

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 81

19th November 1925

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

C O N T E N T S

J. Földi: Rákosi and his Comrades before the Special Court.

The Inter-Parliamentary Communist Conference at Brussels.

Walter Stöcker: The Conference of the Communist Parliamentary Fractions at Brussels.

Politics.

Karl Radek: The Guarantee Pact. III.

J. B.: The Second Stage of the Revolt in Syria.

Paul Marion: The Political Situation in France.

The Labour Movement.

L. . . . g: The Second Congress of the International Federation of Private Employees.

Workers' Delegations in the Soviet Union.

Appeal of the Czechoslovakian Workers' Delegation to the Workers and Peasants of the Soviet Union.

The White Terror.

P. Mladenoff: The White Terror against the Young Workers of Bulgaria.

Union of Soviet Republics.

M. Frunze: The U.S.S.R. Defence System.

L. Trotzky: The Struggle for the Quality of Production.

G. Sokolnikov: The Economic Growth of the Soviet Union and the Part played by the Foreign Credits.

S. Soloviev: The Struggle for Healthy Life and Healthy Work in the Soviet Union.

Al. Dobrogeanu-Gherea: The Moldavian Soviet Republic.

M. Frunze: The Nature of Future Warfare.

Agitation and Propaganda.

On the Methodics of the Communist Central Schools.

Book Reviews.

J. R.: "Uj Marcius" ("The New March").

Rákosi and his Comrades before the Special Court.

By J. Földi.

The bloody system of Horthy placed comrades Matthias Rákosi, Zoltan Weinberger, Käthe Háman, Karl Oery and Ignaz Gögös before the Special Court. Matthias Rákosi was People's Commissar during the Hungarian Soviet Republic, Zoltan Weinberger was condemned three years ago to 15 years hard labour on account of communist Party work, and was exchanged through the intervention of Soviet Russia. Rákosi returned to Hungary 11 months ago and Weinberger five months ago, in order to strengthen the Communist Party and convert it into a thoroughly well-organised Bolshevik Party. Käthe Háman was formerly a railway official, afterwards, during the time of the terrible white terror, the leader of the social democratic women's movement, and later the secretary of the Chemical Workers' Trade Union. Karl Oery was a member of the Executive of the Wood Workers' Union. Ignaz Gögös is a wood-worker. He was at one time a prisoner of war in Russia and was nine months ago expelled from the trade union on account of "Bolshevik disruptive work".

These comrades have together organised the Communist Party, and in a relatively short space of time succeeded in winning for our illegal party a very great influence on the industrial working masses and also began to get a footing among the peasant masses. The Hungarian "restoration" has plunged the working masses into fearful misery. The land reform is bankrupt. The "restoration" has placed enormous burdens upon the working people and has reduced the burden borne by the ruling classes. A people's movement, extending beyond the proletariat, was beginning to arise. Comrade Rákosi and the other comrades wished to organise this people's movement and to create a strong Bolshevik Party which should lead the people's movement. The Communist Party was able, in a relatively short time, to point to great results. The result appears all the greater when it is remembered that in Hungary, membership of the Communist Party suffices in order to be accused of revolt.

It is therefore not surprising that the Horthy government designated the attitude and activity of comrades Rákosi and the

other comrades as high treason, and placed these comrades before the Special Court, although the entire international proletariat was aroused, although the matter was raised in various parliaments and although hundreds of prominent intellectuals from all parts of the world protested to Horthy and Bethlen against the proceedings in the Special Court and against the execution of Rákosi and his comrades. We can say today that the proletarian public opinion of the whole world was aroused against the crime of the Special Court. If we disregard the tone of the protest-resolution passed at the Party Conference of the Austrian Social Democratic Party in Vienna, which had the insolent audacity to describe the accused, who, in spite of the threatening death sentences, behaved in a really heroic and revolutionary manner, as "unripe elements", then we must say that the communist and social democratic working masses in all countries of the world unanimously, and with full class-consciousness, realised what the courageous self-sacrificing attitude of the Communists who defied the most horrible Horthy terror, means.

It can further be said that never since the murder of Somogyi and Bacso has the excitement of the Hungarian working class reached such a pitch as at present. Under the impression of the courageous behaviour of comrade Rákosi and the other comrades, the working masses organised in the Social Democratic Party demanded that the social democratic organ "Nepszava", which has hitherto played the role of denunciator, should alter its tone. Under the pressure of the working masses, the Party Executive and the parliamentary fraction were compelled to raise a protest against the Special Court proceedings. The Socialist Labour Party of Hungary, whose press was at first allowed to lead a semi-legal existence, but which in recent times was completely suppressed, protested by means of leaflets. The workers in the factories on Saturday last continually rang up the secretariat of the Social Democratic Party and of the Trade Union Council and were determined, in the event of a death sentence, to enter on a general strike.

As a result of the pressure of this powerful and spontaneous international mass action, the Court has not ventured to pronounce the death sentence. The transference of the proceedings to the ordinary court is the finest triumph of revolutionary international working class solidarity.

The comrades who defended themselves before the Special Court have, however, also shown that they deserve the revolutionary sympathy of the international proletariat. They knew that the Special Court, should it come to a sentence, could only pronounce one sentence — the death sentence. That however did not prevent any of our five comrades from openly proclaiming their communist convictions.

The spectators, who for the greater part consisted of counter-revolutionaries, bourgeois lawyers, state prosecutors and judges, were fascinated by the courageous attitude of the accused. Bravely and with clear arguments they defended the principles of the Communist International, indicted the bourgeoisie, the Hungarian and international social democracy and the Horthy system, and defended the Soviet Union against the dirty calumnies of the Public Prosecutor; and all with calm assurance as if they were speaking in a public meeting and as if they were not threatened with the gallows. They proudly proclaimed themselves to be communists who consider the proletarian dictatorship to be an unavoidable transition, as a necessary means for the emancipation of the proletariat. They did not deny the necessity of terror; they did not attempt to conceal their convictions. They declared that they are prepared to sacrifice their lives for the sake of their convictions. Their courageous, heroic behaviour determined the character of the whole proceedings, and suddenly converted the dock into a tribune, from which they indicted the present social order, the Horthy system, the Horthy socialists and defended the cause of the Communist Party, of the proletarian dictatorship and of communism. They spoke as if it were in no way their personal affair. It was in vain that the chairman insisted that they defend their own acts, not a single word was spoken in self-defence.

Before the Special Court of Horthy it was the Horthy system that was in the dock while communism celebrated its victory. The accused were not granted a single minute in which to prepare their defence. In spite of this, as if there had been an arrangement as to the rôles to be played, Rákosi defended the Soviet Union, comrade Weinberger scathingly attacked the Horthy system, comrade Göögös broke a lance for the principles

of the Third International. Comrades Oery and Hámán indicted social democracy. They all fought for the equality of the Communist Party of Hungary, even when confronted with death.

The special court of Horthy was thus converted into an effective tribune not only of the Communist Party of Hungary, but of the revolutionary labour movement of the whole world. The magnificent international revolutionary working class solidarity has rescued our comrades from the gallows. Bethlen risked the Special Court proceedings. But he had not sufficient courage to have our comrades executed in defiance of the powerful protest action. Comrades Rákosi, Weinberger, Oery, Göögös and Hámán have shown that this action has saved revolutionaries, has saved bolsheviks for the international labour movement.

THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY COMMUNIST CONFERENCE AT BRUSSELS

The Conference of the Communist Parliamentary Fractions at Brussels.

By Walter Stöcker (Berlin).

Just as in the Summer of last year, on the occasion of the London Dawes Agreement, the Communist Parliamentary fractions met together in Cologne in order to discuss the Dawes Pact, so now the representatives of the Communist fractions have met in Brussels in order, in the first place, to decide on their attitude to Locarno and the Guarantee Pact.

The discussion of the Locarno Treaty was of extraordinary importance. The reports of the representatives of the French, English and German parliamentary fractions, as well as the speeches in the discussion, revealed a united opinion regarding the character of these so-called "No More War Treaties". All comrades unanimously expressed the opinion that these treaties represent agreements among the capitalist imperialist powers against the Soviet Union, against the awakening working and peasant masses in the colonies, and before all against the European working class. All speakers regarded it as the most important task of the Communists, in the face of the pacifist fog of the socialists, to expose the real character of this Pact before the working masses.

It was unanimously expressed that the special feature of Locarno is a certain change in the grouping of forces, that instead of pressure being exerted by France upon Germany, this is now being done by England and America, and in particular the change of the German bourgeoisie from the undecided attitude it has hitherto adopted towards the West, to the unconditional participation in the English Bloc against the Soviet Union. The dangers of this change for the European and Russian working class, and in particular the possibility of Germany being the future theatre of war, and also her pledge to participate in economic and military action against the Soviet Union and to enter the League of Nations, were clearly emphasised.

Thus the Pact of Locarno was clearly characterised in the accepted declaration as a military Pact on the part of the European bourgeoisie, and there was demanded the immediate setting up of a real proletarian united front and a close alliance with the Russian working and peasant class. In view of the outcry of the reformists regarding alterations in the Communist foreign policy, the resolution submitted to the Conference once again emphatically characterised the League of Nations as what it is: an instrument of power of the present ruling imperialist groups, by means of which, under pacifist phrases, they are able to carry out more cunningly their predatory capitalist policy.

It was a matter of course that, at a Communist Conference, there was expressed with particular clearness the necessity of an alliance of the European working class with the awakening working and peasant masses in the colonial countries (Morocco, Syria, India, China) and the resolution on this question strongly opposes every colonial policy and calls for the immediate abolition of the colonial mandates of the League of Nations, as well as the complete independence of all the other colonies.

In contrast to the inability of the Socialist International (in spite of the attempts at Marseilles and at the recent sitting of the Executive) to arrive at a common opinion regarding Locarno, the Brussels Conference once again revealed the great inner strength

of the Communist International by reason of its common Marxist-Leninist conception. The **common declaration** which is to be delivered at the discussions of the Locarno Treaties in the parliaments of London, Paris, Berlin, Brussels, Rome, Prague and Warsaw by the Communist parliamentary fractions, in order to demonstrate by this means how the class-conscious revolutionary working class in these countries are united in their views regarding the Guarantee Pact, was **unanimously** accepted.

The discussion of the Alsace-Lorraine question was also of great importance. Like the enforced Treaty of Versailles, the Locarno Treaty also decides on the fate of Alsace-Lorraine without consulting the wishes of the population of this area. The two members of parliament of Alsace-Lorraine, comrades Stenger and Huber, described in their reports in moving words the fearful colonising policy of the French bourgeoisie in Alsace-Lorraine. The former oppression by German imperialism has only been replaced by new methods of oppression. Both speakers demanded a clear attitude from the French and German Parties.

Thereupon comrade Treint, in the name of the Communist Party of France, made a declaration to the effect that the French Communists are opposing with all their energy the colonial methods of French imperialism towards the population of Alsace-Lorraine. The French Communist Party declared itself in agreement with the present demand of the Alsace-Lorraine Communists: autonomy within the confines of the French Republic, and clearly and unambiguously demanded beyond this the full unrestricted right of self-determination of Alsace-Lorraine up to complete separation.

This was followed by the German delegation, who declared through comrade Stöcker their entire agreement with the attitude of the French Party; the German Communists congratulated the Communist Party of France on its courageous attitude. The German Communists, in supporting the struggle of the people of Alsace-Lorraine for autonomy, expect at the same time from the working and peasant masses of Alsace-Lorraine that they will more and more recognise that their real emancipation can only be the work of a proletarian revolution in Europe.

The **unanimously accepted resolution** protested sharply against the policy of violation of French imperialism and demanded the complete right of self-determination for Alsace-Lorraine. It expressed agreement with the present demand of the working and peasant masses of Alsace-Lorraine for political autonomy within the confines of the French Republic.

This decision of the Brussels Conference is of historical importance, and likewise shows the great inner strength of the Communist International. Whilst the German social democrats, by agreeing to the Locarno Treaty, completely support the handing over of the people of Alsace-Lorraine to French imperialism, and whilst the French socialists are the most energetic representatives of the policy of the French government in Alsace-Lorraine, the Communist Parties of France and Germany, on the ground of the tactics of the Communist International regarding the national question, unanimously demand the full right of self-determination for the people of Alsace-Lorraine.

