

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Official Organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International



Special Congress Number

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

The Sixth Congress of the
Comintern

Editorial

The Foreign Policy of the 2nd
International Parties

WORLD CONGRESS ARTICLES

Some Critical Remarks on the
Draft Programme

The Working Class Movement
between the 5th and 6th
Congresses of the Comintern

August 1st, 1928

Vol. v. No. 15

3d.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

English Edition Published at 16 King Street, London, WC2

C O N T E N T S

THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE COMINTERN Editorial - - - - -	346	THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT BETWEEN THE V. AND VI. CONGRESSES OF THE COMINTERN H. Schwarz - - - - -	358
THE SHARPENING CLASS DIVISION Herman Remmele - - - - -	348	SOME CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE DRAFT PROGRAMME Clara Zetkin - - - - -	371
ON THE AGRARIAN SECTION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME V. Karpinsky - - - - -	354	THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL PARTIES A. Martinov - -	378

The Sixth Congress of the Comintern

THE forthcoming Sixth Congress will undoubtedly be of enormous significance to the world workers' movement and the emancipation movement of all oppressed humanity.

The four years which have passed since the last Congress have again and again provided a thorough test of the basic estimate of the modern age upon which all the strategy of international Communism is built. The Communist movement has grown and struggled in conditions of a partial capitalistic stabilisation. The international bourgeoisie have been successful in healing the wounds inflicted on capitalism by the imperialist war, in raising the level of production to the pre-war mark, and even in exceeding that level. They have succeeded in strengthening their political position, widely resorting to methods of military and police repression in regard to the working class, and finding firm support for their stabilisation policy in international social-democracy. But all these successes in stabilisation have been accompanied by a growth in those forces, the presence of which most clearly reveals the crisis of world capitalism. Those forces are first, the U.S.S.R., the country of proletarian dictatorship, the country constructing socialism, and so providing the international proletariat with an object lesson as to the actual road of emancipation, the country which is gathering around itself the oppressed nations of toilers in the colonies and semi-colonies, arousing them to the struggle against imperialism. Then secondly, there is the widely developed national liberation movement in the colonies, which has drawn dozens and hundreds of millions of people into the orbit of the international struggle with imperialism. And finally, there is the growing leftward trend of the working class, taking place on the basis of the spoliatory rationalisation now being carried out, and the attack on workers' organisations and the limitation of their rights, and also under the influence of the steadily increasing danger of war and so on.

At the present moment the profound contradictions innate in international capitalism are being developed

with new force and fresh conflicts are breaking forth which threaten to engulf the world in a new world war.

The growth of the Communist movement, despite the successes of stabilisation, despite the four years of unceasing white terror and the cruellest of repression, has thoroughly disposed of the social-democratic legends concerning the break-up of Communism, as a temporary product of the post-war ruin. The growth of Communism signifies that there is going on a concentration of the basic class forces into two groups, which will inevitably come into a decisive conflict with each other.

THE questions which the International Congress will have to consider entirely reflect the fundamental problems of the Communist movement.

The Sixth Congress will have to provide an economic and political analysis of the period of development through which we are now passing. The distinctive features of that period have already been indicated in the Plenums preceding the Congress. The change in tactics of two main sections of the Comintern—the French and the British section—which those sections have carried through under the guidance of the E.C.C.I., directly arises out of this estimate of the present position of world development. The Congress will be enabled to sum up the first results of this change in tactics.

The Congress will have to take stock of the sum of activities of the Comintern and its sections during the preceding period, and to check their practice from the viewpoint of those fundamental problems with which international Communism is faced: the struggle for the masses and the conquest of the trade unions, the war danger, the attack on international social-democracy, the support of the colonial revolutions and so on.

The central feature of the forthcoming Congress will be the consideration of the Comintern programme. In the draft which is offered to the Sixth Congress for its consideration, that programme is characterised as follows: "The programme of the Communist Inter-

The Sixth Congress—continued

national is the supreme generalisation of the experience of the international revolutionary proletarian movement, and is therefore a programme of the struggle for the world proletarian dictatorship, a programme of struggle for world Communism." The four years which have passed since the Fifth Congress have greatly enriched the Comintern's experience. At the same time, there has been an immense alteration in the circumstances of the struggle for Communism. Simultaneously the struggle against the international bourgeoisie has taken and is more and more taking on a world character, penetrating into and embracing the most backward peoples, the most remote corners of the globe. The need for formulating the basic views of Communism in regard to principles and tactics has become still greater, still more necessary. The draft programme set before the Fifth Congress has been greatly changed in the direction of a more precise formulation of the Comintern's fundamental principles, as already established in previous Congresses, in the direction of taking into account the new factors of the international revolution, and the richer experience of the last few years. The consideration and adoption of the Comintern programme is an event of great historical importance.

THE Congress will have to consider the methods of struggle against the war danger. Every day adds to the signs of the approaching war tempest. Before our eyes has developed a genuine war against China waged by the Japanese imperialists. The imperialists have not abandoned their designs of encirclement and military attack on the U.S.S.R. On the contrary, under the guidance of the British Conservatives a very real conspiratorial activity against the country of proletarian dictatorship is being carried on. During this past period the imperialists have more than once openly shown that in the struggle against the national-liberation movements in the colonies they intend to apply the most ruthless methods of military coercion. More than ever before, therefore, the work of unmasking the imperialist plans and of carrying on a day-to-day incessant propaganda of the Bolshevik slogans of struggle against the war danger, and of concrete activity in the organisation of the working class for a revolutionary response to the possible war catastrophe is necessary. More than ever before a genuine proletarian consciousness in the sense of international solidarity is necessary now. That solidarity must be demonstrated both in the propaganda of defence of the U.S.S.R. and in the concrete and real support of the proletariat of the colonies and semi-colonies, in a genuine resistance to the imperialists who are suppressing the national-liberation movement. The task of the Congress consists in the first place in giving the decisions taken on this issue an absolutely concrete and practical character. Again and again the Congress will have to arm the proletariat and the oppressed classes with the sharp sword of the Bolshevik methods of struggle against the war danger.

The colonial question, which is also on the agenda, is now taking on particularly great importance, owing to the fact that the great movement of hundreds of

millions of oppressed slaves, which began in China, is now passing on into other colonies, is taking hold of fresh mighty human masses. The experience of the Chinese revolution, which has already passed through a number of important stages in its development, and is now faced with a new revival, must be taken into account in order to strike the more accurately and vigorously at the heart of imperialism in other colonies and semi-colonies. The question of the nature of the revolutions in the colonies, of their motive forces, of the relation between the proletariat and the peasantry, of the role of the proletarian party and its attitude to the petty bourgeois groups, and finally, the most important question of the agrarian revolution, its preparation and its slogans, are all problems which the Congress has to consider. A diligent study and estimate of the peculiar features in the development of the movement in various colonial and semi-colonial countries is demanded of the Congress, and it will have to make a definite pronouncement on the question of the support to be given the colonial movements by the proletariat of imperialist countries. This is all the more necessary now, when in their colonial oppression the imperialists are being actively reinforced by international social-democracy, which is endeavouring to establish its own agencies in the colonies, and is actively intervening on the side of the imperialists and against the proletarian and peasant masses of the colonies.

THE Congress will hear a report on the situation in the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.S.U. This question is important not only because the U.S.S.R. is the chief basis of resistance of the international proletarian revolution, and not only because the C.P.S.U. section of the Comintern directs the struggle and the construction of socialism in an enormous country which has been wrested from international imperialism. The issue is also important because the question of the U.S.S.R. has played, and continues to play, an enormous role in the day-to-day struggle of the Communist Party. For a clear illustration of this one has only to turn to the recent parliamentary elections, during which the Communists and social-democrats more than once crossed swords on the U.S.S.R. issue, on the lessons of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. and so on. Meantime the last four years have also been filled with an internal struggle inside the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern for the Leninist teaching, and for the unity of the Communist army. The Trotskyist opposition, which began with isolated attacks on the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern, went as far as a direct break with Leninism over the fundamental questions of the U.S.S.R. and the Comintern, resorted to methods of open struggle against the C.P.S.U., and was expelled from the Party. This Opposition gathered around it various small groups in other sections of the Comintern, groups which were headed by openly renegade petty-bourgeois elements. In this regard the "experience" of the evolution of the "ultra-lefts" in Germany is highly instructive, for they began with accusing the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern of opportunism, and finished up with a contemptible smash, capitulation, and open transference to the social-democrats. In this struggle against the Trotskyist opposition, against schismatic groupings

The Sixth Congress—continued

in other sections, the Comintern has reinforced its ranks, and has consolidated them for a fresh and still more intense struggle against its enemies, and against international social-democracy and its agencies in the Communist ranks in the first place.

THE forthcoming Congress will set up a fresh landmark in the struggle of the international proletariat for the world proletarian dictatorship. Fresh difficulties have arisen on the road of the struggle for Communism. But the Communist International will carry on that struggle, not only having at its disposal a proletarian advance-guard tempered in battles and expert in the tactics of the class struggle, but also an enormous

human reserve in the form of its allies in the colonies and semi-colonies. Every year, every month of struggle will strengthen that alliance between the foremost proletarian ranks and the peasant masses of the colonies, an alliance which will be able to crush the might of international imperialism. The example of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., which have shown and are showing the true road to emancipation, is before the eyes of the proletariat and the oppressed masses of the whole world. The growth in the class-consciousness of the international proletariat and its consolidation around the Communist banner, the now intransigent and extending revolutionary movement in the colonies, the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R.—these are the three forces guaranteeing the victory of the Comintern.

Greetings to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International!

The Sharpening Class Division

A Study in Election Statistics

Herman Remmele

THE bourgeoisie in every European capitalist country has become nervous. The bourgeois press of all shades discusses the attitude of the bourgeoisie, and arrives at the most varied conclusions about the great influx of supporters into the ranks of the Communist Parties. But the chief tendency in all these conclusions is the determination to organise the struggle against international Communism. The election results in Poland, France and Germany especially have contributed to hastening the formation of a united anti-Communist front from amongst the ranks of all bourgeois elements. We thus see that tendencies and developments, which were formerly vague and indefinite, are now assuming a more definite form and becoming uniform throughout all capitalist countries.

The nervousness of the bourgeoisie is justified by a number of causes, which must be interpreted as a political undermining of capitalist stabilisation and an intensification of political differences. The elections are not the origin of these tendencies, they are at best the thermometer which shows the degree of intensity of the class struggle. From this aspect 1927, and even the second half of 1926, mark the beginning of the change in the Labour movement which intensifies the contradictions in the stabilisation of capitalism. In the leading European industrial countries since the latter part of 1926 big strikes have taken place, of a magnitude unknown in "stabilised" Europe, *i.e.*, since 1924. The general tendency in all the industrial countries in Europe is the substitution of the small, local strike by strikes of whole trades, industries, mass strikes, or even general strikes. A clear indication of this tendency and the changed nature of the proletarian class struggle was given in the mass strikes in England, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Norway and now even in those countries where the trade unions are subjected to the White Terror; for example, the tobacco workers and general strikes in Greece, the miners' strike in Roumania, and

the strike of agricultural workers which took place last year in Italy. This change has occurred at a time when the imperialist Powers are making every effort to win back the stability and security of capitalist economy that existed in pre-war times.

The changes that have taken place in the essence and characteristics of the class struggle of the post-war period are the products of the specific development in the imperialist nature of capitalism as compared with its pre-war development. The rescue of the capitalist system from the turmoil of war, from collapse during the periods of inflation and deflation through rationalisation and a complete regrouping of the material basis of capitalist economy has resulted in the formation of new social combinations to accomplish this rescue, which in turn have brought into being new forms of the class struggle. The conditions of the class struggle demand a much more revolutionary policy and the class solidarity has assumed a much wider basis because of the fetters that have been forged for the proletariat in nearly every capitalist country by the covert introduction of "industrial democracy," "the policy of class collaboration," "the classless peace" in industry, or the "national unity" or "rescue of the nation" in the political field. One of the best-known of these fetters is the machinery of arbitration for disputes over wages and the length of the working day, combined with legal and administrative measures against the workers' rights to combine or strike, which range class justice, State administrative bodies, together with the entire police and military apparatus in the service of the class struggle against the workers. The so-called "democratic" countries are able to carry out in a much more determined manner by laws and regulations what the lands where terrorism rages accomplish by Fascist "illegal" methods. In Great Britain, Germany and now also in the Scandinavian countries—where attempts are being made to transfer decisions on wages and working hours from

The Sharpening Division—continued

the strike meetings to the courts—these attempts constitute a considerable factor in the process of revolutionising the workers. Worthy of note in this connection are the present strikes of the building workers in Norway and the half-day general strike in Sweden, which are both directed against compulsory arbitration, and have occasioned in Norway sharp State intervention. This substitution of the organs of the State for employers' organisations is the most effective method of destroying the false "democratic" arguments that the State is above party.

We have no intention here to go into all the details of these tendencies and the workers' struggle in this connection. The mere mention must suffice to explain the tendencies which were noticeable during the last elections, and which will be still further confirmed in the ensuing parliamentary elections which will take place shortly in Sweden and Great Britain.

Development of Post-War Imperialism

Similar traits are to be found in all the elections which took place since 1926. The peculiar nature of these traits can only be explained by the special development of post-war imperialism. We enumerate here some of these peculiarities:

(1) The united class front of all bourgeois parties (including the social-democrats) against the Communist Parties. On this issue the parliamentary elections were used as the most pronounced and intense form of the class struggle.

(2) The appearance of reformism as the shock troop and most zealous fighter against Communism.

(3) The notable levelling amongst the bourgeois parties and the various groups of interests in the bourgeois camp, which has its main axis in representing the interests of trust capital as against the interests of the proletariat. In this process every attempt to establish independent petty bourgeois policy is destroyed and the independent petty bourgeois parties sink more and more into abject insignificance, or are completely liquidated. The opposing interests in the bourgeois camp tend to be submerged by the joint interest against the workers.

(4) The use of the machinery of government in all parliamentary elections against the Communist movement is one of the favourite weapons employed against the proletariat. This is true not only for those countries that employ terror, but even for the "freest republics in the world," for Germany, France and even for Great Britain amongst others.

Parliamentary elections in capitalist countries naturally do not give a correct picture of the correlation of forces and classes in the enemy camp. For so long as capitalism controls all the power and means of propaganda in the State and in society, the election results constitute only a distorted reflection of social conditions. One of the best illustrations of this was the July rising of the Vienna proletariat, which showed up the serious crisis in this miniature State, although during the elections in April of the same year almost 100 per cent. of the electors voted for the parties supporting capitalism and the State. Furthermore, the fact that the capitalist parties control the apparatus of the State, propaganda

and news enables them to make full use of the possibility of falsifying the degree of class difference and the relative strength of the individual social classes. Yet, in spite of these conditions the election results during the past two years display a tendency analogous to the intensification of the class differences and the changed character of the class struggle. The essential tendencies are as follows:

(1) Great increase in the Communist Party vote in cities and industrial centres in all countries; banishment of the social-democrats from the centres of the industrial proletariat to the countryside and small towns.

(2) Decline in the Communist Party supporters in the countryside and small towns as compared with the periods of inflation and deflation, and increased support for the Social-Democratic Parties in these districts.

(3) Stability of Communist influence and a partial increase in the Communist vote in districts where there are large estates and a population composed mainly of agricultural labourers.

These three phenomena clearly illustrate the change in the position of Communist Parties in the present period when relations between the imperialist Powers are strained. Besides these general tendencies there are many other facts which are important for the practice and tactic of Communist Parties in their defence against terrorist methods. For example, the elections in Poland: with the help of the C.I. the Putsch tendencies and opportunist errors of previous years were liquidated and the Party was enabled to carry on mass illegal work, so that during the recent election period the Party was able to act as an independent force and assume a position at least of semi-legality. The general election was preceded by municipal elections. During these the "prohibited" Communist lists of candidates polled such a large number of workers' votes that the Pilsudsky regime of terror was forced to give partial "recognition" to the Communist candidates during the parliamentary elections. This experience of the Polish Communist Party is of extreme importance for all Communist Parties in those countries where terror reigns, for the majority of these Parties were of opinion that they must make compromises and conceal their identity in order to be allowed to exist.

It is not possible to analyse the election results in the various countries simply by comparing the number of votes polled. Such a method of comparison is made impossible by the different conditions prevailing during the elections in the various countries. But still the tendency of the development of the class forces can be judged to a certain extent, and with this object in view we shall examine the numerical aspect of the elections.

The Polish Vote

In Poland in 1922 the Communist Party polled a total of 128,000 votes. At the election held this year the Communist vote was 830,000, *i.e.*, an increase of 702,000 votes, or 550 per cent. The social-democrats suffered defeat at the hands of the Communists in the most important working-class districts. The P.S.P., the faithful satellite of the Pilsudsky dictatorship, directed its main struggle against the Communist Party and polled 1,400,000 votes, securing 63 seats. But the C.P. 830,000 votes only secured 15 seats, whereas in proportion to its strength and on the basis of the social-

The Sharpening Division—continued

democratic allotment of seats the C.P. should have been given 38 seats, or 45 if treated on the same basis as the bourgeois parties. The individual results in the various cities and industrial centres in Poland give a clear proof of the transfer of social-democratic votes to the revolutionary Communist Party. In 1922 the P.S.P. polled 83,000 votes in Warsaw and the Communists 26,000 votes; this year the P.S.P. polled 43,000 votes and the C.P. 66,000 votes. A still greater transfer of votes took place in the mining district of Dombrov. In 1922 the P.S.P. polled 40,000 votes and the Communist Party 33,000; in 1928 the P.S.P. polled 20,000 votes and the Communist Party 67,000. In Lodz in 1922 the Communist Party polled 14,000 votes and 49,000 in 1928. In Upper Silesia the Communist vote rose from 5,000 in 1922 to 20,000 at the recent election. In Posen the Communist vote rose from 1,600 in 1922 to 12,000 in 1928, whilst the P.S.P. vote rose from 3,000 to 5,000.

The French Elections

The April elections in France followed the March elections in Poland. The Communist Party of France polled at the first count 1,100,000 votes as compared with 875,000 in 1924, *i.e.*, an increase of 225,000 or 25 per cent. The C.P.F. gained votes in 70 Departments and lost in 16. The gains and losses show clearly that the French Communists succeeded in defeating the war-socialists, grouped around Boncour, in the main industrial centres and undermined their influence in the countryside. In Haute Vienne the C.P.F. gained 13,000 votes, the social-democrats lost 20,000; in the Nord Department the C.P. gained 20,000 and the social-democrats lost 12,500; in the Seine et Loire the C.P. gained 9,400 votes and the social-democrats lost 19,000; in Haute Gironne the C.P. gained 4,000 votes, whilst the social-democrats lost 25,000; in the Upper and Lower Rhineland the C.P. gained 18,000 and the social-democrats lost 16,000 votes. The following table shows clearly the advance which the Communist Party made in the industrial districts:

Department	Votes gained	% increase
Allier	8,000	66
Bouches du Rhone	5,673	50
Finistere	5,000	100
Gard	5,500	40
Loire	16,632	(almost) 400
Nord	19,983	33
Pas de Calais... ..	8,968	33
Rhone	8,740	50
Seine et Loire	9,384	180
Haute Vienne	12,876	250
Mosel	9,666	36
Lower Rhine in Alsace	10,459	50
Upper Rhine Lothringen	7,267	100

The great progress which the C.P.F. made cannot be denied, no matter how much the reformists scream about the great "election defeat" of the Communists, because their mandates fell from 27 to 14. The big bourgeois newspapers make no secret about their astonishment at the great flood of red votes. Only parliamentary blockheads from the ranks of the Second International could count an increase in mandates as in-

dicative of the growth of strength. The French socialists secured 1,600,000 votes and 106 mandates, whilst the Communists polled 1,100,000 votes and only secured 14 mandates. If elections were on the basis of P.R. like they are in Germany, then the French Communist Party should have had 71 seats and not only 14. But Poincaré's and Paul Boncour's "democracy" are no better than Pilsudsky's reign of terror.

The successes of the Communist Parties of Poland and France at the parliamentary elections can well be compared with those of the German Communist Party. In December, 1924, the German Communists polled 2,709,000 votes, and 3,233,000 votes at the election in May last. Thus we get an increase of 524,000 votes or 20.6 per cent. The percentage of the Communist vote in the total poll rose from 9 per cent. in December, 1924, to 10 per cent. The Communist vote increased in 22 constituencies out of the total of 35 constituencies in the Reich, and in 9 constituencies there was a decrease, whilst in four districts stagnation was recorded. In 17 constituencies the rise in the Communist vote was far above the general average. In the following table we record some of the most important election results and give the social-democratic figures by way of comparison:

Constituency	C.P. in 1,000's			Soc. Dem. in 1,000's		
	Dec., 1924	May, 1928	%	Dec., 1924	May, 1928	%
Dresden-Bautzen ...	64	106	65	371	400	7
Potsdam II ...	105	172	64	243	301	23
Berlin ...	217	347	60	368	397	8
Hessen-Darmstadt ...	33	52	57	222	192	-13
North Westphalia...	68	107	57	237	293	24
Breslau ...	29	44	52	307	362	15
Hessen-Nassau ...	64	93	45	374	366	-2
Magdeburg ...	46	66	44	351	390	11

The big swing in favour of the Communists may best be judged from the increased vote in the big towns. Besides, in Berlin, which we have included in the preceding table, the Communist vote increased in Koenigsberg (East Prussia) from 23,000 to 32,000; in Stettin (Pomerania) from 13,000 to 17,000; in Breslau (Silesia) from 8,000 to 21,000; in Gleivitz (Upper Silesia) from 5,000 to 8,000; in Magdeburg (Central Germany) from 11,000 to 19,000; in Altona (Wasserkante) from 16,000 to 21,000; in Frankfurt-on-Main (South-West) from 16,000 to 31,000; in Duisberg (Ruhr district) from 15,000 to 22,000; in Hamborn (Lower Rhine) from 13,000 to 19,000; in Dresden from 23,000 to 42,000; in Leipzig from 51,000 to 70,000; in Chemnitz from 26,000 to 38,000; in Halle from 27,000 to 31,000; in Offenbach from 6,000 to 13,000; in Plauen from 7,000 to 10,000, etc.

In the majority of the big centres the social-democratic vote not only fell relatively but also to a certain extent there was an absolute falling off in the poll; the same was noticeable in a number of industrial centres. The Communist vote increased entirely through the transfer of former social-democratic supporters to the Communist camp. The social-democrats lost votes in Chemnitz (57,000 to 56,000), Plauen (15,000 to 14,000), Offenbach-on-Main (16,000 to 11,000). In several towns the Communists were able to outnumber the social-democrats for the first time. In three constituencies the Communists are stronger than the social-democrats—in Halle-Merseburg, Dusseldorf and Upper Silesia. The total social-democratic vote rose from 7,881,000 in

The Sharpening Division—continued

December, 1924, to 9,811,000 in May, 1928; that is an increase of 1,230,000 or 15 per cent. Taken absolutely the increase in the S.D. vote is greater than that of the C.P., but relatively it is 5.6 per cent. below the increase in the Communist vote. The increase in the social-democratic vote is obtained mainly from the ranks of former supporters of the right parties, partly from the petty bourgeois parties, all of which lost heavily. The greatest losses were those suffered by the German nationalists, the party of the monarchist landed proprietors; their vote fell from 6,205,000 to 4,360,000. The German People's Party, the party of the trust magnates, also lost heavily—3,049,000 to 2,670,000. Thus both these bourgeois parties lost roughly 40 per cent. The Centre, the clerical party, also lost, the vote falling from 4,110,000 to 3,705,000, whilst its Bavarian wing, the Bavarian People's Party, dropped from 132,000,000 to 936,000. The Fascists were only able to retain 807,000 of the 1924 vote of 907,000. Even the Democrats, despite their immunity from government affairs, only polled 1,493,000 as compared with the 1924 poll of 1,920,000.

The Swing to the Left

In all the elections in capitalist countries the results have shown that there is a sharp swing to the left amongst the proletarian electorate, and that large numbers of former social-democratic supporters have gone over to the Communist camp.

