

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 55

5th August 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, Schlieffach 213, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

N. Lenin: Theses on the World War.

For the Unity of the C. P. S. U.

For Leninist Unity! For Proletarian Discipline!

Resolution of the Leningrad Party Functionaries on the Decisions of the Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C.

Unanimous Approval by the Organisations of the C. P. S. U. of the Decisions of the C. C. and C. C. C.

Resolution of the C. C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the Matter of Byelenky, Czernyshev and other Comrades.

The Results of the Soviet Elections.

The Trial of Rákosi and his Comrades.

Karl Kreibich: The Fight and the Victory of the Communist Party of Hungary.

Karl Kreibich: Letters from Budapest to the "Inprecorr". VIII, IX, X.

Telegraphic Reports to the "Inprecorr". Eleventh and Twelfth Day. Politics.

R. Palme Dutt: Current Political Forces in England.

P. B.: The Situation in Belgium.

F. Raskólnikov: The Imperialists in the Orient.

The White Terror.

K. L.: Pilsudski's Murderous Government Refuses to Grant an Amnesty.

Theses on the World War.

Drawn up in August 1914.

By N. Lenin.

The following draft theses represent the original draft, hitherto unpublished in English, of the historical theses of the Russian Bolsheviks on the world war, the so-called "October Theses" of 1914. The draft was drawn up by Comrade Lenin in August 1914 under the title, "Theses on the Present War".

Ed.

1. The European and world war bears the clearly defined character of a bourgeois-imperialist-dynastic war. The struggle for markets and for the plundering of countries, the endeavour to stupefy the proletariat of all countries, to dismember and to shatter the proletariat, to incite the wage slaves of the one nation for the advantage of the bourgeoisie against the wage slaves of the other nation — that is the only real content and the only real meaning of the war.

2. The attitude of the leaders of the German Social Democratic Party of the II. International (1889—1914), who have voted for the war credits and who are repeating the bourgeois-chauvinist phrases of the Prussian junkers and of the bourgeoisie, constitutes a direct betrayal of Socialism. Under no circumstances, even if one admits the absolute weakness of this party and the necessity of submitting to the will of the bourgeoisie majority of the nation, can the behaviour of the leaders of the German Social Democratic Party be excused. As a matter of fact this party is at present conducting a national-liberal policy.

3. The behaviour of the leaders of the Belgian and French Social Democratic Parties who have betrayed Socialism by entering the bourgeois governments, deserve the same condemnation.

4. The betrayal of Socialism by the majority of the leaders of the II. International means a partial ideological collapse of this International. The chief reason for this collapse lies in the fact that in this International petty-bourgeois opportunism predominates, the bourgeois character and dangerousness of which has been pointed out by the best representatives of all coun-

tries. The opportunists long ago prepared the collapse of the II. International: they repudiated the socialist revolution and replaced it by bourgeois reformism; they denied the class struggle and its necessary transformation at certain times into civil war, and preached collaboration of the classes; they preached bourgeois chauvinism in the form of patriotism and defence of the native country, and ignored or denied the A. B. C. truth of Socialism already laid down in the Communist Manifesto, that the workers have no country. In the fight against militarism they confined themselves to a sentimental petty bourgeois standpoint, instead of recognising the necessity of the revolutionary light of the proletarians of all countries. They converted the necessary taking advantage of bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois legality into making a fetish of legality, and forgot the obligation, in times of crises to employ the illegal forms of organisation and agitation. An organ of international opportunism, the "Socialistische Monatshefte" (The Socialist Monthly Review), which has long since adopted a national-liberal standpoint, rightly celebrates the victory of opportunism over European Socialism. The so-called Centre of the German Social Democracy, and other social democratic parties cowardly capitulate in practice to the opportunists. The future International will have the task of energetically freeing itself, once and for all, from this bourgeois tendency of Socialism.

5. Among those bourgeois and chauvinist sophisms with which the bourgeois parties and governments of the two competing chief nations of the Continent — Germany and France — specially dope the masses, and which are slavishly repeated by the socialist opportunists — the open as well as the concealed — who cling to the bourgeoisie, the following sophism must specially be mentioned and condemned: When the German bourgeoisie call for the defence of the fatherland, for the defence against Tsarism, for the defence of liberty, of cultural and national development — they lie, as Prussian junkerism, with Wilhelm II. at the head, and the big bourgeoisie always have and always will — no matter what may be the result of the

war — conduct a policy of defending Tsarist Monarchy and never hesitate to hasten to its aid; they lie because, as a matter of fact, the Austrian bourgeoisie are embarking on a robber campaign against Serbia, the German bourgeoisie are suppressing Danes, Poles and French (in Alsace-Lorraine), and are conducting a war of aggression against Belgium and France in order to plunder richer and freer countries. They organised the attack at the moment which seemed to them most suitable for using their latest perfections in war technique, and on the eve of the carrying out of the so-called great military programme by Russia. When the French bourgeoisie likewise call for the defence of native country etc. they also lie, as in reality they are defending countries more backward as regards capitalist technique and developing more slowly, in that they, with their milliards, bought the reactionary bands of Russian Tsarism for the purpose of conducting an aggressive war in order to plunder Austrian and German provinces. There is nothing to choose between the two fighting groups of peoples in regard to the cruelty and barbarity with which they are conducting the war.

6. The task of the Social Democracy of Russia is especially and in the first place the ruthless and unconditional fight against the Pan-Russian and Tsarist-monarchist chauvinism, and against its sophistic defence by the Russian Liberals, Cadets etc. and by a portion of the Narodniki.

From the point of view of the working class and of the masses of all peoples of Russia, the defeat of the Tsarist monarchy, which suppresses Poles, Ukrainians and a whole number of peoples of Russia and promotes the increase of the suppression of the other nationalities by the Great Russians as well as the consolidation of the reaction, which arouses national hatred amongst the peoples of Russia — the defeat of this Tsarist monarchy and of its troops would be the lesser evil.

7. The slogans of the Social Democracy must at present be the following; first an all-round propaganda, extending to the troops and the scenes of war, of the socialist revolution and of the necessity of directing the weapons not against their own brothers, the wage-slaves of other countries, but against the reaction of the bourgeois governments and parties of all countries. Absolute necessity of organising illegal nuclei and groups among the troops of all nations for the purpose of carrying on such propaganda in all languages. Ruthless fight against the chauvinism and patriotism of the petty bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie of all countries without exception. Against those leaders of the present International who have betrayed Socialism, appeal must be made to the revolutionary consciousness of the working masses who bear the entire burden of war and who are hostile to chauvinism.

Secondly, the propagation of the slogan of the German, Polish, Russian and other Republics as one of the next slogans, along with conversion of all the various States of Europe into United Republican States.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE C. P. S. U.

For Leninist Unity! For Proletarian Discipline!

Leading Article of the "Pravda" of July 30, 1926.