Regarding the Washington Agreement and the fight for the Eight Hour Day, it was necessary to take up a new attitude in view of the decisions of the Amsterdam and of the Socialist International to conduct a special campaign from November 15 to December 15 for the ratification of the Washington Agreement. The Conference was unanimously of the opinion that, in view of the renewed offensive of the bourgeoisie, it was necessary to conduct with the utmost energy the struggle for rewinning or securing the eight hour day. For this purpose it was necessary before all to establish international trade union unity and to carry out a real mobilising of the working masses. In this sense it is advisable to participate in the campaign for the ratification of the Washington Agreement, but at the same time it must be clearly demonstrated that this agreement in no way secures the eight hour day, but, by means of numerous exceptions, permits its extension to a nine and ten hour day.

The speeches as well as the discussions showed that conditions in the various countries differ considerably, and that therefore the tactics of the various parties must be mobile. If, for example, in a country such as Belgium there exists a better law regarding hours of work, and which would only be worsened by the ratification of the Washington Agreement, then, of course, the situation there is different. On the other hand, a country in which the Washington Agreement means a certain advance, the Communists must carry out a direct campaign for

the agreement. The discussion on this point was very fruitful and will certainly contribute to uniformity of action of the Communist fractions in this question.

In view of the increased efforts of the bourgeoisie in almost every country to overcome the economic crisis by means of fresh protective tariffs (England, Germany, France etc.), and thereby to burden still further the working masses of the various countries, it was necessary to adopt an attitude to the question of customs policy and commercial treaties. Here also the discussion of this subject revealed the unanimous opinion that it is in the interest of the working masses to conduct the sharpest struggle against this capitalist policy of protective tariffs, and to oppose all hindrances to economic relations between the various countries.

The decision on this question, which was accepted unanimously, adopts a clear attitude from the communist standpoint with regard to the question of protective tariffs and free trade. The discussion revealed that, in view of the differing situations in the various countries and in view of the necessity of an alliance between the working and peasant masses in countries where small peasant masses predominate, elastic tactics are necessary. The question as to how far, in such a situation, communists can agree for the time being to certain protective measures for the small peasants, shall be submitted by the Executive and the whole Comintern to a thorough study and serious investigation.

On the desire of the Polish comrades, the organisation question was also discussed and the wish was expressed that the Executive of the Comintern should provide means for the purpose of better connections of the Communist parliamentary fractions with one another, exchange of material and experiences, common motions etc; for the control of parliamentary work such an institution will also become more and more necessary.

In conclusion, the Conference adopted a sharp resolution against the white terror in Poland, Hungary and the Balkan countries and pledged the parliamentary fractions to do their utmost to fight against this terror.

Thus, taken all in all, the Conference at Brussels has resulted in fruitful work for the Comintern, and has certainly contributed to a better connection of the struggles of the parliamentary fractions of the various sections of the Communist International.

POLITICS

The Guarantee Pact.

By Karl Radek.

III.

Between Victorious American Imperialism and the Uprising East.

The international position of England, which has been shaken to its very foundations is determined by the triumphant advance of American capitalism and by the revolution which is taking place throughout all Asia and which finds a support in the Soviet Union. All the other international questions — the struggle between England and France for hegemony in Europe — are of quite subordinate importance. If there were no increase in the competition of the United States, and if there were no prospects of this competition leading to a conflict, then England would easily be able to settle with France. And if there were no revolution in the East which finds supports in the Soviet Union, then England would have some prospect of emerging victoriously from her present economic crisis, just as she succeeded in overcoming the enormous economic difficulties following on the Napoleonic wars.

The growing strength of the United States of America does not consist in a simple increase in the amount of American capital. America owes her position as the leading imperialist power in the world arena to the fact that she possesses enormous home markets which have given a tremendous stimulus to the development of American capitalism, as well as to her invulnerable geographical position, which renders impossible any destruction of the United States from without. America is beating England in the sphere of industry, of commerce and of credit. She can also beat England as regards competition on the Sea. "It only needs for us to begin competing with the United States in the building of warships and we shall find ourselves absolutely beaten",

exclaimed the organ of the London stock exchange, "The Economist", before the Conference of Washington.

In her competition with the United States England is only defending her positions. As she was compelled at Washington to abandon competition in the building of dreadnoughts, she attempted to make up for this by increased construction of cruisers. Compelled to agree to pay America an enormous annual tribute on account of the war debt, she endeavored to compensate herself for this by increasing the price of rubber. Compelled to agree to give up intervention in China, England compensated herself by sabotaging the treaty regarding the customs, that is to say by sabotaging the compromise with China striven for by the United States. The policy of Great Britain towards the United States is the policy of a desperate, or better said, a disappointed conservatism, a policy which bears the fatal stamp of defeat.

All the more, therefore, is England endeavouring to save her position in the East. How do matters stand with her? The well-known French orientalist, Professor Grousset, published a book last year entitled "La revanche de l'Asie et l'imperialisme britannique" (The Vengeance of Asia and English Imperialism) (Paris, Plon). We take the liberty of quoting the last chapter of this book:

"The chief role of Europe in this sullen resentment, or in this open revolt of the Asiatic peoples has been played by Great Britain.

The world-catastrophe swept away imperialist rule even in Europe. The German, the Austro-Hungarian and also the Tsarist empires had to give place to the rising nationalities. One empire alone remains: Britain in Asia. Greater than the old Roman empire or Spain of the 16th century, less closely knit than the late Austro-Hungarian empire, it stretches uninterruptedly from Constantinople to Calcutta, from Cairo to Singapore. The European war resulted in a fabulous extension of the British empire in the Far East. Japan was its true ally and submissively played the role of the fifth dominion.

In the Middle East, Indian troops occupied Persia up to Transcaucasia. On this side they came as far as Baku, the centre of the oil wells. In Teheran Sir Percy Cox behaved like a viceroy. In Egypt the war permitted the English to set up in place of their temporary occupation a permanent protectorate. With the help of the Sheik of Mecca and his two sons, they held the Arabian world in their hands and were ready, if necessary, to impose on Islam a new Caliph. In Damascus Colonel Lawrence, under the cloak of king Feisal, created a new State of the Omajads; he placed Syria at the disposal of General Allenby and pushed France into the sea, without paying any regard to the promises given. In Mesopotamia Indian troops penetrated to Bagdad, to the raw oil of Mosul, which England, in spite of all solemn agreements, wrested from France.

And finally, in Constantinople, General Milne, after having enforced an armistice in Mudros, laid his hands on Turkey. The Sublime Porte became the simple instrument of the will of the English commissariat and Machmed VI, the last Sultan-Caliph, became the vassal of George V. The Turkish dream of Lord Beaconsfield, and the Iranian dream of Lord Curzon were realised. Egypt was connected with India. British imperialism achieved its aim in a very difficult hour. In view of the awakening of the Asiatic peoples the English Statesmen, if they did not wish to fritter uselessly away the conquests of their soldiers, should have proceeded with the greatest tact. In a few months Lloyd George and Lord Curzon had lost in Asia all the gains of the war.

Sixteen years ago Lord Curzon had brought about the Anglo-Japanese alliance. In the meantime however this action resulted in lowering the prestige of Great Britain and in raising Asia. It was very indiscreet of a European power, which had in its hands the complete control of half of Asia, to provoke the destruction of another European power by means of one of the yellow races. But in the year 1920 the Japanese alliance still continued to exist. Even if it strengthened Japan, it fettered her to England, europeanised and neutralised her.

In the meantime, during the most decisive days of the Washington Conference, Lloyd George compelled the Japanese to appear before the League of Nations in the role of an accused. He compelled them to yield up Shangtung. He dealt with them as he had dealt with France, by enforcing on them a new Shimonoseki. (In Shimonoseki in the year 1894 Russia, Germany and France forced Japan to give up the

fruits of her victory over China. K. R.) The result of all this was that, three years afterwards, the British Admiralty were compelled hastily to fortify Singapore in order to avert the Japanese threat against the Indian coasts.

In the Middle East British insolence aroused the national feeling of Persia to such a pitch of indignation that England lost everything, including those positions which she had occupied since 1911. Since the behaviour of Sir Percy Cox Persia ceased to believe the word of England. And from the moment when Anglo-Indian troops fell back before the Red Army Persia ceased to believe any longer in British strength.

The Persian dream of Lord Curzon has vanished for ever. In India, like causes are producing like effects. The people who were awaiting self-government (Swaraji), were replied to by the British colonial authorities with the shootings at Amritsar. By this means the British succeeded in uniting against them both the Mohammedans and the Hindoos.

But the most amazing error was the Turkish policy of Lloyd George. At the moment when England was attempting to restore the Caliphate and to unite under her own power all the Mohammedan countries in Asia, the British Prime Minister delivered over to Greece the finest Turkish possessions, the country of the sacred throne of Islam, with the two flourishing Turkish towns of Adrianople and Brussa, and also promised them Stamboul. He assumed that he could do just as he liked with the Turks, the leading race of Islam. This meant driving the Turks to revolt, and a revolt is particularly dangerous where it immediately arouses a response throughout the whole of Islam. Islam, which yesterday lay prone, obtained at the moment of its collapse a leader, Mustapha Kemal Pasha, and the fortress of Angora.

From Egypt to Bengal, from Afghanistan to Malabar, all the followers of the Prophet were rising. That which was now taking place on the banks of Sakaria was no longer a fight between Anatolian and Creeks, it was a united struggle between the Islamic world and the British Empire.

And the victory of Angora was not a defeat of the Greeks, it was a defeat of the British, a world defeat, the worst defeat which England has suffered since the revolt of the American colonies. The Treaty of Lausanne confirms not only the loss of the Straits and all the gains of England since 1918, it deprives England of all the advantages of the position which she had acquired up to 1914. As Lloyd George had insisted on making the Greek question a question of English prestige, it was just the same as if England had been defeated by Turkey in October 1918."

Professor Grousset sees the English defeat from the point of view of a Frenchman who is envious of British imperialism and of an orientalist who loves the Eastern peoples. But those who feel the least doubt regarding the correctness of Grousset's views should read the book written by an American who has had 25 years of experience of the Mohammedan East, Alexander Powell, who in his book "The struggle for power in Mohammedan Asia" (published by John Long & Co., London 1925), analyses the relations of England to Turkey, to Arabia, Mesopotamia, Palestine and Persia, and on every page gives a picture of one failure after another, of one defeat following on another.

What is the underlying cause of these failures and defeats? It suffices to cast a glance over the report of the lectures which the former Foreign Editor of "The Times", Valentin Chirol, delivered in 1924 at the Chicago University under the title: "The Occident and the Orient". Chirol is a well-known English Specialist on oriental questions, the author of comprehensive works on the present development of India and Egypt, on the situation in the Far East, and has been a member of many government commissions, among others the Royal Commissions for the study of India in the year 1912 and of Egypt in the year 1920. Let us see how he analyses the collapse of the British policy in Persia:

"After the conclusion of the world war, when Russia for some time ceased to be of any account, British influence in Teheran seemed for a certain time to be absolutely victorious, and the Persian government signed a new Treaty with England which practically placed the entire work of the restoration of Persia in the hands of the English. But Lord Curzon, who was the author of this treaty, once again underestimated the hidden strength of Persian nationalist feeling."

But upon what, according to the opinion of this defender of British policy, is British imperialism based in Persia? Upon

the highest and most reactionary Persian clergy and, finally, upon the Shah, who is as worthless as his predecessors. Chirol praises Riza Khan, but is incapable of grasping why England was unable to obtain his support. What is the meaning of the rise of Riza Khan? Riza Khan is conducting a struggle against the feudal elements which had kept Persia in a state of decay in order to govern it for their own benefit; he is endeavouring to centralise Persia, to set up a system of taxation which will render the government independent of the feudal lords and of the British. For this purpose he is endeavouring to establish an efficient army. He is supported in the first place by the traders, by the intellectuals and all elements, which are interested in the capitalist development of Persia.

Is it a mere chance that Riza Khan finds in the Soviet Union a support but in Great Britain an enemy? The essence of the matter consists in the fact that in the East England is not fighting against the Socialist Revolution, for which at the present moment there do not exist the requisite conditions, but against the developing independent States, even at the moment when these are beginning to enter on the first Stages of capitalism.

If British policy has suffered a defeat in the fight against such numerically weak countries as Persia, Turkey and Afghanistan, which are beginning to take the first steps on the road of capitalist development, then the collision of England with China will mean the collapse of Britain's Eastern policy in the literal sense of the word. Professor Grousset says that the day of the industrialising of China means the end of the British power in the East. But long before China is capable of bombarding the English in the East with the products of her industry — this process is already beginning — the first results of the industrialising of China: the creation of a proletariat and of a bourgeoisie, the mere fact of the uprise of petty bourgeois democracy, places England in a hopeless condition. In China the United States and Japan are endeavouring to find a support in the big bourgeoisie, are attempting, by granting concessions to the bourgeoisie, to create for themselves a social basis, to find a lever with the help of which it will be possible to bring China into the sphere of influence of the capitalist powers, without any disastrous upheavals.

