

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2. No. 1

3<sup>th</sup> Jan. 1922

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

## POLITICS

### The Bloc National on the Eve of Cannes

by Paul Louis (Paris).

At the present moment the French Bloc National is undergoing mishaps—or to express it accurately—a disturbance which deserves attention. The articles which M. Poincaré publishes at regular intervals in "Le Temps", "Le Matin" and "La Revue des Deux Mondes" are a sufficient indication of the delusions and choler of the Bloc National.

This Bloc National is the expression of all the conservatism and all the militarist imperialism of the French bourgeoisie. It was born at the time of the 1919 elections of a state of mind which may be characterized as Napoleonic. According to it, France ought to profit by present circumstances to dismember Germany, whose unity has always appeared to it as a chance combination and an historical error. The "detachment" of the left bank of the Rhine was in its opinion only the first act, and it has not yet consoled itself for having subscribed to a treaty as harmless, in its opinion, as the Treaty of Versailles. It experienced a feeling of pride and of profound joy at being able to state that the armies of France were, as under the First Empire, spread all over Europe. It rejoiced even more, if that were possible, when it noticed that these armies were almost everywhere employed for the defense of the capitalist system.

The Bloc National realizes the gravity of the economic and financial crisis since it has in its ranks a large number of captains of industry and finance, who have acquired some practical experience in these matters. But they are not frightened by the deficit nor by the increase in the debt, which according to M. Chéron, introducer of the budget in the Senate, has jumped in three years from 171 to 328 milliards of francs. They continually repeat the magic formula, "Germany will pay".

Now, they discern to day that all their illusions are collapsing, that they have succeeded in entirely isolating France and that they can no longer deceive a people credulous to absurdity. The London conference, which have been shrouded in obscurity in spite of or rather because of the laconic explanations of M. Briand, has filled the Bloc with a nameless inquietude. The Franco-British antagonism appeared to it, all this time, as the invention of some evil spirit, of extreme pessimists or of ingenious communists. Now, the veil has been torn away.

Its policy is totally opposed to that of the British bourgeoisie. French imperialism is at bottom military; the imperialism of Britain is basically commercial. The French possessing classes desire to satisfy the all-powerful army which is their safeguard, and to assure the exploitation of certain territories through occupation by force. The possessing classes of England, more modern in methods, are seeking, above all, to extend their markets for trade. They attribute the formidable unemployment in England to the restriction of these markets, which increasingly menaces them with revolution.

The Bloc National has already been obliged to evacuate Cilicia. If tomorrow it should be compelled to quit the left bank of the Rhine, the humiliation it would suffer would be severe. If it should be constrained to revise the document of Versailles in its fundamental clauses, it would feel that its allies, the British, Italian and American bourgeoisies (the last have not ratified the

treaty at all), have done it mortal injury. It will not only be its pride which will have been wounded; the interests of the French possessing class will have been struck a serious blow, for it will have to renounce the tribute which it was counting on from Germany.

And if Germany does not pay, who will pay in its place? The revision of the Treaty of Versailles undermines the entire economic and social structure of France. That is why, knowing the trials it will have to undergo (and M. Poincaré himself no longer conceals them from his readers), the French bourgeoisie will go to Cannes with anger and fear, which are manifest in its entire press.

It is not only the revision of the pseudo-peace of 1919 which irritates it, but the certain invitation of Soviet Russia to a general European Conference for reconstruction as well. It still nourishes the same hatred of Russia which the Tories of England had for the France of the Convention. It has forgotten the days of September, the execution of Louis XVI. and the Terror of '93, as the Conservatives on the other side of the Channel have forgotten the death sentence of Charles I. It is beginning to understand that it must either break with the rest of the world or recognize the Soviets, and that if it continues to excommunicate the Soviets it will eventually place itself under the same ban, because it is increasing, by its resistance to reconstruction, the dangers of ruin for the capitalists of all countries.

Never has a ruling class experienced so many disillusiones and felt so much bitterness and apprehension. The Bloc National is at last realizing that in 1918 no country won a victory, that war only produces catastrophes and that all plutocracies are rolling toward the abyss. The Cannes Conference, for many reasons, is disclosing impending dangers and disasters. The Bloc National is going to Cannes trembling in its boots.

### What is Happening in Hungary?

by Josef Pogany.

The Hungarian counter-revolution has fallen into a decisive crisis because its ruling classes which until now fought upon common ground are now driven to war against one another by the Trianon Peace Treaty.

This inner struggle reached the stage of open civil war at the time of the Karlist putsch. At first glance it seemed that with the disarming of the royalist Ostenburg troops and the extradition of Karl Habsburg, the counter-revolution was personified and found strength in the figure of Horthy. But the truth of the matter is that for the second time the inner conflicts between the counter-revolutionary classes resulted in open civil war. Budapest became one large barracks. Various points of the city are occupied by gendarmes, police-guards and military formations. Horthy troops are disarming the Hejjas troops just returning from Western Hungary in nightly raids. An armed insurrection is planned for the liberation of the royalist leaders Rakovszky and Andrassy. At night the streets resound with programs against Jews and with the tumult of the "Awakening Magyars". And at the bottom of all this are the disarmed royalist Ostenburg troops which the royalists are supposedly able and willing to turn against Horthy.

This time the Hungarian counter-revolution is actually in a decisively critical situation. No matter what the outcome of the crisis may be, and no matter whether Horthy remains or not, one thing is certain, that this crisis will lead to absolutely new political formations and that it will smoothen the road of the class-struggle of the Hungarian proletariat.

The Karl coup and the armed civil war which followed it brought the inner conflict among the various counter-revolutionary classes to a head. "Az Ujsag", the organ of the liberal bourgeoisie which has now lost power, makes the following frank statement: "The King question is 'settled' and will no more disappear from the order of the day. Like Banquo's ghost it will appear at every meal."

This organ of the bourgeoisie is right. It was in vain that the national assembly disposed of the Throne question by means of law, the Little Entente by means of mobilization and the Allies by means of diplomacy. This question cannot be stricken from the order of the day in Hungary. The question of the Crown is nothing more than an ideological weapon in the hands of the counter-revolutionary parties. Karl Habsburg is driven out of the country and the royalist party is beaten. But the powerful classes of the royalist party, the large land owning magnates and the bourgeoisie are still alive. These royalist classes are now fighting not for Habsburg but against Horthy. Until now the Throne problem was presented in a positive form: "Power to the Habsburgs, for with them, the large land owners and the higher bourgeoisie acquire power!" At present this problem is presented negatively: "Down with Horthy because he bases his power more and more upon the fat peasantry of the 'Small Farmers' party" and upon the subaltern dictatorship of the officer corps."

The organ of the nobility, "Magyarsag" speaks of the rich peasant as of "The Small Farmers' Party which is rising with the mud of the gutter."

