

a State order to a State-less order, the negation of the political fight which provides for the making use of the existing forms of State in order to abolish them. This is the main point, the foundation stone of the edifice on which the tactics and politics of Bakunism are built up. It is only by falsification that Bakunism can be compared to Leninism; for the latter takes as the foundation of its policy and tactics the dictatorship of the proletariat, the political fight and making use of the State to aid in a transition to a State-less society.

If we look for the causes of the embittered fight between Marx and Bakunin, we find that the chief points on which their opinions differed were just the State, the dictatorship and the political fight. It is hardly necessary to say that in this great fight history has shown who was in the right. Bakunin did not carry off the victory. The triumph of Bolshevism is the death-knell of Bakunism.

VII.

Some of our comrades are inclined to regard Bakunin as one of the ancestors of social democracy and thus of the Communist Party. This is of course nonsense. In the last years of his life, Bakunin tried to adopt the principles of Marx' teaching, but without success. Bakunin was not an ancestor of our party, but a forerunner of the Russian revolution - there is a wide gulf fixed between these two conceptions.

Leninism has its roots in the proletarian movement of the capitalist epoch; Bakunin however was, in spite of all his radicalism, an exponent of the elementary revolutionary character of the pre-proletarian period of the Russian and the European revolutions.

Our quarrels with Bakunin are past history. There is however one feature which brings Bakunin nearer to us than for instance Herzen or any other politician of our past. In spite of all the differences and all the hostility which stood between Bakunin and Marx, one common passion, one common feeling brought them nearer together; both wished that the social revolution should occur as rapidly as possible, both strove for the same end, for the final victory over that order of society, which was characterised by exploitation, force and distress.

Both these passions bring him nearer to our Leninist generation also. In this sense it can be said that there is something of "Bakunism" in our revolution and in Leninism.

But this "common factor" is the same which brought Marx and Bakunin nearer together and without which there can be no revolution.

BOOK REVIEWS

John W. Brown: "The Problem of Migration and the Working Class" (*)

By Erich Gentsch (Berlin).

In the second volume of his report to the so-called World Migration Congress of the Amsterdam and of the 2nd International, J. W. Brown deals with the regulation of migration. In this connection he goes particularly into the details of the question of race. As is well-known, the representative of the Australian Labour party at the World Migration Congress opposed any immigration of "coloured" elements. "Australia must remain a white continent", he said. The report goes on to deal in a detailed way with the restrictions on emigration and immigration practised in different countries, either from the economic, the military or the personal point of view. Not only are the various clauses quoted by which America and other transatlantic countries and also some European ones exclude immigrants, but the races are also given which are excluded by various countries.

*) Volume II published by the A. D. G. B., Amsterdam. See also "Inprecorr" No. 50 vol. 6.

Further, the report deals with the methods of restricting or of canvassing for immigration, as the case may be in the various countries and the different international treaties on the subject. It also deals in extenso with the international and inter-State treaties which concern the protection of emigrants, the facilitation of their return to their own country, the protection of their savings, compulsory insurance against the risks of travel etc. etc.

Another section treats of the organisation of emigration and the attempts of the Reformist and revolutionary associations in the various countries to organise the immigrants belonging to the working class. There is a special demand for the organisation of the Negro workers in North America because the Communists have already done good work in this field.

One of the main sections deals with the position of the immigrated workers with regard to social insurance. On the basis of extensive material supplied by the International Labour Bureau in Geneva, it has been shown that in the majority of cases, the treatment of foreigners is founded on the principle of reciprocity, but not on the recognition of complete equality with the indigenous population. This section is of particular interest because it deals almost exhaustively with the rights of immigrants regarding insurance against accidents, sickness, old age, disablement and unemployment. In this connection the statutes and contracts of the International Trade Union Secretariats are also dealt with. Brown, that is to say, the resolution of the World Migration Conference demands "complete equality of treatment for workers who have immigrated from foreign countries."

Furthermore Brown discusses the economic factors of the problem of immigration, examining especially into the reasons why the United States are no longer the great, all-embracing receptacle for emigrants. In a special section, Brown makes it clear that emigration cannot fundamentally relieve the unemployment, which is at the present moment rampant in England and Germany. In this connection he deals with particular thoroughness with the restriction of the population with the object of maintaining the standard of living.

The last section deals with the policy of migration of the workers. In this section, he enumerates all that has been done by the I. L. F. U., the Trade Union Secretariats and the centres in the various countries from their point of view in the question of migration. In conclusion suggestions are made for an international migration policy. Even at the Berne Congress, the right of States was, as is well known, recognised on principle to restrict immigration in economic crises; for hygienic reasons and if the immigrants are illiterate. Investigation should be made as to whether these three cases should be extended to the exclusion of workers who, by their low standard of living, endanger the standard of living of the native population, and whether special weight should be attached to the fact that certain races do not assimilate. Brown is of the opinion that the international workers should reject the prominence that is given to race distinctions, as being contradictory to the spirit of international solidarity. He thinks that it would be "wiser" if resolutions are passed at all because of the non-assimilation of members of other races, to base them on economic grounds. (7)

Furthermore Brown demands the establishment of international and national migration bureaux with a corresponding influence on the part of the trade unions.

In the meantime, the "World Migration Congress" has come to an end without having passed any significant or fundamental resolutions. Not only were representatives from the countries which receive the largest number of emigrants, Argentina, Brazil and North America, absent, but opinions contrary to the whole Labour movement were expressed by Australia and Canada. In treating of the problems of world migration the necessity for a vast, uniform, revolutionary trade union international embracing the whole world becomes clearly evident. It is a prerequisite, not only for a proletarian policy of migration but also for the victory of the working class altogether that such an International should be formed, including all revolutionary trade unions as well as workers from Asia, Japan, Africa, etc.

Palme Dutt: Danger Signals for the Miners Fight.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 54

29th July 1926

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: Inprecorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

- | | |
|---|--|
| For the Unity of the C. P. of the Soviet Union! | China. |
| The Moscow Functionaries Meeting Unanimously for the Decisions of the Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union. | Revolutionary Ferment among the British Indian Occupation Troops in China. |
| Telegram of the C. C. of the C. P. of Germany to the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. | The Trial of Rákosi and his Comrades. |
| Felix Dzershinsky. | Eugen Landler: The Political Significance of the Rákosi Trial. |
| The International Mourns the Death of Comrade Dzershinsky. N. Bukharin: Felix Dzershinsky is Dead. | Letters from Budapest to the "Inprecorr". V., VI., VII., VIII. |
| To the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union on the Occasion of the Death of Comrade Dzershinsky. | Appeal of the Committee for the Defence of the Victims of the White Terror in the Balkans. |
| The Miners' Struggle in England. | The White Terror. |
| R. Palme Dutt: Danger Signals for the Miners Fight. | Prevent the Execution of Comrade Cziliński! |
| Politics. | Against the White Terror in Finland! |
| Pierre Semard: Poincaré in the Government. | Trial of Sacco and Vanzetti Postponed! |
| A. Kurella: English Gold in Russia. | In the International |
| Taig Shin She: A Pan-Asiatic Congress in Japan. | The Right Danger in Our Party. |

For the Unity of the C. P. of the Soviet Union.

Decision of the Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the Matter of Comrade Lachevitch and other Comrades and on the Unity of the Party.

Adopted on the 23rd July 1926 on the basis of the reports of Comrades Kujbyshev and Jansson.

In the period from 14th to 23rd July there took place the joint Plenary session of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union which was also attended by members of the Central Revision Commission.

The session dealt with a number of important questions regarding the State and economic construction, the inner life of the Party and the position of the workers and in particular with the results of the Soviet elections, the building of dwellings and the obtaining of corn for the current year.

After hearing the report of the Central Control Commission on the cases of fractional activity after the XIV. Party Conference and infringement of the decisions of the 10th and 14th Party Conferences as regards the preservation of the unity of the Party on the part of some leading members and functionaries (Comrades Lachevitch, Bjelenski etc.) of the Party, as well with regard to the connection of this fractional activity with the apparatus of the E. C. C. I. which is immediately led by Comrade

Zinoviev, a member of the Political Bureau, the Plenum adopted a Resolution submitted to it by the Presidium of the C. C. C. and decided to recall Comrade Zinoviev from his post of member of the Political Bureau of the C. C. and to remove Comrade Lachevitch from the ranks of the candidates of the C. C. Comrade Rudzutak was elected member of the Political Bureau in the place of Comrade Zinoviev.

The number of the candidates of the Political Bureau was increased from five to eight and the following candidates were confirmed: Petrowsky, Uglanow, Ordchonikidse, Andrejev, Kirov, Mikojan, Kalanovitch, Kamenev.

After hearing the communication of the Political Bureau on the decisions adopted by it in connection with the recent international events (strike of the English miners, upheaval in Poland, events in China, etc.) the Plenum approved the activity of the Political Bureau and of the delegation of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the E. C. C. I. in international questions.

The Plenum decided to convene the next National Party Conference for the first part of October 1926.

Resolution.

1. The preservation of the unity of our Party was always the object of care of the whole Party and of its Central Organs, of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. The Party, with comrade Lenin at its head, successfully repelled all symptoms of fractionalism, every attempt at a fight against the Party on the part of fractions and groups, "with special platforms and who strove to a certain extent, to rally together and to set up their own group discipline" (from the resolution of the X. Party Conference). The X. Party Conference, which took place in the period of the revival in the life of the country and the Party, in the period of the transition to the N. F. P., adopted a resolution on the unity of the Party drawn up and moved by Lenin. This resolution states:

"The Party Conference draws the attention of all members of the Party to the fact that the unity and firmness of its ranks, the securing of complete confidence among the Party members and the securing of a real, close, comradesly work, really embodying the unity of the will of the advance-guard of the proletariat, is particularly necessary at the present moment, as a number of factors are increasing the vacillations among the petty bourgeois population of the country."

The Party Conference further pointed out that

"it is necessary that all conscious workers shall clearly recognise the harmfulness and the inadmissibility of any fraction activity, which in practice inevitably leads to the weakening of the firm cooperation, and will induce the enemies of the Party who are attaching themselves to the government Party, to attempt more and more often to deepen the cleft and to make use of it for the purpose of the counter-revolution."

The resolution on unity moved by Lenin and adopted by the X. Party Conference, was the guiding line for the Party and all its organs in preserving the unity of its ranks. Based upon the will of the X. Party Conference, the Party got rid of all expressions of fraction activity which made their appearance up to the XIV. Party Conference. At the time of the XIV. Party Conference the Party was once again faced with the fact of fractional activity on the part of the so-called "new opposition"

The XIV. Party Conference decidedly rejected the political and organisatory views of the opposition, which distorted the line of Leninism. In spite of this, the Party Conference and the newly elected C. C. of the C. P. S. U. considered it possible and necessary to put supporters of the opposition in all the leading institutions of the Party, including the C. C. and its Polbureau. The Party hoped that the opposition would, in the course of practical work, recognise and make good its errors. The opposition was therefore given complete possibility of defending their views in the normal Party way in those cases in which differences of opinion over this or that question arose. Although the opposition continued to cling to the errors pointed out by the XIV. Party Conference and brought into the work of the Political Bureau of the C. C. obviously fractional, irreconcilable elements, this defence of the views by the opposition in the normal Party way within the C. C. did not arouse serious fears either in the C. C. or in the C. C. C. regarding the preservation of unity.

2. Unfortunately, however, the opposition in their fight did not remain on the basis of legitimate defence of their views within the frame of the Party statutes, and recently went over to immediate violation of the decisions of the X. and XIV. Party Conferences regarding the preservation of unity in the ranks of the C. P. S. U., while in their fight against the Party they made attempts to create an illegal fraction organisation, directed against the Party and against its unity.

In recent times the Party was faced with a whole number of such fractional measures on the part of the new opposition which found their expression in the holding of illegal conspirative meetings, in the printing and sending both in Moscow and other towns, of tendenciously collected secret Party documents with the intention of discrediting the line of the Party (secret documents of the Pol Bureau distributed among Party members and sent to the organisations of Brjansk, Saratov, Vladivostok, Pjatigorsk, Omsk, Homel, Odessa), in the sending of agents to other Party organisations for the purpose of creating illegal fractional groups (Bjelenki's journey to Odessa for the purpose

of organising an illegal fraction and ascertainment of special ciphers and of places of meeting). It has been ascertained that the threads of these fractional proceedings of the opposition run through the apparatus of the E. C. C. I., at the head of which stands Zinoviev. Special mention must be made of an illegal fractional meeting in the forest near Moscow, organised by Comrade Bjelenki, co-worker of the Central Committee and the E. C. C. I., which constitutes a step towards splitting, unexampled in the history of our Party. This meeting arranged according to all the rules of conspiracy (patrol, strict fractional selection of those invited etc.) was not only led by a co-worker of the E. C. C. I. who acted as chairman, but what is equally unheard-of in our Party—at this meeting concealed from the Party there appeared a candidate of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., comrade Lachevitch, who delivered a report and called upon those present to organise the fight against the Party and against the C. C. elected by it.

All these disorganising steps of the opposition prove already that the opposition decided to go over from the legal defence of their views to the creation of an illegal organisation in the whole of the Soviet Union which would be opposed to the Party and in this manner prepare a split in its ranks.

3. This activity of the new opposition called forth a revival of the groupings condemned by the Party and induced these miserable remnants of groups which are hostile to the Party and consciously aiming at a split, to take up again the work against the Party and its unity, supported by the aid of the new opposition. Thus for example it was ascertained that comrade Michailov, director of Moscow works, who formerly had belonged to the so-called Mjassnikov "Labour group" (which was condemned three years ago by the Party as a counter-revolutionary group) had copied with the aid of non-party typists secret Party documents for the purpose of spreading them among broad circles and also organised illegal meetings.

It has been ascertained that comrade Shugajew, who at one time belonged to the so-called "labour opposition" which was condemned at the X. Party Conference on the motion of Lenin, went so far to conduct among the specialists an anti-Soviet agitation, while at the same time in conversations with them he spoke of a direct fight against the Soviet power by making use of the expected decomposition of our Party thanks to the activity of the new opposition. Finally Comrade Jatzek, who at one time was expelled on account of connection with a menshevist organisation, calling itself "Labour Truth" took part in the spreading of secret documents of the new opposition among the Party members.