The United States can contemplate such a policy because their riches afford them the possibility of giving a good deal to the Chinese bourgeoisie; the far-seeing Japanese politicians can also contemplate such a policy, for the geographical and the cultural nearness allows them to dream of the rôle of organiser of China and of the profits which this rôle would bring them. England however, cannot venture on this policy; she is not in a position to bribe the bourgeoisie of the East with loans, and, what is more important, she is not able to reconcile herself with the creation of great independent bourgeois States in the East. America has no big colonies in Asia. Japan has in her possession only Corea and Southern Manchuria. England, however, possesses India.

The victory of the national revolution in the East in general, and in the first place in the vast country of China, is a direct challenge to Great Britain. Every British imperialist realizes that the achievement by China of a real independence, of an independence which would open up vast prospects for her economic and cultural development, would every day raise in the mind of every Indian worker, peasant, intellectual and bourgeois the question: "Why can China be independent and not we?" The victory of the revolution in China means the victory of the revolution in the whole of India, if not in five then in ten, if not in ten, then in twenty years. It is for this reason that England can make no compromise with the uprising East; it is for this reason that she is opposing the rising East and is destined to be beaten by it.

The British imperialists, who have a foreboding of their approaching defeat, cannot imagine this to be the result of British policy itself. They are seeking to cast the blame on some factor outside of themselves; they find this in the shape of the Soviet Union. It would be childish to deny the enormous rôle of the Soviet Union in the development of the revolution in Asia. The influence of the victory of the Russian revolution and its experiences is accelerating the development in the East. But the Russian revolution is at the same time a historical fact; it is a constituent part of that historical process which is leading the whole of Asia to revolt. The British idea that the Russian revolution must first be crushed in order afterwards to crush the Asiatic revolution, means nothing else than the programme of a fight against the revolution in the East in general.

If, however, this programme appears very reasonable to British imperialism, because the Russian Revolution, as the first socialist revolution, calls forth the hate of the whole capitalist world, whilst it is more difficult to arouse the capitalist powers, who are not interested in defending the British interests in the East, against the national revolution in the East, nevertheless the British plan suffers from the fact that it is attempting to crack a nut at its hardest place. The Soviet Union is already a victorious revolution, organised into a powerful State, and to begin a fight against the revolution in the East with a fight against the Soviet Union, means commencing a fight at the most difficult end. This plan promises England a certain defeat, for she will not succeed in destroying the Soviet Union, and every struggle against the Soviet Union will allow a breathing space to the revolutions of the Eastern peoples and give them a chance to organise.

No matter in what way events may develop, there is not the least doubt that the fight against the Soviet Union and against insurgent Asia constitutes the Central question of English foreign policy, the question which determines the entire foreign policy of the British empire. Every step, therefore, which she may take in any part of the world, can mean nothing else than a partial mobilising against the chief enemy, against the Revolution, which is beginning to blow up with dynamite the already shaken pillars of British world-domination.

The Second Stage of the Revolt in Syria.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

In Syria the month of September represented a sort of breathing space and time of preparation. The first period of the Syrian revolt which commenced with the rising of the Druse on 24th of July last, ended with the following result: the French expeditions against the Jebel Drus were completely wiped out by Soltan el Atrach's cavalry: in Jebel Drus a national Arab government had been formed; the revolt, from a mere local affair, developed into an insurrectionary movement embracing the whole of Syria, the object of which was the abolition of the French mandate and the setting up of a national independent people's government.

In September both camps, the French government in Beirut and the insurgents in Jebel Drus and the most important centres of Syria, began to prepare for fresh struggles. The French scraped together all reinforcements of colonial troops in France and in Morocco which could be spared by General Petain, sent the renowned General Gamelin to the Syrian front, proclaimed a state of siege in the inner Syria provinces, arrested all suspected and "uncertain elements", established special courts and erected high gallows in the market places in the towns, for which zealous military detachments supplied ever fresh victims from the ranks of the "mountain bandits".

For the rest, General Sarrail, the French High Commissioner, reassured his superiors regarding the security obtaining in the country and made a cheap advertisement for himself and the "brave French officers" out of the so-called "relief of Suedida", which constituted an insignificant episode. Finally, the preparation of the French was expressed in bombastic appeals, in which the population were promised the joys of paradise if they would only refrain from revolt, and the most terrible punishments were threatened in the event of their venturing to take up arms against the mandatory power.

The activity of the insurgent leaders was less demonstrative and more thorough. On the Drus front they avoided every encounter until General Gamelin allowed himself to be enticed into taking the same rash step which many Generals had taken before him: to proceed into the interior of the impassable Jebel Drus. At the same time the movement was organised throughout the whole country. Throughout the whole length and breadth of Syria, here in Deir-es-Zor, in the edge of the desert, there in Aleppo, in the extreme North, there in the heart of the country, in the neighbourhood of Hama, Homs and Damascus well-armed bands sprang up as if out of the ground, who, being very mobile, annihilated French posts, destroyed communications, carried the message of revolt from one end of the country to the other. Against each of these bodies of franc-tireurs, troops had to be employed, who mostly returned home without having accomplished anything, as the Arab cavalry detachments dis-

appeared in good time in the boundless desert or in the precipitous mountains.

These pin-pricks first made the French authorities nervous, then furious. If a town, or a district was visited by one of these bands, then the French officers gave vent to their helpless rage on the peaceful population of this district. Whole villages were simply destroyed by means of aeroplanes, artillery and machine guns; "suspected" parts of a town were demolished and the population were forced to pay severe contributions and fines. The French were the best allies of the leaders of the Syrian revolt: they began the war against the whole population of Syria, provoked even the most peaceable sections of the population to revolt.

The revolt had another powerful ally: not for years has the economic position of Syria been so wretched as in this Autumn. In addition to the bad harvest which the Syrian peasantry suffered this year, there came the brutally enforced payment of the agrarian taxes by the French which were to serve to balance the Syrian budget, as the French Finance Minister could not this year, as formerly, grant subsidies to make good the blunders made by incompetent officials in Syria. While the peasants were driven to revolt against the mandatory power by means of bombs and tax-extortion, the situation in the towns was absolutely desperate: the price of food increased by a hundred per cent, the depreciation of the Franc (one of the benefits which the French bestowed upon the sorely-trying Syrians, was the compulsory introduction of the French currency) played its part in completely undermining the position of the poorest section of the population — wage workers, craftsmen, shopkeepers. In the towns hunger prevailed — and instead of bread the French gave bullets and empty words.

At the beginning of October there commenced the second stage of the Syrian revolt. It was introduced by General Gamelin's defeat in Jebel Drus. Three encounters: the attack upon the French camp near Musseifre, the second battle of Sueida and finally, the surrounding of the French troops near Ira (the interior of Jebel Drus) in a few days put an end to the long-proclaimed "victorious expedition" to Jebel Drus. Out of the 8000 French and colonial soldiers who set out with all their artillery, tanks and aeroplanes in order "to chastise" Soltan el Atrach, only a few hundred soldiers managed to escape the slaughter and were hastily transported with all the war material and artillery back to Damascus, abandoning the campaign against the Drus in order to restore order in the interior of the country.

The news of Gamelin's defeat acted as a signal for a general revolt in the hinterland. The towns began to get into movement and the French rule was no longer recognised. Scarcely was the movement quelled in Hama (South of Aleppo), when the revolt broke out in Homs (South of this town). At the same time unrest was reported from Aleppo, Lataquich and even from Baalbek in Lebanon. "There is not a single part of Syria where peace prevails" admitted the French Syrian newspapers in the middle of October. The remnants of Gamelin's army and the weak troops of Sarrail were entirely inadequate to cope with the movement.

The eyes of Syria were directed to Damascus. The capital town of Damascus with its 300,000 inhabitants, its revolutionary traditions from the earliest times (against the Turks and against the French), its enormous importance as one of the sacred towns of Islam, its importance as a political centre for the whole of Arabia, was long ready for revolt. As long as Gamelin and his army stood before the gates a revolt was doomed to immediate defeat. Now however, when the French army was vanquished and the Druse from the South were advancing against the capital, the moment for revolt had come. The French precipitated its outbreak by a great act of culture: The corpses of 30 insurgents who had fallen in the fight were publicly displayed as a warning example...

This was the challenge for the people to revolt. The Southern suburbs of Damascus which are inhabited by the poorer section of the population rose up, drove out or killed the French garrison troops in their quarters and advanced against the government buildings in the centre of the town. General Sarrail only escaped from the insurgents by the skin of his teeth. His palace was demolished. The French retired into the higher lying European quarter of Salchieh and the fortress of Damascus, whilst the insurgents erected barricades in their quarters and opened fire on the government buildings. On the following day French reinforcements arrived, man airship flew over the city and the

French demanded that the town be immediately given into their hands. The insurgents refused. Thereupon the French, without any warning, began a furious bombardment of Damascus. The bombardment continued for fifty hours. Damascus was wrapped in smoke and flames and over the sea of fire there flew squadrons of aeroplanes sowing death and destruction.

When finally the French accepted the submission of the insurgents in Damascus the city presented a terrible picture of destruction and devastation: whole sections of the town were wiped out, thousands and tens of thousands were buried under the ruins of their houses, thousands were without shelter. Men, women, old folk and children lay dead or wounded amidst the ruins. Several portions of the town were still burning; houses continued to collapse. The most beautiful town of the Near East lay destroyed. Streams of blood flowed in the Streets, and above the pitiable picture of destruction there proudly waved the French tri-colour. The communique of the French General staff on the evening of 21st of October (after three days of street-fighting) laconically stated: "The revolt in Damascus has been suppressed, our losses are insignificant. All is quiet in Syria."

Now the last sentence of the communique is certainly not in accordance with the fact. The destruction of Damascus by French artillery and airships has called forth enormous excitement in the whole East. The hatred against the French amounts to fanaticism. The mass-slaughter in Damascus is summoning the whole world of Islam to the fight against French imperialism.

Under such circumstances the artful English consider it expedient to disassociate themselves as far as possible from France with whom only recently they were talking of a close brotherly alliance. The English press, from the "Morning Post" to the "Manchester Guardian", condemns the French system and advises the French to make peace with the Arabs. Among other things, it is pointed out that Syria is better suited for an English mandate than for a French, and that Islam has its best friends in London.

It is hardly to be expected that the only result of the bloody sacrifices of the Syrian insurgents will be a change of mandates. The bombardment of Damascus is in no way the ending of the Syrian revolt, but only the conclusion of its second stage. The French are about to transport thousands of fresh soldiers from Morocco to Syria, while the slogan: "revenge for Damascus" adds fresh fuel to the flames of the revolt in Syria. The first centre of the revolt, Jebel Drus, is still entirely in the hands of the insurgents and the next few days and weeks will bring fresh and serious collisions. Much will depend upon whether the French proletariat will longer permit the mass murder in Syria which, by the way, has cost France alone very dear. Now, when the main front of French militarism has been transferred from Morocco to Syria, the French proletariat must understand how to enforce with all energy the evacuation of Syria by the French troops.

The first stage of the Syrian revolt was concluded by a military defeat of the French which rendered possible the spread of the revolt throughout the whole of Syria. The second stage ended with the crushing of the revolt of Damascus, with the destruction of Damascus. Under the ruins of this town, however, there lie buried along with thousands of victims of imperialist slaughter, the last remnants of prestige and sympathy which France had among the Arabs. To the military defeat of the French in August the bombardment of Damascus has added the greater defeat, the political defeat. French imperialism played out as a great factor of power in the Mohammedan East.

The Political Situation in France.

By Paul Marion (Paris).

The formation of a new Painlevé Ministry, which has been painted with the colours of the Left Bloc, and the fight for the restoration plans in the Finance Commission of the French Chamber are only the parliamentary reflection of a deep-going movement of the French petty bourgeoisie.

For months past the petty bourgeoisie has been the victim of a regular inflation, and of a corresponding increase in prices. The enormous debts incurred by the French State during and after the war are falling due, and have created this enormous crisis of the treasury which is at present claiming the whole attention of public opinion in France.

This ever more disquieting financial situation and the events in Morocco and Syria have exercised such a material and moral effect upon the middle classes, that they were bound to call forth a severe crisis, first in the social democratic and then in the radical party.

The followers and the electors of the Left Bloc (petty bourgeois, small peasants and the backward working masses who are still dominated by a petty bourgeois ideology) have demanded from their political leaders an energetic defence of their interests.