The result of the German election has increased the difficulties of the German bourgeoisie as regards the possibility of manœuvring in the formation of the government and parliamentary coalitions. The parties that formed the bourgeois bloc in the old Reichstag have now only 210 seats as compared with their former 265; as the new parliament has 500 members, 251 are required for the formation of a government majority. Hence the parties that formed the old bourgeois bloc have no longer a majority. The position of the left bourgeois bloc is the same; on the basis of the Weimar coalition policy which the social-democrats advocated, the Weimar parties control 239 seats and thus have no parliamentary majority. A government coalition on the old lines must extend the party of the trust magnates, the People's Party, to the social-democrats, *i.e.*, from Stresemann to Hermann Mueller, or a so-called Concentration Government, the government of national unity in which all parties that support the bourgeois, capitalist regime would be represented, from the "protectors of the republic," the social-democrats, to the "faithful German" monarchists, the German nationalists and Fascists, as "Germany's saviour," Hindenburg recommended after the 1924 election. This idea was accepted in principle by the social-democrats and adopted, but failed owing to the opposition of the German nationalists and Fascists, since the latter did not want to give up their means of agitation in the "struggle against the ideas of Marxism." The great coalition, which existed for a time under Stresemann, but led to constant government crises, has 282 seats, and by the possible inclusion of the Bavarian People's Party could increase the number to 322, thus constituting a strong majority of not quite two-thirds.

Nevertheless, the German bourgeoisie does not feel vanquished by the strong left tendency demonstrated by the May election. Despite the fact that in the bourgeois camp the social-democrats are the "victors," they permit the "vanquished" to dictate the conditions of peace. Already after the election the organs of trust capital, such as the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," the "Boersenzeitung," etc., declared quite openly that the parliament resulting from the election must lead to continuous government crises, that although the coalition, which is unavoidable for the bourgeois parties, controls a far bigger number of seats than ever before, still this coalition is internally unsound and cannot last long. The same papers also prophesy another election at an early date which will correct the results of the May election. The German People's Party at the very first session of the new parliament showed by its method of voting and its demands that it is not prepared to sacrifice the policy of the bourgeois bloc, nor even the political joint work of the bourgeois bloc. At the same time this party declares that it will not join the coalition unless the same coalition is formed simultaneously in Prussia. Prussia has a left government, the trust magnates now demand that here, too, the great coalition should be formed. Nevertheless, these parties which make this demand of the social-democrats decline to establish the great coalition, instead of the existing bourgeois bloc in Wuerttemberg, Bavaria and other countries where the social-democrats have also become the strongest party.

Thus it is quite evident that the German bourgeoisie despite their great defeat in the election feel themselves "masters of the situation," and a strong, united front of all bourgeois parties exists. All the various tendencies and differences that previously existed within the ranks of the bourgeois parties have disappeared, or have been greatly modified; now there is only the united will of the German bourgeoisie to wage a united struggle against the left development of the masses.

How the Workers Vote

Although in Germany this bourgeois front is directed purely against the proletariat, still the percentage of proletarian supporters of all parties is not negligible. In No. 11 of the "Internationale," the theoretical journal of the C.P.G., there is an interesting article by Erich Kunik, in which an attempt is made to analyse the percentage of workers' votes polled by all parties. Kunik undertakes a very comprehensive examination which gives the distribution of the proletarian and non-proletarian votes. As basis for this he takes the data of the official census returns of population and professions, the election results of December, 1924, and the statistics of the professional organisations which support the parties. According to this calculation, out of the 30,289,000 voters in 1924, 18,750,000 were pure proletarian and 11,539,000 non-proletarian voters. This picture serves to show that if it is possible in any country (which is a social-democratic Utopia) for the workers to seize power by means of bourgeois democracy, *i.e.*, through parliament, then Germany is that country. For in Germany almost two-thirds of all parliamentary electors are workers, proletarians who possess nothing beyond their capacity to work. The relation between proletarian and non-proletarian votes may be deduced from the following table:

The Sharpening Division—continued

1.—Right Parties					
Party	Total polled	Prol.	%	Non-prol.	%
German Nat. ...	6,705,000	4,145,000	62	2,560,000	38
Fascists ...	1,066,000	533,000	50	533,000	50
German P.P. ...	3,049,000	610,000	20	2,439,000	80
	10,820,000	5,288,000	49	5,532,000	51
2.—Bourgeois Centre Parties					
Centrum ...	5,253,000	3,256,000	62	1,997,000	38
Economic Party	1,005,000	151,000	15	854,000	85
Split Parties ...	602,000	151,000	25	452,000	75
	6,860,000	3,558,000	49.5	3,303,000	50.0
3.—Bourgeois Left Parties					
S.D.P. ...	7,980,000	6,783,000	85	1,197,000	15
Democrats ...	1,920,000	480,000	25	1,440,000	75
	9,900,000	7,263,000	73	2,637,000	27
4.—Proletarian Party					
C.P.G. ...	2,709,000	2,641,000	97.5	68,000	2.5

This analysis shows that the monarchist parties of the right and the undecided middle parties both polled proletarian votes. The German nationalists, the Fascists and the centre received more proletarian votes than bourgeois and petty bourgeois. In the May election 9,326,000 proletarian voters went over to the social-democrats from the bourgeois parties, i.e., one-third, and 524,000 from the social-democrats to the Communist Party. In another table the author of the aforementioned article gives a more detailed characteristic by dividing the electors into three groups, proletarian, petty bourgeois and bourgeois groups. The result of this analysis is as follows :

Party	Votes polled (in thousands)				Percentage of votes			% of P. votes of total
	P.	P.-B.	B.	P.	P.-B.	B.		
C.P.G.	2,709	2,641	68	—	97.5	2.5	—	14.2
S.D.G. ...	7,980	6,783	1,197	—	85.0	15.0	—	36.4
G.N.P.P.	6,705	4,193	2,345	167	62.5	35.0	2.5	22.5
Centrum	5,253	3,217	1,926	110	61.2	36.7	2.1	17.5
Fascists	1,066	533	533	—	50.0	50.0	—	2.5
Split P.	602	151	452	—	25.0	75.0	—	0.8
Democrats	1,920	467	1,403	50	24.4	73.0	2.6	2.5
G.P.P.	3,049	504	2,015	530	16.5	66.1	17.4	2.7
Economic	1,005	150	851	4	14.9	84.7	0.4	0.8
	30,289	18,639	10,790	861				

This investigation is important because it provides us with a picture of how far the maximum left development can go in the most important industrial European State. This picture shows that the German proletariat has enormous reserves which are now in the enemy camp, and which must be won over for the proletarian class struggle.

Social-Democratic Defenders of Capitalism

The increase in the Communist vote in all capitalist countries, together with the general economic and political difficulties of the bourgeois class has resulted in a more intense persecution of Communists. But not only the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois State apparatus, but

also the social-democrats, the Second International, the Amsterdam International and other Menshevik organisations are adopting a more definite policy against the proletarian revolutionary movement. The increasing class contradictions, the newly awakened activity of the workers in all countries, the mass wage struggles and all the other indications of the threatened stability of the bourgeois State power, drive the social-democrats in their defence of the existing capitalist state and social order to adopt an increasingly hostile attitude to the interests of the proletariat. This explains the bitter struggle against the Communist movement which the Second International is now inaugurating in all capitalist countries. Crass examples of this struggle of the social-democrats against the revolutionary movement are to be seen in the mass expulsions of Communists from the reformist trade unions, the trade union splits in Greece and Scotland, the threat of the British T.U.C. to expel all trade union bodies adhering to the Minority Movement, or which have Communists on their executives, the mass expulsions of Communists from the workers' sport movement, and the declared threat to split the workers' sport movement by expelling entire district bodies which have a Communist majority.

This swing to the right of the social-democrats will be still more intensified by the participation of social-democrats in bourgeois governments. Already the social-democrats have completely capitulated to the parties of trust capital; but the decline of the petty bourgeois parties and tendencies, the decline of the left movement within the bourgeois parties, together with the defection of the masses from these parties, the complete bankruptcy of petty bourgeois policy in all countries, the complete subjection of all bourgeois tendencies to the interests of trust capital, together with all the other changes within the bourgeois camp, have forced the social-democrats to adopt a more pronounced right policy, and with natural petty bourgeois tendency to become the satellites of the big bourgeoisie. This has taken place not only in the big capitalist countries in Europe, but even in countries of far less importance. There is either a complete disappearance of centrist parties or these parties lose their centrist ideology and practice. The clearest example of the right development in the centrist camp is provided by the Austrian social-democrats. At the Vienna Social-Democratic Congress in 1927 the Renner tendency was victorious over the Austro-Marxism of Otto Bauer, who until July 15th had been the undisputed leader. This tendency is also apparent in those parties which belong neither to the Second nor the Third Internationals, such as the Norwegian Labour Party and the Tranmaelites, who took over the reins of government for 15 days, thereby approving the State policy of the big bourgeoisie. Another illustration of this is the desertion of the radical peasant leaders in Yugo-Slavia (Raditsch, Pribitschevitch), in Czechoslovakia, in Roumania, Bulgaria, etc., who are competing with the bourgeoisie for the favour of imperialist trust capital, and are carrying on a declared counter-revolutionary policy by the assurances of their hostility to the Soviet power. All these phenomena in capitalist countries show that the advance of the revolutionary movement brings with it increased counter-revolutionary activities in the bourgeois camp.

The Sharpening Division—continued**A Re-Grouping Process**

Never before has the line of demarcation been more defined or the battle front so extended as at present for the hostile classes in capitalist European countries. A large-scale regrouping process has taken place in both hostile camps during the breathing space in the social revolution due to the relative stabilisation of the capitalist social order. The counter-revolutionary camp of the bourgeois parties and of the social-democrats has become more united. The rivalries of the individual capitalist groups and social classes have given place to the interests of the capitalist as a whole in respect to the workers; the revolutionary camp has secured in the Communist Parties a more experienced leadership. The Communist Parties came into being during the first epoch of the post-war social-revolution, and formed their first fighting forces from the ranks of the social-democrats. They were naturally steeped in social-democratic tradition, and consequently inadequate, but during their ten years' struggle against opportunism and Menshevism, against the attack of the counter-revolution, the bourgeois State power and Fascism they have gained much revolutionary experience and tradition and developed into independent Bolshevik and revolutionary parties of a mass nature. The new wave of revolutionary struggle will undoubtedly find a group of forces quite different, both ideologically and in practice, from that which existed in the period which closed with 1923.

All these powerful changes which have taken place in the bourgeois and proletarian camps have their counterpart in the change which has taken place in the relations between the Communist movement and the bourgeois labour movement, the social-democratic movement, as compared with the position a few years ago. The social-democrats were forced to make big concessions as long as there was a big contingent in their ranks of workers intent on the class struggle, who were trained in the old school and the former Marxist tradition. Centrism as a special brand of Menshevism was the strongest expression of this tactical diplomacy to retain influence over the workers. Centrism was not a half-way house between the right social-democrats, who were avowed supporters of the bourgeoisie, and the revolutionary advance-guard in the Communist Parties; it was an isolation section between Menshevism and the revolutionary class movement, which wanted to keep the revolutionary workers in the ranks of the social-democrats from contact and organisational intercourse with the revolutionary advance-guard. The bankruptcy of centrism clears the way for the proletariat to recognise the class nature and content of the bourgeois Labour parties.

The line of battle between Menshevism and Communism, just as between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, is becoming more sharply defined. The task of winning over the workers from the ranks of the social-democrats necessitates the use of different methods and conditions from those that were customary years ago.

On this account the Communist Parties were obliged to examine their relations to the social-democrats and make certain changes. This was especially the case in Great Britain, France and in a number of smaller parties

on the occasion of parliamentary elections and at other times.

No Concessions to the Reformists

In quite a number of parties tendencies were noticeable, which did not want to recognise the big changes in the international situation, nor adopt the Bolshevisation policy to the existing structure and political conditions in the bourgeois camp. For instance, in the French Party there were those who advocated joint work with a so-called bourgeois left bloc—which has long ceased to exist in France—or at least an unconditional alliance with the social-democrats during the parliamentary elections. In the German Party also there are supporters of the right group within the Party, who expect much from an alliance with the "left wing" as a means of winning over the masses. And yet the parliamentary elections everywhere have shown that wherever the Communist Parties have separated absolutely from the social-democrats the proletarian masses have come most freely over to the side of the Communists, whilst in those countries where it was thought necessary to hide one's real policy and to work side by side with the social-democrats against the bourgeoisie, the social-democrats and the bourgeois parties have been the gainers and not the Communist Party. This was seen clearly in certain constituencies in Germany where the Party had carried on a struggle against the right policy of some leading comrades, whereas in those constituencies where a basic struggle was carried on against the social-democrats and the bourgeoisie the best election results were attained. Similar successes were recorded in the countries where the White Terror prevailed, such as Poland, where the fight was waged on purely Communist lines; but in the Balkan countries where the parties did not dare to come into the open as Communists the results were unfavourable. The same situation arose in France where the Party fought openly in the industrial centres against all bourgeois parties, but in the south the Party thought it advisable to adopt the "support" policy with less favourable results for the Party.

There can be no shadow of doubt that the present situation demands more than ever an absolutely independent revolutionary policy and tactic, because of the sharp class differences, the consolidation of the bourgeois camp into a united counter-revolutionary force, the constantly increasing danger of war and the necessity of the revolutionary proletariat making all essential preparations against the war danger.

The greatest danger for the Communist movement at the present lies in any vacillation or half measures and the tendency to make concessions and compromises with the social-democrats.

All Communist Parties must reject all interpretations of elections and tendencies which lean towards judging our strength from the mere number of mandates secured. Elections are for us only a barometer which show us the correlation of class forces. The position of the barometer this year has justly caused great alarm. This situation forces us to hasten the tempo of the Bolshevisation and organisation of our ranks so that we shall be prepared to meet the pending great class struggles.

On the Agrarian Section of the Draft Programme

V. Karpinsky

THAT part of the programme as published in draft by the E.C.C.I. which may be regarded as the agrarian section is scattered over very varied sections of the Draft, and consists in the fundamental demands peculiar to agriculture, a number of other demands having relation to the peasantry and agricultural co-operation, and a number of proposals of a tactical nature.

The part of the programme devoted to agriculture does not occupy much space, and we quote it in its entirety :

1. The confiscation and proletarian nationalisation of all large, landed properties in town and country (whether private or church, monasterial, and so on), and the transference of State and municipal landed properties to the Soviets, this to include forests, minerals, waters, and so on, to be followed by the nationalisation of all land.

2. The confiscation of all the means of production connected with the large landed properties, such as buildings, machinery and other equipment, cattle, agricultural and dairy produce factories (large mills, cheese and dairy produce production, dried vegetable production, etc.)

3. The transference of large estates, and particularly those having economic importance for demonstration purposes, or of considerable economic value, to the organs of the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet farm organisation for administration.

4. The transference of part of the land, and in particular that part which has been previously worked on a rental basis, to the poor and in part the middle peasantry for exploitation (the proportion of land thus transferred to the peasantry is to be determined both by economic expediency, and by the necessity of neutralising the peasantry and winning them over to the side of the proletariat, and must inevitably vary in dependence on the varying conditions).

5. The interdiction of all sale and purchase of land. A resolute struggle with those who violate this law.

The first thing to strike one about this programme is the limitation implied in the main slogan dealing with the nationalisation of the land. This slogan has been successfully realised in practice by the proletarian revolution on the territory of the former Russian Empire. It will be remembered that this demand was put forward in the programme of every socialist party without exception. But the E.C.C.I. Draft is restricted to the nationalisation only of the large landed properties. The small, and evidently even the medium-sized properties, are not to be nationalised. The nationalisation of *all* land is only proposed as a subsequent

measure, at some indefinite time after the proletarian revolution has taken place.

What caused the authors of the Draft to introduce such serious restrictions into the programme? We find the answer in the following paragraph of the Draft :

“The complete abolition of private ownership of land, and the nationalisation of all land cannot be brought about immediately in the more highly developed capitalist countries, where the principle of private property has taken deep root among large sections of the peasantry. In such countries the nationalisation of all the land can be achieved only gradually, with the aid of a number of transitional measures. As a rule, the nationalisation of production should not have application to the small and medium-sized enterprises (peasants, artisans, handicraft workers, small and medium traders, and so on.)”

Thus there is quite a definite recommendation of an original sort of gradualism in regard to the nationalisation of the land, on the grounds of ensuring that an immediate and general nationalisation of all the land should not cause antagonism between the peasant masses and the proletarian revolution. We must consider this in detail.

Only one point of all this argument appears correct and indisputable to us : the fact that the principle of private property has taken deep root among the peasantry. But we have at once to remark that this principle took deep root and remains extraordinarily strong even to-day among the peasantry of the U.S.S.R., yet it did not hinder the proletarian dictatorship in the least from nationalising all land immediately and without exception.

One can confidently reckon that the property prejudices of the peasantry will not interfere with the realisation of the immediate and complete nationalisation of the land in other countries also, given the presence in the Programme of demands safeguarding the interests of the peasant masses, and granted that the Communist Party have a suitable tactic.

But possibly the authors of the Draft have in view not the principle of private property in general, but definitely of private property in land. If that be so, then it should have been made clear at the outset.

What force is there behind this argument? In the first place it is not correct that the principle of private property in land has taken deep root among vast sections of the peasantry in the more highly developed capitalist countries. It is not correct for the simple reason that in those countries a peasant class is almost non-existent. Take Britain, for example. Tactical

On the Agrarian Section—continued

considerations as to the necessity of taking the property prejudices of the peasantry into account have least force in these very countries.

Semi-Colonial and Colonial Countries

In regard to the semi-colonial and colonial countries the authors of the Draft themselves recommend the immediate nationalisation of all the land. In the countries with an agrarian system analogous to that which existed in the former Russian Empire, the immediate nationalisation of all land is quite possible and expedient, as experience has shown. Consequently there remain the countries with a developed capitalism which at the same time have retained a fairly powerful peasantry, among which private property in land has taken deep root. France, for example. So far as these countries are concerned it would appear that the tactical considerations adduced in the Draft do have force.

But such countries are comparatively few. It is quite incomprehensible why it was thought necessary to introduce a general restrictive formula into the Programme, when that formula has application only to certain countries. Even from the viewpoint of the authors of the Draft would it not have been better to take the opposite course, and not introduce restrictions into the general formula, but to make provisos in the case of certain countries?

However, we have not yet dealt with the authors' main argument in favour of the restriction of land nationalisation: "As a rule the nationalisation of production should not have application to the small and medium-sized enterprises (peasants, artisans, handicraft workers, small and medium traders,* and so on.)" This is to be found in the same paragraph, and immediately after the sentences in which the impossibility of the immediate nationalisation of land in the hands of small and medium owners is argued. By the context it is impossible to understand this in any other way than as an argument in favour of leaving the small and medium-sized estates in private ownership.

But of course this argument is quite inadequate. The nationalisation of all the land is not at all synonymous with the nationalisation of all agricultural production. The nationalisation of land in itself connotes only the abolition of the private owner of land, and not at all the abolition of the owner of agricultural husbandry. The nationalisation of all land can be carried out immediately and without exception, and thus the material basis of the land-owning bourgeoisie can be removed from under him. But owing to the enormous number of small and medium-sized production units the nationalisation of agriculture, on the contrary, is a protracted process, presupposing a struggle with capital located in landed estates, the actual conquest of large-scale production and of the production associations of the small husbandries by the proletarian organisations. Consequently, to argue that it is impossible to proceed to the immediate nationalisation of all land from the impossibility and inexpediency of the

* We may point out in passing that there is no production among traders.

immediate nationalisation of all agricultural production is quite absurd.

The experience of the proletarian revolution has demonstrated the entire possibility and the practical expediency of immediately nationalising all land with the simultaneous retention of the preponderating mass of production units—of all peasant husbandries, in private hands. More than that, with the exception of a small percentage of kulak large farmers, these husbandries have not merely not lost anything by the nationalisation of all land, but, on the contrary, have definitely gained, having increased their dimensions at the cost of the nationalised large landed properties. We know from the history of the Russian revolution that the large landowners endeavoured to divert the peasantry from the nationalisation of the land, frightening them with the argument that the land would be taken away from them also. But to this argument the peasant deputies in the Tsarist State Duma answered: "Let them take our strips, so long as they take your acres." The Russian peasants were right, the proletarian revolution seized the land from the landowners, but in actuality left it in the hands of the peasantry, and even added to it from the landowners' estates.

Peasants against Land Nationalisation

A similar agitation among the peasantry against land nationalisation may possibly be carried on by the landowners at the present time in capitalist countries. But it is even easier to paralyse such an agitation now that we have the experience of the U.S.S.R. with its distinct advantages to the peasantry.

Thus we come to the conclusion that out of the necessity to take into account the private ownership system which has taken root among the peasantry of various countries arises not the necessity to reject the general nationalisation of the land, but only the necessity to accompany this basic point of the Programme with such demands as will clearly demonstrate to the peasant masses that the proletarian revolution not only has no intention of depriving the peasantry of his land and possessions, but, on the contrary, will provide him with an adequate share of land and involve a number of other great advantages.

In declaring against the immediate nationalisation of the land in both the Programme and its commentaries, the Draft suffers by being quite inconsequential, for it also contains the categorically formulated point of the "interdiction of all sale and purchase of land." For the prohibition in practice of sale, purchase, mortgage and testamentary disposal, and so on, signifies first and foremost the abolition of private ownership of land. If the authors of the Draft are afraid of frightening the peasants by the nationalisation of all land, then in order to be logically and politically consequential they should eliminate the point dealing with prohibition of sale and purchase of land from the Programme, or at least they should not extend that interdiction to small (peasant) holdings. Otherwise the end they have in view (to avoid frightening the peasantry) will still not be achieved.

Even if the motive for this formulation of the Draft (the fact that the principle of private ownership has taken deep root among the peasantry) be accepted, there

On the Agrarian Section—continued

is in any case still left the absolutely incomprehensible and quite unmotivated rejection of immediate nationalisation of the medium-sized holdings of land. Such holdings belong exclusively and unconditionally to owners of a capitalist type. What justification can there be for leaving the land in their possession, even from the viewpoint of the authors of the Draft? It seems to us that there is no justification whatever. On the contrary, it is more than likely that the opposition to the proletarian dictatorship put up by the land-owning bourgeoisie down to the capitalistic upper ranks of the peasantry inclusive will compel the proletariat not only to nationalise the land but even to undertake the confiscation (partial or complete) of the means of production of these sections of the bourgeoisie. And it is obvious that a general nationalisation of the land carried through from the very beginning of the revolution will greatly lighten this task for the proletariat. In general it has to be remarked that while the Draft provides a number of tactical considerations in recommendation of a certain caution in regard to the petty bourgeoisie, it completely fails to take into consideration the possibility of active opposition on the part of the great and middle bourgeoisie, including the kulak peasants, and no line of conduct for this situation is laid down.

“Subsequent Nationalisation”

Finally, the Draft leaves entirely untouched as to detail the question of the “subsequent nationalisation of all land” and the “number of transitional measures” to this end. Why should this be preferable from the State viewpoint, and why is it more acceptable to the peasantry than immediate and complete nationalisation? At what moment, and on what motives does this “subsequent nationalisation” become necessary? On what principles are the relations between the proletarian State and the landowners to be established during the period before complete nationalisation is achieved? What connection is there between “subsequent nationalisation of the land” and the nationalisation of the medium-sized capitalistic agricultural enterprises (for they have to be nationalised some time or other), and with the collectivisation of the present holdings? All these highly important questions receive no treatment whatever in the Draft.

We mention certain other details. In the first clause reference is made to confiscation and nationalisation of all large landed property, and of the “transference of State and municipal landed properties to the Soviets,” and so on. It is not clear whether this paragraph has in mind the former property of the bourgeois State and bourgeois municipalities or the land nationalised by the revolution also. It is not clear what is to be understood by the “transference of State and municipal landed properties to the Soviets.” Is a certain decentralisation of the land rights of the State intended here, or only a temporary measure safeguarding the actual seizure of the land by organs of the proletarian dictatorship? Or is there some other significance altogether?

Confiscation of Mills

For some reason the second clause refers to the confiscation of large mills in landed estates, but leaves uncertain the fate of small mills, while making no distinction between the large and small enterprises of other types to be found in landowners' hands. And for some reason or other this clause also leaves the living-houses on landowners' estates unmentioned among the buildings to be confiscated.

As the result of our analysis we deduce the necessity for making fundamental alterations and additions to the agrarian section of the Comintern Draft Programme.

We consider that there is no justification whatever for the Comintern to reject the complete and immediate nationalisation of all the land. But this does not in the least signify that we propose to take no account whatever of the direct interests and property prejudices of the peasantry. We merely think that the peasantry have not only prejudices but also judgment, as Marx said. A Communist agrarian programme can and ought to be formulated in such a way that it will not only not frighten even the most property-minded peasant masses, but will materially interest them in the most vital fashion. Such an agrarian programme can and should be worked out as will satisfy the interests of the proletarian revolution to the maximum, and enable our agitator in any peasant meeting whatever to be victorious over other parties.

