods, but in so far as he sincerely desires the abolition of capitalism, so much the more foreign is he to the hypocrisy of Messrs. MacDonald and Co. Life will teach him when the moment of decisive battle approaches.

The British workers are speaking more and more decisively in favour of a united front with the Bolsheviki, and some of their leaders have already themselves spoken in the language of revolutionaries. This should meet with a repercussion and has already done so among the Social-Democratic workers of other countries. For a long time they believed in all the tales which the Social-Democratic leaders told them about the Russian Bolsheviki and about Soviet Russia. The report of the British Labour Delegation, about what they saw in that country, which showed how the capitalists and their understudies lie, awoke doubts among the ranks of the Social-Democratic working masses as a result of which a pilgrimage of workers into the Soviet Republic has been begun. After the British workers followed the Belgians, after the Belgians followed Germans, after the Germans, Swedes, and they all say with one voice: "They deceived us, we never suspected that an immense country existed at our side in which, despite tremendous difficulties, Socialism is really being taken up and in which the working class feels it is master." The unanimous opinions of all the working class delegates, who had visited Russia, irrespective as to what Party they belong is proof that the united front of the proletariat is not only possible, but that it will be realised in their near future if we concentrate all our energy thereon.

British imperialism, which at one time carried on the policy of encircling Germany with such success and which led to the world war, is now attempting to repeat this experiment with regard to the Soviet Republics, but history does not repeat itself twice. The edifice of falsehood and calumny with regard to the Soviet Republic is beginning to fall to pieces in the midst of the Western European workers . . . Now the imperialists will not be able to befool the masses and convince them that the war which they are instigating against the Soviet Republic is a war of liberation.

If, despite this, war does break out, one may be sure

that the workers will not adopt such a passive attitude towards it as they did towards the 1914 war, for the European working masses have lived through no few revolutionary storms since then. They have already seen both in Germany, Italy, and in Great Britain and in other countries that the power of the bourgeoisie is tottering and is ready to collapse. From the experience of Russia, they have already seen that the proletariat is capable of taking power into its own hands, and of maintaining it for a number of years, and marching towards Socialism with unshaken purpose. For them Socialism is no longer some distant music, but something near, something that can be felt with one's own hands. Therefore, we may be sure that if the British Imperialists once more set alight a world conflagration, the European workers will begin discussing things in a Russian manner, and this conversation will not be conducive to the good health of the incendiaries.

A. MARTYNOV.



First Bolshevik Congress

(For the 20th Anniversary)

THE Bolshevik Party will go down in history as the Party of **revolution**. And this will be correct not only as far as the **activity** of Bolshevism is concerned, but also as regards its birth as a Party. The revolution of 1905 to a large extent owed its existence to the Bolshevik Party. For the first time in history a Party of the proletariat was forged under the fire of revolution, and in the very process of an acute class struggle.

Only a few months prior to Bloody Sunday, the state of affairs within the ranks of the Russian Social-democracy was such that its opponents thought that Bolshevism would disappear from the arena of the Labour movement. Prominent representatives of Menshevism* openly declared that Bolshevism was decapitated both ideologically and organisationally.

Several months went by and the picture changed somewhat: Bolshevism began to settle down as a compact Party while Menshevism proved to be a tendency, organisationally impotent and rent with internal ideological struggles. What are the reasons for this? They must be sought in the process of the **growth of the revolution** which took place during the second half of 1904, and of **its development** during the first six months of 1905. Menshevism, which was able to beat the Leninist group on the emigrant sector of the revolutionary movement, already displayed its political bankruptcy at the end of 1904, when it started its famous "land campaign." During the period when the revolution was in process of growth, Menshevism proposed to the workers that they should **aid** the Liberals in the struggle with Tsarism. As a result of the Menshevik tactics, a number of organisations came over to the Bolsheviks, and an ideological split arose amongst the Mensheviks themselves (the commencement of the Parvus-Trotsky opposition). The first breath of the approaching revolutionary storm deepened the contention within the Social-Democratic Party, and added new **tactical** disagreements to the old **organisational** ones.

* See Martynov, "Two Dictatorships," and Trotsky, "Our Political Tasks," etc.

Simultaneously, the process of consolidation of the Bolsheviks made headway. In August, 1904, the Bolshevik general staff under the leadership of Lenin assembled and addressed an appeal to the Party to put an end to organisational anarchy by means of summoning a Party Congress. The open and covert sabotage of the Mensheviks, who wielded the central apparatus of the Party ("Iskra," the Party Council, etc.), compelled the illegal conferences of a number of organisations to form their own organ for summoning the Congress—the Bureau of the Majority Committees.

Such was the state of affairs within the Party when the 9th of January events occurred. These events showed firstly, that the Party had not kept up with the movement of the masses: the movement had surged over the head of the Party, and was being led by chance personalities (Gapon). The unity of Party organisations and the creation of a firm leading centre were matters of importance which could not be postponed. A second result of these events was the intensification of the friction between the Party fractions, an increase in the confusion of the tactical advice of the Menshevik "Iskra" and a polemic in the pages of this paper between the members of the Editorial Board.* The working out of a correct tactical policy became a task which was to decide the fate of the revolutionary movement for a whole historical epoch.

It was, therefore, quite natural that in such a situation there was no other way out for the Bolsheviks than by the decision to organise a Congress. "Based on our Revolutionary Right arising from the Revolutionary Nature of the Situation,"† the Bolshevik centre sent an appeal to all organisations to send delegates to the Third Congress of the Russian S.D.L.P. Soon after the Central Committee itself, which was composed of elements who were moderately disposed and who had followed the Menshevik Council of the Party, decided to break with the latter and concluded an alliance with the Bolshevik centre with the tangible outcome that an organisational committee was formed for the convention of the Congress.

* We refer to "Political Letters" (Trotsky) the articles of Parvus and Martov's reply to them ("What is to be Done"?) "Revolutionary Perspectives," etc., written in March-May, 1905.

† The words of Bogdanoff, at that time one of the leaders of the Bolshevik centre.

In May, 1905, just at the time when the Ivano-Voznesensk workers created the embryo organisation of the future Soviet, when an avalanche of mass workers' movements began to move throughout the whole of backward Russia, and when Tsarist Russia met its final defeat in the Far East, which brought the left Liberal strata towards the revolution, the **first Bolshevik Congress** was held—the third in the history of Russian Social Democracy.

II.

The Congress was confronted with the most complicated task of evolving the strategy and tactics of a Workers' Party in a country that was in the throes of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. This revolution differed from the classical bourgeois revolutions, firstly in so far as it was occurring during the epoch of imperialism; secondly, in view of the existence of a relatively numerous and highly concentrated factory and workshop proletariat under the influence of a Social-Democratic Party; thirdly, there was the combining of the working class struggle with the peasant movement which gave birth to contradictions of a much more profound nature than had been the case during the French revolution in 1789. The situation was so peculiar that the maximum revolutionary intuition was necessary and a most profound understanding of Marxism, as the **algebra** of the revolution so as to avoid a rut, which would be disastrous for a revolutionary party in the epoch of revolution.

At the time of the Congress, the discord between Bolshevism and Menshevism had already overrun the confines of an organised dispute. The problems of the general appreciation of the nature of the revolution stood out in all their immensity, as also did the problems of determining its motive forces and the application of the tactical advice of Marx and Engels to the concrete conditions of the Russian bourgeois revolution. It was impossible to give correct separate tactical instructions without having drawn up a fundamental strategical policy. But to work this strategy out meant smashing a number of so-called Marxist, but in reality reformist dogmas, brought forward by the Mensheviks as the latest achievement of European Social-Democratic thought.

It was the first Bolshevik Congress to which fell the honour of the first onslaught on the doctrinaire "Marxism" of the epigones, and that of taking the first steps on the way to reviving the old revolutionary Marxism with its sharpened weapon—dialectics.

(1) According to the dogma of European Marxism, the bourgeois revolution, having overthrown the feudal order, immediately leads to the political rule of the bourgeoisie which is one of the motive forces of this revolution. It is no mere chance that the overwhelming majority of the leaders of the Second International (people like Guesde) agreed with Plekhanov's appreciation of the nature of the Russian Revolution.*

In Lenin's speech on the Provisional Government and the discussion on this speech, the First Bolshevik Congress rebelled against this dogma, and declared that there are only two roads that can be taken in the revolution—either that the bourgeoisie make a deal with Tsarism or else the complete victory of the revolution leading to a **democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry**. The revolution, according to its social-economic composition, is bourgeois, in so far as it has abolished the remnants of feudalism, but not destroyed the foundations of the capitalist State, but it is **not** bourgeois as far as its motive forces are concerned. Such was the reply of the Bolsheviks which so astounded the true European "orthodox" Mensheviks who seemed to have retreated even from the realism of the Europeans themselves. The Russian revolution was a bourgeois revolution since it was above all and mainly an agrarian revolution. But just for this reason Liberalism cannot be consistently revolutionary, for on the one hand it is to a considerable extent managed from landowning sources, while on the other hand it guards the interests of the bourgeoisie which also fears an acute social upheaval.

The Russian Revolution is a bourgeois revolution, but only the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry is capable of fulfilling the task of sweeping away the remains of the feudal order and creating the best conditions for the development of free farming.

But by the irony of fate, this reply of Bolshevism was regarded as an example of "incurable dogmatism." (Unverbesserlicher Doktrinarismus). It is true it did seem doctrinaire . . . to the Bernsteinites.†

* It is well-known that at that time Plekhanov held an enquiry among the prominent European Socialists, putting to them a number of questions connected with the evaluation of the nature and motive forces of the revolution. There was hardly anyone except Kautsky who was able to give a revolutionary Marxist reply to Plekhanov's questions, which were quite abstractly formulated. (For instance, Was the revolution taking place in Russia a bourgeois one or Socialist one? etc.).

† See for example "Sozialistische Monatshefte," 1906, Vol. II.

In order to place the main strategic policy on a sound basis—that of the union of proletariat and peasantry—it was necessary that the second dogma concerning **bourgeois democracy** should also be smashed. The European “orthodoxy” understood by “bourgeois democracy” the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie of the towns. Just from these dogmas the Mensheviks arrive at the conclusion that the bourgeoisie must infallibly be the motive force of the bourgeois revolution, while the Left-wing of Menshevism—the Parvusites and Trotskyites—refuse to consider the revolution as a bourgeois revolution, since in their opinion the Russian bourgeoisie was reactionary. It was the Bolsheviks who found the dialectic solution which was mainly traced out of this very first Bolshevik Congress: bourgeois democracy in Russia is a given factor as expressed in the many millions of peasants.*

In commenting on the decisions of the Congress Lenin wrote: “In distributing the main social groups according to political tendencies we will not be committing a great error if we **identify the revolutionary and republican democracy with the peasant masses.**” The nature of the revolution does not depend upon whether the motive forces of the revolution are bourgeois. The Russian Revolution is bourgeois—even bourgeois reactionary—since it implies a deep-rooted upheaval in agricultural relations.