For a long time the Herriot Ministry, squeezed between the demands of big capital and the threats of its supporters, had continually to repeat the "symbolic gestures", without being able to carrying out one of the reforms promised before the elections of 1924. The first Painlevé Ministry intensified the policy of "restoring law and order", the colonial wars, the lowering of the standard of living and the contradictions of the Left Bloc and of the socialist policy of support.

A similar tendency forced a portion of the radical electors into the socialist camp and drew a section of the socialists into opposition against the methods of their parliamentary leaders.

The result was the resolutions of the Paris Socialist Party Conference in August (campaign of agitation against the Painlevé Ministry) and the Radical Party Conference in Nice in October (for a Ministry of the Left Bloc and the taxation of capital).

In short, the democratic petty bourgeoisie demanded from the Left Bloc that it carries out its policy, that is a policy entirely independent of big capital.

This is the pitiable and continually renewed illusion of a class which claims to conduct the affairs of the Republic, whilst its economic incapacity condemns it either to a barren parliamentary opposition, or to governing in the name and under the absolute control of a capitalist group.

The recent events of parliamentary life have provided a striking illustration of this.

The petty bourgeoisie of the Left Bloc desired, by bringing into power a left-inclined Ministry, in the first place to abolish the inflation and the high prices by compelling the "rich" to pay.

But the new Painlevé Ministry does not live somewhere in the ether, but in capitalist France of the year 1925. Opposed by heavy industry, it finds itself in the hands of certain big banks, the interests of which it has to preserve and support.

Its plan for financial restoration which was introduced some days ago (15% annual tax on property, 15% annual tax on industrial property, 5% annual tax on profits from industry and trade), is such that it permits big business men who have floating capital at their disposal to carry out great loan operations and profitable speculations, and at the same time prepares evil days for the petty bourgeois, the sole supporters of the Ministry.

The financial measures of Painlevé would, in fact, not only hit the tenants, the consumers and the holders of small amounts of treasury bonds but would before all bring about a fresh inflation and a new wave of high prices.

The socialist and left radical deputies in the Finance Commission have protested and introduced amendments to the new projects. But one will realise the real meaning of this "struggle" when one investigates the solution which has been proposed by the members of the Left Bloc: consolidation of the treasury bonds and partial consolidation of the coupons of the Defence Loan, participation of the State up to 15% in industrial and commercial undertakings, stamping of banknotes in order to restore to the State the sum lost by the depreciation, reduction of rensions. As a matter of fact these measures would, as a result of financial mechanism, bring about similar disasters to the middle classes as were brought about by Painlevé and would bring similar benefits to the speculative bankers (it should be remarked that the same could be said regarding the draft of the so-called capital levy of the leader of the Socialist Party, Léon Blum).

In the Financial Commission of the Chamber the socialist and Left radical parliamentarians are chiefly concerned in obtaining purely formal concessions, in order to be able to allay the fears and the indignation of their electors. Speculating banks and representatives of the democratic petty bourgeoisie have negotiated for several days over these concessions. Whatever the immediate parliamentary results of these negotiations may be, one political lesson is to be derived from them: as long as the French petty bourgeoisie, in order to avert the threats which oppress it, endeavours to fight upon the basis of democracy, its

representatives, when they come into power or wish to retain it, will have to submit to a certain group of financial people, and if they refuse to do so and persist in their demands, they will be driven back into parliamentary opposition without achieving any practical results.

The only way out for the petty bourgeoisie is the immediate support of the struggle of the proletariat.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Second Congress of the International Federation of Private Employees.

By L . . . g.

A few weeks ago, the International Federation of Private Employees, the employees' section of the International Federation of Trade Unions (Amsterdam), held its second congress in Copenhagen. The first congress was held in Vienna three years ago. The Federation arose out of the secretariat of the International Commercial Clerks in the I.F.T.U.

At the congress the following countries were represented: Germany, Austria, England, France, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Sixty delegates represented 800,000 employees organised in free trade unions.

The business report of the International Secretary, Smit (Holland), which, in the most important questions, was insignificant, was placed in the hands of the delegates and verbally supplemented by the reporter. In the report, the secretary maintained that, in the three years between the 1st and 2nd congress, the League had developed and consolidated itself very satisfactorily. The secretariat and the Executive Committee of the League had devoted their attention particularly to observing questions of social policy, such as the 8 hour day and Sunday rest. Various Unions which had asked to be admitted to the Federation "had to be refused as they did not fulfil the preliminary conditions of membership". It is characteristic that among the Unions which were not accepted are: the Co-operative Union of German Theatrical Employees, the Union of German Ship's Engineers and Machinists (both affiliated to the German employees federation) and finally the Employees' Union of the Soviet Union. Smit declared that the Union of Ship's Engineers and Machinists should join the Transport Workers International, and that the Theatrical Employees should form an International of their own.

In the discussion, which at times became very lively, an Austrian representative accused the international secretary and the Executive Committee of the League of passivity with regard to social policy. The same speaker moved a resolution that the seat of the international bureau should be moved from Amsterdam to a country which was in the heart of social political fights (the Austrians would like to have the secretariat in their hands). A German representative found fault with the inactivity and the bad information service of the secretariat during the strike of the French bank employees. He further criticised the refusal of membership to the Union of Ship's Engineers and the Co-operative Union of Theatrical Employees.

The International Federation of Private Employees, was, indeed, altogether found wanting in the strike of the French bank employees. The French bank employees carried on a severe fight against financial capital for weeks on end without the Federation troubling to give them any real help. In spite of this, Urban, President of the Federation, maintained that the Federation had materially proved the justification for its existence and its activity by its "relief action for the French bank employees on strike". The French bank employees, who started their strike with great enthusiasm and whose movement only broke down because of material exhaustion, were at any rate in no way aware of any real activity or any positive relief on the part of the Federation.

The fact that Messrs. Smit and Comrades do not wish to admit the free trade union organisation of the theatrical employees and the Union of Ship's Engineers into the Federation is very clear evidence of the narrow-minded guild point of view of these "class fighters"; for they are at the same time the bitterest opponents of the transformation of the

trade unions from trade organisations to industrial organisations, to which of course, the employees would have to belong.

The English delegate, **Hallsworth** moved a resolution in favour of the admission of the Employees' Union of the Soviet Union. In support of his resolution, he very rightly pointed out that the Federation would be a mere torso until the large Employees' Union of the Soviet Union belonged to it. The reformist chiefs made an attack on this proposal. The demagogue Smit maintained that the representatives of the Employees' Union of the Soviet Union had up to now adopted an ambiguous attitude in all negotiations, and further that the trade unions of the Soviet Union were much more political organs of the Soviet State than independent organisations of workers.

What answer can be given to this impudent demagoguery of Messrs. Smit, Urban & Co.? **Well, in the interests of truth, it must be stated that Smit, Urban & Co. have up to now made use of every form of direct or indirect sabotage in order to prevent the admission of the Employees' Union of the Soviet Union to the Federation.** As regards the description of the trade unions of the Soviet Union as political organs of the State, as it pleased the reformist trade union leaders to describe them, it should be remarked that the Soviet State is no instrument of the power of the bourgeoisie, but an instrument of the power of the victorious working class. The trade unions of the Soviet Union, as an organisation for the protection of the economic, social and cultural interests of the workers and employees, have therefore naturally no reason to be in opposition to their State. **The demagoguery of Smit, Urban & Co. is all the more insolent because, in the capitalistic countries, in which the trade unions are necessarily in violent opposition to the (bourgeois) State, the yellow poisonous plant of co-operation with the capitalists and of reconciliation with the bourgeois State continues to bloom and flourish.** The policy of co-operation with the capitalists and reconciliation with the bourgeois State is of course, in its effect, contrary to the interests of the workers and employees.

In spite of the sabotage of Smit and his comrades however, the power of the idea of unity is already so great that the Congress could not refrain from passing a resolution which contains the following paragraph:

"The Congress welcomes with much pleasure the attempts to persuade the All-Russian Trade Union Council of the Soviet Union to join the IFTU. It gives expression to the hope that these attempts will soon meet with success and that the Russian comrades will be admitted to the IFTU., not as divisionists or oppositionists, but as brothers, as colleagues. As soon as this has been accomplished, the Russian unions of commercial and office employees and of technicians will, automatically be admitted to our Federation, in accordance with the statutes and after the resolutions passed have been recognised."

The thoroughly demagogic and hypocritical form of this resolution cannot blind our eyes to the fact that the idea of trade union unity can no longer be suppressed even in the circles of the employees.

The motion proposed by the **Austrian** delegation that the League should be **divided into classified groups**, was rejected. There are already special groups for **bank employees** as well as for **technicians and foremen** within the League.

Smit gave a report on social legislation. His speech culminated in the thesis that, according to circumstances, the employees must, in one country work for the extension of the existing social legislation, and in another, fight for the inclusion of employees under the protective laws which apply to all "employed persons". The representatives of the **Austrian** delegation demanded special rights for employees. **Aufhäuser** of the German Employees' Federation opposed the Austrian conception and pleaded for **unification of social legislation**. The debate ended with the passing of a **compromise resolution**, according to which each section can do as it wishes. **The point of view that employees should have special rights is absolutely wrong and reactionary.** The whole of social legislation must embrace all occupational categories of the working class.

As regards the problem of **unemployment of employees**, a resolution was passed, in which the hope was expressed that the Unions belonging to the Federation would do everything in their power to exert pressure on the governments and parliaments of their countries to abolish unemployment and to make adequate allowances for out-of-work employees. In regard to the

question of hours of work, the Congress demanded in a resolution that the **Washington agreement** should be carried through. **The transformation of the trade unions into industrial unions and the inclusion of employees in industrial unions was rejected by the Congress.**

The Second Congress of the International Federation of Private Employees was too deeply sunk in the slough of reformism to be able to solve the burning questions of the day. Any points of dissension which revealed themselves at the Congress were quickly smothered up by any compromise that was possible. As a matter of fact, each section of the Federation can do or neglect to do whatever it pleases.

At the same time, it becomes more evident from day to day that the closest union between the employees and the workers, the combined struggle of all the exploited classes is, even for the employees, a pre-requisite for improving their position. **The position of the employees is more or less wretched in all capitalistic countries. It is only in the Soviet Union that improvement in the position of the employees advances steadily hand in hand with the improvement in the position of the whole people.** The fact that the admission of the Employees' Union of the Soviet Union into the International Federation has up to now been prevented, is documentary evidence that the reformist leaders are opposed to the formation of a proletarian united front. **Nevertheless, under the blows of capitalism and through the systematic work of the class-conscious employees, both trade union unity and the close bond between workers and employees will be realised in time.**

WORKERS' DELEGATIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Appeal of the Czechoslovakian Workers' Delegation to the Workers and Peasants of the Soviet Union.

The delegation of Czechish workers, who visited the Soviet Union from the beginning of October till the 7th of November, have, on their departure, issued the following appeal:

"Thanks to the brotherly support of your organisations we were able in the course of six weeks to **get a thorough insight into the various branches of your social, economic and cultural life** and to become acquainted with various parts of your enormous country. **We were able to see everything we wished, we were able to speak with anybody who interested us without let or hindrance.** We thank you for the hearty reception you gave us and for your hospitality.

The Soviet Union is a State in which the working class rules in alliance with the peasantry. As a result of the revolutionary upheaval, enormous changes have taken place in the social and economic life of Russia. Whilst in the bourgeois States financial and industrial capital plays a decisive role, in the Soviet Union the Soviets maintain a dominating economic position and the working class through the Soviets have in their hands the whole of big industry, transport, the banks and foreign trade. Private capital only retains possession of commerce and small production and even here the Soviet power is ousting private trade by supporting the co-operatives.

The efforts of the Soviet power are directed in the first place to the **reconstructing and perfecting of industry and economic life in general.** In this work it is meeting with great obstacles in the shape of the prevailing agricultural backwardness and the remnants of industry which was thoroughly shattered by the imperialist and the civil war. The Russian workers realise these obstacles and are working most devotedly in the work of restoring the national economy. Old workshops are being reorganised and modernised, while at the same time new works are being erected. A wide-scale electrification programme is being carried out. The entire national economy is being systematically conducted by the State.

Whilst even in the years 1920/21 an economic decline was to be seen, the last four years have brought with them a **tremendous advance** which, unlike the boom periods under capitalism, have resulted in a **real improvement in the position of the working class, an increase in wages as well as the setting up of**

workers' rest homes, children's nurseries, clubs etc. In the capitalist countries economic reconstruction is carried out at the cost of the working class, their wages and social gains. Exact data show that in the year 1926 300,000 fresh workers will be employed in the Soviet factories. It is in this way that unemployment is being reduced. The provision for the unemployed is incomparably higher than in the capitalist countries.