The decisions of the Joint Plenary Session of the C. C. and the C. C. C. have called forth a mighty echo of solidarity and support in our Party. From all parts of the Soviet Union resolutions are pouring in, welcoming the decisions of the Plenum, fully and entirely approving the policy of our Leninist C. C. and condemning in the sharpest manner the fractional behaviour of the Opposition. Our celebrated Bolshevik Party, this powerful army of fighters numbering over a million, stands up like one man in defence of Leninist unity, encircles like an unshakable wall of iron its Central Committee and raises its powerful voice against those who dared to touch the tried solidarity of the Bolshevik ranks, who wished to divert the Party from the Leninist standpoint and began to push it towards the abyss of a split. The Party remains the same Party as it always was — hard as steel, the Party of Lenin, a firm, mighty, united, united and again united Party.

The supporters of the New Opposition, who are not very numerous, conducted a fraction fight against the Party and against the Central Committee. Every fraction struggle, however,

has its inevitable logic. This inner logic of fraction struggle has proved to be very miserable for the New Opposition and has led it into unexampled political bankruptcy.

Already at the XIV. Party Conference of our Party there was issued by the leader of the New Opposition, by Comrade Zinoviev, the slogan of freedom "for all former groups in the Party", the slogan of freedom of fractions and groups. Regardless of the decisions of the highest Party authority, of the Party Conference, the opposition, after the XIV. Party Conference, not only did not abandon the anti-Bolshevist slogan of "freedom of fractional groupings", but it increased its fractional activity to an unheard-of extent, led it into illegal channels and thereby raised the spectre of a split in the Party.

If one regards from the political side the oppositional slogan of freedom for fractions and groups in the Bolshevik Party, then it is seen to be a slipping down on the part of the New Opposition to Trotzkyism: Unity of the Party, without fractions, without groupings, is the organisatory principle of Leninism. On the other hand, to consider our Party as a collection of fractions, groups, "little groups", "tendencies", "shades", is the organisatory principle of Trotzkyism. The representatives of the New Opposition have gone over from the first principle to the second. They have thereby fallen into the ideological morass of Trotzkyism.

Not only that. In the mouth of the representatives of the N. O. P. (New Opposition) the slogan of freedom of fractions and groupings constitutes a glaring lack of political principle. Only recently: in the years 1923, in the year 1924 and even in 1925, the leaders of the present Opposition, along with the whole Party, characterised Trotzkyism as a "revision of Leninism". Only recently Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev exposed the Trotzkyist slogan of freedom of fractions and groups, and characterised Trotzkyism on account of this slogan as a "Menshevist deviation". And now they themselves have become that which they formerly characterised as a "Menshevist deviation": Trotzkyism has now become their "new" evangel (an evangel which, for the rest, has been considerably torn by our Party). It is hard to find in the inner history of our Party an example of a more surprising and more rapid change of direction, a greater capacity for political somersaults.

The "fighting" slogan of the opposition — freedom of "fractions" and "groups" — means, in addition to the ideological capture of the "N. O. P." by Trotzkyism, something still further. The slogan of freedom of all former groups in the Party is, if the opposition continues to insist upon it, nothing else than an objective bloc of the New Opposition with the "former group" of Shljapnikov and Medvedev. But Shljapnikov and Medvedev, against whom Lenin conducted a ruthless fight, are very well known to the Party. The Shljapnikov and Medvedev group is an ultra-Right group in our Party, a group of capitulators to the international financial plutocracy, to the Urquharts, to the II. International, to Amsterdam, to the supporters of bourgeois democracy and it is to such a "former group", which stinks of real Menshevism, that the New Opposition is prepared to offer its hand for the purpose of a common fractional fight against the Leninist C. C. It is with such a weapon that the new Opposition wishes to combat the Leninist Party Leadership. Such is the record in political lack of principle achieved by the New Opposition.

It is unnecessary to say that every attempt to set up a bloc of "fractions" and "groups" against the C. C. will encounter the most energetic and unanimous resistance on the part of our whole Party and will result in a miserable fiasco. Our Party is ideologically sufficiently strong and powerful, thanks to that heritage which Lenin has left it, to be able to overcome that "theoretical" and "political" mixture represented by the New Opposition. Our Party is also strong enough to nip in the bud every attempt at illegal fraction activity and to fulfil the command of Lenin to annihilate all fractionalism. The Party will know how to preserve the ideological purity of Bolshevism. The Party will not tolerate fractional attempts against Leninist unity.

And if the Plenum of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. has resorted to measures against those comrades who wished to introduce an illegal fractional attack on the Party, then the whole Party, like one man, rises up and says to the Central Committee: You have acted quite correctly! The Central Committee must defend Party unity and proletarian discipline.

The Central Committee is fulfilling, and will fulfil its duty to the Party.

Resolution of the Leningrad Party Functionaries on the Decisions of the Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C.

We publish below the decision of the combined Plenum of the Leningrad Gouvernement Committee and the Gouvernement Control Commission of 27th July 1926, as well as the unanimously adopted decision of the meeting of functionaries of the Leningrad organisation of the C. P. S. U. of 28th July 1926. Ed.

After receiving the report of Comrade Bukharin on the results of the Plenum of the C. C., the meeting of functionaries of the Leningrad organisation declares that in the current year the Soviet Union, under the leadership of our Party and its C. C., in spite of passing economic difficulties, is proceeding steadily forwards on the way of economic growth, on the way of increase in the importance of the socialistic elements in the economy of the country, on the way of further consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the leading role of the proletariat in regard to the peasantry.

The meeting takes note of those enormous difficulties which our Party and its Leninist C. C. have to overcome in leading the dictatorship of the proletariat and the life of the country. This leadership is being carried on under conditions where, along with the growth of Socialism, there is also a partial growth in the capitalist elements in the country, and where, along with the growing activity of the proletariat, there is a growth in the political activity of the petty bourgeois and bourgeois strata. In these circumstances the Party, in its work, had also to reckon with inner-Party difficulties, as deviations and vacillations frequently occurred within the Party and which objectively reflect the pressure of non-proletarian elements on our Party. As a result, the last Plenum of the C. C. was obliged, in addition to solving a whole number of highly important questions of the economic life of the country (obtaining of grain, housing question, international labour movement), to devote its attention to the unceasing disruptive fractional activity of the opposition, and energetically to repel it. The meeting states that the inner-Party opposition, after the XIV. Party Conference, not only did not cease the opposition fight against the Party, but intensified this fight. It has employed methods of fighting unexampled in their hostility to the Party. It resorted to illegal meetings, to conspiracies against the Party and to false statements before the highest Party authorities, before the C. C. C. The meeting declares the attitude of the opposition which has made use of the apparatus of the E. C. C. I. for the purpose of organising their fraction, to be impermissible, and completely endorses the decision of the Plenum of the C. C. which recalled from his position as member of the Political Bureau Comrade Zinoviev, who bears the full responsibility towards our Party for the apparatus of the Comintern.