The above-mentioned conceptions of “European” Marxism condemned the proletariat in advance to the role of a voluntary collaborator of the bourgeoisie. The “orthodox” dogma says that the role of the proletariat in a bourgeois revolution is restricted to that of pushing on the bourgeoisie. The Mensheviks, further, referred to the decision of the last Amsterdam Congress according to which the proletarian Party can only participate in a government that grows up out of the ruins of **bourgeois** society. Any other tactic would be—Millerandism.†

* A striking example of how Lenin approached this question dialectically may be seen from the following extract from his “Two Tactics”: “There is bourgeois-democracy and bourgeois-democracy. The monarchist-landowner, supporter of the Upper Chamber, “requesting” the franchise while in secret and on the sly he concludes a deal with Tsarism for the limitation of the franchise, is also a bourgeois democrat. The peasant who is armed, comes out against the landowners and officials, and who proposes in a naively-republican manner to turn out the Tsar, is also a bourgeois-democrat.” (Vol. VI. pp. 331-332.)

† It is interesting to remark that already **several months** prior to the 1905 revolution, comrade Martynoff, who was then, so to speak, a classical representative of “European orthodoxy” in the Russian

The First Bolshevik Congress also smashed this dogma. The bourgeois revolution which is basically a peasant one, can develop a revolutionary government during its process, in which the participation of the proletarian Party is not only permissible, but absolutely essential. This government is a coalition of revolutionary classes, and has nothing in common with typical bourgeois governments.

III.

The First Bolshevik Congress was the first Congress in the history of the international Labour movement which presented **in a concrete form** the question of the **struggle for power, and the tactics of mass action**. In the epoch between the Paris Commune and the 1905 revolution, the foundation of Social-Democratic tactics led to parliamentary pressure, and the economic trade union struggle. This strategical line did not terminate in overthrowal of the bourgeois order, but simply in obtaining the maximum concessions from it. It is sufficient to glance at the agendas of the Congresses of the most important parties of international Socialism—the German and French Parties—to become convinced as to this. Parliamentary tactics, labour legislation, the struggle for peace—such were the main questions at these Congresses. Even at the famous Jena Congress in 1905, which met only a few months after the first Bolshevik Congress, the question of the struggle for reform, and the **defence** of the franchise and free coalition dominated the proceedings. The no less famous Cologne Trade Union Congress, as everybody knows, in general prohibited the propaganda of the idea of a general strike.

The first Bolshevik Congress at once showed its true colours as a Bolshevik Party, a Party of revolution, in which there is the hegemony of the proletariat. Of course, the question had to be solved, in taking into consideration the fact that the content of the revolution is bourgeois. **But the methods of struggle were in their essential the same as in a**

S.D.L.P., wrote in his famous "Two Dictatorships": "We are now on the eve of the political liberation of Russian bourgeois society, on the eve of the bourgeois revolution. Anyone who takes a clear account of the conditions of realising revolutionary dictatorship will understand that to advise the Social-Democrats to prepare for a revolutionary dictatorship during **such** a revolution—though this may be only a temporary seizure of power, would be advising them to prepare their own bankruptcy. . . . We should definitely remember that Social-Democracy is and should remain right up to the very Socialist revolution a **Party of extreme opposition** as distinguished from all other parties who may somehow or other, and in some degree or other count on coming into power in bourgeois society.

proletarian revolution. Therefore, the Congress made the first question of its work that of the **armed rising**, as the ultimate outcome of the strike struggle of the mass. The Congress slogan on this question was presented in the thesis of Lunacharsky, taken from the immortal work of Engels, "Revolution and Counter-Revolution." "Insurrection is an art in exactly the same manner as warfare or any other art." That is why the most important speech concerning the armed rising was accompanied by a speech of a co-reporter on the **practical tasks** confronting the Party in this field. And the Congress was unanimous in supporting this slogan of the armed rising and paid main attention to the practical side of the question. Work in the army, formation of armed bases, linking up the work of the rising with strikes, the role of the railways, etc.—such were the things that interested the Congress. There were far-reaching discussions as to whether the work of the insurrection should be centralised, with all forces connected at the centre, or whether the localities should be given a wide scope.

While the Bolshevik Congress was considering such "unusual" questions for Social-Democrats, the Menshevik philosophers were occupied with criticising the idea of a planned organisation of an All-Russian armed insurrection. The Eolsheviks, you see, want to "organise a revolution," while Marxism only decides how to "let loose the revolution." The Bolsheviks accentuate the technical-fighting side of preparation for the insurrection and dabble too much in military affairs. More frank Menshevists wrote openly: "The tactic chosen by the centre of our activities, the Land Assembly, is more suitable for us than the tactics of an armed rising, and the formation of a temporary revolutionary government."

But the question of an insurrection was only one point in the new revolutionary tactics of the Bolsheviks. All the questions of the Congress taken as a whole, having as their task the preparation of the Party for the conduct of the struggle for the overthrow of Tsarism, were based on the question of the activities of the **mass**. The question of a Provisional Government was presented as a question of the dictatorship of the **masses of the people**. The question of the armed insurrection was linked up with the question as to how to divert the energy of the masses from the channels of spontaneous blows against Tsarism into the channel of an organised attack. The Bolsheviks attached most importance to the enthusiasm of the masses and their will for the struggle. That is the only reason why Bolshevism was able to issue the slogan for a democratic dictatorship, the slogan

for a **people's** revolution in face of a terrible enemy, a turbulent spontaneous movement, the commencement of the peasant movement, and the weakness of the Party. "The revolution," wrote Lenin, "is a fete for the oppressed and exploited. The masses of the people have never been able to stand out as active creators of new social orders as during the revolution. During such times the people are capable of performing miracles, which, from the narrow middle-class point of view, are but part of a gradual progress. . . . We would be traitors to the revolution if we did not use this festive energy of the masses and their revolutionary enthusiasm for a merciless and unlimited struggle for a direct and decisive path." (Vol. VI., pp. 383-91, Russian Edition.)

IV.

Will the Party become the vanguard of the working class (and peasantry) **in the struggle for power**, or will its future be that of a European Labour Party, the opposition party to the bourgeois State power?—this was the main point of the discussion in the ranks of Social-Democracy in 1905. The first Bolshevik Congress gave a reply coinciding with the former hypothesis, and on behalf of the whole Party, answered the Menshevik question—"Can we conquer?"—in the affirmative, issuing the slogan **A Provisional Revolutionary Government**. "This government in its origin and its fundamental nature should be an organ of the peoples' insurrection. It should act as a weapon for summoning the National Constituent Assembly. Its activities should consist in realising the programme of minimum proletarian democracy as the sole means of protecting the interests of the people who have risen up against the autocracy"—that is how Lenin commented on this slogan soon after the Congress.

This government was conceived as a governmental coalition of two classes—the proletariat and the **peasantry**. It was conceived as a revolutionary dictatorship of the toiling masses over the bourgeois-landowning exploiting elements or, if you like, a **democratic** dictatorship; it was conceived as a political guarantee of a radical agrarian revolution, as a "government of plebeian terror, as the Jacobin method of dealing with absolutism, feudalism and the petty bourgeois order" (Marx).*

* Directly after this Congress Lenin wrote: "(Decisive) victory will be just this dictatorship, i.e., it must inevitably be based on military force, on arming of the masses, on a rising, and not on some 'legal' or 'peacefully' created institutions. It can only be a dictatorship because the realisation of the reforms immediately and absolutely needed by the proletariat and peasantry calls forth the desperate resistance of the landowners, the rich bourgeoisie and Tsarism. It is impossible to break down this resistance and repel the attempts at counter-revolution without this dictatorship." (Vol. VI., p. 333, Russian Ed.)

To put it more briefly this slogan was linked up with the necessity to overcome the narrow class-sectional interests of the proletariat.

The whole historical significance of this slogan will become still more clear to us if we recall the position of Menshevism in regard to this question, as expressed in the decisions of the Menshevik Conference and in articles in the new "Iskra." The Mensheviks decisively refuted the slogan of a Provisional Government. The following were the arguments: If the revolution in Russia is a bourgeois revolution, then power should also pass into the hands of the bourgeoisie and it would appear that under such conditions it is the duty of the proletarian party to maintain the independence of the class struggle of the proletariat, the fundamental condition for which is that participation in the government cannot be permitted on principle. Either Marxism or Millerandism—such was the polemical trump-card of the Mensheviks. The slogan of the Provisional Government was **inacceptable** since it would mean dilution of the class struggle of the proletariat with general democratic slogans, it is unacceptable since—in the opinion of the Caucasian Mensheviks—"It will compel the bourgeois classes to be averse to the cause of the revolution, and, therefore, weaken its oscillations." The slogan for the Provisional Government is **not real** since it presupposes a united will of the proletariat and petty bourgeoisie (peasantry) which in reality is impossible. The slogan for a revolutionary government is a Jacobin slogan; it signifies the substitution of the revolution by a dictatorship, which might bring with it the doom of a Jacobin dictatorship. Such was the complex of ideas of Menshevism of this most dangerous variety of international opportunism. The first Bolshevik Congress confronted this with its revolutionary Marxist standpoint which consisted in the following: It is true, our revolution is a bourgeois one, but this by no means signifies that its revolutionary force cannot be the proletariat. The working class, participating in the revolutionary government, not only does not betray its class interests, but on the contrary creates the only real guarantees for its class conquests. On the other hand, the Menshevik talk about diluting the interests of the proletariat is essentially a recitation of the speeches of bourgeois liberalism which is interested in the proletariat confining itself to the sphere of a narrow sectional struggle and clearing the field for the general political struggle of the bourgeoisie. The Mensheviks fear that the bourgeoisie will overthrow the Provisional Government. But it so happens that this is just what the Social-Democrats should desire, for this would mean

an end to the treachery of the bourgeoisie since it would expose them before the masses of the people. What the Mensheviks propose is: "The tactics of betraying the revolution and turning the proletariat into a miserable tail-end to the bourgeoisie." The Mensheviks deny the possibility of a "united will," i.e., the union of the proletariat and peasantry. This happens because they approach the very questions of the "united will" in a doctrinaire manner. No part of the petty bourgeoisie can have a united will with the proletariat in the struggle for Socialism, but this is fully possible in the struggle against autocracy, in the struggle for the Republic. Lenin wrote later in his "Two Tactics": "The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat has both a past and a future. Its past is the autocracy, serfdom, monarchy and the privileged rule. In the struggle with this past, in the struggle against the counter-revolution, the 'unity' of the will of the proletariat and peasantry is possible because there is a unity of interests." (Vol. VI., p. 359, Russian Ed.)

V.