Where did the beautiful honeymoon weeks of the counter-revolution go to; where are those pleasant times in which the barons and the bishops vied with each other in the songs of praise which they sang to the "healthy mind" of the peasant, the "anti-communistic Hungarian peasant"! At the same time the organ of Horthy's officer detachments, "Szozat", is bewailing the fact that the clergy is carrying on a passionate royalist propaganda in the churches. The Horthy party arranges a burial celebration in honor of the "heroes" who fell in the civil war. And in a heartrending tone of melancholy the press of the royalist party asks where the fallen heroes of Ostenburg will find their graves of honor?

The "Szozat" is quite right in asking the following surprising question: "Will the civil war go on?" The civil war of the counter-revolutionary classes in Hungary is going on. Yesterday the Hejjas troops seized Ostenburg, to-day the troops of General von Soos are attacking the Hejjas troops, and tomorrow or the day after tomorrow the troops of Lukasich and Ostenburg may attack Horthy's Ofener Burg.

The Hungarian civil war is again raging and is even beginning to spread. In its first phase it meant solely the inner struggle of the ruling counter-revolutionary classes. To-day however, when the counter-revolutionary classes are weakening each other in the struggle, those social classes which could not participate in the government of the counter-revolution or which are groaning under the counter-revolutionary suppression, are beginning to be heard.

Once more the "National Octobrists" suddenly appear in the political arena. They constitute the Gentry wing of the Karolyi revolution and although they displayed a counter-revolutionary attitude even in the first stages of the Karolyi revolution, they were doomed to silence by the Christian-National counter-revolution. The parliamentary opposition group which until now was considered a small group of insignificant noise-makers, suddenly becomes a political factor. The "citizens' and workers' coalition" is quite openly striving for power.

Horthy and his camarilla are beginning to feel the frightful crisis which threatens their power and is spreading in all directions. He is making every attempt to base his power upon a broader social foundation. On the one hand he is negotiating the forming of a "bourgeois government", which is to unite the various divisions of the bourgeoisie. First of all he seeks to establish friendly relations with the liberal bourgeoisie which is not on the best of terms with Parliament and which was forced out of power. It is thereby intended to revive the former labor party, the followers of Tisza. Horthy also attempts to bring certain elements of the *comitatji gentry*, a part of the large landowning class and of the bank-owning bourgeoisie into the government. On the other hand he is also courting the "democratic" elements. He is striving to transform the hitherto concealed support given to his government by the Social-Democratic Party into open and official support. It is seriously being considered that the Vanczak-Payer bureaucratic trade-union group should officially take over the government together with the Hejjas group.

The broadening of the social basis of the government is a life and death question for Horthy. Because the Karl coup was

repressed the large landowning magnates and the industrial bourgeoisie were against him. But the counter-revolutionary intellectuals and a large part of the city petty-bourgeoisie, which until now acted as his main support and shouted most loudly for the counter-revolution, have now also turned against him. Horthy lost not only the support of certain definite classes, but also the entire counter-revolutionary ideology which until now constituted a considerable prop of his rule. One of these props was the idea of the dynasty, of legitimacy. In the battle of Budaörs Horthy himself defeated the idea of legitimacy. The second ideological pillar of his rule was the idea of territorial integrity. The ultimatum of the Little Entente, the yielding of Horthy and the National Assembly proved to the fanatics of territorial integrity, as well as to the counter-revolutionary intellectuals and the petty-bourgeoisie, that the fantastic picture of a Greater Hungary under the rule of Horthy would always remain an empty dream. A third pillar of the Horthy regime was the idea of a national army. The national army must now be disarmed. A fourth one was anti-semitism. But under the pressure of the international and Hungarian Jewish banking capitalists Horthy is compelled to flirt with the Jews and to arrest the pogrom heroes. A fifth factor in the ideological structure of Horthy's regime was the traditional Polish-Hungarian friendship. The Czecho-Polish agreement destroyed this illusion as well. Poland recognized its disinterestedness and neutrality in Slovakia and thus delivered a fatal blow to the chauvinistic dreams of a Greater Hungary. The sixth counter-revolutionary ideological factor was the freedom and independence of Hungary. This illusion collapsed in extreme humiliation. Horthy and his government were not only compelled legally to recognize the loss of the throne by the Habsburgs, but by making Hungary the vassal of the Entente, Horthy put the free choice of a king in a form which obligates Hungary to count with the opinion of the Allies in its choice; this means that the Hungarian throne can be occupied only with the express approval of the Allies.

There is no system of government which can survive civil war going on among its classes, and opposition by its most powerful factors and by the entire intellectual class which, outside of armed force, constitutes its main defense against the masses, and justifies it and makes it holy and inviolable in the eyes of the large peasant and petty-bourgeois classes.

In hopeless despair Horthy is now looking for new supports for his regime. He is attempting to draw into his service not only new social groups and classes but new ideologies as well. It thus happens that he is approaching the liberalism of the former Tisza Party as well as of the Social Democratic Party. He also wishes to draw Jewish banking capital and the Social Democracy into his service and to make them the future supports of his regime.

The Horthy press is beginning to prate about Democracy, Liberalism and spiritual toleration. In his attempt to broaden the basis of his regime, Horthy goes so far that he lands upon foreign and unreal ground. In his pursuit of the favor of the Jewish bankers and the Social-Democratic trade-union leaders, he stakes the only actual basis of his rule by consenting to the partial or complete disarming of the Hejjas troops.

Of course not only Horthy but also the royalist opposition of the large landowners is attempting to reinforce its positions by attracting new masses. The Karlists long ago allied themselves with the Jewish petty-bourgeoisie led by Vaszonyi. And today when the class conflict is becoming more and more intense, they are ready to ally themselves with the devil himself. Apponyi declares that "all of us, legitimists and anti-legitimists must stand together". Karl Huszar, the leader of the Christian petty-bourgeoisie wing of the royalists is already negotiating with the Social Democratic trade-union bureaucrats, and Wilhelm Vaszonyi, the leader of the Jewish petty-bourgeois wing of the royalists went as far as to call the workers "his proletarian brothers" . . . In other words there is a continual race for the favor of the working-class. The Christian Party puts forward far-reaching social and political demands. "Szozat", Horthy's organ prints an article under the caption: "The government is approaching a solution to the labor question".

And how does the proletariat fare under these circumstances?

The proletariat is living under complete oppression. Its only organizations adapted to the class-struggle, the trade-unions, are in the hands of a traitorous trade-union bureaucracy, which sells the organized working-class in the open market and with a most disgraceful shamelessness. Its organ "Nepszava", writes quite openly that in the struggle between the Karlists and Horthy, it will side with those who promise it the most.

The organized working-class, the proletariat, can today become an actual and mighty power in Hungary. The number of organized workers reaches 300,000. Under revolutionary Communist leadership this mass would in the midst of the counter-revolutionary chaos become an overwhelming force. But this great, organized mass is to-day led by Social-Democratic traitors, who like street walkers are willing to sell themselves to any one. They are ready to support Horthy if he revives the "historical tradition" of handing out portfolios to the trade-union bureaucrats; they are also ready to aid the royalists to power if they only take the first step and give the Payer-Peidl-Vanczak clique parliamentary seats and ministerial portfolios.