4. The growing fractional activity of the new opposition led to their playing with the idea of two Parties and increased the anti-Leninist deviation of the opposition to the greatest extent: lack of faith in the forces of the proletariat, and pessimism in regard to the work of socialist construction in general and in regard to the building up of socialist industry in particular, tendency to destroy the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry (middle peasants), which means abandonment of the principle of proletarian dictatorship; tendency to support and screen the ultra-Right deviations in our Party with open tendency towards menshevism (group of comrade Sergej Medvediev, the former leader of the so-called "Labour opposition" which went so far as to propose to hand over our socialist State industry to foreign capital, and which spoke of liquidating the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. etc., that is to say, of liquidating all the revolutionary aims of our Party); tendency to form a bloc on an international scale, both with the Ultra-Left of the type of Korsch as well as with the Ultra-Right of the type of Souvarine, who, expelled from the Communist International, are conducting a furious attack upon the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union under the pretext of an alleged peasant kulak degeneration of our Party. The new opposition brings forward no concrete proposals, makes use of so-called Left phrases which cover the Right opportunist content, and is going over to quite impermissible methods of fighting, leading to a split.

5. The fractional activity of the opposition is not confined to the C. P. of the Soviet Union, but attempts are being made to draw the apparatus of the E. C. C. I. into the fight and with its help to spread the condemned views of the opposition in other Communist Parties, and thereby to prepare the soil for the recruitment of foreign Communist Parties against the C. P. of the

Soviet Union. It must be remarked that the first attempt of the new opposition to go over to conspiratory fractional struggle found its expression in the actions of collaborators in the E. C. C. I. who are immediately connected with Zinoviev, and who attempted to create fractional groups in various Parties of the C. I. (Guralski-Vujovitch affair). In spite of the fact that this case was condemned by the delegation of the C. P. S. U. in the E. C. C. I. and by the Polbureau of the C. C., they continued to make use of the apparatus of the E. C. C. I. for fraction work (above mentioned journey of the co-worker of the E. C. C. I. Comrade G. Bjelenki to Odessa to organise a fraction, as well as the holding by him of an illegal fraction meeting in a Moscow district).

6. The new opposition did not wish to make use of the indisputable right of every Party member to defend his own views, so far, of course, as they are not directed against decisions adopted by the Party, but it preferred, instead of an open and honest expression of its own views within the Party organisations on the basis of the Party statutes, to arrange meetings which were kept secret from the Party and its members and to form an illegal fraction.

The XIV. Party Conference which, by their election into the C. C. and into the C. C. C., had given the supporters of the opposition full possibility of defending their views within the C. C. at the same time issued the instruction: "A decisive fight is to be conducted against every attempt to undermine the unity of the Party, no matter from whence it may come and no matter who may stand at the head". This decision is only a confirmation of the decision of the X. Party Conference, which was adopted on the motion of comrade Lenin at the moment of a particularly sharp fraction fight. The X. Party Conference empowered the C. C. "to carry through the complete annihilation of all fraction activity", and ordered "the immediate dissolution, without exception, of all groups formed upon this or that platform", and instructed

"all organisations to take strict care that no fractional activity whatever be permitted. The non-fulfilment of this decision of the Party Conference must involve unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party."

7. The Party holds responsible for the fractional struggle all members of the Party who took part in it; nevertheless the political responsibility for the Party-splitting struggle is borne by the leader of the opposition at the XIV. Party Conference, Comrade Zinoviev, whose comrades sharing his views take active part in the fractional activity and make use of the apparatus of the E. C. C. I. which is under Zinoviev, while at the same time Zinoviev made not the least attempt to condemn these comrades and to disassociate himself from them.

In view of all the above the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. decides:

a) That as such a situation, in which the actual leadership of the fraction struggle of the opposition is in the hands of a member of the Pol-Bureau, cannot be tolerated, Comrade Zinoviev is excluded from the Polbureau of the C. C., and at the same time all the oppositional comrades, no matter what their position in the Party may be, are warned that should they continue the work of creating a fraction set up against the Party, that the C. C. and the C. C. C. will be compelled, in order to defend the unity of the Party, to adopt towards them the necessary organisatory measures;

b) It is declared that the candidate of the C. C. Comrade Lachevitch, by taking an active part in the creation of a fractional organisation which was directed against the unity of the Party, has injured and abused the confidence of the Party, for which he deserves expulsion from the ranks of the C. P. S. U. In view, however, of the former Party activity of comrade Lachevitch, he is strongly censured as well warned that any attempt on his part to continue fraction work will be followed by his expulsion from the ranks of the C. P. S. U. On the basis of the special decisions moved by Lenin and adopted by the X. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U., Comrade Lachevitch is excluded from the position of Deputy Chairman of the Revolutionary War-Council, while at the same time he is prohibited, for the period of two years, from holding a responsible Party function;

c) the decision of the Presidium of the C. C. C. of 12th June 1926 in regard to comrades G. A. Bjelenki, I. S. Tchernyshev, B. G. Schapiro, N. M. Vlassov, and the women comrades M. W. Vassiljeva and K. A. Volgina, are confirmed.

8. The labour opposition directed against unity has, up to now, found no support in any organisation of our Party; nevertheless the further development of the fraction work of the opposition would face the Party with the serious danger of a split. The Leninist Party will also, in the future, not permit a split in its ranks, and will firmly resist any attempt at a fraction fight.

All organisations of the Party, without permitting a fraction struggle, must, in their practical work for the welding together of the ranks of the Party, strictly adhere to the instructions contained in the resolution moved by Lenin at the X. Party Conference in which it is stated:

"The Party Conference, while instructing the C. C. to carry out the complete annihilation of all fractional machinations, declares, at the same time, that, in questions which attract the special attention of the Party members, i. e. the purging of the Party from non-proletarian and unreliable elements, the fight against bureaucracy, the development of democracy and of the self-activity of the workers, etc., all concrete proposals must be examined with the greatest attention and tested in the practical work. All Party members must know that the Party does not carry out all the necessary measures, because it encounters a whole number of various obstacles, and that the Party, in rejecting non-concrete and fractional criticism, will continue at the same time, unweariedly and with all means, and even with new methods, the fight against bureaucratism, for the extension of democracy, of self-activity, for the exposure and clearing out of hostile elements which have attached themselves to the Party..."

The Party, through the C. C. and the C. C. C., calls upon the Party organisations to make a decisive correction of prevailing faults in the organisations, and, by a thorough discussion of the chief questions of the Party work in all organisations, to increase the activity of the Party members and to educate them in the spirit of the principles of Leninism, by fighting against the petty bourgeois sentiments which often make their appearance under the guise of Left phrases.

9. The Plenum of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. summon all Party members to unity, firmness and Bolshevik discipline, as "the most important pre-requisites for all successes of the Bolshevik Party have always been, the steel unity and the iron discipline, the true unity of views on the basis of Leninism". (From the resolution of the Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C. of 17th January 1925).

In the present period of practical construction of Socialism and under the condition of the N. F. P. and the dangers arising from it on the part of bourgeois elements within the country, as well as the bourgeois environment which still exists, this unshakable unity of the Party is more necessary than ever. The Party has achieved considerable success in the sphere of economic reconstruction and in raising the material well-being of the working and peasant masses. But the Party soberly takes account of the fact that these successes are only the first and, perhaps, the easiest steps on the way to Socialism. There still exists a colossal and extremely difficult work for the further practical building up of Socialism and for raising the material position of the workers and the village poor to a higher level than before.

For this purpose greater unity and discipline in our proletarian ranks are necessary. For this it is necessary to preserve and to strengthen further the unity of the proletarian advance-guard, the unity of our Party.

Without a firm Party discipline, without the submission of the minority to the majority, the Party would prove incapable of fulfilling the historical task which the October Revolution placed before it; to preserve and to consolidate the power of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and thereby to secure the victory of Socialism. The C. C. and the C. C. C. express their firm conviction that our Party will prove strong enough to repel all attempts to disrupt the unity of the Party and all attempts to split and disintegrate the Party.

Against fractions and against the fraction struggle, which hinder the Party from accomplishing the great work of constructing Socialism!

For the Unity and firmness of the Leninist Party!

The Moscow Functionaries Meeting Unanimously for the Decisions of the Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union

Moscow, July 26th 1926.

Comrade Rykov reported today at the meeting of the functionaries of the Moscow organisation of the C. P. of the Soviet Union on the decisions of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the C. P. of the Soviet Union.

After a lively debate the meeting unanimously passed a resolution approving all the decisions of the Plenum. The resolution of the Moscow functionaries meeting especially emphasises the importance of the decision of the Plenum in the question of preserving the unity of the Party and of combating fractionism. The fractional activity of the new opposition led it actually to an even greater deviation from Leninism, to the abandonment of the standpoint which they only recently represented and to an ideological support of the revisionists of Leninism, Trotsky and others.

The resolution approves the decision of the Plenum in regard to the Soviet elections which showed an even stronger rallying of the working class and the main mass of the peasantry — poor and middle peasants — round the Soviets and declares that the opposition in its theses distorts the results of the elections and falsely estimates the elections. The assertion of the opposition border on pessimism and doubt in the capacity of the proletariat to lead the working masses in town and country on the basis of the ever strengthening alliance of the working class and the peasantry.

In estimating the lessons of the English general strike the opposition deviated from the correct tactics of the united front and demanded withdrawal from the Anglo-Russian Committee which would have inevitably weakened the influence of the Comintern upon the working masses in the capitalist States.

The resolution emphasises the correctness and expediency of the decisions of the Plenum in the question of obtaining corn and in the building of dwellings.

The resolution records the transition to the practical realisation of the principles of inner Party democracy and calls upon the entire Party not to permit any fraction and no fresh discussions.

Telegram of the C. C. of the C. P. of Germany to the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

After receiving the report of the representative of the C. C. of the C. P. G. in the E. C. C. I. on the Plenary Sitting of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union the Politbureau of the C. C. of the C. P. G. decides:

1. Its unconditional agreement with the decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union.
2. The most far-reaching support of all measures of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union aimed at defending the unity of the C. P. of the Soviet Union and of the Comintern.
3. To emphasise once again the decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. G. on the XIV. Party Conference of the C. P. of the Soviet Union.

Central Committee of the C. P. of Germany (Secretariat).

FELIX DZERSHINSKY

The International Mourns the Death of Comrade Dzershinsky.

Manifesto of the Communist International.

To All Communists! To the Workers of all Countries! The Russian and the international revolution has lost by the death of Comrade Dzershinsky one of its boldest and most determined fighters, one of its most capable organisers and one of its greatest leaders.

Right from his earliest youth up to his last breath, Comrade Dzershinsky stood in the ranks of the Bolsheviks, in the

front of the proletarian revolution. The life of comrade Dzershinsky consisted of decades of underground work, decades of tremendous sacrifices, decades of never-to-be-forgotten services for the emancipation of the working class. As a member and leader of the Social Democratic Party of Lithuania and Poland, which later became the Communist Party of Poland, Comrade Dzershinsky was a model of a tenacious Party worker, contemptuous of death, in the illegal times of Tsarism. He experienced prison, hard labour and banishment to Siberia. He went as an exile to Austria and Germany. He stood before the courts and accepted with unshakeable calm the severest sentences. On innumerable occasions he was arrested, banished, condemned and hunted down, but not for a moment did Comrade Dzershinsky interrupt his revolutionary work. He escaped from prison and from Siberia and returned from emigration in order to throw himself again into the most dangerous front of the proletarian class struggle.

Liberated from prison by the Russian February revolution, Comrade Dzershinsky took the most active part in preparing and carrying out the Bolshevik revolution. As a member of the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks and of the Military Revolutionary Committee of the Leningrad Soviet, Comrade Dzershinsky was one of the greatest field marshalls of the victory of October 1917. In the fight for the defence of the proletarian dictatorship Comrade Dzershinsky created and controlled the All-Russian Tcheka, this irresistible deadly weapon against all enemies of the workers. Since those days he has been the object of the helpless hatred of all traitors, hangmen and white guardists and of the blind fury of the shattered counter-revolution, but at the same time he has enjoyed the proud esteem and love of the workers of all countries.

After the end of the civil war, Comrade Dzershinsky devoted all his powers to the reconstruction of the country of the Soviets. As People's Commissar for transport and railways he succeeded in restoring the broken down transport system. As President of the Supreme Economic Council he stood at the head of the struggle for the building up of Socialism. His last speech, delivered a few hours before his death, was devoted to the maintenance of the Leninist heritage, to the victory of Socialism, the work of the international proletarian revolution.

Comrade Felix Dzershinsky, a close comrade in arms of Rosa Luxemburg, the true disciple and co-worker of Lenin, belongs not only to the Russian, Polish and Lithuanian workers, but to the International proletariat. His unwearied, many-sided working capacity, his organising genius, his never wavering fidelity to the Party, his exemplary life, filled with struggle and his bravery must continue to live deep in the consciousness of all communists, of all workers.

After Lenin and Frunze we have lost Dzershinsky. The losses are irreparable. But the work lives and will continue to live. Leninism is unvanquishable!

Long live the Party of the Bolsheviks!

Long live the international proletarian revolution!

Moscow, 20th July 1926.

The Communist International.

Felix Dzershinsky is Dead.

By N. Bukharin.

Moscow, July 22, 1926.

Yesterday our Comrade Dzershinsky passed away. He was consumed by his last flaming speech; he had poured out everything the fire of his stormy soul and, consumed by this flame, he passed away for ever.

How full of life he stands on the platform! Simple, energetic, a perfectly tuned instrument. His speech is not a speech, but a cry of the intelligence and of the heart, a cry of frenzied work and creative passion. Every figure re-echoes with this passion. Every word is a sharp arrow which penetrates the minds of his comrades. All feel: this is a man who is wholly and entirely devoted to the cause. For himself, he does not exist. He does not gaze at himself in the mirror of history, just as he probably never gazed at himself in an ordinary mirror. He threw himself into the work. And this work, its needs, its suffering

its wounds, its difficulties, emitted a penetrating cry, convincing, calling for help, insistent, demanding...

A strange flush plays over his cheeks, suddenly appearing, now disappearing. His eyes shine feverishly, burning with inner fire, and at the same time suffering so much. The austere and energetic countenance of a revolutionary fighter devoted right up to the end, to the grave (the countenance of a fanatic the philistines would say). A burning speech, flaming gestures, the powerful outburst of the will... But what ails him? His hands grip painfully at his heart, as if they would tear out a stabbing pain. And suddenly his voice, which resounded so passionately and exaltedly, sinks to a half whisper. Small drops of sweat stand out on his forehead, run down in small streams. "But that is always the case with him" one reassures oneself, as one observes with painful uneasiness the beloved, faithful comrade. But an inner voice says ominously: "Doomed, lost". And a wild pain sweeps over us.