Our Programme should first of all put forward the demand for the (complete and immediate) nationalisation of all the land, forests, minerals, waters, and so on, together with the prohibition of sale and purchase rights in land.

Secondly, it should put forward the demand for the immediate confiscation of all large estates with all edifices, enterprises, stock and equipment, and their organisation into State Soviet farms.

Thirdly, it should declare that the small landholdings in the hands of small and medium peasant husbandries are not subject to confiscation, but will remain in the exploitation of the owners of these husbandries on easy conditions, to be determined by subsequent legislation. All debts and other similar burdens on this land (mortgages,* etc.) are wiped out.

* There is not a word about the mortgage question in the Draft.

READ

THE COMMUNIST

SIXPENCE

MONTHLY

Obtainable from the

WORKERS' BOOKSHOP Ltd.

16 KING STREET, LONDON, W.C.2

On the Agrarian Section—continued

Fourthly, it should declare that small and medium-sized peasant husbandries will, in addition to the land left in their exploitation, receive from the State land fund additional allotments, and in particular those allotments which the peasantry rented from the landowners, monasteries, and so on.

Fifthly, it should declare that the land-holdings in the hands of small and medium-sized husbandries of a capitalistic type can be left in the exploitation of the masters of these husbandries on the basis of rent from the State, and on terms and conditions determined by subsequent legislation.

Such an agrarian Programme would (1) provide the proletarian dictatorship with all the possibilities of exploiting the nationalisation of the land as a most important means to the speedier achievement of the socialisation of all agricultural production; (2) it would remove from the peasantry all fears for the fate of their land and their husbandry; (3) it would establish the direct and very important interest of the main mass of peasantry in the realisation of the Communist agrarian Programme.

In regard to the organs for administration of the land it is necessary that there should be a direct and precise instruction that all land, with the exception of the State land funds and the holdings of the State Soviet farms, is at the direct disposal of the local peasant Soviets, or in the case of the towns of the town Soviets.

Socialising Agriculture

The direct agrarian programme of the Draft is supplemented by a number of demands in the interests of the peasantry, and a number of proposals having reference to the methods of socialising agriculture. Among others, the Draft mentions the following demands:

6. The struggle with usury. The annulment of all operations involving a condition of servitude. The freeing of the exploited strata of the peasantry from all debts, and so on.

7. The organisation of credit schemes for the improvement of agriculture.

8. The support and financing of agricultural co-operatives, collective farms and communes.

Here one is struck by the incompleteness of the demands which can and ought to be put forward by the Communist Party for the purpose of alleviating the situation of the peasantry during the period directly succeeding the proletarian revolution. Other demands have to be added, such as lightened conditions for the exploitation of forests, waters, local hunting, and so on; the lightening of taxation, the reduction of local administration costs, and so on. Such demands have application to all countries and play no less a role than the annulment of debts, for example.

But one is particularly struck by the absence of a general demand for the proletarian State to support the weaker peasant husbandries during the transition period to socialism. One can only presume that Clause 7, dealing with the organisation of credit schemes, has in view assistance to individual peasant husbandries. But in general State support and financing is presupposed only for agricultural co-operatives and collective farms in the Draft Programme. It is true that in one passage having

a tactical character there is mention of "support to the non-possessing, semi-proletarian strata of the peasantry," but while a number of programme demands are stated there is no reference to assistance to the weaker peasantry on their farms.

But why not? Do the authors of the Draft consider that despite the experience of the U.S.S.R., a proletarian State should not afford assistance to the weaker individual peasant farms? Do they think that it is enough to propose co-operation, collectivisation to these husbandries, and if they do not desire or are unable to take one of these two lines, are they to be flung to the arbitrary workings of market relationships (regulated by the State, it is true), in other words, leave them to become proletarianised as they would under capitalism?

Co-operative Husbandries

There is no answer to any of these questions in the Draft, although an answer can easily be found in Marx, Engels, and especially in Lenin, and in all the experience of the U.S.S.R. In its own interests the proletarian dictatorship is bound to take all requisite measures to lighten the position of the peasant, even to the extent of organisational and material assistance to the weaker individual husbandries, and at the same time an assistance which shall be preponderantly in the form of support and encouragement to the co-operative, collective husbandries.

That is quite a definite line of action. Why did it not recommend itself to the authors of the Draft? Why may it not be recommended to other sections of the Comintern? Why is it that in the special section devoted to a description of the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R., the fact of the proletarian State's assistance to the individual weak husbandries is ignored?

In general a definite discrepancy is to be observed between the programme bases of the Draft and the experience of the U.S.S.R., even such experience as is established (for what purpose, for information only?) in the special section of that Draft. For example, in the Draft there is very cautious mention of co-operation, of collectivisation, which *can* be transformed into one of the forms, one of the levers of the socialistic repartitioning of the village. Why only "can"? Why not "must"? Why do they find themselves unable to recommend the well-known co-operative plan put forward by Lenin (and previously put forward by Marx and Engels) for the great majority of countries, seeing that there is a more or less extensive class of peasantry in the great majority of countries? What other plan for the socialistic repartitioning of the peasant husbandries can be put forward? The Draft does not indicate any other

*The Weekly Paper for All
Communists*

WORKERS' LIFE

29, Euston Road, London,
N.W.1

On the Agrarian Section—continued

plan, and yet in the section dealing with the U.S.S.R. the enormous role played by co-operation and collectivisation is not emphasised once. What is the meaning of this?

A further example. The Draft proposes that in the village only the agricultural proletariat are to be depended on, while attracting to them the labouring peasantry and supporting the semi-proletarian section. This directive is in contradiction to the experience of the U.S.S.R., where the industrial proletariat was victorious while relying precisely on the village poor, and where they could not have been victorious had they relied only on the agricultural proletariat, which is an extraordinarily weak group. And this is indicated in the section dealing with the U.S.S.R. But is not the industrial proletariat in a similar position in the case of most other countries also? Is the Lenin formula: "Base yourselves on the village poor, keep the agreement, and then an alliance with the middle peasantry,"

inapplicable to other sections of the Comintern? Where is the proof that it is not?

We consider that it is necessary to make essential alterations in the remainder of the agrarian programme (the demands on behalf of the peasantry), and also in the places where the Draft deals with tactical questions touching the peasantry.

Unquestionably it is necessary, and it is quite possible that the victorious proletariat should take on itself the responsibility of looking after the interests of the poor and middle peasantry, as Lenin taught us to, and that by all possible measures it should so lighten their position that they should feel all the advantages of the new system by comparison with the old.

Only thus will it be possible to neutralise, to draw the great masses of peasantry to the side of the proletariat and into an alliance with the latter.

And that is the direction in which the agrarian part of the Draft Programme of the Comintern should be revised.

The Working-Class Movement between the 5th and 6th Congresses of the Comintern

H. SCHWARZ

THE General Strike and the miners' struggle in England, the revolt of the Viennese workers, the struggle of the workers and peasants led by the Communist Party of Poland, against Pilsudski's Fascist dictatorship, the labour struggles in Germany and Czecho-Slovakia, the struggles of the French workers concerning the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti, the heroic resistance offered by the C.P. of Italy and of Bulgaria to the murderous attacks of Mussolini and Tsankov-Liaptchev, the widespread Labour struggles in Norway and Sweden, the mass movement of the peasants and workers of Roumania—these are the peaks of the class struggles in capitalist Europe in the past few years. What heroism of the masses, what courage of the Communist Parties, what political baseness and weakness on the part of the reformist leaders!

The driving force and the motive power in all these struggles is the opposition of the masses to the intensification of exploitation by wage reductions, the increase in hours of labour, to rationalisation and greater political pressure by capitalist "democracy" or by Fascism. The working class is again rising, the masses are turning to the left. They are becoming more radical, their activity is growing. They are strengthening their organisations, increasing the Communist vote and (at the expense of the capitalist parties), the social-democratic vote. They are gradually taking up the struggle against the effects of stabilisation. The peculiar process of growth both in the revolutionary and reformist work-

ing-class movement is beginning, but the revolutionary movement is growing the more rapidly of the two.*

The upward and downward movements merge into one another, reach different stages. Neither geographically nor temporally are they, or were they, uniform, the forms they assume are multitudinous. We shall now proceed to examine these tendencies of recent years during the period of relative stabilisation.

The Development of the Reformist Organisations

The tremendous growth of reformist organisation in the years immediately following the war (trade union membership in England, 1920, 8.3 million; in Germany, 1922, 8.9 million; in France, 1919, 2.1 million) was followed by a rapid decline. This decrease in membership ceased with stabilisation, and the positions of trade unions remained stable in practically all countries the last few years. It is true that there has been a slight increase in reformist trade union membership in the most recent times. It is more correct to speak of stagnation with reference to the reformist parties.

* In the last German election the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties together received almost as many votes as the Social-Democratic and Socialist Parties in 1919. In 1919 the French Socialist Party, at that time still a united body, received 1,000,000 votes less than the Socialist and Communist Parties together received in the last election. The last election results in Poland show a similar result. This is indisputable evidence of the fact that the masses are moving in an anti-capitalist direction.

The Working-class Movement—continued*Membership of Reformist Trade Unions and Parties**
(In 1,000's)

Year	England		Germany		France		Czecho-Slovakia†	
	T.U.	Party	T.U.	Party	T.U.	Party	T.U.	Party
1913	4,135	—	2,573	1,040	592	69	105	—
1924	5,537	3,194	3,975	940	412	60	556	—
1925	5,497	3,374	4,182	844	516	108	547	176
1926	5,208	3,383	3,934	823	550	95	578	171
1927	—	—	4,385	867	650	95	—	—

The reformist organisations alone now include more workers than were organised in the whole working-class movement before the war; with the revolutionary trade unions and Communist Parties the number is, of course, much greater. The degree of working-class organisation has increased greatly in comparison with the pre-war period.

The Changes in Reformism

Stabilisation did not only affect the organisational development of reformism. Reformist theory also became crystallised; a generalisation from reformist practice, a mixture of the "constructive socialism" of MacDonald and the false "Marxism" of Hilferding.‡
 "... Social democracy is a part of the State..." said Hilferding in his speech at the last German Social-Democratic Congress (May, 1927). He "forgot" to add, of the "bourgeois" State. In truth, the reformist leaders have become a part of the capitalist State. They were that during the world war and during the period of revolution. The last years have only shown that it is not only in "extraordinary" circumstances, but also in the "normal" times of stabilisation that they maintain their alliance with the capitalist State, and not only maintain but strengthen it. At the Kiel Congress, Hilferding presented the reformists with the idea of alliance with the bourgeois State. If it is at all possible to speak of a unified reformist ideology, then that speech of Hilferding contains the ideology of present-day social democracy.

Reformism makes a "socialist" virtue of the development of finance capitalism. The growing concentration of capital, the domination of capitalist States by

* The figures are taken from official publications. For England, the November, 1927, issue of the "Ministry of Labour Gazette"; for Germany, the year book of the Social-Democratic Party and Federation of Trade Unions; for France and Czecho-Slovakia, the press reports of the C.G.T. and I.P.T.U. These figures, particularly for France and Czecho-Slovakia, are not exact. In these two countries the reformist trade union membership is lower than that given above. The trade union increase in France in 1927 is due to the affiliation of the hitherto "neutral" Civil Service unions; in all probability trade union membership increased in Czecho-Slovakia in 1927. The amalgamation of the Czech and German reformist organisations gave an impulse to the workers. The development in other European countries where working-class movements are legal is similar to that shown above. But in the Balkans, where the revolutionary working-class movement is opposed by terrorism, the reformist organisations, their legality notwithstanding, are not progressing.

† Including Czech and German reformists; excluding national socialists.

‡ It is no accident that many social-democratic parties worked out their new programme during the last year; some have already been accepted, others are still being discussed.

finance capital, and the increase in the number of functions taken over by the State which became particularly clear during stabilisation, are interpreted by the reformists to mean that the attainment of socialism only requires that the management of this "economic life" should be placed entirely in the hands of the democratic State.

"This means that our generation is faced with the problem of transforming, by the help of the State and by conscious social regulation, this economic life, organised and controlled by the capitalists, into an economy managed by the democratic State. It follows from that, that the problem with which our generation is faced can be nothing other than socialism."—(Hilferding: Protocol of the Kiel Congress, p. 169.)

This is the philosophy of the reformist leaders, allied in life and death to the capitalist State. Their number is not inconsiderable, and is increasing. The social-democratic directors and managers of public undertakings, the social-democratic civil servants, social-democratic burgomasters and town councillors, the leaders of the co-operative societies, and, not least, the trade union and Party bureaucrats, form a numerically important section.* The process of "becoming bourgeois" has not proceeded equally in all countries, but the development is everywhere in the same direction. Leipart, the president of the German Federation, gives the following description of this matter as it concerns Germany:

"Working-class property, producing co-operatives, labour, banks, etc., also exercise considerable influence on economic life to-day. Representatives of the working class even took part in the negotiations for commercial treaties. Workers' representatives have positions on the administrative councils of the post, national and State railways, on the canal councils, on all bodies concerned with production and administrative affairs of the nation and of the State, and are provided for on the Supreme National Economic Council. . . ." — ("Leipziger Volkszeitung," 10-3-28.)

These reformists have an important influence over those around them, who are fast becoming "bourgeois." They form a growing reformist leadership above that of the Labour aristocracy, which is tending to be narrowed down. That is the basis of reformism to-day. These reformists have succeeded, in the period of relative stabilisation, in gathering round them not only the

* "The Social-Democratic Year Book, 1927," proudly announces: "The municipalities nowadays are employers on a large scale; some large towns control concerns which are among the largest in Germany." In Germany in 1927 there were 770 S.D. burgomasters, 896 borough councillors, 548 salaried town councillors. In France there have been since 1925 613 municipalities with S.D. majorities and 613 S.D. burgomasters; these 613 municipalities have a population of 5.3 million. Valuable material concerning the strength of social-democracy in local government can be found in the special number of the Swedish social-democratic paper.

The Working-class Movement—continued

better-paid section of the working class, but also fairly extensive sections of the working masses.

The improved standard of life of the workers, in comparison with that of the inflation period, or the hope of improvement in their conditions "after stabilisation," eased the situation for the reformists, who, in addition to that, showed the workers a very "simple" and "comfortable" way to socialism. Instead of the "nationalisation" of the immediate post-war period, "socialism" is now to be introduced by the "democratic" State. Socialism, in fact, is almost here, but its management must be taken in hand. The more clearly the effects of modern capitalist rationalisation make their appearance, the more the workers are discovering the social-democratic betrayal. By capitalist rationalisation, in close association with improving market conditions, with increased centralisation of capital, with increasing labour productivity and rising capitalist dividends, etc., the level of the exploitation of the workers is rising, their actual standard of life is falling, the intensity of their work is increasing, their hours of labour lengthened. It was these factors which occasioned the energetic resistance of the working class, manifested in mass strikes and a swing to the left politically. It was these factors which made the Communists so successful in the last elections in highly industrialised areas, which turned the workers in great masses from the capitalist parties. For them this is one step on the road to Communism.

The working class has been thrown back, but not defeated. The workers' consciousness of power, in spite of relative stabilisation, is incomparably greater than in the pre-war period. The cunning reformist, Renner, expressed their consciousness in the slogan: "More power!" The workers are eager to fight for an improvement in their conditions of life, for the realisation of their power. Reformism points out to them the road of "democracy": no bloody civil war, like Bolshevism desires; on to the democratic State! In the immediate post-war period "democracy" was put forward in quite general terms in opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat, but to-day, both economically and politically, it has a more definite duty to perform for the reformists. But the workers are beginning to understand that the idea of "more power to the Social-Democratic Party" is not identical with the idea of "more power to the working class." On the contrary! They are beginning to be convinced that the growing influence of the Social-Democratic Party in the State

weakens the forces of the working class, because social-democracy is using that influence to strengthen capitalism at the expense of the working class. This makes it easier for the Communists to clear the heads of the workers. The building up of socialism in Soviet Russia, as against the "successes" of "democracy," is one of the best methods for enlightening the workers.

Community of Interest and Compulsory Arbitration

The "democratic" regulation of labour disputes is perhaps the most important part of reformist policy in the period of stabilisation.* The cheapening of production by wage reductions, extension of hours and rationalisation, the limitation of the political rights of the working class, are conditions necessary to successful stabilisation. Two roads lie open to the capitalists for putting this process into operation: the Fascist and the "democratic." In countries relatively weak industrially, with a numerous petty bourgeois and weak working-class organisations (Italy-Poland), the capitalists proceeded along the way of Fascism. In the highly developed industrial countries the "democratic" road seemed easier. If, at the beginning of stabilisation, it was possible to doubt the fact, the experience of the last few years has clearly demonstrated that capitalist democracy, with the occasional employment of Fascist methods, is still the predominant form of capitalist rule. The capitalists are anxious to carry through the tiresome and complicated process of stabilisation with as few great social conflicts as possible. The reformist leaders even fear a widespread struggle which, in the given situation, might easily take on a political character.† The joint regulation of disputes, or the transference of their settlement to an "impartial representative of the State," appears to be most suitable both to the capitalists and the reformists.

This has given rise to the proposals and the negotiations in favour of "community of interests," as the Industrial Peace conferences in England, the proposal of the reformist C.G.T. for the legal establishment of a "National Economic Council," the Austrian "Economic Court," the Dutch reformists' proposals in favour of "common interests." All these negotiations and proposals were in preparation for putting "industrial peace" into practice. Clynes expressed the meaning of the Industrial Peace negotiations as follows:

"The main problem is not to set up machinery for negotiation, but to find effective methods for preventing strikes in such a way that both parties will be satisfied."—("Manchester Guardian," 30-11-27.)

The prevention of strikes—that is what it amounts

The Report of the Ninth Congress of the C.P.G.B.

is now on sale at the
WORKERS' BOOKSHOP, LTD.

Price 6d.

Post free 7d.

* "In our system of wage agreements, in the courts of arbitration, we have to-day the political regulation of wages and the political regulation of hours of labour. The personal fate of the worker is decided by State policy." (Hilferding, Kiel Congress.) Hilferding is chiefly concerned with corrupting a part of the working class by "democracy," as was the case in England with Liberalism, and in France with Radicalism.

† That does not mean that the reformists are not carrying on any industrial struggles during the period of relative stabilisation. But they do not help to stir them up. On the contrary, they place themselves at the head of such movements in order to betray them.

The Working-class Movement—continued

to! The practical realisation of this goal can only take place in the form of "voluntary" or State compulsory arbitration. After the industrial peace negotiations had broken down in Australia, the Prime Minister announced an extension of the existing compulsory arbitration.

Germany serves well as an example. Not only in industry, but also in reformism, Germany has progressed further than any other European country. There, in 1927, a period of favourable economic conditions, compulsory arbitration went on with the blessings of the capitalists. That was one of the most despicable betrayals of the working class which the reformists have ever accomplished.

*Industrial Strikes in Germany, 1909-1927**

Year (average)	No. of strikes	Concerns affected	Workers affected (in millions)	Working days lost (in millions)
1909-13	2,171	7,998	0.5	6.3
1919	3,682	32,825	2.7	32.5
1922	4,348	41,775	2.2	23.7
1923	1,878	21,484	1.7	11.1
1925	1,516	16,329	0.8	11.2
1926	316	1,903	0.1	0.9
1927	674	6,924	0.2	2.4

In one year of good markets there were many fewer working days lost than in the four-year pre-war period average. Real wages in 1927 rose on the average by about 5 per cent. although the skilled workers have not yet attained to their pre-war level. That is exactly suited to the interests of capitalist stabilisation.

Would the Fascist method have obtained better results in the settlement of this decisive problem? By no means! It is not un instructive to consider the opinion of D'Arragona and Co. on this development. In the Italian journal, appearing legally, belonging to D'Arragona and Co., Rinaldo Rigola dealt with this matter in an article in which the following passage occurs:†

"There are clear proofs of this change in mental outlook. In Germany in the development of labour courts and the settlement of important disputes by the court of arbitration; in England in the Industrial Peace conferences; in France in the demand for joint control and for the establishment of a National Economic Council as a part of the constitution. Capital and Labour are becoming more and more convinced that, in present conditions, to carry on the struggle to the bitter end would injure both parties, and they are turning their forces to a consideration of improvements in the machinery of production and of more rational industrial forms. The principle of co-operation has triumphed. Affairs have developed the same way in Italy also."

With malicious joy, D'Arragona and Co. contemplate the development of their reformist colleagues who, by "community of interest" or compulsory arbitration, are binding the trade union movement to the capitalists. But these reformists are moving within the framework of bourgeois democracy, and so deceive the masses.

* "Vorwaerts," 5-5-27.

† "Problemi del Lavoro," February, 1928.

The working class has not accepted this development blindly. The opposition to industrial peace and compulsory arbitration is growing. In Germany, in 1927, the method of compulsory arbitration could only be employed with a very elastic interpretation, and even then there were strikes concerning the adjudications (*e.g.*, the hatmakers' strike in Saxony). In Norway, at the beginning of June, 1928, the building workers' struck in opposition to the wishes of the reformist leadership, and in spite of the fact that the arbitration law provides for very stringent measures against infringements. In England the Dyers', Bleachers' and Finishers' Union voted against the industrial peace negotiations by 32 votes to 31. At the other trade union conferences recently held in England there were small and large minorities opposed to the Industrial Peace negotiations. These are serious indications of the break-up of the reformist front, which grew so rapidly because of the leftward swing of the masses.

The question of leadership in Labour struggles is becoming a prominent one for the revolutionary trade unions and Communist Parties.

Political Community of Interests

If, in the economic sphere, the process of stabilisation began with industrial peace or negotiations for it, the position was entirely reversed in the political sphere. The capitalists and the reformists temporarily severed their political connections, such as coalition governments. In all countries, without any exception, the social-democrats were gradually pushed out of the government, which was taken over by the capitalists alone, so that they might be able to proceed energetically with carrying out their plans of stabilisation.

Common interests in the industrial sphere, benevolent reformist opposition in the political sphere—this reformist division of labour proved successful for the capitalists and for the social-democrats. The capitalists being "reinsured" could exert pressure on the workers in industrial disputes, while the social-democrats deceived the masses with their "opposition." The election successes of the social-democratic parties were to a great extent the result of their opposition policy.

This social-democratic opposition was carried on within the limits of the possibilities afforded by this relative stabilisation. The reformists never conducted a real struggle against capitalist governments. They only opposed the "bad," "reactionary" part of the government, and were anxious to form a coalition with the "good," "democratic" part of the bourgeoisie. The efforts of the reformists were really directed to forming a coalition of the industrial capitalists with the Labour aristocracy, using those words in their broadest meaning. This reformist policy helped towards differentiation among the masses, and the drift towards the Communist Party began.

The election successes of the reformists, at the expense of the capitalist parties, during 1928 in the leading capitalist countries made the question of political community of interest, expressed in a coalition or any other form, one of immediacy. The social-democrats no longer object in principle to a coalition with the bourgeoisie. Recent years have demonstrated that. The reformist parties which were previously opponents of a coalition policy, such as the French Socialist Party and

The Working-class Movement—continued

the English Labour Party, have progressed very far in the direction of coalition. The centrists renounced the principle of hostility to coalition, and declared this question to be a matter of tactical expediency. Opposition to the great coalition is growing less and less among the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party. This is the result of reformist practice. "More power" is equivalent to coalition for the social-democratic leaders.

Nevertheless, there are tremendous obstacles in the way of political community of interests. The coalition governments in the immediate post-war period were, in the interests of the capitalist class as a whole, composed of petty bourgeois parties; but the new coalition governments are directly and openly of the capitalist class. In the earlier period the petty bourgeoisie—using the word in its fullest meaning—ruled in the interests of the capitalist class who were forced to grant concessions to the workers; but to-day governments can only carry out a policy suited to the large-scale capitalists, in order to carry on with the work of stabilisation. On this account the durability of reformist-capitalist coalition in the period of relative stabilisation is problematical. Even the most peaceful operation of the processes of stabilisation requires a most flexible policy on the part of the social-democrats as well as of the capitalists. In the leading capitalist countries of Europe the bourgeoisie are anxious to maintain the parliamentary-democratic system, at least for a time.* Even if only to retain the appearance of democracy by allowing the mechanism of the parliamentary system to continue working, the capitalists are not averse to allowing the reformists to hold office for the time being. But apart from these more or less formal considerations, there are other factors decisive for the capitalists. The transference of a part of the responsibility for stabilisation on to the social-democrats would act as a restraint on the leftward swing of the workers, and, with reformist help, particular difficulties can be cleared out of the way. (In Germany the problem of rationalising the State, in England problems of foreign policy, Indian and Egyptian questions, etc.)