In so far as the Congress brought forward the slogan of the revolutionary government as a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the **peasantry**, is displayed, in so doing, its attitude towards these two classes. In this question the Bolshevik tactics were on the conception that the Russian Revolution was indeed a bourgeois revolution because of its agrarian nature. The instructions that the Congress issued after discussing the reports of Lenin and T'skhakaya on the peasant movement were to support the peasantry in their struggle for the land, to the extent of confiscating the landowners' holdings, to the point of seizure and distribution of the land by force. But the agrarian revolution demands a radical political revolution, the exertion of the revolutionary energy of the peasantry, and the renunciation of local restricted fronts of the class struggle. **The first Bolshevik Congress, for the first time in the history of the international Labour movement, presented in a clear manner the question of the union of the proletariat and peasantry in the struggle for power.** The significance of this becomes yet clearer if we remember how the question was presented at that time. They presented it as representatives of sectionalism in the Labour movement, presented it as a question of work among a "particular stratum," while the Bolshevik Congress drew up on the peasant question "the tasks of leadership in the **general-national** interest of the struggle against Tsarism on the part of the whole extensive revolutionary democratic

movement" (Lenin). While the Congress endeavoured to promote the peasantry to the role of the most important motive force of the revolution, the Mensheviks sacrificed themselves for the sake of supporting the Liberals, i.e., especially the landowners. This difference in the two tactics was clearly emphasised by Lenin in his work commenting on the decisions of the Congress: "The Conference (of the **Mensheviks—N.L.**) with its **general-national political** slogans in the revolutionary period unconsciously **descends to the level of the mass of landowners**. The Party Congress with its general-national-political slogans **raises the peasant masses up to the revolutionary level.**" (Vol. VI., p. 327, Russian Edition. Black type everywhere Lenin's.)

The first Bolshevik Congress did not only formulate a clear strategical line in the bourgeois-democratic revolution of Russia. In the following lines written by Lenin in connection with the decisions of the Congress we already have a clearly expressed idea of the workers' and peasants' coalition in the **proletarian, Socialist revolution**. "**The proletariat should carry the democratic upheaval to a finish, drawing with them the masses of the peasantry in order to strangle the force of resistance of the autocracy and paralyse the powers of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat should achieve the Socialist revolution by uniting to itself the masses of semi-proletarian elements of the population in order to break the force of resistance of the bourgeoisie and paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie.**" (Vol. VI., p. 371, Russian Edition. Black type Lenin's.)

It is only by taking into account this main strategical instruction that one can understand for instance why the Congress gave permission for union with the S.R.'s in the event of the joint struggle: why it was not very long before the Congress when the Bolsheviks were carrying on a stubborn fight against the S.R.'s.*

The alliance with the S.R.'s was considered as an alliance with the representatives of certain strata of the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie and peasantry. Bolshevism, which already at that time began to display the flexibility of its tactical policy, by taking into consideration the upward trend of the peasant movement and a definite influence of the S.R.'s in certain districts, understood that the struggle with the S.R.'s, just as with the petty bourgeois Socialist

* Ideological criticism, of course, did not cease even with the decisions of the Congress.

Utopians, did not exclude the possibility of a business alliance with them on the basis of the struggle against autocracy. The doctrinaire Mensheviks looked upon this tactical move as a retreat and in connection with the general conception of Bolshevism, regarded this new move as being a step nearer to the policy of the "Narodniki." They thought that an alliance with the Liberal landowners had more in common with "Marxism" than a union with revolutionary petty bourgeois parties.

VI.

But the first Bolshevik Congress did not only produce clear political slogans. It also endeavoured to create the organisational pre-requisites for carrying out these instructions by means of abolishing the organisational confusion which prevailed in the days of Menshevik rule in the Party.

Firstly, the Congress put an end to the anarchy in the Party leadership, and created a single centre in the form of a Central Committee including in its composition a number of practical workers for illegal work.*

Secondly, the Congress drew up a constitution, liquidating the Menshevik points accepted at the previous Congresses and in line with the organisational principles of Bolshevism.

Thirdly, a course was taken whereby advanced workers could be drawn into illegal committees which up to the moment had almost exclusively been composed of intellectuals.

Fourthly, the Congress presented in a clear manner the question as to the necessity of combining illegal activities with legal work, the significance of which is tremendous in any mass movement. Later, Lenin wrote in "Two Tactics": "We must utilise legal and semi-legal societies so that we can turn them when possible into points of resistance for the future Social-Democratic Labour Party in Russia."

Fifthly, the Congress gave instructions to the Party organisations concerning changes in the form and content of agitation and propaganda. Agitation and propaganda instead of merely serving individuals and small groups should reach thousands and tens of thousands of the masses. One dele-

* Among whom, for instance, was Rykoff.

gate even proposed that Lenin should be entrusted with writing a number of popular pamphlets.

In this manner the decisions of the Congress on the organisational question were in line with the general trend of the Congress work, the aim of which was to form a compact and disciplined party out of an unco-ordinated system of organisation, to be based upon the masses, and lead the masses in the struggle for the overthrow of autocracy. It was, of course, no fault of the Congress that the subsequent events of 1905-6 which ruined the whole course of the revolution brought the Party face to face with a new organisational chaos.

VII.

As we have seen revolutionary dimensions characterised the decisions of the Congress. At the same time the Congress throughout adopted the standpoint of **revolutionary realism**. The Congress openly announced for instance, that the revolution will not remove the bourgeois order, but on the contrary will only clear the path for its development. The Congress strictly distinguished the tasks of the democratic and Socialist upheaval, which the Mensheviks were quite unable to understand. The Congress openly warned the Party and proletariat about the powerful chances of victory for reaction, and presented clearly the question of there being two revolutionary perspectives: either the **complete** victory of the revolution or its **defeat**. By issuing the slogan of the revolutionary government, the Congress did not hide from the Party the fact that tremendous obstacles stood in the way of the realisation of this slogan. What is more, the Congress took care even to give a guarantee that in reaping the fruits of victory the first place would belong to the proletariat. Almost all the delegates were in agreement with the following words of Lenin which he polemicised with certain Left comrades:

“One cannot unconditionally assert that the proletariat will decide the fate of the revolution. The same with regard to the role of the leaders. In the resolution of Voinoff* the expression is more prudent. Social-Democracy can organise a rising, might even bring it off, **but whether or not it will be guaranteed the leading role is impossible to foresee**—this will depend upon the forces and the degree of organisation of the proletariat. **The petty bourgeoisie may be better**

* Lunacharsky, reporter on the question of the armed rising.

organised, its diplomats may be stronger and more experienced. Comrade Voinoff is more careful—he says “You might fulfil this.” Comrade Mikhailoff† says “You will fulfil this.” Perhaps the proletariat will bring a decisive outcome to the revolution, **but it is impossible absolutely to confirm this.** Comrades Mikhailoff and Sosnovsky‡ have committed the same error which they accused comrade Voinoff of ‘Don’t count your chickens before they’re hatched.’ ”§

Lenin issued just the same warning also on the question as to the attitude towards the attempts of the Tsarist government to stave off the victory of the revolution by means of the creation of a rump parliament in the form of the Land Assembly. The majority of the Congress agreed that it was impossible to give categorical instructions for a boycott of such institutions. Everything would depend upon concrete conditions. The revolutionary realism, with which all decisions of the Congress were made, assisted the Bolsheviks in taking up a correct position on all questions relating to current events. This made itself particularly clearly felt during the last months, when the Mensheviks, in face of the stormy events, were obliged to suppress a number of decisions of their own conference.

VIII.

In the Congress decisions, an analysis of class relations based on materialistic dialectics, was combined with unexampled revolutionary enthusiasm, profound faith, and creative power of the masses of the people. That is why the decisions of the Menshevik Conference which were full of slavish adherence to practical instructions and vague phraseology in essential appreciation of events were qualified by Lenin as: “This is not the language of politicians, but the language of some kind of research workers.” History has confirmed Lenin’s words. The Menshevik Conference has already been relegated to the archives. The decisions of the first Bolshevik Congress have been justified in two Russian revolutions.

† Delegate of the North-Western Committee, at that time prominent Bolshevik worker.

‡ Desnitsky-Stroeff, delegate from Nijni-Novgorod, elected to the C.C. at the Congress.

§ See Minutes of Third Congress of the Russian S.D.L.P., p. 182. Black type ours.

Bolshevism has not at any single stage in the Labour movement gone back on its main strategical slogan as put forward by the first Bolshevik Congress—**democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry**. Every time it has simply put this slogan in line with the concrete tasks of the working class and supplemented it with a more profound content. In 1906, using this slogan as a starting point, Bolshevism defended the idea of the nationalisation of the land as an economic basis for this democratic dictatorship. During the **years of high tension, 1912-14**, Bolshevism, in complete accordance with its basic ideas, issued the slogan, **Democratic Republic and Confiscation of the Land**, which was to place the proletariat at the head of a new popular revolutionary wave. **In the very thick of the war**, when the horizon of a new revolution already appeared in sight, Lenin once more repeated the reality of the former slogan in his famous October theses in October, 1915. "The social composition of the future revolution in Russia can only be a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry." **But now** the tasks of the working class are more complicated than 10 years ago, when the Congress first issued this slogan. Now "the tasks of the proletariat in Russia" are to carry to a finish the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia **in order to** (black type Lenin's) set light to a Socialist revolution in Europe."

The **1917 revolution** took place. Once more Bolshevism confirmed the correctness of its basic strategical policy. The replacement of the slogan for a democratic dictatorship by that of "All Power to the Soviets" seemed to some to be an ideological over-armament, but was in reality simply an application of the general ideas of Bolshevism mainly drawn up by the first Congress, to a new concrete revolutionary situation. And when the working class and the peasantry of Russia **came into power**, Lenin, the founder of the first Bolshevik Congress, gave a correct reply in his answer to Kautsky concerning the judgment of history on the decisions of the Congress:

"The events happened exactly as we said they would. The process of the revolution has proved the correctness of our judgment. **At the beginning together and with "all"** the peasantry against the monarchy, against the landowners, against mediævalism (in so far as the revolution remains bourgeois—bourgeois-democratic). **Afterwards** together with the poorest peasantry, together with the semi-

proletariat, together with all the exploited **against capitalism**, against also the village rich, the kulaks, the speculators, in accordance with the development of the revolution into a **Socialist** one.*

N. LENZNER.

* See "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky," Lenin's Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. XV. pp. 508-509.



E.C.C.I. Letter to All Organisations & Members of the C.P.G.

DEAR COMRADES—As early as the last session of the Enlarged Executive—March-April, 1925—and shortly afterwards, we discussed in detail, in conjunction with the representatives of the German Communist Party, those questions in which, in our opinion, the greatest defects of Party work are evidenced. The most important question—the question of the German Party—was at that time, and still continues to be, the problem of increasing the **recruiting powers** of our Party, the problem of winning the masses, especially the masses of Social-Democratic workers. Our general political line has been determined from this standpoint, and from this standpoint we have considered the other questions. Among these we find the following tasks; work in the **trade unions**; **convincing** the Social-Democratic workers (questions of propaganda, “change of tone,” etc.); the **“normalising” of Party life** (inner Party democracy, employment of the former opposition, freedom of discussion, election of Party functionaries, introduction of fresh leading forces, etc.), was regarded by us at the same time as a pre-requisite for the establishment of correct relations towards the masses outside the Party; **the liquidation of the hidden fight against the International** (liquidation of the custom of so-called independent emissaries in other parties, sincere carrying out of the real Bolshevik line).

