

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Published twice monthly).

Vol. VIII. No. 7.

Workers' Library Publishers,
35 East 125th St., New York.

April 15th, 1931

CONTENTS

	Page
THE TRIAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL OF SABOTEURS AND INTERVENTIONISTS By A. Martynov	178
DECAYING CAPITALISM AND EMANCIPATED LABOUR	182
POLITICAL PREPARATIONS FOR WAR AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION By F.B.	190
PREPARATION OF TRANSPORT FOR ANTI- SOVIET INTERVENTION By A.B.	198
MAIN FEATURES OF BRITISH FACTORY PAPERS By N.H.	204
UPPER DIGOUL By P. de Groot	208
INTERNATIONAL CONTACTS OF THE PROLETARIAT	211

TEN CENTS

THE TRIAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL OF SABOTEURS AND INTERVENTIONISTS

By A. MARTYNOV.

THE title of this article accurately expresses the character of the trial which has recently come to an end in Moscow. Before the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. there appeared fourteen of the members and most active collaborators of the counter-revolutionary Russian Menshevik Centre. Among them were old Mensheviks who had participated in the Menshevik movement from the very beginning of the latter. They were working under the instructions of the Menshevik Central Committee abroad, they were working on the basis of a "new" tactical platform which had been discussed by the delegation abroad of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (Dan, Dalin, Abramovitch), together with the leaders of the Second International and, in particular, with the leaders of German Social Democracy. These fourteen counter-revolutionary saboteurs, on being confronted with irrefutable evidence at the preliminary investigation, had already found themselves compelled to drop the mask behind which all the Parties of the Second International hide themselves, and to make more or less complete confessions. In the person of these fourteen accused, the Second International appeared before the international and Soviet proletariat in all its hideous nakedness.

What sort of social basis did they possess in the U.S.S.R.? Lenin wrote in 1919:—

"In order to win over the majority of the population to its side, the proletariat must, in the first place, overthrow the bourgeoisie and seize the State power in its hands; it must, in the second place, introduce the Soviet power, having smashed into smithereens the State apparatus; thereby destroying at one blow the rule, authority and influence of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeois class collaborators over the majority of the non-proletarian working masses. In the third place, it must annihilate the influence of the bourgeoisie and petit bourgeois class collaborators over the non-proletarian working masses by means of the revolutionary realisation of the economic needs of the latter at the cost of the exploiters." (Lenin—"The Elections to the Constituent Assembly and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.")

These same conditions for destroying the influence of the bourgeoisie and petit bourgeois class collaborators are also indispensable and sufficient in order that the Communist Party may win to its side the *whole* working-class. In the thesis "On the Role of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution" adopted at the Second Congress of the Communist International, it is stated:—

"As long as the State power has not been conquered by the proletariat, the Communist Party will as a rule have in the ranks of its organisation only a minority of the workers. . . . Only after the final defeat of the bourgeois structure becomes obvious to all, will all or almost all the

workers begin to enter the ranks of the Communist Party."

This condition for winning the whole working-class to the side of Communism has been realised now in a full measure in the U.S.S.R. There, the proletariat by experience has already convinced itself of the realisation of the economic needs of the toiling masses at the cost of the exploiters and of the final defeat of the bourgeois structure. There, therefore, not by the forcible measures of the Soviet power against the proletariat as the Social Democrats slanderously assert, but by their own experience, the working-class has once and for all put an end to the access of the Mensheviks to their ranks.

The political party of the saboteurs who were in the dock undergoing trial was called the "Russian Social Democratic *Labour* Party (Mensheviks)." At one time, this Party was connected with definite strata of the workers. At one time, it represented the opportunist wing in the Russian Labour movement. Now, according to the unanimous admission of the accused, they did not possess and were not able to organise any connections with the workers in the U.S.S.R. At one time, the Mensheviks possessed fairly large connections with the printers, who to a certain extent represented in Russia the labour aristocracy. Now, the Menshevik saboteurs are not able to find a single working printer who would agree to print their subterranean leaflets. The "leaders" were compelled to produce them themselves on a hectograph to the total of eighty copies.

When at the session of the Menshevik Centre (the All-Union Bureau of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.), a discussion took place on the question of their present social basis, the opinion was expressed that the sole stratum of workers on the sympathy of whom they might at present rely was the de-classed kulaks and small traders who had found their way into the working-class, and that the sole basis for Menshevism now in the U.S.S.R. was to be found in those employees of the Soviet apparatus belonging to the old intelligentsia, those old "specialists" who were now under the threat of being cleaned out of the Soviet apparatus. In correspondence with this, voices were raised at the Menshevik centre proposing to delete the word "Labour" from the title of their Party. This proposal, however, was rejected and for very obvious reasons. For, is it not true that the R.S.D.L.P. is one of the sections of the Second International? To eliminate the word "Labour" from this title would mean to reveal to the Social Democratic workers in the capitalist countries the

secret of the not far distant future of their own Party and to show them that they and their leaders would also inevitably find themselves on different sides of the barricades.

* * *

Who were their allies in the U.S.S.R.? At first they formed a close bloc with the counter-revolutionary Social-Revolutionary Kulak Party of Kondratiev. But the leaders of Menshevism abroad considered that this bloc was too narrow. Mr. Abramovitch, who made an illegal journey into the U.S.S.R., told them that to be afraid of going outside the limits of a bloc with the S.R.-Kulak Party meant to exhibit "a petit-bourgeois deviation." In what sense? In the sense that the tasks of the moment demanded also close co-operation with the big capitalist counter-revolutionary organisation of the "Industrial Party." According to the depositions of the "Left" Mr. Sukhanov, this proposal of Abramovitch at first produced in the Russian Menshevik centre doubt and resentment:—

"It was declared that by entering into an agreement with the Industrial Party and utilising its financial support, the Social Democrats would become a mere agency, that we should become the direct hirelings of White Guard, Fascist and perhaps monarchist and espionage organisations and would surrender ourselves and our Party to the service of their aims."

These doubts were dissipated by very weighty arguments:

"It was pointed out, on the other hand," said Sukhanov, "that contact and co-operation with the bourgeoisie was in the highest degree characteristic of Social Democracy, that underground Parties representing the working-class always made use of assistance from the capitalists, that Social Democracy acted against the Bolsheviks not only alongside of Kerensky and Konovalov but also with the supporters of the Romanov monarchy, with General Krasnov, in so far as the concrete aims and tactical measures of the Parties coincided."

As a result of the discussion, these weighty arguments triumphed and it was decided to make contact with the Industrial Party, this matter being entrusted to Sukhanov. The former "Left" Social Democrat Sukhanov conscientiously fulfilled this task and received from the Industrial Party in three meetings fifty thousand roubles. Besides this, Groman received from the Industrial Party through Larichev two hundred thousand roubles. This sum was not very large for the object of the "Party." Obviously, the counter-revolutionary capitalist organisation did not estimate at a very high value the Mensheviks who had lost all connections with the workers and who had shown themselves completely impotent as regards corruption of the workers of the U.S.S.R. On the other hand, more considerable sums were given to the Mensheviks by German Social Democracy, through the Central Committee of the Mensheviks abroad, as brothers in the faith, from a sentiment of counter-revolutionary solidarity. And from the Paris "Torgprom" (Trade and Industrial

Committee) itself—the organisation of the Russian White Guard capitalist-emigrants—these allies received a certain amount. They were worthy of it!

* * *

What were the programme and tactics of the counter-revolutionary Menshevik Centre? The centre was set up in 1928. But the groups which entered into its composition had already carried on counter-revolutionary activity prior to this, and as early as 1924 they had worked out a platform which amounted to the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. But the methods for the realisation of this restoration suffered considerable change during the past period. As early as 1927, Dan gave the Russian Mensheviks instructions to occupy themselves with sabotage, or as he delicately expressed it, with "disorganising work." At first, this sabotage pursued a very modest goal; by creating difficulties in the State economy to induce the Soviet power to return to the old methods of N.E.P., with which was connected the hope of the Mensheviks for a gradual capitalist transformation of the U.S.S.R.

When it became clear that this was hopeless, that the Soviet power had set a firm course towards an extended Socialist offensive, the Menshevik sabotage adopted another aim—by the disorganisation of supplies to produce risings in the U.S.S.R. When the Mensheviks became convinced that this activity also was hopeless, that by their internal forces they would never be successful in overthrowing the Soviet power, they adopted the policy of intervention and determined to subordinate all their sabotage activity to this intervention, co-ordinating it with the sabotage work of the Industrial Party and with the interventionist plans of the French General Staff.

The initiative for this new course of policy was derived from abroad, from the foreign delegation of the R.S.D.L.P., which itself took this line not independently but in agreement with the parties of the Second International and particularly the German Social Democratic Party. In 1928, Abramovitch made his illegal journey into the U.S.S.R. with the special object of directing the work of the All-Union Bureau of the Menshevik Central Committee towards the preparation of intervention by means of sabotage. The Menshevik Groman declares that according to the words of Abramovitch:—

"Before his departure for the U.S.S.R. there took place in Berlin a secret conference in which there participated Abramovitch, Dan, Dalin, Hilferding and Breitscheidt (all "lefts" or ex-"lefts"—A.M.) and at which were finally decided the questions of the new policy and a decision taken for furnishing financial support and organisational assistance for the carrying through of the new line of policy."

* * *

Of course, both the leaders of the Second International and the foreign delegation of the Mensheviks were fully aware that it was impossible to come out

openly before the proletariat with propaganda for intervention against the U.S.S.R., that such propaganda would arouse the indignation of the proletariat of the whole world. Consequently, they adopted a policy of an absolutely double-faced character. *In practice* they prepared intervention on the territory of the U.S.S.R. itself by means of sabotage and the financing of sabotage. *In practice*, they prepared for intervention in the capitalist countries by means of systematically discrediting the Soviet power, by means of asserting the inevitability of economic catastrophe in the U.S.S.R. (in which they themselves had long ceased to believe), by means of a systematic campaign of slander against the Soviet power, about "Soviet dumping," about "forced labour" in the U.S.S.R., about "Red Imperialism," etc. At the same time, with shameless hypocrisy they declared in public that they were against intervention. The Menshevik Salkind asserts that Abramovitch during his visit to the U.S.S.R. expounded with cynical frankness the principles of this hypocrisy before his comrades. He said:—

"Of course, officially, for the future also, both the Second International and the German Social Democratic Party must from a whole number of international and inner-Party considerations (the negative attitude towards intervention of the lower strata of the working masses), take up a negative position towards intervention, but in essence their position corresponds with the position on this question of the delegation of the R.S.D.L.P. abroad. And the delegation of the R.S.D.L.P. received the assent of the leaders of the Second International and German Social Democratic Party in the financing of Party and sabotage activity as well as in the preparation of intervention."

* * *

In the light of these depositions, the international proletariat cannot fail to grasp the monstrous extent of the lies of the leaders of the Second International. Mr. Abramovitch, posing as a "left" Social Democrat, carries on in the pages of "Die Gesellschaft" a friendly polemic with Kautsky, who writes furious drivel about the Soviet Union copied from his present tutor, the Right Menshevik Garvy. Abramovitch, friendlily correcting Kautsky, declares that "Bolshevism has not yet become Buonapartism, it still embodies a large element of revolution (of course, Utopian, Asiatic and barbarian revolution)." In accordance with this, he endeavours to create the impression that he is not in agreement with the methods recommended by Kautsky for overthrowing the Soviet Power. He writes:—

"Insurrection, or rather more correctly insurrections, undoubtedly lie within the bounds of probability. But a *victorious* overthrow can be realised only through the struggle of one part of the dictatorship itself against another. If this takes place as a result of the pressure and under the pressure of the *mass movement of the proletariat* developing under democratic-socialist slogans, then a democratic liquidation is entirely possible and even probable." ("Die Gesellschaft," No. 12, 1930. pp. 540-541.)

In this mild fashion, Mr. Abramovitch expresses himself in print, the same Abramovitch who already two years earlier made a special journey into the U.S.S.R. where he persuaded his comrades to abandon the hopeless drudgery of activity with the workers and to concentrate all their efforts and all their labours on sabotage in the Soviet apparatus, and where he persuaded them to enter into alliance with the Industrial Party and together with the latter to undertake systematic sabotage for the preparation of intervention. It is not remarkable that this accomplished rogue, on learning of the confessions of his friends, has now followed in the footsteps of Poincaré and written to the press swearing not only that he did not say what has been attributed to him, but that he never even made any trip into the U.S.S.R.!

* * *

The Mensheviks who have been working in the U.S.S.R. and who have seen with what enthusiasm and heroism the proletariat is devoting itself to Socialist construction, have been able to convince themselves that in the event of intervention the whole proletariat of the U.S.S.R. and the overwhelming masses of the peasantry will be a bulwark in defence of the conquests of October. They are aware that intervention if successful will cost innumerable bloody sacrifices on the part of the proletariat and the main masses of the peasantry, and that in such circumstances the assurance of Abramovitch that the participation of the Mensheviks and of the Second International as a whole in intervention will guarantee the establishment of a "democratic" structure on the ruins of October is indeed equivalent to a counterfeit promissory note.

Consequently, in this question, as in the question of co-operation with the Industrial Party, they at first expressed certain hesitations. However, not seeing any other path to the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. as demanded by their programme, they quickly allowed themselves to be "seduced" and like dissolute "Marxists," if one may say so, they gave as their justification the obligation which they alleged Marx himself had spoken about, "to lighten the birthpangs of history"! The former "left" Social Democrat, Sukhanov, declared:—

"From the tactical point of view, the platform was based on the conception of the inevitability of intervention and on the necessity to lighten the birthpangs of history, collaborating in the liquidation of Bolshevism even along a path *involving the danger of the greatest national misfortune and the dismemberment of the country.*"

Thus, we see that there is no kind of vileness which these prostitutes are not ready, to cover up with "Marxist" phraseology. Their method of covering up the blackest counter-revolutionary acts by "Marxist" formulae has only one precedent in history. When the Jesuits of the "Holy Inquisition" condemned heretics to be burnt at the stake, they—these

merciful Christians—formulated their sentence in the sanctified phrase, "Let them be dealt with as mercifully as possible, without the shedding of blood." This meant that they should not be put to the sword but burnt at the stake.

* * *

Menshevism, which began its development as a Liberal-Labour Party under the cover of a falsification of Marxism, has logically ended its career as a Party which has lost all connection with the working-class, as a Party of counter-revolution and sabotage, as a Party which stops at nothing in its struggle against the revolutionary proletariat, as an ally of the counter-revolutionary big bourgeoisie, as an agent of the most predatory imperialism, viz., French imperialism, as a Party of the Capitalist Vendée, the Versailles Party which came out against the Commune. Lenin already in the epoch of the first Russian bourgeois revolution, with his genius was able to foresee where the Mensheviks would logically arrive at *in the situation of a proletarian revolution*. It was precisely on that account that already at that time he conducted such a furious struggle against them. In 1908, Lenin wrote :—

"That which we now experience frequently only ideologically, viz., disputes with the theoretical revisers of Marx; that which now makes its appearance in practice only as separate, partial questions of the Labour Movement in the form of tactical disagreements with the revisionists and splits on this basis—will inevitably have to be experienced by the working-class on an incomparably larger scale when the proletarian revolution sharpens all thorny questions, concentrates all disagreements on to points which will possess the most immediate significance for determining the behaviour of the masses, bringing about a separation in the heat of struggle between friend and foe and making it necessary to cast off bad allies in order to be able to deliver decisive blows against the enemy. The ideological struggle of revolutionary Marxism against revisionism at the end of the nineteenth century represents only a preliminary to the great revolutionary struggles of the proletariat in its advance to the complete victory of its cause in spite of all the wavering and weaknesses of the population." (Lenin. "Marxism and Revisionism.")

Already during the epoch of the first bourgeois

revolution, Menshevism bore within itself all the germs of its future treachery. However, if in 1905 the curtain of history had been raised for an honestly erring Menshevik and he had been shown the present visage of Menshevism as it actually is, he would recoil from it with horror and shuddering. We have no doubt that also the honestly-erring Social Democratic workers in capitalist countries who have not yet outlived their old Social Democratic traditions, when they get a closer acquaintance with the character of the living Mensheviks now facing trial in the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., will also recoil from them with contempt, disgust and indignation. Yet it is a fact that these Menshevik-saboteurs worked according to the instructions of the Party of the Second International, according to the direct instructions of the leaders of the Second International and with the aid of money from the parties of the latter. From this the Social Democratic workers must and will draw the following conclusions :—

The Soviet Power has entered the decisive year of the Five Year Plan, which must complete the construction of the foundations of Socialist economy. The Parties of the Second International see this clearly and are as much frightened by it as is the bourgeoisie of the whole world. Consequently, they are straining every nerve in order to convert the decisive year of Socialist construction by means of intervention into a year of the downfall of the Soviet Power. They make a mistake. The international proletariat and the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. will take care to see that this year shall be a year of the downfall of the Parties of the Second International.

All sections of the Communist International must make known on the widest possible scale all the facts and materials relating to this trial in Moscow. Let the proletarians of the whole world learn the naked truth about the Parties of the Second International and about their leaders. This truth will effect a deep breach in the Second International which fully deserves the appellation of the International of Saboteurs and Interventionists.

DECAYING CAPITALISM AND EMANCIPATED LABOUR

THE bourgeoisie seeks a way out of the unprecedented crisis in intervention against the U.S.S.R. It makes desperate attempts to switch the dissatisfaction of the masses into other channels, by inciting the workers against the Soviet Union. Fabulous tales about "Soviet dumping," said to be the cause of the crisis, are told to the peasants who are utterly ruined by the agrarian crisis. The working masses, bowed down by acute unemployment, and looking to the Soviet Union as to a lighthouse in a storm, are told wild tales of the "forced labour" under which the Soviet workers toil, and of how the workers, threatened with criminal punishment or the withdrawal of their bread ration if they disobey, are torn from their wives and forcibly driven hundreds and thousands of miles away to work.

The very same imperialist plunderers who are shouting against "forced labour" in the U.S.S.R., and for the defence of "free labour," while the majority of the masses in their own country are poverty stricken, heap up profits not only through hired slavery, but also through the labour of slaves, real in the legal sense, who can still be found in their own colonies. Bourgeois writers do not hide the fact that in the Dutch Indies, the Belgian Congo, French Equatorial Africa and French Madagascar, in Liberia (under the protection of the U.S.A.), in English Sierra Leone and even in Egypt, slavery is still practised.

Lord Cecil said in the League of Nations that there are no fewer than ten million slaves in the world to-day. The Editor of the French "Temps," on returning from a journey through the French and African colonies, said:

"In order to construct 140 kilometres of railroad, the French Government spent 17 thousand human lives. Seventeen thousand corpses lie at the bottom of the ocean, etc., etc."