The meeting records with regret that the united inner-Party opposition is departing more and more from the ideological standpoint of the Party and is now issuing a special platform in a whole number of highly important questions of international and inner politics — a platform which in its nature constitutes a complete break away from the ideas of Lenin. The meeting expressly notes the political lack of principle of Comrade Zinoviev and his supporters, who at the time of the last discussion, without any reason, accused the majority of the C. C. of semi-Trotskyism and now, in fundamental questions, have themselves slipped down to the standpoint of Trotskyism. The opposition is revealing more and more its lack of belief in the socialist path of development, and is proceeding from denying the socialist character of the Soviet State to doubting its proletarian character. On the other hand, the opposition has not grasped the slogan of vitalising the soviets, and gave out an entirely false estimation of the results of the Soviet elections this year. It disregards the important achievements in regard to really attracting the working and peasant masses into the work of socialist construction and, in face of the fact that political activity of the village bourgeoisie has increased, fell into a panic. In the questions of Party organisations the opposition has completely departed from Leninism, and in its attitude is guided by the conception which regards the Party as a bloc of legalised fractions with various ideological contents. It formed a bloc

within the Party which is in fact hostile to the Party, which combined in its ranks followers of Trotskyism, of the New Opposition, and fragments of the so-called "Labour Opposition" (Shljapnikov, Medvjedev). Under the cloak of "Left phrases" the most prominent representatives of the opposition place themselves in actual fact in one front with the Right semi-Menshevist elements who are striving for the liquidation of the Comintern, the handing over of the economic key positions of our country to foreign capital and the establishment of political democracy in our country. Exceedingly symptomatic is the fact that supporters of the Trotsky opposition, likewise under a suitable cloak, are beginning to circulate rumours regarding two parties in our country, and regarding the legalising of fractions within the Party as a preparatory step to legalising various political Parties.

In the economic policy the opposition has adopted an un-Leninist standpoint to the question of industrialising the country, in that it treats the industrialisation of the country in such a manner and proposes such ways and methods for its realisation as would lead to the dissolution of the workers' and peasants' bloc and to undermining the foundations of the proletarian State.

The opposition attempted to bring disintegration into the ranks of the C. P. S. U. in that it proclaimed anti-Leninist ideas in the question of the present international movement. The opposition erased the estimate of the present economic and political situation as a temporary stabilisation of capitalism, and in fact revised the united front tactics by proposing withdrawal from the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee. Although they came forward in this sphere under the cloak of Left phrases the opposition become practically a centre of attraction for all the ultra-Left (of the Korsch type) and the ultra-Right (of the Souvarine type) elements within the Comintern.

In view of all this the meeting of functionaries of the Leningrad organisation fully and entirely endorses the decision of the last Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C., and insists upon the employment of energetic fighting measures against the splitting activity of the united opposition and assures the C. C. of its fullest support in all measures necessary for guaranteeing Leninist unity and discipline in the ranks of our Party. Only if unity and discipline are secured will the Party be able to overcome all the difficulties which stand in the way of socialist construction. The Meeting emphasises at the same time the necessity of a decided and successful carrying out of inner-Party democracy. But in no circumstances does it understand by this the toleration and encouragement of fractional activity; but a serious, concrete, systematic work in raising the activity and consciousness of the Party masses, in the attraction of new forces and in the Leninist education of the Party.

Long live the united Party of Lenin!

Longe live the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.!

Unanimous Approval by the Organisations of the C. P. S. U. of the Decisions of the C. C. and the C. C. C.

Moscow, July 28, 1926.

The decisions of the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. are being widely discussed in the organisations of the C. P. S. U. In Moscow there took place largely attended meetings of the active Party members in all the district organisations, at which members of the political Bureau delivered reports. In the provinces there is also being carried out a far-reaching campaign for popularising the decisions of the Plenum. Everywhere the meetings are marked by the greatest enthusiasm. The renewed action of the Opposition and the attempts to split the unity of the Party have without exception, aroused protests in all meetings. All the decisions of the Plenum are unanimously approved.

The mood of the Party members in the industrial districts is best characterised by a resolution unanimously adopted by the organisation of Baku, after hearing the report of Comrade Ordchonikidse, candidate of the Polit-Bureau. The resolution calls attention to the fact that Comrade Zinoviev, after the XIV. Party Conference, did not cease the fight against the C. C., made

use of the apparatus of the E. C. C. I. in order to incite foreign communist Parties against the C. P. S. U. and established connections, now with ultra-Left and now with the ultra-Right groupings.

The resolution further declares that the meeting learns with the greatest astonishment that Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev have gone over to the position of Trotskyism of the year 1923, although both comrades carried on at that time the bitterest fight against the distortions and the replacement of Leninism by Trotskyism. Reconciliation with Comrade Trotsky in the year 1926 was necessary for them, and served the purpose of forming a bloc for a common fight against the C. C. which stood for the correct Leninist line. Against Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, who considered the industrialisation of the Soviet Union to be impossible, the XIV. Party Conference decided, with complete silence on the part of Trotsky, that the industrialisation of the Soviet Union is the principle line for the Party in the next period. The disorganising work of the opposition within the Party hinders the practical carrying out of the industrialisation of the country. The Party must do everything in order to expedite as much as possible the rate of industrialisation.

The resolution emphasises that the whole attitude of the opposition after the XIV. Party Conference, constitutes objectively the creation of an illegal organisation throughout the whole Soviet Union in order to prepare a split in the Party, and welcomes all the measures of the C. C. which aim at preserving the unity and the Bolshevik discipline of the Party.

Similar resolutions have been adopted by the Party organisations of Charkov, the Ural, Tiflis, Northern Caucasus, Tula and others.

Resolution of the C. C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the Matter of Byelenky, Chernyshev and other Comrades.

As a supplement to § c of the resolution of the combined Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union of July 23rd 1923 in the affair of Comrades Lashevitch and others and on the unity of the Party, the Presidium of the C. C. C. publishes the following decision of July 12th 1926.

The following were examined:

1. Gregor Jakovlevitch Byelenky, member of the Russian Social Democratic Labour party from 1901 to 1903, member of the C. P. of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) since 1903, born in 1884, self-taught, son of a petty bourgeois superintendent, professional revolutionary since 1912, private in the Czarist army in 1908, has not served in the Red Army, formerly a bookbinder, formerly secretary of the Party Committee of the Moscow urban district Krassnaja Pressnja, at present occupied in the Agitprop of the E. C. C. I.

He is accused of having infringed the resolutions of the 10th, 13th and 14th Party Conferences with regard to party unity, fractions and groups; of having been one of the organisers of the conspiratory meeting of members of the Party on June 6th 1926, on which occasion he abused the confidence placed in him by members of the Party at the time when he still observed the Bolshevik line of action of the Party and himself fought relentlessly against all opposition; of having taken the chair at this meeting and being thus entirely responsible for the attempt to cause dissension and disunion in the ranks of the united C. P. of the Soviet Union and to form a special fractional organisation within it.

At the meeting of the Commission of Investigation of the C. C. C. on June 8th 1926, he tried to conceal the fact of the conspiratory meeting having been held and of his share in it by refusing to give any explanations with regard to it, thus bringing into greater relief his hostile attitude towards the Party.

It was resolved:

1. To declare:

a) The accusations against Comrade G. J. Byelenky of having been guilty of actions leading to the disintegration of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, are proven,

b) Comrade G. J. Byelenky, who has been a member of the Party since 1903 and for several years held responsible positions in the Party, has abused and betrayed the confidence of the Party and would deserve to be excluded from the ranks of the C. P. of the Soviet Union.

2. In consideration of the previous revolutionary activity of Comrade G. J. Byelenky as a Bolshevik, the C. C. C. nevertheless resolves:

a) To give Comrade G. J. Byelenky a severe reprimand with the warning that he would be excluded from the ranks of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, should he make any attempt to continue work which aims at forming fractions.

b) To deprive Comrade G. J. Byelenky of the right to occupy any responsible post in the Party or Soviets for a period of two years.