Before the Party Conference, the representatives of the Executive once more negotiated with the representatives of the German Party, although not entirely officially; this was at the wish of the German representatives.

At these negotiations the **three** most important groups of questions were discussed.

Firstly: The Executive pointed out the existence of certain **Right** deviations in the leading group, Ruth Fischer-Maslov; the adoption of a too parliamentary attitude, etc.

Secondly: It was decided that a really new course should be followed in the **trade union question**: that a strong and capable trade union department be demonstratively elected at the Party Conference, or instructions to this effect given to the new Party Central.

Thirdly: The representatives of the Executive insisted that fresh leading forces are to be elected to the Central, especially comrades familiar with trade union work, and including some comrades of the opposition. Not for the purpose of dragging the Party over to the "Right," as has been deliberately wrongly asserted, but in order to create means of access to the vacillating members of the Party.

The Executive received **three** subsequent inquiries as to the elements of which the Party Central was to be composed, and **three** times it confirmed its advice.

At the Party Conference itself these decisions were, for the most part, **not** carried out. Comrade Ruth Fischer's group not only sabotaged the decisions, but at the same time caused the delegation sent by the Executive to be treated in such a manner that it was obliged to issue a declaration to this effect. At the conclusion of the Party Conference an offer of an alliance on the part of the Scholem-Rosenberg group against the Executive was tacitly accepted, a proceeding void of all principle, seeing that **politically** the Party Conference was being carried on in the spirit of fight against the ultra-Left. A conflict with the representatives of the Youth International was brought about in an analogous manner; the International Youth Conference, in which the representatives of 13 countries participated, has officially stated its standpoint with regard to this, and addressed an appeal to this effect to the Executive.

This brought about a severe crisis. The **first** delegation coming to us with instructions for the disavowal of the E.C.C.I. delegation was obliged to admit, after a heated discussion, that the Executive was right. The whole delegation made a declaration to the effect that it held the criticism made by the E.C.C.I. to be correct, that it considered the standpoint represented by the E.C.C.I. delegation to have been right, and that it was in agreement with the political line taken by the Youth representatives and by the International Youth Conference.

Meanwhile it was decided—at the wish of the German delegation—to have the larger body of representatives sent for. Ruth Fischer employed every possible means in order to delay their arrival.

The **second delegation** was divided into two groups. At first comrade Ruth Fischer opposed the criticism of the E.C.C.I., but after a long discussion in the Commission of the E.C.C.I., participated in by the representatives of all the leading Parties, she too made a declaration acknowledging the correctness of the criticism made by the E.C.C.I.

This, briefly stated, is the state of affairs. We wish, however, to add some further explanations, for the purpose of making the standpoint of the Communist International clear to the German comrades.

1. The General Situation.

The world political situation may be regarded as extremely critical. Despite the relative stabilisation in Central Europe, the fundamental inconsistencies of modern capitalism are causing a state of extreme tension. The rapid growth of the Soviet Union, the decline experienced by England, the successes of the International Red united front (Anglo-Russian trade union bloc and the struggle for unity; the German and other workers' delegations to Soviet Russia; the workers' and peasants' congresses in France; the revolutionising of the whole English Labour movement, etc.), and the enormous increase in the acuteness of the colonial and semi-colonial struggles for freedom (Morocco, Syria, and especially in China) on the one hand; and on the other hand the concentration of imperialist forces against the Soviet Union (the military-diplomatic "ring" around Moscow; agitation in the bourgeois press; English policy and the security pact; preparations for war and blockade; the attitude adopted by Kautsky and the Social-Democratic press, etc.)—these are all symptoms of the general aggravation of the situation.

Among this complex of symptoms one of particular importance is Germany's **fresh orientation** towards the West. This orientation is creating another general trend of feeling among the people, and is even mirrored to a certain extent among the least class conscious sections of the proletariat.

Two different processes are to be observed among the German people. In the first place, the fresh wave of sympathy for the Soviet Union; the Social-Democratic workers are beginning to develop towards Communism. Not directly towards the Communist Party, but by roundabout paths and in novel ways, which the Party must learn to estimate. A typical example is furnished by the workers' delegations.

On the other hand, we have to record the growth, in certain—if small sections of the working class of the so-called “anti-Moscow” tendencies, an expression of the fresh orientation of the bourgeoisie. This process is also going on in the German C.P. to a certain extent. The so-called ultra-Left tendency is frequently merely a cloak for Social-Democratic, reformist, “Levitic” tendencies, which threaten to change into direct betrayal of the international working class. These two processes are of an international character, and are thus of particular importance.

There is no doubt that a number of circumstances greatly increasing the difficulties existed at the time when the Left took over the leadership of the Party. The October defeat, six months of illegality, the MacDonald Government, Left elections in France, and the Dawes Report with its resultant reformist illusions among broad strata of the working class. But in spite of all this, the losses sustained by the Party, unavoidable to a certain degree, would not have been so great if the leaders of the Party had not committed the above grave errors.

In spite of this we must state here that the above-mentioned group of leaders in the Party Central have not by any means showed themselves capable of reacting properly to the new processes taking place in the working class. Although the general situation is by no means unfavourable, the number of members in the Party, at best, only maintains its level; there is a serious falling off in the trade unions; there were serious losses at the political elections; the recruiting powers of the Party are insufficiently developed, despite the apparent unity, which is by no means a Bolshevik unity. This is the point which has now been reached. The Party leaders have not proved capable of winning over the Social-Democratic and non-party workers.

The Ruth Fischer-Maslov group has not proved capable of an energetic fight against the “ultra-Left,” in reality anti-Communist tendencies, and has even supported these tend-

encies by playing a highly ambiguous role in international questions.

2. Trade Union Work, the Comintern and the Leading Groups in the Party Central.

These defects in leadership have been most strikingly evidenced in the trade union question. As early as the Frankfort Party Congress (1924), at which the victory of the German Left over Brandlerism was decided, considerable differences arose between the Executive and the new German Party leaders in the trade union question. The leading group Maslov-Ruth Fischer, it is true, opposed the crassest advances made by the ultra-Left abandonment of work in the reformist unions, but their half-hearted decisions (for instance, with reference to the independent unions) showed their failure to grasp the fundamental essence and the full extent of the problem of our trade union work. This lack of understanding of the importance of trade union work has practically had the effect of causing the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group for months to carry out the decisions of the Comintern imperfectly. A confidential telegram sent by the Executive after the Frankfort Party Congress was sent in a circular to all the district secretaries for the purpose of inciting these to protest against the Executive; the anti-trade union propaganda in the ranks of the Party was inadequately combatted up to the Fifth World Congress.

At the Fifth World Congress, the slogan of international trade union unity was placed on the agenda for the first time. This Congress regarded this new slogan as the fundamental element of our whole Bolshevik strategy, the first aim of which is the winning of the majority of the working class. In this connection the Fifth World Congress analysed the MacDonald Government as what it really was: the reflection—though false and reformist—of a profound historical process of development in the English working class.

The German delegation, under the leadership of Ruth Fischer, at first opposed the propositions of the Executive at the Fifth World Congress. A veiled insinuation was made that the struggle for international trade union unity was merely a "move in the game of Russian foreign politics," an attempt at a rapprochement to the Social-Democratic MacDonald Government.

It was not until after lengthy negotiations that the dele-

gation allowed itself to be convinced of the untenableness of its policy. The accusation that the struggle for trade union unity was merely a diplomatic move in Russian foreign politics can only be attributed to a fundamentally anti-Bolshevist and Social-Democratic mentality on the part of the leading group. The like accusation made by MacDonald himself, and by all the English and international social traitors, in order to discredit the struggle for trade union unity.

The struggle for unity among the trade unions is a constituent of Bolshevist strategy towards the majority of the international working class. Those who have not grasped this have not been able, and are still unable, to form a correct estimate of the total world political constellation of the present day, and are even less able to carry out the tactics of the Comintern in their own country with full energy.

The lack of comprehension revealed by the leading group in the international trade union campaign is on a line with the serious errors and omissions of this group in their trade union work in Germany itself.

The decisions of the Fifth World Congress in the trade union question have been "carried out" too much by means of mechanical pressure and threats of organisatory measures.

On the other hand the actual work of enlightenment, the ideological education of the members of the Party to an understanding of our trade union policy, and the working out of a positive line of policy with the A.D.G.B. (General German Trade Union Federation) have been exceedingly deficient.

This has meant an increase in the severe losses suffered by our Party of late years in every sphere of trade union work. Whilst the opposition counted 88 delegates at the last congress held by the General German Trade Union Federation (1922), at this year's congress it was represented by only two delegates. We have lost a number of payment centres and local cartels. Not only in numbers, but in ideology, and above all in organisation, we have greatly lost influence among the free German trade unions with their more than 80 per cent. non-party membership. Although there are a number of objective factors (the changed political situation, the mass expulsions, the reactionary statutes and election stipulations of the trade unions) which have also contributed to bring about these losses, still the errors and omissions of the leading group of Party leaders have played the main role.

The main errors of our trade union work consist of the incapacity to grasp and secure, politically and organisationally, the trends and currents favourable to us among the broad masses of the working class. For some months there have been signs of the gradual re-awakening of political activity among large sections of the German working class (the building workers' strike, and various other wage struggles in the different branches of industry, the wood workers' struggle, great demonstrations in various cities, successful Red Days, etc.). The Party leaders have not shown themselves capable of reacting to these new phenomena, above all they have not been able to take advantage of them for our trade union work.

We have already mentioned that comrade Ruth Fischer's group dissolved the former trade union department of the Central without according the matter due consideration. The express undertaking of the representative of the Central to propose the renewed formation of a strong trade union department at the Tenth Party Congress, was not adhered to. There can only be two explanations of this omission: either the leading group **forgot** to carry out the decision of the Comintern, or it did not **want** to carry it out. Should the first be the case, then the leaders forgot one of the most important political and organisatory tasks of the Party; should the second be the case, then they sabotaged the will of the Communist International. In either case they have undertaken a serious responsibility towards the Party and the International.

One of the reasons why the leading comrades of this group neglect the trade union question is their lack of faith in the political power and activity of the masses, both of the members of their own Party and of the working class in general. This pessimism, which is anything but Bolshevism, on the part of various leading comrades has, for instance, been expressed as follows:

"If we disregard the head functionaries, and take the trouble to descend into the ranks of the members, we shall find that our proletarians in the shops and factories are very uncertain in their defence of the Communist Party. They do not feel themselves as the victors of the future, but as people following a tradition for the sake of decency." (Speech delivered by comrade Ruth Fischer at the Central Committee meeting on 9-10

May, 1925. See protocol in the pamphlet: "The Monarchist Danger and the Tactics of the German C.P." p. 55.)