The force of these workers who, while swinging towards the left, still tread the path of parliamentary democracy, and therefore follow the social-democrats, is to be used by the reformists in the interests of the capitalist class.†

The second period of social-democratic-capitalist coalition governments will have an essentially different character from the first. After the war the question was

* Social-democratic policy in those countries where the capitalists rule with the aid of bloody terrorism is another matter. In Italy, where the S.D. Party was made illegal, the members have transplanted their work abroad and left the working class to their fate. In Poland where the S.D.P. is the only legal working-class organisation, it openly compromises with Fascism (socialist ministers, etc.), at the same time speaking on behalf of "democracy." This is a peculiarly complicated way of misleading the masses. In the Balkans social-democracy is a politically insignificant factor.

† This does not exclude limitations on capitalist democracy, of which there are innumerable instances, from changes in the electoral system to limitations on the legality of Communist Parties.

one of guarding against the proletarian revolution;* in the period of relative stabilisation the importance of political community of interest lies in the direct assistance rendered by the reformists in the reconstruction of capitalism, by means of small and temporary concessions to the workers. This reformist policy leads on to further differentiation among social-democratic workers, and it was on such grounds of expediency that Otto Bauer uttered his warning against coalition governments.

"He (the social-democratic minister) cannot defend the bourgeois republic, and cannot build up capitalist economy without an agreement with the bourgeoisie, and not without encountering sharp hostility from the workers who rebel against capitalist rule in State and economy. So, in spite of the most honest desire to serve the working class, he becomes an ally of the capitalists against certain sections of the working class."—(Otto Bauer: "Kampf," Vol. I., 1928.)

The social-democratic allies of the capitalists showed uncommonly great political elasticity in the post-war years. They will not disappoint us in the period of political "community of interests" which is opening. The Communist Parties will have to fight to defeat their policy.

The problem of the united front with the rank and file of the social-democratic workers has again become a matter of urgency.

The Capitulation of Centrism

Differentiation among the social-democrats did not proceed, and is not proceeding during stabilisation, in the "old way." The reformist leadership—a growing band—is going to the right, and the majority followed them; others came to the Communist Party, while centrism surrendered practically, politically, in organisation and in principle; its influence was shattered.

The practical and political position of centrism was tested in the two most important events in the working-class movement during the time of stabilisation: the rebellion in Vienna and the General Strike. In those two powerful and elemental mass movements, in which the centrists were forced to take the lead (at that time they controlled the Viennese S.D. Party and the General Council) they surrendered openly to the consistent reformists. When, in Vienna and London, matters reached the threshold of revolution, the centrists surrendered the field to the declared reformists, and helped them to bring the movement back into "legal channels," after which they left the leadership of their organisations, in England entirely, and in Austria preponderantly, in the hands of the avowed reformists. This policy (policy by courtesy) of the centrists showed no

* The capitalists are trying to win over the reformists to their imperialist policy. The second August 4th is being prepared. Not in vain does Paul Levi write: "The capitalists are straining every nerve to win their workers over to their policy of imperialism. The Republicanisation of the Reichswehr (German National Guard), the recognition of the Black, Red and Golds, are morsels thrown to entice them." ("Socialist Policy and Economy," June, 1928). This tendency does not exist only in Germany, even if it is clearest there. The facts are similar in England, France and all other imperialist countries.

The Working-class Movement—continued

new tendencies when compared with their deeds immediately following the war. But in the true homelands of centrism, in Austria and England, in which the Viennese centrists had placed so much hope, they were given the opportunity of appearing in their true colours.

The result of this centrist policy was, in Vienna, the advance of the right wing social-democrats under Renner, who had the majority behind him at the last Congress.

In England, thanks to the betrayal of the centrist and reformist leaders, the working-class movement suffered a defeat. The movement of the workers, pressing forward since 1917, received a set-back; the centrists fled to the camp of the more consistent reformists, and, together with them, dissolved the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee. After the Second and a Half International had succumbed to the Second, the centrists succumbed to the reformists in the Trade Union International.

The organisational surrender of the centrists was completed in the past year by amalgamation with the avowedly reformist parties or by entry into the Second International (Norway, Switzerland, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland). To-day there are no more important centrist parties, but only centrist tendencies in many social-democratic parties. (The Italian Maximalists only exist in exile.)

The reaction in ideas among the centrists is no less complete. They have announced their new theory in the Linzev programme of the Austrian social-democrats. Instead of the "... legal establishment of councils in the constitution of the democratic republic..." there is the "democratic road to socialism," with the recognition of the necessity for force—if that is necessitated by the capitalists' actions. Then followed Bauer's surrender to Renner at the Vienna Congress of 1927. In 1919 and 1920 the legal establishment of councils in the democratic constitution was the programme of the centrists, in 1926 democracy was mixed up with "force," and in 1927 we have Renner's coalition. What elasticity of theory! And how do they differ from the avowed reformists?

Even Otto Bauer was forced to spend a good deal of time in determining the new position of centrism. In an article which can almost be considered as a programme, he defines it as follows:

"In periods of revolution the Marxist centre must try to protect the workers from the left danger, from the temptation of Bolshevism. Now, in the period of the stabilisation of capitalism, the Marxist centre must fight against the socialist parties losing their soul, and, under the influence of that stabilisation, changing into narrow, short-sighted, 'nothing-but-reformism' parties, mere reform parties no longer fired with the will to socialism."—"Kampf," December, 1927.)

The centrists will not keep the reformists back from "nothing-but-reformism." They have already been convinced of that in practice. Some of Otto Bauer's German friends expressed themselves in favour of the "Great Coalition" when negotiations concerning it were in progress (June, 1928). The centrists still remaining

in the social-democratic parties may check still hesitating sections of the working class on their way to the Communist Party. But the capitulation of the centrists has cleared the field between reformism and Communism.

The Communist Parties and Relative Stabilisation

In the early period of stabilisation the Communist Parties, attacked by the capitalists and the reformists, were in a very difficult position. The change from a period of revolution to one of stabilisation brought them defeats: temporary loss of membership and widespread pessimism and doubt in their own ranks. The defeat in Germany in autumn 1923 also threw back the working class movement in the surrounding countries. Not merely on account of their proximity, but because Germany was the country from which the spirit of insurrection streamed out to all Central Europe.

The reformists triumphed after the defeat. It was "exit" to the Communist movement. And, in fact, as a result of the workers' retreat and under the pressure of social-democracy, many "right" and "ultra-left" crises arose in a number of Communist Parties in the years 1923 and 1924. Their ideological strength gave way.

The elections in May, 1924, resulted in a great victory for the C.P.G. and a defeat for the S.D.P.G. The election in December of the same year showed the opposite result. In May the revolutionary struggles were still fresh in the memory of the workers; in December they were in favour of stabilisation. This development, typical of the change to stabilisation, took place in the countries around Germany in various forms, in different directions and to an unequal extent in the year 1923-24; and was repeated two years later in England and in a few northern countries in quite different circumstances, but with essentially the same tendencies.

The depression was of short duration only. The effects of stabilisation and the work of the Communist Parties soon opened the eyes of the workers. They shook off these "leaders" who had lost their heads at the first great setback. The ultra-left and right wing difficulties were overcome, and the new rise of the working-class movement and of the Communist Parties began. To-day in all the important capitalist countries of Europe (Germany, France, England, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Italy) we have mass Communist Parties,* although the situation is not actually revolutionary, the parties in Italy and Poland being subjected to the most ruthless terrorism. Wherever the Communist Parties are being made illegal they are fighting with the utmost heroism against the capitalists' rule of terrorism.

The leftward swing only brought a part of the workers affected into the ranks of the Communist Party. The increase in reformists is not inconsiderable, although during the election for the German Reichstag on May 20th the C.P.G. increased its vote by 20.3 per cent. as compared with December, 1924, and the

* The S.D.P. of Germany was in the Government three times after the war. 1919, in an acutely revolutionary situation; 1920, after the Kapp Putsch, when there was again a serious danger of proletarian revolution; and in autumn, 1923, when the workers' revolution was again imminent.

The Working-class Movement—continued

S.D.P.G. only by 16 per cent. The increase in the reformist following is to a large extent due to the fact that all previous struggles against the effects of stabilisation took place in the industrial field, and we have not yet learnt how to take the leadership of industrial struggles into our own hands. The revolutionary trade unions in France and Czecho-Slovakia have in the last few years obtained much experience in this matter, and have already begun to emerge from stagnation. The anti-trade union feeling among members of the Communist Party was overcome long ago. The number of Communist workers holding positions in reformist trade unions is growing (Germany and England). If we intensify our work in the trade unions we shall do even better.

Our victories compel us to do so! The election results of 1928 show that the membership of the Communist Parties has changed, not only quantitatively, but qualitatively too, and changed in the right direction. In Germany, France, Czecho-Slovakia and Poland the influence of the C.P. is growing in all the industrial centres, as opposed to the more backward areas. In the capitals and in many large towns where political life is most active they have the majority of the working class behind them. Without doubt the Communist Parties received, during the elections in the spring of 1928, many workers' votes which previously went to the social-democrats.

The organisational development of the Communist Parties was not so favourable as the political, even though in comparison with 1924-25 it has improved somewhat. The change to group organisation has proceeded

very well, but there is a great discrepancy between the political influence of the Communist Parties and their organisational strength.*

The Communist International remained a revolutionary mass party with a Marxist-Leninist theory, even in the period of stabilisation. Its ideological strength has made great progress in recent years. The new policy in France and England helped to Bolshevise the whole Comintern, and the keynote of the policy of the Communist Parties in the coming imperialist war is important practical preparation for the struggle against that war.

There is every cause to look with confidence into the future. We have revolutionary mass parties in spite of stabilisation, and the spirit of rebellion is active among the Communist Parties!

* Even many reformist writers cannot deny this new wave of the Communist movement, not even in reference to England, where the influence of the C.P.G.B., in spite of its small numbers, is growing. We quote the following extract from Cole's "History of the British Working Class," Vol. III., p. 215: "The Communists undoubtedly won adherents rapidly in the years 1926 and 1927 from among the miners and other discontented elements who have lost their belief in the tactics of moderation." The C.P.'s of small countries (Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria) could not, even in the period of stabilisation, develop into mass parties. With the exception of Austria, where exceptional conditions prevailed, no great class struggle took place in any of those countries in the entire post-war period, and consequently the masses were not given the opportunity of seeing the reformists in their true colours, nor did differentiation proceed so far among their followers.

The S.D.P. of Germany with a vote of 9.1 million, and with 860,000 members, organises 9.4 per cent. of its voting strength. The C.P.G., with a vote of 3.3 million, and a membership of 150,000 organises only 4.5 per cent. of its vote.

NOW READY

NOW READY

LENINISM

By J. STALIN

*A Complete, up-to-date and
authoritative book on Com-
munist Theory and Practice*

472 pages :: :: 4s. 6d.

To be obtained from

THE WORKERS' BOOKSHOP, LIMITED, 16 KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN, WC2

The Struggle for Colonies and the Coming War

P. Shubin

I.

THE disproportion in the economic and political development, intensified as the result of the "equilibrium" established by the first world imperialist war, has involved the sweeping away of the foundations of Versailles. The partitioning of the earth carried out in 1918 is now in sharp contradiction to the actual correlation of forces between the various imperialist States and their groupings. The disproportionate expansion of colonial possessions, the lack of correspondence between that expansion and the tempo of growth of productive forces in the chief imperialist countries, rendered the first world war inevitable. To-day, on the eve of a fresh imperialist war, the economic and political map of the world proves to be still more without justification in principle than it was in 1914, still more are adjustments necessary from the point of view of the manifest ability of the various spoliatory States in the sphere of conquest and annexation. Versailles and all the treaties built around it have ceased to be "just"; they do not consider the various international robbers according to their acts; they assure one more and another less than they can take over on the basis of their own financial, economic and technical military power. And consequently those treaties have to be re-adjusted by force of arms.

World-Wide Armed Conflict

If, none the less, a world-wide armed conflict has not broken out so far it is only because the factors delaying the beginning of the war are at the moment of greater force than they were on the eve of the first war. The growth of these restraining forces is determined by the bourgeoisie's regard for the experience preceding that war, the fear of proletarian revolutions and colonial insurrections, and the fear that the general imperialist front may be broken through by the armed mass of workers and peasants.

It is not necessary for us to give a history of the development of all the international conflicts which have led to the present world map being an entirely unreal one. We mention only the chief points. The first place is occupied by the intensifying conflict between the U.S.A. and the British Empire, the latter of which is in the throes of a chronic crisis. Of course, one may not represent the position as though Britain were already impotent in this struggle, or as though the role of all or part of Europe as an ally of Britain is a circumstance which American capitalism can ignore owing to the extent of its financial, economic and technical might. At any rate, the correlation of forces between the U.S.A. on the one hand and Britain, plus a part of Europe, on the other, cannot be summed up so simply in 1928. Europe, with several of its countries possessing a super-nationalised production machinery and mighty produc-

tion and trading federations, stabilised currencies and a restored credit system which penetrates into all corners of the world—this Europe is armed to the teeth for the economic struggle with America. This is true in still greater degree of the war resources of super-militarised Europe. The fact that with its colossal financial, economic and technical resources, the United States is still unquestionably pre-eminent over Britain, plus her possible continental allies, enables American imperialism to achieve a re-partitioning of the world. And the fact that that American pre-eminence is in danger (owing to the growth of trustified Europe on the one hand, and the intensification of crisis on the other) compels American imperialism to hasten with these demands for a "just" repartition. Never has American imperialism been so aggressive as it is to-day. This aggressiveness is explained by two categories of diametrically opposite factors: the highly developed production machinery, which is able to drive Europe out of a number of markets, and take from her her main sources of raw materials on the one hand, and on the other the approaching crisis, which threatens to demolish the pre-eminence of that production machinery. Both these factors work from opposite points to the one end of stimulating the U.S.A. to find a way out in open conflict, at first economic and financial and then military, with British imperialism and its allies. War is being prepared not only by the disproportion of development within the entire world imperialist system, but by the contradictory development of America itself.

Policy of American Imperialism

The traditional policy of American imperialism consisted in an insistence on the principle of the "open door," in other words, the formal equality of the rivals in regard to the capture of spheres of influence and in resources of an economic and financial nature. Naturally, even in its palmiest days under the cover of this liberal formula American imperialism resorted to a shameless diplomatic terror and blackmail in regard to those countries to which was granted the possibility of "freely choosing" its enslaver. But now that American imperialism is no less (and is possibly even more) than its European brother a "hegemony of monopolistic unions of the largest *entrepreneurs*," the "open door" policy proves to be somewhat trammelling even as a cloak for the diplomatic game. American steel is proud of the fact that it can beat the European on the world market by its very cheapness, "other things being equal." But the American admirals felt no constraint in making essential modifications to this formula in 1927 by declaring that these "equal conditions" presuppose the possession of the mightiest fleet possible in order to defend trade interests. The American syndicate of motor trusts trumpet their victory over the

Struggle for Colonies—continued

British monopoly in rubber with the resources of economic and financial organisation; but simultaneously the chairman of the syndicate warns the Congress Commission that the consolidation of that victory necessitates the repeal of the laws existing in the Philippines for the restriction of landed properties, or in other words, the intensification of the colonial monopoly of the American rubber consumers, and a further concentration of land acreage into their hands. Even the U.S.A. financial capital, which hitherto has been so confident of its pre-eminence as to enter into the struggle with its rivals in any part of the world without demanding any State legislative advantages, is now more and more openly raising the question of the necessity to safeguard to itself the punctual payment of sums outstanding on various kinds of loans by resort to methods of State compulsion. In the process of its violent development and ruthless struggle with its entrenched rivals American imperialism is more and more resorting to armed struggle for the seizure of colonies, concealing its actions under the Monroe Doctrine specially adapted for the purpose whenever possible, and struggling to wrest the colonial monopoly out of the hands of its rivals wherever that is necessary. For even more than during the period of the first world war a decisive importance is now attached to that motive of colonial policy which comrade Lenin characterised in the following words: "The possession of colonies alone gives a complete guarantee of the success of the monopoly against all the chances of the struggle with rivals, including even that chance in which the rival desires to defend itself by a law establishing State monopoly. Even for American imperialism the struggle for markets and raw materials is being transformed into a desperate struggle for acquisition of colonies. The accusations made against Wilson to the effect that when concluding peace he took no care to ensure to the U.S.A. strategic points in the Pacific in order to safeguard the roads to the Philippines, accusations which are being made more and more frequently in American, and particularly in military, literature, hide merely the growing insatiability of American appetites for colonial possessions.

Partitioning of the Colonies

But if the U.S.A. also is raising the question of the partitioning of the colonies, it is quite evident that the "equilibrium" established in 1918 is becoming a complete anachronism. For in actuality what "right" has some "miserable" little Holland to have a monopolistic possession of Indonesia, when the chief consumer of rubber from Java and Borneo is the motor industry of America, which in all regards is smashing the motor industry of the whole world? What "right" has Holland to stand between some Ford and Malayan rubber when, in addition, it has no fleet which could dare to compare with that of the U.S.A.? From the Yankee point of view France has more right to dominate the Pacific Ocean, but her ambitions also far exceed her ammunition: the French may manifest some pretensions to the Mediterranean, but they are absolutely impotent to defend their Pacific Ocean colonies, which penetrate even into the Antilles, or almost into American imperial-

ism's waistcoat pocket. But even so these anachronistic and out of date colonial relationships are of comparatively small import as compared with the chief anachronism, the colossal colonial riches of Britain, by comparison with her economic, and "consequently" military, decline. The U.S.A. cannot clear the "old folk" out of the islands of the Pacific Ocean not because it would be difficult for her to deal with the second-rate imperialism, which is interested in the maintenance of the present division of the colonies. Any alteration in the grouping of the colonial positions of the great and petty imperialists threatens some link in the British colonial system, and in its turn that system presents a watertight whole which among its fundamental purposes includes the defence of the monopoly which is at the heart of the British Empire, the monopolistic possession of India. But from the United States aspect the British position in India is that of a dog in the manger. Not, of course, in the sense that Britain has not abstracted enormous tribute from India, or has not exploited her as a supplier of cheap raw materials and as a purchaser of industrial goods, but in the sense that British imperialism, with its marked decline, is not in a position to develop that continually increasing exploitation of India's industrial resources which only a large export of capital can ensure. Britain is forced to subordinate the interests of India's industrial development to three factors: (1) The endeavour to avoid anything which would threaten to any extent the unlimited British monopoly of India; (2) the endeavour to drive India's industrial development artificially, now that its complete suppression is no longer possible, into those spheres of industry which least threaten the basic and most profoundly affected spheres of British industry, and to impose a slower tempo even on them; (3) the struggle to subordinate the abnormal, spasmodically developing economy of India also to the interests of the dominions, to whom the metropolis must guarantee imperial preference in corresponding spheres of export in order to retain them within the Empire. British imperialism is administering India with out-worn, spoliatory methods, repressing the development of production forces and thus setting restricted bounds to that exploitation. American imperialism could exploit India with the modern methods of financial capital, which would allow the development of her productive forces and would ensure to the U.S.A. a wide field for an extended production of super-profit. The export of British capital to India is gradually dropping, and in 1927 had fallen to an insignificant sum. American capital would fling itself on India with all the ardour of first love, if the iron railing of the British colonial system did not stand in the way to preserve the monopoly of India. The destruction of that railing is the secret purpose of American imperialism. To that end it has a secret but faithful ally in the form of the Indian bourgeoisie, who, manœuvring between the growing avidity of London and the rise of the national-revolutionary wave, seeks salvation in the "enlightened" imperialism of Washington. The "dissatisfaction" of American imperialism is not, of course, the only factor making a war in the Pacific and Indian Oceans inevitable.

While to American imperialism open military struggle is necessary in order to achieve the redistribution of the colonies and spheres of influence, Japanese

Struggle for Colonies—continued

imperialism, which enjoys the advantage of its geographical position, is striving with frenzied feverishness to exploit the time remaining till the actual outbreak of hostilities in order to seize everything which falls to its hands. But it would be inaccurate to conclude from this that Japan is in favour of a protracted delay of the war. On the contrary, so far as one can judge by the press, the Japanese military authorities are of the view that "if a war with the U.S.A. is coming, then the sooner the better." The "defensive" plan of Japanese militarism, i.e., the seizure of the Philippines before the arrival of the American fleet, and the destruction, or at least the disablement, of the American squadron by submarine attacks on the road from the Hawaiian Islands to Asiatic waters, can be regarded as a possible one, given the present relations of forces and speed of the Japanese and the American fighting ships (if one is to believe official reports, in other words, if one is to consider that the falsehood included in them does not exceed the normal). But every year of delay changes the position to Japan's disadvantage. Japan is unceasingly building its sea and air fleet, but it is deprived of the possibility of building it at such a rate as the United States, which by its latest plan for a simultaneous rapid building of six fast passenger steamships (in reality aeroplane carriers) has once more reminded the world that it remains unsurpassed in regard to ability to create colossal sea units. Japan is even more troubled by America's chemical preparations, which are concealed at least from the ordinary observer, but of which one can judge indirectly by the exceptional successes of her "peace" chemical industry, which has overtaken and surpassed its rivals. Consequently Japanese imperialism has no justification for delaying the war decision for too long a time, and so she endeavours all the more energetically to exploit the secret conflict between America and Britain, paralysing the activities of both Powers in the Pacific, in order to consolidate her own position on the Asiatic mainland. The seizure of Shantung, Manchuria and Mongolia, the open military division of China, all Tanaka's policy, unique in its challenging adventurism, would be impossible if Japan did not start from the necessity of "catch the moment," facing the risk of an immediate outbreak of the war conflagration.

Versailles Partitioning

However, the Versailles partitioning has no correspondence with the last decade of growth of tusks and talons among various imperialist spoliators, not only on a world scale in regard to the Pacific Ocean, but on a European scale, with reference to the Mediterranean. In the first place, Italian Fascism is steadily preparing to make a leap similar to that which Japanese imperialism has so far made with impunity in the Yellow Sea. The Versailles distribution of the spoils of North Africa between Italy and France grows more and more out of correspondence with the correlation of forces between the two antagonists. In North Africa, France possesses colonies with a population only slightly smaller than that of the home country; she is laying down roads across the Sahara, and is thus raising the importance of her Central African colonies as sources of raw

materials and reserves of cannon fodder; the overthrow of the Riff power has brought the French possessions in Morocco within a distance from Gibraltar which a bombing squadron can easily cover in present-day conditions. On the other hand, militaristic Fascism is in external conquests seeking a way out from both its political and its economic crisis, in doing so taking its stand, according to Mussolini's latest magniloquent utterance, on the "command of morality and the laws of justice." The Italian squadron's manœuvres in the Mediterranean are an illustration of Rome's diplomatic demands in the dangerous part of that sea. Simultaneously Italian imperialism is manifesting increasing activity in the eastern section of the Mediterranean, not only in the Balkans, where it has already succeeded in restricting French influence, but on the shores of the Red Sea and in particular in the Abyssinian area, where with the secret support of America, and in the latter's interests, it is participating in the work of supplanting the British monopoly. Italian imperialism is putting forward pretensions to Tripoli, in Abyssinia, on Lake Chad, and to the connecting of its Central African colonies by trade roads with the ports of the Mediterranean. The adjustment of the "historical errors" of Versailles in the interests of Italy's colonial expansion is one of the factors rendering inevitable a growth of conflicts on the European continent.