And these same bloodsuckers, who drain the strength of these slaves, are now shedding crocodile tears about "forced labour," alleged to be in existence in the Soviet Union. But they are not alone; the social democrats of all shades are with them, and their shouts exceed all others. Not only does "Vorwärts" write about "forced labour," but the "left" social-democratic "Chemnische Volkzeitung" and the "left" Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung" do so too.

This violent campaign against "forced labour" in the U.S.S.R., conducted in complete

unison, from the Americans, like Senate Fish, the English Diehards and the French Senators, to the "left" social democrats, has after all its good side. It brings the fundamental question before the broad working masses as to which system is the higher—the capitalist or socialist; and this question is put to them at a moment when capitalism is rapidly decaying and the Soviet Union is steadily building Socialism; when Socialism is no longer a promise of the future, but is embodied in flesh and blood, when it can be seen with the eyes, and touched with the hands. We can rest assured, therefore, that this campaign, to which we must reply, to which we are replying in a true Bolshevik spirit, will come to a shameful end and will only help considerably to increase the drive of the proletariat towards Communism, and to strengthen their fight for the Proletarian Dictatorship throughout the world.

* * *

With regard to the "free labour" of the hired worker in capitalist countries, we can turn to Marx for a classical description:

"This sphere that we are deserting, within whose boundaries the sale and purchase of labour power goes on, is in fact a very Eden of the innate rights of man. There alone rule Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham. Freedom, because both buyer and seller of a commodity, say of labour power, are constrained only by their own free will. They contract as free agents. . . . Equality, because each enters into relation with the other, as with a simple owner of commodities, and they exchange equivalent for equivalent. Property, because each disposes only of what is his own. And Bentham, because each looks only to himself. . . . On leaving this sphere of simple circulation or of exchange of commodities . . . we think we can perceive a change in the physiognomy of our dramatis personae. He who before was the money owner, now strides in front as capitalist; the possessor of labour power follows as his labourer. The one with an air of importance, smirking, intent on business; the other, timid and holding back, like one who is bringing his own hide to market and has nothing to expect but—a hiding." (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I.)

This is "free labour" in capitalist countries. But this is not all. In order that the capitalist may, without let or hindrance, exploit the "free" worker under circumstances of capitalist accumulation, in order that he may freely develop capitalist production, he must have at his disposal a sufficient supply of "free" working hands, and the capitalist system arranged for this, with its

“natural law of population which expresses itself in the creation of a superfluous working class population.

“But if a surplus labouring population is a necessary product of accumulation or of the development of wealth on a capitalist basis, this surplus population becomes, conversely, the lever of capitalist accumulation, nay, a condition of existence of the capitalist mode of production. It forms a disposable *industrial reserve army*. . . . Independently of the limits of the actual increase of population, it creates, for the changing needs of the self-expansion of capital, a mass of human material always ready for exploitation.” (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I.)

The industrial reserve army, i.e., the unemployed, is closely connected with the capitalist method of production, and therefore the realisation under capitalism of not only true “freedom of labour” but also of “the right to work” are mere utopian dreams. In his book, the “Civil War in France,” Karl Marx wrote :

“The right to work, in the bourgeois sense, is a contradiction, a miserable pious wish, but behind the right to work looms up the power over capital, behind the power over capital the expropriation of the means of production, their subjection to the organised working class, therefore, the abolition of wage labour, of capital and of their mutual relations. Behind the ‘right to work’ stood the June insurrection.” (Marx, *Civil War in France*.)

The industrial reserve army is a condition of the existence of the capitalist means of production. But it is at the same time the force which presses upon wages, and upon which to a very considerable extent, depends the law of absolute impoverishment of the working class in capitalist society :

“Relative surplus population is therefore the pivot upon which the law of demand and supply of labour works. It confines the field of action of this law within the limits absolutely convenient to the activity of exploitation and to the domination of capital.” . . . “The relative mass of the industrial reserve army increases therefore with the potential energy of wealth. But the greater this reserve army in proportion to the active labour army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated surplus population, whose misery is in inverse relation to its torment of labour. Finally, the more extensive the Lazarus-layers of the working class, and the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism. *This is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation.*” (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I.)

If, thus, “freedom” of the means of production, hunger and unemployment are the forces which harness the workers to the chariot of capitalism, then in what does this “free” worker differ from the slaves of old (who, incidentally, still exist)? They differ only in the *kind* of slavery. F. Engels in 1844 wrote :

“The proletariat is, therefore, in law and in fact the slave of the bourgeoisie” . . . “the only difference as compared with the old out-spoken slavery is this, that the worker of to-day seems to be free because he is not sold once for all, but piecemeal by the day, the week, the year, and because no one owner sells him to another, but he is forced to sell himself in this way instead, being the slave of no particular person, but of the whole property-holding class. For him the matter is unchanged at bottom, and if this semblance of liberty necessarily gives him some real freedom on the one hand, it entails on the other the disadvantage that no one guarantees him a subsistence, he is in danger of being repudiated at any moment by his master, the bourgeoisie, and left to die of starvation, if the bourgeoisie ceases to have an interest in his employment, his existence.” (Engels, *Position of the Working Class in England*.)

Thus wrote Marx and Engels in the middle of the XIX century, when industrial capitalism was at the height of its glory, in the epoch of free competition. Now in the period of the crisis of capitalism, and especially the present economic crisis, the situation has essentially changed. In what direction?

During the partial stabilisation of capitalism, the social democrats assured us that the situation, in comparison with Marx’s time, had changed in the sense that, now the era of “organised capital” and “economic democracy” had arrived and monopolist capitalism was organically being converted into Socialism. Now that an acute crisis is raging, the social democrats are silent on this point, for only a madman would believe it. Now every worker who remembers pre-war times understands clearly that the situation on the labour market, in comparison with Marx’ day, has changed in quite another direction. First, the much talked of “freedom of labour” or more exactly speaking, the “illusion of freedom” of which Engels wrote, has disappeared. Of the fantastic edifice which the social democrats built up during the period of partial capitalist stabilisation, there remains not that which they built up in words (“organised capitalism”) but that which they built up in deeds—limitation by means of compulsory arbitration and forcibly suppressing all strikes of even the “freedom” to sell one’s own labour power as a commodity.

In conditions where the intensivity of labour has risen to an extraordinary degree, as compared with Marx’ time, in conditions where wages are being everywhere cut down, and the standard of living universally lowered, in conditions where the capitalists are taking back from the workers all the gains of the early post-war period; strikes are either completely prohibited

(Italy) or prohibited after compulsory arbitration or suppressed by terrorist strike-breaking methods (Germany) or, as in England (the "Labour" Government Trades Disputes Act!) are permitted only as a form of struggle for increased wages in individual factories, but on no account as a general strike against the capitalist offensive.

The present situation on the labour market, secondly, differs from that in Marx' time in that unemployment to-day can in no way be looked upon as a reserve working army. Already during the course of the post-war crisis of capitalism, unemployment has taken on the form of chronic mass unemployment, which could not be drawn into industry even in periods when trade was good, a reserve of labour power which even in these times exceeds in number the unemployment of the worst periods of so-called "normal" capitalism. Since the outbreak of the economic crisis, it has taken on colossal dimensions (50 million), and in countries where unemployment insurance existed, it is being considerably cut down or abolished entirely. This means that unemployment, from being "a condition of existence of the capitalist mode of production" is now converted into a condition of its decay. It is about just this conversion that Marx and Engels wrote:

"It (the bourgeoisie) is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to provide security for its slaves even within the confines of their slavish existence; because it has no option but to let them lapse into a condition in which it has to feed them instead of being fed by them. Society cannot continue to live under bourgeois rule. This means that the life of the bourgeoisie has become incompatible with the life of society." (*Communist Manifesto*.)

How does capitalism seek a way out of this unemployment? If we put aside those remedies which, having nothing in common with the reduction of unemployment and its ensuing poverty, are put forward only for demagogic purposes and actually amount in practice to transferring the burden of assistance to the unemployed from the shoulders of the capitalists to those of the half-starved workers (which the social democrats favour), there remain a few "real" measures which prove that capitalism has arrived at the end of its journey and that its "saviours" are trying to return from capitalist hired slavery to forms of pre-capitalist slavery.

We will indicate here only two remedies. In the U.S.A, many municipalities, in order to increase the demand for labour, began to prohibit the use, on municipal works, of any kind of mechanised labour, permitting only the use of "grandfather's" implements—the pick and shovel, which require a considerable number of workers.

This means that decaying capitalism has to deny all things progressive that it has brought into history, to deny machine labour as an essential pre-requisite for the liberation of man from the power of the elements (unrealisable under capitalism). This signifies the return to slavish dependence upon nature. The second example indicates not the enslavement of man to nature, but the individual legal enslavement of man to another man.

The German fascists, the "national socialists," have introduced a proposal in the Reichstag to deprive the unemployed of benefit, and with the money thus saved to organise compulsory labour for 800,000 unemployed youth, who will go to the village to carry out agricultural, timber and other work, with imprisonment for those who refuse to participate. In the spirit of this Fascist Bill, a certain bourgeois newspaper proposes the introduction of annual compulsory labour for young working women, between 20 and 22, at a wage of 30 pfennings—the usual soldiers' pay, this labour to be spent in domestic service, which would make it possible for young men to take the places of such young women in the factories at reduced wages corresponding to those paid for women's labour. Thus plans are being put forward to remove young working men and women from industry, where they are subject to the revolutionary ferment, and to convert them into bondslaves at home and in the fields. This is "free labour" under modern capitalism. In those circumstances of ever-increasing slavery, loud shouts are raised against alleged "forced" labour in the U.S.S.R.!

* * *

In 1902, Karl Kautsky, in reply to a speech by ex-minister Pearson, who attempted to prove the inevitability of the collapse of the Proletarian Revolution through internal causes, wrote "Social Revolution and the Morrow of the Social Revolution." Kautsky even then was no Marxist, and his book from the viewpoint of revolutionary Marxism cannot stand criticism. It is enough to point out that, in depicting his idea of the day after the proletarian revolution, he even fails to mention the dictatorship of the proletariat, and essentially denounces all dictatorial measures as, for instance, confiscation without compensation. But still, in those days, Kautsky was on the side of the revolutionary Marxists, and, although in a poor, opportunist fashion, he nevertheless fought against the anti-socialists. What, in the opinion of the author of the book, should the victorious proletariat do to organise labour on a social basis? It—

"must occupy itself with the next *fundamental* problem; it will have of necessity to solve the problem of how to eliminate the destitution of the unemployed" . . . "bourgeois society cannot, in this sphere, go farther than half measures, for otherwise it would cut away the basis upon which it rests. Only the proletariat, the victorious proletariat, is capable of introducing, and will introduce, measures which can absolutely abolish destitution created by unemployment."

Further on he asks how the proletarian régime can draw workers into the labour process :

"One cannot, of course, entirely count upon the impulse to work alone, this is the weakest." (Not always weak! This is where the opportunist ears of Kautsky become visible!) "Undoubtedly much stronger is the discipline of the proletariat. We know that when a workers' union decides to call a strike, the discipline of the organised worker is sufficiently strong to urge him voluntarily to lay himself open to all the dangers and horrors of unemployment, often to whole months of starvation, if only the common cause be victorious. So I think that if the force of discipline can drive the workers out of the factories and workshops, then force of this same discipline can keep them at work" . . . "Proletarian discipline has nothing in common with military discipline. No, this is democratic discipline, this is voluntary subjection to elected leadership and the decisions of the majority of one's own comrades." (Remember these are social democratic workers!)

Moreover, as Kautsky then said, to draw the workers into the labour process, work must be made attractive: "to achieve this, of course, is not so simple; but at any rate the beginnings of this will be laid down by the proletariat immediately upon their obtaining power, by reducing labour time. Side by side with the attractiveness of labour another factor will inevitably play a part—attractive terms of payment for labour."

All that Kautsky mentions here, the Soviet Government has already accomplished; it has liquidated unemployment; it has introduced voluntary proletarian discipline; it has shortened the working day; it has systematically raised wages. And yet the renegade Kautsky and his colleagues assure us that the Soviet Government has converted the country in a penal settlement.

There is a method in this madness. When Kautsky wrote his pamphlet in 1902, he based the possibility of instituting proletarian discipline in Socialist society to secure labour power for production upon the fact that already within capitalist society the proletarians prepare the way to a disciplined struggle for their class interests; already then they are prepared to make any sacrifices to avoid becoming strikebreakers. But now Kautsky and all the social-democrat leaders themselves have become professional strike-

breakers, being most closely connected with the capitalist apparatus of oppression, and having lost all sense of proletarian class-consciousness, all feeling of proletarian solidarity. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that they describe the Soviet régime as a hard labour settlement. They feel that if Proletarian Dictatorship were set up in their own country, they would deserve nothing but imprisonment.

Will methods of labour discipline always be the same? Not at all. In his pamphlet "State and Revolution" Lenin wrote :

"But this 'factory discipline' which the proletariat will extend to the whole of society on the defeat of capitalism and the overthrow of the exploiters, is by no means our ideal, and is far from our final aim. It is but a foothold as we press on to the radical cleansing of society from all the brutality and foulness of capitalist exploitation; we leave it behind as we move on. . . The more complete the democracy, the nearer the moment when it ceases to be necessary. The more democratic the 'State' consisting of armed workers, which is 'no longer really a State in the ordinary sense of the term,' the more rapidly does every form of the State begin to decay . . . the necessity of observing the simple, fundamental rules of any kind of social life will become a habit." (Lenin, *State and Revolution*, English Edition, C.P.G.B., pp. 132-3.)

Labour discipline is necessary *only* in class society, but it is necessary in *every* class society. No class society can exist without labour discipline. In his article "A Great Beginning," Lenin wrote :

"The feudal organisation of social labour was based on discipline maintained by corporal punishment, in circumstances of ignorance and abandonment of the toilers, who were robbed and insulted by a handful of landlords. The capitalist organisation of labour is based on hunger discipline; where innumerable masses of toilers, despite the general progress of bourgeois culture and bourgeois democracy, in the most advanced civilised and democratic republics, are still an ignorant, abandoned multitude of hired slaves and oppressed peasants, who are robbed and insulted by a handful of capitalists. The Communist organisation of social labour, the first step towards which is Socialism, is based (and the longer it exists the more will this be so) upon free, class-conscious discipline of the workers themselves who have cast off the yoke of both landlords and capitalists." (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XVI.)

The transition from one form of discipline to another, especially from capitalist to socialist, is exceedingly difficult and is achieved gradually. In his speech at the Congress of the Supreme Council of National Economy in 1918, Lenin said :

"Remember the whole transition from bond-slavery to bourgeois economy . . . This transition seems, historically, simple . . . And even this

change from one exploiting discipline to another discipline cost years, if not tens of years . . . of transitional time, during which the old feudal landlords quite sincerely thought that everything would be ruined, for to carry on without bondslavery was impossible. . . .” “The new discipline, labour discipline, discipline of comradesly mutual assistance, Soviet discipline is worked out in actual practice by millions of toilers and workers. We do not expect, or reckon on, rapid successes. We know that this business will take up a whole historical epoch.” (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XV.)

The pre-requisites for the complete setting up of this “Soviet discipline” were certainly created in the U.S.S.R. only gradually, during the process of realising the fundamental strategic tasks, which Lenin laid down in 1918 after seizing power, and after the first drive of counter-revolution. This task was to take “the road of new economic construction, the road of forming new social ties, new labour discipline, a new organisation of labour, linking up the last work of science and capitalist technique with mass organisations of class-conscious workers, creating large-scale Socialist industry.” (Lenin, Vol. XVI.)

Now the Soviet Government has already begun the work on a broad scale of “linking up the last word of science and capitalist technique with mass organisations of class-conscious workers, creating large scale socialist industry.” Now the Soviet Government has drawn the village as well into Socialist production, through Soviet farms and collective farms. Now the Soviet Government has entered the period of Socialism. It has, therefore, also become possible to accomplish on a *national scale* this “new social link, labour discipline, discipline of comradesly assistance, Soviet Government has drawn the village as well possible, but also inevitable, absolutely imperative.

The Soviet Government has entered the decisive year of the Five Year Plan, which must complete the construction of the foundation of Socialist economics. In this decisive year it is proposed to increase the production of State industry by 45 per cent. To do this, a new two million persons must be drawn into industry. In 1903, there were 3,557,000 workers in heavy industry, out of a total of 13,684,000 workers. In 1931 there will be 4,241,000 workers in the heavy industries and a total of 16,200,000 industrial workers. It is proposed this year to bring into industry 800,000 women, chiefly wives and daughters of industrial workers. This enormous influx of new workers into industry must take place in conditions, when unemployment is already entirely liquidated, in circumstances when collectivisation of the village, which improves the position of the peasants and raises the in-

comes of peasant farms, is checking the desire of peasants to go into industry, despite the fact that collectivisation and mechanisation of agriculture creates a large reserve of unused labour power. This sharply raises the question of supplying labour power inside industry.

But it is not only a question of supplying labour to industry. Workers must be trained for qualified work (in 1931, 1,300,00 qualified workers must be trained). It is a question also of re-distributing qualified workers, sending them from less important to more important centres of industry. All this has brought before the Soviet Government the question of a planned supply of labour to national economy, and the corresponding reorganisation of the People’s Commissariat for Labour. For this reason, the Central Executive Committee of the Council of People’s Commissars on December 15, 1930, decreed “on the regulations concerning the engagement and distribution of labour power, and how to cope with the unorganised drift of labour power from one industry to another.” This decree has become the target for all the enemies of the Soviet Government, who calumniously interpret it in the sense of the setting up of a general régime of “forced labour” in the U.S.S.R.

On what basis does the Soviet Government, in actual reality, intend to work in order to guarantee the necessary amount of labour power to each individual industry, to destroy the drift of labour power; in order to draw women into industry, primarily wives of workers and collective farmers; in order to redistribute the surplus qualified labour power; in order better to utilise reserve of labour in industry? Not on force, not on compulsion. This is base calumny, combined with the organic inability of the bourgeoisie and petit-bourgeoisie to understand the new character of labour in the country of victorious Socialism. The chief basis on which the Soviet Government works and will work is voluntary labour impulse, the enthusiasm for Socialist construction, Socialist competition, voluntary proletarian and collective farming discipline. Comrade Stalin at the XVI. Party Congress said :

“Only the blind can fail to see that a tremendous revolution has taken place in the psychology of the masses and in their relation to labour, which has radically altered the features of our factories and works . . . The most remarkable feature of competition consists in the radical revolution it has wrought in men’s views of labour, because it transforms labour from a disgraceful and painful burden, as it was reckoned before, into a matter of *honour*, a matter of *glory*, a matter of *valour* and *heroism*. There is not and cannot be anything similar in capi-

talist countries." (Stalin, *Political Report to the Sixteenth Party Congress*. Modern Books, pp. 99-100.)