II. Ilja Spiridonovitch Chernyshev, born in 1892, attended a village school and a party school, of peasant extraction, wood-worker, member of the C. P. of the Soviet Union since 1918, non-commissioned officer in the old army from 1914—1917, in the Red Army from 1918—1921, former member of the Bureau and the Party Committee of the Moscow urban district Krassnaja Pressnja and chairman of the Soviet of that urban district, at present vice-director of a woodware factory.

He is accused of having organised, in common with Comrade M. M. Lashevitch, the candidate of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, Comrade Byelenky, the former secretary of the Party Committee of the Moscow urban district Krassnaja Pressnja, and Comrade Shapiro, a conspiratory fractional meeting of members of the Party on June 2nd 1926 and of having personally taken part in it, of having made use of his connection with the workers, who knew him as a comrade who had previously fought with decisive measures against opposition groups.

At the meeting of the Commission of Investigation of the C. C. C. he denied in a categorical manner, in spite of categorical evidence from workers of both sexes, whom he had invited to this meeting, having taken any part in it, and did not admit having had a share in it, thus bringing into greater relief his hostile attitude towards the Party.

It was resolved to declare:

1. The accusations against Comrade I. S. Chernishev of having been guilty of actions leading to the disintegration of the C. P. of the Soviet Union are proven.

Comrade I. S. Chernishev should be given a strict reprimand with the warning that he would be excluded from the ranks of the C. P. of the Soviet Union should he make any attempt to continue work which aims at creating fractions.

3. To deprive Comrade I. S. Chernishev of the right to hold any responsible post in the Party or Soviet for the period of two years.

III. Boris Gregorievitch Shapiro, born in 1898, member of the C. P. of the Soviet Union since 1918, formerly a smith graduate of the Sverdlov University, private in the old army from 1916—1917, commissary in the Red Army, formerly vice-manager of the Party Committee of the Moscow urban district Krassnaja Pressnja and instructor to the Moscow Party Committee.

He is accused of having, in common with Comrade M. M. Lashevitch, the former secretary of the Party Committee of the Moscow urban district Krassnaja Pressnja and chairman of the Soviet of the Moscow urban district Krassnaja Pressnja, Comrade Chernishev and others, taken part as one of the organisers, in arranging the conspiratory fractional meeting of members of the C. P. of the Soviet Union on July 6th 1926.

At the meeting of the Commission of Investigation of the C. C. C., he denied categorically, in spite of the categorical evidence of workers of both sexes who had taken part in the meeting, that Shapiro had invited them to this meeting, that he had shown the appointed place to participants in the meeting when they arrived at the railway station, that he then personally took part in the meeting — denied categorically these facts which were stated by the Commission of the C. C. C. and made false statements to the C. C. C., thus bringing into greater relief his hostile attitude to the Party. He regarded his allocation to party work in Circassia as a punishment for action in favour of the opposition.

It was resolved to declare:

1. The accusations against Comrade B. G. Shapiro, of having been guilty of actions leading to the disintegration of the C. P. of the Soviet Union are proven.

2. Comrade B. G. Shapiro should be given a severe reprimand with a warning that he would be excluded from the ranks of the C. P. of the Soviet Union should he make any attempt to continue work which aims at creating factions.

3. Comrade G. B. Shapiro should be deprived of the right to hold any responsible post in the Party or the Soviet for the period of two years.

IV. Matryena Wassiljevna Wassiljev, born 1895, member of the C. P. of the Soviet Union since March 1917, three years at the elementary school, cotton worker, at present technical secretary to the nucleus of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the "Water Channel" factory in the Moscow urban district Krassnaja Pressnja.

She is accused of having taken part in the conspiratory faction meeting of the Opposition and having regarded it as possible to conceal this fact from the leading organs of the Party, thus being accessory to a conspiracy against the Party. At the meeting of the Commission of Investigation she considered it permissible to deny having taken part in the said meeting, in spite of the categorical assertions of workers of both sexes who were present with her.

It was resolved:

1. To give Comrade M. W. Wassiljev a severe reprimand.

2. To deprive Comrade M. W. Wassiljev of the right to hold any responsible post in the Party or the Soviet for the period of a year.

3. To point out and clearly explain to Comrade M. W. Wassiljev that by this behaviour towards attempts on the part of the opposition to create a fractional organisation within the C. P. of the Soviet Union, she had transgressed against the resolutions of the Party with regard to unity, had promoted a split in the Party, had given others an example of a breach of discipline which is quite unpermissible within the Party, and had thus weakened the dictatorship of the proletariat.

V. Nicholas Martinovitch Wlassov, born 1884, locksmith, one year at elementary school, member of the Right S. R. from 1905-1907, member of the C. P. of the Soviet Union since 1918 in the Moscow urban district of Krassnaja Pressnja, has not served in the Red Army, works on the tramways.

He is accused of having taken part in the conspiratory fractional meeting of the Opposition and of having regarded it as possible to conceal this fact from the leading organs of the Party, thus admitting of a conspiracy against the Party. At the meeting of the Commission of Investigation of the C. C. C., he admitted his mistake.

It was resolved: To point out and clearly explain to Comrade N. M. Wlassov, that by this behaviour towards attempts on the part of the Opposition to create a fractional organisation within the C. P. of the Soviet Union he had transgressed against the resolutions of the Party with regard to unity, had promoted a split in the Party, had given others an example of a breach of discipline which is quite unpermissible within the Party and had thus weakened the dictatorship of the proletariat.

VI. Xenia Andrejevna Volgin, born 1887, worker in a sweet factory, did not finish her schooling at a Moscow town school, since March 1917 member of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the Moscow urban district of Krassnaja Pressnja.

She is accused of having taken part in the conspiratory fractional meeting of the Opposition and of having regarded it as possible to conceal this fact from the leading organs of the Party, thus being accessory to a conspiracy against the Party. At the meeting of the Commission of Investigation of the C. C. C., she admitted her mistake.

It is resolved: To point out and clearly explain to Comrade X. A. Volgin that by this behaviour towards attempts on the part of the Opposition to create a fractional organisation within the C. P. of the Soviet Union, she had transgressed against the resolutions of the Party with regard to unity, had promoted a split in the Party, had given others an example of a breach of discipline which is quite unpermissible within the Party and had thus weakened the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Results of the Soviet Elections.

The Resolution of the United Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the C. P. of the Soviet Union.

(Passed on July 20th, 1926, on the basis of the report of Comrade Molotov.)

1.

THE CHARACTER AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN.

1. The Soviet elections of 1926 represent the first wide-spread and open election campaign since the end of the civil war and since the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship. For the first time since the civil war, the fundamental social groups of the urban and rural electors have openly appeared at the Soviet election. Further, this Soviet election took place in the circumstances of rapidly growing activity on the part of the working masses.