German Imperialist Demands

Finally, it is sufficient merely to mention the sharp lack of correspondence between the frenziedly increasing appetites of German imperialism and its actual position in the international sphere in order to estimate what a complexity of conflicts is developing in connection with this fact throughout the world. During the last ten years the growth of production forces in Germany has developed at a tempo overtaking and surpassing the growth of production forces in all other capitalist countries. Shattered by the imperialist war, stripped naked at Versailles, finished off by the Ruhr occupation, inflation, and so on, German capital has succeeded in restoring the main spheres of industry at the expense of super-complex exploitation of the working class, its high technical efficiency and qualifications, and in achieving a position in which not one European cartel can manage without its participation, and in which even the monopolists of the chemical and steel-founding industries of the U.S.A. secretly send suitors to the corresponding German trusts. Germany's role as initiator in all these European cartels, which are ostensibly for the purpose of a friendly, peaceable satisfaction of the pretensions of each of the participants, can hardly delude anybody now, after the experience of the first imperialist war. International cartels (and particularly the latest financial agreement between Mond and the American banks, which only a blind man can consider as a sign of the slackening of the Anglo-American conflict) present a peculiar form of the "interlacing" of interests which is an inseparable feature of imperialism and of the maturing of imperialist conflicts. Now more than ever before it is clear that the "peaceful" alliances are preparing for war, and in turn develop out of war, each conditioning the other, giving birth to the changes in form of peaceful and unpeaceful struggle from the one and the

Struggle for Colonies—continued

same basis of imperialistic associations and the mutual relations of world economy and world politics." The revision of the Dawes Plan, which almost all the interested participants are now demanding, and to which sooner or later Poincaréist France will also have to agree on the basis of corresponding compensations, cannot, of course, satiate the appetites of German imperialism. On the contrary, the growth in Germany's stability in the international sphere will incite her to raise with fresh force the question of her colonial share, of spheres of advantageous operation, concessions, monopolistic profits and so on, and of the extension of economic territory in general, an issue which has special importance for German imperialism at the present stage of its development.

From the point of view of the strongest imperialist countries the repartitioning of the earth is an issue the necessity of dealing with which is urgent. All the elements of a fresh imperialist war are at hand.

* * * * *

II.

Attempt to Render U.S.S.R. Powerless

The forces stimulating the imperialists to delay the beginning of universal war, despite their growing mutual antagonisms, are well known. They are: the existence of the Soviet Union, the danger of proletarian revolutions, and the inevitability of colonial insurrections. In order to prepare the field for the coming war all imperialistic groupings have one common task—to render the U.S.S.R. powerless, to disarm the workers' movement for a certain period, to safeguard themselves from the direction of the colonies. During the last two years, with the increasing participation of social-democracy, the imperialistic bourgeoisie has worked mainly on the resolution of the first two tasks. Hence the extraordinary activity of the imperialists with a view to isolating the Soviet Union, and for preparing a "preventive" war against it, or at the least a point financial and economic boycott, which would weaken the power of the first republic of Labour as an anti-war factor. Hence the policy of civil, industrial and similar peaces, with simultaneous terroristic attacks on the Communist Parties and the workers' mass organisations, the policy of class collaboration, under the cloak of which the fusion of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals with the machinery of the bourgeois state is now proceeding. Only recently has the bourgeoisie set about the resolution of the third task, *i.e.*, the political working of the colonies. It has to be emphasised that we refer definitely to the "political" working, for the military and technical preparation of the colonies as strategic points and human reserves for the coming war has gone on unbrokenly since the first day of the Versailles peace. But these are insufficient to ensure the "fidelity" of the colonies to imperialism in the event of war. Imperialism cannot but take into account the fact that since 1918 insurrections have arisen in all the most important colonies, insurrections which have either been suppressed or have ended in the monstrous semi-compromise of the treacherous native bourgeoisie with their en-

slavers, but which have in every case entailed heavy and bloody sacrifices from the toiling masses. These colonial insurrections, shattered with extraordinary harshness and again maturing, will develop with exceptional force as soon as the pressure of the imperialistic terror is relaxed, in other words, as soon as war breaks out. Of course, imperialism will adopt various repressive measures and will perfect its machinery for colonial violence, in order to safeguard its rear during the world war. But naked violence alone is no longer sufficient in the case of colonies which have passed through the heavy experience of national-revolutionary struggle; there must be also a corresponding political falsehood for the purpose of masking it. The task of the slave-owners in the colonies is becoming more complex than formerly. In 1902 Hobson accused imperialism of "blindness," owing to the "carelessness with which Great Britain, France, Italy and other imperialistic nations take . . . the road of suppressing the colonies with the assistance of native troops." So far the bourgeoisie have come through satisfactorily with this "carelessness"; basing themselves on the purely reactionary elements of the native feudalists, princes, militarists, and so on, imperialism has succeeded in driving the mass of colonial peasantry into the firing line without essential complications resulting. But now, after the wave of national-revolutionary movement which has taken place, that is insufficient. Just as the bourgeoisie could not have faced the working masses with the fact of the imperialist war if they had not had their agents inside the Labour movement, so in the same way they need to install their agents at the heart of the national-revolutionary movements, in order to ensure the participation of the colonies in the war. This role of imperialist agents can only partially be played by the national bourgeoisie after the development of the class struggle in the colonies and the open treachery of the national bourgeoisie in the first type of colonial insurrections has resulted in the compromise of the latter in the eyes of the toilers. The development of the class struggle in the colonies results in the position that the bourgeoisie are compelled to organise their agents in the colonies along European lines, *i.e.*, with the aid of social-reformism. Hence this sudden interest in the colonial question which is now being displayed by the Second International at the very moment when preparation for the repartitioning of the colonies is at its height. When the organ of the pseudo-Marxists, the "Arbeiter Zeitung," prints a very exalted communication about the presentation of two reports, one on "Militarism and Disarmament," and the other on "Colonial Policy and the Working Class," to the autumn Congress of the Second International, and almost sees the finger of God in the coincidence of these two issues, is it not *ipso facto* revealing the secret diplomacy which has aroused the Second International to raise the colonial question in 1928? So far as the reformist resolutions on "disarmament" are concerned, after the experience of 1914 do we need any further proof that they are all eyewash to get the working class into the war? Is it not proved beyond a peradventure that when the diplomats begin to work particularly hard at the "preservation of peace" and the leaders of social-democracy vociferate with particular violence of their readiness to "struggle against war" it signifies that the war danger is extremely great? The raising of the colonial

Struggle for Colonies—continued

problems only witnesses to the role that colonies will play in the coming war not only as objects but as also subjects of the war conflict.

In 1914 the aims of the spoliatory war were hidden behind phrases such as national defence, the defence of the fatherland, the self-determination of nations, and so on. In the coming war, which in its class content will be distinguished in principle from a "dispute among the imperialist spoliators themselves," that falsification of the truth will no longer have potency. The prologue, or at least a part of the coming world war, will be an armed attack of a more or less large grouping of imperialist States on the Soviet Union and in general on the Soviet revolution in all its forms. In order to conceal the true nature of such a new war a new diplomatic falsehood is also necessary. During the last few years the Second International has worked at its preparation with exceptional energy. "Forgeries composed an organic part of the 'national' policy and of Bismarck's 'genius' as a statesman," wrote William Liebknecht in 1870. But the coarse Bismarck falsehoods are child's toys by comparison with the system of forgeries, hypocrisies and instigations which the Second International is now developing in order to "justify" in the eyes of the working class the war now being prepared against the Soviet revolution. The "pacifism" of the Second International is the fundamental basis of this system of falsifications. Objective conditions demand of the reformists that this basis should now be extended to policy in the colonies. And the Second International is going to the oppressed masses of the East with the olive branches of peace in its hands. This new role of the social-imperialists demands special training and experience. To the aid of the reformist leaders, who are directly associated with the slave-owning bourgeoisie of their own countries, now comes Otto Bauer with his "distinterestedness" in direct colonial pillaging, with his Pharasaic neutrality. This, of course, does not hinder at all the fact that every paragraph of the resolutions advertised by the "Arbeiter Zeitung" shout of the direct connection of the authors with the Colonial Offices of the corresponding countries, with the trust companies exploiting the corresponding colonies, and with the staff of world imperialism as a whole.

The Second International Resolution

The Second International resolution would wish to be generous in its promises. But even this wordy liberality has its limits: the reformist diplomats do not grant an equal degree of "liberty" to all oppressed peoples alike, they do not recognise them all alike as having earned their condescending attention. The reformist resolution has the profound conception of dividing colonial countries into different "types" according to the degree of their preparedness for receiving the blessings of independence; but the one thing common in its application to all these "types" is the fact that the Second International makes each colony only such concessions as will not destroy the monopolism of imperialism in the given country.

The Second International is prepared to recognise "sovereignty" only to China and Egypt. It is a pity

that the reformist leaders go so far by their own mental effort only in 1928, *i.e.*, when world imperialism is planning to "recognise" the Nanking-Pekin Government *de facto*, and British imperialism is not averse to conferring a paper independence on the Egyptian bourgeoisie under corresponding real guarantees. So long as the Canton Government was playing the role of revolutionary factor, these extremeist lefts of the Second International, not to mention the open allies of intervention, treated the "Asiatic nationalism" of the Chinese revolution with contempt, endeavouring in all ways to restrain the European proletariat from support of the Chinese revolution. And only after the Kuomintang counter-revolution had taken adequate formulation did the Second International provide itself with "its own" Chinese right wing Kuomintangist, who in the summer of 1927 laid plans before the Executive Bureau for grafting the shoots of European reformism on the Chinese workers' movement. But even then the Chinese bourgeois State was still unworthy of a diploma for maturity from the Second International. Only on their own initiative did the Japanese social-democrats offer Chiang Kai Shek their services in the organisation of yellow trade unions in the summer of 1927. But the Second International as a whole demanded proofs of their trustworthiness and guarantees from the Chinese national movement to the same extent as bourgeois diplomacy. "The radical dimensions" of the reformist resolution in regard to the recognition of China's "independence" only connotes that world imperialism is ready on certain conditions to come to an agreement with the Chinese bourgeoisie in regard to the exploitation of hundreds of millions of Chinese workers and peasants. In face of such "independence," connoting for the people in reality the maintenance of the old imperialistic cabal, only in new forms, Otto Bauer is as necessary a figure as Chiang Kai Shek and Feng Yu Hsiang.

India's Good Fairy

For India the good fairy of the Second International found a more modest gift—autonomy. But why such stinginess? For even the Indian National Congress, under the influence of a fresh relapse into super-avidity on the part of rotting British capital on the one hand, and the demands of the population of India, condemned by Britain to hunger and death, on the other, has been compelled to put forward the demand for the separation of India from the British Empire. Why did Otto Bauer, who so capitivatingly describes how when they were working on the resolutions the Executive Bureau received reports from the socialist parties of the corresponding capitalist countries,* take no pains to enlighten himself as the nature of the resolutions and decisions now being passed in India in all workers' and peasants' meetings? It is because, not by mistake but quite consciously, he writes his resolution to the dictation of the Simon Commission, the aim of which consists in preparing India for the coming war, by bribing the bourgeoisie with a few crumbs, deluding the most backward section of the toilers, and shattering with sword and fire the leading elements of the national-revolutionary

* The "Arbeiter Zeitung" promises to publish these reports in a separate book; one can only welcome the appearance of such documents.

Struggle for Colonies—continued

movement. The two members of the Labour Party who entered the Simon Commission were boycotted with the same class hatred as were Birkenhead's bourgeois representatives; the British workers who sent these two youngsters to Parliament in 1924 have now demanded their resignation. During their journey to India Purcell and his assistants were forced to disorganise the national revolutionary struggle by other roads than that of drawing the Indian proletariat away from it. Now more than ever before British imperialism has need of an international mask for its spoliatory and provocational policy in India, and the Second International will provide it with that support in the form of a "demand" for India's autonomy.

Second International's Role in Indonesia

But the Second International plays a particularly contemptible role in regard to Indonesia, the heroic struggle of which against the Dutch enslavement makes a glorious page in the recent history of insurrections in the colonies. For Indonesia (which for some reason the Second International thinks is composed only of Java) Otto Bauer does not demand even autonomy: the utmost that he is prepared to give it amounts to a parliament with a Dutch governor. The Dutch section of the Second International acted with foresight in waiting with its programme until hundreds and thousands of Indonesian revolutionaries had been shot down by Dutch machine-guns or had perished on Dutch gallows, while dozens of thousands more are rotting and dying in Dutch prisons. Only after the extermination of the finest fighters of Indonesia and in the circumstance of a ruthless terror crushing the entire population can the Dutch social-democracy pluck up such impudence as to attempt to open their own "department" in Indonesia.

But when displaying such tenderness in regard to all slave-owners, could Otto Bauer be expected to refrain from caring for his own native German imperialism? As a result the programme of action put forward for the tropical African colonies took a distinctly original turn. As is well known, the tropical colonies are an object of desire to German imperialism, and it would be strange if the colonial resolution drawn up by the Second International had such a wide sweep as to deprive that object of its peculiar attractions and charms. Of course, that did not happen. "The tropical and the southern-tropical colonies of Africa and the Pacific Ocean," writes the "Arbeiter Zeitung," "must still remain under the administration of the central governments for the time being, since those latter governments can be far more effectually controlled by the working class." So far, under the administration of the central governments controlled by such representatives of the proletariat as Bauer and Company, the native population are dying in slavery, poisoned by all the charms of European civilisation (unendurable labour, narcotics, syphilis, and so on). But the Second International magnanimously agrees that this aspect needs to be regulated somewhat: "In the case of these colonies the whole system of proposals has been drawn up by the finest specialists of the British Labour Party and the Netherlands social-democracy." The salvation of the tropical colonies is thus to consist in

being placed under the control of the League of Nations Mandate Commission, in other words, in the hands of one of the executive organs of imperialist robbery.

* * * * *

III.

Social-Imperialists

The special attention which the Second International is now paying to the colonial question is both an indication of the approaching war for colonies and a factor speeding up the approach of that war. It would be the greatest of errors to under-estimate this new manoeuvre of the social-imperialists. The reformist colonial commission have concocted a coarse and revolting mess, and one which only emphasises the slave-owning intentions and tastes of its authors. But it must not be forgotten that the Second International by no means makes pretensions to the shattering of the national-revolutionary movement with its own strength. It assumes to itself the less heroic, but from the viewpoint of imperialism, the no less respectable role of privateer in the theatre of colonial struggle. In the designs of its inspirers the road to social-reformism in the colonies must be laid down by the long-range guns of the imperialist fleet, by bombs dropped from aeroplanes, and the bribery of the native bourgeoisie or various of its sections, who will open the national revolutionary front to imperialism. Behind the armies of the conquistadores have hitherto followed the fathers of the church, missionaries armed with the Evangel and preaching humanity and submission to the oppression of the exploiters. Of course, a "peaceful," normal and safeguarded spoliation in the colonies could not be achieved by missionary bands, but it could be consolidated and safeguarded by them. And now to the assistance of the fathers of the church come the leaders of the Second International and Amsterdam, armed with a special opium for the colonies. At the same time the class struggle in the most highly developed colonies is throwing out of its midst various centres of reformism, with whom the European social-traitors hasten to make connections. Thus the workers of India, who are now displaying such self-denial in the heavy strike struggle, would have thrown out Purcell in twenty-four hours, if first of all the entire machinery of British violence had not stood behind him, ravaging and rending the Indian workers' movement, and if, in the second place, Purcell had not had allies in India itself in the form of a miserable handful of corrupt politicians of the type of Jushi (?) and Chaman Lal, who at the moment of the destruction of the workers' movement captured the machinery of the trade unions. And the extent of the danger of the Second International's new manoeuvre is determined by that fact.

At the foundation of the First International Marx spoke of the necessity for the proletariat to "master secret international policy, to watch the diplomatic tricks of their governments." At the present time the secrets of international policy equally menace both the proletariat of imperialist countries, and the labouring masses of the colonies. The unmasking in the colonies of the diplomatic tricks of the governments which are consciously and calculatingly preparing a world war at the cost and with the participation of the "coloured peoples," is the most important task of the international proletariat. In this system of bourgeois diplomacy the

Struggle for Colonies—continued

social-reformist attack against the growing class-consciousness of the workers and peasant poor in the colonies is taking on especial importance. It is necessary to recognise that from our side so far very little has been done to warn the toiling masses in the colonies of this danger. The resolution of the agitational and propagandist tasks connected with this work lies entirely ahead.

“In order to ensure our existence until the following military clash between the counter-revolutionary imperialistic West and the revolutionary and nationalistic East between the civilised States of the world and the States that are backward in eastern fashion, but which compose the majority, that majority must succeed in becoming civilised.” During the five years which have elapsed since Lenin wrote those words the colonies and semi-colonies have taken a number of most important

steps along the road to civilisation. This period has been characterised by the development of capitalism and the growth of class-consciousness in a number of colonies; the great Chinese revolution, the heroic insurrection in Indonesia, the insurrection in Morocco, the insurgent struggle in Syria, the beginning new phase of revolutionary struggle in India. The struggle between the counter-revolutionary West and the revolutionary East has developed in various parts of the world. Nowhere has it provided a final resolution of the task as yet, but in many places it has approached that resolution. The imperialist war and the preparation leading up to it will give these clashes a first-class international importance. The possibility is by no means excluded that the new impending forcing of the imperialist front will occur in connection with the colonial struggle and as its result. The entire international situation dictates the necessity that the Comintern should throw its finest forces into that section of the front.

Some Critical Remarks on the Draft Programme

Clara Zetkin

THE mere existence of the Communist International proves the necessity and significance of a uniform, basic programme for all its sections. The Communist International wants to “make history” in the Marx-Engels sense as it should “make” history. Its task is to unite all revolutionary forces of the proletariat, as well as all workers, oppressed classes and peoples in a systematic manner, and to organise them and develop their capacity and desire for action. This requires to be done in order to lead these forces, developed to their utmost, to overthrow world capitalism and realise Communism as the new social order of the world. The Communist International will not, nor should it, allow itself to be driven by the course of historical events; it must constitute a driving force in the midst of the whirlpool of events, certain as to its aims and methods. If this tremendous task is to be fulfilled there must be international uniform guiding principles—true to Lenin’s theory that a good movement must have a good theory—and these principles must be set down in a programme.

“To the Masses!”

In accordance with the aim in view the Programme of the Communist International must satisfy Lenin’s slogan: “To the Masses!” It must provide all Communist Parties united in the International with the basic principles of their policy and their entire activity; it must determine the international policy for activity in keeping with the revolutionary awakening and development of the proletariat and the working masses in the struggle for our final goal. This can only be attained if these masses do not merely consider the Communist Parties as their faithful leaders in the struggle for daily

demands, who know and understand their conditions of life and their needs to be free, but also, and above all, as the precursors and pioneers of a new world order (Weltanschauung), a higher social order, free from exploitation and oppression. The urge for this new, higher order, the unerring desire to create it must become a clearly recognised force, which knits the manifold daily struggles closely together and drives us forward stage by stage on a definite path, at the same time lending these struggles determination and significance beyond that of the moment.

Consequently the entire world-regenerating and creative content of Communism must be made clear to the consciousness of the masses and become an unflinching source of strength. Our Programme must serve this purpose by its content and structure. It should not be a compressed, learned compendium of our principles and tactics for comrades, who, thanks to their thorough theoretic training, understand historic development from the point of view of historic materialism. It should rather incite and fit all responsible officials and members of the Communist Parties to explain Communism as a liberating world-conception, as opposed to all the other ideologies, to their brother and sister workers in factories, trade unions and wherever else they may meet. And more than that: our Programme must of itself awaken and rally, act as a determining and illuminative force amongst the masses of the proletariat and all classes and social strata, who rebel against the social order in consequence of the rule of trust capital and the decay of bourgeois culture in the imperialist epoch. Our Programme must become the common property of the masses generally.

From this point of view, in my opinion, the Draft Programme of the Communist International, adopted by

Some Critical Remarks—continued

the Programme Commission of the E.C.C.I., is not quite satisfactory. The text submitted by the Programme Commission of the E.C.C.I. for examination and criticism seems to me to be not in the manner of a programme in its sections dealing with principles, or a programmatic introduction into the Communist social order and world conception as a whole, but rather a series of leading articles and studies on certain dominant and leading phenomena and problems.

The Programme Criticised

Naturally, it is a mere matter of course that requires no special mention, that in this era of the life and development of capitalism, imperialism, as a prominent decisive historical force, should occupy the chief position in the Communist programme. A profound and far-reaching analysis of the nature of capitalism and of its many-sided economic and social effects would be a necessary premise if our Programme were to provide a sharp and clear-cut definition of the working of the subjective and objective driving forces of social development; driving forces which incessantly and inevitably decide the fall of world capitalism by world revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the development of Communism as a world social order. The Draft strongly emphasises the fact that imperialism is the highest and last stage of capitalist development, it depicts imperialism as the purest and most developed historical expression of capitalism. But just because this is the case I think that our Programme should deal with imperialism in a correspondingly extensive manner.

Nevertheless, the broad basis of a programme exposition of the nature and effects of capitalism need not be a concise history of capitalism *ab ovo*. But I think it essential that there should be sharply defined and clearly stated definitions both of the economic basis and the ideological superstructure of the bourgeois order which culminates in imperialism. I miss any such definitions in the Draft, I miss an illuminating and concise survey of the economic and social structure of the bourgeois order, a survey which gives a clear characteristic of the different classes and their position, which determines their attitude to the question: Capitalism or Socialism.

Needless to say, the Draft notes the chief classes of the bourgeois order which oppose one another as deadly enemies: the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. It establishes their strained relations, which drive the workers on to revolutionary struggles for the seizure of power on an international scale. But it does not penetrate into the historic nature of these relations and their decisive; manifold, economic and social ramifications. The intermediate classes between the two poles in the bourgeois order are only dealt with later; particularly in the sections on "The Strategy and Tactics of the Communist International" and "The Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism," where an analysis is made of the role they could play in the proletarian fight for freedom, and the measures to be taken to win them as allies, or at least to neutralise them. But the Draft makes no analysis of their needs and position as a class, nor does it attempt to explain the contradictions and vacillations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In this

respect, as might be expected, the peasantry gets more attention than the urban petty and middle bourgeoisie who with the intellectuals, form a very important section. Yet in highly developed capitalist, industrial countries the urban middle classes will be no less welcome than the peasants as indispensable allies—or maybe dread enemies—of the belligerent revolutionary proletariat.

The Draft contains an exposition of the most important and burning problems which the bourgeois order fails to solve, which, on the contrary, imperialism accentuates, extends and multiplies in the course of new developments, thereby showing its complete impotence as a social and cultural factor in reproduction and construction. There is not even a modest reference in the Draft to such phenomena and problems even of a social nature. In my opinion the explanation for this lack is the treatment of imperialism as the dominant political force, especially as regards its destructive and far-reaching effects in foreign policy, which make its economic results retreat into the background and important social events disappear.

The Communist International has had heated debates on rationalisation, but in the Draft this subject is only touched on incidentally. The Draft does not indicate by a single syllable that rationalisation creates new problems and makes old ones more difficult, nor does it deal with the accompanying circumstances which have decisive influence on the working and living conditions of the proletariat. The imperialist era, the highest and last stage of capitalism, is marked by phenomena indicative of an increased and aggravated stage of decline and disintegration in the ideological superstructure of bourgeois society. Copious examples are to be found in science, justice, sanitation, public education, parliament and other organs of the bourgeois state and of public life. Fascism and the reign of terror, for instance, prove clearly that the bourgeoisie, in the struggle against the advancing forces of the proletariat, destroys the legal basis of its own social order. No day passes without its court scandals which corroborate the dishonesty and corruption of bourgeois morality. The bourgeois social order is incapable of banishing the terrifying phantoms: mysticism, pessimism, cynicism, all leave their spiritual imprint.

The Draft Programme does not as much as touch on phenomena of this nature. And yet it is such as these that make the still uninitiated, passive masses realise the common danger of capitalism, and the necessity for its destruction, rather than a straightforward interpretation of the basic laws of capitalist profit-making economy. For social problems serve to awaken class-consciousness in many and spur them on to inquire into the laws that operate blindly in the economic depths. Furthermore, on the basis of private property there are problems and disintegrating phenomena that clearly demonstrate that the bourgeoisie—as Engels said—is on the downward grade of its development, and is steering irretrievably towards its downfall. The picture of the historic situation which leads to world revolution and world Communism is incomplete without a clear interpretation of the decisive facts together with their causes and results. By utilising them in our Programme, confusion, uncertainty and weakness will be brought into the ranks of our enemies and the prospects of proletarian

Some Critical Remarks—continued

victory strengthened, and consequently, there will be a double advantage. We cannot afford to overlook this.

The shortcomings already mentioned are, in my opinion, responsible for the fact that there is not sufficient emphasis laid on the dynamics of the development, which hastens and guarantees the victory of the proletarian world revolution and the destruction of capitalism during the imperialist epoch. The Draft does not enable the reader to grasp this development by giving a short, plastic exposition of the material and ideological tendencies and phenomena which portend the death knell of the bourgeois social order, the class rule of the bourgeoisie. In the Draft there are far too many ready-made, abstract conceptions, which we Communists know well, but are partially or wholly incomprehensible for the uninitiated masses. Agitational catch-words take the place of the reality that they would understand. Repetition in this respect is no substitute for convincing proofs. The Draft lacks the historic clarity which should serve as a guiding force to awaken and enthuse the masses.