With a gloomy foreboding I left the session of the Plenum yesterday immediately after the speech of Felix Dzershinsky. I was told already that he had been taken ill. It was desired not to disturb him, as absolute calm was necessary. But the fatal foreboding grew more and more... And suddenly, a telephone call: "Dzershinsky is dead!"

"Dzershinsky dead!" Did you, friends and comrades, know this man? We had many heroes, and there are still many powerful, steel-hard people in our "iron cohort". But Dzershinsky was unique in his way, and we no longer have his like. A real burning lava of the revolution; no ordinary human blood flowed in his veins. It is strange to imagine Dzershinsky asleep: almost impossible to conceive of his being dead. For he was a real fire of the revolution, lighting up everything like a torch, untamable like a tornado, burning and consuming like a powerful passion. Who ever saw Dzershinsky weary? Who ever saw him inactive? These questions had no meaning for Dzershinsky. For he, so it seemed, worked, fought, glowed without pause, knowing neither rest nor repose. This was his nature. "When I work, I work with all my might", he said in his last speech. And his whole life was one such work...

Revolution means sacrifice. And the revolution had taken full and complete possession of Dzershinsky. With long years of imprisonment behind him, Felix, freed from his fetters, flung himself into the turbulent stream of the great year 1917. We all remember this threatening revolutionary fighter at that time. Pitiless against the enemy, always at his post, Dzershinsky completed the work, whilst he repelled with a firm hand all the attacks of the enemy. Sleepless nights; constant restlessness; continually clenched, dry and powerful hand. Eternal vigilance; enormous responsibility. And at the same time absolute freedom from any posing, even of historical posing. Never at any time did Dzershinsky play the part of a Danton or Marat. He was simple, as simple as it is rarely given to anybody to be. He always did that which the Party ordered him to do — the Party, which to him was dearer than anything in the world, and for which he has lived and for which he has died. And therefore, Dzershinsky was and remains a knight without fear and without reproach, a knight of Communism, who will never be forgotten.

Both in the Tcheka as well as in the Transport Commissary, in the economic work, as well as in the C. C. of the Party and among the masses, Dzershinsky was known to be incorruptible, bold, inflexible, crystal-pure, straight and open. He always went about with open visor. He always spoke the truth, and was strict with himself, as well as with others, when it was necessary to be strict. Not infrequently he said the truth in a way nobody but he could say it. And he had a complete right to do this. He had won this right by his whole life, by the life of a true fighter of the revolution, to whom the revolution was everything: air and light, warmth and love, and life itself.

An infinite and boundless belief in the creative forces of the proletarian masses drove Dzershinsky forwards. It filled him completely. It had taken complete possession of him. Moulded out of one piece, Dzershinsky pursued his way with extraordinary natural simplicity. It was for this reason that he enjoyed such an authority; it was this that made his personality so charming, and rendered him so beloved. A quite extraordinary honesty towards the cause was combined in him with an enormous fullness of real human sympathy for humanity:

this severe President of the Tcheka was, in fact, a charming human personality, a delightful comrade to everybody who trod the path of the revolution.

Not so long ago comrade Dzershinsky had a "holiday". This "holiday" consisted in his spending day and night investigating the position of the metal works of the South. From this "holiday" Dzershinsky returned more ill than before. Nobody felt our shortcomings so keenly, with such inward pain, with such uneasiness as this fighter. He suffered literally on account of every failure, no matter how small. With each of his steps he refuted the notorious "popular wisdom", according to which everybody considers his own interests first. The care for the community, for the great and the small, gnawed at him uninterruptedly, and at the same time compelled him to expend all his forces right up to the end, to a sort of frantic over-exertion. As Dzershinsky performed every piece of work with the greatest conscientiousness, he forgot himself entirely. And he burned like a torch which lights the way to the great future of humanity.

This pre-eminent man lived and died for our Party, for its unity, for the dictatorship of our class. The chief trust he leaves behind is: Unity, united work, creative deed, struggle. It will be realised, and the victory will be complete. This thought is bound up with the unforgettable figure of our dear comrade. Farewell brother! Farewell our true fighter!

To the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union on the Occasion of the Death of Comrade Dzershinsky.

The death of Comrade Felix Dzershinsky one of the leaders of the C. P. S. U. (B), has stirred the Executive Committee of the E. C. I. deeply.

On behalf of the revolutionary youth of the whole world we express our sincerest sympathy. We grieve with you at the untimely death of one of the best champions of world revolution.

From the steel ranks of the Old Bolshevik Guard death mercilessly snatches the most devoted champions of the working class.

The working class youth of the world must weld its ranks together more closely than ever before around the Communist Party; in the stubborn struggle for the ultimate liberation of the working class it must prepare for the Party champions of the revolutionary cause like Dzershinsky.

The life and work of Comrade Dzershinsky should serve as an example to every young worker and peasant.

Death has torn out of the ranks of the Communist Party one of its finest leaders. The proletarian youth pledges itself to continue his work.

Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Y. C. I.

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

Danger Signals for the Miners Fight

By R. Palme Dutt (London).

A new situation has arisen in the miners' fight, which is serious for the future. This situation has arisen from the acceptance by the Miners' Executive of proposals, nominally arising from a Church Committee, for a settlement on the lines of the Samuel Report and an eventual reduction in wages. These proposals, as they stand, are unacceptable to the Government; but they open the way to a compromise in complete contradiction to every decision and expression of the Miners' and the mere fact of these proposals being accepted by the Miners' Executive has aroused new hopes in the bourgeoisie, and alarm and protests in the miners' ranks.

On July 14th, a Church Committee, containing seven bishops and leading Free Church representatives, and representing the "Industrial Christian Fellowship", met the Miners' officials. This meeting might appear as a simple philanthropic peace venture of the innocent men of God; but its real character was

sufficiently plain from the surrounding circumstances, which showed it to be closely parallel to the Samuel intervention in the General Strike. According to the *Manchester Guardian*, the Committee was acting under the guidance of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was in close touch with the Government.

The situation at this date is important to note. On July 12th, just two days before, the Government and coalowners had made their supreme attempt to break the miners. The pits were reopened on the basis of an eight hours day, and no immediate reduction in wages, though heavy reductions were shortly to follow. It was hoped that the miners, exhausted by privation and the distress of their families, would straggle back to work individually, and the Federation would be smashed. The attempt completely failed, with the solitary exception of the special district of Warwickshire, where a few thousand returned. The miners stood solid by their Federation, and the Government's move made not a pennyworth of difference to the situation.

Meanwhile the General Council and Parliamentary Labour Party were exerting heavy pressure on the Miners' Executive to break their resistance. Ever since June 23, when the Miners' Executive made the dangerous mistake of signing the Pact with the General Council to postpone the Special Conference and silence all criticism for the past, that pressure was increasing in force. Despite this Pact, the General Council did not hesitate to let be issued a Report which consisted of a shameful and calumniating public attack on the Miners for refusing to surrender, and an insistent demand that they should accept a reduction of wages. The demand for an embargo on coal and a levy of the whole movement in support of the miners was refused by the General Council. The miners' leaders, including Cook, were now making statements which concentrated on hours rather than on wages, and which talked of the necessity of resuming work on the old conditions as a preliminary to negotiations. The General Council deemed the moment ripe to invite the Miners' Executive to a conference, which took place on July 15. The calculation of the General Council and the Parliamentary Labour Party was expressed in the following terms by the "Times" of July 15:

"The General Council, presumably, are anxious to urge upon the Executive of the Miners' Federation the need of stating that at last they are prepared to accept the Report of the Royal Commission with all that it implies..."

"As long as the miners, to use the words of the General Council, are prepared to face starvation for a slogan, Labour Members of Parliament realise that little can be done, but there is a growing feeling that, properly handled, the miners would not now prove quite so adamant as they were at the beginning of the dispute."

In this can be seen expressed the cold-blooded calculation of the reformist Labour leaders on the weapon of starvation to break the miners.

On July 16th the Church Committee sent to the Prime Minister a basis of negotiations, to which they had secured the agreement of the miners' leaders. The terms of the Bishops' Memorandum cover the following points:

1. Resumption of work on old wages and hours: Government subsidy.

2. New National Agreement within four months. Both reorganisation and "the reference to wages in the Report" to be worked out by the Royal Commission, and embodied in legislation.

3. In the event of disagreement at the end of the four months, a Joint Board with an independent chairman to make an award binding on both parties.

These terms, it will be seen, represent 1) acceptance of an eventual reduction of wages 2) compulsory arbitration. Nevertheless they were officially agreed to by the Miners' Executive: and the Church Committee were able to add triumphantly in their letter to the Prime Minister the following declaration signed by the four officials of the Miners, Smith, Richards, Richardson and Cook:

"The suggested terms of settlement have now been submitted to the full Executive Committee of the Miners' Federation, and we are instructed to inform you that if a settlement can be arrived at upon the terms set out, the Committee are prepared to recommend their acceptance by the miners."

This was the first new declaration of policy of the Miners' Executive since the beginning of the dispute. It was an abandonment of the old policy of No Reductions as decided by the Conference of April 9, and the change was made without consulting the membership. At the same time Cook announced a new slogan: in place of the old "Not a cent off the pay, not a second on the day", the new slogan ran "To work we will go on the status quo".

The reaction of the miners to this new and unexpected move of their Executive was immediate. From two of the most important coalfields, South Wales and Durham, came at once official protests. The Executive Committee of the South Wales Miners Federation, as soon as the news came, passed the following resolution late on July 17th:

"After having before us an intimation that the National Executive have empowered a deputation of Church leaders to approach the Government in order to put before it terms which are in opposition to the Conference's decisions, this Council instructs the secretary to communicate with the Miners Federation of Great Britain Committee, urging that the authority to present the proposed terms of settlement be withdrawn, pending the calling of a National Conference to discuss the matter."

On July 21st the Executive Committee of the Durham Miners' Federation passed a public protest at the action of the National Executive, which they declared to be "subversive of Federation policy".

The Government of course immediately rejected the Church terms, which involved a Subsidy. On these grounds Cook has defended the move as a tactical move, exposing the "fight to a finish" policy of the Government and the vanity of hopes of settlement on lines of the Report, and therefore serving to confirm waverers and strengthen support in the working class movement. He declared in an interview to the *Daily Herald*:

"My friends in South Wales need not be alarmed. Well-wishers and sympathisers who believed the Government was amenable to reason now know definitely that the Government does not want a peaceful settlement by negotiation. What they want is surrender by the miners' leaders to the terms they have put forward. They were never prepared to accept either the Samuel report or the Samuel memorandum. It would now be wise for those Labour leaders who have been prating about the Report to recognise the facts and declare where they stand, either to support the miners' policy against reduction of wages or longer hours, or support the Government and the mineowners in their opposite policy."

This is a very dangerous line of argument. It did not need a surrender and new policy by the Miners' Executive to prove that the Government has abandoned the whole sham of the Samuel Report, an abandonment that the Government itself has publicly declared. Nor will concessions win over to a fight those Labour leaders who are behaving as the bitterest enemies of the miners, and who will only use concessions to demand more. It is true that the Government has refused the present terms, and is no more likely to accept them than the old Samuel memorandum. But this very fact means that the only net effect of the move is a concession by the Miners on the two cardinal issues of a reduction in wages and of compulsory arbitration. Once the Executive have declared their readiness to accept a settlement involving a reduction of wages, how can they continue the fight for No Reductions? The bourgeoisie have at once seized hold of the concessions made in order to press them further; and debates have been fixed in both Houses of Parliament to call attention to

"the recent public expression of willingness on the part of the miners' leaders to recommend the men under certain conditions to accept both wage reductions and arbitration."

The General Council and Labour Party leaders will certainly also take the opportunity to press the advantage.

The situation is thus a critical one, and a path of slippery negotiations and formulas, similar to the Samuel memorandum, has been begun. A National Delegate Conference, representative of the miners throughout the country, is urgently necessary to clear the position.

POLITICS

Poincaré in the Government.

By Pierre Sémard (Paris).

Poincaré has been called upon to form a government of the so-called "National Unity", and the entire reactionary press announces that the "saviour of his country" is capable of saving the Franc! The big bourgeoisie believe that the man who is responsible for the slaughter of 1914/1918 and for the occupation of the Ruhr, the man of reprisals and conspiracies, possesses all the necessary qualities to bring order into the finances, in that he secures order in the streets.

Poincaré's reappearance in the political arena is due to the impotence of the parties which formed the Left Bloc and the indolence and treachery of its leaders. Herriot and his Radical Socialist Party have provided the spectacle of the collapse of democracy and its surrender to the forces of reaction and of fascism.

Our Party, on principle, naturally has no confidence in any bourgeois government. If our Party votes for certain bills submitted by the ruling bourgeoisie, it is because these laws are capable, or appear capable, of ameliorating or improving for the moment the lot of the worker; because the latter would not understand that those who call themselves their protectors reject laws regarding which they are still of the opinion that they could better their living and working conditions.

Now the Herriot government submitted an empty and contradictory programme, a mixture of reactionary and democratic elements, which transfers all burdens on to the shoulders of the working and peasant masses, as did the draft of the experts defended by Caillaux. This government had as its object the attainment of a parliamentary majority which should permit it, under the Republican democratic mask, to carry on the policy of the big bourgeoisie and to attempt along with it to restore the franc at the cost of the working masses.

It was therefore the duty of the Communists to vote against this government. It is not the Communists who played into the hands of reaction, but the sham democrats, the constant defenders of the bourgeoisie, who are always impotent and who capitulate to reaction. Even the Left "Ere Nouvelle" wrote: "Herriot, by stepping down to the Deputies' benches in order to drive out Briand, has thereby prepared the bed for Poincaré". Thus the Left papers themselves admit the most reactionary combinations on the part of the leaders of the Left Bloc.

But we communists say to the workers: No matter whether Herriot or Poincaré, the fight will not be carried on in parliament, but outside parliament. In order to defend your lives and your rights, threatened by the governments which are in the service of capitalism and which are supported by the fascist organisations, you must organise on the trade union field in the C. G. T. U. and strengthen your class party, the Communist Party. The workers know that the forces of capitalism will have to be combated in the factories and in the street, both in order to defend the immediate demands and the liberties of the workers and in order that the proletariat may seize power. A powerful united front of the proletarians must be set up in the factories.