We are firmly convinced that these declarations represent an under-valuation of the Communist Party of Germany, a Party which, despite all its defects, is one of the soundest and best proletarian sections of the Comintern.

An even crasser statement is that contained in Ruth Fischer's speech (in the German Commission of the Pre-sidium) to the effect that "the masses flee from everyday life, and play at soldiers."

"I believe the cause of the difficulties arises from two main sources, these, however, being again connected with one another. Firstly, a concealed trend of feeling, deep down among the masses of the members, towards liquidation, which says: We have won no victory, why should we trouble ourselves to build up a Communist Party? We can just as well carry on class warfare among the Social-Democrats. As an example and proof of this we may cite the really impassioned enthusiasm with which our Party members take part in demonstrations and in the Red Front Fighters' Union. Why? Because they can play at making revolution without performing any organisational work. It is my conviction that our comrades take refuge in the demonstrations to save themselves the daily work in the trade unions and factories."

These ideas have nothing whatever in common with either a correct estimate of the actual situation, nor with Bolshevism. They are an attempt on the part of the leading group to substitute a **false** criticism of the totality of the Party members for self-criticism. This under-valuation of the Party members and of the working masses is a further key to the errors of the comrades in question, in trade union and other work.

The actual task incumbent on the Party is precisely the opposite of this; it should increase the confidence of the Party in its own power and in all the sound forces existing in the working class; it should awaken the fighting spirit of the Party and arouse its consciousness of its growing strength.

3. Relations to the Communist International.

The great political currents stirring the working class are not without influence on the Party representing the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. The impulse felt by ever-broadening strata of the working class of the Soviet

Union is mirrored within our own ranks by their permeation with Leninism and with the experience gained by the Bolsheviks. And on the other hand, the vacillations and treacheries of certain Labour groups, influenced by the bourgeois anti-Moscow agitation, have their final effect in the "anti-Moscow" tendencies, that is, the tendencies directed against the Soviet Union, against the Russian C.P., and against the Comintern within our Party.

This danger is all the greater in the German C.P. because all its nuances and currents, without exception, are at the present day still, to a large extent, subordinate to the influence of Social-Democratic "West European" traditions.

Every deviation from Communist policy which has hitherto occurred in Germany has begun with an attack upon Soviet Russia, the Russian C.P., the Comintern. Seven years of experience in the German revolution have taught us that **all** deviations of this description, no matter whether disguised as "Right" or "Left," have either developed directly into Social-Democracy, or have practically entered into an alliance with it. This applies to the German Communist Labour Party, to Levi, to Friesland, to various followers of Brandler, to the Schuhmacher group, etc.

The changes in the political situation, the final transition of the German bourgeoisie to a Western orientation, the climax reached by Social-Democratic agitation against Soviet Russia, render the danger of anti-Bolshevist deviations in the German C.P. at the present juncture greater and acuter than ever.

The ultra-Left group Scholem, Rosenberg, Katz, who reproach the Comintern and its most important parties of "opportunism," have nothing in common with Leninism, but on the contrary, their relations to the Comintern and their attitude towards the problems of the German revolution are expressly anti-Bolshevist in character.

Dangerous and essentially Social-Democratic deviations of this nature are to be found, however, not only in the officially ultra-Left group, but among the leading persons in the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group. Comrade Maslov's writings cannot be regarded as a contribution to the serious, conscientious, theoretical education of the Party in the spirit of Leninism. His greatest literary works in particular are a concealed and extremely dangerous attack upon the principles of Leninism, and against the whole policy of the Comintern at the present period.

In his book: "The two revolutions of 1917" (Vol. 1, Part 4, p. 45), comrade Maslov writes as follows on the Third World Congress of the C.I.

"I am firmly convinced that such grave errors were committed at the Third World Congress that this Congress did far more harm than good to the European (!) parties. **Certainly this applies to the German C.P. . . .**

"At the Third World Congress a general attack was made on the Left, and which was carried to a ridiculous point: comrade Trotsky discovered highly acute "Left dangers" even in Frossard's party . . . in the French C.P. **It is to be regretted that comrade Lenin made the same mistake.** It is the sole error known to me (!) in Lenin's dealings with the Party. **Thus to fail to recognise the character of a Party like the German C.P.,** with its powerful Social-Democratic traditions, especially under rightly recognised objective conditions **which afforded no opportunity for Left excesses . . .**

"The Third Congress declared Levi to be actually in the right . . .

"The Congress drove the German Party (like the French) to the Right, **brought about a serious and lengthy liquidatory crisis . . .**"

The Executive declares before the whole Communist International that this monstrous attack upon Lenin and Leninism cannot be tolerated under any circumstances.

The reproach that the Comintern not only recognised Levi's criticism of various ultra-Left errors in the Party, but declared the group of renegades around Levi to be "actually in the right," "drove" the "European parties" into opportunism at the Third Congress, and "brought about" the liquidation current in the German Party, is a repetition of the assertions made in 1921 by Rühle, Pfemfert and those adherents of the Communist Labour Party of Germany who have since landed in the camp of counter-revolution. Comrade Maslov attempts to oppose to Lenin's alleged "opportunism" a "pure" "Left" and specifically "West European" Communism. This is precisely the standpoint taken by Paul Levi, Frossard, Hoeglund, and all the enemies of Leninism.

Behind the mask of combatting Trotskyism and the

renegade Levi, Maslov prepares his attack on Lenin, who "failed to recognise the character of the German C.P." Beneath the cloak of combatting "West European" deviations from Communism, that is, anti-Bolshevist deviations, Maslov propagated a "West European Communism" of the worst kind.

It is not by accident that to-day, in 1925, comrade Maslov makes precisely the Third World Congress the object of his attack.

The Third Congress embodies precisely **that** concrete link in the chain of the development of Leninism and of the Comintern which is of the greatest immediate practical significance in the present situation for all Communist Parties, but above all for the German. The Third World Congress took place at a turning point of international proletarian revolution, at the moment of transition from the period of tempestuous revolutionary upheaval in the years immediately following the war, 1919 and 1920, to the period of slower revolutionary development in 1921 and 1925—and beyond this. The fresh estimate of the international situation enabled the Third Congress, under the leadership of Lenin, to draw fresh conclusions for the tactics of all Communist Parties.

Whilst the First and Second World Congresses determined only the general outlines of the strategy and tactics of the Comintern, the Third Congress worked out the concrete policy to be pursued by the Communist Parties during the present transitional period between the two revolutions. It placed the slogan: "**Go to the Masses**" in the centre of our policy, that is, it directed our course towards the winning over of the great majority of the working class. With this it created the beginning of the **Bolshevist united front tactics**, the axis around which our present policy revolves.

Those who—like comrade Maslov—deny this important turning point in our tactics, those who seek to discredit it as a "swing to the Right," those who deride it as a concession to Trotskyism or to the apostate Levi, **are attacking the fundamental principles of the Comintern.**

The practical consequences of comrade Maslov's false theory are inevitable. If we delete out the basis of the united front tactics, the results in practice must be zero. If we assert that "Lenin failed to recognise the character of the German Communist Party," then we cannot lead this Party in the spirit of Leninism. Comrade Maslov's ideology is antagonistic to Leninism, not only in tactics, but in principle. It is one of the roots of the resistance still opposing

the tactics of the Comintern in the German C.P. to-day. It is one of the roots of the years of misunderstanding encountered in **trade union work**, this main centre of our policy, among the leading group of the German Central. And finally, it is one of the roots of the continuous coquetting on the part of the alleged "combatters" of the ultra-Left group, headed by comrades Maslov and Ruth Fischer, with precisely this group itself.

Since the Third World Congress, the attitude of the Maslov group to the Comintern has been unsound and un-Bolshevist. At the Jena Party Conference this group opposed the standpoint held by Lenin and the Executive. Not only did it criticise—and quite rightly—the opportunist distortion of the united front tactics on the part of the Brandler group, but it brought forward all manner of objections and reservations against the actual united front tactics of the Comintern, and against the slogan of the "Workers' and Peasants' Government." Up to recently these anti-Bolshevist tendencies possessed decisive influence in this group. The fact that the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group, despite all warnings from the Comintern, combined with the Scholem-Rosenberg-Katz group to form a firm unit until five months ago did not fail to bring its punishment. At the Frankfort Party Congress various "anti-Moscow" advances were made (in the trade union question, in the question of the selection of members to compose the Central, etc.). In spite of the objection raised by the Executive, comrade Ruth Fischer **sent** several emissaries to various sections during the course of the past year, entrusted with the "mission" of altering the tactics of the Executive by fractional means. The result of these emissaries' journeys has been the discrediting and alienation of the German Party in the brother parties of the Comintern.

These tendencies were expressed with special clearness at the last Party Congress. All the proposals made by the Executive in the trade union and Central questions were rejected, despite the given undertaking to accept them. At the Party Conference not a word was said—except in comrade Thaelmann's speech—about the promised demonstrative change to be made in our trade union tactics.

Every delegate to the Party Congress received from the Central a copy of a special number of the Berlin "Funke," the main contents of which were a—"diplomatic"—attack by Maslov on the Comintern. In this article, entitled: "Some observations on our Tenth Party Congress," Maslov wrote as follows :

“The subsequent Left of the German C.P., before the Fourth World Congress, raised the demand of **“Back to the Second World Congress”** in this sense, and quite rightly. Comrade Zetkin, in her above-mentioned book of memoirs, relates that Lenin laughed at this “foolishness.” I do not doubt it, for I can easily imagine how this slogan was presented and interpreted to him. . . .

It is not for nothing that the Fourth Congress, despite Lenin’s derision, expressly confirmed the 21 conditions, and it is not for nothing that the Fifth World Congress was compelled . . . to return deliberately and emphatically to the principles of the Second. . . .”

Here again Maslov attempts, by means of demagogic confrontation of the Second, Fourth and Fifth World Congresses on the one hand, and the Third on the other, to destroy ideologically the political development of the Comintern, and to discredit the principles of Communist policy at the present period. Maslov also makes the untrue assertion that: **“The Levites, unfortunately, have received the actual support of the Russian comrades.”**

This agitation against the “Russian comrades” is followed in Maslov’s article by the equally dangerous legend that “the Levites rightly regarded themselves as victors at the Congress in Moscow (!)”. . .

“The Third Congress,” proceeds Maslov, “had above all the effect of preventing the German C.P. from finding clearness for itself. Thus the Third Congress . . . exercised a similar effect upon the German C.P. as the Heidelberg Party Conference two years previously; despite correct decisions . . . **a harmful effect.**”

“If the principles of the Second Congress had been propounded without the bogey of “Left” dangers being raised . . . then in all probability the crises of the German and French Communist Parties would have been considerably shortened.

But the Executive too, and the Russian comrades (!) were not at all agreed”

Maslov writes further that not his group, but the Executive, “has for a long time prevented the German Party from entering into satisfactory relations with the Executive.”