The Communists know that the time is not yet ripe for the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary, but they also know, that the time has come for serious proletarian fights. At this time definite measures for reinforcing the working-class can be undertaken. Now we can and must fight for and win amnesty for the political prisoners, general liberty, freedom of the labor press, unemployment benefit and a 100% wage increase.

## Manifesto of the Egyptian Socialist Party to the Manual and Brain Workers of the World.

The brutal and aggressive tone in which the British militarists and colonial officials have replied to the sacred demands of the Egyptian people have opened the eyes of the most naive and credulous among us. The veil has been torn and the hideous features of our oppressors have been revealed in all their ugliness.

With pride and dignity we hurl back the defi thrown in the face of the Egyptian people by the British militarists and imperialists. Forty years of foreign occupation with all its military terrorism and its arbitrary laws of persecution have not been able to weaken for a single instant our firm resolution to fight and to make all the necessary sacrifices for the conquest of our independence.

1919 demonstrated to the world and to our oppressors the vitality of our people which did not recoil before any menace to proclaim on high its right to national life and liberty. It is not by diplomatic steps and negotiations between ministers or delegations which do not represent the wishes of the people that independence can be obtained. Only the workers and peasants, conscious and organized, can win it.

The Socialist ideal which is the expression of the renaissance of the peoples of the world has appeared on the scene of Egyptian political life. The Egyptian Socialist Party will place itself in the vanguard and in the first ranks of battle for the demanding of our rights to complete national independence, freed from all imperialist and capitalist enslavement, domestic as well as foreign.

The Egyptian Socialist Party, standard-bearer of the proletariat and party of the class-struggle, declares that in the union of the entire Egyptian people in its supreme fight against the oppressive power of British imperialism it will integrally maintain its Socialist program and will not renounce its struggle against the Egyptian capitalist tyrants and oppressors, accomplices and associates of the tyrannic foreign domination.

Egyptian intellectual proletariat will cease all collaboration, of whatever nature it may be, with our oppressors and whoever will adopt a contrary attitude will be a traitor to the higher interests of the people and of the holy national cause.

The Egyptian proletariat workers and peasants, extends a fraternal hand to the world proletariat and particularly to the proletariat of Great Britain, so that together they may mount to the assault of the imperialist citadel which under its weight suffocates not only the enslaved peoples of the Orient, but also pitilessly exploits all the laboring and producing masses of Europe. The peoples of the Orient count on the assistance and support of the world proletariat in their struggle against the common enemy.

The struggle for the conquest of independence on the part of the peoples of the Orient is also a struggle bearing a clear Socialist character. The world proletariat is enslaved and exploited by the same enemy — rapacious capitalism.

Let the diplomats plot and intrigue and betray the interests of the masses. We, the proletariat, are ready for a long and bitter struggle, are forming our battle-lines, are organizing our forces in the trade-unions and are bringing together the workers of the city and country. Let the intellectuals go to the peasants to create a united political and economic front which will at the same time act as a counter-balance to the influence of the bourgeoisie.

Without hesitation and without fear let us group ourselves around the banner of the International for the final struggle

against our only enemy, British imperialism, which is to-day the highest expression of world capitalism. On the victory of Socialism and on the seizure of power by the proletariat depends the independence and emancipation of the peoples of the Orient. And by the indissoluble union of the workers of the West and of the East we will vanquish our common enemy — capitalist imperialism.

Long live independent Egypt!

Long live the International of the workers!

Long live the Social Revolution!

The Egyptian Socialist Party.

Cairo, 22 December 1921.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Instigators of the Split in the CGT.

W. L. Amsterdam is about to be tested, and the eyes of the proletariat of the entire world are upon it. Will it bring about the splitting of the French trade-unions to the joy of the bourgeoisie, in order to "set an example", and to try to drive off the "pest" of revolution through a "radical operation" of this nature? Or will it still possess enough devotion to the interests of the workers to avert the threatening split, and to assure the unity of the movement—even if that will cost it its posts of leadership?

That is the situation to-day in the trade-union movement in France. The question of French unity is in no way simply a question of France but it is *international* in its scope.

Comrades Monmousseau and Rosmer have justifiably pointed out recently in "Humanité" that in 1920 the leaders of the C.G.T. already pursued the policy of split in which they rightly saw the only means of saving themselves from the revolutionary opposition. But in May 1921 Jouhaux and his colleagues turned the question of the fight against the revolutionary current in the trade-union movement into an international problem, and the Executive Committee of the Amsterdam Trade Union International is instructing its affiliated national executive committees to combat the minority in the trade-union movement with the weapon of exclusion. The Communist and Red Trade Union Internationals called upon the laboring-masses to fight for the social-revolutionary policy in the trade-union movement and if need be to remove the yellow leaders of the trade-unions from the leadership, but in no case to split the mass-movement and in no way to impair the unity of the proletarian fighting front. The leaders of the Amsterdam Trade Union International answer this by calling upon all the trade-union bureaucrats who have remained loyal to it to drive out the "revolutionary bacillus" in the trade-union movement by means of a "radical operation"—even if that should mean the splitting and destruction of the mass-movement. *The reformist policy of the collaboration with the bourgeoisie must triumph even at the expense of the unity of the movement!*

During the Lille Congress the French bourgeoisie was outspoken and made no secret of the fact that it longed most eagerly for the splitting of the trade-union movement. The "Temps", the "Journée Industrielle", the "Information" and other newspapers of the upper bourgeoisie constantly urged Jouhaux, Merheim and Dumoulin to effect the split quickly. Indeed they made no secret of the fact that Moscow as well as Amsterdam and Amsterdam as well as Moscow were an evil in their estimation. The French upper bourgeoisie—one of the most selfish and narrowest in the world cannot as yet reconcile itself with *any sort of trade-union movement whatsoever*. If would like of most of all to see the wage-slaves standing before it as *completely unorganized* objects of exploitation. Its organ, the "Temps", expressed this quite frankly on December 23rd, in an article treating of "Moscow and Amsterdam", and moreover, this tendency of the French capitalist class is no secret to the Amsterdam adherents in France. And as things went so far that the revolutionary opposition was driven to call a special unity-congress on their own initiative, thereby offering the leaders of the C.G.T. a formal pretext for causing the split, *these leaders made use of this pretext joyfully. They did not consent to any concession which the opposition proposed to them in the interest of unity. They rejected all compromise proposals because they consciously desired the split.* Dumoulin declared this openly in the December 12th issue of the "Petit Parisien", the organ of the big capitalistic concern Arago-Dupuy.

In his article he wrote the following: "Syndicalism is going through a crisis which, after having passed through a period of sickly groping is now reaching its acute stage, and is on the way to recovery through a radical operation".