2. As on former occasions, the working class took a foremost part as regards its activity. In comparison to the last election campaign, the activity of the workers and of the trade union members in general has increased, though it is true, to a comparatively insignificant degree. (The number of trade union members who actually took part in the election, increased in the R. S. F. S. R. from 52 to 57% of all those organised in trade unions.) This last fact can be explained either by there being no immediate danger from the enemies of the proletarian dictatorship under present circumstances, or by the Party and other proletarian organisations not devoting sufficient attention to the election in the working class districts, further by work in the urban Soviets not being sufficiently developed and, in connection with this, by the chief attention of the workers being devoted to the activity of the organisations of the Party, the trade unions and of industry.

3. In the towns, the participation of the proletarian strata, which are not organised in trade unions (wives of workers, unemployed, workers who are not organised in trade unions etc.), as well as of the working strata of the petty bourgeoisie (small industrialists etc.) has considerably increased. The increase of the percentage in which they took part in the election campaign (in the R. S. F. S. R. this percentage has risen from 24 to 37 in the period 1924/25) is particularly striking, as their activity in previous election campaigns was quite insignificant.

4. In the villages, the election reflected on the whole the improvement of the political situation. This found expression in the manner in which the chief mass of the inhabitants of the villages, the middle and poor peasants, took part in the election (the number of peasants of the R. S. F. S. R. who actually took part in the elections rose from 41 to 47% of all the rural electors). The greatest activity was shown by the masses of the middle peasants who often, in the course of the elections, got into much closer touch with the poor of the villages. The village poor and especially the agricultural workers however still showed an unsatisfactory activity. The beneficial effect of the work among the village poor, which up to now had only been intensified to an insignificant degree and only in some districts, was demonstrated in the growth of the activity and the improvement in the organisation among the rural poor. On the other hand the large peasantry, who often showed great activity, were compelled, in the majority of cases, to abandon the open defence of their class interests and their anti-Soviet policy and they took refuge in hiding their class ambitions under the sheep's clothing of the so-called "interests of the village poor", "revolutionary legality" etc.

5. The election campaign brought into higher relief the predominance of the different social strata in town and country and gave evidence of still greater solidarity of the working class and the peasantry in standing by the Soviets. It also emphasised the difficulties, which, in view of the new conditions, have arisen in the work of the Soviets and the deficiencies in carrying out the leadership of the Party. The Soviet election of 1926 is consequently of extraordinary importance, as it put to the test the policy of vitalising the Soviets and of carrying through revolutionary legality. The results of this general election campaign — the first since the policy of vitalising the Soviets was carried through — must above all be examined from the point of view of further strengthening the proletarian dictatorship on the basis of the development of the (proletarian) Soviet Democracy.

II.

THE VITALISATION OF THE SOVIETS, THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP AND THE LEAD OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

6. The policy of the vitalisation of the Soviets, as an actual step on the way to the development of the Soviet Democracy (the proletarian democracy), must be based on the principle that the proletarians and the poorest peasant semi-proletarians should remain the "regular and only foundation of the whole apparatus of State" (see the programme of the C. P. of the Soviet Union). This not only does not exclude the necessity of a real and ever extending enlistment of the whole chief mass of the peasantry in Soviet construction, it actually demands it as a preliminary condition to the strengthening of the Soviet Power.

In the period in question, this task is of particularly great significance for the proletarian dictatorship, in view of the consolidation of the material basis of the proletarian dictatorship (State industry is becoming more and more the decisive basis of the whole economic system of the country), in view of the considerable growth of the proletariat, which is ever increasing in numbers, in view of the great strengthening of the whole Soviet system and finally of the Communist party itself, which is at the head of the proletarian dictatorship. This is why special emphasis is laid at present on the task of consolidating the alliance between proletariat and peasantry. "The chief principle of the dictatorship is the maintenance of the alliance between proletariat and peasantry, so that the proletariat may maintain the share that it holds in the Power of the State." (Lenin.) From this arises the necessity of creating a broad and active circle, consisting of middle and poor peasants, round the Party in the village.

7. The alliance between proletariat and peasantry will only become a firm support to the dictatorship of the proletariat, when the leading part in this alliance is ensured to the proletariat. For this reason the policy of the vitalisation of the Soviets, as a genuine proletarian class policy, demands that the activity, the independent activity and the organisation of the proletariat should be reinforced with all possible means, and especially that the proletariat should take part in the Soviet elections and in all activities of the Soviets in every way. We must therefore not judge the positive political significance of the election campaign merely by the absolute figures as to those who took part in the election, but also by the degree in which the participation of the proletarian section of the electors in the work of the Soviets, and their influence on that work grows and is strengthened (under the proletarian section we understand both the urban and the rural proletariat), and by the rate at which the quantitative and qualitative significance of the advanced workers of both sexes elected to the Soviets grows, and the active and really leading influence on the whole work of the Soviets increases.

8. The policy of the vitalisation of the Soviets also aims at doing away with the remnants of the political influence of the bourgeois elements (Nepmen, large peasants, bourgeois intellectuals) on the working masses. Any carrying out of the policy of vitalising the Soviets can only be recognised by the Party as right, if it intensifies the organised fight of the workers themselves against all political attempts of this or that bourgeois element to influence the masses — a policy which will consequently lead to the final isolation of the bourgeois elements in the country. In connection with the election campaign, which gave expression to the growing activity of the petty bourgeois strata both in town and country, it becomes evident how very necessary it is that the masses should be enlightened with regard to the political action of the bourgeois elements, either open or secret (the latter is much more frequent now), that this action should be unmasked to them and that every attempt of such bourgeois elements to defend their intellectual and political positions, should be relentlessly combated. (For instance, the attempts to spread propaganda for their reactionary ideology by publishing literature which is "friendly to the New Soviets" ("Smjena Wlech"), in the character of the forbidden paper "Novaja Rossija"; further, their attempts to make use for political purposes of some economic, cultural and religious organisations contrary to the interests of the proletarian dictatorship, especially in the National Republics, where the proletarian strata are numerically particularly weak etc.)

9. In view of the circumstances of the new economic policy and in view of the partial restoration of capitalist conditions

and of the still continuing development of home and peasant industries in large numbers, it is inevitable that there should be new attempts on the part of the petty bourgeois political parties (Mensheviks, S. R.), to re-establish their organisations and their influence. It is now possible for them to conceal these attempts to gain a right to existence in some form of making use of the vitalisation of the Soviets (and also of the Cooperatives etc.). The counter-revolutionary agitation for the necessity of establishing special peasant — in reality large peasant — parties and trade unions, which would inevitably be opposed to the proletariat and the Communist party must for instance, be counted amongst these attempts. On the other hand it is also possible that attempts may be made to cast the bait of petty bourgeois policy (for instance Neo-Menshevism) in a so-called "purely proletarian" disguise, under the cover of a so-called "genuinely proletarian" policy and treacherous "Left" slogans, which are opposed to the line of action of the C. P. of the Soviet Union. It is also inevitable that there should be attempts to re-establish the petty bourgeois nationalist parties (Petljurists, Djardists, Alashardinzes etc.). Apart from actually satisfying the real needs of the masses of workers, the Party must consequently make the improvement of the economic situation of the chief mass of the peasantry the centre-point of its attention, as it always has done, thus nipping in the bud the economic cause of the political fluctuations of the small property owners. It must combine economic measures with a relentless and systematic fight against every petty bourgeois political vacillation, from whatever side it may come and in whatever external form it may show itself. The Communist Party and the Soviet Power must continue to frustrate energetically and without mercy every attack of the petty bourgeois political groups, whose political idea is and remains a return to capitalism and an attempt to lead the country back to a bourgeois Power, which make these groups in reality direct accomplices and actual tools of international capital.