He relates with complete approval the following incident :

“When the Executive endeavoured, after Jena, to correct its (completely unjustifiable) attack by inviting a Berlin delegation to visit Moscow, it was too late; the delegation unanimously declined this **invitation to a feast already over**, and Friesland, already Right, wrote the letter of refusal at the request of the organisation.”

This last paragraph is an unexampled attempt at lowering the Communist International in the eyes of the German workers.

The anti-Bolshevist dalliance in Maslov's group is in itself the best proof that Lenin was not merely “setting up the bogey of Left dangers” at the Third World Congress, but that these dangers still exist to-day, four years after the Third World Congress and are hampering the development of the German Party, hindering its participation in sound political work, and poisoning its ideology. The most expressed representative of these Left, or rather Levitical dangers, is Maslov himself with his conception of the Third World Congress.

The whole German Party, above all the best comrades of the German Left in all the Party organisations and districts, are faced with the duty of exerting their utmost efforts to break with the non-Bolshevist system of relations between the Party and the Comintern promoted by the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group.

Another thing which must be broken with—definitely broken with—is the system of “bookkeeping by double entry” employed by the above-mentioned comrades for a full year in their relations with the Comintern. Instead of sincerely carrying out the correct lines laid down by the Comintern, this group has made continual attempts at side-tracking, substantiating their action to their own Party members by references to an alleged “pressure to the Right” on the part of the Executive; at the same time they have offered systematic resistance to the Executive, by referring to an alleged “ultra-Left tendency” among the members of the German Party.

The experiences gained during the fighting period just past, since the Frankfort Party Conference, have proved to every German Communist that the Comintern has proved to have been unconditionally right in every disputed question with the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group. It has been right in the united front tactics and in the trade union question. It was as right in the question of the Presidential Election as it has been in its warnings—disregarded for years—as to the ultra-Left dangers in the German Party.

We are firmly convinced that the Communist workers of Germany will speedily recognise that in the present struggle for the inner Party course to be pursued by the German C.P. for its relations to the Comintern, for its relations to the masses of the workers, for its relations to Leninist theory, the Comintern is **absolutely in the right**, whilst the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group is **unconditionally in the wrong** in all these questions.

4. The Inner Life of the Party.

The leading group of the Party Central has not showed itself capable of adopting the right measures for gaining access to the masses. Another reason for this failure has been the wrong line of inner Party policy pursued by this group.

As already mentioned, the questions concerning inner Party life were discussed in detail with the representatives of the German Central at the session of the Enlarged Executive. These representatives of the Executive pointed out that the ultra-centralism, the mechanical pressure, the predominating administrative measures, the lack of propaganda and of any methods for spreading conviction, the dread of fresh forces, etc., were bound to be absolutely disastrous in effect. At this consultation it was decided to strengthen the inner Party democracy. We were of the opinion that after the victory over the Right has been won, and the Left has the upper hand in the Party, the organisatory guarantees for an all-round correct general policy are given, and the problem of Party **education** comes into the foreground. On the other hand, we believe that the circle of the new cadre of leaders was to be widened: The possibility of making a wider selection of Party functionaries should be guaranteed, and this cannot be done without discussions, eligibility for election, and a conscious policy towards attracting and testing new workers. In this connection we further demanded that fresh forces should be employed, among these the best members of the former opposition, who have remained true to the Comintern and to the Party. This work has, however, not been done. On the other hand, this question formed for us a part of the question of the relations towards the non-party and Social-Democratic workers. For when purely administrative methods are employed in the Party, the same policy is applied on a larger scale to the workers outside of the Party, and the result is the cutting-off of the possibility of winning over the fresh workers. We believe that unless the Party undertakes these inner party

reforms, it will not be capable of carrying out a correct policy among the masses. For this reason the Executive demanded these reforms to be made in the direction of "normalising Party life." During the session of the Enlarged Executive the German delegation, headed by comrade Ruth Fischer, **accepted** these proposals.

These problems were discussed once more with the German delegation before the Party Conference. The Executive proposed that the Central should be enlarged by a number of Party workers closely connected with the masses. Among other points, the Russian comrades pointed out that since Lenin's death the Russian C.P. has greatly increased the number of members in its Central, thus strengthening the Central, establishing its authority more firmly, and at the same time improving its communications with the mass of the Party which—in combination with the inner Party democratisation—created better conditions with the masses of workers outside the Party (Lenin recruitment).

The German Party Conference, however, was prepared and carried out in such a manner that, in spite of all promises, the direct contrary was attained. Although there exist strong wing groups in the Party (ultra-Left and Right), this fact was not reflected in the least at the Party Conference itself. There were no political discussions, as every delegation had discussed in detail beforehand what was to be said: even at the Party Conference itself—the highest instance of the Party—freedom of discussion was annulled. How scanty were the preparations made for the Party Conference may be seen from the printed motions sent in by the districts. Only seven motions were proposed: one referring to Esperanto (!), four to subscriptions, one to worker correspondents, and one to courses of communal instruction.

Analogous phenomena are to be recorded in the sphere of ideology. Never in the Labour press has one witnessed such advertising as that accorded to comrade Maslov's pamphlet. As a matter of fact, this pamphlet consists solely of **correct** quotations and thoroughly **incorrect** observations furnished by comrade Maslov. It was according to this pattern that it was attempted to develop the mental life of the Party.

This would not matter so much if the personal authority of the leaders stood very high. But this authority must possess some pre-requisites, and not merely be mechanically acquired. Unfortunately, these pre-requisites are lacking, and this is a danger for the whole Party.

In the Party there is a lack of control **from below**, that is, from the members of the Party. At the same time the leading group has been carrying on a perpetual struggle against control **from above**, that is, from the Executive of the Comintern. In this manner such a state of affairs was created as led to a loss of sense of responsibility, which led to various and quite intolerable things.

Such a structure of the Party renders impossible the development of its recruiting. Such a system as this destroys the Party itself. This system must be done away with, in order that an even worse crisis may be avoided, a crisis which might be really catastrophic in effect.

5. The Danger of Lack of Principle.

Practical Bolshevism consists, among other things, in acting upon theoretically acknowledged, honestly thought-out political lines. But in the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group the inner convictions, the inner estimate of the situation, are in obvious conflict with the line accepted. The underlying basis of this group is extremely pessimistic; it lacks revolutionary perspective; it is filled with the conception that the masses are completely passive, fleeing from everyday life, **playing** at soldiers, etc. The task of winning over the masses is impossible of accomplishment. And on the other hand the Comintern "demands" that the masses be won. Here already there is consistency within this leading group, its **pessimism** leads to its coquetting with the ultra-Left. The demands of the Comintern are met with an acknowledgment, on paper, of these demands, and with an endeavour to realise them in life, but without faith in them. Hence the vacillating attitude and political flabbiness of this group, a flabbiness combined with a diplomacy of the worst description in its relations to the Comintern.

A typical example of this is the Tenth Party Conference.

We have already referred to the "intellectual" preparations made for the Conference: comrade Moslov wrote the articles, the sole purport of which was to discredit the importance of the Third World Congress, to deprive the whole tactics of the International of their basis, and at the same time to lay the foundation for the ultra-Left groups.

Formally, however, the fight was **against the ultra-Left** at the Conference. But as soon as it came to a conflict with the International, the **political line was immediately forgotten**

and the bloc with the ultra-Left formed. And in Moscow comrade Ruth Fischer declared that the Party Conference had tended to the ultra-Left, and that she could do nothing against it, although anxious to do so! On the one hand, support is lent to ultra-Left tendencies, and on the other hand it is declared: We found ourselves in a state of emergency.

These "tactics" already possessed their traditions. In Moscow comrade Ruth Fischer declared over and over again that the "masses" hinder her in carrying out the policy recommended by the Executive, whilst in Berlin she has stated the C.I. forces an incorrect policy upon her.

This habit also found expression in comrade Schneller's speech in Moscow—comrade Schneller has since admitted this error—in which he declared (in order to defend **persons**) that the **Left** was **bankrupt**. **We consider this assertion to be wrong. It is not the Left which is bankrupt, but some of the leaders of this Left**, and the Left itself will hold its own along other lines, winning over ever-increasing numbers of the party members, and developing energetic and positive work.

In the fundamental contention against the Communist International a great part is played by the argument that we are constantly wanting to "drive the German Party to the Right."

We once more here expressly point out that in all important problems subsequent experience has **completely** justified the standpoint of the Comintern. This is now clearly understood by **everyone**. Only a politically completely limited mind could fail to grasp that without these tactics we should have had to-day, in place of the Party, merely a small group of Communists, and of very bad Communists at that.

The **legend** of the constant "driving" of the Party towards the "Right" by the Comintern must be completely and finally destroyed. We emphasise that at the present moment the Executive is not criticising the leading group from the "**Right**," but **from the Left**. Any argument brought forward in support of the assertion that the Comintern is striving to drag the Party "to the Right" would be regarded by us as a deliberate lie. It is precisely in order to extricate the Left, and with it the whole Party from out of the bog that we insist upon the proposed reforms.

6. The Tasks of the Party.

The criticism of the errors of the group which has been leading the Party up till now will only be of real and permanent benefit if it leads to a better and more determined ful-

filment of the **positive** tasks of the Party towards winning over the masses.

At the present juncture, the most important task of the Party is to react speedily and energetically upon the impending political re-grouping within the German working class. The most significant symptom occurring of late months is the rising resistance among broad masses of the workers against the "Western orientation," that is, against the going over of the bourgeoisie to the side of the Entente imperialists, against the leadership of the Second International, and the orientation of these working masses towards Soviet Russia, and—if by round-about ways—to proletarian revolution. Without over-estimating the significance and speed of this process of development, the Party must accord these new symptoms a place in the centre of its attention, follow their development with the utmost care, and take them into account at every step in practical politics.

Everything depends upon the increased recruiting powers of the Party. In dealing with the masses of Social-Democratic workers now tending to the Left, the Party must find new formulas, another tone, fresh material for agitation. It must be thoroughly informed upon all events in the camp of the Social-Democrats, and must make a special study of the local conditions in the various districts, sub-districts and local groups in order to influence them by our agitation. The masses of Social-Democratic workers now turning away from their counter-revolutionary leaders, and beginning slowly and hesitatingly, but incontestably, to turn towards proletarian revolution, must be made to feel that the Communist Party is really a party of the workers, a party which fights tenaciously for the workers' interests, for their partial demands, for their daily needs, a party which does not regard the workers merely as an object for agitation, but as class brothers, and which is sincerely endeavouring to form the proletarian united front in the class struggle.

All other political steps undertaken by the Party must be made from the standpoint of this **main task**. Above all our parliamentary work must be carried on with this standpoint in view. On every occasion, and with reference to every political question, we must seek to find the platform from which the Party can speak to the masses of the workers in the trade unions and among the Social-Democrats, to the end that they may be won over for class war. This is the light in which we must place all the questions of the Security Pact, of the League of Nations, of the trade agreements, credits, tariffs, taxation, housing policy, etc.