The Soviet economy is not a complete socialist economy, although many branches have considerably approached the socialist form. Considered as a whole, Soviet economy is a transition stage to pure socialist planned economy. If the international working class are conscious of their duty towards the Soviet Union, if they do not permit armed intervention against the Soviet Union, then the realisation of the socialist economy will be accelerated.

The Russian proletariat is already class-conscious enough not to permit the return of capitalist forms of economy. The Russian trade union organisations are not only organs for the protection of the workers' interests and for raising the standard of living of the working class, but they are decisive partakers in state economic and social political life, in legislation, in the mental and physical education of the working youth. The factory councils are real decisive factors in the workshops, their powers are far greater than in all other countries. In common with the Red Directors the factory councils are working for a proper management of economy and for the observation of the general economic interests of the people. The factory council elections are carried out quite freely and are participated in by all the workers.

The social insurance is on a very high level, the sick pay is on a level with the average wage. Invalids and disabled are provided with a life pension amounting to their previous wage. The other forms of social insurance are thoroughly satisfactory. Laws protecting motherhood for working women, especially the benefits for pregnant women, are regulated in an advanced manner, entirely unknown in the capitalist world. The worker has nothing to pay for social insurance. The contributions for this are borne by the State and the private employer. The eight hour day is strictly observed. In occupations injurious to health, as well as for young workers in general, the hours of work are restricted to six hours a day. Factory scholars work only four hours while the remaining four hours are devoted to special training, for which they received adequate pay. This training is given gratis. Only those workers have to pay taxes who receive more than 75 Roubles a month.

The position of the workers in the various branches of industry is entirely satisfactory. The average wage, especially of the skilled workers, is higher than the average wage of the Czechish worker. Certain articles of food are cheaper than with us whilst various articles of consumption are dearer. As a result of the rapid pace of economic development a further improvement of the conditions of living of the Russian worker is to be expected, whilst in the other countries the standard of living is falling.

The Soviet government is carrying out the colossal task of enlightenment among the masses of the people who were left entirely without education under czarism; it has great achievements to record in combatting illiteracy. Apart from the many sided school system, based upon the new principle of work, the Soviet government is carrying on a great work of culture by means of the trade unions and party organisations and numerous workers' clubs, circles and libraries.

The solution of the problem of nationality in the Soviet Union can be regarded as a model for the whole world: all peoples enjoy autonomy and the full possibility of all-round independent economic and cultural development; the constitution of the Soviet guarantees every nationality the right and the possibility to withdraw from the Union. There is no sign of national suppression, in the offices and schools and before the courts the language of the local population is employed.

The delegation have realised that by the spread of lying reports regarding the Soviet Union the international working class has been systematically misled. We shall only tell the Czechoslovakian working class the truth regarding your conditions of living and employ all our energies for the setting up of trade union unity. We hope that the brotherly relations which have been established will continue and that they will help us to overcome capitalism and to realise the socialist ideals.

The above appeal is signed by the chairman, the secretary and the remaining members of the Delegation.

THE WHITE TERROR

The White Terror against the Young Workers of Bulgaria.

(On the occasion of the political trial of the C. C. of the Y. C. L. of Bulgaria.)

By P. Mladenoff (Sofia).

The government of the White Terror has organised a particularly intensified terror against the young workers, peasants and students in Bulgaria. In order thoroughly to understand the White Guardist regime of professor Zankoff and General Wolkoff, we must not lose sight of the special measures which professor Zankoff's Government and the counter-revolutionary Bulgarian bourgeoisie have undertaken and carried through against the communist youth movement.

The thirty years of revolutionary activity of the Labour party in Bulgaria under the leadership of the late trusted leaders Dimiter Blagoeff and Georgi Kirkoff have struck root deeply in the young generation of the working class, the poor peasants and young artisans. Before the war the young workers, and since, the young peasants and students also, gathered round the banner of the revolutionary class-conscious proletariat. In the factories, in the country, in the high schools and technical schools, a new generation grew up in Bulgaria who had already broken away from bourgeois prejudices, traditions, chauvinism, religion and monarchism, who derived their knowledge exclusively from communist literature.

It was easy for the Bulgarian youth — under the influence of revolutionary traditions and of present conditions — to imbibe proletarian and communist class ideals and their methods of fighting. This explains why, in so small a country as Bulgaria which has experienced two wars of conquest and national catastrophes, the Young Communist League could, until immediately before the September insurrection in 1923, attain a membership of 20,000 and an enormous influence on the masses. Parallel with this, a large Young Peasants' League developed after the war which, from the beginning, took up an attitude of opposition to the bourgeois political parties. In these circumstances, things came to such a pass that the question: "Where does youth belong?" became one of the most burning political questions of the post-war crisis (Bulgaria took part in three wars between 1912 and 1918) and in the revolutionary crisis in Bulgaria which began with the insurrections in June and September 1923. For this reason one of the most sanguinary sides of the Fascist and counter-revolutionary policy of Zankoff's is the White Terror for the annihilation and physical extermination of the Young Workers and Peasants Leagues in Bulgaria.

The slogan which Zankoff and Wolkoff issued to their executioners: "Children and youthful communists as well as their parents must be exterminated unconditionally and relentlessly to the last man, in order to make a revival of the communist movement in Bulgaria impossible", began to be put into practice immediately after the September insurrection.

In carrying through this "pedagogical professorial slogan" — it must be borne in mind that the bloodhound Zankoff is a professor, educator and Minister for Public Education — whole organisations of communist youth were slaughtered in Bulgaria, for instance in the villages of Dona-Banja (Samakoff district), Warshetz (Berkovitz district) and Lopushna (Berkovitz district). After April 16th this year, all the 13 members of the Young Communist League in the town of Orhanije were slaughtered to the last man.

In Bulgaria, almost all the young people engaged in factories, workshops, arsenals etc. were arrested, condemned or murdered.

In Bulgaria, many boys and girls were excluded from the schools and colleges. Hundreds of students of the Sofia University were arrested and interned in remote corners of Bulgaria.

In Bulgaria, dozens of trials of juveniles have been instituted. In Sofia there were two such cases, one against 31 and the other against 20 young people. In Vratza there was one trial of nine schoolgirls, in Plovdiv several trials of boys and girls. Trials of young persons were daily events in all towns where military courts and courts-martial were held. The trials

of juveniles are carried on in an atmosphere of hatred and with a pronouncedly provocative attitude on the part of the Fascist and the bourgeois Press. While the above mentioned trial of the 31 young people of Sofia was proceeding, a Fascist gang of detectives and officers in the reserve broke into the Court and wanted to illtreat the accused juveniles in the presence of the judge and during the proceedings. This unprecedented scandal caused Dr. Stateff, the bourgeois defender of the accused, to oppose the gang with an energetic protest in the following words: "If you want to murder the accused, you might have done it long ago; in no case can you do it in Court."

In Bulgaria, some hundreds of young people have already been sentenced to death by hanging and to imprisonment for life; other death sentences on juveniles are to be expected. The military courts have sentenced thousands of young people from town and country to penal servitude for 5—20 years, merely for belonging, to, or being suspected of belonging to Young Communist Leagues.

The trials of young workers and peasants have not ceased. The end of this endless chain of trials of young people is not yet in view; the attention of the international Young workers and peasants should again be called to this circumstance.

The relentless Fascist reaction of the Zankoff bandits is anxious to crown its blow against the Young Communist Leagues with a new trial of the members of the CC. of the YCL. of Bulgaria. Preparations for this trial have been being made for a year. A few months after April 16th, the proceedings were brought to a conclusion by the public prosecutor demanding death by hanging for all the members of the CC. The trial of the CC. is built up on false documents, of which Zankoff has altogether made liberal use in his violent attack on the working class. The trial is built up on the invented and despicable accusation that the YCL. of Bulgaria is a terrorist organisation, concerning itself only with individual terror, assaults etc.

The people's murderer Zankoff carried on the trial after April 16th against the best sons of the Bulgarian working people, under the false accusation that the Communist Party is no political organisation of the masses and the people, but an organisation of terrorist gangs. On the basis of this accusation the gallows were erected in Bulgaria. Zankoff however did not succeed in corrupting the opinion of the majority of the mass of the Bulgarian people and of those abroad as to the most popular and strongest Bulgarian mass party, the only one which represents the interests of the broad masses of the working people. Now, the government gangs are again trying to make use of this accusation in the trial of the CC. of the YCL., by branding the YCL. as an organisation subordinate to the Communist Party. In reality there is not the slightest political or "legal" justification for this trial of the CC. of the YCL. of Bulgaria.

This trial is one of the most patent evidences that the government gangs want to revenge themselves on the young workers and peasants because they have dared to throw overboard the bourgeois prejudices and traditions and to gather round the banner of the freedom movement of the workers and peasants. The whole development in Bulgaria is such that whoever dares to lift his hand against the present revolutionary youth, against the YCL., its members and leaders, raises his hand at the same time against the revolutionary history and traditions of Bulgaria, against the present and future of the whole of the Bulgarian working people.

The Bulgarian youth demands:

No further death sentences! Abolishment of capital punishment!

That the present death sentences should be neither confirmed nor carried out!

The broadest political amnesty for and liberation of the thousands of young people who are now in prison!

Re-engagement of all the young workers of both sexes who have been locked out and dismissed, who have been arrested and sentenced as victims of the White Terror!

Re-admission of all pupils and students of both sexes who have been excluded from schools and universities, the lost time being counted and the forfeited rights restored!

Abandonment of all trials of young workers and peasants!

Abandonment of the trial of the CC. of the YCL. and liberation of all who have been arrested and are neither members of the CC. nor have anything to do with it!

The young Bulgarian workers look for the energetic and determined support of the young workers and peasants of the capitalistic countries and of the Union of Socialist Soviet Repu-

blics. The fact that Zankoff and Wolkoff in their bloodthirstiness are, with the aid of the Fascist military league, preparing a new holocaust among the Bulgarian working masses, makes it more imperative than ever that an international activity of the proletarian youth, not only of the communist but of the social democratic and non-party youth of the whole world should support the young Bulgarians.

The terrorists of June 9th in Bulgaria are dissatisfied because a revolutionary working class and an undaunted generation of young workers still exist in Bulgaria. They want to slaughter 20,000 more workers and peasants, and have already worked out a new plan to this effect through their military League. The mass murderers of the Bulgarian people feel that their days are numbered and that is why they want to turn the whole country into a heap of ruins so that no one after them can undertake the work of liquidating their blood-stained inheritance.

The life of hundreds and thousands of young people are still threatened in Bulgaria!

All the victims of Zankoff's White Terror, who are still alive, must be rescued! Everything possible must be done to prevent new orgies of the blood-stained Zankoff regime!

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The U. S. S. R. Defence System.

From the Speech of Comrade Frunse at the III. Soviet Congress of the U. S. S. R. on 19th May 1925.

The system of defence of any country must be based on an accurate and clear understanding of the nature of all military encounters possible for such a country. The nature of such collisions must be estimated by us on the basis of a thorough consideration of the following three main factors:

1) Its social class nature, 2) from the point of view of the number of enemies and their numerical strength, and 3) from the viewpoint of their technical resources which may and are bound to be used in future wars. From the standpoint of the first factor I have included, — the social-class nature of the future war — the question is solved, as far as we are concerned by the nature of our State. We are a State of workers and peasants. In our country labour rules. This means that we will not conduct a war with any State where power will also be in the hands of the workers. We will not conduct a war with peoples, — national wars. We can only conduct a class war with the enemies of the toiling masses. If for instance things came to a clash with Roumania or Poland, we will not be waging a war in order to encroach upon the property of the Roumanian or Polish people, or on their independence, but in order to guard the interests of the toiling masses of our Union from attacks on the part of the ruling minorities of these peoples. Applied to our internal war policy, this means that we will build up and are building up our Army on a class social basis. This means that our Red Army as may be seen from its title is an army of workers and peasants, an army of the toilers. We cannot entrust arms to those social groups whose interests are hostile to the interests of the toiling masses with the right and duty of defending our workers' and peasants fatherland. We may see at a glance a proof of the impossibility of this in the fact that on the other side of the Soviet border there exist enormous numbers of bourgeois-landlord emigres numbering more than a million and a half, practically the entire mass of whom represent a weapon of struggle against us for all our enemies. One of the paragraphs of the law which we recently drew up and presented for the sanction of the Union government maintains that it is only the toilers who may be entrusted with the right to defend the Socialist fatherland with arms.