Conditions for the Overthrow of Capitalism

The "Introduction" to the Draft Programme declares: "But the development of imperialism not only creates the material prerequisites for socialism, it simultaneously creates the conditions for the overthrow of capitalism." This is correct, but it would be better to substitute "completes" for "creates," for imperialism is the completion of a historic process of development, which leads to the appointed goal. Also in other parts of the Draft the Communist perspective is proved with the assurance that the "material prerequisites for the creation of socialism" develop or exist. But only one kind of prerequisite is provided in the Draft, *i.e.*, the organisational. As regards the conditions for the overthrow of capitalism those who study the Programme ascertain that the insufferable, growing exploitation and enslavement of the proletariat under imperialism cause a constantly, increasing national and international unification, which reaches its apex in the Communist International and its systematic, organised struggle for world Communism. Recognition is given to the increase in the revolutionary strength of the struggling proletariat in capitalist countries, which has been the result of the growth in rebellious outbreaks amongst the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

The correctness of this line of development cannot be denied. But the statements which are made in the various sections of the Draft provide no clear, compact picture of the material and also of the ideological prerequisites and conditions, both for the conquest of capitalism and the development of socialism. The objective and subjective forces of social development, which inevitably cause both the one and the other, are not represented either in their multiformity or entirety, nor in their full vitality. The Draft Programme's repeated references to the inherent contradictions within capitalism and imperialism, the uninterrupted rise in the organic composition of capitalism and the consequent fall in profits, which stimulate the quest for super-profits by exploiting the colonies and semi-colonies are but pale and lifeless phrases. The economic, political,

social life and action, which these expressions embody remain the secret of the author of the Draft and of all those who know revolutionary Marxism and terminology. But for those masses who are still to be won and led the phrases are foreign and dead; they are as incomprehensible as the revolutionary method and dialectic materialism of Marx and Engels are to the uninitiated. The Draft Programme in this connection pre-supposes that which the Programme should make the common knowledge of the masses.

Women and the Revolution

I think it extremely important that some of the specially glaring shortcomings in the Draft already criticised should be made good. The Draft pays no attention to the complexity of facts, which, under the rule of imperialism, and especially in conjunction with rationalisation, hasten the destruction of the old-fashioned productive household and transform enormous masses of women from Lilliputian home producers to producers on a modern scale in big factories. This process of transformation is of tremendous consequence and constitutes a revolutionary factor of first-class importance. It creates the economic basis for the social equality of the sexes both in law and practice, for the complete social and human liberation of woman, for the abolition of marriage for money or other advantage, the dissolution of family property, the recognition of motherhood as a social service and the obligation of society to care and educate children and the young. And last but not least amongst the colonial and semi-colonial peoples the tortuous disintegration of domestic production and the family by the predatory claws of capitalism has a revolutionary effect, especially in breaking up ancient beliefs which reduced women to the level of domestic animals.

The tablets are crumbling on which are inscribed the "Thou shalt" about the social and sex relations between the sexes and the relations between parents and children. The most disgusting domestic conditions, family tragedies, prostitution, orgies and excesses protected by hypocritical bourgeois honesty, infantile mortality, appallingly large numbers of waifs and strays, and juvenile crimes cry out in capitalist countries for new social rules of life. The tendencies to introduce marriage and sex reforms, the fight for legal abortion, the decline in the birth rate and the rapid spread of the "birth control" movement, in other words neo-Malthusianism, are an eloquent language in themselves. Of no less importance are the endeavours to introduce fundamental educational reforms as regards method, character and goal. In all capitalist countries, and even in the East, organised masses of women are carrying on a struggle for equal rights with men. The army of proletarian women, women workers, who are fighting jointly with their class comrades in all economic and political struggles, is becoming more numerous and more certain of its goal. In China the women workers and peasants participate in the revolutionary movement.

What an instructive contrast to the attitude of the bourgeois social order is provided by the construction of the socialist state of proletarian dictatorship which faces all these phenomena and problems. In one the effort to hold on to the past, to preserve what is rotten and decayed, so that the power of dead property over living

Some Critical Remarks—continued

beings is portrayed as "the law of the family"; and unavoidable concessions for the protection of mothers and children's education are carried out as though they were being handed out alms. In bourgeois democratic countries women's suffrage in face of open and covert opposition is working for the actual realisation of the formal equality of women. In the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the other hand, there is the honest endeavour of the Soviet power to realise to the full throughout the entire country the legal right of women in all fields of social activity. In the fight with cultural backwardness and poverty numerous social institutions are being established and perfected, which relieve women from much domestic labour and facilitate their maternal duties. There is a passionate seeking for new forms for the union between man and woman in order to establish a new legal system, which will ensure the liberty of the individual, whilst observing social bonds and responsibilities.

The Draft Programme does not breathe the slightest word about all this fermenting and to a certain extent chaotic life, which affects millions and often interferes in a much more destructive way with the personal life of the individual than many other events in the course of historical development. There is no doubt that both in the Soviet Union and outside it—for in this field too the Soviet Union serves as the great historical experimental field of world Communism—external and internal contradictions of development are in wild disorder, and that this period is far from ended. But is that not also the case in many other fields of social activity about which the Draft comes to theoretical and practical conclusions? In my opinion a Communist Programme should not omit stating its attitude to the revolutionary processes here referred to; it should make a cool and daring statement by the application of the revolutionary methods of dialectic materialism of what degrades and of what advances, or what is direction and goal in the tendencies of development in which natural and cultivated tendencies are closely interwoven. The revolutionary youth of all countries is waiting impatiently for the Communist International to make a statement on these points, so that it may gain clarity and guidance for its conduct of life. The educational advisers and friends of this youth also feel the necessity for such a statement in the Programme.

Conventional Phrases

The Draft Programme restricts itself to a few conventional phrases about the equality of women and propaganda amongst them, leaving untouched this very extensive, intricate and difficult complexity of questions here enumerated. It does not even mention what is immediately practical and undisputed. That is to say the extraordinarily great importance to be attached to the participation of masses of women in the revolutionary class struggles of the proletariat, and what is more important, their co-operation in the socialist work of construction for the development of world Communism. The very appearance of women on the battlefield of the class struggle constitutes in itself a tremendous piece of revolution. The Draft Programme, that completely

ignores all this, was written on the ground that has already absorbed the blood of so many women in order that it might become the realm of proletarian dictatorship and of socialist construction. There is no mention made of the exemplary sacrifices and bravery of women in the struggle, their untiring devotion to the work of the Soviets in all organisations and social institutions in order to transform the Soviet State into a Communist social order.

The demands which Communists make for the period of struggle, for the conquest of power and for the transition stage from capitalism to socialism do not contain a single one on behalf of women. No demand is made for full civil rights, nor for the welfare of mothers and children. In the section dealing with "Strategy and Tactics" the systematic activity of Communist Parties for the training of the revolutionary masses of women is restricted to women workers and peasants. Statistics show that even in highly industrialised countries women manual workers constitute a minority of women proletarians, and that in practically all capitalist States, in industries of decisive importance for the conquest of power—mining, metal trade, railways—the number of women manual workers is very small. Experience has shown that women workers in these and other industries are the bravest collaborators of men in the struggle, that they often have decisive influence on the course and outcome of strikes and agitations. A classic example of this was the heroism of the women during the General Strike and the miners' struggle in England. Why should workers' wives and petty bourgeois women be excluded from the army of the world revolution, since the Draft Programme has recognised the necessity of recruiting both the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie as allies? Furthermore, in extending the battle front against imperialism attention must be paid to the increase in the number of women employees as compared with that of women manual workers as a result of rationalisation. Statistics for Germany and the United States of America prove this fact, which cannot be ignored by the industrial proletariat when mobilising for the struggle for victory.

The chief principle for the systematic activity of Communist Parties amongst proletarian women as a whole, amongst women workers of all kinds, must be the greatest possible extension of the battle front against imperialism and of the working front for the establishment of socialism and in conjunction with this extension increase of activity. Our Programme must realise that the collaboration of the broad masses of women does not only mean the increase in the number of the revolutionary forces, but also the improvement in the quality. Woman is not only an unsuccessful copy of man, as a female being she possesses her special characteristics and value for struggle and construction, and the free development of long chained-up energy will help on the struggle and the work of construction. Therefore I miss from the section in the Draft "The Ultimate Aim of the Communist International," not only the statement, that together with abolition of private property the industrial and social differences between the sexes and generations will also disappear as well as other effects of private property; but in a still greater degree I miss the stress that should be laid on the enrichment that will ensue in the culture of world Communism. Another gap in the Draft

Some Critical Remarks—continued

in this connection. There is no mention made of the importance for the versatility and the rich resources of culture in the Communist human family of the inclusion of the hundreds of millions of Eastern peoples—and together with them the women of the East—whose talents and capacities, oppressed through all the ages, will have freedom to develop and will be contributed to the general good.

The “Intellectuals”

The remarks about the “Intellectuals” are not, in my opinion, in keeping either with their position as a class, so full of contradictions and conflicts, or with their far-reaching importance as allies in the struggle of the proletariat, especially in the general transition to Communism. No thought is given to the varied necessities of learned men, technicians, artists, writers, teachers, officials, although therein is actually to be found the lack of liberty and the necessities imposed on science, art, national education and of culture itself by the bourgeois social order. The Draft contains no special slogans on behalf of the intellectuals beyond the general demands for education and culture. It affirms that the “intellectual technical forces” hang on the survivals of the bourgeois order, and that the proletariat, besides suppressing in an energetic manner all counter-revolutionary activities, must not lose sight of the necessity of attracting these qualified social forces to the work of socialist construction. The proletariat attempts to attract the intellectual, technical forces, to bring them under its influence and to secure their close collaboration in revolutionising society. In another place the demand is made for the extension of the influence of the Communist Parties to the lower strata of the intellectuals.

There can be no difference of opinion as to the necessity of recruiting the lower strata of the intellectuals for the struggle and work of construction of the revolutionary proletariat; by these are meant those intellectuals that have become proletarianised, or are on the brink of the proletarian class, who are separated from the workers only by the social status of their occupation and their bourgeois outlook. But, in my opinion, our recruiting should not be limited to the lower strata of the intellectuals. Such a conception is a variable, vacillating quantity, and besides there are frequently intellectuals to be found who are filled with enthusiasm for the Communist ideal and rebel against capitalists. Revolutionary thought and the desire to fight in individuals, despite class position, is not always bound up with property and income. And then why recruit only “technical intellectual forces” for the realisation of socialism? Does not this great goal require the conscious and free co-operation of scientific research workers and teachers, doctors, lawyers, teachers, artists, constructive and educative forces of all sorts? The proletariat has urgent need of the co-operation of the intellectuals in the difficult task of the socialist education of the middle and small peasantry, the raising of the standard of the toiling masses by the cultural revolution, the crystallisation of a firm, clear, far-reaching and at the same time purely Communist world conception, and the victory over all bourgeois ideologies and their re-

formist variations. Philosophers, poets and other intellectuals were amongst the bravest and most successful fighters amongst the former revolutionary bourgeoisie in the battle against feudalism, and created the ideology of the new ruling class. Imperialism especially must thank the intellectuals that the idea of the “greater fatherland” took hold of the masses and drove them into the World War. The intellectuals were in all countries the preachers of “the fight to a finish.” Teachers, doctors, agronomists—to mention just these three classes—neutralise the power of the clergy in villages and small towns and also the activities of other counter-revolutionaries. In this connection I wish to make a few parenthetical remarks. The declaration that religious ideology must be overcome is to be welcomed. But the form does not seem to me to be in keeping with the heights of historic materialism and the historical significance of religions in the life of the people; it borders on bourgeois free-thinking. In the demands for the period of struggle and construction the state reorganisation of public health is omitted. It is the pillar of “human politics,” just as national education and labour protection are the pillars of the revolutionary proletariat in the State of the proletarian dictatorship.

The Draft Programme contains sections which I think require to be put more clearly, or to have explanatory notes if they are to avoid misinterpretation. For example: the phrase which says that the Communist International signifies a new principle for the organisation of the masses will make the uninitiated ask, What is this new principle? The expression about the one-time uniform world economy is correct in so far as there was no state until the 1917 revolution in which production was based on socialist principles. But there have always been, and there still exist within the framework of the capitalist method of production in world economy a considerable measure of pre-capitalist methods of production, feudal methods which capitalism opposed. The phrase, “The hierarchy established by the division of labour and with it the antagonism between physical and intellectual labour will be abolished” would be improved by readjustment. In my opinion, the abolition of this antagonism has other reasons besides the disappearance of the hierarchy established by the division of labour.

Imperialism and the Revolution

The Draft stresses the fact that “Unevenness of capitalist development becomes still more accentuated and intensified in the epoch of imperialism,” and also “the uneven development of its various parts is reflected in the uneven development of the revolution in separate countries.” To this should be added that it expresses the dialectic of history, that imperialism simultaneously cancels this unevenness—which is a prerequisite of its existence—increasing to the utmost the contradictions between capitalist classes in the various countries and, on the other hand, in spite of all the differences pointed out, it unites the proletariat nationally and internationally, brings over to its support colonial and semi-colonial peoples and drives the oppressed and exploited of the whole world on to the path of revolution. Germany is counted amongst the highly developed capitalist countries, with powerfully developed productive forces and

Some Critical Remarks—continued

highly centralised production, still it cannot boast of an old bourgeois-democratic regime. Up to November, 1918, the prevailing regime in this country was, to quote Bismarck, "absolutism in undress," and now at the head of the German Republic the declared monarchist Hindenburg reigns as President with very far-reaching, undemocratic powers.

Quite apart from the greatest estimation of the unique historical importance of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union I consider the phrase vulnerable which points out that the proletarian dictatorship of the U.S.S.R. forms the main force of the international socialist revolution—the basis of its development. The main force of the process of the further development of the world revolution in the present capitalist countries consists in the strength and ripeness of the objective and subjective forces in those countries. The existence of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. has a powerful influence on their effect and creative activity. Therefore this sentence would be better if put thus: The proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union is one of the most important decisive driving forces for the advancing international socialist revolution, it is its vanguard and its best support in the process of its development. The praise meted out to the international proletariat by stating that its support helped its brothers and sisters in the Soviet Republic to withstand the armed attack of the internal and foreign counter-revolution is undeserved. The heroism of the Russian proletariat and peasants, strengthened by their belief in the support of the international proletariat, alone was responsible for this miracle; it is a debt of honour on the part of the workers in capitalist countries to wage a ruthless struggle against the imperialist desires to throttle the U.S.S.R. The construction, the ramifications and the functions of the Soviets should be treated in greater detail.

Tactics of the Transition Period

The tremendous importance of the agrarian revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries should be made absolutely clear by a characterisation of their economic and social structure. The "betrayal" of the national revolution by the bourgeoisie in these countries should be explained from the class point of view. The enthusiasm and fidelity of the bourgeoisie for national independence, the fatherland, had everywhere their special reasons, and were always connected with very tangible class interests as exploiters or rulers; the value of these ideals rises and falls with the benefit to be reaped. The bourgeoisie in the colonial and semi-colonial countries prefers to capitulate before imperialism and become its ally, than to capitulate to the revolution and the liberation of the toiling masses which it exploits. The bourgeoisie "betrays" its national ideology in order to preserve its class rule of property. In my opinion our Programme should state this, and thereby it would not only contribute to a better understanding of events in colonial and semi-colonial countries, but also help to destroy the social-imperialist legend of the reformists about the joint fatherland of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The Draft Programme is very eloquent in the ex-

position of the transition period from capitalism to socialism; it enumerates a comprehensive number of measures which the victorious proletariat should carry out by means of the dictatorship in the various countries. It is a platitudinous matter, of course, that the proletariat of all countries will weigh the positive and negative experiences of the great socialist work of construction in the Soviet Union in the transition period to socialism. I feel that this unavoidable homage in the Draft has caused a certain automatic repetition of the measures to be taken. But historical developments in the various countries will necessitate many a deviation from the course indicated, deviations which will be permissible only in so far as they are in keeping with the basic goal.

Just one other point. Why does the Programme specify the seven-hour day as the goal, and what is the justification for deciding on the eight-hour day for colonial and semi-colonial people? The decision as to the normal working day seems rather petty when compared with the great revolutionary measures for the expropriation of the expropriators, for this can possibly be decided during the class struggle before the dictatorship of the proletariat. Besides, there is the possibility that in defence of the Soviet State and its socialist construction it may be necessary to prolong the working day for certain groups, or for the proletariat generally. I think it more important and more in keeping with the great change to be accomplished that workers be ensured the legal right to determine working hours, wages and all the conditions of labour through their workers' councils in conjunction with representatives from trade unions and the economic organs of the Soviet State.

Strategy and Tactics

The section "Strategy and Tactics of the Communist International" should take precedence of the section dealing with the transition period, for it has to do with the struggle for the conquest of power. This takes precedence over the period of the actual exercise of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The seizure of power is the next stage to be reached; it is the most pressing task of the moment, and no time should be lost in carrying it out by any unnecessary negotiations. The transposition of these sections is also justified by the fact that the measures taken for the conquest of power should prepare those of the transition to socialism. In addition to foreign political conditions the results of the struggle for power will determine the manner of dealing with the problem of war, Communism and N.E.P.

I think the ideological and organisational nature of the Communist Parties should be more sharply defined. Especially their relation to the trade unions as sections of the general revolutionary Labour movement, which should be under the leadership of the Communist Party as the supreme representative of the proletariat. Amongst the reformist organisations and masses the idea still prevails that trade unions should be "neutral," "non-political," independent of the revolutionary class party and its leadership. There are also the traditions of trade unionism in Great Britain, syndicalism in France, the subjection of the German Social-Democrats to the commands of the General Commission of Trade Unions—this fatal victory of reformism in Germany. Furthermore, it would be of consequence to adopt a de-

Some Critical Remarks—continued

cisive attitude towards the special functions which the trade unions should fulfil on the basis of capitalist society. This would help to overcome the influence of the reformist trade union bureaucracy.

The conclusion of the Programme should be: "The Ultimate Aim of the Communist International—World Communism." This section could do with a more highly coloured exposition without any tendency to utopian pictures of mere details. I also consider it necessary that the Programme should contain a compendium of the scattered arguments against reformism and social-democracy. The scattered nature of these arguments disturbs and dims the basic line of the Draft Programme, and by superfluous repetition undermines the force of these arguments. These arguments include the critical characterisation of "Constructive Socialism" and the insignificant Guild socialist tendency. Both of these are varieties of reformism. The statements about "anarchism" and "revolutionary syndicalism" might also be included in this section, for in spite of all their revolutionary talk their activity has a similar effect: the splitting of the forces of the revolutionary proletariat. The point might be raised as to whether all these arguments about all the non-Communist organisations and sects would not be better in a special section with a title something like: "The splitters and wreckers of the revolutionary Labour movement."

In concluding my article I should like to make some critical suggestions in respect to the arguments against reformism in the Draft. The *leitmotif* of these arguments begins already in the "Introduction" with the betrayal of the social-democratic leaders, and the systematic bribery and corruption of the Labour aristocracy with the assistance of the extra profits gained by the bourgeoisie in colonial countries as the cause of the split in the ranks of the proletariat and the defeats suffered by its revolutionary vanguard. The statement about the betrayal of the social-democratic leaders is correct, and no term is too strong for their condemnation. It is also an incontestable fact that the bourgeoisie corrupts the Labour aristocracy. We must utilise both of these facts and impress them on the consciousness of the masses. Still we must not deceive ourselves about the betrayal of the reformists and the corruption of the Labour aristocracy which only constitute the partial truth in answer to the question as to the causes of the defeats of the proletarian revolution and the temporary relative stabilisation of capitalism. The painful supplementary explanation must be made that in the most highly developed capitalist countries the great majority of the proletariat is still in the reformist camp and not in the revolutionary ranks.

The contradictions of imperialism include the advancement both of the national and international organisation of the proletariat and also its national and international disintegration. The first imperialist war was a powerful proof of this, and the post-war period is in no way inferior to it. Imperialism splits the proletariat as a class, not only by the bribery and corruption of the Labour aristocracy, and a large section of its political and trade union leaders, who have a big responsibility for the split, but also splits the workers nationally and internationally to their very depths by

strengthening the illusion amongst the masses that they too can benefit by the bourgeois social order. The majority of the workers in the United States under Gompers rejected the revolutionary class struggle at a time when the country was in receipt of European capital, and there were as yet no colonial extra profits for bribes. In Germany the great majority of the proletariat decides for the coalition with the bourgeoisie, and not with the Workers' and Peasants' Government, even after nine years of accumulated misery, during which there can be no question even of the crumbs of colonial extra profits. The Communist Party was not lacking in its zealous exposure of the betrayers and corrupt elements, who themselves gave the game away by their inactivity and the bourgeois nature of their policy of sacrificing the interests of the proletariat. And yet the great majority of the proletarian masses rally to the black-red-gold banner of reformism. The last elections in Germany were a clear proof; in this respect they were typical of the international situation.

Our Programme as a Weapon of Struggle

Let us admit that in the various countries the weakness of the still young Communist Parties, the errors and shortcomings of their policy and leadership have delayed the adherence of the proletarian masses to the revolutionary ranks. But this, too, is only a partial truth from which we shall undoubtedly learn, but which does not cover the whole ground. The decisive factor in the attitude of the majority of the workers is that they are still ruled by reformist convictions. The masses of the proletariat, of the workers, hope and wait for the formal democracy of the bourgeois order, and its promised gifts; they fear the revolution and its sacrifice. They have more confidence in the bourgeois alliance with the class enemy than in their own revolutionary strength. The chief task of Communism lies in destroying the paralysing, enslaving mass adherence to democracy; the masses must be raised from reformists to revolutionaries. In a hand-to-hand struggle with the enemy, world conception against world conception: on the one hand reformism, on the other Communism.

The significance of the Programme of the Communist International in this struggle is apparent. The Programme must be a mine of historical knowledge, which gives strength to pursue the path through the manifold complexity of daily events, which links up millions in the steadfast desire to march onwards to revolution! From this standpoint the Draft must fill up certain gaps and be more sharply defined theoretically. Of course, there should be no mercy shown to the crimes of the reformists and the Second International. This denunciation should be accompanied by a clear and thorough exposition of the main theories of the reformists with which they deceive and hoodwink the masses. Not only should the illusion about the democratic republic and the Utopia of ultra-imperialism be absolutely smashed, but also the foolish drivel about "the idea of the State," which subordinates the class interests of the proletariat, the fable about "economic democracy," that old Bernstein revisionist drug that Hilferding unearthed, which claims that the supremacy of the employer is to be overcome, without the revolutionary class struggle, by means of peaceful trade union

Some Critical Remarks—continued

policy, social reforms and ten-pound shares and all the rest of it. Our Programme must be a model both in content and form for our campaign for the masses of toilers, for the solution of our twofold task: to win over these masses once and for all from the reformists and unite them with the Communist Parties in a red united front, not for the struggle for daily demands, but for the struggle and victory of the revolution.

The Draft which will fulfil these demands will constitute a broad basis for a Communist Programme. I am convinced that our Programme after careful revision by a commission of leading theoreticians and practical

workers should be submitted to all sections of the Communist International for a thorough public discussion. Such a discussion will be a fruitful method of securing inspiration from the fulness of social life and activity, which Lenin so often praised as an inexhaustible educative source. It will help to establish clarity and certainty in the national sections on theory and practice. It will accomplish necessary and good educative work amongst Party members, and in addition amongst the masses who have not yet been recruited. The collaboration of the masses in the work of drawing up our Programme will constitute a part of the work of liberating the working class, which must be the business of the workers themselves.

The Foreign Policy of the Second International Parties*

A Martinov

WHEN a partial stabilisation of capitalism set in, when the revolutionary wave rolled back over the continent of Europe, the bourgeoisie of the European countries, feeling that their position had grown stronger, almost everywhere put an end to the coalition with social-democracy (except in Belgium).† The Second International parties, who had saved capitalism by their treachery, then fully realised that in reward for their services to the bourgeoisie they were thrust into a back seat, that their influence on the policy of the capitalist States was at a minimum. In his report on the Marseilles Congress of the Second International which took place in 1925, Crispin, speaking at Heidelberg, said: "In the report of the international secretariat the Socialist International was called 'The International of everyday life'; at the present time we still do not possess an international which has the power through mass activities to influence world policy. That fact has to be openly recognised in order to guard the workers from fresh illusions." When at Marseilles a proposal was made to add to a certain resolution a demand for the declaration of a universal strike in answer to the Moroccan war, it was turned down, in Crispin's words, on the grounds that "we should become a laughing-stock if we put forward that demand at the present time, when socialists in France possess neither the strength nor the resources to put an end to the war by means of mass action."