On December 17th, comrade A. Rosmer, one of the leaders of the Red Trade Union International and at the same time one of the founders of Communist International, published an article in the "Humanité" in which he stamped as a lie and calumny the assertion that "Moscow" effected the split in France or desired it. On December 16th, comrade Lozovsky, general secretary of the R.T.U.I. sent a telegraph to Oudegeest, the secretary of the Amsterdam Trade Union International, proposing to avert the threatening split through a common conference of all the interested parties. The leaders of the C.G.T. replied to this by submitting the matter to the Executive Committee of the Trade Union International (December 20th number of the "Peuple"), whereby they acknowledge that the mainspring of the split in France does not lie in Paris but in Amsterdam. But the condition set by Oudegeest for the intervention of the Trade Union International is that Moscow try to postpone the special congress of the French opposition, and also that the French opposition be excluded from the common congress which is to be called.

Thus, Amsterdam has thrown off the mask. Although the mainspring of the French split is apparently in Amsterdam, still the heart of the Trade Union International is in Paris. M. Jouhaux, general secretary of the C.G.T. and first vice-president of the Trade Union International wants the split in France because he desires to see a trial of strength between Amsterdam and Moscow on an international scale.

In spite of those of the left who favor the split (during the Congress of December 24th, Comrade Monmousseau severely criticized the impatient ones who wanted to reply to the provocations on the part of the C.G.T. leaders by means of an immediate break), and although the Congress represented the majority of of the C.G.T. and therefore could justifiably speak and act in the name of the C.G.T. (in Paris 1528 trade-unions were represented, whereas the Lille Congress was made up of representatives from 2924 unions), notwithstanding all that, the opposition once more tried in Paris everything possible to avoid a split with the Jouhaux-Merrheim-Dumoulin minority. Regardless of the provocative behaviour of the Jouhaux crowd toward the Congress (according to information given to the press of December 24th, "these people neither represented the majority of the C.G.T. nor did they consider it necessary to submit any sort of statements or proposals to the bureau of the C.G.T."), in spite of that the Congress gave the last opportunity to the Jouhaux clique to prevent the split. Indeed it even decided that the C.G.T. itself call a new special trade-union congress for the first quarter of 1922. In order to make this concession lighter for the Jouhaux group, the revolutionary syndicalists did not insist that the trade-unions must join the Comités Syndicalistes Révolutionnaires (C.S.R.) as entire bodies. But the Congress which represented the majority of the C.G.T. could no longer tolerate the fact that the destructive policy of Jouhaux and Co. should be supported by the money of trade-union members. It has created an administrative commission which is to serve as a temporary tie among the organizations, and which is to distribute confederation cards and collect membership-dues.

"Le Peuple", the organ of Jouhaux and his colleagues is already greeting the split as an accomplished fact. The position it takes shows once more that the wish is father to the thought. In reality the fate of unity in the French trade-unions movement lies in the hands of Amsterdam. Moscow wants no split, because the split would be in the interest of the bourgeoisie. For that very reason Amsterdam desires it—because its leaders are the spiritual servants of the bourgeoisie. France will be a sample of what these servants—the Jouhaux, the Thomases, the Mertens, the Leiparts—are capable of doing in their hatred of the social revolution and of Moscow. If Amsterdam wants the fight then it must bear the sole responsibility for the damage to the labor movement. But Moscow does not fear the fight, even though the poor "Freiheit", led astray by the "Frankfurter Zeitung", is already prating about Moscow's capitulation to Amsterdam!

## The Indian Trade Union Congress

by Manabendra Nath Roy.

While the British Imperialists are vigorously beginning the reign of terror in order to crush the nationalist movement, organized labor is becoming an important factor in the political struggle. Trade Unionism was not introduced into India till 1916, and the organized struggle of the working-class for economic improvement remained practically unknown until recently. In the short space of time, the working-class movement has progressed amazingly. Of course, Nationalist preoccupations confused class-interests, thereby making the growth of Trade Unionism rather distorted. But nevertheless, the industrialization of the country has brought into existence a huge army of proletarians living in

unspeakably horrible economic conditions. These masses of workers have started the struggle for the betterment of their class.

In the first Trade Union Congress, held in 1920, all the trade unions of India were organized into a National Federation. The great advance made in the short space of one year is demonstrated in the proceedings and resolutions of the Second Trade Union Congress, held in the coal districts of the province of Behar in the first week of December, 1921. Before the Congress met, a strike of the miners had been on. The mineowners called upon the Government to prohibit the holding of the Congress. They even went so far as to suggest the dissolution of the Congress with the help of military forces. But the Government, busy in the campaign of repression against the National Congress, did not think it prudent to pay heed to the mineowners' request.

The opening of the Congress was marked by a great demonstration, in which more than 80,000 workers took part. The number of delegates and visitors which could be accommodated in the hall was 10,000; thousands more congregated outside. A large crowd of workers, including 36,000 miners on strike, fired with enthusiasm, lingered around the Congress hall during the sessions. In his opening speech, Chaman Lal, Secretary of the Trade Union Congress, demanded Swaraj for the workers, and declared that they were determined to be free. He further said "India's political subjection is due to its economic subjection, and this the combined might of all organized workers, would destroy." The condition of the miners who are carrying on a desperate struggle, naturally attracted great attention from the Congress. The miners' leader, Viswananda, who in company with a number of other trade-union leaders including the President-elect, Joseph Baptista, had made a tour of inspection of the mining districts, made the following pronouncement: "If the present misery of the workers of India is allowed to continue, then nothing can stop Bolshevism. Let them take heed, because the workers are determined to become the rightful owners of the wealth produced by their labors." According to the report submitted to the Congress, the average wage in the mines was six-pence per day. Starvation was raging among the workers.

One of the most interesting features of the Congress was that the same Mineowners' Association which asked the Government to break up the Congress, ended by requesting a hearing before the assembly of the organized workers. Permission to speak before the Congress was granted to the President of the Association, who declared the intention of reducing the working-week to 44 hours, and invited the representatives of the striking miners to open immediate negotiations. Promises were made in the name of the owners that decent houses should be built and schools provided for the workers' children. Still more, a deputation from the owners publicly apologized for having attempted to suppress the Congress, and presented a resolution condemning their own action. This incident shows the strength acquired by the organized workers of India in the short period of their activity.

But the leadership of the working-class movement in India is not all that might be desired. Most of the important unions are headed either by English skilled workers indirectly connected with the Government, or by humanitarian reformists without any conception of the class-struggle, or by opportunist nationalist politicians. The defective leadership of the Trade Union Congress is betrayed in the following remark of its President, himself a petty-bourgeois intellectual: "The political policy of the Congress must steer clear of extreme individualism and Bolshevism, and follow the golden mean of Fabian Socialism." But despite himself, he couldn't help expressing the energy of the masses of rebellious workers whom he pretended to lead. In the course of his speech, he declared that "the efforts of the organized workers would gain Swaraj for India in ten years."

In the last session of the Congress, two resolutions were unanimously adopted, one appealing to the workers of the world to secure peace and bread for Russia, and the second declaring that "wars can be avoided only by the united efforts of the working-class of the world." More than 100 unions with a total membership of 1,500,000 were represented in the Congress.