The working masses, disappointed and discouraged by the impotence and the betrayal of the parties of the Left Bloc, are demanding the dissolution of parliament. So be it! But for our Party this is not an end, but a means in order to come before the great masses of the people, to show them who are responsible for the present crisis and to submit our programme to the masses which alone can emancipate them from enslavement by capital. Dissolution of parliament? By all means! In order that the working and peasant masses can express their hostility to the plans of the big bourgeoisie, demand the nationalisation of the banks, the monopoly of foreign trade and workers' control, and can work for the establishment of a workers' and peasants' government which will carry out these demands through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

English Gold in Russia.

English Government organs support the sending of money to Russia for Counter-revolutionary purposes.

By A. Kurella (Moscow).

The English government has raised a great outcry over the money sent by the Russian trade unions in support of the English miners. It has endeavoured to prove that this money has come from the Russian government or least has been forwarded through it. The reports regarding the collections which have been carried out in the U. S. S. R. and as to the manner in which the money has been sent through the banks have nailed these lies to the counter.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that the cry regarding Russian gold in England is rather out of place on the part of those who, in 1918, 1919 and 1920, not only financed counter-revolutionary revolts in the territory of the U. S. S. R., but also organised armed intervention in this country. The English government could put forward the excuse that there was still a "war" on at that time, and that this intervention is a thing of the past.

But we now learn that in recent time the English government has allowed its official representatives in Moscow and Leningrad to have money remitted through them; and that in the year 1924 when "peace" prevailed between the two countries; when trade relations were officially established; when a clause in the Treaty which had been concluded, expressly provided for the cessation of every kind of official propaganda in the other country; when the two countries had established permanent official missions — in this year the representatives sent to Russia by the English government in order to regulate economic relations, received money which was sent to Russia for counter-revolutionary purposes.

The Glasgow "Forward", the organ of the Scottish Independent Labour Party, published documents in its number of 3rd July last which irrefutably prove this.

In the "Times" of 11th March 1924 there appeared a letter signed by seven members of the committee "For the Relief of the Clergy", calling for contributions of money to support the persecuted Russian Clergy. Contributions were to be sent to the Bishop of Birmingham or to a certain Major W. T. Pole. "Further particulars regarding the action which has been undertaken can be obtained, in confidence, from the above-named address", stated the letter.

A certain Mr. Harriman considered it necessary, before he contributed his mite, to inquire whether the money might not, perchance, fall into the hands of the terrible Bolsheviki. In reply to his letter to this effect he received the following reply by return post:

"61, St. James Street
London SW. 1
10th March 1924.

Private and Confidential!

F. Harrison, Esq.

58, Belsize Road

South Hampstead N.W., 6.

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 18th inst. I have the honour to inform you that all contributions and letters which we send to Russia are addressed to the British Trade Representative, Mr. Hodgson, Moscow, or Mr. Thomas Preston, the British representative in Petrograd.

It is, of course, impossible for us to state in printed publications that the relief work undertaken by us is only possible owing to the co-operation of the British representatives in Russia, but it is a fact.

You can be assured that the money will not be wrongly used and that none of your remittances will find their way into the hands of the Bolsheviki or into the hands of the clerical renegades, of the so-called "Red Church".

I should be much obliged if you would treat this information as strictly confidential.

Your obedient servant

W. Tudor Pole*.)

*) Retranslated from the Russian.

We wonder how the English government thinks to justify this role of its representatives in Russia. Perhaps that it was a case of charitable work? Did not the English government know that it was precisely in the year 1924 that several big trials against the clergy took place, who were found guilty of counter-revolutionary activity of espionage, and that the relief action abroad was called forth by these prosecutions? The public opinion of the whole world will be able to pronounce judgement as to what relief is "more moral": the relief which the millions of Russian workers afforded their English comrades who are fighting for their existence, or the relief which the English capitalists and Bishops granted to people who were prosecuted by the ordinary courts on account of high treason, and partly also for ordinary criminal acts. And it can judge which government acted more correctly: the Soviet Government, which in strict observance of the treaties refrained from any immediate support of the action of the Russian trade unions in the sending of money, or the English government which, in violation of the treaties, directly organised the sending of money for counter-revolutionary purposes.

A Pan-Asiatic Congress in Japan.

By Tang Shin She.

The Imperialists of Europe wish to convoke a Pan-European Congress; those of America intend to create a Pan-American League of Nations, while those of Asia have convened for August 1st of this year a Pan-Asiatic Congress.

These movements did not originate exclusively among the imperialists; the Second International and the Amsterdam International have also played their part in the matter. Several months ago the newspapers of the Second International and the Amsterdam International reported that a Pan-Asiatic Labour Congress was to be convened in Shanghai, and now it appears that a Pan-Asiatic Congress is to meet on August 1st. in Nagasaki (Japan).

As regards the anti-Japanese movement in China, in the political sense as well as the economic, which has arisen on account of the 21 demands of Japan, the Japanese assume that the antagonism has been produced by American agitation, and for this reason they have long desired to call a Pan-Asiatic Congress. The murderous shootings in Shanghai on May 30th, 1925, which in reality were caused by the Japanese, are being used by them to ingratiate themselves with the Chinese whose indignation is directed against the international Imperialists. Japanese politicians sent repeated delegations to express to the Chinese their "sympathy" with them in their fight against the "Whites". With clever and cunning words they endeavoured to stir up racial hatred on the part of the yellow peoples against the Whites. They immediately found adherents for this idea among the Chinese bourgeoisie, and committees were promptly formed in Shanghai and Peking to prepare for the Pan-Asiatic Congress.

The original plan was to hold the Congress in Shanghai, but as the revolutionary wave in China continued to increase from day to day, and because such a congress would meet with greath resistance, it was decided to hold it in Nagasaki in Japan. In all there were to be 100 delegates at the congress, Japan and China each sending 25 representatives, while the remaining 50 should come from India, Persia, Turkey and other countries. Under no circumstances is English to be spoken at the congress: French may be used when necessity arises.

It was, however, not satisfactory to the Japanese that, after all the trouble they had gone through to prepare the congress, only those politicians who live on Japanese money and the expelled members of the Kuomintang Party — all persons of but little significance in China — were willing to attend. They therefore, towards the end of May of this year, sent a delegation of parliamentarians to Shanghai to invite the Chamber of Commerce of that city. But as a portion of the small traders displayed an anti-imperialist tendency, while, on the other hand, some of the bigger merchants were under English-American influence, there was little to be done in regard to the Chamber of Commerce beyond inviting a hundred members to visit Japan for the purpose of fostering friendlier relations between Japan and China, which invitation was accepted.

What is the purport of the Pan-Asiatic Labour Congress?

Last year the Japanese Government sent the reformist Labour leader, Bunji Suzuki, the Secretary of the Japanese Federation

of Labour to the Congress of the Internationale Labour Office at Geneva. Shortly afterwards American newspapers published the report that a Pan-Asiatic Congress was to be held in France under the presidency of Suzuki. This plan, naturally, emanated from the Geneva Labour office and the Amsterdam Trade Union International, and with no other object than the disruption of the Asiatic Labour movement, for it had long been a source of great dissatisfaction to these bodies that the Asiatic Labour organisations all incline towards the Red International of Labour Unions or are actually affiliated to it.

After his return to Japan — after the shooting in Shanghai Suzuki stated in the course of an interview with a representative of the Japanese Press, that the Pan-Asiatic Labour Congress would take place in Shanghai and that its chief aim would be the levelling up of the wages of Asiatic workers with those of Western workers. The reason for the sudden shifting of the scene of the congress from France to Shanghai may be attributed to the fact that the Japanese imperialists needed their reformist leaders for their own purposes and were not disposed to have them exploited by other imperialists. At the beginning of this year it appeared as though the congress would really take place in Shanghai. In consequence, the General Secretary of the Shanghai Trades Council, Li Li San, wrote an article on this subject in April this year in "The Guide Weekly":

"...What attitude should the workers adopt in regard to a congress of this kind?

1. We have observed how the Western working class have been deceived by their reformist leaders, and that as a result they are still to day under the yoke of capitalist domination. The reformist leaders are nothing but the jackals of the bourgeoisie, and no matter what fine words they may utter we cannot afford to trust them.

2. During the recent imperialist world-war eight million of our fellow workers were slaughtered under the slogan of Defence of Home and Country, while many millions were crippled for life. Now the Japanese Imperialists want to deceive the working class of the Far East with the same slogan of Defence of Home and Country. We must not tolerate this.

3. The large majority of the peoples of the East suffer under imperialist oppression. There is only one way for us: A united front against imperialists! The workers in particular must line up in this front. It must also be their task to see that the Pan-Asiatic Labour Congress, which is merely a manoeuvre of the imperialists and a campaign of lies on the part of the reformists, is prevented..."

This single attack served to bury the magnificent Pan-Asiatic Labour Congress.

The extension of the British naval base at Singapore, the manoeuvres of the American fleet in the Pacific Ocean and the strong revolutionary tendency in China forced the Japanese imperialists to try to bring about a Pan-Asiatic Congress for the bourgeoisie and for the workers, in order to smash the revolutionary united front in Asia and to defend their conflicting interests against foreign imperialists. Such action signifies nothing less than preparation on the part of Japanese imperialism for a war in the Pacific Ocean.

CHINA

Revolutionary Ferment among the British-Indian Occupation Troops in China.

The English have for a long time been making use of a particularly large body of Indians as occupation troops and police for China in order to suppress the local population. Other imperialists are hiring from the English these Indians for their concession areas and settlements in order to use them for their own purposes. The Rickshaw coolies and streeturchins stand in greater fear of the Indians than of the English and other foreigners.

But these Indian police are now being infected by the strong revolutionary ferment within the Chinese population and by the latter's fight against the imperialists. When, in the past year, the great strikes broke out in Hongkong and Canton, many of the Indian police abandoned their posts and betook

themselves to Canton. Many of the Indian police, who remained behind were killed by the English on suspicion of being revolutionary minded.

On the 22nd May last the Portuguese in Macao discovered a revolutionary conspiracy among the Indian police who had been hired from the English, whereupon the entire 3rd. Battalion of the Indian occupation troops in Hongkong was disbanded. All the remaining Indian troops were disarmed. In addition to the warships in Hongkong and Macao, the English are now bringing black troops for their protection. In both of these towns the Indians and Chinese are not allowed to speak with each other probably because the Chinese are the carriers of the bacillus of the revolutionary plague.

Since last year there has existed in Canton a Union of Suppressed Peoples in which Chinese, Indians, Koreans and Annamites are represented. The Indians have already accomplished considerable practical work.

THE TRIAL OF RAKOSI AND COMRADES

The Political Significance of the Rákosi Trial.

By E. Landler.

The political significance of the Rákosi trial was obvious in Hungary, and also in the international sphere already before its commencement. But the trial first acquired its real political significance during the proceedings, as a result of the behaviour of the accused.

There were countries where the white terror is exercised on a larger scale than in Horthy Hungary. It is certain, however, that the school masters of the White Terror in Europe after the war were the Horthy brigands, and it is equally certain that the white terror in Hungary has been carried out with the most barbarous, brutal and diabolical means. When the detachments of the white terror were let loose in Hungary and the reign of violence of the counter-revolution assumed a consolidated form, the Hungarian white terror, with Magyarish means and methods, was continued in legal forms. As part of this method there is the retention of the exceptional laws of the war time towards political "criminals", the use of special courts, wholesale internments, and similar measures. To this there also belongs the juridical practice, according to which the holding of communist opinions is regarded as subversive activity, and under certain circumstances can be punished with the death penalty.

It was on the basis of such an exceptional law and of such an interpretation of the law that, in Autumn of last year, Comrades Rákosi, Hámán, Oery, Gógós and Weinberger were brought before the Special court; and if the outburst of indignation of the international working class had not rescued them, their fate would have been the Horthy gallows.

The 30 accused Communists and the 25 members of the Socialist Labour Party of Hungary, who are at present before the court on the charge of Communism, clearly realised that they can only save the cause, and with it themselves, not by cringing excuses, but only by earnest, class conscious attack on the system itself. The accused communists, without exception declare that they do not defend themselves before a class court; they all without exception deliver accusatory speeches against the government of Franco-forgers and against the social democracy, which makes pacts with the same government.

The Communists stand up courageously in the court against the prevailing terror and regard the court as a tribune for propagating the principles of Communism among the proletariat. Neither the tactics of the President, in particular his attempts to embarrass and confuse the accused simple workers in order to cause them to proclaim an uncommunist standpoint, nor the unexampled cruelty (even in Hungary) with which the President metes out punishment of various kinds to the accused for alleged contempt of court, such as dark cells, deprivation of food, plank beds, can prevent our comrades from proclaiming their opinions.

Comrade Rákosi delivered a powerful accusatory speech against the ruling Horthy system. He defended the memory of the proletarian dictatorship in Hungary and pointed out its true significance. He shows how irresistible is the developing

movement of the people, the leadership of which, in spite of the terror, in spite of everything, will come into the hands of the Communist Party, and at the head of which the Party will achieve legality. Only when the Communist Party succeeds in gaining the leadership of this movement will the proletariat and the peasantry be able to overthrow the present regime.

But the other comrades also, without exception, behave like heroes before the class court.

Our comrade Katharina Hámán is cross-examined by the President:

President: You declared before the Public Prosecutor that you do not condemn the activity of Bela Kun during the proletarian dictatorship, but approve of it. I ask you, do you now refuse to answer this question or do you confirm that declaration?

Hámán: I do not refuse to answer. I fully and entirely stand by my statements regarding the activity of Bela Kun. I approve of the activity of Bela Kun. I fully and entirely approve of the actions of the Communists during the dictatorship, and I am proud that I myself took part in this work.

President: What was the purpose of your movement?

Hámán: To set up the communist society with the aid of the proletarian dictatorship.

The President addressed the following questions to Comrade Gógós:

President: You declared before the Public Prosecutor that the pre-condition for the emancipation of the proletariat is the existence of an illegal Communist Party. Since when was the illegal Communist Party organised in Hungary?

Gógós: Ever since there have been communists in Hungary, who does not agree to an illegal communist Party in order to overthrow the bourgeoisie is not a communist.

The President questioned comrade Keller:

President: Do you approve of the Communists wishing to overthrow the bourgeois society by means of an armed revolt?

Keller: Of course I approve of it.

President: Why do you approve of it?