Despite the fact that the Second International parties were expelled from the coalition governments and found themselves involuntarily in the position of oppositions, despite the fact that on their own confession they had

lost all possibility of influencing foreign policy, they continued faithfully and truly to serve in the work of capitalist stabilisation, showing the masses that the governments had their support, and scattering pacifistic illusions among those masses.

Hilferding's "Realistic Pacifism"

Even in 1914 Kautsky had sketched the prospects of the coming super-imperialism, which would eliminate the possibility of a repetition of imperialistic wars. Yet in that sketch Kautsky still included the enslavement of the colonial peoples. But when the League of Nations was established after the war, when the Washington conference was called, when the Dawes plan was put into operation, Hilferding, the present-day theoretic leader of German social-democracy, built up a complete theory of super-imperialism on the basis of these post-war experiences of co-operation and agreement among the imperialist Powers, which theory is a genuine apology for the international situation now coming to pass in the capitalist world. In his article "Realistic Pacifism" and in other articles published in "Die Gesellschaft," Hilferding argued that the changes which have taken place in the structure of capitalism since the war and the post-war growth of "democracy" are leading to a radical change in international relationships. In face of the enormous concentration of capital, competition results in such devastation that capitalist expansion is beginning to be achieved not by way of the victory of the strong over the weak, but by way of agreement among the strong. The same tendency is more and more being revealed in international relations. "Britain needs quietness and peace in order to resolve her internal imperialistic problems. British foreign policy is now consciously and resolutely directed towards avoiding as far as possible all internal and external disturbances." (For which reason it provoked an enormous conflict in its coal industry, and carried on a supremely spoliatory policy in China, and for which reason she never folds her

* This article is a chapter (abridged somewhat) of a book by the author: "The Present-Day Second International," now being prepared for the press.

† At the present moment the bourgeoisie in Germany is again preparing to enter into a coalition with the social-democrats. But this is an indirect result of the new rise of the workers' movement, which found its reflection in the recent elections.

The Foreign Policy—continued

hands in the work of preparing a war against the U.S.S.R.) "The U.S.A. and Britain have reduced (!!) their fleet to one level, thus making the chances of a war clash equal, and so avoiding the possibility of that clash," and so on. "Competition is overcome thanks to the community of interests. The Powers mutually guarantee one another their possessions." Together with this the factor of the democratisation of the State also works in favour of the establishment of a stable peace: "for the will of the State is equal in activity to the willed direction of the various classes or political parties, and this parity of activity is becoming more and more conditioned by the strength of the Labour Party. This also connotes that a decisive change has been effected in regard to war."

"War has thrown more light on the situation. The old thesis: capitalism is war, socialism is peace, has become inaccurate in both its sections." "In both its sections," because, according to the author, at the moment a pacifistic idyll reigns in the capitalist world (broken by such details as war in Morocco, in Syria and in China.—A. M.), and because at the moment the Socialist Soviet Republic (the only country which has put forward the demand for complete disarmament.—A. M.) is the greatest war danger of all in the author's view. "Just as the national emancipation movement of the Balkan peoples was exploited by the Tsarist policy for Russia's aims as a great Power, so Bolshevik foreign policy is endeavouring to exploit the national contradictions and the emancipation struggles for its own purposes, which are an original kind of blend of the realistic Russian policy of expansion and world revolutionary romanticism."

Hilferding's theory of "realistic pacifism," this enormous fraud, decked out in the guise of a "scientific" theory, dominates the Second International at the present time, and all the parties of that International now act in the capacity of troubadours for the League of Nations.

The Reformist Smoke Screen

The "pacifism" of the social-democratic parties has as its aim the concealing of the feverish preparations being made by the bourgeoisie for a new war, and for a counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R. in the first place, from the working class; its purpose is to lull the attention of the working masses and so disarm them. But the Second International parties have not restricted themselves to the role of smoke screen, of a cloak for the imperialist policy of the bourgeoisie. Every one of them has actively supported the foreign policy of its own government, and in so far as there are contradictions between the interests of the imperialist States, contradictions which are intensifying, so do the various positions taken up by the social-democratic parties in problems of foreign policy contradict one another.

Capitalistic France is striving to guarantee itself from a reconsideration of the spoliatory Versailles Treaty, is striving to create a powerful armed fist against the possibility of Germany's desiring to throw off the Versailles yoke, and with the aid of this mailed fist is striving to hold the newly formed European States in a state of vassal subjection, and to retain in its hands

enormous colonies; and the French Socialist Party is the scout and skirmisher for this imperialist policy. The socialist Paul Boncour represents the interests of French imperialism at the League of Nations, he is also the President of the Military Council, he is also the author of the law for the militarisation of the whole country, he has also declared that France will not clear out of the Rhenish provinces, and he has also travelled to vassal Poland in the name of French imperialism, and has greeted the Polish soldiers with the words: "You stand on guard for civilisation against Eastern barbarism." And his party veiled the robber advance in Morocco.

German Social-Democracy turns West

German social-democracy in its turn has been the scout for the foreign policy of its own bourgeoisie, which policy has led to the partial stabilisation of German capitalism and to the regeneration of German imperialism. German social-democracy was the most furious defender of the "policy of fulfilment" of the "Dawes Plan," of the Locarno pact, and of the "orientation to the West." When the Locarno pact was concluded at the end of 1925 German social-democracy welcomed it as a victory for its own policy. The Locarno pact guaranteed the maintenance of the present frontiers between Germany and France, established on the basis of the spoliatory Versailles Treaty, maintained the inequality between the German armaments and those of her neighbours, maintained the occupation of part of the German territory and the demilitarisation of the zone to the east of the Rhine. And, finally, it bound Germany by the 16th paragraph of the League of Nations constitution, from which arises the obligation under certain conditions to participate in a war against the U.S.S.R., as a "violin of the peace." It thus restricted Germany's possibilities of manœuvring between West and East. In return for this it opened the road to her participation in the League of Nations, and in the latter's imperialist policy. That was the reason why German social-democracy said with patriotic pride that Locarno realised that which they, the Social-Democratic Party, had striven for earlier than any other party. In an article on Locarno in "Die Gesellschaft," Breitscheid wrote: "We social-democrats have long been demanding Germany's inclusion in this world organisation (the League of Nations), and we can welcome with satisfaction the fact that the German Government, after long vacillation and opposition, has also come to our point of view. Unquestionably, by becoming a member of the League of Nations (he should have added, a member without equal rights.—A. M.), we lose some of our freedom of movement. . . . In exchange we win the right to participate in the resolution of international problems (read: participate in imperialist policy.—A. M.) which formerly we were not allowed. And in what actually did our freedom of movement consist? It is said that we could choose between East and West, while now we have finally committed ourselves to a western orientation. It is also said (and on this point the German Communists and nationalists are agreed) that we have directly committed ourselves to participation in the struggle of the western capitalist Powers against Soviet Russia. "Is that correct?" the author asks, "It is true that out of paragraph 16 arises the necessity under certain conditions, and in the

The Foreign Policy—continued

measure of our military and economic forces, to participate in an expedition against Soviet Russia, but that possibility will arrive only when Russia, having rejected peaceful mediation, attacks one or another State." (And of course the judges of this point will be the League of Nations!—A. M.)

"For the present government in Moscow this obligation of Germany's is perhaps inconvenient, but the same door is open for them through which Germany has passed." (In other words, Russia also has the possibility of entering the League of Nations and thus being transformed from a socialist into an imperialist State.—A. M.)

German social-democracy was ready to subject its beloved fatherland to all humiliations before the strong in order thus to win the right in their turn to participate in the spoliation of the weaker peoples. To this end we may note that it threw its old programme demand of a militia to the winds and retained the Reichswehr for present-day Germany; in other words, it stood for the retention of a small, purely class, counter-revolutionary army, impotent to struggle against the victorious Powers, but none the less of service in the repression of the proletarian revolutionary movement. Besides, when German capitalism began again to consolidate its position, when simultaneously the imperialistic appetite of the German bourgeoisie began to increase under the flag of struggle for the universal reduction of armaments, German social-democracy began to strive for the actual right to increase Germany's armaments and for the development of the Reichswehr into a large army, coming into conflict on this point with the "brother" French socialist party.

Kautsky's Venom against U.S.S.R.

The same features are to be observed in the case of other social-democratic parties. Each of them defends the interests of its own fatherland, its own bourgeoisie in other words, and on this ground more or less serious differences of opinion between them are possible. But all these differences disappear when the main issue is in question: the salvation of capitalism from the Communist danger and the struggle against the U.S.S.R. as the main lever of the Communist revolution. In this regard the secret thoughts of all the Second International parties have been most frankly expressed by the renegade Karl Kautsky. At the beginning of 1925 he gave a report in the Bureau of the Second International on "The International and Soviet Russia," which he afterwards published in his own name.

In this disgusting pamphlet Kautsky slobbers venomously against the Soviet Republic, and provides a complete programme for the overthrow of the Soviet power.

Where is the force necessary to carry out that overthrow to come from? "The Soviet Government is greatly in need of money. In order to obtain it they offer foreign capitalists most favourable conditions for the exploitation of Russia. If Russia is unconditionally granted sufficient loans the Soviet power can hold on a long time." Consequently we must see to it that loans are granted only on the condition that the Bolshevik Government renounces its dictatorship regime, and we can en-

sure this, for "in the majority of capitalistic countries in which the conclusion of a loan is possible, the workers either have the State government in their own hands, as was recently the case in Britain [!!], or have the possibility of bringing influence to bear on the government." While proposing this form of economic pressure in order to force the Soviet Government to renounce the dictatorship of the proletariat, the cunning old man does not think that the Bolsheviks will themselves capitulate or even make concessions of principle. Nor does he demand that. "The less the possibilities of forcing this regime to make democratic concessions," he writes, "the greater the likelihood that it will not be able to maintain itself, but will end in a catastrophe." He further declares that a "general elemental rising" will inevitably break out in Russia, and the Mensheviks and S.R.'s should make ready for this, in order to place themselves at the head of the insurrection. The author not only awaits that elemental insurrection, but incites the peasants to make it, endeavouring to convince them that if the insurrection leads to pogroms, to the triumph of reaction and the restoration of the Tsarist monarchy, that is still not so very terrible: "The Bourbons also," he writes, "on their restoration in France after the overthrow of Napoleon, were unable to return to the aristocracy and the church the land which had been confiscated." Thus has the student of Karl Marx travelled as far as Nicholas Nicholevitch Romanov!

In what conditions will this "happy conclusion" arise? In a war with Russia! "In all the States of the East," Kautsky writes, "the Bolsheviks are now striving to establish centres of conflagration in order at a suitable moment to set all Europe on fire and to despoil it." (The worthy renegade clearly represents the position as though the Soviet Government will have the impudence to lay their hands on the sacred "property" of the imperialists in the form of 300,000,000 Hindus and 400,000,000 Chinese. And he proposes now to save that "property" from Bolshevik "pillage"!—A. M.) "This incendiary policy is not altogether free of danger for those who are making it. One fine day it may draw Russia into a war under conditions very unfavourable to her. . . . That the social-democrats should endeavour to save the Bolshevik system under such conditions is not to be thought of." More than that: "In the event of a universal rising of the people, neutrality would be political suicide."

And so the U.S.S.R. is to be set fire to from both ends. The Judas Kautsky makes the reservation that he, as a social-democrat and pacifist of course does not recommend his comrades to "organise an insurrection," nor does he recommend them to demand war against the U.S.S.R.; he is only depicting the inevitable prospects; he only expresses the desirability of those prospects being realised—the prospect of overthrowing the Soviet Government even at the cost of a restoration of the monarchy. He only counsels his colleagues not to remain neutral when the "catastrophe" occurs; he only advises the peasantry not to be frightened of the consequences of an elemental rising.

Kautsky's excessive frankness spoils his whole business. The Bureau of the Second International turned down Kautsky's draft resolution, and even the Menshevik Dan hastened, though politely, to disown any

The Foreign Policy—continued

association with Kautsky or his plan in the "Socialist Courier." The Bureau of the Second International refused to publish his report under their auspices for two reasons. In the first place, Kautsky had said too openly what the leaders of all the Second International parties are thinking, and the Bureau knew that such frankly cynical speeches would evoke indignation even among the social-democratic workers. For the specific mission of the Second International consists in hiding the robber policy of imperialism under democratic and pacifistic phrases. Secondly, at that time there did not exist the conditions for a decisive attack on the U.S.S.R. in a united front, for the partial stabilisation of capitalism had not embraced all the capitalistic countries of Europe; the partial stabilisation of capitalism had already begun on the continent of Europe in 1925, at a time when British imperialism was still passing through a severe crisis, which was alleviated only after the liquidation of the General Strike and the miners' lock-out, and especially after the great defeats of the Chinese revolution. (the Chiang Kai Shek *coup d'état*) in the spring of 1927.

Role of the Second International

If we follow the history of the Second International from its Marseilles Congress in 1925 down to the present time, we see that its main course remains without change: the course of stabilisation of world capitalism, for preparation of the conditions for overthrow of the Soviet Government, and for the liquidation of the revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies, to be realised first and foremost by way of spreading democratic and pacifistic illusions among the masses, by an idealisation of the latest phrases of capitalism and by discrediting the Soviet system in all ways possible.

At the same time we see that the changes in the correlations of forces and in the reciprocal relations existing within the capitalistic world have immediately had their reflection in the Second International, and have led to the formation of corresponding groupings and regroupings within it.

From 1925 till the spring of 1927 the following process was to be observed in the capitalistic world: British imperialism was passing through a severe crisis, on the internal industrial front in connection with the conflict in the mining industry and the General Strike and miners' lock-out, on the colonial front in connection with the development of the Chinese revolution. Simultaneously on the European continent a *rapprochement* was being effected between Germany and France, which had its expression in the Locarno Treaty, in Briand's meeting with Streseman at Tours, and in the formation of the steel trust. This one-sided *rapprochement* came up against a double obstacle both at Tours and immediately after, on the one hand from the U.S.A., and on the other from Britain. So long as the question of inter-allied debts remained unsettled the U.S.A. refused that financial aid to Germany which the latter needed in order to make economic compensation to France for the withdrawal of the French army of occupation from the Rhine provinces. Whilst Britain was afraid that a close *rapprochement* between France and Germany would disturb the "European balance of power," and would de-

prive Britain of her role of arbiter in European affairs, and so she answered to Tours by a *rapprochement* with Italy, directed against France.

All these events found their reflection in the internal reciprocal relations of parties in the Second International. The right wing of the British reformists did not at that time feel themselves safely in the saddle, thanks to the difficulties put in their way by the British bourgeoisie. While they were masters of the Labour Party, they were not at that time masters in the General Council of the Trade Unions. In such conditions they were forced to make temporary concessions to the "lefts" (who themselves were only temporarily "lefts") on the question of an agreement with the U.S.S.R. and the formation of an Anglo-Russian Committee. In such conditions they could not take active part in the affairs of the Second International; at that time the British reformists were represented in the Second International by "lefts" and "independents." On the other hand, the *rapprochement* which took place at that time between the German and the French bourgeoisie found its reflection inside the Second International in a *rapprochement* between the German and the French social-democrats on questions specially touching their "fatherlands."

From the moment of the liquidation of the miners' lock-out and particularly from the moment of the first crisis in the Chinese revolution (spring 1927) the position of British imperialism becomes consolidated.

The British General Strike

In connection with this the right wing British reformists begin to raise their heads. Even on the eve of the General Strike, at the Congress of the Labour Party at Liverpool, they had succeeded in getting their revenge for the "left" Congress of trade unions at Scarborough, but now they began to turn to a more resolute attack on the "minority movement" and the Communists, breaking the link with the Russian trade unions, and beginning openly to support the aggressive policy of the Conservative Government directed against the U.S.S.R. In this connection the right wing of the British reformists began also to play a more active role in the Second International, forcing it to pay more attention to the special interests of British imperialism.

At the same time, in 1927, the successes of capitalistic rationalisation and the improved economic situation in Germany were assisting the recovery of German imperialism. This process had its reflection in the Second International in the stronger role played by German social-democracy, which under the pacifistic flag of struggle for universal reduction of armaments, and by way of a criticism of the militarisation of France (through the lips of its "left" wing) began in actuality to struggle for the establishment of "equality" in armaments and for obtaining colonial "mandates" from the League of Nations. On this ground a certain amount of wrangling developed between German social-democracy and the French Socialist Party.

Finally, a number of processes of a similar nature which developed in capitalist States—the consolidation of the position of British imperialism, the consolidation of the position of the Conservative "national unity" in France, the worsening of relations between the French Government and the U.S.S.R., and the beginnings of a

The Foreign Policy—continued

revival of German imperialism—all taken together had their reflection in the more openly aggressive position taken up by the Second International in regard to the U.S.S.R.

We shall attempt to illustrate these regroupings and vacillations inside the Second International by facts from its existence.

The Locarno Treaty

On the eve of the conclusion of the Locarno Treaty the Second International held its Marseilles Congress. This Congress was occupied with two groups of questions: the western problem (League of Nations, Geneva protocol, a guarantee pact) and the eastern problem (the developing conflict with Soviet Russia).

On the first group of questions disagreement arose between the British delegation on the one hand, and the French, Belgian and German delegations on the other. The Franco-Belgian-German bloc energetically defended the "guarantee pact" for the same motives as it was defended by the bourgeoisie of their countries. For the French and Belgians it was a guarantee against the German war danger and an assurance of the stability of the western frontiers, established by the Versailles Treaty; for the Germans it was a guarantee of the stabilisation of capitalism in Germany and the condition of her entry into the League of Nations, in other words of her participation in imperialistic policy. The British delegation was against the restricted "guarantee pact" and in favour of the Geneva Protocol, which connected pacts of non-aggression with partial disarmament. This they did for two reasons: first, because the question of the maintenance of the frontiers between Germany and France as established by the Versailles Treaty did not interest the British bourgeoisie to the same degree as it interested the French; and, secondly, the "Geneva Protocol" had a more clearly expressed pacifist stamp, and consequently was more suitable for the stupefying of the masses than was the "guarantee pact"; and at this time of growing internal crisis and a swift leftward trend of the masses the British reformists had so great a need of a good pacifistic mask that even the right wing of British reformism had made the Geneva Protocol its platform during the existence of the British Labour Government. In correspondence with this, at the Marseilles Congress the British delegates demanded that the question of a guarantee pact should be left open, and that each party should be allowed to vote as it wished. The French delegation soothed the British with the point that the League of Nations would maintain a strict guard over the peace against any possible "violators." "If any real attempt to break the peace occurs," said Blum, the leader of the centre of the French socialists, "no obstacles ought to be set up to the defence of nations subjected to attack [here read "Poland," for example.—A. M.], or to their support [read, for example, "against the Soviet Republic."—A. M.] by all the members of the League of Nations."

Finally, the British, as was only to be expected, surrendered their apparently more pacifistic position, and made a miserable compromise. The resolution adopted unanimously said that the "guarantee pact" could be

supported, if it satisfied certain conditions. Of course the resolution puts great hopes in the League of Nations: it will be necessary to transform it into an "all-embracing and truly democratic League"; an "International Economic Council" has to be set up, which will eliminate the economic difficulties between States; and the League will have to call a conference which will prepare the ground for universal disarmament.

In voting for this purely opportunistic Utopia, the arch-opportunist Filippo Turati, in the name of the Italian "Unitarians," the German-Czecho-Slovakian party, the Austrian party and the Russian Mensheviks added a declaration to the effect that the resolution ought to have been more "socialistic" and more "Marxian." The secret of this somewhat unexpected "Marxist" criticism of the resolution by the old reformist Turati and his company consists in the fact that the bourgeoisie of Italy, Austria, and so on were also not highly enraptured with the "guarantee pact."

The Eastern Problem

The eastern problem was considered in a commission in which the Austrian Marxist, Otto Bauer, and the Russian Mensheviks, Dan and Tseretelli, participated. Otto Bauer was the reporter on the eastern problem to the Congress, and he was listened to, in the words of the social-democratic press, with "rapture and heartfelt agitation." The reason why the centrist representative Bauer was put forward as reporter, and not the two social-democrats should be clear from what we have already said. It was necessary to couch a resolution talking of preparation for an attack on the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese revolution in a diplomatic form, acceptable to the British reformists, who could not pronounce themselves openly in favour of the aggressive policy of Chamberlain and Co. on the eve of a severe and gigantic industrial conflict. It was not possible to find a more suitable person to draw up a hypocritical formula than Otto Bauer. It was not without reason that after Otto Bauer's activities at Marseilles the British reformists called him the "greatest man in the International."

In his article, "The Marseilles Congress," printed in Nos. 8 and 9 of "Der Kampf" for 1925, Otto Bauer drew a parallel between the present position of Europe and its position in 1815. At that time the "Sacred Alliance" of princes, founded at the Vienna Congress of 1815, the "Sacred Alliance" which defended the monarchistic state order, peace, and the "sanctity of agreements," stood at one extreme. At the other extreme stood the "Young Europe" of the bourgeois revolution. Now we see an analogical antithesis: at one extreme the "pacifism of the dominant and the satiated," at the other the "contrary militantly-revolutionary tendency, the bearer of which is Bolshevism."

Superficially this would seem to be quite a flattering analogy for the Bolsheviks; but in actuality this hypocritical formula insinuated that the imperialistic Powers desire peace, and the Bolsheviks want war. Otto Bauer built up his report and his resolution at the Marseilles Congress in correspondence with this thesis. He "welcomed" the emancipation movement in China and the East generally, but . . . it had to be remembered that in so far as this movement takes the form of revolution, and moreover is supported by the Bolsheviks, it

The Foreign Policy—continued

carries in itself the menace of a war which "would annihilate civilisation." And he then proposes to the peoples of the East that they should stop the revolution and "confide" their fate to western "democracy," in other words, to the League of Nations, in regard to which, by the way, he can hardly have many illusions, judging by the Austrian experience. The chief idea running through all the resolution dressed up by Otto Bauer and accepted by the Congress amounts to this: the proletariat and the revolution must capitulate to the bourgeoisie and then we shall possibly avoid, and possibly not avoid war. We cite only that part of the resolution which had direct reference to the Soviet Republic.

"The International again declares and further emphasises the obligation of all socialist parties . . . to struggle against aggressive tendencies directed against the Soviet Union. . . . The Congress welcomes the improvement in the international situation of the Soviet Union, which has resulted . . . mainly, thanks to the activity of the Socialist Labour International [!!]. . . . This circumstance gives the International the right to demand of the Russian people that it should strive for the restoration of all political and trade union liberties in the Soviet Union, that they should put up opposition to any aggressive, annexation policy on the part of their government. . . . The war danger would be greatly lessened if in the Soviet Union the decision on the question of peace or war was in the hands not of a dictatorial government, but of the peoples of the Union themselves."

Attack on the U.S.S.R.

This resolution provided all the enemies of the U.S.S.R. with a demagogical weapon in the struggle against the Soviet Government, which apparently is thrusting Russia into war and is following annexational aims, thanks to its dictatorship regime. The resolution, of course, makes no mention of the necessity to annihilate the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie in Britain, France, Italy and so on. And finally, in speaking of the rights of nations to self-determination, the resolution mentions by name only Armenia, Georgia and the Ukraine, which have already determined themselves, but makes no mention of those countries which are groaning under the oppression of the imperialistic Powers.

One would have thought that this hypocritically pacifistic resolution, directed against the U.S.S.R., could have completely satisfied all the parties of the Second International. And yet, after it was adopted De Brouckere, speaking in the name of the delegations from France, Belgium, Poland, Esthonia, Latvia, Armenia, Georgia, Finland, Bulgaria, Yugo-Slavia, Hungary and Switzerland, made a declaration in which regret is expressed that the resolution does not sufficiently emphasise the "danger of the eastern European (*i.e.*, Soviet) imperialism" and its "bayonet methods," that it makes no mention of the desirability of Russia's entry into the League of Nations, and, on the other hand,

touches indirectly on the colonial question, the consideration of which had been postponed for two years by the Congress. Despite these deficiencies the delegations mentioned voted for the resolution for one simple reason: it reclaimed unconditionally the right of peoples to self-determination, and first and foremost the right of "unfortunate" Georgia and Armenia to self-determination. The "pacifistic" Marseilles Congress was definite and clear in its impotence, cowardliness, and hypocrisy, its lackeyism to the bourgeoisie, and fear of revolution.