This absolutely new attitude towards labour has given rise to a strong, ever-growing movement among the workers to voluntarily bind themselves by agreement to remain in their factories, and to wage war against the drift of labour power from one industry to another. Already, in the Leningrad district, 56.8 per cent. of the workers in the metal and electrical industries have expressed their desire to bind themselves voluntarily to their factories till the end of the Five Year Plan. The same wish has been expressed by 71.2 per cent. of the workers in the chemical industry; 37.5 per cent. in the timber industry; 62.7 per cent. in the paper industry; 87.7 per cent. poligraphic workers; 34.3 per cent. leather-workers; 45 per cent. garment workers; and 38.1 per cent. textile workers. Before the Soviet elections, 50 per cent. of the workers were drawn into Socialist competition, and 50 per cent. into shock brigades. This movement is rapidly spreading throughout the country; and in the collective farms a movement is developing to send the surplus labour power into industry, and to send collective farmers, declaring themselves shock-brigaders, into other localities to direct the work there as leaders and organisers.

Whence this colossal proletarian impulse? First, the workers recognise that they work entirely in their own interests and not for an exploiter; that they are building socialism; they already directly feel how rapidly they are travelling along the road to Socialism; they proudly regard themselves as the harbingers of the world proletarian revolution. This impulse, secondly, comes from the fact that each success in the cause of industrialising the country is accompanied in the U.S.S.R. by the improvement of working conditions.

The workers see that, thanks to their own heroism in the field of labour, and to the sturdy growth of industry, it has been possible to liquidate unemployment at a time when in the capitalist world the number of unemployed has reached 50,000,000; the workers see that thanks to heroism in the field of labour, thanks to the growth of productivity, it was already possible in 1929/30 for 62 per cent. of the factories to introduce the 7-hour working day, and that in 1931 92 per cent. of the remaining factories will adopt the 7-hour working day, whereas in capitalist countries the working day is lengthening. The workers see that, thanks to the growth of labour productivity, it has been possible to raise their actual wages by 169 per cent. of the pre-war figure, while in capitalist countries wages are

falling. The workers see that thanks to the increase in the national income, as a result of their heroic labour, living conditions are also gradually improving.

In 1930, the social insurance budget was 1,600 million roubles, in 1931 it will be 2,138 million roubles, whereas at the end of the Five Year Plan it will amount to 2,950 million roubles. The 1931 budget includes several new items of expenditure, which aim at considerably improving medical assistance and so on, to the workers. For example, five million will go to organise "Fifth Day Rest Houses," twenty million to kindergartens, crèches, dinners for schoolchildren; twenty million for sanitation—baths, laundries, etc. Finally, 100 million roubles has been assigned for training qualified workers, chiefly women.

The workers see that the Soviet Government, not only in the interests of the rapid development of industry, but also in order to lighten the burden of labour, aims at mechanising labour in the mines, forests, on building construction. The workers see that the Soviet Government is taking most energetic, all-inclusive steps to abolish the breach existing between physical and mental labour, to raise the qualification of the workers; that the whole system of education in the U.S.S.R., is arranged so that proletarians and proletarian children have the first opportunity of entering the middle and higher educational centres, while the number of such institutions is rapidly increasing.

Finally, the Soviet Government not only morally, but materially, furthers and promotes the Socialist competition both in the sphere of distribution and of increased payment for labour. According to the decree of December 15, skilled workers and specialists, who are transferred to other work, either because they previously did not work at their professions, or in order to satisfy the requirements of more important branches of national economy at the expense of the less important, are offered special privileges. They are allowed the right to retain their previous dwelling rooms, and are guaranteed new rooms in the new place of residence; their children are accepted into schools, children's homes or kindergartens; payment of expenses incurred in removing to the new district are covered, etc. The workers and engineering and technical workers, who excel in shock brigade work and socialist competition enjoy various privileges under this new decree; if their living conditions are unsatisfactory, they are the first to be given new rooms. Their children have the first opportunity of entering higher educational institutions

and technical schools. They are first to be admitted to rest homes and sanatoria. The members of their families, on applying for work, are sent to those factories where their relatives are working, and so on.

The bourgeois and social-fascist press spread calumnies to the effect that the Soviet Government forcibly drives workers to almost uninhabited regions, where they are forced to work and live in unbearably difficult conditions. In order to obtain a clear idea of the sort of conditions that the Soviet Government actually tries to create for the workers, who set in motion the giants of industry in the one-time wastes of the land, it is sufficient to read interesting data on the estimates for construction quoted by Comrade Ordjonikidze in his report to the All-Union Conference of Works in Soviet Industry. According to the estimates of the Kharkov tractor factory, the main workshops will cost 11,380,000 roubles, housing 17,725,000 roubles, and professional and technical educational schemes 11,725,000.

We have a similar state of affairs in the Nizni-Novgorod "Avtostoi" Ural works—"Stalmost" and the "Dnepropetrovsk" combine. Here are the estimates for the Magnitstroi: House of Soviets, 2,500,000; Palace of Culture, 7,700,000; House of Physical Culture, 2,000,000; schools 13,000,000; Park of Rest and Culture, 20,000,000. This last estimate is clearly a luxury, which with our present meagre means, we must temporarily withhold. Comrade Ordjonikidze indicated this when he said that for the time being it is enough, on these new constructions, to guarantee the workers good homes, schools, and clubs, and the palaces can be built a little later, in a few years time. But the mere fact that it is possible to make such estimates shows that a social gulf separates Soviet construction and capitalism.

We see what levers are actually brought into operation by the Soviet Government, in order to realise planned socialist organisation of labour, and how much it corresponds to the flood of insolent lies broadcast by the bourgeoisie and its social-fascist lackeys, in order to save capitalism from the ruin that menaces it, and in order to prevent the proletarians of capitalist countries from following the example of the Soviets.

Does this mean that the Soviet Government, in order to realise its mighty plan of Socialist construction, refrains from using severe measures of Proletarian Dictatorship? Nothing of the kind. Socialist construction is being realised in circumstances of the sharpest class war. The class enemy is making desperate attempts to smash this work of construction. Everyone

knows what violent resistance to Socialist construction is still being shown by the kulaks. Everyone knows how the specialist wreckers tried to put a spoke in the wheels of Socialist construction. And within the working class itself there is a section, especially among workers who have recently arrived from the villages, who are infected with individualism and who manifest a spirit of cowardliness and sabotage, and drift from one factory to another.

Finally, within the party itself there are feeble links who fall the prey of petty bourgeois defeatism, there are unstable opportunist elements, who are actually agents of our class enemies. The party is waging a relentless war against these, backed up by the heroic enthusiasm of the basic masses of the proletariat and mobilising these masses in the struggle against the disorganisers of Socialist construction. And this serves as the source of calumnious accusations about the introduction of "forced labour."

The whole initiative of this campaign against forced labour in the U.S.S.R., as is known, lies with a section of the American bourgeoisie, the Fish Commission, who have an economic interest in the whole affair, and who have achieved the boycott of Soviet timber on the pretext that it is apparently produced by means of "forced" labour. It is no secret and the Soviet Government has made no attempt to hide the fact, that in the U.S.S.R., in connection with all-round collectivisation, the kulaks are being liquidated as a class, and that kulaks who carry on counter-revolutionary work, are exiled to the Northern regions. The Soviet Government does not aim at physically destroying its enemies, it aims at disarming them. But the Soviet Government has no intention of feeding drones. In the Soviet Republics everybody is obliged to work. But the wild fantasies of the bourgeois press are based on the myth that timber is obtained by forced labour in the North, especially in Karelia.

The President of the Council of People's Commissaries of the Karelian Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic, Comrade Diuling, has revealed all the absurdity of these calumnies. He has shown how in Karelia, the *whole population* is engaged in the forests, that last year the Karelian peasantry obtained 45 million roubles income from timber. In these circumstances it is clear that the fraction of exiled kulaks engaged in this work is very inconsiderable. This is obvious even from the fact that the productivity of labour in the forests as compared with last year has increased by 40 per cent. Would this be conceivable if the work were done by forced labour?

Repressive measures are used against drifting workers, and disorganisers of industry. Of what form are they? First, the *social conscience of the proletariat* as a whole is aroused against the offenders; their names are openly put up on big black boards (not entered in black lists, i.e., secret lists, as the social democratic "Vorwaerts" insinuates. This arouses the indignation of the social democratic leaders and this is quite natural—do not they in their own lands encourage strike-breaking methods and engage themselves in them? But they do not limit themselves to indignation. They lie and calumniate. We have already mentioned how they substituted the word "board" for "lists," but this is not all. The Decree of 15 December mentions that "wilful disorganisers of industry, *who themselves leave their jobs in State factories without satisfactory reasons*, on seeking work at Labour Bureaux will not be allowed to *work in industry or transport* for six months;" and the People's Commissary for Labour adds a commentary to the effect that if during these six months they again turn to the Labour organs for work, they shall be sent on *mass manual labour*. The Social democratic "Vorwaerts," quoting this, first omits to quote the reference to "wilful disorganisers," who drift from job to job "with-

out satisfactory reasons," and then again the point that they have closed to them for six months *only* industry and transport, and in no way work in general; and as a result they spread foul calumnies about all the workers who voluntarily leave their work, being "doomed to death by starvation!"

It is quite obvious that the social fascists are hard put to it, if they have to turn to such obvious trickery, that any thinking worker who reads the Soviet decree, will see through their cunning. As for the essence of the question, we have no doubt at all that every honest social democratic worker will understand that to wilfully smash up the progress of Socialist construction for purely ulterior motives, is just as much blacklegging as when a worker in capitalist countries actually blacklegs during a strike; and that the evildoers deserve to be treated in the same way.

The bourgeoisie and its lackeys have dared to risk drawing a comparison between the decaying capitalist world and the land of emancipated labour. Can we have doubts concerning the answer to the question against whom millions of proletarians in capitalist countries will bring in a verdict of the death penalty?

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

Volume 13

MARCH, 1931

Number 3

NOTES OF THE MONTH.—LEFT SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM. R.P.D.
 ON THE EVE OF THE CHARTER CONVENTION. HARRY POLLITT.
 ORGANISING SLAVE LABOUR IN BRITAIN. F. DOUGLAS.
 SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND WAR ON THE SOVIET UNION. ALLEN HUTT.
 FORCED LABOUR IN AFRICA. GEORGE PADMORE.
 BRITISH WORKERS AND THE "SPARTAKIADE." VIC. FARRANT.
 BOOK REVIEWS.

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

64 pages



6^D.

Through any Newsagent

POLITICAL PREPARATIONS FOR WAR AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

By F.B.

THE Sixth Congress of the Communist International drew up for the whole working class a clear and irrefutable statement of the lines along which is proceeding the feverish preparation of imperialist countries for war, directed, above all, against the Soviet Union.

In the first place,

"The Congress points to the tremendous growth of armaments, to the great innovations introduced in the sphere of military technique and to the measures for militarising the population and economy of all the capitalist countries."

In the second place,

"Imperialists combine with military preparations within the sphere of external politics, redoubled reaction within the country. Without a 'peaceful' rear, imperialists could not carry on war."

And, thirdly,

"Imperialists can only introduce their war policy, thanks to the active co-operation of international Social-Democracy."

The one is combined in the closest manner with the other.

The ever-intensifying war danger demands that all Communists and workers make a most searching investigation into those *political means* for the preparation and carrying on of war by which the imperialists hope to retain the efficacy of their military-technical and military-organisational preparation and to defend themselves from the revolutionising influence of war on the army.

It is all the more important to know these political means and moves for the preparation of war, since the bourgeoisie in every war hides and masks them behind various "innocent" screens of cultural and "purely-peaceful" work.

He who really wishes to fight against the political preparation of the imperialists for war, and, in time of war, to fight against their political means of struggle, must know thoroughly the whole "mechanics" of the application of these means with the aim of exposing them and setting up against them our class Communist education of the toiling masses.

At the same time we must not lose sight of the experience of the imperialist war of 1914-1918. In order to understand a great deal of the modern practice of the political preparation of the bourgeoisie for war one must study this experience carefully. The bourgeoisie, at least, does this with exhaustive thoroughness. It seeks in this experience an explanation of the difficulties and

failures encountered. It desires to understand the mistakes committed and to avoid them in the present setting and in the coming war.

The bourgeoisie went to war in 1914-1918 with, from its point of view, not a bad rear and not a bad political condition in its army.

Why was this so? Why did millions of workers, who but the day before were dissatisfied and active combatants of the class struggle, follow, the day war was declared, submissively and obediently, the banner of their masters, "their" bourgeoisie, and go to the front?

Let us take two contrasting explanations—that of the arch-bourgeois professor G. Delbruck and that of Lenin.

G. Delbruck says: "The whole collection of anti-government phrases vanished like smoke (the voices of Social-Democracy on August 4th, 1914), the 'international proletariat' proved a pure myth; in a single moment the *mask was torn off, and we found that it had covered the honest face of the German worker* who desired nothing more than to fight side by side with the rest of his countrymen when the fatherland called. Until 1870, mobilisation had been accompanied in many places by the use of force, even in 1913; but on this occasion nothing of the kind happened. And the reason is that at present every German, so to say, is organised and heeds his organisation; and once these organisations act jointly with the State power, then is created that tremendous force which we saw before us during this mobilisation."

And Lenin: "The objective conditions of the end of the nineteenth century particularly strengthened opportunism, converting the use of bourgeois legality into slavishness, creating a small stratum of bureaucracy and aristocracy of the working class, attracting to the ranks of the Social-Democratic party many petty-bourgeois 'fellow travellers.' The war accelerated this development, transforming opportunism into social-chauvinism, transforming the secret union of the opportunists with the bourgeoisie into an open one. Meanwhile, the military authorities introduced everywhere a state of emergency and a muzzle for the working masses, whose old leaders, almost without exception, went over to the bourgeoisie."

The success of the first years of the war (weakening of the class struggle, the patriotic hypnosis of the masses) was the result of the whole

system of the political preparation of the bourgeoisie for this war, with the main links of this system—State preparation (through the press, schools, churches, art, coercive measures, etc.), and the active treachery of the social-chauvinist parties.

The present setting and the present system of the political preparation of the bourgeoisie for war has much in common with the pre-war period (up to 1914), a period about which one can say in the words of Bismarck: "At no time are so many lies told as before a war," but which has even more distinguishing and new characteristics.

The main difference consists in the fact that the "general line" of the present preparation of the bourgeoisie for war is national *Fascism*, and its methods and means—social-fascism.

Fascism and social-fascism are now the chief methods for retaining power and rule over the workers in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

We must master thoroughly the simple truth that the special, concretely directed work of creating activity in the masses, arousing in them an ardent desire to fight, is but an insignificant part of the whole system of the preparation of the rear for war.

That is why the main object of our work of exposure is not so much the patriotic propaganda that is openly carried on (this we must expose most widely), but, above all, the *base*, due to which such open patriotic, imperialist propaganda can bear fruit. This base is the faith of the masses in their social-fascist leaders and in their bourgeoisie.

The basic foundation on which the bourgeoisie have so far been able to carry on their political preparation for war is Fascism and Social Fascism.

"The Fascist method and the method of coalition with Social Democracy, are not the methods usually employed in 'normal' capitalist conditions; they are the symptoms of the general capitalist crisis, and are employed by the bourgeoisie in order to stem the advance of the revolution." (*Programme of the Communist International*, English Edition, p. 13.)

Here our main blows must be directed. But at the same time we must paralyse, weaken, expose the immediate, direct, political preparation for war.

* * *

If one is to analyse the political preparation of the bourgeoisie for war, one can easily discern three basic elements in this preparation. They are—*propaganda*, *organisational-political measures*, and *coercive measures*.

Take any side of the political activity of the bourgeoisie, influencing directly or through a number of intermediary links the state of pre-

paredness of the bourgeoisie for war, and you will always find these three elements. Let us take, for example, the school: It is deluged with chauvinist poison (propaganda), a staff of teachers and school administrators are trained who are completely subjected to, and distributed by, the clever hand of the state apparatus (organisation work); schools tending in an undesired direction are closed or fined by the power of the State apparatus; those teachers who show revolutionary tendencies are tried or dismissed, etc. (coercive measures).

Or, take the army. Soldiers (and all workers recruited into or serving the army) are specially worked on politically (propaganda); the cadres and organising forces are arranged in a corresponding manner (organisation work); service in the army is compulsory; terrorisation by trial and disciplinary punishments take place (coercion).

We see that in the present setting, with the greater and greater revolutionising of the working class, the bourgeoisie strengthens and widens the use of all of their three main means. But most attention is paid particularly to the first method—*propaganda*. The two remaining methods it tries to keep in the shadow, masking them with particular care.

Why so much attention to propaganda?

The bourgeois propaganda expert, G. Lasswell ("Technique of Propaganda in the World War"), writes that propaganda—"is a concession to the ability of the modern world to reason. Much more can be gained by deception and trickery than by force."

What is *new* in the present propaganda, and in the whole preparation for war, is that the organisations of national-fascism and social-fascism have finally, openly, and on a very wide scale set themselves to work *with their "modern" fascist methods*.

This was excellently expressed by the British Colonel Fuller, the preacher of a mechanised army without masses of soldiers (from workers), inspiring the bourgeoisie with mortal fear: "In this war, which Russia (read—the Soviet Union—F.B.) has been carrying on against us in the course of the last decade, *we have received many psychological blows* and have sustained more than one moral failure. And yet we have not inflicted a single answering blow, because we are not masters of those weapons which could degrade it We have unfolded before us a new tactical field which we shall be forced to work over. And since Russia's aim is to destroy civilisation by setting up one class against another, the remedy must be sought *not only in a similar attack on Russia*,

*but through the removal of the social ills which have developed within our civilisation.”**

Thus, slightly pretentiously and hazily, does the bourgeoisie formulate its orders to Fascism, “smear over, patch up, gloss over the defects and disintegrating portions of the decaying bourgeois order.” And the Fascists, from the most ardent monarchists to the “left” Socialists, patch up and gloss over.

Certainly there exist “nuances” between them. While the national-fascist speaks of strengthening the armed forces for the sake of defending a given country with a particular structure and ruling bourgeois group at the head of the country, the social-fascist demands for the same end the “democratisation” of the armed forces for the sake of defending democratic conquests.

The following are the most characteristic demands of social-fascism which make a pretence of “fighting” the war danger, but actually represent the further strengthening of the system of armed forces: “smallest possible army in the barracks (peace-time establishment); limitation of the stocks of arms which every government will have the right to maintain; short term of service.”

This programme of the social-fascist “fight” against war is actually a struggle for a powerful army for its bourgeoisie; a small army in the barracks, but . . . a reserve army of many millions being trained in the system of the fascist military unions; a small reserve of weapons, but . . . complete mobilised readiness of industry, affording on the outbreak of war the possibility of producing tremendous quantities of the most up-to-date and perfected weapons; a short term of service, and . . . consequently a marked increase in the number of people passing through the army.