Keller: There is not a worker today in Hungary, however simple, who does not clearly realise that the bourgeoisie will not voluntarily hand over power and the means of production to any parliamentary majority. The bourgeoisie will defend itself with force. Nothing is more natural therefore than that force will be met with force.

The attitude of the accused also clearly shows that this fight in the court room for legality is being conducted without any illusions. Those who, even under the shadow of the gallows, acknowledge Leninism, are quite clear that the legality of the Party cannot be obtained by court proceedings, nor by a court verdict, but only by the organisatory strengthening of the Communist Party and by increasing its mass influence in Hungary. The accused make their fight before the court subsidiary to the fight for strengthening the Communist Party of Hungary, in that, with unexampled courage, they oppose the murderous Horthy regime and demonstrate to the suppressed, embittered and impoverished proletarian masses that only the Communist Party can lead them in the fight for the annihilation of this system. The fight for legality assumes before the Horthy court the form of a fierce fight against the regime of counter-revolution. This trial cannot fail to have an effect upon the working people of Hungary.

But this trial is also of great importance outside of Hungary. Rákosi and his comrades have now shown that the solidarity action of the international labour movement last Autumn has rescued from the Horthy gallows, worthy comrades, self-sacrificing fighters for the cause of Communism. The manner in which these comrades have placed their lives, which were rescued by international solidarity, at the service of the unrelenting fight against imperialism, is bound to have its effect upon the international working class.

The trial, however, possesses special political importance in two other directions.

The Bohlen government wished to discredit the Socialist Labour Party of Hungary, and for this purpose connected the trial of the leaders of this party with the trial of the Communists. The government wished to brand the leaders of the Left labour Party as communists, in order to deprive the Socialist Labour Party of all freedom of movement. Although the indictment had to admit that there was no proof against these leaders regarding their membership of the Communist Inter-

national and their connection with the Communist emigrants, they are nevertheless being accused of Communist subversive activity.

The course of the proceedings up to now has shown that the obvious baseness of the Bethlen government will also suffer failure in connection with this trial. This will not only be because Stefan Vági and his comrades declared that they are not members of the Communist International, but also because these accused so courageously and emphatically proclaim their belief in the class struggle and stand up so heroically against the murderous Horthy regime, that their conduct so far as accused socialists are concerned, is unexampled since the war. It is certain that the attitude of the leaders of the Socialist Labour Party will greatly contribute towards the revolutionising of the working masses of Hungary.

The great political importance of the trial finds expression also in the fact that in no political trial have the social democratic traitors been so completely exposed as in this one. One of the most important witnesses for the Prosecution is Gabriel Horowitz, a member of the social-democratic Central Committee and General Secretary of the Hungarian Wood Workers' Union. Even before he came forward as a witness this rascal had been exposed as a police spy. It had already become evident before that the Hungarian Social Democracy is one of the most respectable sections of the Labour and Socialist International, which hesitated neither at open denunciation or at sending secret information to the police or, by the vilest denunciation, at depriving simple workers of their daily bread when it was a question of defending their own and the interests of the bourgeoisie. In the course of the trial it has transpired that this social democracy, since the first days of the white terror up to the present moment, has been the most sure support of the murderous Horthy regime.

There is no doubt that the accused are threatened with severest punishment by the Horthy court for their heroic behaviour. The more the vengeance of the Hungarian counter-revolution finds expression in the condemnation of the accused, the greater will be the effect of this trial on the fights which the sections of the Communist International are conducting for the overthrow of capitalism.

Letters from Budapest to the "Inprecorr". Fifth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, July 10, 1926.

To-day there was commenced the cross-examination of those accused who belonged to the Vági Party and of the accused who are not included in the Rákosi-Weinberger group. The first to be cross-examined was

Stefan Vági.

He stated:

He belonged to the Hungarian Social Democracy since 1903. Before the war the question of seizing power was never raised in the Party. In agrarian-feudal Hungary the working class possessed neither the right of combination nor the franchise. The class struggle was fought round the question of the franchise. I was in this struggle that the Hungarian proletariat created its revolutionary tradition. The peasant masses also took part heroically in the fight for democratic rights.

After the overthrow of the Habsburgs it was not the social democratic party, but history which raised the question of power. It is absurd to maintain that the revolution was the work of a few inciters. The setting up of the rule of the workers was the historical act of the Hungarian proletariat.

I am not a communist, but I adopt the standpoint of Marxism, of the decisive class struggle. It is from this standpoint that we consider ourselves to be the accomplices of the bourgeois revolution which has not yet been fully carried out. And just as I do not deny the peasant war of 1514, just as I do not deny the bourgeois revolution of 1848, nor the Paris Commune of 1871, so do I not deny 1919, the year of the proletarian dictatorship in Hungary.

The overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship was followed by the blackest night for the Hungarian proletariat. White terror reigned in the country.

The President calls Vági to order and calls on him to defend himself. Vági, however, continues without letting himself being intimidated.

70,000 prisoners were thrown into the dungeons and numerous martyrs were dispatched to the next world.

The President again calls Vági to order.

Vági: Already at that time I protested against the behaviour of the social democratic Party of Hungary. Social democratic leaders took part as leaders in the first bloody regime. They expressed their approval of the Exceptional Courts and the internments. The social democratic leaders were the confederates of the most frightful white terror. In spite of the fact that the Hungarian proletariat continued to fight under the most terrible white terror, maintained its revolutionary tradition and offered heroic resistance, the leaders of the Hungarian social democracy still continued their betrayal of the class struggle. In spite of the fact that the brutal white terror crushes every movement for freedom and wishes to cripple the proletariat, the leaders of the social democracy at every decisive moment backed their heads to the wall and supported the counter-revolution. I can assert with a clear conscience and without any exaggeration that the surest and most reliable supporters of the counter-revolution are the Hungarian social democratic leaders.

I, as a revolutionary Marxist, could not look idly on while the Hungarian proletariat, which still fought determinedly during the most terrible fury of the white terror, was being slaughtered. I saw how the landless peasants and agricultural workers were deceived by the so-called land reform. There was never an alternative base than the betrayal by the Hungarian ruling class of the rural proletariat with the land reform. I saw how the ruling class shamelessly enriched itself with the aid of this land reform. I saw how the so-called patriots made a great mouth regarding the shameful peace of Trianon and talked of the integrity of Hungary, but at the same time, by the "sanitation", bargained away the country and its independence to the foreign capitalists.

The "sanitation" plunged Hungary into the most unheard-of poverty. It is not only the Hungarian proletariat that is perishing from hunger and misery, but also the town petty bourgeoisie and the so-called intelligentsia have been pushed down into the ranks of the proletariat. Every month hundreds seek by suicide a way of escape from "stabilised" Hungary. Even under these circumstances the social democratic leaders have remained true to Bethlen and followed him like his shadow. They concluded a Pact with him. During the sanitation they concluded a civil peace, and in both great and small affairs have established a world record in history in the sphere of treachery. With the putrefaction of the Hungarian counter-revolution the mentality of the social democratic leaders has become more and more putrefied.

The counter-revolution is only held together by the fear of revolution. The social democrats are afraid of nothing so much as the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. When it was no longer possible to conclude open pacts with Bethlen, the social democratic party concluded a bloc with the democrats, which was under the leadership of the legitimists. Whilst Horthy and the Race Protectors converted Hungary into one huge cemetery, the social democratic leaders sat contentedly in the bog of corruption of the white terror, and enriched themselves from the pickings from the various corruption cases.

I was excluded from the Party in December 1924, because I dared to criticise the activity and the tactics of the social democratic leaders. After the overthrow of the dictatorship, the Party was to have returned to the old social democratic programme of 1903.

I made it my task, by means of systematic work, to alter within a short time the whole line of thought of the social democratic party in this sense. We sought to gain our supporters among those sections of the Hungarian working class which had not been demoralised by the counter-revolution.

President: To which International do you belong, to the III?

Vági: The Party Executive sent delegates to the Marseilles Congress of the Second International. It was impossible for the whole Party to define its attitude to this question for Hungary is the classic country not only of swindlers, but also of those who override the laws — so that we could not hold a congress where we would have decided this question. The II. International had set up a commission in Vienna, which included Kautsky and Otto Bauer, and whose task it was to investigate the situation of the Hungarian social democracy.

The Second International was well-informed as to the position in the Hungarian social democracy, and knew the leaders of the Party. The Second International called upon the Executive of the Hungarian social democracy to put a stop to the expulsions, but the Party Executive did not take any notice of this.

President: What were the Defence Organisations which you formed?

Vági: The social democrats tried to represent our movement as being a manoeuvre of the "Awakening Hungarians". They sent workers to the foundation meeting with instructions to break it up, by which means they succeeded in getting the meeting dissolved by the police.

President: In a written statement which was found on you by the police it is stated that the government in which Payer sat as a government of the gallows.

Vági: Because, under this government, leaders of the Hungarian working class were executed.

President: You said before the police that you are following the straight line to communism.

Vági: I did not say that. I only said that the social democrats will only achieve their aim in 4500 years.

President: You were elected as honorary Chairman by the Vienna Communist Congress?

Vági: I knew nothing whatever of that. Your Lordship could just as well have been elected there.

President: You are not to make ironical remarks. I call you to order.

President: Does your Party stand on the basis of the Communist International?

Vági: It has not yet adopted any attitude to the question of the International.

President: It has recognised neither the II. nor the III. International?

Vági: No, for the Congress was to have decided this. But the Congress could not be held, because there is no right of assembly in Hungary.

President: I ask you once again: Do you stand on the basis of the III. International?

Vági: I declare once again that I am a socialist.

President: Have you anything further to say in your defence?

Vági: I should only like to deal with the mistakes in the indictment of the Public Prosecutor.

President: You must not make use of such expressions. I call you to order.

Vági: But there are mistakes in the indictment.

President: I call you to order for the second time, and order you not to say anything with regard to this, otherwise I shall have to punish you seriously.

The next accused to be examined was

Aladar Weiszhausz.

He worked in the organisation of the railway workers and belonged to the opposition which opposed the trade union bureaucracy. In the year 1925 he joined the Vági Party. He tried to get the social democratic party to convene a Congress in order to pass definite decisions regarding the question of unemployment and other important questions. The Congress, however, was not called, although the leaders of the Party had promised the Vienna Commission of the Second International to hold this Congress.

Regarding the Vienna Commission of the Second International, the accused also states that this body condemned the Party of the Hungarian social democracy. The Party received the order: stop the expulsions! But the leaders declared after they had returned to Budapest that everything would remain as it was before.

President: How was the opposition organised, in the old Party or in the trade unions?

Weiszhausz: Already in December 1923, at the Congress of the Party, strong oppositional voices were to be heard. Because the working class was not in agreement with the leadership of the Party.

President: You stated at a public meeting that since the overthrow of the dictatorship, the position of the working class in Hungary has been growing worse every day; that the workers are being treated like the serfs of the middle ages; that all burdens of the State rest upon the shoulders of the

workers; and that in Hungary there exists no freedom of the press and of meetings.

Weiszhausz: Yes, I said that.

President: Did you not also say that the proletariat can only achieve a better future by its own strength, and by way of the class struggle?

Weiszhausz: I also said that.

President: Then you said that reaction, which wishes to bring back the middle ages, must be crushed.

Weiszhausz: This sentence is torn from its context in my speech and distorted by means of leaving out certain words.

Giving the reasons for his oppositional attitude to the social democratic leaders, the accused continued: How abominably the social democratic leaders behaved is shown by the case of Comrade Franz Dohány, who is also one of the accused, but is a member of the social democratic party. This comrade was paid 100,000 crowns by the leaders in order to break up our meeting. At the municipal elections in Budapest the social democracy concluded a pact with the bourgeois parties, particularly with the Vászony Party. It was bound to come to a split, because such things were intolerable.

President: Why did you go so often to Vienna?

Weiszhausz: Because, I have my family there.

President: With whom were you together there?

Weiszhausz: With Kunfi, Garbai and Böhm.

President: With Landler also?

Weiszhausz: No, I did not even know that he is in Vienna.

President: Did you not know that Katherine Haman was carrying on communist propaganda in the Vági Party?

Weiszhausz: I did not notice anything of that.

President: Who was the treasurer of the Vági Party?

Weiszhausz: Gögös.

President: Why was precisely Gögös elected, who was a communist?

Weiszhausz: Because we knew him to be a staunch, good and honest comrade.

President: When the police prohibited your demonstration you spoke against the prohibition.

Weiszhausz: I only said that, in view of the fact that the demonstration was prohibited right at the last moment and that therefore the workers, in spite of this, would come, the leaders should go there and tell the workers that the demonstration was prohibited and that they should not allow themselves to be provoked by the police.

Emerich Palotás

was a member of the Vági Party since its foundation, and was also in the Central Committee and Secretary of the Party. He received a salary of 400,000 crowns a week.

President: Did you know anything of the course of lectures?

Palotás: No.

President: Of what did you speak in Hernád street (premises of the Vági Party) at your lecture?

Palotás: On the organisation questions of the Party.

President: With what foreign groups were you in connection?

Palotás: With none, only with individual workers.

President: Did Haman often speak in the meetings of the Central, and what did she say?

Palotás: Everybody spoke at the sittings, and today I can no longer remember what they said. I do not know anything whatever of the later Party activity as I was ill.

Stefan Huber

was chairman of the Party after the arrest of Vági. The Party wished by legal means to improve the position of the Hungarian working class.

President: You demanded at a meeting the establishment of relations with Soviet Russia?

Huber: Yes, in order that the workers in Hungary might find employment.

President: Was there anything said in the Party regarding connections with the III. International?

Huber: We have nothing in common with the III. International.

President: Did you notice that Haman, Tóth, Oery and Gögös conducted communist agitation?

Huber: No.

President: Were you in connection with the emigrants in Vienna?

Huber: With none.

Heinrich Hajdu

is now heard. He is a well-known writer, contributor to the newspaper "Nyugat" (The West) and the best translator of Ibsen in Hungary. His translations of Ibsen, for example, are performed in the Hungarian National Theatre in Budapest. He was expelled from the social democracy because he joined the opposition. He disagreed with the entire policy of the Party. He joined the opposition because he came across tremendous abuses. Thus he learned that Emerich Szabo, a member of parliament, as head of the woodworkers' Union threatened those members who opposed the increase of the Union contributions with internment in Zala Egerszeg (the notorious death camp of the interned revolutionaries). We drew up a protocol regarding this and reported to the Party Executive but who, though repeatedly urged, did not do anything in the matter.