At the same time the combatting of the monarchist danger, the struggle against class legislation, the fight for a complete amnesty, etc., must be combined with the daily economic wage and labour struggles of the proletariat.

In order really to find access to the best section of the German Social-Democratic workers, the fight must be taken up against those excesses which originate from the time when the struggle was carried out with the weapons in hand. The greatest damage is caused to the working class when, for instance, mutual fighting is indulged in between Communists and Social-Democrats (at meetings, among the youth, etc.), which are taking place even to-day and for which the Social-Democrats are responsible, although the Communists also are not free from blame. Such fights are welcomed by the counter-revolutionary leaders of the German Social-Democracy, and these leaders, of course, consciously incite such a struggle. The Communists must take up the initiative in order finally to put an end to such things, which, of course, pre-supposes the goodwill of the Social-Democratic workers.

One must understand how to distinguish not only in words but in deeds between the counter-revolutionary Social-Democratic leaders and the broad mass of the Social-Democratic workers. Our press and in particular our factory newspapers (wall newspapers, etc.) must know how to conduct the agitation against the criminal policy of the Social-Democratic leaders, so that every Social-Democratic worker in the factory or workshop in question feels that he, the worker at the bench, the simple representative elected to the factory council is regarded differently from the high "Barmat" leader, who in parliament sells the worker again and again.

The real change of policy in this respect which will be perceived by all workers, will be accomplished when the Party concentrates all its forces upon increasing our trade union work. The Social-Democratic Party of Germany must be beaten by our trade union work. The red united front must be formed by our trade union work.

The Party and its trade union fractions must carry on a wide-scale agitation in all unions, local branches regarding the visit of the first German workers' delegation to Soviet Russia. This visit must awaken a powerful response in the whole of the German Labour movement.

The urgent desire for unity felt by the workers must be crystallised as speedily as possible by the development of a

Left-wing in the trade unions, after the pattern of the English Labour movement. This is the next step forward to be taken by the German Party in the German and international unity movement. The great movement for the unity of the trade unions will win over the broadest masses and will bring a fresh influx of members into the free trade unions, if the Communist Party becomes the driving force for trade union unity. The Communists must learn to do their best, most energetic, and concrete work in the trade unions; they must **prove** to the non-party and Social-Democratic trade union members, by means of object lessons, that they are able, in their character as Bolsheviks, to be active trade union members at the same time. This means a number of fresh tasks for our fractions in the trade unions: Real penetration into trade union life, intense study of economic and political relations (the formation of trusts, rise and fall of economic prosperity, situation in various branches of industry, peculiarities of certain spheres of economics, etc.), the working out of a clear and competent tariff and social policy, the leading of labour struggles, especially in the strategy of the strike, the adoption of a definite standpoint with regard to all organisation questions arising in the trade unions, the struggle for the industrial unions, the accordance of special consideration to the roles and tasks of the shop stewards, the emphasising of the interests of juvenile workers within the trade unions, the safeguarding of the interests of the female workers, etc.

The organisation of a competent trade union department in the Central of the German C.P. must afford the proof that the leaders of the Party are seriously inclined to make this work the fundamental task of the Party.

The carrying out of our work in the trade unions implies a determined reorganisation of the Party in accordance with the organisation decisions made by the last Party Conference. The new statutes and lines of organisation laid down by the Party Conference in Berlin must be realised with the **utmost rapidity**. The new organisatory course of the Party is closely bound up with the new political course. **The line of action common to both consists of the transference of the preponderance of all political organisatory work performed by the Party into the workshops and factories, to the end that the masses of the workers here employed may be won over.** The following three spheres of work are to be made the chief tasks of the new organisatory course:

1. The reform of the inner Party course in the direction of the normalising and democratisation of Party life, of lively

connection between the leaders and the members of the Party, by means of all the organisations of the Party.

2. A real and absolutely consistent reorganisation on the basis of the factory nuclei.

3. The organisatory comprehension and firm establishment of Communist influence in all non-party Labour organisations, above all in the trade unions, but at the same time in the mass organisations which are being formed among the proletariat.

The realisation of an active connection between the leaders and the members of the Party demands the abolition of super-centralisation and the employment of fresh forces, not only in the Central, but in all the leading organs of the Party, especially among the district leaders; it further demands the guarantee of collective work in the entire membership and the closest co-operation with the Comintern.

Co-operation with the Comintern is the more necessary that it enables the Party to be enriched by the experiences gained by the whole International.

Besides the reform of the inner Party course and the re-organisation on the basis of the factory cells, another factor of greatest importance is the rapid development of a system of really Bolshevik **Party fractions**, capable of practical work on their own initiative, in every workers' organisation without exception in which there are Communists. This task is by no means confined to the trade unions, but applies equally to all other non-party mass organisations, whether these have already existed for a long time, or whether they are just being formed. The Red Front Fighters' League affords the best example of the new formation of proletarian mass organisations on the basis of the fighting experiences of the German proletariat. The rapid adaptation of the Party to such organisations (sport associations, tenants' league, free thinkers' league, Red women's league, etc.), and making use of the same for strengthening trade union work, are necessary.

Among the errors and defects of the leadership of the German C.P., not the least is their completely wrong policy with reference to the Young Communist League of Germany. The numerical weakness and the difficulties experienced by the Youth League in Germany are to be explained to a considerable extent by the fact that the Party has done next to nothing to aid the Youth League to attain a very much higher standard. The main cause of the weakness of the German

Youth League lies however in the fact that up to recently it has trod the same wrong path which the Party has been led by its leaders and has shared all the errors of the Party. It is thus the more significant that at the 10th Party Conference only the Youth openly and to the end defended the proposals of the Comintern. This is a certain symptom that the Youth has already begun to choose the right path for itself, without the aid of the Party, and even in spite of the resistance made by the Party leaders. Therefore the attitude of the representatives of the Party leaders towards the Youth was quite inadmissible, as it found expression in the obstruction at the Party Conference and the subsequent "pressure" put upon the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Germany. The Party must understand the fact that the adoption of such an attitude with regard to the Young Communist League is capable of destroying the whole of the Communist work which has been done among the youthful workers; this work is, however, one of the most important pre-requisites for the real Bolshevisation of the Party.

The organisations of the rural and petty bourgeoisie require the special attention of the Party. At the same time the necessary steps must be taken in Germany towards the practical realisation of a **Leninist peasant policy** in Germany. The Party must mobilise the increasing discontent of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry in the questions relating to revaluation, trade agreements, credits, taxation, and tariffs, for the purpose of a common struggle against the big bourgeoisie (Communist fraction work in the revaluation and tenants' associations, the organisation of the vintners, small holders, tenant farmers, etc.).

The **parliamentary work** done by the Party in the whole country, in the provinces, and in the municipalities, must be conducted in the main from the point of view of promoting our work in the mass organisations. For this an indispensable pre-requisite is the closest co-operation between the parliamentary fractions and the Communist fractions in the trade unions, etc.

The Party must not forget for a moment that serious Right and ultra-Left dangers still continue to exist in its ranks. Mechanical measures, however, do not afford any safeguard against these dangers, but solely a broad, thorough system of enlightening and educative work carried out by the Party, penetrating right down to the last member and comprising every organisation and cell. The ideological overcoming of all errors in the spheres of practice and theory is

best accomplished by means of the **permeation of the Party** with the principles of Leninism and of the Comintern, by means of the **application** of these principles to the actual conditions obtaining in Germany, and by means of the practical Party tasks arising out of this application.

This work of inner Party propaganda must be consciously commenced by a broad campaign of enlightenment among the whole of the members, explaining the necessity and the political import of the present discussion.

7. Why Must the Change be made in the Party Precisely Now, and Why Must the Change be Rapid?

Many Party comrades will ask why the change in the leadership of the German C.P. has become so "suddenly" necessary; in reality, however, it is not a matter of differences which "suddenly" arose between the Executive and the Ruth Fischer group. It is rather a question of differences which have existed during the whole course of the last eighteen months, and which have become more and more acute until the present state of affairs, entirely intolerable for the Party and for the International, has been reached. The Executive has warned the leading group more than once against the continuation of their deviations. As early as the Session of the Enlarged Executive the Russian delegation informed the German delegation, under the lead of Ruth Fischer, after days of serious consultation, that the continuation of the wrong inner Party course hitherto pursued would render a severe conflict inevitable. The representatives of the Executive in Germany pointed out again and again the deviations and errors of the above-mentioned group. But all advice and earnest comradelike warnings remained without effect. Up to the last the Executive has sought to avoid the breaking out of an open conflict and the resulting necessary organisatory measures. It was solely for this reason that the Executive confined itself to negotiations with the leading group in the Party Central and refrained, in the hope of regaining sound conditions by these means, from submitting the accumulating antagonism to the organisations and members of the Party. We have attempted to convince the group Maslov-Ruth Fischer of its errors by means of educational methods and comradelike co-operation. Despite our misgivings, we avoided an open conflict in order that we might throw no difficulties in the way of the German Left, with whose political line the Executive has solidarised more than once, at a moment when it was undertaking a severe struggle against the Right and ultra-Left deviations in the German C.P.

This necessary step has been rendered easier for us by the circumstances that within the Left of the German Party the centre of a powerful opposition has been formed against the system of comrades Maslov and Ruth Fischer. The Berlin Party Conference, and the events immediately following its close, proved finally to the Executive that all hopes of settling the differences in the course of normal co-operation are shattered. The attacks made by comrades Maslov and Ruth Fischer force upon us the urgent necessity of laying the question of the German Party openly before all the members.

May our enemies break out into a howl of triumph and point their fingers at the sore points of the German Party. May the bourgeoisie and the local traitors of whole Germany fling scorn and derision upon the Party. Lenin taught us to expose ruthlessly all the errors of our Party, the sole Party of the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat, with Bolshevik openness, without considering the enemy. There is no Party in the world able, like the Communist Party, to recognise and to expose its defects openly and to its logical conclusion. This is the sole pledge for the rapid and complete overcoming of these errors.

The Executive is profoundly convinced that no Communist worker in Germany will permit himself to be confused or misled even for a moment by the shrieks of triumph which may certainly be anticipated from the bourgeois and Social-Democratic press.

And may all the adherents of the Right and ultra-Left in our own ranks too consider the right moment to have come to venture forward again. May the Brandlerists declare that "the Left are bankrupt." The Communist Party of Germany will none the less advance in serried ranks without lending an ear to the cries of the Right or ultra-Left opponents.

We repeat once more : it is not the German Left which is bankrupt, but some of their leaders.

The German Left, with all its faults in the past and in the present, has never been merely a group of individuals. It has a great historical role to fulfil. It drew the lessons of October 1923, it defeated Brandlerism, it united the torn Party at the moment of its severest crisis.