10. In view of the danger already referred to of fresh attempts to revive petty bourgeois policy, the question of the inadmissibility of two or more political parties under the conditions of a proletarian dictatorship (especially if we are steering a course towards the development of Soviet Democracy) must on principle be put very clearly. The existence of several political parties — and the fight for power which would result — could lead to nothing but the actual destruction of the alliance between the proletariat and peasantry which has been achieved at so great a cost and which is now being consolidated. This would mean the complete disintegration and the direct undermining of the most important foundations of the proletarian dictatorship. The existence of a fight between various political parties (as also the existence of pronounced fractions in one uniform party) is incompatible with the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat and would, by its nature, mean nothing else but some form or other of a resurrection of bourgeois Democracy. In the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship therefore, we refuse to recognise "the basis of Parliamentarism itself, the usual form of the bourgeois party system" (Lenin). The experiences of the proletarian revolution in our country have completely confirmed this principle of the development of the proletarian dictatorship.

11. The fact that the C. P. of the Soviet Union has become in the course of the proletarian revolution the undisputed and only leader of the proletarian dictatorship, is an enormous historical achievement of the proletariat and at the same time one of the most important and fundamental conditions for the really victorious development of the proletarian revolution. This fact shows what should be the nature (in its most essential features) of the Communist Party, the party of the victory of Socialism; it must be capable of carrying on a correct proletarian revolutionary policy, it must above all be deeply rooted in the masses of workers and in the broad masses of toilers in general, and finally, it must understand how to combine iron discipline with true democracy within the Party. The development of Soviet Democracy demands that the organised vanguard and the leaders of the proletarian dictatorship — the party of the proletariat — should in the first place itself tread the path of the real development of genuine democracy within the Party, whilst maintaining and further consolidating its iron discipline, its unshakeable unity and the true, firmly-welded proletarian solidarity of the ranks of the Party. It is only as a united party and as the sole leader and guide of the proletarian dictatorship

that the Communist Party can ensure the victory of the proletarian revolution.

12. The only party in the country of the proletarian dictatorship, the Party of the Communists, must however intensify more and more the work of attracting non-party workers and peasants to help in the total work of Soviet construction. In the present circumstances, one of the central tasks of our Party must be to fight against bureaucracy in the apparatus of State, to fight against the numerous bourgeois-bureaucratic remains and their influence in all fields, to fight for a real improvement and a transformation of the apparatus of State. This demands that the Communist Party should enlist the non-party workers and the working peasants in the work of Soviet construction and should give leading positions in the State apparatus to those of them who are most devoted to the cause and most active. This is the most practical way by which mutual confidence and reciprocal control of the party members by the non-party representatives, and of these by the party members, can be effected. Only in this case (presuming that the work for raising the cultural level of the masses is pursued with more zeal), only if the Party shows the greatest possible understanding for the demands of the masses and gets into closer touch with them by way of giving the masses a more practical share in socialist construction, finding and applying the most pliable forms of organisation for Soviet activity and combining with this activity the work of other mass organisations (in the first place the trade unions, the conferences on production, the Co-operatives etc.) — only then will it be able constantly to intensify its work for the construction of Socialism.

III.

THE RESULTS OF THE ELECTIONS.

13. The chief result of the election campaign is that this campaign has fully confirmed the correctness of the political course entered on by the Party at the 14th Party Conference. We realise this from the fact that the authority and influence of the Party among the masses of workers and peasants has undoubtedly grown. In view of the firm course entered on by the Party, that of making greater endeavours to enlist the non-party workers and peasants in the work of the Soviets, it was inevitable that there should be a certain decrease of the percentage of Communists in the Soviets, especially in those in which their percentage was previously the highest (for instance in the urban Soviets). Nevertheless the results of the recent election not only did not weaken the leading part played by the Party in the Soviets, on the contrary, it unmistakably strengthened it. This is confirmed by the fact that the election campaign revealed the absence of even the least perceptible influence of the petty bourgeois parties (Mensheviks, S. R. etc.), nay even showed that they are completely bankrupt.

14. The increased activity of the masses in the elections was demonstrated by the enlistment of considerable numbers of new workers; of new strata of workers and particularly of new strata of the peasantry, small tradesmen, employees, the intellectuals in the villages (teachers etc.) in the work of Soviet construction. The total number of those who exercised their right to vote has considerably grown since the last election, thus, in the R.S.F.S.R. alone from 17 to 19.5 millions. The first wide-spread and open election campaign has unmistakably confirmed the fact that, in spite of all the clamour of the petty bourgeois reaction about the "dying out of the Soviets" (nominally because of their class-homogeneity) it is an indisputable fact that a revival of the Soviets has really begun.

15. The election campaign has made it evident that the task of carrying through correctly and guiding the politics of the election campaign has become very much more complicated. Nevertheless, although some time has elapsed since the end of the election campaign, the discussion of its results both in the party organisations as a whole and especially in the periodical Press must, in the majority of cases be described as unsatisfactory, even as decidedly weak. At the same time, special attention must be called to the insufficient political valuation and explanation of the election results, and it must also be pointed out that very often there is a lack of any authoritative statistical data which would give an exact picture of the class fight and of the social and political tendencies which found expression in the election campaign.

16. In view of the growing activity of the chief mass of the peasantry, particularly of the middle peasants, and of the

growing confidence in the Party, more favourable conditions are arising in the villages for the creation of a bloc of the middle peasants and the village poor against the large peasants and, in connection with this, we can report successes in the creation of an active non-party circle round the Party and round the Soviets. This, however, implies that our Party is faced in the present period by particularly important tasks and difficulties in accomplishing the necessary work for the following reasons:

a) The party organisations in the villages have not yet sufficient experience in the formation of an active non-party peasant circle, and therefore the growing activity of the chief mass of the peasantry is far from being sufficiently organised and turned to account by our Party.

b) In consequence of the fact that activity among the agricultural workers and the village poor grows very slowly, more slowly than the activity of other rural groups, the interest and the share taken by the agricultural workers and the village poor within the non-party peasant groups is still not infrequently of but little significance. This results in much slower progress being made in the selection from among the circles of agricultural workers and the rural poor of persons to fill responsible functions in the Soviets (as well as in the Cooperatives, in the Peasant Relief Committees and in other organisations), than is the case in the circles of the middle peasants.

17. In the towns, the proletarian circles which are not organised in trade unions and the working strata of the petty bourgeoisie have taken a much larger share in the election than they have done in previous ones. In connection with this and with the insufficient attention paid by the party organisations and other proletarian organisations to the elections in the working class districts, the share taken by the strata mentioned in electing representatives to the urban Soviets has considerably increased. This fact deserves special attention in view of the Soviets of those towns in which the proletariat forms the minority of the population.

18. As regards the leading part played by the Party, it should be specially mentioned, that the party organisations in the villages entered on the last election campaign with much more organisation, no longer with that lack of purpose which was to be observed at the by-elections last year. Undoubted success can also be recorded in the field of preparatory measures of organisation and of the improvement of the election technique (more frequent election meetings, previous choice of candidates, election regulations etc.).