## IN SOVIET RUSSIA

### Our New Land Policy

by N. Ossinsky (Moscow).

People's Commissar for Agriculture.

The point of departure for our new economic policy was, as known, the replacement of requisitions and the monopoly of wheat by a tax in kind and by a free commerce in agricultural

products. All the rest follows as a result. Upon this basis, what will the new village—different certainly from that of the ancient regime and from that of the requisition period—be like?

Certain comrades imagine that it will be characterized by a rapid bourgeois development. The communes, they say, will fall to pieces; the peasants will become bourgeois; and we shall allow them a free hand and confine ourselves to organizing the semi-proletariat and the proletariat of the villages for the class-struggle.

These comrades jump too quickly at conclusions. A rapid differentiation of classes is impossible in our villages. First of all, the peasants will need several years to recover from the effects of the civil war. Besides, it must be kept in mind that the dictatorship of the proletariat, contrary to all other governments, will do nothing to favor the development of the tiller of the land into a bourgeois. And as to results otherwise, we think that it is not the parcelling of the land or the bourgeois development of agriculture that will bring him the greatest yield but rather the development of a close net work of land lots, cultivated on a small scale, closely connected among themselves by cooperation. Small scale cultivation will disappear by itself when mechanical tractors and electric tools take the place of the day laborer and his horse, i. e., when industry will in its turn come to the aid of agriculture. And the road can be made easier for it only by an extension of peasant cooperation.

Thus we do not think that the Russian village of tomorrow will be distinguished by the parcelling of the land and the rapid differentiation between bourgeoisie and proletariat. To be sure, these results will also follow, but on the whole our villages will remain on a certain average level much below this extreme and that is all we need wish.

Will we retain the peasant within his village, will we prohibit wage labor in agriculture, and subleasing of land? NO.

Our rules will be:

1. To allow the peasant the possibility of developing normally a petty-bourgeois economy.
2. Not to favor by any special measure the growth of large privately owned estates.
3. To aid, with all our power, the development of peasant economic cooperation associations.

We shall permit wage labor under certain conditions—for the busy season, on those farms—that lack manual labor (farms of widows, wives of soldiers in the Red Army, etc.) and on model farms. The trade-unions, the cooperatives, or other organizations, will help us to settle these questions.

The subleasing of the soil from peasant to peasant will be permitted with great restriction only when fully justified. (In the same cases as the employment of manual wage labor.) In principle this is not desirable. At any rate, it must be said quite unequivocally that there can be no question of denationalizing the soil or of restoring private property. The usufruct of the soil will not be less durable and less defined. But no one will be allowed to buy, sell, or mortgage any land. We shall thus be insured against the reappearance of land ownership.

In no case may the usufruct from the soil serve as „social insurance“: the peasant incapable of cultivating his plot may neither rent it out nor keep it while working at something else. If he cannot truly do his work as a peasant, he will have to transfer his land to someone else.

The parcelling of the soil neither frightens nor seduces us. We confront it with the sole condition that it create an immediately increased productive force. We see prospects for the improvement of agriculture only in a better agronomic education of the masses, which will result in each peasant's interest in and knowledge of his land, in the passing from old forms of communal work to superior forms and in the inviolability of the principle of land nationalization.

But what will be the function of the large, cultivated Soviet estates in the new village? They will have numerous very important functions to perform. In the first place, they will furnish the peasant with improved seed and cattle. Improvement of seed and cattle raising were formerly tasks of large private estates, which they fulfilled quite inadequately. Henceforth all agricultural cultivation devoted to these tasks will be in the hands of the State or will be submitted to the rigorous control of the cooperatives.

Other Soviet estates will serve as model agricultural establishments. These, too, will remain in the hands of the State. Their managers will have about the same freedom of action in the market as a good steward had in former days.

A third kind of agricultural cultivation may be qualified as „consumers' farms“. The latter will be ceded not to indi-

viduals, but to factories, to consumers' cooperatives, and even to good peasant cooperatives.

On the borders of Russia where uncultivated lands abound, big agricultural concessions may be made on the condition that modern machine labor be introduced there. Big land grants may be made there to farmers working under the control of the State according to the plans of production approved by it.

To recapitulate: in the agricultural domain we are going neither in the direction of old capitalism nor in the direction of a revival of the old social relations—we are going toward an order in which a certain capitalism of the proletarian state bearing within it the first elements of socialism, exists side by side with petty bourgeois customs and relations being gradually transformed by the development of superior economic forms.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### To the Marseilles Congress of the French Communist Party.

Dear Comrades,

The Communist International sends fraternal greetings to its French section assembled in Congress.

A year has passed since the Congress at Tours, where you made a great effort to liquidate War „Socialism“ in order to break with reformist equivocation by joining the Communist International.

The comrades that left you and whom many of you, perhaps, regretted at first, have also broken with all equivocation. They had asserted that they would remain true revolutionaries, friends and defenders of the Russian Revolution, despite their separation from the Party. But their opposition to the Communist principles that had made them withdraw from the purified party soon turned them into avowed counter-revolutionaries, repeating the calumnies of the capitalist press against the Russian Revolution and becoming the defenders of the Social Democratic counter-revolutionaries who are among the bitterest enemies of the workers' and peasants' Revolution.

The party of dissidents is falling under the influence and political control of Renaudel, Grumbach and Blum, that is to say of those who during the war betrayed the French working-class and International Socialism, of those who have not given up the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and who use the French Party as a hyphen between the International of Vienna and the Second, the International of ministers and kings.

Tours—the accomplished split and energetic purification—was the result of a reaction and anger on the part of the working-class against War Socialism and Reformism that had betrayed its interests.

But Tours was also the point of departure of a new epoch in the history of the French revolutionary movement—it was the birth of the Communist Party. A year separates us from the Congress of Tours. There is not a single revolutionary who regrets the split and purification that was accomplished there. But it is not enough merely to cast a glance at the road travelled by the enemies of communism, it is also necessary to examine the work accomplished by the Communist Party in this first year of its activity.

The Communist International greets with joy the results of your efforts to regroup and reorganize your Federations, to constitute a big party of 130,000 members and to develop widely a thriving Press.

In the face of imperialism and reaction of which the French bourgeoisie forms the most solid citadel in the world, the Communist Party and its Press are alone in showing organized resistance. In the course of the past year the Communist Party succeeded in extending its real and growing influence over the working masses and the small peasants of France.

These happy results should not, however, veil from us the weaknesses and shortcomings of the first year. The Communist International is not satisfied as of old with sending congratulation to its sections. Its duty is to point out to them, in a fraternal spirit, their weaknesses in order to seek in a close and friendly collaboration with them a removal of these weaknesses.

Guided solely by the interests of the World Revolution the Communist International has always in its relation with the French Party taken account of the special conditions of its evolution and the milieu in which it had to carry on its fight.