I left the social democracy, because I am convinced that the Bethlen government can only be overthrown by a workers' Party which stands on the basis of the class struggle; the social democracy, however, has betrayed the class struggle, and because I, as a consistent Marxist, could not remain a member of a Party which concluded a Pact with Bethlen which the Commission of the Second International, under the chairmanship of Karl Kautsky, stigmatised as immoral.

President: Which International did you acknowledge?

Hajdu: Neither, but I am in favour of our entering the Second International.

President: Have you not noticed that Haman is ultra-Left inclined?

Hajdu: No, for in that case we should have expelled her from the Party.

President: You were also a member of the Neupest Municipal Council?

Hajdu: No, only of the committee for culture.

President: What proposals did you bring forward there?

Hajdu: Only those of a cultural and social-political nature.

President: Did you have connections with Rakosi?

Hajdu: No, I only first learned from the indictment that I was involved in this affair.

The accused brings forward evidence to show that he only worked legally, that he did not pursue any insurrectionary plans, and that only recently he intervened with the Lord Mayor of Budapest and the Minister for the Interior regarding various questions, among others regarding permission for the Vagi Party to hold meetings. Of the emigrants he had only had connections with Kunfi, Buchinger, Garbai and Böhm. He did not know why he had been arrested. His arrest had put a stop to his literary activity and exposed his family to poverty.

Gabriel Osvath

was President of the Woodworkers' Union. He repudiates the charge of having been connected with the communists. He knew nothing whatever of the action of Rakosi.

President: You condemned Vagi's radicalism?

Osvath: Yes, for a time, because I feared that we were persecuted. For the rest, Vagi has replied to the reproach that Communists were in the Party by saying that one could just as well assert that "Awakening Hungarians" were in the Party.

Czvidi

in reply to the President, admits that he opposed the nationalism and the nationalist phrases of the social democratic leaders, and also the treacherous attitude of the leaders to the working class.

President: At whose behest did you carry on agitation?

Czvidi: At nobody's behest. It was the moral duty of a class-conscious social democrat.

Sixth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, July 20, 1926.

Today the cross-examination of the accused was concluded. Only members of the Vagi Party were cross-examined: all of whom declared that they do not stand on the basis of the III. International and knew nothing of any communist agitation in the Party. They did not know Rakosi. But all of them cri-

ticised the criminal attitude of the social democratic leaders, who allowed no criticism in the Party and denounced inconvenient people to the police. They also admitted that the Vagi Party organised defence troops, in the same way as the social democrats. There also existed a singing club, for which the police displayed a great interest. Almost all the accused stated that they had been beaten by the police.

Michael Szabo

declared that the social democratic leaders went so far in their savage terror against opposition members, that in dozens of cases they succeeded in getting employers to throw them on the street. The social democrats also made it their practice to denounce as bolsheviks those who carried on opposition. We wanted to cleanse the Party of the parasites.

President: I warn you not to use such words. Was Katherine Haman particularly radical in her activity in the Party?

Szabo: Her standpoint was the same as ours.

Paul Roth-Vándor

is a writer: was in Paris and in Germany, where he was arrested as a "French" spy. When he returned home he became an employee of the Anglo-Hungarian Bank, but was soon discharged. He entered the Vagi Party and wished to organise the youth.

Georg Tóth

is the husband of the accused Katherine Haman. He left the social democratic party. He knew nothing of the presence of his wife at the Congress, as his wife was ill at the time, and, so far as he knew, was being medically treated. He then states that, on his arrest the detectives called his mother and wife whores, and because he protested against this he was terribly beaten and tortured for ten days in succession. His daughter and his two brothers-in-law were also tortured for days on end, solely because they are relatives of the accused Katharina Haman.

President: You will be severely punished if you do not take care of what you are saying!

Tóth: I cannot control myself when I think of how I was beaten, and how my wife and my mother were insulted by the detectives.

President: I call you to order! The medical certificate says nothing as to any signs of your having been ill-treated.

Tóth: I was not examined until two weeks after the ill-treatment. For the rest, with the methods of examination of the police doctors.

President: I call you to order on account of this remark!

Franz Dohany

a cab driver, right at the beginning of his cross-examination, declared that he was one of those who received 100,000 crowns from the social democratic leaders to break up the foundation meeting of the Vagi Party. As a reason for this, they were told that the Vagi Party is a manoeuvre of the "Awakening Hungarians". But I observed the Vagi people more closely at their meeting.

President: Do not talk in that rambling fashion! Be more brief!

Dohany: But your Lordship, I must explain the matter to you in order that you can understand me. (Laughter.)

President: Silence! Speak to the point!

Dohany: As a result of my observation I soon realised that the story regarding the "Awakening Hungarians" was only an invention in order to prejudice the Vagi Party in our eyes.

President: You collected money for the purpose of obtaining red flags?

Dohany: Yes, I do not deny that.

President: But you wanted to use the flags, although the meeting (the demonstration of the Vagi Party on the evening of 6th March 1926, following the fresh arrests of the Vagi people) was forbidden?

Dohany: I only read of the prohibition of the meeting, but I have never read that red flags are prohibited in Hungary? (Laughter.)

President: A placard bore the inscription: "Down with the money fongers!"

Dohany: Quite true!

President: Then you were arrested?

Dohany: Yes, and beaten and stabbed by the police.

President: On the evening of the 6th of March you were very much afraid?

Dohany: I was afraid: Of whom and of what? I was

sergeant major in the war, I am not afraid of anything (laughter, the President threatens to clear the court).

President: You attached a red flag to the street lamp post?

Dohany: Yes, Your Lordship.

Emil Brecska

describes the Hungarian robber-system.

The President calls him to order.

Brecska: Your Lordship, if you knew anything of the prisons and the detention houses in Hungary you would not call me to order so often. I was sent back to my place of domicile, to Salgótarján, and was beaten at almost every station. I got absolutely nothing to eat on the journey. And when I arrived in Salgótarján, the magistrate said that such dangerous, communist vagabonds are only at home in Budapest. He finally sent me back the same way to Budapest.

Johann Krieszl and Ladislaus Schömann declare that in the first place they were engaged in organising the young workers of Hungary. Hungary is the country in which the young workers are exploited in the most fearful manner.

When Schömann stated that the Levente institution only serves the purpose, under the cloak of patriotism, of stupefying the young workers so that they become unresisting objects of capitalist exploitation, the President energetically called him to order and forbade him to speak further on this theme.

Josef Beres

had been for three years a member of the social democracy when he came over to the Socialist Labour Party. He left the social democratic Party, in the first place because this Party calmly looked on even when the very modest land reform law was not carried out by the counter-revolution. When he protested against this in the Party, the Central Committee of his trade union intervened, so that he was discharged from the factory in which he worked.

Alexander Steinlein

was charged by the President with having delivered a speech likely to cause disorder at the June demonstration in 1925, and in which he attacked the government, the Habsburgs, the existing social order and the Hungarian social democracy.

Steinlein: The rule of the Habsburg, the Bethlen government, the Hungarian social democracy have stirred up the working people so often and to such an extent, that I could contribute nothing more to its stirring up.

The President calls him to order.

Josef Papai

declares that in the Police Prison for ten consecutive days he was beaten two hours every day. He was beaten on the stomach, the breast and the head with whips made of ox-hide until he became unconscious. Then the warders threw water over him and when he again recovered consciousness, they jumped upon his stomach until he again lost consciousness.

Seventh Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, July 21, 1926.

Today there began the hearing of witnesses. Already on this first day of the hearing of witnesses a more severe course is to be observed in the proceedings, which only emphasises the weakness of all the evidence for the prosecution.

Georg Nagy

landworker from Tolnátamási, is the first witness. Gögös was with him in Autumn 1924 and tried to induce him to join the Vagi Party. He promised to send good books and pamphlets, which duly arrived. He also spoke of the Congress but nothing of Bela Kun. He (Nagy) however refused to go to Vienna and recommended Pödör for this purpose.

Stefan Pödör

also a landworker from Tolnátamási says the same as Nagy. He withdraws his original statement incriminating Gögös; he made the statement because the gendarmes has boxed his ears and because he was angry with Gögös for involving him in the affair.

Public Prosecutor: When were you telling lies, then or now? Pödör: Today I speak the truth. The gendarmes received us with blows and abused us as being followers of Bela Kun. We then admitted what they demanded.

Defender Dr. Lengyel: Who first spoke of Kun, you or the gendarmes?

Pödör: The gendarmes, it was their first word.

President: It is not permitted to put the answer in the mouth of the witness in this manner.

The head of the political police

Police Officer Dr. Schweinitzer

is now heard. He states: From confidential reports of our detectives we learned of the organising of the Vagi Party and their connection with the Communists. The news of the founding of the Vagi Party aroused great enthusiasm in emigrant circles in Vienna. This Party is held in high esteem also in Moscow. An important member of the Central Committee of the Party went to Paris and there got into connection with the Communist Confédération du Travail. We observed the doings of the Vagi people since September 1924 and noticed that the movement developed towards the Left. Vagi wished to destroy the social democracy, to gather around him the extreme radical working class, and thus to bring the labour movement on to communist lines. Parallel with the Vagi Party the Communist Party began to be organised. At first the Communists were brought together in the Vagi Party and then a separate C.P. and a Communist Youth League was founded, and this after the Russian methods of organisation.

The witness then refers to the police protocols and declares them to be correct and in order. He then reports on the connections of the Vagi Party with Vienna and Paris; the connection with the latter town being the task of Tibor Vadnay. In Vienna the Vagi Party had been in connection in the first place with Böhm. With regard to the person who furnished the police with information from Vienna, the witness refuses to give fuller details, as otherwise future observation would be rendered impossible. In answer to a question of the President, he admits that he is only repeating the communications of detectives and the results of "observations". 37 detectives have altogether spent 235 days in order to discover the connections of the Socialist Labour Party with the illegal Communist Party. As regards the sources of money of the Vagi Party, witness can only say there could have been other sources of money than those stated by the Party itself.

Judge Szabolcska: Is it true that the accused were mishandled by the police?

Schweinitzer: Such rumours were spread abroad right from the beginning, and the Prime Minister received telegrams from a number of countries protesting against these mishandlings. But nobody was mishandled. I had all the accused immediately examined by the Police Doctor and none of them showed a trace of ill-treatment.

Public Prosecutor: Do those involved in the matter belong to the elite of the working class, or were they the scum, and before all the unemployed?

Schweinitzer: Most of the people were without occupation and from the lowest circles of the working class.

Public Prosecutor: Where did the Communist propaganda come from?

Schweinitzer: From Vienna.

Public Prosecutor: The Vagi people say that they did not know (?) that Communist propaganda was being carried on in their Party.

Schweinitzer: That is impossible. They must have known of the holding of the course.

Public Prosecutor: Did the Vienna representation of the Soviets have its hand in the game?

Schweinitzer: No, they were compromised and drew back. Only the Vienna Hungarian emigrants took part in the affair.

Defender, Dr. Lengyel: Was the investigation carried out on the command of higher authorities, or did you act on your own account?

To organise powerful demonstrations against the white terror in Finland!
Long live the revolutionary working youth of Finland!

Moscow, 13th July 1926.
The Executive Committee of the Young Communist International.

Trial of Sacco and Vanzetti Postponed!

Just before going to press we received the following telegram from Comrade Cannon of the Workers' Party of America: "Sacco Vanzetti hearing for New Trial Postponed until September."

It would thus appear that the united protest of the international working class against the intended execution of our two comrades has so far been successful. It is necessary, however, to continue the protest movement in order to ensure the acquittal and speedy release of these two class fighters.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Right Danger in Our Party.

The following has been published in "Pravda", Editor.

The "Pravda" recently published a communication about the activities of the small group of the so-called "opposition of Baku". At the head of this group were the "leaders" of the former "labour opposition", Comrades Medvedev and Shliapnikov, whose names are not unknown. Comrade Medvedev determined the political character of the Baku group, gave it instructions, was the ruling spirit of its whole work which was directed entirely against our whole Party and its Central Committee. The Central Control Commission, after examining into the activities of the Baku group, resolved to mitigate the hard verdicts passed on the simple workers by the local party organisations, hoping that these comrades would be capable of further improvement and would recognise their voluntary or involuntary political mistakes.

An important political document had a great influence on the treatment of this affair by the Central Control Commission. This document is an exhaustive letter of Comrade Medvedev's addressed to the Baku group. This letter dates from 1924. It deals directly with questions and discussions which were brought up in our Party during the discussion in September of that year. This letter is by no means out of date at the present time, it has indeed gained in political actuality. This letter-brochure of Comrade Medvedev's throws a brilliant light on the question of the degeneration of certain opposition groups, on the question of their "growing in" to Menshevism.

In this letter, Comrade Medvedev exercises sharp criticism of the political course adopted by our Party and contrasts this course with the "opposition political Labour platform". Comrade Medvedev does not concern himself with questioning the correctness of some part or other of our policy, this or that individual factor in that policy, he attacks the whole policy of the Party, penetrates to its very foundations and rejects these foundations lock, stock and barrel. Medvedev himself states that he is opposing the foundations of the present policy of the Party, its internal policy (Party, economics), the Comintern etc. We shall soon see what, according to Medvedev, are the "festering sores" and "errors" of our policy. Now, however, we would ask what way of salvation Medvedev himself has to propose, what is the nature of his own counter-platform.

Expressed briefly, Medvedev's "programme" is as follows: liquidation of the independent communist movement in Western Europe, liquidation of the R. I. L. U., liquidation of independent State industry in the Soviet Republic and replacement of the latter by concession capital.

"What?" will the perplexed reader probably ask, "that is absolutely incomprehensible!" These proposals smell miles away of genuine 100% Menshevism. Is not Comrade Medvedev a representative of the "labour opposition?" Comrade Medvedev attacks our C. C. "from the Left", perhaps only too much from

the Left! Medvedev is, a close brother in arms and the right hand of Comrade Shliapnikov. And is not Comrade Shliapnikov surrounded by a halo of "Left", "class-conscious", "super-radicalism"? Medvedev in his own writings insists that he is only developing the principles which he holds "in common" with Shliapnikov. It is the general thing to regard the Shliapnikov-Medvedev group as the extreme Left group in our Party, as a group which has succeeded in being on the "Left" of Bolshevism, whereas any child can see that the platform which is developed in Medvedev's letter to the "Baku workers", does not contain an atom of "Leftness", that on the contrary it contains in a cynically naked form, extreme Right, outspoken Menshevik demands.