* * *

Most concrete and characteristic is the *fascisation of the methods* of preparation for war revealed in the modern system of the construction and preparation of the armed forces.

How are we to estimate the fighting capacity of the capitalist armies?

We must first of all remember, in an investigation of this question, several political lessons which the capitalist countries received in the struggle against the Soviets from 1917-1921 and which they appreciated to a greater or lesser degree. It is very useful for us to know this.

We think that the most important lessons which the bourgeoisie learned and took to heart in its war preparations are the following: The bourgeoisie understood excellently that the struggle of the Russian counter-revolution under the open slogan of a *complete restoration* of the Tsarist

régime was the greatest mistake. It understood the exceptional revolutionising influence (not comparable with any other known example in the history of warfare) on its rear and army, of the struggle against the Soviets. From these two lessons the bourgeoisie drew corresponding deductions: that it was necessary to bury in the archives the monarchical platform of a united Russia, and that it was necessary to try, on the other hand, to come forward as a “champion” of national “emancipation” and the democratisation of the régime of the dictatorship; that it was necessary, finally, to try to “protect” its army with particular care and with special methods against the disintegrating influence that a war against the U.S.S.R. would have on it.

It would be short-sighted, of course, to think that all the measures taken by the bourgeoisie to strengthen its army politically have only in view war against the U.S.S.R. Certainly in the struggle against the Soviets these armies need exceptional political stability, if their masters wish to conquer. But to a no less degree the whole arsenal of means of the political strengthening of the army counts on war among the capitalist countries themselves, and against the oppressed, colonial nations, for the threat of Bolshevism does not exist exclusively in the U.S.S.R.

“With a view to preventing the harmful action of propaganda, the gentlemen of the bourgeoisie fence themselves off with ‘cordons,’ ‘wire-entanglements,’ graciously affording Poland, Rumania, Finland, etc., the honour of protecting the ‘entanglements! . . . But how can people, not desiring to be ridiculous ‘fence themselves off’ from the idea of Bolshevism, if there is favourable ground for this idea within the country itself?” (J. Stalin).

And the capitalists understand this excellently. But the *desire* to neutralise the influence of Bolshevism by their measures for strengthening the army is still no guarantee or solution of the question. Capitalism here finds itself in a blind-alley.

We see that the most contradictory views have existed side by side among bourgeois thinkers during the last years. Some are for an army of machines with a minimum of persons, others for an army of many millions.

Here we must say at once that these seeming contradictions in the views of the military ideologists of the bourgeoisie only reflect the objective contradictions and conditions on which the bourgeoisie must build their army. The “dream” of the bourgeoisie about an “ideal army” is a dream of such an army that would not be subject, or at least subject to a minimum degree, to the influence of the irremovable class contradictions within

* Re-translated from the Russian.

capitalist society, aggravated particularly in times of war.

"The crux of the question does not really lie in the contrast between a 'large' and a 'small' army—imperialism is not up to the task of reducing the army. For imperialism this is a problem of squaring the circle. But the whole *practical* significance of these talks about 'small armies' lies in the search for a *means* of so organising the present capitalist army as to guarantee its reliability to imperialism." (Bubnov).

The thoughts of the bourgeois war politicians and strategists can be formulated briefly in the four following propositions:—

1. The experience of the World War and of the civil war in the U.S.S.R. convinced the bourgeoisie of the weak fighting capacity of modern mass armies, the army disintegrating for political reasons as soon as the revolutionary movement, the class struggle in the country, grows.

2. The bourgeoisie would, therefore, wish to have an army of machines, served by a class-homogeneous staff, by ideological and conscious defenders of the capitalist order.

3. But the modern level of war technique and all the conditions of modern warfare—the power of artillery, the considerable length of fronts, the great power of endurance of the belligerents, thanks to the mobilisation of the national economy, etc.—*does not allow them to be content with an army in which there are "few people and powerful machines."*

4. Consequently, only one compromise is possible—to create an army (a) of a mass character, (b) with a powerful technique, and (c) with great political stability and "resistance" to revolutionary influence.

That the "mass-character" of the army does not stand in contradiction to a high level of technique can be seen at least from the fact that the growth of technique in a definite fighting unit or association not only is not accompanied by a reduction, but, on the contrary, sometimes by an increase in the number of staff. Thus, for example, the American infantry division consisted in 1913 of 24 machine guns and 19,300 men; in 1923 of 754 machine guns and 19,300 men, while in 1930 there were 19,400 men.

* * *

By what means does the bourgeoisie try to attain a politically stable army regardless of its "mass-character"? Does not the "mass-character" of an army mean its recruitment mostly from among the workers and toilers, and in case of countries with many nationalities (as, for example, Poland) from large strata of national minorities?

At the root of all the measures lie the State measures for the further fascisation of the country.

In the preparation for war, Fascism and social-fascism are used to their fullest extent. Without a "peaceful" rear imperialists could not carry on a war. The bourgeoisie takes precautions to ward off whatever organised opposition in the workers there may be to a military policy. Toward this end use is made of the whole arsenal of the fascisation of the country and the working-class movement, the "taming" of the trade union movement and a number of laws (about trade unions in England and elsewhere) and measures "calculated to secure the armed suppression of every class workers' movement immediately war is declared." (Thesis of 6th Congress of the Communist International.)

It is natural that these State measures should be the *main base* on which rests the political stability of the army. The greater the success of the bourgeoisie in Fascism the more reliable a base does it create for its army.

In order to lend its army the necessary political stability the bourgeoisie effects a whole system of measures which can be divided up into two groups—measures of an organisational-political character, and measures of an ideological-propaganda character.

The first group of measures includes, above all, the widespread development of *fascist military organisations and unions*. Their aim is threefold: (1) the creation of military support inside the country for the struggle against the proletariat; (2) the military and political preparation of reliable cadres for the army; (3) the provision of mass military training outside the ranks of the army in order to accumulate a trained reserve.

Zoldan, Fuller and others, in their discussions of the army of the future, place their faith on "strong fellows" on whom, it would seem, alone rests the fighting capacity of the modern army. These "strong fellows" are being developed by the system of fascist unions and associations. A Fascist Polish magazine, the "Strezhlets," ("The Sharpshooter") defines the tasks of these organisations as follow:—

"We must in a planned way, and in good time, extend the network of our influence to include the widest circles of society, so as to embrace not only those who desire to work to-day for their training, but those untrained upon whom the Government will hurriedly call in the days of mobilisation. Every rifleman must try to gain the greatest authority and moral influence in his circle, aspiring to become a leader in his factory, his shop, the village and the school, and even among those who are not important from the point of view of military preparedness. . . This authority offers the possibility of mobilising

millions under the banner of the Government not only in time of war, but in the no less important mobilisation in case of *internal difficulties*."

The Polish Colonel Rovetsky adds to this :

"These semi-military formations or organisations can be adapted after the close of mobilisation for the *further formation of military sections*; their internal unity and great moral value will lend them great significance."

Thus we see that one of the methods of solving the most important problem of the political stability of the army—the problem of "the organising forces" by the methods of a mass character—is the creation of a military-fascist organisation.

It must not be forgotten that military-fascist organisations are precisely the *mass form* of the struggle for political domination in the army. And, as mass organisations, they have their advantages and defects. It must not be thought that the composition of these organisations are uniform as regards their national character. On the contrary, departing from the general principles of fasciation, the bourgeoisie counts as extraordinarily important (and Social-Democracy helps in every way) the enlistment in these unions of as many workers and proletarians as possible. And the bourgeoisie and social-fascists have achieved some success in this. But this is, at the same time, their weak and dangerous spot. With the growth of the revolutionary movement a decreased fighting capacity and even the break-down of these organisations can be entailed.

The bourgeoisie certainly does not limit itself only to these means for solving the problem of the organising forces. The chief means of solving this problem is the creation of cadres of officers and non-commissioned officers. A number of methods have been applied towards this end: the careful class and national selection of officers; the creation of wide reserves of cadres of officers from among the intelligentsia and bourgeois youth (through military training in Universities and high schools); the creation of a reliable layer of professional non-commissioned officers; and a system of privileges and organisational measures in relation to non-commissioned reserves (allotment of land, credit facilities, unions, etc.). It is particularly important to emphasise the creation of large strata of professional cadres; in the French army, for example, the cadres reached 40 per cent. of the entire composition of the army during peace times.

The next group of measures concerns the regulation of the personnel of the army according to class, national, territorial, and other characteristics. Those singled out by revolutionary speeches and thoughts are registered and are used more

carefully. The accumulation in one and the same section of a compact mass of national minorities, etc., is avoided.

Thus, the class selection of officers, the creation of professional cadres of non-commissioned officers, a military skeleton of Fascists and intellectuals, the sifting out of those suspected of revolutionary thoughts, the "dispersing" of soldiers of "dangerous" nations—these are the basic measures which the bourgeoisie of all countries use in order to get out from the enchanted circle,—the inevitable danger inherent in mass armies.

Confusion is created amongst some comrades because the French (Paul Boncour) talk about a national mass army, the English (Fuller) or Germans (Zolden) about a professional, small army. Actually, the French, English and German armies, as well as any other army, follow one and the same path in the principles of construction, and they part ways only in details dictated by the peculiarities of each country. The few differences there are in the construction of the capitalist armies which delude some of our military writers, depend on the peculiarities of the military-strategic situation of such country—such as the insular position of Britain (Fuller does not propose his plans for the colonies); the Versailles shackles on the Germany army (her "hidden force"), etc.

It must be definitely understood that the emphasis is to be placed not on the "mass" character or "small" number of the bourgeois army, but on the methods of the struggle of the bourgeoisie for their fighting capacity. Emphasis must be laid on those measures by which the bourgeoisie try to weaken the inevitable negative side of mass armies, because in modern war it is precisely the strength and *lasting effect* of these measures that decides the question of the revolutionising influence on the fighting capacity of the capitalist armies of war, active political measures taken by the proletariat.

This is how matters stand with regard to the organisational-political measures assuring the fighting capacity of their armies. But the picture will not be complete if we do not mention first the whole system of punitive-coercive measures, terrorising workers and soldiers, terrifying and frightening them away from revolutionary organisations or actions. It is sufficient to follow up the lists of sentences, trials, executions, etc., which are far from completely registered in the revolutionary press of the capitalist countries, occurring in the "practice" of the armies of these countries. And secondly, we must mention the whole system of organisational measures for the isolation and preservation of the soldier masses

(mainly the peasants), from proletarian revolutionising influences, in barracks, or at the front.

The second group of measures (the ideological-propagandist preparation of the masses and maintaining influence over them during war) also proceeds completely from the general policy of the bourgeoisie; the adoption of "new" methods for maintaining their rule (national-fascism, social-fascism).

Bourgeois propaganda appears now and will appear in time of war under a Social-Democratic and national-democratic guise.

The decisions of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, time and time again, with exhaustive thoroughness, emphasised the continued speculation with the hackneyed slogan "defence of the fatherland." It is true, certain "variations" of this general line of the bourgeois and social-fascist deception and ideological submission of the masses were brought about by time. If, in 1914-1918 "democratic" England and France "defended" themselves from "imperialist" and "Junker" Germany, and "democratic" Germany—from "Tsarist Russia" and the "emancipator of the Slav," Russia—from imperial Austria, then now, with the essence remaining the same, the words are changed. Now "democratic" France will "defend" itself against Fascist Italy, "free" England against the "imperialism" of America, and "the freest of the free" America against the "imperialism" of England, the latter against the "attempts" of Chinese bands on the life and freedom of Englishmen in China, etc. And all together, the "democratic countries of the world"—England, America, France, Poland, Roumania, etc.—against "Red Imperialism," against the "enemies of civilisation," against the persecutors of free religion, etc.—against the U.S.S.R.

And what does the fact that the whole ideological-propagandist struggle for the masses and against us, appears under a social-fascist democratic guise, mean?

It means that the bourgeoisie have grown "cleverer" and have buried in the archives as worthless and dangerous, open political struggle for their aims; both in the war among themselves for the subjection of other capitalist countries and in the war against the Soviet Union for the complete "restoration" of the bourgeois order in the U.S.S.R.

The purveyors of political slogans, the organisers and executors of the whole *propaganda* side of the political struggle for preserving the subjection of the masses, and the fighting capacity of the army, are the social-fascist and national-fascist organisations. Social Democracy is the

chief agent in regard to slogans masking the preparation of war against the U.S.S.R. When the rule of the bourgeoisie is menaced by extreme danger it comes forward and plays an open fascist role. Under conditions when the dissatisfaction of the masses against capitalists must be diverted, it acts in the capacity of an opposition party.

Social fascism makes use of its advantage (still retaining considerable political influence over the masses) in order to create and formulate, in case of war and particularly during war, a "public opinion" among the masses such as is desired by the bourgeoisie.

Why is it successful in this? Because there are still strong "tendencies among the working class which to a more or less degree express ideological subordination of the proletariat to the imperialist bourgeoisie, or reflect the ideological influence exercised upon the proletariat by the petty bourgeoisie." (From the *Programme of the Communist International*, Eng. Ed. p. 51.)

Social Democracy tries to find a theoretical basis for its tactics in the question of war (and revolutionary struggle combined with war). The German Social-Democrat Schwartz (for example) declares: "The thesis of the Stuttgart Congress that capitalism is war, is untenable." Kautsky declares:

"There is nothing *false* than the assertion that a lasting international peace can only exist with the accession of Socialism, and that while the capitalist methods of production exist, war is inevitable."

In order to prove his point Schwartz resorts to the following argument:

"Capitalism destroyed feudalism and absolutism, and now it is destroying the very institution of war, and it can attain its ultimate historical victory: the abolition of war as a means of policy."

But the chief means is the dissemination of the ideology of pacifism, the denial "in general" of any war, a struggle against war "in general." The not unknown Austrian Social Democrat, Y. Deutsch, writes:

"Labour Parties have grown powerfully in a majority of countries; in several they have come into power. Everywhere *they will work in order to prevent a solution of the existing antagonisms by means of war.* But if, regardless of that, war breaks out, the Labour Parties, with even greater difficulties than heretofore, will be able to lay down a passive 'no' to their own country. They (the Parties) will have to participate in the war as participators in and organisers of defence."

And the "left" of the "lefts," Paul Levy, speaks even more explicitly.

"Do I desire the defence of the country *prior* to a revolution or only *after* power has been transferred to the proletariat? To this one may answer: *The Socialist always desires to defend his fatherland!*" Such is the "theory" of Social Democracy

which lies at the bottom of all servile work on the ideological "securing" of the fighting capacity of the army and of an obedient rear.

"In place of the theory of the inevitability of war under capitalism, it has substituted the bourgeois deceit of pacifism and the lying propaganda of 'ultra-imperialism'; it has exchanged the theory of the revolutionary downfall of capitalism for the counterfeit coinage of 'sound' capitalism transforming itself peacefully into Socialism." (*Programme of the Communist International*, Eng. Ed., p. 53.)

But the dirty work of the social-fascists is not confined only to their own country. To no less (and perhaps even to a greater) degree, the bourgeoisie need the services of the Social-Democrats in order to call forth amongst the masses in their country a negative attitude to the U.S.S.R.

Now there is no longer the slightest doubt that the social-fascists have taken upon themselves the ideological-political preparation of war against the U.S.S.R. and the political struggle during the war. The social fascists fulfil their tasks with extraordinary energy and it only depends on the "position" taken ("left," "centre," "right," etc.), whether they are more screened or open, more subtle or crude. If the "rights" speak frankly about the defence of their fatherland and hence of the necessity of the working class fighting actively against the U.S.S.R., such sagacious people as Kautsky prove this more cleverly and subtly. To say, for example, directly that the U.S.S.R. is an "imperialist power"—will not be believed. It is necessary to base the struggle against the U.S.S.R. on a struggle for "saving the conquests of the Russian Revolution" from the Bolsheviks.

On what do our enemies try to play in the political struggle for the masses and against the U.S.S.R.? On the illusion of reformism of which the working class of the West has not yet rid itself (hence "the struggle against terror," "the struggle for democracy"); on the furious opposition of the kulaks to Socialist reorganisation of the village, and their attempts to influence groups of peasants. (Hence—"for saving the Russian peasant," "against the destruction of the peasant," etc.). On nationalist dregs and survivals. (Hence — their championing of the nationalist intellectuals and the kulak class) and the religious credulity, the backward strata of the toilers, etc., etc.

It must, of course, not be forgotten, that every country will bring into the whole ideological-political struggle its peculiarities resulting from the policy and the situation of a given country. In the struggle against the U.S.S.R. one set of actions and slogans will be applied by Poland, and different ones by Finland, Roumania, etc.

But it must also not be forgotten that with due regard to all the peculiarities of our direct opponents, it is not they who will define the basic political line of propaganda against us in the future war. This line will be dictated by the expert in this matter, the accomplished and experienced Western-European bourgeoisie, and its not less experienced Social Democracy.

In any case, it is clear that this ideological-political struggle for the masses and against the U.S.S.R. will be tremendous in its scope. One need only look at the extent of the ideological-political struggle for the masses now, before war, in order to understand what will be the dimensions of this struggle in time of war. Almost a complete monopoly of the means and forces of the struggle for the ideology of the masses, the press, schools, intelligentsia, State power apparatus! A "united front" of all groups of the bourgeoisie and all shades of social-fascists in case of war. All this guarantees a wide scope for the struggle for the ideology of the masses and a ruthless suppression of the revolutionary and Communist organisations and their struggle for winning over the working masses and the working class to their side.

Thus the matter stands from the quantitative side. But the qualitative side is considerably more complex for the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie is playing with fire. Is not the Social-Democratic covering of the ideological-political struggle the last weapon in reserve? Furthermore, it is a double-edged weapon.

"By stimulating the growth of the corrupt upper stratum of the working class, however, imperialism in the end destroys its influence upon the working class, because the growing contradictions of imperialism, the worsening of the conditions, of the broad masses of the workers, mass unemployment among the proletariat, the enormous cost of military conflicts and the burdens they entail, the fact that certain Powers have lost their monopolist position in the market, the breakaway of the colonies, etc., serve to *undermine the basis of Social-Democracy among the masses.*" (*Programme of the Communist International*, Eng. Ed., p. 6-7.)

Not without cause do bourgeois propagandist-writers seek the recipe for a more lasting effect, particularly in a state of war, of their propaganda. The bourgeoisie is not in a condition to hide from itself the chief weakness of its propaganda — its *falsity*. Hence all those "revelations" in the nature of the writings of A. Ponsonby:

"The lie represents a generally recognised and extraordinarily effective reflection of war. Some Governments exploit it completely consciously in order to delude their own population, or with the aim of enlisting the neutrals to their side, or finally, in order to mislead their opponents."