In estimating the work of this first year we are also taking account of the state in which the Party was left after the split. We know that a party which had suffered such deviation from principle during the war cannot suddenly become Communist by

voting a motion in Congress. The vote of Tours marked the will of the Party to become Communist. The first year, therefore, had to mark a constant effort, a continued labor to give the Party its Communist character.

The effort of the Party was great: it was not sufficient. With you we wish to seek some of the causes of this weakness. Convinced that the Congress of Marseilles is anxious to continue the work begun at Tours and broadly to take into account the suggestions of the International for the reinforcement of the Communist character and policy of the Party.

The Party suffered from weakness in its leadership. The Central Committee was absorbed by a multitude of current administrative tasks, but failed to give the Party a firm policy or direction. It did not guide the daily thought and activity of the Party. It did not give it a collective conscience.

The Party suffered from the lack of an agrarian policy, of a trade-union policy, of an electoral policy. The Central Committee left the examination and the solution of all these questions to the Congress of Marseilles, fearing that the Federations would accuse it of dictatorship if it solved them on its own initiative.

Every revolutionary will understand, however, that in a Communist Party the Executive, having once been designated by a Congress and having thus obtained the confidence of the Party, ought to have the widest latitude in directing the policy of the Party according to the theses and resolutions adopted by national and international Congresses.

It is necessary that, beginning with the Congress of Marseilles, the Executive of the Party be more firm and become a true guide, controlling and inspiring the thought of the Party, directing parliamentary activities, taking definite position, day after day, in national and international policies.

It would be useful, it seems to us, to entrust the small administrative tasks to an administrative secretaryship and to choose from the Central Committee a directing group of at least five members whose chief task should be this daily guidance of the activity and the thought of the Party.

As a corollary to this labor of firmer leadership the Party must develop a spirit of greater discipline. Communists ought to feed themselves before all else members of the Party and act as such in all their public and private life.

The trade-union policy of the Party is certainly the most important and most delicate question put before the Congress of Marseilles—a question which the Party failed to solve in the entire first year of its existence.

The Communist Party if it is to be the vanguard and artisan of the Social Revolution cannot fail to take interest in trade-union questions. There are no labor questions that are not trade-union questions; there are no labor questions that are the Party's own. It must therefore adopt a line of direction in all questions of a trade-union nature. It must make an insistent claim before the working-class upon the right and the duty of taking active interest in these questions. It must demand that its members be Communists in the unions as well as in the Party.

A Communist Party ought not tolerate any of its members supporting the policies of Jouhaux and the Amsterdam International. It ought plainly to tell those who agree with Jouhaux that their place is in the party of Renaudel, of Albert Thomas and of Longuet.

The Party ought also to combat energetically Anarchist and purely Syndicalist ideas that deny the role of the Party in revolutionary activity. It ought to make it equally plain that its will and that of the Communist International is not the subordination of the unions to the Party, but the participation of all members of the Party in the work and struggles of the trade-union minority in France.

The Party ought to seek the closest cooperation of those Syndicalists who in contact with the events of recent years have thoroughly revised their revolutionary ideas in a fraternal spirit, it ought to discuss with them all revolutionary problems.

The Party ought to demand from the Syndicalists precision in their present ideology, and must combat all the ancient vestiges of Anarcho-Syndicalist thought. We have no doubt that if the Party asserts itself as a true revolutionary and Communist Party it will attract not only the sympathy of large proletarian masses, but also the adhesion of Syndicalist Communist comrades who still mistrust it. It is by a policy carried out without flinching or opportunism that it will win them.

The draft of the theses on the union question elaborated by your Central Committee, is only the first attempt in the clarification of this fundamental question.

Those who say that the economic struggle does not concern the Party are either complete ignoramuses or persons to whom Communism is a joke. The Party ought to absorb all the best elements of the working-class and in the sphere of thought it ought to inspire all proletarian struggles, comprising evidently also the economic struggle.

The union as a union is not made subordinate to the Party as a party. In this sense the union is autonomous. But the Communists acting in the midst of the unions ought always to act as disciplined Communists.

Through a series of circumstances many valuable revolutionary elements who consider themselves as Syndicalists are still outside of the French Communist Party. We ought to reach an agreement with them and sooner or later meet them in the ranks of a united Communist Party, but we cannot and we ought not encourage Syndicalist prejudices concerning the Party and political action.

When the delegation of the Communist Party was at Moscow attending the 3rd Congress, the Executive Committee called their attention to the necessity of controlling the non-official Press of the Party by the Central Committee.

The Executive Committee had in view especially "La Vague" of Brizon and the "Journal du Peuple" of Fabre, both of which were following a policy in disaccord with that of the Party and the Communist International.

The clear principles of the Second World Congress laid it down that no member of the Party could invoke the right of the so-called free press in order to publish periodicals over which the Party had no absolute control.

It was in complete unanimity with the French delegation then at Moscow that the Executive brought up the question just mentioned. Since then, however, it has received no reply from the Central Committee of the Party.

The Executive asks the Congress of Marseilles for the Party's answer to this question which it considers as one of the most elementary questions of Communist discipline and one which the Central Committee could and should have solved.

The delay in solving this question is all the more deplorable because, since the transmission of this resolution, an opportunist tendency has become crystallized around the "Journal du Peuple" regretting the result of Tours and bewailing the separation of the dissidents and of Serrati, preaching even open collaboration with bourgeois parties in the form of a Left Bloc. It is not surprising that the comrades who follow this policy, hostile to the very principles of Communism, feel that our resolution has them in view and seek to put the blame for it on the shoulders of the French representative of the Executive Committee.

We hope that the Party Congress at Marseilles will clearly express its opposition to such a policy and will recall the group of comrades to Communist discipline.

It seems necessary to us that the French Party seek to establish closer and more constant relations with the workers in the factories. Too often the Press of the Party is imbued with a spirit of mere raillery rather than expression of a true revolutionary and proletarian character. The Central Committee, besides, counts among its members too small a proportion of factory workers. It seems necessary to us that in the elections for the new Central Committee more place be found for the labor element.

The French Party has also been always too much out of contact with the life of the International. We hope that in the future closer ties and more frequent relations will permit the French Party to take an active and fruitful part in the life of the Communist International.

Just as we consider every French question a question for the entire International, so we hope that the proletarians of France will consider as their own every question that comes before the proletariat of Germany, Russia, America, etc., and in discussing it will take an active part in the work and struggle of all sections of the Communist International.

All these important questions, most of which we think should have been solved by the Central Committee in the course of the year, are submitted to-day to the deliberation of the Marseilles Congress.

We hope that the work of this Congress, inspired solely by a great desire and ardent hope of seeing the triumph of the Social Revolution, will give your Party a great new impetus, a foundation of solid doctrine, clear tactics.

After this first year of stabilization and organization, the Congress of Marseilles ought to mark a new epoch and serve as the beginning of a year of intense and fruitful labor, the labor of winning over new large masses to our ideal; a year of struggle also, of a more and more effective struggle against the reformism of Amsterdam, of London, of Vienna and of Geneva and against the bourgeois or Left Combinations: a struggle to weaken and vanquish the most insolent criminal imperialism in existence.