From the point of view of the second factor — the number and numerical strength of our possible enemies we must once more seek the answer in the nature of our State. Up to the present we are the only workers and peasants State in the world. We are surrounded by hostile and semi-hostile bourgeois elements on all sides. We may expect a blow at any and all sectors of our tremendous state frontier. This fact, the fact of our isolation compels us to treat the question of our State defence in a special way. We should have an army such as can protect the frontiers of Soviet territory on all sectors and in all directions in the event of a serious encounter. In practice this means that a system of

defence is necessary such as would secure that the entire mass of toilers capable of bearing arms could take the field. Our system of defence should acquire such organisational forms as will commit all the many million masses of workers and peasants to undergo training.

As far as the third factor is concerned — the technical resources for the struggle, we must here take into consideration the experience of the last imperialist war. This experience goes to show that no quantity of reserves of arms and ammunition prepared in peacetime and concentrated in stores will suffice for conducting operations. These will all be expended during the first few months whereas the war may be of a protracted nature. That is why we must construct the economic system of our country and direct our economics both in the industrial and in the agricultural field in such a way as will cope with the needs of defence. Everyone of our enterprises, or the group of enterprises in the form of trusts, should calculate on the necessities of defence when organising its peace-time production, and should build up its economic system so that it will be easier to change over to supplying the needs of a future army of many millions in war time.

Such are the conclusions that are obtained from an analysis of the nature of our possible future war. These conclusions should also determine the trend of our military policy. On the basis of these conclusions we are carrying on the organisation of the armed forces of the Union.

The Struggle for the Quality of Production.

By L. Trotsky.

An energetic campaign is at present being carried on in the Soviet Union, with the active co-operation of the broadest masses of workers and peasants, to raise the quality of production. In the following article we publish part of Comrade Trotsky's speech before a Commission specially appointed by the Supreme Soviet for National Economy for the purpose of raising the quality of production. Editor.

The view prevails that under capitalism, improvement in the quality of production depends on competition. This is true, but only up to a certain point. In proportion as production becomes concentrated — trusts, syndicates — competition gives place to monopoly in the chief branches of production. This does not however by any means necessarily imply a deterioration in the quality of production. The development of technique and the organisation of production has created new methods of improving the quality. Such methods are: technico-scientific experimental work, the establishment of norms for technical production with regard to certain goods, standardization, correct control, distribution of certificates, certification as to goods on the part of competent technico-scientific institutions etc. Thus, even under capitalism, competition is not the only possible method of improving the quality of production, and this is still the less the case with us, where the most important branches and undertakings of industry are concentrated in the hands of the State, where a combined influence is possible, both on industry and on the quality of its production.

Special emphasis should be laid at the present time on this idea, as many of our economic functionaries are, without making use of their critical faculty, allowing themselves to be carried away with the idea that competition is a decisive factor in technical and economic progress. The methods of competition have found a particularly illustrative, and at the same time obviously negative application in our electro-technical industry. One of our State factories engaged in the manufacture of electric bulbs competed with another. Each concealed its secrets of production from the other, though both were far behind foreign technique. It is quite evident that progress in this field can only be obtained for us by making use of foreign technical aid, by the introduction of experimental work and comparison, but can never be obtained by competition between two State factories, both of which are still in their infancy and compete with one another at the cost of the State, although they might have a much more serious standard of comparison for competition — the bulb which is current in the world market. Now that our two strong-current trusts have combined, these abnormal conditions have ceased to be, and the undoubtedly great achievements of Moscow and Leningrad will experience further developments as a result of their competing in common

with the European electric bulb. Not only the Leningrad and Moscow factories, but above all the consumer will profit by this.

In many, indeed in most cases, when we have before us, bad or even deliberately fraudulent productions, it is not so easy to decide what is the cause — the so-called general conditions, lack of technical training, incompetency on the part of the directors of the undertaking or possibly evil intentions. All these causes may be combined in various proportions. It should further be mentioned that every trust and every factory, which fails to fulfil the conditions of contract as regards the quality or the generally established norms for the goods in question, has the possibility of throwing the blame on other economic bodies by alleging that they have delivered bad raw material or bad technical equipment. There will be many disputes in all these questions. For this we must be prepared, and we must in good time provide the right organisatory forms for the competent and rapid solution of conflicts connected with the question of quality. In the next few years, these questions will assume considerable importance in our economic life. The reason is clear, our industry is growing and the reciprocal relations of the individual branches and undertakings of industry require to be exactly determined.

Until a short time ago, hardly a word was heard as to the quality of production. The growth of production was compared with the so-called pre-war standard in goods or with the prices in catalogues of 1913, the question of quality was entirely ignored. As for the consumer, he had to be glad if he did not get two right or two left boots, though not every consumer had such good luck. Even now, the reflection of this epoch can still be observed in some of our co-operative organisations. From now onwards things will be quite different. Every stage of economic advance will be accompanied by increased attention to the quality of production. The State itself will set an example. The military authorities will strictly demand exact fulfilment of the conditions of contract. These more exacting demands of the military economic officials, which are already manifesting themselves, are a sound and progressive factor. The Commissars for traffic and the Commissars for post and telegraphs etc. are becoming more and more exacting. The economic functionaries often complain of the "hair-splitting" of the State as a consumer.

It is quite possible that in individual cases there actually exists a certain amount of bureaucratic hair-splitting. This however is a secondary question. In general, a thoroughly progressive process is going on, every consumer demands an improvement in the quality of production. This fact is also reflected in the reciprocal relations between the trusts. If the People's Commissar for post and telegraphs uses pressure on the weak-current trust, the latter, on its part, demands better cable conduction from the strong-current trust. The engine-building trusts demand good iron, the textile trusts demand merino wool, good cotton, good dyes etc. Disputes between individual economic bodies arising therefrom, are an inevitable consequence of the campaign for better quality of production. These disputes should not be swept away with a wave of the hand as mere quarrelsomeness, but must be understood in their progressive sense. We need competent, qualified commissions of experts in all branches of production. This is one of the components of a mechanism which is to guarantee a constant improvement in the quality of production in a developing socialistic society.

One more question. It has often been said that the comparison of present day production with the so-called pre-war standard should be abandoned as unsuitable, not only because for us the pre-war standard is not ideal, but particularly because the question of the quality of production does not enter into this comparison. We must compare the production of our industry with the corresponding production of the present day world market. That is the only right and instructive standard. In establishing definite technical norms for our industry and seeing that they are carried out, we must, for the most important products at any rate, calculate a coefficient of comparison which expresses the relation between our products and the achievements of world production. If, let us say, our pencil is twice as dear as a foreign one, and, because of its brittleness is used up three times as quickly as a foreign one, and if, in addition, it writes three times worse than a foreign one (this must also be taken into consideration), the coefficient of comparison will be $1:2$ multiplied by three times three = $1:18$, i. e. our pencil will be 18 times worse than a foreign one. Such a coefficient may seem enormous, nevertheless, in some cases, it is quite true

An end must be put to judging by rule of thumb — “a little worse”, “a little dearer”, “a little less durable” etc. “A little” multiplied by “a little” and again by “a little” results in a coefficient of this kind which seems enormous.

Thus a coefficient of comparison which exactly determined, strictly tested and illuminated from all sides by the functionaries for production, will have a tremendously educational, i. e. stimulating effect. This will have a greater effect than competition between two State factories, both of which are equally backward as compared with foreign production.

The gradual alteration of these coefficients of comparison will be the best standard for the consolidation of our socialist position in the international capitalist environment. If, in much worse times, we combated every illusion and self-deception, we have now much less use for them than ever. What we have accomplished, is big enough to throw a strong light on the gigantic problems which are still unsolved. The capitalist world is strong through the colossal preponderance of its technical power, but we are strong through the possibilities opened up to us by the nationalisation of industry and the co-operation of scientific and technical work. In order to make the best of these advantages, we need a fearless acknowledgment of our backwardness and passionate endeavours to overcome this backwardness. The vague talk about our backwardness must be replaced by the language of exact figures. The coefficients of comparison will be a measure of our strength and our weakness, and will spur us on to an uninterrupted struggle to improve the quality of our production.

The Economic Growth of the Soviet Union and the Part played by the Foreign Credits.

By G. Sokolnikov.

Hardly anybody will be found nowadays to dispute the fact that we are in a condition of economic growth. It is a generally recognised fact, and it only remains for us to determine in what way we can advance most rapidly and with the least inconvenience.

The path we have to travel, is undoubtedly a very long and tedious one. In order not to lose the right standard, we must be clear as to the level from which we started our ascent. This level is so low that it is impossible to compare it with that already reached by other countries. Thus for instance, the level of the productivity of work in agriculture in our country is so low that our harvests only represent a **third of what were possible**. Our agriculture to a large extent still clings to mediaeval conditions. This is to be taken into account in applying a standard to all the resources of the country. In industry also the productivity of work is fairly low.

As regards prospects however, it should be emphasised that there is hardly any country in Europe which is in so favourable a position as our Soviet Union. The natural resources of our country exceed by far those of the richest countries in Europe. These sources combined with the existing enormous man-power, guarantee genuine progress. Thus the transition from the three field system to the four field system would, without any great revolution in agriculture, make it possible to **double the harvests**, and this would cause such possibilities of export that the greatest economic cataclysm would result in foreign markets.

We must, so to speak, discover America in Europe, and this can be done if we stir up those forces of production which at present are latent in European Russia and especially in Siberia.

What form does the process of economic growth take with us? The draft budget of the Soviet Union for the current year has just been published, according to which the final sum of the budget is established at 3800 millions. In the financial year 1922/23, we had a budget of 1300 millions, and in the two following years 1900 and 2600 millions respectively. **Thus our budget has increased threefold within three years**. If we add to the total sum of our budget the provincial budgets of 1200 million, we have 5000 million roubles. In the turnover of money we also see a development. The total value of the notes in circulation in 1922 amounted to about 100 million gold roubles. Immediately before the reform of the currency was undertaken it amounted to 300 million, and to-day it is 1200 million roubles.

The programme for the employment of capital in industry, agriculture and transport for the current financial year is reckoned

in general at 2000 million. One third of this sum can be raised from the industrial bodies, but two thirds of it must be allocated by the State budget and raised with the help of the State system of credit.

Will this programme of the extension of industry be carried out? It is my belief that in spite of all difficulties, the deviations from the programme will only amount to a small percentage.

Before the war, 63% of our industrial equipment was obtained from abroad. We must obtain machines and above all the means for producing means of production from abroad. This will mean a gain of several years.

The means for the solution of this problem can be obtained in two different ways — by making use of the possibilities of credit and by procuring the greater part of the means by realising part of our production in foreign markets. Each way demands and supports the other, therefore we must take **both ways**.

In no circumstances must we continue the Czarist policy of credits; for us, making use of foreign loans can only be an **expedient**. This of course does not mean that we entirely disregard the value of foreign credits. It only means that we **must chiefly direct our attention to the development of exports**, and especially to those branches of industry which do not demand any immediate and extensive new equipment. The first key to the solution of the problem is a rapid **development of agriculture**. Good organisation of the sale of the surplus of our agricultural production in foreign markets will be an extremely important factor.

The question of foreign credits and loans clashes with the problem of the old debts. New loans are refused us with the idea of thus compelling us to pay the old Czarist debts. We must indeed admit that when we ask for loans in Europe, we are in an awkward position, as we are knocking at the door of governments who themselves have nothing. The reason why Europe grants us no loans is not, as many European politicians and financiers say, because they have no confidence in us, but because, **with the best will in the world, they cannot make us any appreciable loans**. Europe itself is living to a very large extent on the means it obtains from the other side of the Atlantic.

Our new credit relations will be based on an **increasing trade** with foreign countries. This is proved by the agreements which we have recently concluded; the agreement with Italian firms and the contract with a German group of banks. The growth of our foreign trade is indisputable. We must lay the greatest stress on the **internal forces of the country, on raising the productivity of work, on better organisation of the national economy and finally on the further development of our own system of finance and credit**, so as to derive from it the means required as an advance on the economic boom.

We shall not fail to overtake the advanced countries in culture and technique, and we shall prove by deeds what a socialist economic organisation can accomplish, in which the development of the productive forces of the country is a deliberate aim of the whole people and the chief task of the State as a whole.

The Struggle for Healthy Life and Healthy Work in the Soviet Union.

By S. Soloviev (Moscow).