The *basic lines* analysed above of the ideological-propagandist struggle of the bourgeoisie for the maintenance of its rule over the masses, pursuing as organisational-political measures the task of dampening, weakening, dulling the sharp fires of class and national contradictions, are completely and wholly adapted within the army to strengthening its fighting capacity. Thus the matter stands with the ideological-propagandist preparation of the masses, with the methods of influencing them in times of war, and a political struggle against the U.S.S.R. Has the bourgeoisie any weapon like our political work in the Red Army? As is known, the bourgeoisie *tries* to ape us and organise something *externally similar* to our political work. They do not accidentally "admire" our political work. They have seen the tremendous effectiveness of this work—during the civil war—in the training and the organisation of the Red Army, in the class education of the soldiers of the intervention armies, in a number of recent "rehearsals" for the coming war (the attack, successfully repulsed, on the Chinese Eastern Railway, provocations in Central Asia, and others).

But between these attempts and our political work there is a profound difference in the underlying principles.

The difference consists in that in the U.S.S.R. the basic interests of the main masses of the peasantry completely and fully coincide with the interests of the proletariat, fighting for these interests through its dictatorship in the shape of Soviet Power, while the interests of the proletariat and wide masses of toilers in capitalist countries are sharply opposed to the interests of the governing class of capitalists.

The more sagacious and frank of the bourgeois writers on the questions of political struggle (or "propaganda" as they call it) do not hide the fact that propaganda is not a new, and hitherto unknown weapon of struggle which only made its appearance during the world war. The crux of the matter is that in that war "propaganda" took on an unexpected and hitherto unprecedentedly wide scope. Propaganda, or more truly, the whole arsenal of means and methods for political struggle, became an indispensable element of war.

But it is characteristic that the bourgeois military investigators of the political struggle cannot explain to themselves the real nature of this struggle or "propaganda." And in their researches they turn their attention, ordinarily, first to the political work in the Red Army.

What interests the bourgeoisie in our political work? Its technique? Its scope? No! *In this respect it is we who have something to learn*

from the bourgeoisie. It would be worth while, at least, to make such a comparison. "The Committee of Social Information" in the U.S.A. issued for the front 1,438 works of art, posters, drawings, etc., while the political administration of the Western Front issued during the whole Soviet-Polish campaign only 39. Or to go by circulation: the same committee issued thirty pamphlets for the front with a circulation of 75,000,000 while the circulation of our pamphlets rarely exceeded 10-15,000.

But the matter does not lie in technique and in material scope. It is not this that attracts the glances of the bourgeoisie to our political work. They are interested, above all, in the, for them, incomprehensible, amazing, bordering on the "marvellous" *ultimate result—the colossal success of our political work.*

We can mention a number of characteristics which the bourgeois military agents attribute to our political work in the Red Army.

For example, the British Colonel Fuller writes:

"Russia established the deadly form of psychological war . . . (for) against Russian methods of struggle our mighty fleet is as effective as a steam hammer against radio waves."

Or take the words from a review in the "Militärwochenblatt" of a German book of a certain Ivanov on the Red Army:

"One must not underestimate the significance of political work on the morale, the discipline, and the training of the army. The results are extraordinary. The army is firmly united and inspired with one aim: to serve in the great work and fulfil its proletarian and national duty. Hence—its good army discipline during duty, hence—the comradely solidarity among heads and subordinates off duty, hence—the urge to study and acquire knowledge, and as a last result, the feeling of self-consciousness and pride in their achievements."

As the reader sees, the bourgeois writers want, in every way, to puzzle out the cause of the success of our political work, but cannot. For it is not given unto them. They cannot understand that the *whole secret* of our success lies not in technique and method, but in the political base on which the Red Army is organised, and hence—in the class content of our political work.

It cannot be otherwise—we are the Party of scientific thought.

Again, and once again, we mention Stalin's classic definition on this point. Answering the question of the Sverdlov students (the worker-peasant Government— an Actual or Agitational Slogan?) he said:

"The formulation of the question seems to me to be somewhat absurd. It appears that the Party can produce slogans which do not correspond with

reality but serve only as a goal, as some kind of clever manoeuvre. Why is 'agitation' mentioned here? It appears that the Party can advance slogans which have not, and could not have a scientific basis. Is this true? Certainly not! Such a Party would deserve but a short existence, to vanish later as soap bubbles. Our Party would then have been, not a Party of the proletariat, carrying out a scientific policy, but empty foam on the surface of political events."

A certain Polish war writer, Lieutenant-Colonel A. Marushevsky, following up our political work and literature on it very painstakingly, writes in "Bellona :"

"Supposing that the educational work being carried on at the present time in the armies of the Western Governments under the name of moral training or cultural-educational work is masked political work, Soviet authors have created for it the term of 'political working up.'"

Yes, we assert, that one must separate and fence off our political work from that carried on in bourgeois countries and armies in just such a term.

Bourgeois "propaganda" is based on lies and treachery. This is not concealed by the "propagandists" themselves. Our political work is scientific and based on objective class truth.

We train the working masses politically on the basis of their objective class interests. The bourgeoisie "work up" the consciousness of these masses, in order to imbue them with their ideology on them and substitute it for their class consciousness, in spite of the objective interests of the toilers.

This must not be forgotten in speaking about the political bourgeoisie's preparation for war.

PREPARATION OF TRANSPORT FOR ANTI-SOVIET INTERVENTION

By A. B.

MEANS of communication have received very serious attention in the military-political plans for intervention against the U.S.S.R. These problems are treated both in the political and trade agreements. The Polish-Czecho-Slovakian Trade Agreement of 1926 is a typical example of this. It binds the contracting parties

"not to plead political complications and not to obstruct rail or other means of transit should one of them engage in war. In regard to the transportation of goods, no prohibitions must be issued for individual groups of merchandise, in particular, products of the so-called war industries."

If such provisions are not included in trade agreements between other countries, they are dealt with in the agreements between their military staffs.

It is enough to limit ourselves to two examples to see clearly the particularly careful work and increased attention that war specialists, diplomatists and general staffs are paying to questions of transport, transit, etc. During 1923-1929 France, Great Britain, Italy and Czecho-Slovakia had already supplied the most probable direct participants in intervention—the western neighbours of the U.S.S.R.—with the following quantities of war materials :—

Light machine guns and automatic pistols	7,500
Rifles	450,000
Heavy frame machine-guns	10,000
Cartridges	400,000,000
Guns	1,800
Shells	1,400,000
Aeroplanes	2,800

In the first year of actual war, with the corresponding growth in the requirements of the armies, imports must tremendously increase. The importation of war supplies (besides that of reserves and their own production) in the first year of the pre-supposed war, for a coalition of these same interventionists, is expressed in the following figures :—

Light machine-guns and automatic pistols	31,000
Rifles	1,300,000
Heavy frame machine-guns	10,000
Cartridges	5,000,000,000
Light guns	4,000
Heavy guns	1,200
Shells	41,000,000
Aeroplanes	1,000
Tanks	1,000

The delivery of goods to belligerent countries, their transport to the scene of military action, the rapid conveyance of armies, has stimulated a definite plan of railroad, highway and port construction and the creation of separate water routes and an increase of tonnage.

All imperialist Governments are involved in a feverish construction of a merchant marine. To-day, no one conceals the fact that the merchant marine will participate in the future war, not only as a means of transportation but as an auxiliary military unit. The "Journal de la Marine Marchande"—the organ of French shipowning circles—ridicules the London Conference on Naval Disarmament, and cites curious and, of course, considerably underestimated figures

on the number of merchant ships which could be converted into auxiliary war vessels :—

Merchant vessels from 6,000 to 30,000 tons, making 15 or more knots :

Great Britain 208 vessels	2,700,000 tons
U.S.A. 57 "	625,000 "
Japan 17 "	173,000 "
France 21 "	145,000 "
Italy 20 "	298,000 "

Vessels more than 30,000 tons, making 20 or more knots :

Great Britain 8 vessels	266,000 tons
U.S.A. 1 "	60,000 "
France 2 "	78,000 "
Italy 2 "	65,000 "

Vessels less than 6,000 tons, making 20 or more knots :

Great Britain 50 vessels	115,000 tons
U.S.A. 4 "	12,000 "
Japan 2 "	10,500 "
France 9 "	18,000 "
Italy 2 "	6,900 "

These figures stand in need of considerable alteration. The American expert, Admiral MacGowder, asserts that 30 per cent. of the British Fleet can already be used to-day for cruisers. In France, with the active participation of the Government, construction has been begun of large tonnage vessels with a speed of 32 knots which, during war, will be converted into light cruisers. The "Journal de la Marine Marchande," already cited by us, suggests "Are not armed merchant vessels of 35,000 to 40,000 tons, with a speed of 27 to 30 knots, worth a cruiser of 10,000 tons?" The new course of American marine policy, a fleet suitable for war at no matter what cost, found expression in the Jones White law of 1926. The Government, while rendering tremendous financial assistance to American navigation and shipbuilding, retains complete control over the activity and the development of the merchant fleet.

The establishment of new lines, the working out of shipbuilding plans and projects for vessels in construction, is controlled by a special Government commission with the direct participation of representatives of the Ministry of the Army and Navy, who have the last word and who refuse to approve projects if these do not meet the requirements of military technique. Such examples could be multiplied, since this line forms the basis of the modern naval policy of all capitalist countries.

These facts and figures are of essential significance in a discussion of the question of the preparation for intervention against the U.S.S.R. In the light of these figures and facts, the hints and abstract declarations advanced *à propos* of the London Naval Conference by two persons : the Rumanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mironescu, and the London correspondent of the "Chicago Daily News," take on a concrete character. The latter wrote in his paper that the Soviet Union seemed to be invisibly present at the Conference, occupying the minds of all its participants.

In an interview published in the Vienna "Neue Freie Presse," Mironescu declared that the London Naval Conference deemed essential increased naval armaments on the part of the Black Sea States, armaments destined for action against the U.S.S.R. This means that the vessels of the merchant fleet will be thrown into increasing the struggle against the U.S.S.R. not only as transports but as military units.

An analysis of the plans for land routes makes obvious their subordination to a single aim : the creation of a base (naval and land) for war supplies in different places and then connection with the countries designated for the role of direct interventionists. On the Baltic Sea, the port of Gdynia is being built, 20 kilometres from Danzig. New sea bases are being built on the Rumanian shore of the Black Sea and Constanza is being re-equipped as a military-naval base. Salonica with its "free zones" was designated in the Anglo-French agreement of 1928 as a chief base for action from the land and the sea against the U.S.S.R.

The construction of railways and highways, particularly in Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia aims chiefly at connecting the corners of this triangular sea base by the quickest and most direct roads with the chief points within the country for the development of war action against the U.S.S.R.

In the present article we can only touch upon railway construction in a very limited way, to the extent that it explains the action of the interventionists in the Baltic, the Black, and Mediterranean Seas. Poland is constructing the Gdynia-Upper Silesia railroad passing through Bromberg, and the first section is already open for traffic. The extremely heavy traffic of the roads passing from Bromberg and Dirschau to Danzig was given as the official motive for the creation of the new railway net. But this does not even convince bourgeois economists. Dr. Herman Steinhardt writes in the "Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv"—the organ of the Institute of World Economy and Sea Transport in Kiel University :

"Naturally, the question arises, would it not be possible to increase the carrying capacity of the railroads from Upper Silesia to the sea port through other, considerably cheaper ways? Much would be gained if the competing German ports of Stettin and Koenigsberg were used for Polish trade." (Vol. 31. 2nd Notebook, p. 600).

The economic advantages of the transport of coal along the railway under construction is denied by another German magazine, the organ of the ship-owning circles "Hanza," which declares that

"the transport of coal will have to be carried out at a loss if Polish coal is to retain its competitive capacity in the Scandinavian market." (December 20, 1930).

A glance at the map is sufficient to convince one of the fact that this railway connecting Gdynia directly with Bromberg, has strategic significance and is

designed for the rapid conveyance of war materials through Gdynia and Danzig coming chiefly from France and recently from Belgium. A well-known French firm manufacturing guns, Schneider-Creusot, which made a loan of one milliard francs to the Polish Government for the further fortification and equipping of military ports and their rear, received the right to exploit the road as security.

"Hanza," hinting at the extraordinary strategic significance of this road, maliciously notes: "It is doubtful whether the Schneider concern is pursuing only business considerations (i.e., drawing from it only economic gains).

The French bourgeois organ, interested in railways, "Le Chronique du Transport," conveys the information in its issue of July 25th, 1930, that:—

"Poland decided to take part in the construction of a railway bridge across the Danube (Rushuk Jurjua), joining the Bulgarian with the Rumanian railways and through these latter with the Polish railway net. The passage through Bulgaria must give access to Polish exports to the Mediterranean Sea through Salonica, and to Black Sea ports. This project interests Rumania as well as Poland since it would receive through Salonica a direct connection with the open sea for the rapid transit of its products to the shores of the Mediterranean Sea and the East."

The organ of Liapchev, the Bulgarian Prime Minister, the "Preporetz," wrote openly concerning this project that:

"the construction of the bridge joining the Rumanian and the Bulgarian railway net (so far not existent since the Danube separated them) will also join the Baltic with the Ægean Sea and will be very significant in case of war of Poland and Rumania with the Soviet Union."

The Bulgarian Government has already begun to realise its plan for a short railway route to Salonica. With this in view, they have already improved the railway from Sofia to Radomira, and are continuing work in the direction of Dupnitz and a project is being worked out for a railway trunk line to go from there to Salonica. There is an agreement for the construction of a railway bridge with the help of foreign capital over the Danube at Orshov (somewhat below Belgrade) between Rumania and Jugo-Slavia in order to join Warsaw and Bucharest with the Adriatic Sea. Other words, only another variant of the means of communication by rail, the aims of which were declared by "Preporetz."

Finally, "The Rumanian Economist" sketches a plan for the reorganisation of the Rumanian railway system for the joining of the Black Sea ports with the land military bases of the anti-Soviet front:

"The railway system of Rumania must be unified, its natural direction is the mouth of the Danube. It is essential to unite the Rumanian ports of the Black Sea with all the bordering points of Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary and Jugo-Slavia. Work in this direction is already going on. The construction of a new railway line between Busai and Kronstadt, for which it was necessary to excavate fourteen tunnels, is a line which represents very special interest for transit through

Rumania. This line directly joins the Czecho-Slovakian border with the river and sea port Braila. The new railway line reduces the distance between the border and Braila by 65 kilometres. What has been done to attract part of the eastern railway traffic of Czecho-Slovakia to the mouth of the Danube, must also be done, and done very quickly, with regard to other neighbouring States."

The significance of the Danube, not only from the point of view of Rumanian anti-Soviet plans, but also from the point of view of the general preparation of imperialist war against the Soviet Union, is emphasised by "Argus," the magazine of economic circles. According to its declaration, the Black Sea shore of Rumania has great significance for Europe, since in case of war it "guarantees a direct connection with sea routes through the Danube."

In its turn, Poland, in the words of "Hanza," is also making great sacrifices in order to organise transit through Constanza as it did in the construction of a bridge over the Danube. About a year ago, a new railway bridge was opened across the Dniester at Zaleshchikov and the railway branch from this point through Rumanian territory up to the Polish station Colomb which strengthened the connection with Lvov-Chernovitsa and Halats.

The apices of this triangle, as we have pointed out above are: the Polish ports and Danzig on the Baltic Sea the Rumanian ports on the Black Sea shore and Salonica on the Mediterranean Sea. In order to understand the planned character of the work for the creation of these sea bases for an attack on the Soviet Union, we must digress slightly from the main theme of this article and refer to isolated parts of these military-political agreements which were the fruit of long and persistent preparatory work chiefly on the part of French diplomacy. Summarising the negotiations, which were carried on in Bucharest and Warsaw in relation to the Polish-Rumanian attack on the U.S.S.R., it must be noted that their results lead to the following conclusions:—

1. According to the French opinion, there is no guarantee that the rapid conveyance of troops from Poland to Rumania and vice-versa along the railway will take place completely without interference, therefore these divisions will be transported by sea to Gdynia, and England and France will take the responsibility of defending the transport ships by sending a definite number of boats to this Polish port.

2. England is beginning to build a military-naval base in Constanza, the Rumanian port for the development of operations against the U.S.S.R.

Work in equipping Constanza as a military-naval base has been carried on feverishly. The official organ of the Rumanian Government, "Independance Roumaine," immediately after the London Conference, announced the successful conclusion of negotiations with Britain on the execution of these constructions. Last summer, the French General

Gurod, inspected the work and expressed his satisfaction with its progress. It was supposed that toward the beginning of this year, the construction of the bases would be finished. One of the first acts of the Maniu Government after the accession of Carol to the throne, was to negotiate with London for a loan of £10,000,000 to be used exclusively for military-naval construction and the equipping of large naval bases. The Paris edition of the "Chicago Tribune," through its London correspondent, asserted that the British shipbuilding industry, which is suffering from economic crisis and absence of orders, is reacting very sympathetically to the Rumanian project and that, together with the firm ready to advance a loan, there are influential elements in the city ready to create difficulties for the Land of the Soviets. Soon after this, a Viennese newspaper announced the construction of a naval base on the shores of Suiglida, to the north of Constanza. The plan for the construction of the base provides for the excavation of a canal between Suiglida and the Black Waters, which will reduce the route for vessels going from Braila to Constanza by three days. The construction is being financed by English-Dutch capital.

Just as clear a picture of preparation for war against the U.S.S.R. is shown by the port construction of Poland. One must also not forget the picturesque expression in the "Kreuzzeitung," which somehow managed to notice that the Baltic Sea is one of those points at which England could directly put the knife at the throat of its Soviet enemy. A bloc of the States bordering on the Baltic Sea is being welded together. Denmark, on whom the passage to the Baltic Sea depends, is deepening the Erezunt in order to permit the passage of deep-water war ships and has already given its consent to the unhindered transportation of arms to Danzig and Gdynia.

One of the acts in the preparation for war against the U.S.S.R. is the building of Gdynia. The construction of a military-naval base at this point widens infinitely the radius of action and the power of the interventionist fleets acting against the U.S.S.R. Gdynia with its modern fortifications, port warehouses, mechanised equipment, storehouses for explosives and military supplies and its great possibilities for military transport, is a powerful base both for strengthening the front and supplying it with war supplies and for military operations on the Baltic Sea. That persistence and haste with which the imperialists have carried on and are continuing to carry on the work in building up this weapon against the Soviet Union, is characteristic.

As far back as 1921, Polish military opinion decided to realise the pre-war idea of the German Naval Command and create a military port in Gdynia. Its protected situation, its depth (10 metres) forced the military specialists to turn their attention to this little fishing village which barely numbered 400 inhabitants

in 1919. In 1923, the Polish Parliament decided to begin the construction of a port there, and in the summer of the following year the Polish-French Consortium under the Schneider Co. began work. The period designated for the completion of the work was the end of 1930, but the intensified preparation for intervention against the U.S.S.R. demanded an acceleration of the work, and already in 1927, in a supplementary agreement, the period was reduced by one year. The first to be ready was the military port.