It is at your Congress that you are going to forge the arms and the instruments for these battles and these labors that await you.

The Communist International hopes that Marseilles will be a still more important date than Tours in the history of your Party. The International follows your labor with a keen interest, certain that the French Party will do its duty in the common task of the complete emancipation of the workers.

Long live the French Communist Party!

Long live the Communist International!

Long live the World Revolution!

The Executive Committee of the  
Communist International.

## IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

### The Amsterdamers and the Russian "Collapse"

by W. Lada.

The Amsterdamers of all countries are shouting with joy and are jubilant. The Dissmanns and Merrheims, as good revolutionists and good theorists, gave warning beforehand—they would not enter into any revolution. Lenin and Trotzky—these half-witted soldiers of fortune—engaged in revolutionary adventures and have suffered a shameful shipwreck!

Reader, don't laugh. For this is in short the idea contained in a long article which appeared in the trade-union press of the Amsterdam International on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of Soviet rule. In the November 19th number of the German "Metal Workers' Journal", the organ of the biggest of all the German Social Democratic trade-union federations, we read the following as the inference drawn from a consideration of four years of Soviet rule in Russia:

"As things stand in Russia at the end of four years of Soviet rule there can be no doubt that a new capitalist order is imminent there. In a certain sense Russia is receding economically to where the Czarist regime left it. This certainly does not correspond with Lenin's and Trotzky's purposes—Hard reality shows itself once more stronger than dictatorial will and rashness. It is clear that this development is a reflection upon the Soviet rulers and their teachings. *Indeed the old Socialist masters have written in order to guard against such a bitter experience. The outcome of the Soviet Russian policy could have been foretold from their writings and has often been foretold.*"

And Merrheim, the general secretary of the French metal workers' federation, wrote the following in the "Atelier" of November 12th in an article entitled, "The Lesson of Facts—Four years of Bolshevism in Russia—Lenin is forced, in self-disavowal, to recognize his errors, and to confess the collapse of his theories of force and adventure."

"On January 1919, soon after the armistice, I tried at Corbeil to warn the workers against the erroneous idea that if a political revolution were possible the economic problems could be solved at the same time . . . Lenin's latest speeches and writings do not only establish the fact of this defeat (of his policy) but force even the blindest to perceive Lenin's abdication as well as the disavowal of his entire doctrine, his principles, his conception of the revolution and of the social transformation . . . It was easy to foresee this defeat. It was inevitable for those who, like the Bolsheviks, allowed themselves to be dazzled by the idea of violence and force. And when I mentioned my speech at the beginning of this article it was to set down once more the real revolutionary doctrine as opposed to the doctrine of adventure, of futility and impotence, the irredeemable shipwreck of which has been announced by Lenin himself."

Wherein consists the "collapse" of Lenin's and Trotzky's theory and practice over against which Merrheim and Dissmann set up their own theory and practice with so much triumph? It consists in this, that according to the Dissmann organ Russia is faced with a new capitalism and according to Merrheim's quotation of Lenin himself Russia is forced to pass over from production and distribution on a Communist basis to an economic system "which contains more elements of the old economic arrangement than before". And wherein lies the spiritually rich theory and practice of the Dissmanns and Merrheims? In this, that the political revolution should not be entered into, if there is no assurance that it is possible to control successfully and to turn into account the means of production.

Cheap truths of spiritless "leaders" who cannot find their own way in the great transformation of world history! As arrogant as is their criticism, so is their apology for their own practice and "doctrine" delusive.

As for the first of these, their criticism, we ought to take two things into consideration in order to do justice to the

Bolshevik achievement in Russia. First, what goal did the Bolsheviks set for themselves on the eve of the revolution; secondly, what they have in fact achieved.

As for the first, Radek has already justifiably pointed out that the program which Lenin drew up in April 1917 provided for no abolition of capitalist private ownership, but rather for the control by the workers and peasants over the government-machinery with the nationalization of banks, the transfer of land and property from the hands of the feudal nobles into those of the laboring peasants. I still remember how at a conference which the Bolsheviks held in Switzerland during the war they foresaw the social revolution for the West European countries and they designated the accomplishment of this as a duty of every revolutionary Socialist whereas they confined its aims in Russia emphatically and clearly to a democratic revolution.

But the Revolution has its own logic and its immanent laws of development. It cannot achieve its aims unless its conscious followers, that is, the proletariat in certain cases, go far ahead of these aims. For men create their history themselves, but not of their own free will. The social milieu and the enemy classes decide the course of the revolution perhaps in the same measure as do the very followers of the revolution—the revolutionary class. What wonder then if, as a consequence of the overstepping of the aim which they could possibly set for themselves as a result of given historical conditions, they suffer a defeat and must then make a "strategic retreat"? But how spiritless are those "revolutionaries" who call attention to this with malicious joy and, like those Philistines in the poem by the great Russian poet, sneeringly refer to the prophets and forerunners of the Social revolution to and "teach" their young followers "Don't imitate them".

We must call attention to another point. It is basically false—this statement made by the Dissmann organ and reprinted and greatly praised by the "Miners' Journal"—that Russia has gone back economically to where Czarism had left it. The Amsterdamers coolly and consciously lie when they say that "out of the pretended dictatorship of the proletariat the real dictatorship of capitalism is growing". What is happening in Russia now? The "Shop Council Journal", another organ of the same German Metal Workers' Federation, in an article by O. Neuraths replies as follows to this question in clear contradiction to the above-mentioned lying assertions of the "Metal Workers' Journal", but in accordance with the facts: "It is possible for capitalist economy of such a nature to result without bringing about the private ownership of the means of production in contradistinction to the economic order in which private ownership of means of production remains, but burdened with so many limitations that it becomes almost insignificant".

In reality a peculiar economic system is being worked out in Russia, by which the most important means of production (outside of land) are for the greater part in hands of the government which is recognized as representing only the interests of the laboring population, the other part in the possession of the capitalist class without as a rule in its ownership. As long as Soviet Russia stands on such a firm basis that world capital is seeking a political and economic understanding with it, the Amsterdam people are lying outrageously when they prate about "dictatorship of capitalism" in Russia. Not to mention those individuals who have sold themselves body and soul to Stinnes, and under cover of the Ebert Republic make it possible for Stinnes to set up a real dictatorship of capital in Germany!

Now we come to the other side of the question. Let us consider for a moment with the "Miners' Journal" that Soviet Russia has in reality not gone forward, but backwards. This is, so to speak, "the disastrous result of four years of Soviet rule". And yet, what have the Hues and the Dissmanns, the Merrheims and the Jouhaux to show as a result of the seven years of their activity since the outbreak of the world war? The Ebert-Republic with its disordered finances, with its decaying economic system, with its starving working-class and its gormandizing bourgeoisie? In France a similar picture with slightly different colors! Certainly, neither in France nor in Germany is the ruin so great as in Russia. But Russia has its period of destruction of the time of the Revolution behind it, whereas for the West-European countries it is before them as even the "Metal Workers' Journal" itself admits in the following words. "Like an iron broom the Soviet dictatorship has swept away a great deal from the mountain of spiritual mud and political and social backwardness."