All the same we must admit that there have been great deficiencies in this respect. Side by side with an appreciable improvement in the methods of administration on the part of the local organisations, especially in the villages (renunciation of methods of command and nomination as regards the Soviets), the bow has often been over-stretched in the opposite direction, i. e. on the side of direct rejection of any leadership on party lines; on the side of the party organisations considering that their task in the election campaign is merely that of allowing themselves to be taken in tow.

In a number of organisations, the attempts to "hide the face" of the party organisation, not to appear in their own name in defence of the policy of the Party, to abandon openly putting up and defending their own candidates, did not find sufficient opposition. Further, the following defects must be mentioned: insufficient attention on the part of the party organisations to the Soviet elections in the working class districts, inadequate political instruction of the provincial organisations, lack of proper discussion of the Soviet election in the Press etc.

19. Cases of misrepresentation of the political lines of the Party must be specially pointed out. Among these cases we must reckon the concessions, contradictory to the lines observed by the Party, in the working out and explanation of the election instructions (both by central and local Soviet organs), as well as the incorrect application and loose interpretation of these instructions and explanations in practice in the provincial elections. In connection with this, we must emphasise that it was a mistake to reduce the circle of persons not entitled to vote, at a time when there is a certain increase of the bourgeois elements both in town and country.

20. The part taken in the elections by the trade unions (especially the industrial trade unions), the Cooperatives, the Peasant Relief Committees, the Village Poor Committees and other organisations, was entirely inadequate. Special attention must be made of the lack of organised participation on the part

of the youth and of the meetings of women delegates, especially those of the women workers.

21. The growing activity of the masses found expression in the somewhat increased interest shown by the Red Army and Navy in exercising their right to vote (at the last election campaign it was, on the average, 70% of the total strength of the Red Army).

The Red Army has already become one of the most important training schools for Soviet functionaries, especially for the villages. The demobilised soldiers of the Red Army are taking an ever increasing share in the work of the village Soviets. This fact makes it necessary for the Party to keep a particularly close watch in this direction.

22. Up to the present we have insufficient data with regard to the activity of the newly-elected Soviets. In general, however, the work of the new Soviets reflects a further growth of their activity, especially in the villages. The village Soviets are increasing in strength on the basis of the improvement of the budgets of the village communities and of the development of independent activity on the part of the poor and middle peasants, and are increasing in authority in the eyes of the working masses of the rural population. As compared with previous years, the part played by the Soviets in rural life has grown in the present period. In contrast to this, the activity of the urban Soviets which until the publication of the "regulations as to the work of the Soviets", which were recently passed, had insufficient material (Budget) and legal-organisatory basis, has only developed slowly and in an inadequate measure. It is only now, on the basis of the new "regulations", that, relying on the growing activity of the masses, the town Soviets have the opportunity of attracting to their work the working strata of the town, above all of course the industrial worker.

IV.

CONCLUSIONS AND PRACTICAL TASKS.

The Party which continues the policy of vitalising the Soviets (trade unions, cooperatives etc.), must set itself the following tasks:

1. In order that the light for the improvement of the whole Soviet apparatus may be intensified and that the bureaucratism of this apparatus and its seclusion from the masses may be overcome, the workers, peasants and other sections of those engaged in work must be enlisted in larger numbers and with more energy in the whole work of the Soviets (sections, councils, commissions).

2. With the same object in view, more energy must be devoted to the selecting larger numbers of non-party workers and peasants for responsible functions in the Soviets (trade unions, cooperatives etc.), whilst great stress should be laid on raising the standard of their education in politics, general culture and special subjects.

3. A greater responsibility of the elected members of the Soviets and a better realisation of their duty to render account to their electors must be demanded. For this purpose, it is necessary, among other things, that the electors should be informed, that, if their representatives in the Soviets do not act to their satisfaction, they have the right to recall them.

4. The election instructions of the central and local bodies must be corrected and brought strictly into harmony with the Soviet Constitution and the general lines of the Party. It is necessary to work out supplementary directions with regard to the application of the election instructions in the districts with a population of nomads or semi-nomads.

5. Things must be brought to such a point that the Soviet Constitution and the election norms established by the instructions dealing with them, are correctly carried out. In doing so, special care must be taken that those citizens who, according to the Soviet Constitution, are not entitled to vote, be prevented from taking part in the Soviet elections. In order therefore, that the compilation of the lists of electors may be controlled and Soviet legislation properly carried out, it is necessary that factory workers, agricultural labourers and the village poor, as well as middle peasants should be included in the election commissions.

6. In order that the Party may be under better guidance in carrying out the work in the Soviets, the following are necessary:

a) The continuation of a systematic and uncompromising fight against both the remnants of the methods of "command" and "nomination" with regard to the Soviets and the symptoms

of a "tail" policy in carrying out the elections and the work of the Soviets.

b) Increased interest in the election and work of the Soviets in the working-class districts, so that the workers of both sexes immediately engaged in production may be induced to take a maximum of active interest in the elections and activities of the Soviets.

This is above all necessary in localities with a small proletarian population, since the other working strata, employees, small tradesmen, domestic servants etc., are taking an increased share in the elections and the work of the Soviets.

c) More lively, immediate and systematic guidance on the part of our party organisations in the elections and in extending the connections between the Soviets and the workers and peasants by the elected Soviet representatives.

d) Greater attention on the part of the Press to the discussion of the results of the election and the work of the Soviets.

e) More attention to the right application of the Soviet Constitution in practice and to the election instructions to that effect.

7. With regard to the active non-party peasant elements in the village, the following is necessary:

a) Systematic work in the establishment and guidance of an active non-party element in the villages. In doing so, there must on no account be any fusion of the party organisations with these active non-party circles, nor any transformation of the latter into definite organisations of their own.

b) Particular attention must be devoted to drawing the agricultural labourers and the village poor into this active circle and to increasing the share and the influence of this section within the active circle, and to a wider selection of agricultural workers and village poor for fulfilling functions in all the bodies of the Soviets, the Cooperatives etc.

8. It is further necessary to accelerate the application of the new "regulations concerning the town Soviets" and to work out the problems of the new duties of the town Soviets, both in general and in particular for the towns with an insignificant proletarian population.

9. There is further a need for an approach and close connection between the activities of the trade unions, co-operatives etc. and the activity of the Soviets; the part taken by these organisations in the election campaign must be considerably reinforced.

10. The same must be said with regard to the work of the youth and of the meetings of delegates of the women workers and peasants and also with regard to the enlistment of unorganised women.

11. Emphasis must be laid on the duty of interesting the workers of the backward National Republics and of the provinces in the elections and in the whole work of the Soviets. Here we are in many cases faced by the immediate duty of creating and developing Soviets as the real organs of Soviet Power.

12. Among the individual sections of electors, particular care must be taken that the Red Army and Navy take part in the elections and in the work of the Soviets.

13. With the object of attracting larger numbers of workers to the Soviet elections, it is necessary to take further steps for improving the preparatory measures of organisation and the election technique itself.