How did it happen, how could it happen that the "Left" has become "the Right?" How could it happen that the heroes of Left phraseology suddenly began to repeat the A. B. C. of the Menshevik "Socialist Messenger", to cast sheep's eyes at the social traitors and to thirst for concessions from foreign countries? Through what enigmatic "sequence of thought" did the Left Medvedev arrive at "Right" Menshevism? How is it that the petty bourgeois Right danger developed in the ranks of our Party out of the ideology of the "labour opposition" of Shliapnikov and Medvedev?

In order to explain this phenomenon, in order to understand that it is by no means a coincidence but has a historical basis, we must first of all give extensive quotations from Medvedev's letter.

1. Comrade Medvedev's "Economic Course"

Why does not Comrade Medvedev accept the economic course which our Party is following? He does not accept it because, according to his opinion

"all kinds of State large industry are at bottom regarded merely as an appendage, a supplement to the small, even the smallest peasant holdings." (Here and from now onwards underlined by us, Editor of the "Pravda".)

"If... the C. C. maintains that this peasant market forms the limit for State industry beyond which it cannot go and that it will solve all questions of industry from this point of view, we naturally see in this policy a threat to State large industry and to the existence of the working class itself."

"This is the fundamental character of the economic policy of the Party during the next period of our rule. In our opinion, this involves a tremendous danger to the interests of the working class and to the further fate of State large industry."

He thus maintains that the economic policy of our Party involves a "tremendous danger to the interests of the working class." Worse still, it threatens the "existence of the working class itself." Its mistake is, in his opinion, that it endeavours to bring the interests of State large industry into harmony with the interests of small peasant production or, as Medvedev chooses to express himself with great effect, it is turning industry into an appendage and a supplement to the small peasant holdings. Why however are Lenin's commands as to the economic collaboration between town and country relegated from the statutes of the Medvedev-Shliapnikov platform? How is it that the "adaption" of State large industry to the requirements of agriculture is "strictly forbidden" by Medvedev?

Comrade Medvedev's answer is simple and clear. According to Medvedev's views it is nonsense to bring the development of large industry into harmony with the development of peasant farming, because small peasant farming has absolutely no prospects of any kind of development. Small peasant production must inevitably come to grief.

"We are of the opinion", thus the opposition platform, "that the small and smallest factories are doomed to perish in the conditions of the Nep, in their dependence on world markets."

"All attempts to save them, to help them to maintain themselves or to develop further, are reactionary and Utopian."

The only issue from this situation for these ruined peasant masses is the development and growth of State industry, in which domain these masses might find employment for their labour powers."

"That part of the peasant population (!?), which is outside the said masses, is the peasant Kulaki bourgeoisie,

which shows to us the same hostility as did the bourgeoisie of the old system."

This is Comrade Medvedev's hopelessly hard verdict with regard to the rural population. The whole rural population, with the exception of the leading group of the bourgeois Kulaki, must perish, must be turned out of their occupation and transformed into an innumerable industrial "reserve army", which might find employment for their labour powers only "in the domain of large State industry". If this is the case, there is of course no object in "troubling" about collaboration with any of the middle peasantry who are "condemned to perish", there is no object in maintaining economic contact with it, no object in "developing" peasant farming and leading it towards socialism with the aid of the co-operatives, just as there is no object in carrying on policies of economics, prices, credits etc. which would be in keeping with State industry. Everything of this kind is, in Comrade Medvedev's opinion, nothing but reactionary "Utopian nonsense" which threatens the very existence of the working class.

In Comrade Medvedev's opinion there is only one "alternative" to the inevitable ruin towards which millions of peasant farms are fast drifting, i. e. as rapid a development as possible of State large industry. The development of State industry must advance at such a rate, that it can absorb the whole mass of the rural population which is becoming pauperized. Where, however, are the gigantic means to be found which would be necessary to ensure this fabulously rapid rate of the development of industry?

This brings us to the actual kernel of Medvedev's platform. We will let Comrade Medvedev speak for himself. Comrade Medvedev chiefly explains where, in his opinion, the gigantic means necessary for the development of industry are not to be found.

"To conclude that we should be able to extract enough capital for the development of our extinct industry from taxation, would be to console ourselves with hollow illusions."

"To flatter ourselves that we could raise this capital 'out of pennies' would be to add to the old illusion another, worthy of the offspring of the petty bourgeoisie."

The necessary "amount of capital" cannot be got out of taxation, we cannot raise it from "pennies". What can and should we do? We must knuckle under to international capital, answers the Medvedev-Shliapnikov group.

"We demand", runs the document, "that the Government should take energetic steps to raise the necessary means by foreign and internal State loans and by granting concessions with greater loans and greater sacrifice than the State was prepared to take on itself for granting credits. We are of the opinion that in view of the present economic position of our country... great material sacrifices to international capital, which is prepared to build up our industry, would be a lesser evil than the condition into which we might drift in the next few years with regard to industry and agriculture, a condition which would be ruinous for us."

Either "ruin" or a policy of boundless concession! — these are the horns of the dreary dilemma on which the Shliapnikov-Medvedev group places the working class of the Soviet Union. The working class of the Soviet Union is of course to choose the "lesser evil", i. e. at the command of Shliapnikov and Medvedev to kneel before Mr. Urquhart and to accept the yoke of international capital.

2. The International Political Course Followed by Comrade Medvedev.

"The international policy of our Party", declares Comrade Medvedev, "is the continuation of our internal policy in the international arena."

As we have seen that the policy of the Party within our country is "ruinous", that it threatens the very existence of the working class and that it therefore requires radical revision, it is natural that Comrade Medvedev expects an equally radical revision of the policy of our Party within the Comintern, nay even a revision of the tactics of the Comintern itself.

The document does not admit of the slightest doubt in this respect. Comrade Medvedev proclaims in black and white that he is on principle "an enemy of the policy of the Comintern."

"The soil from which the Comintern draws its nourishment, — the masses of European workers, — is obviously hopeless. It does not bring us nearer to the masses of the international proletariat, but separates us from them."

"In all... countries of Central Europe, which are of decisive importance for the world revolution, the tactics of the Comintern have led to the Communist section being torn from the whole mass of the organised forces of the proletariat... with the result that both the whole movement of the working class and its Communist section became disorganised because it was isolated from the whole mass of the organised proletariat, thus losing the possibility of acting on that mass from within. We are bitterly opposed to this policy."

Medvedev, the "bitterest opponent" of the whole policy and tactics of the Comintern, appears also as the "bitterest opponent" of the individual Communist Parties. Medvedev, however, explains the existence of these latter as the consequence of "our attempts to transplant our methods of work mechanically to all the countries of Western Europe". But

"... these attempts lead literally to the disorganisation of the labour movement of this country; to the formation of communist sections, which are materially unable to maintain themselves and must be kept at the cost of the property of the masses of Russian workers who, in the present circumstances, can therefore not use it for their own purposes."

"In reality, a rabble of petty bourgeois lackeys are nurtured who, for the sake of Russian gold, profess to be the proletariat and represent the most revolutionary workers in the Comintern."

Medvedev's insane attack on the Comintern is completed by his defence of the 2nd and the Amsterdam Internationals. If, according to Medvedev's views, the Comintern has turned into an organisation of a "rabble of petty bourgeois lackeys", international social democracy and the Reformist trade unions assume in Medvedev's eyes the proportions of an organisation of the real "masses of workers".

"Our judgment of the social democratic parties of Western Europe is sharply distinguished from the judgment of our leaders."

Medvedev's group protests against the systematic agitation against and discrediting of the proletarian class organisations of the proletariat of Western Europe (the social democratic organisations! Editor of the "Pravda"). In the same way, Medvedev's group protests against "this discrediting of every social democratic government as such", for instance Macdonald's "Labour Government" in England.

"This Government is represented as a government of the bourgeoisie. We cannot in any way agree with such politics and tactics."

It is disastrous for the cause of the true socialist revolution."

In order to avert this "disastrous" issue for the cause of the true socialist revolution, the Medvedev-Shliapnikov group recommends liquidating the independent Communist Parties and dissolving the R. I. L. U. The chief slogan of Medvedev's "international policy" is: Back into the ranks of social democracy!

"We believe that the actual situation is that organisations such as the R. I. L. U. actually form intentionally or unintentionally, an instrument for separating the masses of Russian workers and the Communist masses in Western Europe from the masses which really count in the whole proletariat."

"We consider that the Communist masses of workers should remain an integral part of the masses of workers who are organised in trade unions, co-operatives, the socialist parties etc.; that all attempts to create an organisation which holds aloof from these masses, should be rejected with determination as adventures which disorganise the labour movement."

This then is the magnificent "platform" of the decadent representatives of the former "Labour Opposition". Thus, the Labour Opposition demands:

1. The liquidation of the Communist Parties as "a rabble of petty bourgeois lackeys; 2. the return to the Social Demo-

cratic parties; 3. the liquidation of the R. I. L. U.; 4. affiliation to the Amsterdam International.

This is the "creed" of the Medvediev-Shliapnikov group.

3. The Evolution of the "Labour Opposition". Growing into Menshevism.

The above quotations give fairly exhaustively the contents of Medvediev's letter to the members of the "Baku Opposition". It must now be clear to our readers why our Party could not pass over this document in silence. The Medvediev document has deep political significance, not so much because it has disclosed in an extremely concise form the peculiar paths followed by the "Labour Opposition" group in its political errors. The whole Shliapnikov-Medvediev group is of negligible importance, and the fight waged by Comrade Lenin against this group must still be fresh in the memory of our Party. The significance of the Medvediev letter is extraordinarily instructive in that it reveals with unprecedented force and impressiveness the regularity which anti-Bolshevist deviations observe in their development.

Medvediev's letter is the most perfect example of a deviation from the Bolshevik line. In it, the "fermentation of the minds" of the Labour Opposition reaches the point where these "ideas" deposit an almost chemically pure Menshevism. Medvediev's letter reveals which slogans may and must inevitably develop into Menshevism, and in what way. Thus, the letter is a warning to the Party of the danger that some zigzag path or other "towards the Left", with a tendency to form a bloc with the Medvediev-Shliapnikov group may develop into a fatal zigzag towards the Right, into Menshevism. Medvediev's letter is therefore an impressive warning against the Right danger in the ranks of our Party.

The programme of Shliapnikov-Medvediev is a programme of complete liquidation of Bolshevism with the help of Menshevism. The Medvediev letter is steering towards the general substitution of Menshevism for Bolshevism. In order to be convinced, we need only attentively analyse the contents of this document.

The realisation of the Shliapnikov-Medvediev platform, demands as a basis:

I. The liquidation of socialist construction in our country.

Our Party holds the view that it is possible for it to build up Socialism in our country with the active participation of the working class. Our Party believes that Socialism will triumph in our country. The most decisive lever for socialist construction for our Party is the development of large industry in the country with highly developed techniques.

Not every development of large industry however can, in our country, be estimated as a triumph for socialist construction. The development of industry in our country will only signify a victorious advance of Socialism, when this development becomes the development of the industry of a quite special social type, that is to say when just socialist industry grows, when the "factories of a consistently socialist type" grow and flourish, when the increasing predominance of the socialist elements in our national economy is ensured. If however we do not achieve this growing predominance of the socialist factories, the cause of Socialism in our country is hopelessly lost.

Comrade Medvediev however bases his arguments, not on the development of socialist large industry but on the development of large industrial concessions, on the building up of economics on the basis of State capitalism. In Medvediev's "large industry", the preponderance is ensured not to the socialist concerns but to concerns working under concessions. Medvediev would extract the most important capital, that which is needed for reviving our "extinct industry", for restoring the "devastated industrial districts", from the pockets of the international bourgeoisie. But Mr. Urquhart will not, for pure love of us, come riding on a white horse to save our "extinct industry". For the enormous sums invested in our industry, the Urquharts would demand an enormous lion's share of the surplus value produced by our workers. This would inevitably result in the concessionaries and the foreign bankers gaining more and more economic influence in our country; it would mean that the command over our industry would be transferred to world capital. "Our" industry would become a fief, a branch

of international financial capital, and our proletariat, numbering many millions, would become an object of exploitation for the foreign capitalists. We must of course approve of concession contracts. The mistake of Comrades Shliapnikov and Medvediev (which borders on a crime against the Party and the working class) is not that they approve of concessions. Their mistake is that they are in favour of unlimited concessions, of completely handing over our industry to world capital. The "economic course" which Shliapnikov and Medvediev would take aims at a real Dawesation of our country, a Dawesation which would be the prelude to a return to capitalism and the collapse of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Medvediev and Shliapnikov would sell the birthright of socialist construction which was bestowed on the proletariat of the Soviet Union, for a mess of pottage of concessions. Their attitude to the problems of socialist construction is the Menshevist one of "letting it go hang". For them, the chief thing is the development of productive forces. Proletarian leadership in the development of productive forces is a matter of indifference to them. Let the workers kowtow to the foreign plutocracy, if only the large industry, established by Urquhart, develop, if only the workers find a "use for their labour power", if only they muddle through. The Menshevism of Shliapnikov and Medvediev finds a supplement in the psychology of guild, "economism", the prejudices of which it hopes to arouse in our workers, who are actively building up Socialism.

The period which has elapsed since the Medvediev document was written, has been a period during which the political "ideas" of Shliapnikov and Medvediev were put to the test, and they proved a complete failure. Our "extinct industry" has made enormous progress. The equilibrium of the "devastated industrial districts" has been restored. The proletariat has by no means capitulated as it was recommended to do by the latest type of liquidators. The policy of the Party has not only not led the working class of the Soviet Union to the Medvediev "ruin", on the contrary, it has considerably consolidated its power and its weight in the country. By tremendous efforts, step by step, by making mistakes and correcting them, scraping together "penny by penny", the working class has raised the industry of the Soviet Union to its pre-war level. Now the working class is leading the country forwards along the path of industrialisation, and just those will prove bankrupt who doubt the possibility of socialist construction, who would attempt to lead the party in Medvediev's footsteps and once more begin to croak about the "ruin" of our country. The "disbelief in the possibility of socialist construction", which was referred to in the resolutions of the 14th Party Congress, found its most pregnant expression in Medvediev's document. This is why this "ideology", like others, has experienced so pitiable and disgraceful a fiasco.