Merrheim, to be sure, intends to oppose the "economic" to the political revolution, and the German "Bergarbeiter-Zeitung" with even greater reformist sincerity expresses the wish of reaching Socialism by way of "managerial and industrial democracy". But this eloquence won't entice a dog from its

kennel. Still less can it destroy capitalist dictatorship and turn the capitalist system into a socialist industrial order.

And so the fact stands: the work of Lenin, Trotzky and their Party belongs to history in the highest sense of the term. The criticisms of their Amsterdam opponents, however, belong to the sphere of fault-finding political fogies, who have always been so influenced by pioneer historic events. The Social Revolution in Europe and in the entire world is nevertheless still the historic order of the day and neither the Hues nor the Dissmanns or Merrheims will prepare it by their "managerial and industrial democracy". For the Revolution is coming, as Lassalle said "with flowing hair and in iron sandals". It is coming like a whirlwind overthrowing and shattering on its way all that is corroded and rotten.

## The White Terror

### A Penal Law Against Communists in Switzerland

by Willy Trostel (Zurich).

In the Swiss Federal Parliament a certain law, dealing exclusively with the persecution of the working-class will soon come up for discussion. That part of the Federal criminal law which comes under "Crimes against constitutional law and order" will be rendered considerably more severe. After the November uprisings which took place in Zurich in 1917, and after the national general strike of 1918 and that of 1919 in Zurich and Basle, the bourgeoisie did not seek to improve economic conditions, but rather to sharpen the tools of persecution and conviction against the fighting workers. As a result the so-called "Preventive Imprisonment Initiative" was launched and although it received 100,000 signatures it was rejected by the parties in power and by the federal government because it did seem somewhat too "severe", and above all too much of a revengeful act against the fighting workers. They did not wish to persecute "crimes against constitutional law and order" immediately after labor conflicts. In April of this year the Häberlin Law, intensifying the federal criminal law, was introduced.

In the introduction to this new law, the following among other things is said: "It is self-apparent and easily understood that in the last seven decades, as political forms, parties, various interests and political and economic aims changed, the methods of struggle against the existing form of government also changed. We have nevertheless learned from experience that even in our country the constitutional way of acquiring political power is no longer sufficient and is too slow a process for many; and unfortunately these many do not consist only of agitating foreigners...."

"The events of 1918 and 1919 revealed the charged atmosphere in certain circles. The order and safety of the state were seriously threatened (!). To-day the Communists, openly and dictatorially directed by Moscow, are furnishing fresh fuel to the anti-government and anti-constitutional (!) flame of certain extreme elements which, far from hesitating in committing illegal acts, even openly breach them. Under these frightful conditions every lawful and state-supporting element and every law abiding citizen must stand behind the government and demand the most ruthless persecution of these agitators and provocators. Here we can no longer speak of democracy; here a strong cleansing arm has to be applied."

Because the existing laws "offer no sufficient protection to constitutional law and order and domestic safety, and because the existing laws directed against high treason and revolt do not strike at the *evil methods of present-day revolutionary mass action*", the new law must be applied with such severity that no struggle of the working-class either in preparation or going on can escape it. It is only too self-evident that this law is particularly directed against the state employees whose right to strike is taken away and whose right to organize is limited to an illusion.

The new law prohibits all demonstrations and strikes. In the oldest democracy in the world (!) as in no other country an attempt is being made to suppress economic movements by means of a penal law. No attempt is made to trace the causes of the wage-struggles and the demonstrations back to the ever growing misery of the working masses; they do however attribute them to foreign influences. The following statement shows clearly how this law is directed against the Communists and the Communist International in particular: "The Swiss revolutionists have adopted the revolutionary tactics of Russia and

are organizing mass demonstrations and general strikes which disturb economic life and lead to revolution (Bravo!); their purpose is to bring together as many people upon the street as possible and when a favorable opportunity presents itself, to commence civil war".

Lenin and other comrades are then quoted and the conclusion is reached that these mass-actions which cause disturbances in economic life, lead to the overthrow of constitutional law and order, and finally to civil war, must be severely punished. "This is of course a protective measure for the state whose existence is threatened by these mass-actions. It can no longer be tolerated that individual elements (!) should imitate and follow the Russian method, shake the foundations of our government and throw our country into chaos, to the detriment of our fellow citizens."

Not only are organized demonstrations and strikers to be punished, but also preparation of strikes and which that of course every act of agitation and propaganda for the revolutionary labor organizations. The following are classified as acts of "preparation": conspiracies, revolutionary courier service, the furnishing, collecting, distributing and keeping of arms, the issuing of proclamations and the organizing of revolutionary institutions—workers' councils, revolutionary tribunals, etc. The reactionary tone of this law is expressed by the following: "Since experience teaches us that the orders for a revolution in our country also come from outside and that the discussions of revolutionary plans can take place in foreign countries, we must therefore expressly punish crimes committed in a foreign country". By means of this sentence it is sought to prevent our comrades from attending international conferences, but its main effect will be that of increasing the field of activity of the political spy-system.

That being insufficient, it is also sought to do away with other so-called democratic popular laws, such as freedom of belief and freedom of press. All revolutionary propaganda, literature, agitation and "general preparation of opinion for the revolution", are to be covered by the law. "We must recognize the fact that inciting speeches held at meetings, newspaper articles and revolutionary literature constitute an effective weapon in the hands of the revolutionaries. These means of agitation have an evil effect upon those 'incapable of thinking for themselves', namely, upon our youth whose revolutionary spirit was thus intensified and who were edged on to violence. For this reason we find it necessary to take measures against the revolutionary propaganda."

Furthermore, this law punishes those who incite the government employees to disobedience, those who organize or direct soldiers' organizations and carry on revolutionary propaganda in the army. Weeks and months of imprisonment are provided for.

This Häberlin bill is a typical example of the fact that even the democratic form of government is nothing more than a tool of suppression in the hand of the ruling class which can find no way out of the ever-increasing economic crisis. Those in power seek to fortify themselves behind severe reactionary measures and extraordinary laws. Legal sanction is to be given to their reactionary proposals by a complaisant Parliament.

The Swiss Communist Party looks calmly upon this extraordinary law which far from paralyzing its activity will rather intensify it, though not in as open a form as heretofore. All the gagging laws in the world cannot weaken the revolutionary movement; they rather increase and intensify revolutionary propaganda and with it the revolutionary struggle. Our watchword is:

Untiring activity for the World Revolution in spite of everything!

---

## Notice of Change of Address

We call the attention of all our correspondents and subscribers to the change in address of the „International Press Correspondence“ and urgently request that all communication be sent to the following address:

FRANZ DAHLEM, BERLIN SW 48,  
FRIEDRICHSTR. 225, v. III.  
FOR INPREKORR.

**The Administration.**