The German Left must uphold and continue the best traditions of the vanguard of the German industrial prole-

tariat and of the best and most powerful Party organisations, as those of Berlin, Hamburg, the Ruhr area, and the Rhine country. At the same time it must show itself capable of eliminating everything that is wrong, immature, and un-Bolshevist from its past and present. Then it will not only be the Left, but the real Bolshevist, leading heart of the German C.P.

Lenin taught us that when we openly and ruthlessly criticise our own errors before the whole working class, then these errors have already been half overcome. During the course of the twenty-five years of its history the Russian C.P. has more than once exposed and overcome its weaknesses—free from all petty bourgeois sentimentality and all egoism. The German C.P. will follow this example.

The main defects are not to be found in the thoroughly sound proletarian membership of the Party, but among the leaders, who have proved incompetent. The Party is confronted by great new tasks. The situation is not developing against us, but for us. For some months the class struggle in Germany is no more on the downward but on the **upward** line.

It is only if the whole Party recognises all the signs of the times, and if it relies upon itself, upon its own powers, upon the Communist International, and upon the unconquerable force of the German working class, then it can overcome the crisis and lead the German proletariat to victory. In this case victory is certain.

Executive of the C.I

Zinoviev, Bucharin, Manuilski, Piatnitski, Losovsky (Soviet Union), Jacob (France), Brown (Great Britain), Kuusinen (Finland), Scheflo (Norway), Kilbom (Sweden), Kolarov (Bulgaria), Dimitrov (Bulgaria), Boschkovitch (Jugoslavia), Katayama (Japan), Roy (India), Mitskevitsch Kapsukas (Lithuania).

Delegation of the German C.P.

Thälmann, Ruth Fischer, Dengel, Schwan, Schneller, Scher, Kühne, Strôtzel, Heinz Naumann, and the Central Committee of the C.P. of Germany (Section of the Communist International).

Resolution of the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany on the Decision of the Executive in the German Question.

1. The C.C. of the G.C.P. approves the report on the negotiations between the delegation of the G.C.P. and the Executive of the Comintern; it agrees without reservation with the decisions of the Executive.

2. The C.C. is in agreement with the open letter addressed by the Executive to the members of the German Party, and recognises the correctness of the criticism exercised by the Executive with regard to the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group which hitherto led the G.C.P.

3. The C.C. agrees with the organisatory decisions of the Executive, and resolves to carry them out immediately.

4. In order to persuade the broadest masses of the Party members in all the districts and organisations of the correctness and necessity of the decisions arrived at, the Central is to organise a far-reaching enlightening activity throughout the whole Party.

5. The Central Committee, as a united body, has to carry out the decisions of the Executive, and to defend them against all resistance.

6. The inner work of the Central Committee is to be organised in accordance with the new course, along the line of increased collective work, that is, of the most intense mutual co-operation among all the members and candidates of the C.C.

7. It is only possible to avoid a Party crisis if the C.C. brings the whole Party **unitedly** together in accordance with the new decisions and leads it unitedly forward on the path of practical positive tasks.

8. Every attack against the general lines laid down by the Comintern, and against the decisions newly made in the German question in particular, must be ruthlessly combated, from whatever side it may come, whether from the Right or from the ultra-Left.

Passed by all votes against one, and one abstention.

Rosa Luxemburg: Introduction to Political Economy

THIS fragment from the literary bequests of Rosa Luxemburg, which has recently been published, does not change in any way the objective historical position which has been allotted to Rosa Luxemburg by the matured Communist Movement, but it brings into prominence the extraordinary capabilities of the author, perhaps much better than all her previous published works. These capabilities—the capabilities of a great propagandist—the live popularisation, this never wearying repetition of Marxian thoughts, a vivid, powerful and yet finely-differentiated method of exposition and the continuous endeavour to reproduce Marxism on a plane which is always new, all this has not its origin only in psychological facts, but is closely linked up with Luxemburg's mode of life and her historical circumstances.

To-day, in 1925, after a six years' period of "self-discernment," there is no doubt that R.L. had not this historical mission of being the bearer of the results and the new historical aspects of the Russian Revolution to the German, and thereby to the entire European Social-Democratic Movement, which would be transformed as a result therefrom. On the contrary, her theoretical life work is the basis of that open and covert opposition which gives expression to the entire or partial lack of understanding of the Russian Revolution which arose from the historical limitation of the German Workers' Movement.

In comparison with Kautsky, the ideologist of the German Party Presidium, Rosa Luxemburg was able, in view of her close contact with the Russian and Polish Revolutionary Movements, to represent ideologically that the German proletarian mass, which had not participated in the process because of gradual organisation (through the Party

and Trade Union organisations) and the ideological strengthening of the Labour Aristocracy. On the one hand this was caused by the excessively abstract political attitude and the definitely organisational diletantism of Luxemburgism. On the other hand, because the real orthodoxy of Marxism had become of necessity the ideological form of the opposition, and just because the literary-ideological struggle formed the main part of the activity of the opposition, she had by opening up new questions raised up theoretically the Labour Movement and the Marxist-social criticism from the morass into which it had been brought by Kautskyism. The almost magic influence of Rosa Luxemburg in the revolutionary proletarian movement at the close of the war and immediately after the war sprung from two sources: (1) in the eyes of the European masses she stood closest to the Russian Revolution, she appeared to be the most suitable link between the Russian and Central European revolution; (2) her theoretical works formed a complete "system" which of necessity at the beginning of the proletarian revolutionary mass movement took the place of the crumbling Social-Democratic ideology.

The "Introduction to Political Economy," the political economic lectures of Rosa in the German Party School, forms undoubtedly a revolutionary work. The book, published by Paul Levi, has a pompous, inane, empty introduction and begins with the chapter: "What is political Economy?" in order to lead right away to "The Tendencies of Capitalist Economy." This work illustrates the entire historical tragedy of Rosa; even this division confirms this to a large extent. She begins with an extraordinary fine and short analysis of the definition of bourgeois economic science (Roscher, Bucher, etc.), and then follows an endeavour to account for revolutionary tactics in a scientific economic manner.

In Kautsky's hands "Karl Marx' economic teachings" is essential for the explanation of the process of the German capitalisation, he considered it to be his task to produce "outlines" and extracts. Whereas Rosa's conception of Marx, "transformed the science of the method of production of capital into the scientific basis of Socialism." For her, Marxian economics are "the necessary foundation of proletarian education." "The last chapter of Political Economic Precepts is the social revolution of the world proletariat." Therefore how different is her method of popularisation from

that of Kautsky. The Marxian categories, the results of a powerful abstraction process, do not become dead formulæ, but are filled with the events of real life. Prior to the discussion of this category there is a debate with the representatives of bourgeois economy on the essence of political economy and on the object of economic research and two long treatises on the economic historical position of primitive Communist Society. This is placed in juxtaposition to the Morgan "silencing" of bourgeois science and Cunow's "Sociology" and the entire present-day civilisation with its private property, class rule, man rule, compulsory laws and forced marriage. Unfortunately, in this book there are only some few specially valuable fragments, (wage-law, the essence of commodity production) of Marxian fundamental laws, but still the material here provided is sufficient to demonstrate the difference of *niveau* when compared with Kautsky.

The professors of bourgeois economy of German imperialism appear in their systematic vulgarisation, that is to say, vulgar systematisation which blurs and muddles conception. Growing German capitalism is not the beginning of capitalism, capitalism in itself, of Great Britain of 100 years ago, and the degree of class-consciousness of the proletariat is also much higher than that of the British wage labour.

The simultaneous development of German Socialism with that of German capitalism has shackled all scientific objectivity, every serious enquiring spirit and prevented even the opening up of scientific problems, namely: the analysis of the phenomenon of world economy by means of classical economy. In opposition to "the conception of popular economy" of the "ever-perfecting microcosmos" Rosa points out that "behind the dry hieroglyphics of international trade, an entire network of economic entanglements exists which are in no way connected with the simple exchange of wares which only exist for professorial wisdom." It was not the economists of German capitalism, nor the theoreticians of German Social-Democracy, but the ideology of the unorganised German proletarian opposition who put the question of what is principally new in "the enormous extension of the realm of capitalism, the development of the world market and world economy."

But the central problems of Rosa Luxemburg's life, the determination of the right relation "between tactics and principle" was in vain; for no correct answer could be given

to an incorrect tactical, organisational conception of the explanation of the principles of the imperialist world movement of capital, the development of capitalism and its scientific explanation.

Rosa Luxemburg is the child of her age, when the Labour Movement was, according to Lenin's words, divided into reformism and anarchism. And even though this period gave colour to the entire activity of Rosa Luxemburg, still she was an "eagle" flying high above the morass of German Social-Democracy. The "Introduction to Political Economy" is a new justification of Lenin's opinion.

B.L.



BOLSHEVISING

THE

Communist International

*Report of the Enlarged Executive
of the Communist International*

Contains the famous theses on Bolshevisation and full report of the most important discussions since the Fifth World Congress. This book is indispensable to every Communist and revolutionary worker.

Price - - - - *Two Shillings*

Special terms for quantities; 19/- per doz. post free.

Order from the

COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP,

16 King Street : Covent Garden : London, W.C.2

If you want to get the theory of the Communists,
To understand exactly the *HOW* and the *WHY*,
You must read the

“Communist Review”

The price is now **FOURPENCE** and there is no
better value for the money anywhere

The October issue contains:

From Minority to Majority. J. R. Campbell

Mosul and Irak. A. McManus

Bolshevising the C.P.G. Thomas Bell

Felix Edmondovitch (Dzerjinsky)

International Capitalism and its Apostle Karl Kautsky.

(N. Bukharin) J.M.D.

A Bible for Bolsheviks (Que Faire?) J. McDougall

Order from your **NEWSAGENT** or from the
Communist Bookshop, 16 King Street,
Covent Garden, London, W.C.2



Dorrit Press
Limited, T.U.



68-70 LANT ST.,
BOROUGH,
S.E.1

BOLSHEVISING

THE

Communist International

*Report of the Enlarged Executive
of the Communist International*

Contains the famous theses on Bolshevisation and full report of the most important discussions since the Fifth World Congress. This book is indispensable to every Communist and revolutionary worker.

Price - - - - Two Shillings

Special terms for quantities: 19/- per doz. post free.

Order from the

COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP,

16 King Street : Covent Garden : London, W.C. 2

If you want to get the theory of the Communists,
To understand exactly the *HOW* and the *WHY*,
You must read the

“Communist Review”

The price is now **FOURPENCE** and there is no
better value for the money anywhere

The October issue contains:

From Minority to Majority. J. R. Campbell

Mosul and Irak. A. McManus

Bolshevising the C.P.G. Thomas Bell

Felix Edmoundovitch (Dzerjinsky)

International Capitalism and its Apostle Karl Kautsky.

(N. Bukharin) J.M.D.

A Bible for Bolsheviks (Que Faire?) J. McDougall

Order from your **NEWSAGENT** or from the
Communist Bookshop, 16 King Street,
Covent Garden, London, W.C.2

Centropress
Limited, T.U.



68-70 BANT ST.,
BOROUGH,
S.E.1