II. The Liquidation of the Alliance between Workers and Peasants.

This forms one of the chief points of the political platform of Shliapnikov and Medvediev. With Shliapnikov and Medvediev, the failure to understand or, to be more exact, the open rejection of the foundations of the Leninist doctrine of a bloc between the proletariat and the peasantry, is directly linked with their liquidatory attitude to the construction of socialism and their hopes for the salvation of the country with the help of concession capital. It is worth while to reflect once more on this circumstance, especially for those who take too great liberties with Leninism in the peasant question, who are inclined to introduce improvements into Lenin's fundamental doctrines, who consider the speeches on the firmness of the Smyschka "tedious" and "antiquated", who believe that differentiation has thrust the question of the middle peasants into the background etc.

As a matter of fact, there is only one step between rejecting the Leninist conception of the peasantry and an exaggerated idolizing of the Urquharts. The rejection of the prospects of a firm alliance with the middle peasants must lead to the exclusion of the prospects of socialist construction in a country of peasants.

The platform of Shliapnikov and Medvediev proves this with mathematical simplicity. In Medvediev's letter, the whole peasantry is treated patronizingly as "rustics". All these "rustics" are regarded as a petty bourgeois element, hostile to

the proletariat and as nothing more. In such circumstances it is of course impossible that there should be a "bloc", an economic and political alliance with the peasant stock.

If it be true that the proletariat, which forms the minority of our population, is surrounded by a hostile cordon of "rustics", if furthermore it be true that peasant farming is doomed to decay and "ruin", if it be true that any attempt to save peasant farming from ruin, is, according to Shliapnikov and Medvediev, a "reactionary Utopia", if the word "middle peasant" is unknown in Medvediev's vocabulary, if Medvediev's conception that the development of urban industry is only possible at the price of the ruin of peasant farming, be true, how is it possible, we must ask ourselves, that the proletariat, surrounded by 20 million hostile peasant holdings, can control the national economy of the country, can construct socialism? It is impossible to construct socialism in a "besieged fortress". The "idea" of constructing socialism in a peasant country, while continuously carrying on war with the peasantry, would be the most idiotic absurdity. If that be the case, were it not better to bury all "socialist" prospects, were it not better to return to the family coach of Struve, to "sit at the feet of capitalism?"

Medvediev did do this, for he had no other alternative. He was compelled to do it, otherwise he would have come to grief. His platform "condemns" the peasantry to degeneration. According to Medvediev all the "rustics", with the exception of the Kulaks, must "perish" and form an ocean of unemployed. To these millions and millions of unemployed, Medvediev promises a "quick employment of their labour power." But for this purpose he demands that the "forces" of international capital should be employed to an unlimited extent in our country. This accounts for his slogan: Clear the way for concession capital!

The rejection of Lenin's doctrine of an alliance between workers and peasants has bitterly avenged itself. In the platform of Shliapnikov and Medvediev this rejection shows up as a Menshevist capitulation to the bourgeoisie.

We should be very naive politicians were we to believe that Medvediev's coquetting with international capital is merely a coincidence, that we are dealing with an "incidental" and unpremeditated "subsidiary clause" concerning concession in a platform which is otherwise "Left". If we remove this central point, the point regarding concession capital, from the economic programme of Shliapnikov and Medvediev, we should place both the proletariat and the peasantry of the Union in a still more distressing position; for the peasants there would be a prospect of absolute, hopeless ruin, for the proletariat the disastrous prospect of a peasant Vendée.

III. The Liquidation of Proletarian Internationalism.

This is the battle cry of the liquidators of our day. Medvediev's "criticism" of the Comintern and the Communist Parties is particularly acrimonious. Medvediev's programme of "international politics" is a "bel, unique" in its way, on the Communist International, and an equally revolting apology for international social treachery. The programme of the "international policy" of Medvediev serves in reality as a supplement to his "economic" programme. Medvediev is prepared to pay a heavy price, if world capital will only be "willing" to come to the Soviet Union and to restore the "disturbed" order; he is prepared to offer it at the head of the Comintern! The liquidation of proletarian internationalism, the dissolution of international revolutionary labour organisations is, in the eyes of the world bourgeoisie, a valuable guarantee for "peaceful" and unlimited concession work. Lenin and our whole Party well knew that for the "science" of concessions, a premium of apprenticeship can and must be paid. Shliapnikov and Medvediev however, who have sunk into Menshevism, have got so far, that they are prepared to pay for the concessions with the surrender of the world revolution and the revolutionary International.

What is most revolting and monstrous in Medvediev's letter is, that he tries to justify his betrayal of international Communism by claiming that it is in the "interests of the world proletariat"! What a pitiable "justification"!

The revolutionary communist Parties are described as a "rabble of petty bourgeois lackeys". The parties of Barman and Noske, of Renaudel and Macdonald on the other hand are

glorified as true "proletarian class organisations". Is it perhaps because the Renaudels and the Scheidemanns led the proletariat to the slaughter in the great war? Is it perhaps because these gentlemen have helped and are helping in the imperialist enslavement of the colonial and backward countries? Is it perhaps because Noske and his consorts massacred thousands of German workers in 1919? Or is it because the "class proletarian" gentlemen stirred up Kautsky against the Soviet regime just as the Russian White Guardists stirred up Souvarin and Milyukov?

The Communist sections of the Comintern are said to be a "rabble of bourgeois lackeys", it is said that they merely disorganise the "international labour movement". The international labour movement is on the other hand "organised" by the Privy Councillors of His Majesty, by the Thomas's and Boncours, organised in the antichambers of Ministerial Cabinets, at the green table of the League of Nations, in the General Staffs of the capitalist States...

The capitalist prisons are overcrowded with the "rabble of petty bourgeois lackeys". The rabble of the "class proletarian" social democratic leaders receive on the other hand every honour and favour from the capitalist bourgeoisie. (Is it because of the victory of the "true socialist revolution", for which the tactics and politics of the Comintern are "ruinous"?). The Government of the Soviet Union is said to be of a petty bourgeois character. The MacDonald Government on the contrary is said to be a real "labour government" (no doubt because it continued to throttle and plunder India just as Gladstone and Chamberlain have done, because it managed the Indian "rebels" as well as they have done!)

And Medvediev's poisonous hissing about the "Russian gold"? All Bolsheviks, all revolutionary workers know this only too well!

Every class conscious worker understands that the Soviet Union is the first point of support of international socialism. Every class-conscious worker also realises that the success of socialist construction in our country depends on the successful development of the revolutionary movement on an international scale. The proletarian power of the Soviet Union has not gained its strength only through the power of our proletariat and the firmness of the alliance between workers and peasants; the proletarian power in the Soviet Union is strong also as a result of the support and the sympathy extended to it by the broadest strata of the international labour movement. The revolutionary proletariat of the Soviet Union has helped its brothers in other countries and will continue to help them. No attacks of rage on the part of our enemies will prevent the victorious proletariat of the Soviet Union always making its own cause of the international proletariat.

Medvediev dances round the "Russian gold" and collects the filthiest weapons of the social revolutionary "Dni" (the organ of the Russian White Guardists) and of the reactionary bandits after the manner of Churchill. In doing this, Medvediev is rendering truly Menshevist service to international reaction. His "regret" about "Russian gold" is pure hypocrisy. He protests against the proletarian help which the Soviet proletariat gives to the international revolutionary workers. In return, he is prepared to sell "Russian gold" to the concession capitalists in the bulk. The Russian workers are not to be allowed to help their class brothers. Instead of this, Medvediev would, out of the sweat and blood of the working class of the Soviet Union, build a magnificent temple of concession for the imperialist bourgeoisie and press all the keys into its hands. Medvediev believes that he can convince people that this would be for the true weal of the "true socialist revolution". Yes indeed, this "true socialist revolution" of Medvediev's has a pleasing appearance!

Medvediev who "dethrones" the Comintern, is full of enthusiasm for the angelic goodness of international social democracy. He absolutely "disapproves" of the "agitation against and discrediting of the "class proletarian" social democratic leaders, which is going on.

...there is nothing contrary to nature", says Medvediev, "in the world proletariat entrusting the conduct of its fight just to those who do not offer it red inventions (!) but are clever enough to know how to protect it from the evil of the day."

For Medvediev, who is so thoroughly Menshevised, the word "red" has in itself become an invective. Medvediev disapproves of "red inventions" he thirsts for "concession realities" and would have the Soviet proletariat do the same. He is acting quite consistently when he flees from "red inventions" and seeks shelter under the yellow banner of the Amsterdam International.

IV. The Liquidation of the Bolshevik Party and Orientation towards Political Democracy in the Country: this is the logical conclusion of the Medvediev-Shliapnikov platform. Menshevism in economics and Menshevism in international politics must inevitably lead to Menshevism in internal politics and in the politics of the Party.

What indeed should, according to Shliapnikov-Medvediev, the Party be? It should represent a certain sum of "tendencies", "shades of opinion", of fractions and groups which contradict one another. Shliapnikov and Medvediev would like to give complete freedom within the Party to all these fractions, groups and grouplets. As further, according to Medvediev, "six sevenths of our Party" have become petty bourgeois, it would be a case of chosing the "proletarian class groups" out of all the fractions and groups and taking our political orientation from them. "The only fraction", writes Medvediev to the members of the "Baku Opposition", "which has a future in the working class", is the fraction of the "Labour Opposition". As Medvediev has shown by his own example, the "future" of the Labour Opposition has proved to be quite ordinary, common Menshevism.

From these facts, Shliapnikov and Medvediev draw the following important conclusions:

With regard to organisation, our Party ought to be transferred on to Menshevist lines (a number of groups and fractions).

Among all the fractions, the "fraction of the Labour Opposition" should have decisive influence, i. e. the fraction which stands on Medvediev's Menshevist ideological platform.

If however we admit of Menshevism within our Party and even ensure predominance to Menshevism, we must also admit of Menshevism outside the Party. The legalisation of the new Menshevism of Medvediev and Shliapnikov would logically lead to a legalisation of the old Menshevist Party. From the point of view of the "Baku" platform, the fight against Menshevism, i. e. against Medvediev's platform itself, would be inconsistent beyond words. Medvediev is prepared to go over to the camp of the 2nd International, to the camp of international Menshevism, to the camp where the Russian Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries are actively working. It is impossible to fraternize with the Amsterdam renegades, with MacDonald and Kautsky without at the same time holding out a hand of friendship to Schwarz, Dalin and Abramovitch. If it comes to that, in what respect are the Russian Mensheviks worse than their "class proletarian" petty bourgeois boon companions?

In this way the Medvediev platform would become an instrument for propaganda for political freedom for the Mensheviks and thus also for political democracy in our country.

In the Medvediev platform, bourgeois political democracy comes into line from the other end also. Bourgeois political democracy is an inevitable result of the economic course taken by Shliapnikov and Medvediev. The economic course of their platform is, to the exclusion of everything else, a hope for concession capital, the desire to give it a leading part in our national economy, whilst sacrificing the leading part played by the proletariat in economics. The economic lead of concession capital must ultimately become a political lead. Concession capital needs political "guarantees" for its predominant position in economics. It has no use for the political trappings of the proletarian State, it needs a settled bourgeois democracy.

The significance of the Medvediev-Shliapnikov platform consists in the fact that it has revealed to us with astonishing clearness the mechanism of the origin of the Right danger.

Our Party is the only political party in the country. The petty bourgeois Right elements have therefore a natural tendency to trickle through the channels of our Party. They can worm their way into "fractions" and "groups" within our Party. But in what way? The Right danger can of course enter the arena with its visor raised. Some petty bourgeois group or other can

issue direct Right slogans, slogans of petty bourgeois democracy, of a return to capitalism etc. In this case however would be recognised at once as a Right danger, it would reveal itself with one blow to the masses of our Party members, would become visible to all. In the Party under Leninist leadership it would then be easy to nip the Right danger in the bud.

This is the reason why the Right tendency must at first appear on the scenes in a masked form, under a Left banner. If it is impossible to defeat our Party by an open front-attack they must attempt to fall upon it from the rear. In order to bring the Leninist Party lead, the largest mass Party in the world to its knees, the Right elements must "try their luck" becoming a "mass force" themselves. The mass force is a financial-material force. In order to wrench the Party from Menshevism towards the Right, they must previously convince the masses "from the Left", must offer them Right matters under a Left banner.

For this purpose, they work at first with the weapons of social democracy. They adorn themselves at first with "love of the workers. They try to play with skill" on the strings of the guild interests of the working class. They address the backward strata: "What would please you?" and they promise them everything. It is quite possible to promise the masses of unemployed that their "labour powers shall immediately be put to use", and to fail later on to keep the promise. It is possible to promise immediate super-industrialisation and then to materialise this industrialisation according to Medvediev's prescription with the help of Urquhart and General Dawes. It is possible to promise the poor mountains of gold and then to give them nothing. It is possible to promise wages without saying out of whose pocket they will come. And for this purpose the unity of our Party must be thoroughly shaken up (Shliapnikov's "Labour Democracy", groups and fractions, the slogan of the "Freedom of all former groups" and so on). For the time being, the true objects of the fight must remain concealed.

These are "the rules of the masquerade" of the Right, which wraps itself in a Left mantle in vain.

The "mistake" of Shliapnikov and Medvediev is that they have burnt their boats. In their case, "secret things have become made clear." In their case, Bolshevism has become Menshevism, the Left has become Right. Their "true socialist revolution" to be materialised through the "knights without fear or reproach of concession. In the place of "red inventions" they have bourgeois democracy, Lenin's place is taken by MacDonald and Noske.

The Shliapnikov-Medvediev platform signals the danger in our Party. The Party realises this danger. It realises whether the "Labour Opposition" is steering. It realises what is in progress, what slogans, what promises lead to Shliapnikovism and to Medvedievism, how the Right danger is growing and how it may grow!

We are well aware that there are those who love freedom to form fractions and groups, who are at present coquetting with the Shliapnikov-Medvediev "group". The whole Party can therefore ask every one of its members which side he is on in the following questions:

For the consolidation or for the liquidation of the Communist Intern?

Should the Communist Parties be regarded as "a rabble of petty bourgeois lackeys" or as the main revolutionary force of the movement?

Should the R. F. E. U. be consolidated or should we liquidate the Amsterdam International?

Should we form a bloc with "bloodhounds" like Noske or should we fight against them?

Are you in favour of socialist construction or of enslavement to Urquhart?

Do you wish for an alliance between workers and peasants or for subjugation to world capital?

Are you for Lenin or for MacDonald?

The whole Party will reject, with all determination, attempts of the Mensheviks to betray the Communist revolution. The whole Party will of course repulse the accusations, allies and protectors of Menshevist tendencies within the Leninist Party!