The Polish Government justified the need for the construction of a port in Gdynia, of course, to commercial considerations. It asserted that the tremendously growing foreign trade of Poland could not be catered for by Danzig, which, according to the Versailles Treaty was to serve the interests of Polish transport. But the figures of Polish statisticians refute these assertions. The economist Steinhardt, whom we have already quoted, comes to the following conclusions:—

"The general increase of Polish foreign trade since 1927 is absolutely insignificant, while the growth of imports and exports by sea routes since 1928 has even ceased. There cannot be, consequently, any talk about the necessity for a new port."

Polish plans for the construction of ports have also in view a port to be constructed directly on the shores of the Baltic with the help of foreign capital. The Ela peninsula, at whose base a seaport has been built, and which is united by rail through Putzig with the main Polish trunk line, will be used for this purpose.

Even this sketch of the preliminary lines of communication for war against the Soviet Union, is quite sufficient grounds on which to judge how important it is for the Communist Parties and revolutionary trade union organisations to concentrate their anti-imperialist work on the defence of the U.S.S.R. on this front. Here we must say frankly that, regardless of significant work done in this respect, neither the Communist Parties nor the revolutionary trade union movement has until now given to work among transport workers, the attention it demands, on account of the ever-growing and accelerated pace of the preparations for anti-Soviet intervention.

The struggle against intervention and in defence of the U.S.S.R. is the regular, composite and inseparable part of the organisational and propagandist activity of the International Committee of Propaganda and Action of the Transport Workers, of the International Sailors and Dock Workers of the revolutionary trade union organisations and minorities, as well as of the International Seamen's Clubs.

The International Red days of the struggle against imperialist war in the defence of the U.S.S.R. have revealed, on the one hand, a vast reserve of revolutionary power of the proletariat, ready to defend the fatherland of all workers, and on the other hand, the

positive results of the exposure campaign on the part of the revolutionary trade unions. Those wide masses of transport workers for whom the preparation of the imperialists for an armed attack on the country which is building Socialism grows clearer with every day, have been aroused. The Marseilles dock workers answered the prohibition of demonstration by the Trotskyist leadership of the federation with a strike, demonstrating their readiness to prevent the transport of arms against the U.S.S.R. In Bordeaux there was actual fighting in the city streets. The Socialist mayor of the city ordered the use of arms. The demonstrators took a hall by force and opened a meeting. The Hamburg dock workers and sailors overcame a detachment of police and armed "Reichsbanner" members trying to stop the demonstrations with arms, etc., e c.

The merchant sailors arranged fraternisation with the navy. Similar occurrences took place between the Hamburg sailors and those of the war-fleets of Sweden, Italy, Spain and the Argentine. The Y.C.L. of Germany, England, and Denmark utilised the visits of warships to Hamburg, London, Copenhagen, Italy, France and Poland, for propagandist purposes. In the proclamations issued on these occasions, the imperialist preparation for war against the Soviet Union and the necessity for all the proletariat to defend the Government of the Proletarian Dictatorship is explained.

The recently organised Red International of Sailors and Dock Workers, utilised the trial of the "Industrial Party" to expose the preparation for intervention against the U.S.S.R. In its proclamations it set forth the concrete tasks of the struggle.

"Not a single gun, not a single shell, not a single gas balloon, not a single tank, not a single aeroplane, etc., must be loaded on or carried by ships built by us or on which we serve, if these materials are destined for the destruction of the conquests of the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union. Prevent the loading and carrying of war materials to the warehouses of imperialist Poland, Rumania, etc.. Organise control committees in the ports, on the railways and on the ships."

The cases cited do not exhaust the list of the propaganda and organisational activities of the revolutionary organisations of the transport workers in the field of fighting against the war danger, threatening the Soviet Union. These are but examples of the vast scope of the work observed in different places and carried on by different organisations.

But it is enough to acquaint oneself with the content of these numerous resolutions with which the international sea-going proletariat answered the exposed plans of the interventionists in order to see its weak side. We shall not be mistaken if we say that, with the exception perhaps, of isolated resolutions, all of them speak of the readiness of the sea transport workers to come to the defence of

U.S.S.R. "in case of an attack on it by the proclamation of war," etc. Here, the insufficient ability of the revolutionary organisations to combine the desire of the masses to defend the Soviet Union with direct organisational activities to-day, and sometimes an opportunist under-estimation of the entire seriousness of the situation is manifested. Hence, the discrepancy between words and deeds : in resolutions—refusal to load arms against the U.S.S.R. actually—daily transport of arms to Gdynia, Danzig, Constanza. And we know of only one case where the decision not to load arms was rigidly adhered to—by the Hamburg dock workers.

This inability to unite the ultimate aims of propaganda with the current tasks of the struggle cannot but have its negative reaction on organisational results. Therefore, all this work very often loses its systematic character, increasing at separate points (the religious crusade, the Koutepov case, the dumping campaign, etc.) and assuming then the character of a campaign. Let us take, for example, Gdynia : after many strikes of the dock workers of November, 1928, the wages were set at 1.20-1.40 zloty an hour, i.e., half as much as was received in the neighbouring city of Danzig. This case of robbing the dock workers by a decrease in wages in order to strengthen the means for the preparation of anti-Soviet intervention should play a large organisational role in the work of fighting against imperialist attacks on the Soviet Union. Or, take another example : The Seamen's International correctly demands the organisation of control committees on ships, but how is this to be done if the French Unitary Federation (C.G.T.U.) for the first time in all the three years of its existence, has only now advanced the slogan for the creation of ship cells—the basis of all work among proletarian sailors. In the French marines, the lower network of the trade union organisations is weak just because of the absence of ship cells, and time and systematic persistent work is necessary if they are to be created. Meanwhile, the sailors of the French merchant fleet must receive particular attention because the command of the military fleet is recruited exclusively from among them. Due to the establishment of the "inscripts maritim," they are both trading and warring vessels. The Sixth Congress of the C.P. of France laid down the necessity of strengthening work in the army and fleet, and to this end, the task of creating organisational cells among the merchant marine and fishermen in order to have the lower organisations of the war fleet prepared.

In this respect, we have something to learn from the bourgeoisie and social fascists. See with what care they organise and preserve reliable and disciplined cadres. Many countries maintain what are called naval reserves. Members of this reserve are recruited mainly from among the crews and the administration

of merchant ships and receive special military training, being periodically called up for training and bound to serve. In the world war, it was disclosed that a very significant percentage of the British merchant marine was made up of members of the "Royal Naval Reserve." Not long ago, at a banquet of the Naval Reserve, the toast was drunk that "the officers and sailors of the Reserve be found, in the coming war, on all types of ships, from the greatest warship to the very smallest motor-boat." After the war, a special club was organised for members of the Reserve, which was to strengthen the military-patriotic spirit of its members, for propagandise and development of the idea of the Reserve and the recruiting of new members. Recently, prize target practice has been organised among the Reservists, who were divided up for the contests by the command according to different ships' companies.

The President of the reactionary American Seamen's Union, Andrew Furuseth, voiced the thought common to all social-fascist leaders of marine trade union organisations :

"Adopt measures for short service, not to exceed a year, in the U.S.A. military fleet of people having had three years' service in the American merchant marine. In the course of this time, teach them how to fulfil fundamentally the duties of marine soldiers. This will assure a labour force for the merchant fleet with the highest qualifications and give a really reliable valuable reserve for the war fleet."

In this connection, it is necessary to dwell on the exposure activities of the revolutionary organisations. We can, to a certain extent, expose the cards of the interventionists who are preparing an attack on the Soviet Union, describe their tactical manoeuvres, and, in favourable cases, point to individual war preparations, but we choose wholly concrete, everyday cases, which are taking place in any port, on any ship.

The question of the Naval Reserve and its significance in the preparation for war is practically untouched in the Press. The participation of the social-fascists in the moral political preparation for war is described, for the most part, in such a general way, that it even loses its definite contours. For example, "Sturm," the organ of the revolutionary German seamen, writes in its last issue that :

"The Amsterdam International Transport Federation, the reformist Seamen's International, remains silent and acquiesces in the preparation of a religious crusade against the Soviet Union."

This is a reflection of the opportunist appraisal of the role of social-fascism, as a passive observer of the preparation for war that is going on. Social-fascism is active, it has joined with the bourgeoisie, and carries on this preparation together with them. Edo Fimmen—leader of this reformist international, spoke only half a year ago, in Gdynia—the citadel of the most reactionary Pilsudskism and the stronghold of the anti-Soviet front of the imperialists. A few months ago, the official organ of the German

Seamen's Union, the "Verkehrsbund," had the impudence to compare the Soviet Union with "Zuchthausland," as the sailors baptised Germany for its navy regulations. This magazine wrote :

"The Bolshevik navy regulations have a devilish similarity with the old Kaiser regulations of ill-fame, for changing which the free union, through the representatives of the organised sailors, is carrying on an embittered struggle."

The aim to discredit the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat is clear. Look, they say, the Kaiser's regulations permitted the captain to beat the sailors, put them in chains, throw them from prison to prison during the whole voyage, arrest them on the boat, deprive them of food, take away their property, etc. These are permitted by Socialist regulations as well. And we, reformist representatives of the organised seamen, struggle with them whether they be kaiser or Socialist inspired. The official organ of the National Seamen's Union of Great Britain, in answer to the proclamation of the International Seamen on the defence of the Soviet Union, in its issue of January 28th, 1931, reprints the infamous slander of the "Daily Mail" about forced labour in the U.S.S.R., just as if it had not noticed the refutation which appeared even in the English bourgeois Press.

What a number of such facts could be cited ! But they frequently remain unanswered in the revolutionary seamen's trade union press. And we must acknowledge that the social-fascists are certainly not silent and do not limit themselves only to acquiescence in war preparation of the interventionists. But the revolutionary trade union press of the transport workers answers the social-fascist slanders too weakly by descriptions of the successes of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., the development and realisation of the tasks of the working-class, possible only in a State of the proletarian dictatorship. But this is the basic element for developing a rigid proletarian consciousness and creating class warriors for the Soviet Union. Under no circumstances should one treat the regime of the proletarian dictatorship, entering upon its fourteenth year of existence, treat Socialist construction, the Five Year Plan, which, in several branches has already been realised in two years, in some, is to be realised in three years, and to be realised as a whole in four years—as a "Socialist experiment" as does, for example, the French seamen's newspaper, "Cri du Marine."

It is impossible to remain silent here about another mistake committed by the same organisation. In the same article, the development of the world revolution is pictured as follows :

"The world revolution goes along two such paths : on the one side, the revolutionary workers' front, fighting for the achievement of the best conditions of life, for the organisation of defence against capitalism, on the other—workers and peasants of the U.S.S.R." . . .

And the same mistake is met in its definition of the character of the Seamen's International :

"Tens and hundreds of thousands of sailors and dock workers, having decided to carry on a really bitter struggle with the furious attack of capital, with the bloody orgy of Fascism, with the heretofore unheard of treachery of the trade union and social-fascist bureaucracy, has formed a really revolutionary International."

Here, the basic task of every revolutionary organisation is missing, i.e., the struggle with the capitalist order, its overthrow and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. With such basic organisational mistakes, the struggle with

intervention against the Soviet Union loses its concrete features. It degenerates into a sentimental expression of sympathy for the Soviet order and a pacifist call to peace, depriving itself of its basic content: the preparation for the overthrow of the capitalist order and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, since in order to convert the imperialist war into a civil war, slogans alone will not suffice. For this, it is necessary to carry on the careful organisation of preparations before the war has begun.

MAIN FEATURES OF BRITISH FACTORY PAPERS

By N. H.

THE following survey of British factory papers covers fifty-three copies of twenty-three factory papers issued during the last five months. Out of these papers, twelve come from the Sheffield district, four from Scotland, two from London and Tyneside respectively, and one from Lancashire, Bradford and South Wales respectively. Eighteen of the papers are published in the mining industry, three in rail-shops or on big railway stations, one in the metal industry and one in the transport. As far as can be seen, only six of them are published by Party factory cells and others by groups of the Minority Movement or by groups of the United Mineworkers of Scotland.

In general they all justify the name factory papers, in so far as they devote more or less space to the everyday grievances of the workers in the enterprise, either in articles or in workers' letters. Not only do they deal with conditions of work, wages, etc., but also with housing and other questions of communal policy of interest to the workers. This shows that the C.P.G.B. and the revolutionary opposition certainly have through these papers good and direct contact with the workers which is one of the basic elements for successful mass work. Another good feature revealed by the papers is the growing attention paid to international questions, also in the everyday work. No less than twenty-eight of the fifty-three copies examined contain special short articles or notices on international matters, out of these twenty-two deal mainly with the Soviet Union and the war danger. The agitation for the defence of the Soviet Union could be said to be fairly good. Not only do the papers understand how to compare workers' conditions in Soviet Russia and England fairly well, but in addition during the last months some of them have started to publish special correspondence from the U.S.S.R.

Unfortunately, in concretising and carrying through the policy of the Party and the M.M., the papers are weak and this is the most basic weakness of the factory papers.

How Do They Prepare for Struggles?

Let us for instance turn our attention to the eighteen papers published in the mining industry and see what role they played in the preparations for united strike action in the coalfields. The *Thorne Butty Squasher*, which in general must be said to be one of the best factory papers, in the issue of October 10th, 1930, writes about the threatening wage-cuts and spread-over, and concludes:

"Only by united action can the miners defeat the wage-cuts and the spread-over, which the owners and their lackeys, the trade union officials, are trying to force on them."

There is nothing false in this statement, no deviations of any kind, But it is so remote and abstract. It does not say what we mean by united action, neither what the miners in Thorne should do to achieve it. And those are exactly the things that must be hammered into the minds of the workers. If not, when the time for action is due, the workers will not follow us because they do not know our line of action.

In the *Thorne Butty Squasher* for November 21, 1930, a concrete lead is given. The miners are told to "form Pit Committees, send militant delegates to all conferences," and some good general demands are put forward; but which conferences and for what purposes the conferences are called is not stated. Here it was possible also to issue the call for a meeting to elect delegates instead of merely issuing this general slogan and leaving all further action to chance.

In its issue of December 19, 1930, the *Thorne Butty Squasher* attacks the reformist leaders of the M.F.G.B. for their betrayal and argues on these grounds for the setting up of independent leadership. But here again there is nothing concrete to show why independent leadership must be established just now, no programme of action, no demands, only a vague warning: "for the attack is coming." Far better would it have been for the *Butty Squasher* to put before the workers the concrete issues for the solution

of which the independent leadership must be established.

The *Denaby and Cadeby Rebel* of January 1, 1931, writes in a leading article after attacking the M.F.G.B. leaders :

"... they desire to break the unity of the miners in the pits—to play off . . . all counties against each other in order to prepare the wage-cuts and the spread-over. Therefore the need for unity is greater than ever."

The paper is of course correct. But what unity, on which bases and under what leadership is it to be established? These most important questions of the role of the M.M. and Committees of Action, which must be answered if we want the workers to understand and follow us, the paper does not mention. The *Bentley Turnplate* of December 24, 1930, writes :

"Miners of Yorkshire, follow the example of the Russian workers, close up the ranks, build unity committees with the railwaymen. Unite the working-class movement in fighting for the Workers' Charter."

What purpose should the unity committees serve, how to build them and why and how the giant task of uniting the working-class movement must be undertaken, the Bentley miners are certainly interested in knowing. But the *Bentley Turnplate* apparently sees no need of giving a concrete lead in answer to these questions. Such abstractions bring no results.

During the Scottish miners' strike in December, 1930, only the *Lamp* (Dawdon) and the *Lamp* (Mosley Common), which in comparison with all the other 16 pit papers are very good, reacted well and called for solidarity. And this they did in a very good way, formulating demands and calling on the workers to fight for them in solidarity with their Scottish comrades. Other papers like the *Silvester Rebel*, No. 20, gives a weak call for solidarity because "to save them is to save yourselves."

It is worth while mentioning that a paper like the *Harworth Spark* in its issues of January 1 and 30 and February 1, has not a word to say either about the South Wales strike or any lead to give for March 1, when the old agreements terminate in a number of mining districts.

Of the railway papers examined, the *Northern Star*, No. 3, the *L.M.S. Rebel* of January 2, and 23, and the *Colwick Call* of January 2, 1931, have not a single word to say about the miners' fight.

More quotations similar to those above could be given from many of the papers examined, and, with the two exceptions mentioned, they would all show the same, viz., that the agitation for the Party and M.M. policy carried out in the daily work of the organisations is very weak and abstract and needs correction if success is to be achieved.

Treatment of Every Day Grievances.

Of further importance in preparation for the big struggles is the question how the papers react to daily small local issues in the pit and factory which the

paper serves, i.e., what kind of a lead do they give to the workers in their everyday economic and political grievances. It is here that we have to carry out the main struggle with the reformists, it is here we have to conquer the independent leadership and prove the correctness of our policy and our ability to lead the workers. And just here our weakness, as expressed in the factory papers, is the greatest. It seems that the comrades in the editorial boards do not consider it a necessary task of the C.P.G.B. and the M.M. to give a lead to the workers on every-day grievances. When the comrades themselves write about the workers' grievances, they just relate them and state like the *Harworth Spark* of December 19, 1930 :

"This method (of dumping stone dust in heaps) saves the company paying the wages of the men that should be employed to do this work."

This certainly must be said, but above all we should tell the workers what to do in order to make the company stop this method, And we should certainly not, like *The Maltby Flatsheet Guide* of January 23, 1931, end an article with a question to the workers :

"What is the reason the men are not enforcing the usual travelling time instead of having to rush towards the pit bottom at the knock, under this new method?"

In all earnestness one could answer the M.M. group which publishes *The Guide*, that the reason may be that they nor anybody else has perhaps taken the trouble to organise the workers to fight against "this new method."

Workers' Correspondence.

The quotations already made give the impression that our comrades only think of merely voicing the workers' grievances, of being a forum for them. And that this impression is correct can very clearly be seen in the way the papers utilise workers' correspondence. Very interesting workers' letters appear on many questions, such as violation of the Mines Act, wage-cuts, unemployment, etc. Our papers publish them but either make no comment or entirely inadequate ones.

The *Torch* of December 12, 1930, contains five workers' letters. One worker writes about the miners paying blacksmiths for pick sharpening and the company utilising the smiths for other work, or that the miners cannot get their picks sharpened. Here is apparently a grievance which means something to the workers, not getting their picks sharpened means not only that they are cheated of something for which they have paid, but it means also harder work. The duty of the *Torch* was here to raise at least a demand for getting picks sharpened as paid for, perhaps also a demand for pick sharpening at the cost of the company and to show the workers how to get it. The duty of the comrades behind the *Torch* was to organise so that the workers get their demand carried through. The

Torch has nothing to say, and so apparently the comrades also failed to show in this very concrete case that they were fighting for the workers and organising their fight. The other three letters also received no comment. Apparently here are three more cases where our comrades failed to show that the Party is the leader of the working-class.