Franco-German Rapprochement

The Marseilles Congress, which was held on the eve of the conclusion of the Locarno guarantee pact, was dominated by the fact of Franco-German *rapprochement*. The same fact dominated the Luxemburg Conference of the German, French, Belgian and British socialist parties, called on the initiative of the German social-democracy in November, 1926, after the negotiations begun between Streseman and Briand in Tours had come to a dead end. The magniloquent pacifistic resolution of the Luxemburg Conference proposes "to exert pressure on the governments in order to urge them to get a move on with the work of peace," and indicates measures necessary in order to achieve "an actual and lasting Franco-German *rapprochement*, without which a stabilisation of peace is impossible." The inadequate nature of these measures had to be recognised by one of the initiators of the conference, by Breitscheid, who after it was over wrote in the "Vorwaerts": "Taking into consideration the present state of things, we are prepared to propose ways out of the difficulty acceptable to capitalistic diplomacy, if only that diplomacy is really desirous of peace." But that is the essence of the matter, that despite the rosy pacifistic prospects depicted by the Luxemburg resolution, "capitalistic diplomacy" does not and cannot want peace. Evidently taking into account the fact that the Franco-German *rapprochement* had come up against a double opposition, that of the U.S.A., which demanded that the war debts should be paid to her before anything else happened, and that of Britain, which in answer to Tours immediately began to form a bloc with Fascist Italy, pursuing anti-French aims, the Luxemburg Conference emphasises first the necessity of a struggle against Fascism, which menaces the work of peace, and secondly, the necessity of liquidating the inter-allied debts. But the suggestion that it is possible to convince "democratic" America of the necessity to annul war debts and to convince the "democratic" Great Powers of the necessity to wage a struggle against Fascism is simply throwing dust in the eyes of the proletarian masses, and this was proved so immediately after the conference. The further negotiations for the regulation of the western-European problem were carried on not against Mussolini, but jointly with Chamberlain and Mussolini.

At the end of 1926 and the beginning of 1927 the idea of a Franco-German *rapprochement* took form in two slogans: the united States of Europe (including France, Germany and Britain) and a continental bloc (including Germany and France, but not including Britain). Both these slogans, one point of which was directed against American imperialism, the other against the Soviet Re-

The Foreign Policy—continued

public, found a speedy echo in the ranks of German social-democracy.

The Conference of the Executive Committee of the Second International, which was held in Paris on 12th and 13th February, 1927, was also dominated by the idea of Franco-German *rapprochement*. And this fact found its reflection in the manifesto accepted by the conference.

On the question of the Italo-Yugo-Slavia conflict, in which Britain stood behind Fascist Italy, and France behind Yugo-Slavia, the Executive Committee's manifesto pronounces sharply against Italy and declares that in this conflict Yugo-Slavia is in a position of self-defence.

The Executive Committee's manifesto pronounced still more severely against American imperialism, in this case reflecting the interests of the French bourgeoisie. But, of course, it did not say a single word about France's imperialist policy in Syria, Morocco and Indo-China, nor of the imperialistic plans of France's vassal, Pilsudsky.

The Chinese Crisis

On the Chinese question the manifesto puts forward the demand for China's absolute sovereignty and the recall of the foreign troops from China, doing so not from love of China, but openly to pique Britain and in agreement with the "left" wing of the British reformists (but not with the Labour Party leaders).

Of course, the Executive Committee could not refrain from making attacks on the U.S.S.R.; this the Second International has always done, irrespective of what group predominated in its counsels at any given moment. The German delegation read a report on the notorious "grenade affair." On the proposal of the Russian Mensheviks (Abramovitch) a resolution of protest against political persecution in the U.S.S.R. was carried. In this connection a decision was also taken on a proposal put forward by the "left" British reformist Brockway, to send a commission to carry out enquiries into the conditions of political prisoners on the basis of information collected "from first-hand sources."

The February Conference of the Second International Executive Committee was the last in which the Franco-German grouping set the tone. Thereafter ensues a certain reconstruction of the ranks inside the Second International, in connection with the developing crisis of the Chinese revolution. The right wing of British reformism raises its head and passes to the attack. The demand for the recall of troops from China disappears from the official documents of the Labour Party. The leader writers of their organ, the "Daily Herald," also maintain a discreet silence on this point. As for the Independent Labour Party, in a resolution adopted in March the demand for the recall of the troops is still made, but it is now pushed into the background; the first place in the resolution is occupied by a demand for the opening of negotiations with the Cantonese. MacDonald dotted the i's and crossed the t's of the Chinese question in a speech on March 30th in Glasgow. "The Labour Party," he declared, "has never said that

the armed forces ought to be recalled immediately from China. Our point of view is that in future and in the interests of security the most expedient resource would be the maintenance of mobile armed forces in China, but not military garrisons." This signified complete support to the British Conservative Government's imperialistic policy in regard to China.

In order to ensure the victory for their point of view (in other words, the point of view of the British bourgeoisie) in the Second International, the right wing of the British reformists sought support in the secretariat of the Amsterdam International. The Amsterdam International willingly went to meet the right wing British reformists. In a resolution of the Bureau of the Amsterdam International, adopted two weeks after the February Conference of the Second International Executive Committee, on 25th February, 1927, and dealing with the Chinese problem, mention is made only of the abolition of privileges in China, of Customs reforms and so on, and of the necessity of carrying on negotiations with the Cantonese on these issues, but there is not a word about the recall of the troops from China. "In this sense the Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions supports the policy of the General Council of Trade Unions and the Labour Party," says the resolution. On the Italo-Yugo-Slavian conflict the Amsterdam International also rejects the one-sided French point of view, which found expression in the February manifesto of the Second International Executive Committee. The articles published in the organ of the Amsterdam International on this issue endeavour to take up a neutral position between France and Britain. These articles simultaneously criticise the vacillating policy of Germany and Turkey (between a western and an eastern orientation), and emphasise the importance of the Anglo-American co-operation then being developed. The French Socialist Party succeeded in getting a commission appointed by the League of Nations for an investigation of the Italo-Yugo-Slavian conflict. On this matter out of complaisance for the specific interests of British imperialism, the organ of the Amsterdam International in its issue dated 29th March, resolves to reveal the impotence and uselessness of the renowned League of Nations: "The League of Nations does not possess sufficient authority or sufficient desire to avoid conflicts between individual States"

The attack on the foreign policy of the French Socialist Party as only a reflection of the foreign policy of French imperialism, was also contributed to by the "New Leader," the organ of the "Independent Labour Party," under the banner of "left-wingism," of course. "We begin to doubt the strength and readiness of the international socialist and Labour movement to avoid a war catastrophe, when we see French social-democracy defending the law for the militarisation of the entire nation. The initiators of this law were two generals and Paul Boncour. If socialists act in this fashion it is time they renounced their claim to be regarded as internationalists and anti-militarists."

This sudden pressure on the specifically French point of view had its consequences in regard to organisation. Renaudel proposed the summoning of a fresh conference of the Second International Executive Committee at the beginning of April. His proposal was turned

The Foreign Policy—continued

down, and on April 3rd a joint session of the Bureau of the Second International and that of the Amsterdam International was held instead. The resolutions accepted by this conference heralded the partial victory of the leaders of British reformism over the French Socialist Party. The resolution on the Chinese problem no longer says a word about the "absolute sovereignty" of China, and instead of the recall of troops there is mention in a restricted sense only of "the recall of those troops and warships which were sent to defend unjust privileges." This formula would be completely satisfactory to Churchill and Birkenhead, who also, after all, had never openly said that they were sending troops to China "in order to defend unjust privileges." The resolution on the Balkan question recognises France as equally responsible with Britain for the situation in the Balkans; there is not a word about Yugo-Slavia being in a condition of self-defence. Finally, the resolution against Fascism in Italy is formulated in extraordinarily mild language, in complaisance to British imperialism.

After Chang Kai Shek's *coup d'état* the right wing of the British reformists increasingly and more openly associate themselves with the policy of British imperialism, and their point of view finds increasing echo in the Second International.

Secret Support for Capitalist Attacks on U.S.S.R.

When the British Conservative Government decided to break off all diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R., the British Labour Party restricted itself to proposing a resolution in Parliament, which contained the following sentence: "Our country should not have been drawn into such a policy until a special commission had investigated all documents relating to the affair and had presented a report on the matter to the House of Commons." This resolution, in which there was not even a hint of censure on the government, really signified secret support to the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. The organ of the Dutch social-democracy, "Het Volk," which in correspondence with the colonial interests of the Dutch bourgeoisie always took the side of the most extreme right representatives of British reformism, and which has the former general secretary of the Amsterdam International, Oudegest, on its staff (a man who is a perfect speaking trumpet for the right wing of the British Labour Party), expressed its complete satisfaction in regard to the break of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. "Russia is now more isolated than ever before, and the tragedy is that the Russians are themselves to blame for this." The French socialists speculated on the apparent disagreement between Briand and Poincaré, since at this time full agreement had not yet been reached on the question of immediate policy in regard to the Russian question; and they manifested a certain restraint in regard to the U.S.S.R. On the question of a speech made by the Minister for Home Affairs, Sarraut, which was a genuine declaration of war on Communists and on the Soviet Government, but with which Briand had not then openly associated himself, the socialist Blum made an interpellation in the House of Deputies which sharply distinguished the struggle against the Communists

(which Blum approves) from the struggle against the Soviet Government (which awakens his doubts). "Hitherto," he said, "diplomatic relations between the western States and the Soviet Union have been based on the view that there is a distinction between the Comintern and the Soviet Republic. In Sarraut's speech I found not a hint of such a distinction." German social-democracy, which, in distinction from its French brother, observed a formal neutrality in the Anglo-Russian conflict, at the same time made it transparently clear that their sympathies were with the British Conservatives. At the Kiel Parteitag, wishing to steal a march on the "lefts" and taking the weapon out of their hands, Breitscheid said: "The German nationalists are agreed to support Britain at a high price, in exchange for the withdrawal from the Rhine frontiers, for example. But we will not join an anti-Soviet coalition at any price." In printing Breitscheid's speech the "Vorwaerts" cut out (not accidentally, of course) the last sentence, and furthermore, in a leader for the 28th May the central organ of German social-democracy expounded the official point of view on the question of the Anglo-Russian conflict fairly transparently. This leader begins with the pacifistic humbug that "Germany remains neutral," and that, "so far as we know, there are no circles of repute in Germany which would think of participation in a coalition war on Russia," that the opinion even of the British Government is that France will not break with Russia. After these hypocritical pacifist phrases, intended to drug the attention of the workers, the "Vorwaerts" declares: "But, on the other hand, we are not open to the view that Russia is a lamb which is unable to befoul the water. Russian espionage and conspiratorial methods are a scourge to the whole world." The purport of the article is clear enough: we are observing a "neutrality" in the Anglo-Russian conflict at the moment. But we lay the blame for this conflict on the U.S.S.R., and when this conflict leads to war we shall be on the side of the "just" as against the "unjust."

When the declaration of the Supreme Council of Soviet Trade Unions to the General Council of Trade Unions was published, serving the British reformists as an excuse for breaking up the Anglo-Russian Committee, the continental reformists hastened to speed up the process.

Murder of Comrade Voikov

When the murder of comrade Voikov occurred the position of the Second International was an extraordinarily difficult one; the connection between this murder and the break of diplomatic relations between Britain and the U.S.S.R. was too obvious, and it was very difficult for parties making their appeal to the masses under the flags of "democracy" and pacifism to take under their protection the encouragement of methods of assassination, and especially such assassinations as had the provocation of war as their open purpose. Consequently the majority of the social-democratic newspapers confined themselves to lulling the consciousness and enfeebling the agitation of the masses with declarations to the effect that an immediate war danger did not exist, that neither the Polish nor the British Government bore direct responsibility for the murder, that in

The Foreign Policy—continued

breaking diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. the British Government bore only moral responsibility for the affair. "Vorwaerts," the central organ of the German social-democrats, however, was dexterous enough to exploit even this ruffianly crime for defaming the U.S.S.R. On the note which the Soviet Government sent to the Polish Government, "Vorwaerts" miserably insinuated on June 10th: "If one government publishes unproved and unprovable charges against another government, even at a time when passions are at their height, it puts itself at fault in the eyes of all impartial people. The declaration that British diplomacy is deliberately planning and working against Russia with methods of murder and attempts at assassination can only be regarded as the product of an enfevered fantasy. . . . Thus they have reached the point of hunting after spies and the defamation of foreigners, which represents a danger to all foreigners residing in Russia. . . . No government, and certainly not that of Russia, will gain sympathy for itself by resorting to defamation of other peoples, a method well known to us since the world war."

We repeat, when comrade Voikov was killed the position of the social-democratic parties was altogether a difficult one. At such a moment one needed to have the shamelessness and impudence of the "Vorwaerts" to attack a State whose representative had fallen a sacrifice to murderers, instead of attacking those who encouraged assassination. But the social-democratic press completely gave themselves away when in answer to the murder of comrade Voikov and a number of other attempts at assassination, and in the interests of self-defence, the Soviet Government summarily shot twenty well-known White Guard counter-revolutionaries. This act of necessary self-defence evoked a storm of hypocritical indignation among the social-democrats. "Populaire," the organ of the French Socialist Party, in its issue for June 11th poured out crocodile tears: "It is infinitely grievous to think that such deeds are consummated in a country where the leaders pretend to be building socialism." Certain "left" social-democratic newspapers realised that the murder of comrade Voikov and a number of other simultaneously discovered attempts at assassination would create a direct war danger, and in their terror of this approaching danger did not dare openly to attack the Soviet Government for the measures of self-defence adopted by them. At one time the "Leipziger Volkszeitung" even spoke in a language quite unusual to it. On June 13th it wrote: "The social-democratic movement always took the representatives of the red terror under its protection, and the greatest historical service of the First International consisted in the fact that it fearlessly defended the Paris Commune. . . . Consequently we do not pronounce against such measures in principle . . . if they are necessary to repulse the pressure of counter-revolution. . . . Whether that prerequisite is present in Russia at the present time we do not intend to judge. But the probability is that it is so." But this was a solitary and transient voice in the social-democratic camp. The attitude of the "Vorwaerts" was typical of German social-democracy; under the guise of a hypocritical "objec-

tivity" this paper represented the act of the Soviet Government which revealed its resolution and which at once achieved its end, which at once cut short the work of the bandits, as an act apparently witnessing to the impotence and decline of the government. The "Vorwaerts" wrote: "If we desire to interpret the Moscow events in a sense most favourable to the Russian Government, we should have to come to the conclusion that almost ten years after the Bolshevik revolution Russia is still in a state of civil war. . . . By returning to the terror, the Russian Government reveals to all the world that it feels itself weak. . . . By the Moscow mass shootings the Russian Government has played into the hands of the British Conservatives, who in actuality are after all not intending to resort to war methods in the struggle against Russia [?!], but are striving to isolate her morally, politically and economically, and thus to force her to capitulate. . . . A regime which theoretically pursues the aim of making people more free, more happy and more human, and which after ten years' practice still cannot emerge from the bloody sea of civil war—such a regime is bankrupt." Thus wrote the "Vorwaerts," not of those who send murderers or encourage murder, who encourage attempts at assassination, the blowing up of bridges, incendiarism and so on, but of a socialist government which has occupied itself for six years in peaceful socialistic construction, and resorted to the sword only in the interests of necessary self-defence at a moment of elementally rising war danger, and achieved its aim successfully in the very shortest space of time.

The Second International Unmasks Itself

The year 1927 was one of economic prosperity in Germany. The capitalistic rationalisation of industry, which had been carried through at the cost of the working class with the active support of social-democracy, had consolidated German capitalism, and had given wings to the hopes of the German bourgeoisie of a reconsideration of the Versailles Treaty and the revival of German imperialism. In correspondence with this the influence of German social-democracy inside the Second International had also grown, the more so as the entire capitalistic world imposed and imposes a most responsible task on German social-democracy: the task of setting up a barrier against the penetration of Bolshevism into the European working masses across the most dangerous and most vulnerable section of the front.

The increase in the specific weight of German social-democracy and the consolidation of the position of the right British reformists led to a regrouping of forces inside the Second International, which held a session on 12th to 14th September, 1927. The decisions taken by this conference signified the defeat of the French point of view in the western Franco-German problem. The Dutch delegate Albardeau read a report of the Commission for Disarmament which had been appointed in February, 1927. The report was composed along the lines desired by the French Social Party. In accordance with the position of the French bourgeoisie and the French socialists it declared that it would be possible to start upon a reduction of armaments only after "security" had been reached by way of all-embracing international agreements, and that the first prerequisite

The Foreign Policy—continued

to disarmament was the "democratisation" of the army and its subordination to parliament "in agreement with the measures already partially applied in Austria, Sweden and France." This "democratisation" of the army, which in regard to France conceals the militarisation of the whole country in the event of war, was subjected to "left" attack from Otto Bauer, who attacked Paul Boncour's military law. As the result of the discussion the Executive Committee Conference rejected the report and instructed the Commission to redraft it. Simultaneously the conference made a pacifistic gesture: it unanimously voted in favour of the Geneva Protocol. This vote was unanimous because the British reformists had long since bound themselves by the obligation to defend the Geneva Protocol (during the Labour Government's term of office), whilst the German social-democrats admitted, and openly said, that it had no practical significance. On this matter the "Vorwaerts" for 7th December, 1927, wrote with cynical frankness: "It would be incomprehensible for Germany to think of dropping one more heavy boulder on the grave of the Geneva Protocol, which has been so well buried by Mr. Chamberlain."

Jesuitical Formula

The conference revealed the true character of its "democratism" and pacifism by the resolution which it adopted, prohibiting parties attached to the Second International to participate in the "League against Imperialism," on the ground that this organisation has as its aim the disintegration of the proletarian elements in the national movement or to subject their interests, and also the interests of the entire national movement, to the interests of any one Power (read: the U.S.S.R.). This Jesuitical formula which hid a counter-revolutionary decision under the "left" argument of the necessity of preserving the purity of the class proletarian principle, bore on its face the stamp of the author of the resolution: Otto Bauer.

The next conference of the Second International Executive Committee took place on 25th-28th February, 1928, in Zurich. This conference finally adopted a draft resolution on the question of disarmament, over which the Second International had racked its brains for two years. This draft revealed the victory of the German point of view over that of the French in regard to the Franco-German problem. This victory was expressed in two ways: first, the resolution again ratified the concession which the French socialists had already made to the Germans in regard to Germany's right to retain its mercenary army, and also in regard to "disarmed" Germany's right to demand the disarmament of the victor countries. Secondly, the resolution categorically condemns the military system which links the principle of mass universal mobilisation with that of the maintenance of a strong military framework organisation—the French military system, in other words.

In all other respects the resolution on disarmament, unanimously adopted by the conference, is a miserable and hypocritical pacifistic antidote to the proposal made by the Soviet delegation to the Geneva Preparatory Commission on Disarmament, a proposal which caused a

great fluttering in the dove-cotes of the imperialists and their social-democratic camp-followers. The resolution declares that "while complete disarmament, which is the aim of the International, is at present unachievable, even in the present political situation there are forces which are striving for the limitation of armaments. The ruling classes fear of a new revolution, which any war would render inevitable, the recognition that rivalry in armaments threatens automatically to lead to war, the monstrous increase of expenditure on armaments in connection with the revolution in military technique, and the need to ensure the security of capitals invested abroad, and finally the recognition that it is impossible to hold conquered nations long in a disarmed state if the victor countries also do not set about the reduction of their own armaments in accordance with the obligation they have taken on themselves—all these factors make for the limitation of armaments." Thus the authors of the draft sow illusions among the masses in regard to the pacifistic tendencies of the "democratic" part of the ruling classes, deliberately deluding the proletariat, for, of course, they know very well that it is the very fear of revolution which stimulates the bourgeoisie to perfect their military technique and to increase their armaments, that it is the very fear of a revival of German imperialism which has driven France to accept Boncour's law, that it is for the very purpose of "ensuring the security of capitals invested abroad" that there is going on a feverish race in the construction of war fleets, and that, in fine, the increase of expenditures on armaments does not frighten, but only gladdens the representatives of the now dominating heavy industry who wax fat on these expenditures.

The Hypocritical Draft

The hypocritical, pacifistic draft adopted at the February Conference of the Executive Committee expresses the present official point of view of the Second International in regard to the problems arising out of imperialistic war. But the problem of the army and its armaments interests the proletariat not only in connection with the prospect of an imperialist war, but also in connection with the prospects of revolution. For very understandable reasons the official representatives of the social-democratic parties say not a word on this. They know very well that in the event of the break-out of civil war they will be on the same side of the barricades as the bourgeoisie, and that they also will act as did Noske and Severing. But "such things are done, not talked about," as was once said with reference to Bernstein. Consequently the leaders of the Second International allow the irresponsible "left" social-democrats to burble about this ticklish question, for the special mission of these latter consists in hiding the miserable opportunistic policy of their party behind florid "revolutionary" phrases. One has but to make the acquaintance of the articles of Zeiger, Dr. Klaus Zweining, Kurt Hiller and others, dedicated to the army question, and published in the journal of the German "left-wingers," "Der Klassenkampf," to realise how well the "left" social-democrats fulfil their mission in regard to the given question. They all, as "left-wingers," recognise that socialism can be achieved only by way of revolution and civil war. But as true social-democrats, into

The Foreign Policy—continued

their "revolutionary prospect they introduce just so much pacifistic dilution as is necessary in order to ensure the defeat of the revolution. Zeiger and Zweining argue that socialistic military policy ought not to take the form of introducing the class struggle into the army, that socialists ought to "out-live the illusion of military activity," while Kurt Hiller supplements this theory by saying that "from the pacifist point of view it is necessary to abolish compulsory military service in civil war," for there are people who have a higher call than to struggle at the barricades.

The "Pacifists" Prepare for War

Thus pacifism is the programme uniting all the social-democrats, from the extreme right to the extreme "left." But the social-democrats do not confine themselves to this; they themselves are preparing for war, and first and foremost for war on the U.S.S.R., and in this direction they manifest particular activity of recent times.

When the British Conservative Government broke off diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. the British reformists not only did not make any protest against this action, but by their action in breaking with the Anglo-Russian Committee they actively supported this preparation for war against the Soviet Republic. In its struggle against the U.S.S.R. the German social-democrats not only followed its government's example, but even surpassed it. A section of the German bourgeoisie long continued to defend the Rapallo policy, insisting on Germany's neutrality in regard to the U.S.S.R., albeit in the interests of blackmailing the Entente Powers. From the very beginning German social-democracy was dissatisfied with this policy of manœuvring between the West and the East, from the very beginning they struggled to get the German Government to take up a definite "western" orientation. and when Streseman finally took this course German social-democracy welcomed his action as a triumph for their point of view. The fruits of this new course have already been revealed.

The Shakhty Affair

When the Shakhty affair came to light in the U.S.S.R., and when several German engineers were incriminated the "Vorwaerts" strove to out-shout all the bourgeois press in its frenzied attacks on the U.S.S.R. On the 14th March "Vorwaerts" wrote: "In seeking an intelligent explanation of this latest escapade of the people in the Soviet lunatic asylum, the most credible explanation is admittedly that they had to find a scapegoat for the complete bankruptcy of the Russian industrial plan, in order thus to distract the attention of the Russian workers from the sins and the incapacity of their own government. . . . The accusation of sabotage sounds absolutely fantastic. . . . To think that in a country where every other man is a G.P.U. spy German technical experts would dare to enter into a conspiracy with a handful of Russians in order systematically to make enterprises unprofitable, and even in order to destroy them in the event of war!" And when two days later Streseman broke off the negotiations for a trade agreement with the Soviet Government on the pretext of the arrest of the German engineers, but in reality in the interests of an economic attack on the U.S.S.R., "Vorwaerts" hastened to declare that it "unconditionally approves this measure," and that "a purely socialist German government could not have acted otherwise in such a case."

Thus German social-democracy, which is gradually winning for itself that role in the Second International which it played before the war, is beginning with the active support of all the other parties of the Second International to realise the programme which Karl Kautsky outlined in 1925. That programme is short and definite: economic blockade or an even stronger economic pressure, as the preparation for war on the Soviet Republic. However, this by no means implies that German social-democracy, or the Second International as a whole, will now openly speak of what they are actually doing. The cloaking of preparations for the counter-revolutionary war with pacifistic and "democratic" phrases still remains the historical mission of the agents of the bourgeoisie among the working class.