There is a profound and essential difference between the way the working class regards its own health and the way it is valued by the bourgeoisie.

In a number of **bourgeois States, health legislation** for the workers, sickness insurance etc. exist, it is true, but they are only “conferred” on the workers in a measure which suits the interest of the capitalists in gathering in their profits without interruption. The fear of the **bourgeoisie** that epidemic diseases which arise in proletarian districts, may spread further, plays an important part in the improvement of sanitary conditions and prompts them to carry through sanitary measures.

Health is necessary for the **workers** in order to preserve their physical and mental powers in this epoch of the fight for their liberation. Health is necessary for them so that on the day after the victory over the bourgeoisie they may display their power in defending the revolutionary achievements, in consolidating their State, and finally in preparing for future victories.

No one has given such pregnant expression to the invaluable significance of health and a healthy life for the workers in the

cause of socialism, as Lenin. In May 1919, during the civil war and the period of greatest distress, when typhus was spreading irresistibly, Lenin said:

"In a devastated country, the rescue of the workers is the first duty. The first productive force amongst mankind in general is the worker. If his life is preserved, we shall be able to save and reconstruct everything. At the moment of our country's devastation, our chief task will be to save the life of the worker. If we are able to preserve it for a few years, we shall save society, the country and socialism. If we do not accomplish this, we shall slip back into the slavery of wages. This is the position with regard to the question of socialism which is not born from the imagination of the pacifist fools who call themselves social democrats, but from actual reality in the raging and cruel class war." (N. Lenin, "On the Deception of the People by the Slogans of Freedom and Equality", collected works, Russian edition vol. 16, p. 214/15.)

Somewhat later, in December of the same year, Lenin, at the 7th Soviet Congress, in proclaiming the necessity of combating typhus stated:

"We must devote our whole attention to this question:

Will the lice defeat socialism or is socialism going to defeat them?" (N. Lenin, Report of the Soviet of the People's Commissaries at the 7th Soviet Congress". Collected works, Russian edition, vol. 16, p. 421.)

Statistics show the result of our work in the following figures:

At the end of 1924, typhus in the Soviet Union had been reduced to almost one thirtieth as compared with the year 1920 and was not far removed from the pre-war number of cases.

Number of persons who suffered from typhus	
1913	118,419
1920	3,354,856
1922	1,401,145
1923	242,390
1924	122,546

Cholera is obviously completely banished from the Soviet Union. In the summer of 1924 only 11 cases were recorded, whereas in 1921 and 1922 86,178 persons suffered from cholera.

The improvement in the conditions of health of the working masses is best controlled by science through the mortality rate, the number of births and the increase in the population. If this standard is applied in judging the present health conditions after the cataclysms and sanitary disasters which the population has experienced, it will be seen that, as compared with pre-war times, the mortality is less, the number of births is almost the same and the increase in the population has surpassed the pre-war level, so that the reduction in the population in the years 1920/21 has been equalised.

Year	Deaths Per 1000 inhabitants	Births	Increase
1911—1913	27.3	43.8	16.5 increase
1920—1922	33.4	33.0	0.4 decrease
1923	22.7	43.5	19.8 increase

On the basis of these figures, statistics justly prove that in 1923 466,000 persons less died in the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic than was the average mortality in the last pre-war years.

Now that this first, most important success has been achieved with its decisive influence on the campaign in the future, the Soviet State is faced by another task of extreme significance. It can be expressed in a few words — a campaign against epidemics and to rescue the working class by a broad and systematic restoration to health of their life and their work.

The next questions in the campaign for healthy life and healthy work are concentrated round one central point, that of organising hospitals and institutions for combating disease in such a way that their chief aim will not be limited to helping the sick, but that they should on the contrary strive in every way to improve the conditions under which the workers live and work; the whole system for the protection of mothers, infants, children and juveniles should be arranged in such a way that it ensures step by step health, birth, development and training to the young organism.

As the key to the solution of these most immediate questions, the application of the so-called dispensatory method in all branches of activity in the domain of health seems the most suitable. In our circumstances, the essential nature of this method is that the patient is given every sort of care and assistance in all hospitals and institutions for combating disease. Take as an example a person suffering from tuberculosis. The chief duty of the public health institution is to inquire exactly into his illness, to investigate his conditions of living in his family and at his work, to instruct him and those in his environment in the principles of hygiene and, in case of necessity, to admit him to a hospital, sanatorium, convalescent home etc.

With regard to the dispensatory method it is especially important that the public welfare work should not be limited to individual patients, but that it must begin gradually to embrace, first the families of the patients, then the places of work, later the whole of production etc. To put it briefly, the preventive activity of health work assumes a wholesale character in that it removes the causes of the general spread of social diseases, including tuberculosis.

At the same time the Soviet State must, through legislation, care for the sanitary protection of towns and villages, of food-stuffs, of labour etc.

The widest individual and associated activity of the working masses, on which the Soviet State is based, thus finds its application in the organisations of the Public Health Sections of the Soviets, of the Commissions for establishing healthy conditions of life and work in work-places, the Sub-Committees in the dispensatory institutions etc. In these collective institutions, in which are represented, besides the organised masses of the workers, such institutions as the Labour department, Sickness Insurance Societies and Trade Union Organisations, it is possible, thanks to their cooperation, to put into practice the forms of help mentioned.

On the other hand, thanks to these collective institutions, the whole Public Health System in its application to home life and work has become for the workers something near to them, comprehensible, and their own. Every successful result of this system therefore appears as a success achieved by the whole mass of workers.

The Moldavian Soviet Republic.

By Al. Dobrogeanu-Gherea.

The establishment of the autonomous Socialist Moldavian Soviet Republic, which took place a year ago, fell like a bolt from the blue on the ruling clique of Roumania.

In the first place, this event complicated the position of the Roumanian Government in the Bessarabian question. If further proof were needed that the Soviet regime helps to liberate the peoples, this was certainly one of the most striking proofs. Those in power in Roumania persistently calumniated the Soviet regime by describing it as the personal dictatorship of a small oligarchy over the great masses of peasants and of the population of Russia speaking non-Russian languages. They even imputed motives of imperialist lust for conquest to the attitude of the Russian Soviet Government in the Bessarabian question. And then occurred, in a natural way, as a step on the path of the establishment of political, national and cultural independence of the peoples of Russia, the announcement of the autonomy of the Moldavian people living close to the Roumanian border. The Ukrainian Republic created a suitable political frame for the free development of the individual national and cultural aspirations of the Moldavians of Russia which had so far hardly made themselves felt.

The attitude of the Soviet Union in the Bessarabian question corresponds exactly to its policy towards all the peoples in its territory. The demand for a plebiscite in Bessarabia is only a consistent part of this policy.

The Roumanian Government, in a hypocritical way, expresses its satisfaction that the Soviet Union, by founding the Moldavian Republic recognises the existence of groups of Roumanians in the Soviet Union. This will however be all the less likely to deceive anyone since not only the national minorities but even broad masses of the Moldavian population of Bessarabia, who speak the Roumanian language, are opposed to the Boyar capitalist State of Bratianu.

In Roumania, these anti-Roumanian tendencies of the masses of the population of Bessarabia are recognised as an indisputable fact. Even those in power in Roumania are perfectly convinced of this fact and admit it openly in private conversation. The extreme intensification of the terror may possibly be a measure of desperation, but it will certainly never convert the victims of the terror to patriotism.

In the creation of the Moldavian Soviet Republic, the centrifugal tendencies of the broad working masses of Bessarabia have now found a solid goal for their political, social and cultural aspirations. The "ruling order" is however threatened by a far greater danger which has crossed the Pruth which separates Bessarabia from Roumania. This was proved by the last elections for the Agricultural Chamber. In the whole of Roumania, crowds of peasants went to the polling booth to protest against those who are exploiting them. The broad masses of the electors succeeded, by means of a violent assault with revolutionary means in enforcing their will and organising a demonstration against their so-called "benefactors", the like of which has never been seen before.

Those in power in Roumania are well aware of the dangers which threaten them, but nothing can save them from their fate. The Moldavian Soviet Republic represents the future of Roumania, a source of horror to the oppressors, of hope to the working masses.

The Nature of Future Warfare.

Speech by Comrade Frunse delivered at the Conference of the Military Scientific Organisations of the Soviet Union, end of May 1925.

What will be the nature of future wars?

The work done by our Military Scientific Societies and in general accomplished by our military scientific-theoretical school already provides sufficient material for us to give a fairly exhaustive reply to this question. The first element determining the nature of any future war which the U. S. S. R. may be compelled to conduct, is its peculiar social-class nature. The war which we will wage, will not be a national war. It will be a revolutionary class war. This means that our army will not fight for any kind of narrow-national interests, will not fight in order to conquer or to encroach upon the property of other peoples but in order to protect the conquests of our revolution from the attacks of the internal and external class enemies of the proletariat. This factor is reflected in our entire constructional work. It is just this which determines the workers and peasant class nature of our army. It permeates the entire system of our organisation, and finds its reflection in the methods of training and teaching in the army and in a number of other practical results.

Another characteristic of future wars will be their **allembraing and decisive nature**. There will not be a clash over trifles which can be quickly solved. No, the future war will be between two different social-political and economic systems, each of which excludes the other. How does this arise? This arises from the class nature of our State.

Our State is organised both politically and economically on a quite different basis from the bourgeois world surrounding us. A profound and irreconcilable contradiction lies at the basis of our economic and political organisation and the organisation of bourgeois States, and once this contradiction commences to be solved by military methods, it will lead to a sharp, profound and in all probability long drawn-out encounter. This latter factor is in the first place connected with the fact that we ourselves, our Soviet Union represent very palpable dimensions both from the point of view of the size of the population and also from the point of view of our economic resources. On the other hand we will have against us all, a considerable part of the bourgeois capitalist world, which in turn can raise tremendous forces against us. That is the reason why when it is a question of a serious encounter that this can hardly be decided within a short space of time by a knock-out blow.

The third factor which influences the nature of future war fare in a decisive manner is **the factor of technique**.

The experience of the imperialist war has shown what a tremendous role technique will play on the future fields of battle. The development of aviation, chemistry and wireless telegraphy, etc., open up very wide perspectives in this connection. At the present moment it is even difficult for us to picture how the army which has proceeded the furthest ahead along the path of techni-

cal development in bourgeois countries, will emerge from the field of future battles. The weapons they will use will probably be very different from what we have seen during the imperialist war. The war of the future will to a very large extent, if not entirely, be a war of machines. This fact again brings us face to face with a number of new demands.

Finally, the fourth factor which in my opinion will characterise our future war is the factor of **mass formation**. I consider that once it is a question of deciding serious conflicts, all the forces at the disposition of the combatants will be thrown into the struggle. At any rate, we must not picture future struggles as far as we are concerned, as though we may be able to get along with small armed forces, without touching the wide masses of the population and without harnessing all the resources at the command of the State. I say: "At any rate — as far as we are concerned", because with regard to bourgeois armies, I admit that the fact of the internal class struggle becoming more acute, may compel them to resort not to the arming of the entire mass of the population but to placing all their hopes in technique. We may observe signs of this even at the present moment. But even under such conditions they will at the same time bring forward such forces which we will only be able to fight with by bringing armed masses on the scene.

The above, comrades, are in my opinion the four main factors which compel us to arrive at definite conclusions with regard to the nature of future wars which we will have to conduct.

AGITATION AND PROPAGANDA

On the Methodics of the Communist Central Schools.

I. General Considerations.

The methodics of the instruction depend on three main factors: firstly the richness of the programme, secondly the theoretical knowledge of the pupils, thirdly on their power of assimilation. On the whole we can state, as regards our Communist Party schools, that the programme is rich enough, whereas the theoretical basis of the pupils, as compared with the programme, is insufficient. As regards the power of assimilation of the pupils, we must take two important circumstances into consideration: firstly that we are dealing with adults and secondly the circumstance that they are **proletarians**, factory workers, who take an active part in production and in the class war, and whose psychology — and consequently their imaginative faculty and their estimate of the phenomena of life and of society — are solely determined by these points of view.

The following subjects are the foundation of the programme of instruction. All these subjects must figure on the plan of instruction in a greater or less measure, according to the length of the courses. The omission of one of these subjects might have the effect of interfering with the homogeneous (equal) character of the whole course and making it more difficult for the pupils to follow.

The following then are the subjects in the course:

1. Economic geography.
2. Political economy.
3. History of the modern class war.
4. History and questions of organisation of the Labour movement.
5. Theory and practice of Leninism. (Imperialism, Theory of the State, strategy and tactics of revolution, national and colonial questions, the role of the Party in the trade unions and cooperatives, history of the Communist International and the Red Trade Union International.)