In *The Silvester Rebel*, No. 21, a miner's wife writes about her husband's small wages and how her furniture is taken away for unpaid rent. She apparently inclines to the view that it is the fault of her husband and the other miners, so she ends up with the question: "What are our men made of?" The Editor answers: "Some jellyfish and glue." This answer may be very witty, but it is certainly not the answer a Communist should give a miner's wife when she brings her trouble to him.

This incorrect method of commenting, or failing to comment, applies to all the papers examined, with the exception of *The Lamp* (Dawdon) and *The Thorne Butty Squasher*, which tries to give a concrete lead in every case, and in some instances do it very well. The lack of a lead to the workers in their everyday grievances, is then, as already said, general and indicates clearly that the political line of the C.P.G.B. and the M.M. is yet far from being understood among their membership and that this has to be achieved if we really want to solve our task of conquering the independent leadership of the workers.

The Question of Independent Leadership.

In connection with the question of conquering the independent leadership it is also clear, that we still have to combat the strong remnants of the pre-Ninth Plenum line in the local organisations. The *Denaby and Cadeby Rebel* of January 23, 1931, asks about the miners' home coal if it is not "time that the local T.U., leaders took this question up with the management" and tells the miners re another question that if the management does not "put it right, report to your union committee and see that they take it up." Somehow, however, this gentle "Rebel" does not feel quite sure that the T.U. leaders will do any good, therefore it adds:

"If your T.U. branch committee is not active enough, get your pit committee formed."

The same false line finds a still stronger expression in the *Edlington Lamp*, No. 1 (the paper has no date, but must, according to its content, have been published in the end of November or the beginning of December, 1930). In an article headed "The Top Question," this paper writes:

"The union leadership may not have adopted the right policy in the matter, but the rank and file have not been sufficiently interested in the matter either to press the leadership to adopt a different policy which they can adopt."

This reformist leadership which according to the quoted M.M. paper "may not have adopted the right policy," and which can be pressed to do what the workers want, must indeed be a very nice one. At least according to the *Edlington Lamp* which continues its advocacy for it:

"... where it comes to an issue where the management do not intend to give way if they can help it, the branch officials are told that they do not represent the majority of the men."

The *Edlington Lamp* has really discovered the egg of Columbus for the reformist officials. Nobody can come and tell them, that they are no good, that the workers lose wages, get longer working hours and worse conditions because they prevent them from fighting. They have the words of the M.M. pit paper for that, everything is the fault of the lazy workers who do not organise in the branch and give the reformist officials a chance to represent the majority of the men.

After all this, the reformists will certainly forgive the *Edlington Lamp* for the following agitation for the M.M. made at the end of the same article:

"If there are some who consider that the whole national organisation of the miners as it stands to-day under the political leadership of the Labour Party is not the efficient fighting organisation which it should be and is operated on the wrong lines, then they should join the National Miners' Minority Movement."

Such mistakes as these are of course so much more serious when they, as in the case here, are made in a situation when we are trying to bring the workers up on our line against the reformists. It is as clear as can be, that when we under such circumstances recommend the local reformist trade union bureaucrats as working-class leaders, when we tell the workers to go to them with their grievances, we destroy every chance of getting the workers to follow us in the bigger fights.

Approaching the reformist leaders with demands must serve as a means of exposing their anti-labour essence, their inability and disinclination to put up a fight for the interests of the working class.

In connection with this it must be pointed out that other papers, through their failing to comment upon workers' letters, sometimes give voice to real reformist ideas, which especially in the time of struggle are liable to cause much confusion. In the *Silvester Rebel*, No. 21, a "Disgusted Y.M.E.'er" writes about the Scottish miners being on strike:

"... seeing that we in Yorkshire remain at work, do you not think it would be best for them under the circumstances to return back to work and try to get the miners throughout the whole country to prepare to make a fight of it in February."

If the editor thought anything about that, if he for instance, thought that the Yorkshire miners should not remain at work as the reformist had told them, but come out and fight together with their Scottish fellow workers, or if he thought that "Disgusted

Y.M.E.'er" preached defeat of the Scottish miners, he kept it very closely to himself.

In the *L.M.S. Rebel* of January 23, 1931, somebody proposes the distribution of unemployment among the railway workers :

"I consider it would be fair to all shopmen if the company were to adopt four days a week, some of the shops are losing it (?). Also it would keep us off the unemployment benefit. I think the company would be dealing fair play all round to the workers."

It is quite clear that this proposal would only bring benefit to the capitalists. The workers would all be working four days and getting wages only for four days, and the capitalists and their State should not need to pay any unemployment benefit. But yet the comrades publishing the *L.M.S. Rebel* do not think it necessary to make a single line of comment. That is a mistake. Our factory papers are not forums for false ideas. They should be organisers and leaders of the workers' struggle. And to be this they must strongly combat opportunism, especially when it tries to pop into their own columns.

On the Charter Campaign.

Let us now look at the role of the factory papers in carrying through the Charter campaign. Some papers conduct very good Charter agitation, but as can be understood from what is already said about the weak or non-existent lead in the everyday grievances of the workers, this activity on the part of most papers is none too good.

In twenty of the fifty-three copies, the Charter is not mentioned at all. In others it is mentioned in form of a slogan : "Fight for the Workers' Charter !" or in a song : "Solidarity must be our slogan, the Workers' Charter be our creed !" In others again, all one can see about the Charter campaign is a notice telling "every miner" that he ought to know that the Charter Movement is growing and Charter Committees are "springing up." If anybody's curiosity should be raised by this method of agitation and he should want to know something more about the mysterious Charter, the editor advises him :

"Ask the militants what the Workers' Charter is, that is causing so much discussion throughout the country."

Only two papers, *The Lamp* (Dawdon) and the *Holloway Bus Worker* have understood how to link up the Charter with the workshop and pit grievances and concretise its demands accordingly. All the others agitate for the Charter in a very general and abstract way, by putting the Charter demands at the end of a leading article, or by mechanically just publishing the Charter demands and calling the workers to fight for them. Also no paper, with the exception of *The Lamp* (Dawdon) and the *Holloway Bus Worker*, thinks of linking up the agitation for the Charter campaign with its solidarity appeals for the Charter fights that are already going on. The fight for the Workers' Charter seems to be looked upon as

something which is going to be carried out in the future, when all the forces of the working-class are rallied, and no understanding is revealed of the fact that the working-class has to be rallied in hundreds and thousands of small fights for the Charter demands.

The question of how to fight for the Workers' Charter is badly or not at all answered. *The Silvester Rebel*, No. 20, for instance, writes about the Charter demands :

"This can only be achieved by a revolutionary leadership, forming councils of action, councils of aid and strike committees under the guidance of the National Minority Movement which is reflected in the Workers' Charter."

This is generally correct, only it must not be stated in this abstract way.

Recruiting for the Party.

In closing it is necessary to devote a few lines to the factory papers and recruiting work. With regard to the Party, this work is very bad. Most papers say nothing about the existence of the C.P.G.B.; in others, the word Communist is just mentioned. Only two papers make any effort to help in recruiting work. *The Lamp* (Dawdon) tries in an article to convince a worker why he should join the Party. The other paper, *The Thorne Butty Squasher*, publishes a form: "Join the workers' Party that fights." Let us hope that the workers know they mean the Communist Party. With regard to the M.M., things stand a little better. The name of the M.M. is frequently mentioned and the workers are called upon to join it. Very seldom, however, is it clearly explained why they should join it. Good recruiting work is only made for the United Mine Workers of Scotland. The papers published in connection with, or under the auspices of, this organisation, utilise every chance to tell the workers to join it, and do it on concrete issues.

The factory papers as mirrors of the daily work of the Party and the M.M. show us that there are many mistakes and shortcomings to be overcome. Many can be explained by the fact that the comrades working as editors of factory papers have not as yet gained as much knowledge and influence as they have revolutionary will and enthusiasm. But a greater reason is the under-estimation of the tasks of organising and leading the workers in the everyday struggles.

A monthly or possible fortnightly review of the factory papers should be published, either in some of the Party organs or as a separate bulletin, where a comradely criticism of all mistakes and shortcomings should be given, together with concrete examples of how to work, and where also practical organisational questions of the trade union and cell work can be discussed. In this way, practical aid can be given to the local comrades in this good work and excellent mass weapon of the Party.

UPPER DIGOUL

A Monument of Dutch "Civilisation" in Indonesia.

By P. DE GROOT (Amsterdam)

THE purpose served by the plains of Siberia for Russian Tsarism, and the islands of Lipari for Italian Fascism is served by Upper Digoul for Dutch domination in Indonesia.

In the dark days at the end of 1926 and the beginning of 1927, when the revolt of the oppressed masses in the islands of Java and Sumatra had been drowned in blood, the Dutch imperialist butchers loosed their dastardly vengeance on the revolutionaries who had caused them such hours of supreme disquiet.

The insurgents in hundreds were mowed down by arms or hanged by "judicial" decree, without the pretext of a trial. With the noose on their necks, they died with the cry on their lips, "Hidoupla Communis," (Long live Communism). Thousands of them filled the prisons, where, according to the Government, there are still 2,600 up to the present day. But this was not sufficient for the Dutch "civilisers." They wished to wipe out completely the revolutionary organisations, both the Communist Party and the National Revolutionary organisation of the Sarekat Rajat, by getting rid of the "dangerous" cells. Relying on "extraordinary powers," almost 2,000 persons suspected of belonging to these centres and against whom no definite charge could be made, were deported by administrative decree.

As a place for deportees, the Government chose the "sub-department" of Upper Digoul in Central New Guinea. On the banks of the River Digoul, places were cleared in the virgin forest inhabited only by wild Papuan tribes. In this "least civilised part of the world" according to their own admission, Dutch imperialism wished to bury the colonial revolution of Indonesia.

AN OFFICIAL REPORT.

In April, 1930, three years after its foundation, the Dutch Government sent a member of the Governmental Council of the Dutch Indies, Mr. Hillen, to Upper Digoul to look into the situation.

The motive of this mission is not clear.

Probably, the Government began to find the cost of the camp a little too high. In fact, according to the calculations of Mr. Hillen, the camp at Upper Digoul costs the Government about £82,500 a year.

As the avarice of the Dutch bourgeois shopkeepers is the only passion which might moderate their cruelty, we may justifiably consider this

to have been the initiative for Mr. Hillen's journey.

Mr. Hillen sent a written report which was discussed in the Chamber of Deputies. From this document, in spite of the natural camouflage of an official report, we can gain an idea of the situation of our comrades who are interned there. Above all, by its conclusions we can let the international proletariat judge the barbarism of Dutch imperialism, which wreaks its vengeance on hundreds of poor peasant and workers, of whom they are forced to state now, after three years of indescribable suffering, that they are absolutely "innocent," even in their eyes.

THE CAMP AND ITS INHABITANTS.

In his report* Mr. Hillen describes the situation of the camps as he found them.

There are two encampments, one called Tanah Merah, the other called Tanah Tingih. In all, there are 1,175 people interned with their families who followed the interned into exile. Upper Digoul contains 2,000 people. The interned are classed in five categories:—

Working on Government service	110
Day Workers	380
"Naturalists"	225
Tanah Tingih	70
Living at their own expense	350
Invalids	40

Those working on Government service are internees who by their conduct have won the confidence of the commandant and who perform the duties of police agents, telephone employees, instructors, etc. They receive a small salary.

The day workers are internees who carry out clearance work for the Government. They receive one Dutch florin per day. Those who live at their own expense are the internees who have still resources of their own or who work for others. The "naturalists" are those who persist in the policy of non-co-operation, even in exile. They refuse to work for the government. Seventy of the internees are isolated from the others at Tanah Tingih, several kilometres away. They refuse all contact with the authorities and refuse to work.

* Report of Mr. W. P. Hillen, member of the Council of the Dutch Indies, to His Excellency the Governor-General, concerning the camp at Upper Digoul. Weltevreden, July 22nd, 1930.

The "naturalists" and the Tanah Tingihites receive a ration valued at twelve Dutch florins a month (about £1). We shall see what this means in relation to the prices of commodities at Upper Digoul.

Most of the internees belong to the intelligentsia, or semi-intelligentsia, old employees and instructors. There are only 5 per cent. of peasants among them. The average age is 32. In addition to the internees, Upper Digoul is occupied by a garrison of six Infantry Brigades with officers, N.C.O.'s, etc. At the top there is all the government machinery, two assistant residents, a military commandant, a police superintendent, two military doctors, etc. Each of the "big bugs" gets at least a thousand Dutch florins a month.

CONDITIONS OF LIFE AND WORK.

The cost of living is high in Upper Digoul.

The prices mentioned by Mr. Hillen in his report are exorbitant for Indonesia. Dried fish costs one florin per kilogram, an egg costs 10 to 12 cents, a banana 10 to 12 cents, a cucumber 60 cents, a fowl 2.25 florins, cocoanut oil .75 florins a litre, salt .32 florins a kilogram; vegetables and fruit are excessively dear. The common food, katjang idjou, costs .4 florins a kilo.

In view of these prices, we can imagine what is represented by a wage of one florin per day, or a ration valued at .4 florins per day which is received by the "naturalists" and the Tanah Tingihites, or the subsidy of 20 florins a month received by the invalids.

To avoid dying completely from hunger, and since they have no longer any money to obtain commodities, the unfortunate people try to get some vegetables from their little plots of barren land. The land is sterile at Upper Digoul. The Government tried to utilise the labour of the internees to clear land for sowahs (rice fields), but without any result except that of torturing the interned day workers. Mr. Hillen stated himself that this work is too severe for people unaccustomed to work in the fields.

MALARIA AND BLACK-WATER FEVER.

"Tanah Merah and Tanah Tingih are haunts of malaria," coldly states Mr. Hillen in his report. Tropical malaria is rampant, followed by black-water fever. Mr. Hillen reports that at the beginning of 1930, there were 360 suffering from fever in February, 162 in March, 147 in April, and 136 cases of malaria in May. Thus, in February, 17 per cent. of the population were suffering from malaria. The previous year, the percentages varied from 15 to 17 in winter, and

6 to 14 for the rest of the year. From July 1st, 1928, there have been 72 cases of black-water fever per year. In all, there were 159 cases up to May, 1930. No fewer than 14 persons have died of black-water fever, 13 have died of malaria in 1929 and 4 more in the first five months of 1930. These are the official figures given by the military doctor. There is no guarantee of exactness. For that matter, Mr. Hillen speaks only of the internees. From another official source, "Government Communications," in May, 1929, we find that the mortality among children at Upper Digoul was 95.67 per thousand during the first year of the internment and 49.75 per thousand during the second year. From the end of March, 1927, to the end of February, 1929, 32 children died out of 64 who were born. This gives a 50 per cent infant mortality.

Dutch imperialism is acting like the God of the Old Testament, and is carrying out its vengeance to the third generation!

After this, we need not inquire as to the general state of health of the internees. Mr. Hillen himself quotes the book of the English doctor, Manson (Tropical Diseases) that patients suffering from black-water fever must be immediately sent away from the infected area for a period of a month to a year. Mortality from the disease is very high.

Naturally, the internees are not sent away at all; they must remain at Upper Digoul where a painful death inevitably awaits them. The Government is always "attempting to improve matters." "We should not go by the English proverb of killing the Communists by inches," says Mr. Hillen. What a good Government! It gives quinine to the internees to make them more or less immune. The fact that Mr. Hillen himself caught malaria at Upper Digoul proves that the remedy is not efficacious against malaria. It is necessary to take at least .6 grammes a day without a break for several years. But this means to be poisoned. Of course the Government does not like to kill the Communists by inches! It adopts the better practice of killing them by yards!

THE "REFRATORIES."

The Tanah Tingih camp is reserved for the "refractories." These are the people who not only declare themselves, like the "naturalists," in spite of all punishments, to be the open enemies of the Dutch régime, but those who also refuse to do any work for it, and who abstain from any contact with their oppressors.

In his report, Mr. Hillen describes his visit to Tanah Tingih. He entered it, accompanied by

half a dozen of the "big cheeses," the Commandant, the Assistant-Residents, etc. But the internees took no notice of them, pretended not to see them, and certain of them expressively turned their backs. The military doctor gave out that he was making a visit to the internees, but no one came to him. Proud and implacable, the internees have the strength, in spite of years of suffering, to show their deep hatred for their jailers. They understood the purpose of Mr. Hillen's visit. They were aware that he had the power to propose to the Government to liberate them. A docile attitude would have opened for them the prospects of liberty, of deliverance from the hell of Upper Digoul!

But they persisted in their magnificent hate, they preserved an attitude worthy of the oppressed classes of Indonesia in face of the representatives of imperialism. Our prisoner comrades of the anti-imperialist war did not flinch. They showed, these 70 "refractories," of Tanah Tinggi, with their wives and children, the irreconcilable determination of the exploited masses of the workers and peasants of Indonesia, to fight to the end against the yoke of the Dutch bourgeoisie. But this spirit of struggle is not confined to the internees in Tanah Tinggi.

In September, says Mr. Hillen, 200 internees in Tanah Merah demonstrated against a reduction of rations for those who refused to work for the Government. Thirty of them were imprisoned. For there is also a prison in the great prison building of Upper Digoul, a barrack where the sun of New Guinea burns through the galvanised iron roof. It contains regularly at least thirty prisoners who are being punished for negligence at work, relates Mr. Hillen.

ESCAPES.

During the existence of the camp, 67 internees in all have risked attempts at escape. They have all miscarried.

Most of the fugitives were obliged to return after wandering vainly in the virgin forest, hunted by wild Papuans, without food or water.

At the beginning of this year, some of them reached British territory. The authorities, representing the MacDonald "Labour" Government, as good colleagues of the Dutch imperialists, arrested them at Thursday Island and handed them over to their jailers. A Dutch Government vessel came triumphantly to Thursday Island to carry them back to Upper Digoul! Four fugitives are missing. It is not known whether they have died of hunger and starvation or whether they have fallen under the arrows of the Papuan tribes who form the "natural" guard

around the camp. Digoul is the torture chamber of Dutch "civilisation."

What a touching solidarity between the head hunting savages* and the most Christian Government represented at the League of Nations in Geneva by the Junker Mr. Loudon.

THE INNOCENTS.

Mr. Hillen questioned 610 internees, almost half of them. He states that most of the internees have not the slightest notion of the meaning of Communism or the Communist Party or the Sarekat Rajat. Hillen also states of a considerable portion of the inhabitants of Tanah Merah that "the motive for their internment is not solidly founded." He timidly touches on the "possibility of error committed in good faith" as a result of the "great haste" with which the local government had to act "in order to obtain the desired effect on the population." "My investigations gave me the opinion," says Mr. Hillen, "that the question of internment has in reality been carried too far in certain quarters."

He proposes to set at liberty during the next two years 412 of the 610 internees whom he examined.

Thus, men, women and children are sent to the horrors of Upper Digoul. They are exposed to tropical malaria, to black-water fever, quinine poisoning. They are forced to work to the limit of their powers for a wage of a florin a day, the value of a kilogram of dried fish. They are allowed to die of hunger, to be devoured by illness! And after three years, a gentleman is sent who questions them and concludes that they are treated thus "without well-founded motives" because of "great haste"!

This is a gross lie which is used by Mr. Hillen for the purpose of excusing the Government which is guilty of the torture not only of those who have committed the crime of adopting the slogans of the Communist Party of Indonesia, but of others who have not even done this!

In the Chamber of Deputies at the Hague, in the session on October 21, 1930, the Minister of Colonial Affairs, de Graaff, stated that the internments took place for a period of three years, and that there is no question of haste whatever or of "errors" on the part of the local decorated scum.

On the contrary, the Minister states coldly that the "operations" were carefully controlled by the director of "justice," by the Council for the Dutch Indies and by the Government itself.

* The Papuans have the amiable habit of cutting off the heads of their enemies from other tribes and of any other person who does not please them.

TOWARDS THE LIQUIDATION OF UPPER DIGOUL?

In his report Mr. Hillen proposes the gradual liquidation of the camp at Digoul. Apart from some hundreds whom he proposes to liberate in two years, he wishes to transfer the "refractories" to another locality which will be "more healthy" but above all, less expensive. In the discussion in the Chamber, the Social-Democrats associated themselves with these propositions.

The Dutch social-imperialists in Indonesia after the insurrection demanded the hanging of Communist "assassins." "Het Volk," the organ of the Social-Fascist party in Holland, directed by the "good" Mr. Albarda, formally defended the right and the duty of the Government to set up the camp of Upper Digoul "in the interests of the order and safety . . . of the Indonesian population"!

This does not prevent their adopting an indignant pose and demanding from the Government the liberation of those who are "innocent" in the eyes of a member of the Indonesian Government such as Mr. Hillen, and the transfer of the "refractories" to a "healthier" internment camp. These hypocrites at the same time, naturally declare themselves against the propositions of the Communist fraction in the Chamber, who demand immediate and total amnesty, the immediate and complete liquidation of the Upper Digoul, all

other camps, and the repeal of "extraordinary powers."

Meanwhile, the Dutch bourgeoisie do not think of changing their colonial practice. Through the mouth of their Minister of Colonial Affairs, they declare that "the institution of internment is necessary in Indonesia in the interests of order and public quiet. . . . "There is necessary," says His Excellency de Graaff, "a preventive institution of a political character which has been considered necessary for dozens of years and of which the necessity is confirmed in practice." (Chamber of Deputies, October 21st, 1930.)

Immediately after the rebuff given by the Hillen report, the Government liberated 219 of the "innocents" and gave the order to make plans for a new internment camp.

But the most cruel oppression and exploitation of the masses of Indonesia, of which the camp at Upper Digoul is only a characteristic episode, continues and sharpens under the influence of the unprecedented economic crisis.

The real and active support of the proletariat of Holland and of the whole world is necessary to help the workers and poor peasants of Indonesia to organise their struggle and to march, along with them, for the immediate liquidation of the camp at Upper Digoul and the "extraordinary rights," for a complete amnesty and for final liberation from the yoke of imperialism.

INTERNATIONAL CONTACTS OF THE PROLETARIAT

(The experience and practical proposals of the Kharkov-Mechanical Works)

THE Vth Congress of the R.I.L.U. set before the International Committees of Propaganda and Action (I.C.P.A.) the task of internationalising strikes and the workers' movement of the whole world. The Vth Congress confronted the movement with the task of converting the I.C.P.A.s into real revolutionary Internationals of various industries, the main basis for the solution of these acute questions for the revolutionary trade union movement has in the establishment of international proletarian contacts.

The Stalin Electro-Mechanical Works at Kharkov (G.E.Z.) has during last year maintained close proletarian contacts with the workers of the Berlin A.E.G. Works. *During this year, the workers of this factory have sent over 300 individual and collective letters to Berlin and about 480 copies of the German edition of the journal "The U.S.S.R. In Construction."* They received a delegation from the A.E.G. in May and invited two A.E.G. workers to a Soviet

health resort. A great deal of work has been carried out among our workers along the lines of international education.

We are now extending our contacts with the workers in the biggest electric plants in the world; e.g., Alsthom (Paris), Brown-Bowery (Vienna), General Electric (America).

On the strength of the experience of international work in our factory, we wish to make some proposals of how to arrange international contacts in capitalist concerns.

The fundamental principle of work for international education in the factories is to instill the international idea in all the work in the factories, because every factory in the U.S.S.R. and every factory nucleus of revolutionary trade unions in capitalist countries should be equally fortresses of the international revolution.

One of the forms of international education is to be found in *International proletarian contacts*. These contacts must be brought about, not only between the workers of capitalist and Soviet fac-

tories, but also *between the workers of capitalist factories in various countries*. Such contacts must be organised between factories of a similar type (i.e. producing the same commodity).

We must bring about contacts between each factory in Germany, France, England, etc., and several other factories. It would be a good thing if these contacts, especially in capitalist countries, corresponded to the organisation of international industrial cartels. Such "proletarian cartels of international contact" (if it might be so expressed) would undoubtedly play a great political rôle.

There is no doubt that properly organised international education will assist us in carrying on the revolutionary struggle. Therefore we propose to introduce another form of mass work into the organisational scheme of work in the factories—*groups of international contact*.

After the example of the G.E.Z. Works, we propose to organise in all factories *factory groups of international contact*, into which should be enlisted voluntarily the workers, their wives, the youth and the unemployed. In capitalist undertakings, it is of great importance to include members of reformist trade unions, Catholic unions, etc., in these groups. We must aim at making the factory groups of international contact in capitalist firms *a new form of the united front of workers from below*. This will make it possible to extend the influence of revolutionary workers among the broad masses.

A factory organiser must be in charge of the work of the factory groups of international contact, who will be appointed by the factory group. The factory organisation will control and direct the work of the organiser. If there are no such responsible comrades in the national centres of the revolutionary trade union movement to look after international training, the lower functionaries in the international contact groups will be left without leadership. Therefore, all the national and district central bodies of the revolutionary trade union movement will have to appoint special comrades to carry on work for international contacts. This is roughly the scheme of organisation of the work for international contacts and international education.

In addition, every workshop should elect a delegate for international contact. He will group around himself the whole workshop to take part in international proletarian contacts.

International proletarian contacts must be made into mass contacts. The question of contacts must be discussed at wide workers' conferences of factories or at factory meetings. Here the question must be decided with which factories and

with which countries the workers wish to establish contact.

Further, a practical plan of work for international contacts in the factory must be worked out, according to the concrete conditions of every individual factory.

The workers of the A.E.G. in Berlin made a very interesting proposition to organise in their factory a *holiday of revolutionary contacts*. This is a very interesting idea. The day when in some factory international contacts are set up with another country should be celebrated as an international proletarian holiday.

There are many forms and varieties of contact work; correspondence, exchange of delegations, work among foreign workers, work connected with the revolutionary press, contact with detached groups of workers. We will deal with these questions in detail.

Collective correspondence is of great political importance. This correspondence is organised as follows: two to four workers in the workshop are appointed to draw up a letter. They write a letter and submit it for discussion at a general meeting of the workers. At the meeting, additions and amendments are made, and those present sign their names.

As an example we can point to a letter from the moulding shop of our factory. The letter took up three pages and the signatures nearly four pages. A letter from the workers of our factory which was sent to the proletarians of the Alsthme factory in Paris had over 6,000 signatures.

Such collective letters are of great political importance. Of course, this does not rule out the possibility of individual contacts.

Correspondence should be constantly attended to. Every letter sent from one country to another should correspond to the political campaigns being carried on at that time by the Communist Party and the revolutionary organisations of the trade unions of both countries. The letters will then be of real agitational importance.

For instance, if, say, in Germany, Factory Committees are being elected, the Czecho-Slovakian comrades who are sending them a letter must first of all acquaint the German workers with the doings of their Factory Committees, with the difficulties of the work, how they overcome these difficulties, how they struggle against the reformist organisations in the factories, etc.

Soviet workers can make the German workers acquainted with our self-criticism, our methods of election, the right to recall members of Factory Committees who have become bureaucratic, who have become separated from the masses or have

distorted the Leninist line. They must describe at the same time the participation of trade union members in Socialist construction, etc. If such letters arrive in Germany about the time of the elections they will play a great agitational rôle.

Every letter must be written with a definite aim. We should not write too generally or write in a shallow way about many things, but only on two or three questions. But the letters must be concrete, practical, with figures and facts, so that they will agitate by facts and proofs.

On the other hand, the concrete questions of the work in the factory must be connected up in every letter with the final aim of the revolutionary proletariat, i.e., the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Every letter that is received must be made widely known to all the workers in the factory. It should be published in the factory paper, read at general meetings, specially duplicated and distributed throughout the factory.

It is recommended to send to the factory with which you are in contact, resolutions, reports, manifestoes, factory newspapers and other material issued by the local revolutionary organisation. In this way, comrades will always be well acquainted with events going on in other countries. Such information will assist in organising international solidarity in strikes and will improve information on the strikes which are taking place.

Once direct contacts between revolutionary factory organisations are established, detailed information about approaching strikes can be obtained in time and arrangements made to react to them in a proper way.

Mutual information is of great importance also for the Soviet Union. If in some of our factories the industrial plan is not being carried out, it is of extreme political importance to hear the opinions of foreign comrades on this question. For instance, as a result of such a communication to the workers of our factory, ten workshops organised themselves as complete shock brigades, which were named after the Vth Congress of the R.I.L.U.

The Soviet workers consider that the best help that can be given to the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries is the rapid growth of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.—the fatherland of the proletarians of all countries. At the time of the Berlin metal workers' strike *over one thousand workers in our factory joined shock brigades* which were named after the *revolutionary metal workers of Berlin*, and 45 of the best shock brigaders joined the Communist Party and the Y.C.L.

It is often thought that the necessity of translating letters is a great hindrance to establishing contacts. But this must not deter us. There are foreign workers in nearly all factories. The foreign revolutionary comrades working in any country should be attracted to work on international contact. Some assistance can be given by the W.I.R., the I.L.D. and other revolutionary organisations. Letters to and from the U.S.S.R. can be translated in the offices of the C.C. of the Trade Unions.

If the factory is in contact with several other factories, e.g., German workers with French, English and Soviet workers, the letters can be written in several copies and sent to all these factories.

How ought the revolutionary press to participate in international contacts? We propose the formation of worker correspondent circles in every country. These circles will send correspondence to the revolutionary press of other countries. For example, round the paper "Trud," the organ of the Central Council of Trade Unions of the Soviet Union in Moscow, a circle of worker correspondents could be formed which would send letters to the organs of the revolutionary trade unions in France and Germany. In Paris, such circles of correspondents would send letters to the U.S.S.R., Germany, Czecho-Slovakia. There should be exchanges of worker correspondents' letters.

The revolutionary trade union press must have special sections for international education and international contacts, printing in these sections letters from other countries and also instructions on international education.

The exchange of workers' delegations is of great importance. We propose the practice of exchanging delegations between various factories in capitalist countries. These delegations must have a clearly expressed political character and not degenerate into tourist excursions. They should be sent at a time which will coincide with political campaigns. For example, if a strike breaks out in the Ruhr, the English miners should time a delegation to arrive in Germany at that time, and the German miners should send a delegation to England. Subscription lists should be put out and voluntary contributions collected to pay the expenses of the delegations. The delegations should be elected at wide mass meetings. The arrival of the delegation should be utilised to organise international conferences which will link the factories together.

The delegations should acquaint themselves with the work of the local factory organisation of revolutionary trade unions and

with workers' meetings. Together with the local comrades, they should work out a number of measures for strengthening mass work and for transferring the experience which has been accumulated in the other country.

In order to attract the workers, a special factory committee should be elected, and demonstrations organised to meet the delegation so that great political action should result.

Contacts should be organised between individual groups of toilers, although they may not be working in the factory, but are connected with it (e.g., workers' wives, school children, pioneers, etc.).

We particularly propose that pioneers should be interchanged in summer pioneer camps. Such camps are already organised in Germany and America. It will not be difficult to organise them in other countries also.

It would be a good thing to organise circles for the study of foreign languages.

We propose the organisation in the factories of special amateur photographic groups with contacts with similar groups in other countries. It would be useful to hold a competition for the best photographs, e.g., between photographic circles in the U.S.S.R., France and Czechoslovakia. The conditions of the competition should be; the best expression of the struggle of the revolutionary proletariat in the factory or their participation in Socialist construction; the best technical photographic results, etc.

We propose the organisation of a special group of postage stamp collectors. This is extensively practised in other countries among young workers. Such factory groups should be organised under our influence and we should keep them in mutual contact, arranging mutual exchange of stamps, etc.

These are also methods of proletarian contacts.

The revolutionary sports movement is very important owing to the increased work of the social-fascists. Special attention must be paid to this branch of the work.

The G.E.Z. makes the following proposition; to organise reports of the Red Sportintern in the largest centres of the electrical industry in the U.S.S.R. and other countries, to form factory groups of physical culturists.

We have laid much emphasis on the word "factory" and we think that in this we are absolutely correct.

The slogan of the Vth Congress of the R.I.L.U. is: "Face to the factories." In our international educational work we must base ourselves on this slogan.

Therefore, in particular, we must form factory groups of physical culturists. We know, for in-

stance, that in Berlin there is a big sports society "Fichte" under revolutionary leaders. It can and should form teams in the factories, e.g., football teams in Siemens' Works and in the A.E.G. and arrange matches between them.

But that is a detail. With regard to international contacts, we must arrange international matches between sports groups belonging to the factories which are in contact with each other.

For example, the Alsthme works in France might form a group of metal worker sportsmen and send them to Berlin to play a football match with the team of the Berlin A.E.G. factory.

It would be utterly foolish, of course, to arrange these matches simply from the technical point of view, as to who could put the ball between the goalposts most times. This is not the question, the important thing is international education and the strengthening of international proletarian contacts. Such sports meetings should be given a clear political character.

In many cases it is very difficult to send a sports delegation to another country, but it is very easy to carry on a correspondence physical cultural contest. Such a contest is carried on as follows. Suppose the sports groups in the Citroen factory in Paris and the Wenz works in Germany agree that on a certain date they will hold a light athletic contest in their own towns. After the events have taken place they exchange letters in which they state the results of the contests. Such contests may be races on skates, skis, etc. It is interesting and possible to carry on chess or draughts tournaments by post or telegraph between groups in various factories.

Work among foreign workers was dealt with in detail at the Vth Congress of the R.I.L.U. This work is of tremendous importance for countries like France, America and U.S.S.R. We think it necessary to attract foreign workers to the work of the factory groups for international proletarian contacts. In particular, speeches should be arranged in the factories by foreign workers who arrive. This work is of special importance for us in the U.S.S.R., because, from the visiting comrades, we may prepare experienced organisers for the revolutionary trade union movement abroad. If we attract these comrades to our everyday trade union work, if they take part in the work of our Factory Committees, if we attach them to sectors of the Factory Committee, they will participate with us in the practical creative constructional work and will become organisers of trade union work.

We have written a lot. It may seem that all this cannot be adapted to some particular country. We do not imagine for a moment that everything that we have written is applicable to every

country. It is necessary to understand how to carry out everything in conformity with the concrete conditions of work of any country. But in the main, a great deal of it can be used in practical work.

We must make a real start in organising contacts between the workers in factories of various countries.

We propose that the I.C.P.A. of metal workers should organise an international meeting of proletarians of the big electric plants of the world, at which the foundations can be laid of inter-

national proletarian contacts in the electrical industry. We think that such conferences should be carried out in other industries also.

By extending and strengthening international proletarian contacts, we shall internationalise the strike battles and convert the I.C.P.A.'s into militant internationals in various industries.

L. Slutskin	Vassiliev
U. Temni	Shornik
L. Medvedeva	Besrukov
L. Shestoval	A. Neiman
Obshinikov	

Out Immediately

BUILDING COLLECTIVE FARMS

by J. STALIN

Containing the following important documents:

A Year of Great Change.
 Questions of Agrarian Policy in the Soviet Union.
 On the Policy of Liquidating the Kulaks as a Class.
 Answers to Questions put by Students of the Sverdloff University.
 On the Grain Front.
 Dizzy with Success.
 Reply to Comrades on the Collective Farms.

From the Political Report to the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., June-July, 1930.

1. Agriculture and the Grain Problem.
2. The Turning of the Peasantry towards Socialism and the Rate of Development of the Soviet and Collective Farm Movement.

Appendices.

1. Model Statutes of Agricultural Artels.
2. The fight against Distortions of the Party Line in the Collective Farm Movement.

STALIN'S REPORT TO THE 16th CONGRESS OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

LIFE OF STALIN. *By his Comrades.*

Each 2/6 cloth,
1/6 paper

MODERN BOOKS LTD., 16 KING STREET, LONDON, W.C.2
 WORKER'S LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, 35 EAST 125th STREET, NEW YORK

RED HOT FACTS ON THE U.S.A. "SLAVE LABOUR"

LABOUR AND COAL, By Anna Rochester. The background of conditions which have made one-fourth of all American miners permanently unemployed. \$2.00 6s.

LABOUR AND LUMBER, By Charlotte Todes. The book exposes timber speculation, railroad steals, waste of resources and the lives of the lumberjacks. \$2.00 6s.

LABOUR AND TEXTILES, By Robert W. Dunn and Jack Hardy. A vivid story of cotton and wool with their "stretch out," child labour and the crisis that faces them. \$2.00 6s.

Published by International Publishers in U.S.A. and Modern Books in Great Britain

FOR MASS SALES

THE TASKS OF THE WORKING CLASS

in mastering the technique of production J. STALIN ½d.

50,000,000 UNEMPLOYED

One Penny

THE SUCCESS OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN

V. M. MOLOTOV

Shortly

THE WRECKERS EXPOSED

W. M. HOLMES describes the Moscow Trial of the Industrial Party (Twopence); and shortly, a full report of this trial.

THE MENSHEVIK TRIAL

The Indictment of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. recently condemned. Sixpence

THE DEVELOPING CRISIS OF WORLD CAPITALISM :

The Revolutionary upsurge and the Tasks of the Communist International V. M. MOLOTOV Sixpence

THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

O. PIATNITSKY Shortly

WORKING WOMEN — WAR IS COMING

One Penny

FROM THE PUBLISHERS OF THIS MAGAZINE