The enumeration of the subjects should not give the impression that they can, from the point of view either of their content or method, be dealt with independently of one another, in separate and parallel courses. It is much more important to give the programme a homogeneous character and to make it possible for the pupils to grasp it at one glance and to understand its smallest details.

We repeat that the more or less thorough treatment of one or other of the subjects mentioned, depends in the first place on the duration of the courses. The chief question however is to know which subject to take as the centre point of the programme, in such a way that the others are grouped round it as round a main thread.

II. Methodics of the Educational Material.

The question just put can also be regarded as a question of the "organisation of the educational material".

"Unity of theory and practice" has for some time been a suitable formula for characterising our whole communist system of education, in contrast to the scholastic, academic character of bourgeois pedagogics. Unfortunately this formula has, up to the present, had no actual content either as regards the educational material or the application of the new methods.

Nowadays however we are on the whole, unanimously agreed that the material of every subject of instruction must be actual and concrete, and that historical digressions, which consequently do not deal with actualities, are only permissible in so far as they explain the present in all its concrete complications and throw light on the manifold facets of the process of development.

This principle is absolutely right, as is proved by the experiences of the Russian Party schools and of the first Leninist school in France. It is true that the most important thing — and that is where the chief problem lies — is to find the right relation between "actuality" and "history". We must be on our guard against the error of taking no account at all of the "historic" element, under the pretext that it has no longer any connection with the problems of the present day. We particularly emphasise that actuality and the present are only concrete and can and should, with all their complications, be understood as something concrete, in so far as they actually represent the whole of the historical process. This is a fundamental principle of the Marxist-Leninist dialectics, and it is valid not only as far as the actual process in nature and society is concerned, but also as regards the development of theories and sciences. Thus, for instance, Leninism could not be understood without Marxism, as it is the completion and the concrete application of Marxism in a definite epoch (that of imperialism).

Understood in this way, the programme of our Leninist schools must contain "historical digressions"; our task is to see that they are subordinated to the actual problems. It is clear that Leninism is the centre of gravity of the subjects of our educational programme enumerated above. This is the natural basis on which all the other subjects are built up. This means that economic geography, political economy etc. must be studied to the extent to which they form an integral part of Leninism and also as they are essential to the comprehension of Leninism.

The problems of economic geography (concentration of industries round certain centres, competition for markets, development of shipping routes etc.) can, for instance, be directly combined both with the problems of imperialism and the fundamental ideas of pre-imperialistic capitalism (free trade, periodic crises, rates of profit etc.) and with the fundamental ideas of imperialism. (Lenin's theory of the State is the immediate result of Marx' experience gleaned from all bourgeois revolutions and the Paris Commune; Lenin's doctrine of the Party is the fruit of conscientious study of all the forms of organisation of the International Labour movement and, in the first place, of English trade-unionism, syndicalism, etc.).

Without going into further details, we see that if we make Leninism the guiding line of the instruction, it will be possible to organise all other subjects and their method of treatment, in such a way that the educational material will, in spite of its richness and variety, have a completely homogeneous character. This is absolutely necessary so that the pupil should not accept this material as dead ballast but find in it a real and practical stimulus to action.

In this sense, the principle of the actuality of the material taught, can and should be realised in the Leninist schools. All means possible should further be employed to develop the initiative of the pupils. In what way can this be accomplished?

III. Methodics of the Active Instruction.

The first question to ask ourselves is, what is the best method of instruction. It has often enough been argued that the method of long lectures by the professors in which only a passive part is assigned to the pupils, should on no account be adopted. On the contrary, the form of collective discussion seems to be one of the conditions of independent, collective work of the pupils in general, both as regards the assimilation and digestion of the theoretical material and as regards the

solution of the special practical tasks with which the instruction is combined.

Of course, collective discussion does not in itself put into practice the principle of the self-activity of the pupils. This self-activity must reach so far that the pupil grasps the programme laid before him by the teacher in so concrete a way, as to make a plan of work out of it which provides exactly the amount of material which can be dealt with in a week, the arrangement of the subjects and the methods of work in common.

For this purpose we suggest the following procedure. By means of an introductory lecture, the teacher expounds to the pupils the general construction of the programme, the intimate connection between the various subjects, the graduated development of the material, in order that they should understand the homogeneous structure of the programme. Special attention should be paid to the following fact. If the programme of instruction contains various subjects (for instance those mentioned above), it is by no means necessary to begin teaching all subjects from the first week; for just this procedure would artificially separate the various lessons from one another. On the contrary, the instruction should take up the various subjects one after the other, in such a measure that, with this grouping of the material, it is possible to focus the whole on the chief subject, Leninism. But it is absolutely necessary for those in charge of the various courses, to collaborate as closely as possible. The collaboration of the pupils depends on the collaboration of the professors.

In order to deal with the work in a collective way, it will be a good plan to form small groups of at the most five pupils. These groups must of course be based on the free choice of the pupils. These working groups are in common responsible for the work done, in that they must keep conscientious registers and maintain mutual understanding with regard to their activities, and further submit the results obtained to the judgement of the whole school. It will also be useful, at the end of a certain period of instruction (say a week) to take up this control and self-criticism under the guidance of the teacher. This opportunity should also be used for criticising the methods of teaching and for making suggestions as to how the points criticised can be improved.

Practical illustration of the phenomena should be largely used with the object of enlivening the instruction systematically. Auxiliary material of all kinds, diagrams, models, maps and pictures should be used to the greatest possible extent, especially when it is a question of illustrating statistical material. All these means will help to give living force to the material and, what is most important, to create a concrete and dynamic connection between the various lessons.

The collective discussions should be arranged in such a way that the most important guiding lines are brought to the knowledge of the pupils in writing. In this way the chief idea will then be worked out and should afterwards be dealt with in detail by the various working groups as the result of their collective work. This might be illustrated in a concrete way by the example of a discussion on the national and colonial question, as follows:

Discussion No... National and colonial questions.

1. The national and colonial questions in the present (Ireland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, China and Morocco).
2. Division of the countries into oppressed countries and imperialistic countries.
3. The national and colonial question illustrated against a concrete background.
4. The right of the nations to self-determination.
5.
6.
7.

The leading thought in this example should be that of combining the national fight, the national revolutionary movement with the struggle of the proletarian classes, to which it should be subordinated. With this object in view, the first thing to be done is to collect and expound the Leninist articles and the decisions of the congresses of the Communist International on this subject. This immediately gives a good opportunity of preparing the pupils systematic reading of the chief works concerning Marxism and Leninism. We emphasise this especially because it is necessary to lay great stress on the systematic reading of books and papers and the collective working up of this material by the pupils. We must give our pupils a clear

conception of the methodical way in which Marx or Lenin work out the solution of definite problems in their writings. Finally we recommend at the same time the use of Stalin's book "Lenin and Leninism" for this purpose.

The aims of our school will only be achieved if we succeed in teaching our pupils how to assimilate, accept and digest the educational material. Although — except in the Russian Party — we have as yet very little experience and not much in the way of results to record in this sphere, we are justified in hoping that the more energetically and boldly we advance in our pedagogic experiments, the greater success we shall have in impressing Marxism and Leninism on our pupils as the doctrine of revolutionary action.

BOOK REVIEWS

"Uj Marcius".

(„New March”, Central Organ of the C. P. of Hungary.)

By J. R. (Vienna).

The new monthly paper of the C. P. of Hungary has been appearing in Vienna since August. Up to the present, three thick issues (four numbers) have been published with a total of 216 pages. The reappearance of a central organ of the C. P. of Hungary is one of the signs of the revival of the revolutionary Labour movement in Hungary and testifies to the fact that in the midst of the most violent persecution, in conditions of complete illegality, the Party has increased in strength, has gathered its forces and is preparing to seize the leadership of the movement of the Hungarian working masses towards revolution. The title of the paper alone indicates that the Party proudly holds by the traditions of its heroic past, while its contents show that the Party is at the same time conscious that in Hungary, just as in all other countries, the conditions of revolutionary policy have completely changed since 1919. The article "Will there be another revolution in Hungary?" by Bela Kun in the first double number of the paper is devoted to the analysis of these conditions. Those in power in Hungary proudly claim that there will not be another revolution in Hungary. Comrade Kun takes the class which give a revolutionary direction to the development in Hungary, one after the other under the magnifying glass. Apart from Hungary being intertwined with international politics, it is just the specific problems of Hungarian society which demand a revolutionary solution.

Eugen Landler's article: "The Industrialisation of Hungary", in the first number, serve to bring into relief the strategic line of the C. P. Hungarian social democracy says that Hungary is an agrarian feudal country and the proletariat must first help the bourgeoisie to gain democracy. Landler thoroughly wipes out this story. He points out that even before the war an intensive industrialisation was taking place in Hungary, that in agriculture itself the use of machinery and the transition from the production of corn to the production of plants used in industry was assuming larger and larger proportions.

The conditions of agricultural proprietorship and the differentiation of classes in the country is shown up in the article by Bela Racz: "Land Law Reform and the Peasant Question", in the first number of the paper. "Land Law Reform" has made no difference to the colossal preponderance of landed estates as compared with small proprietary farms. With reconstruction, a new indebtedness is laid on the peasants. In this question, the assumption of a correct policy in the C. P. of Hungary is a piece of self-criticism. Comrade Kun makes a start in his article: "Let us Learn from the Peasants" (No. 3).

A considerable space in the paper is devoted to the trade union question. An article by Rakosi deals with the question

of trade union unity (Nos. 1 & 2) and shows how this slogan should be applied in Hungarian conditions. The article has a sad actuality on account of this opposition being excluded from the Hungarian leather workers' union on the occasion of the persecution of communists by the Hungarian police. — The article by Michael Kapus on the Hungarian metal workers trade union (No. 3) unfolds a living picture of the stagnation of this organisation of the Hungarian working class which was once so powerful, a stagnation which has resulted not only from the crisis but also from the methods of the trade union leaders who proceed against the opposition with black lists, denounciators, exclusions. Bela Szanto deals with the international trade union movement in several contributions.

Apart from exhaustive treatment of events in the economic, political and Labour movement in Hungary, the paper contains articles on international policy. In numbers 1 & 2 are reproduced speeches by Zinoviev on Morocco and China (an article by Lukacs in the third number deals specially with the present colonial wars) and by Stalin on "The Fate of Socialism in the Soviet Union". Josef Revai's article in Nos. 1 & 2 analyses Hungarian foreign policy, its transition from irredentism to subservience to English imperialism. Julius Alpari unfolds a picture of the world situation in connection with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union (Nos. 1 & 2).

The part of the paper which is devoted to a survey and is full of matter, regularly contains the following headings: The Communist International, Hungarian Events, World Economics and World Policy, Soviet Russia, International Trade Union Movement, International Peasant Movement, Social Politics, Culture, Bibliography. — As a special indication that the Party has already succeeded in establishing a connection with the masses, we point to the numerous letters to the editor from Hungarian Workers. These workers' letters contain extraordinarily interesting material with regard to the internal structure, stratification and psychology of the Hungarian working class.

We must devote a few words in particular to the most recent, the 4th number of this excellent, Marxist-Leninist paper. This number concerns itself almost exclusively with the latest persecutions of communists in Hungary. The presence of comrade Rakosi in Buda-Pest has led the Hungarian bourgeoisie and its Press to indulge in regular orgies of lies and fears. On the basis of quotations, the paper shows how the bourgeois and social democratic Press refutes its own "sensational" communications, how the whole accusation — insurrection, list of deaths, millions of dollars — has shrivelled into the mere fact of the existence of a Communist Party in Hungary. Why did Rakosi go to Hungary? This question of social democrat and bourgeois Philistines, for whom an illegal organisation and a putsch are identical from the beginning, is answered in the official organ of the C. P. of Hungary to the effect that the Communist Party must gain the confidence of the working class just in the phase of preparation for the revolution, by participating in all the daily struggles and by sharing the daily needs, and that the Party must send its best people into the firing line just for this detail work. — This number contains workers' letters from Hungary about the hunting of the communists. These letters express the great change which has taken place between the present situation and that of 1919-1920-1921. The Hungarian working class of to-day can no longer be intimidated! Persecution and terror steel their hearts, make them more experienced and defiant. The arrest of Rakosi and his comrades is indeed a severe blow for the C. P. of Hungary, but the voices of the Hungarian workers show that the "victory" of the police over the Hungarian revolutionary workers was a Pyrrhus victory.

The paper will become an important weapon in the fight for the liberation of the Hungarian working class.