14. Better organisation of the rendering of accounts and especially of statistics of the results of the election campaign is necessary in order to obtain more correct estimates of the class elements and class tendencies, which become evident in the course of the elections and in the results of the elections.

* * *

First the 14th Party Conference and then the 14th Party Congress have approved the policy of the vitalisation of the Soviets. The chief tasks of this policy were: detachment of the middle peasants from the large farmers (Kulaks), the political isolation of the large farmers, extension of the alliance between the proletariat and the village poor on the one hand and the middle peasantry on the other hand, the enlistment of the main mass of the peasantry in the work of socialist construction, consolidation of the leading part taken by the Communists among the broad masses of workers in town and country. The first wide-spread and open election campaign which was carried through on the basis of this policy could not of course be entirely free from a certain transitional character, it could not but show some features characteristic of a period of transition

from the old method of the Soviets being guided by the Party to the new methods. In spite of the difficulties which came to light in the course of the election, this election campaign fully confirmed the correctness of the policy carried out by the Party. This is proved even by a simple comparison of the last election campaign with the double elections of the previous year. The Soviet elections in the villages showed how far the general political situation in the villages has improved under the new course of party politics; the growing activities of the chief mass of the peasantry (village poor and middle peasants) were directed into Soviet channels and developed in this direction. The elections on the basis of the vitalisation of the Soviets have brought to light the commencement of a detachment of the middle peasants from the large farmers, an approach between the middle peasants and the village poor, the growth of the political activity of the village poor, a weakening of the political influence of the large farmers on the masses of peasants. The elections have proved that the Party has laid the foundation stone of the organisation of the rural poor into an independent political force in opposition to the large farmers under the new conditions which prevail in the villages. The general result of the Soviet elections in the villages is that they have emphasised the growth of the authority of the Party, of the confidence in it shown by the masses of poor and middle peasants, who form the decisive majority in the villages, and the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship. The complete futility of the attempts made by the new opposition at the 14th Party Congress to undermine the confidence in the policy of the Party, has been clearly revealed. The results of the Soviet election showed that the Opposition which, at the 14th Party Congress, took its stand against the new course of party politics, wished to draw the Party back to the old and obsolete methods of leadership. Had this policy of the new Opposition been adopted, it could only have led to a weakening of the Party in the villages, to an increase of the political influence of the large farmers, and thus to the influence of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the country being weakened.

Furthermore, the results of the policy of vitalising the Soviets are of special significance for the development of Soviet Democracy (proletarian Democracy) in general and above all for the fight against bureaucratism in the apparatus of State. This first success shows that the abandonment of the policy of vitalising the Soviets and thus of developing the policy of Soviet (proletarian) Democracy in present circumstances, which was practically the policy of the new Opposition, would have meant that the Party would actually have been subjected to the pressure of our apparatus of State which is still permeated by bourgeois-official influence and is to a large extent of a bureaucratic nature. The Party has entered on a firm course for the increase of the work of developing the Soviets and for the transformation of the whole apparatus of State; it has further enlisted greater and greater masses of workers and peasants in this work and has thus created favourable conditions for an efficient fight against bureaucracy.

In summarising the results of the Soviet elections, the Party renders itself an account of the difficulties and deficiencies which have become evident, and it will continue to carry through with still greater confidence the genuine Leninist policy of vitalising the Soviets, which has been begun.

THE TRIAL OF RAKOSI AND COMRADES

The Fight and the Victory of the Hungarian Communist Party.

By Karl Kreibich.

Comrade Karl Kreibich attended the trial of Rákosi and his companions up to the conclusion of the case for the prosecution.

Budapest, July 26th, 1926.

The case for the prosecution in the Rákosi trial has now been concluded. It was the chief event of this trial, the whole purpose of which has been to hide a scandalous legal murder by means of semi-civilised proceedings designed to win approbation abroad. This may surely be stated, even though judge-

ment will not be passed for several days yet and cannot now be predicted; for, in view of the absolute hollowness of the "evidence of guilt" that has been brought forward against the accused, and in view of the complete collapse of the case for the prosecution, the least punishment which can be expected, namely the suffering which the accused have borne since their arrest a year ago, constitutes a wicked travesty of justice. The only "proofs" which have not been demolished are the anonymous reports of the police spies; the rest have been swept clean away in the course of the proceedings. All the witnesses for the prosecution have withdrawn their evidence, and after the swearing in of the four police officials there was not a single person in the court who was not fully convinced that here four police rascals have committed the vilest purgery. Even such a loyal paper as the "Pester Lloyd" has to-day been obliged to admit that the only tangible proof arising out of the whole trial is the admission on the part of the accused Communists of their relation to the Communist International.

In spite of all this, however, there is no prospect of even a mild sentence, especially in regard to our Communist comrades. Horthy's gallows-justice will not be satisfied to deal merely with punishable offences; it will also insist on punishing the Communist for the convictions which they have so fearlessly and proudly confessed.

However shocking and painful the thought may be that our brave Hungarian comrades may have to endure years of imprisonment in Horthy's gaols — indeed, whatever the judgement may be, and no matter what excesses may be practised by Hungarian blood-justice, this trial will not only remain a scroll of fame for the Hungarian Communist Party; it is the first signal success of the C. P. H. since the collapse of the dictatorship of the Soviets and it will be the starting-point for further victories.

After unspeakable trouble and suffering our Hungarian comrades have taken up the fight forced upon them by the ruling powers, and they have made a start among the Hungarian proletariat. In face of great difficulty, and by means of illegal activity, they succeeded within a short period in gathering about them a group of the best and most valiant proletarian class-fighters. The success was so great and the effect of the illegal communist agitation among the masses was so marked that the Social-Democratic workers began to rebel against the corrupt and politically and morally infected leaders of their party and of the trade unions. The Social-Democratic leaders were frightened and denounced their own comrades to the police as Communists, while at the same time attempting to denounce the Communists to the workers as Hungarian Fascists in disguise. A successful trick employed at this time by an agent-provocateur put a sudden end to the endeavours of our leading Hungarian comrades to organise a Communist Party and get its function legalised.

The interruption was a very painful one, but by virtue of their revolutionary training our Hungarian comrades were able to put a correct estimate upon it: "Our opponents are stronger than we are and are in a position to force us to fight on the ground that is most advantageous to them — and as such they regard the law-courts and prisons; we are compelled to make a stand in these places." The prison, which was intended to be their grave, and the court, which was designed to be the place of their execution, they made the scene of a desperate struggle which they maintained with so much courage, stubbornness and dexterity that, although their opponents had all the instruments of power in their hands, while they themselves were practically defenceless, to-day they are indisputably the victors and the judgement can but add to the ill-fame of the present Hungarian regime and its creatures.

Thanks to the tenacious resistance of the Hungarian Communist revolutionaries, to their hunger-strike and to the protest action of the working masses abroad initiated by the Communist International, the police inquisition with its system of torture, the prison and the summary condemnations have been overcome and disgraced. The comedy of a "proper trial", by means of which the Hungarian Government wished to throw dust in the eyes of foreign public opinion was transformed through the steadfast and clever bearing of our comrades into a tribunal before which they appeared as the passionate accuser, while the ruling system suddenly became the accused and is to-day the condemned. The "defence" of the accused constituted the first public Communist agitation speeches made in Hungary since the collapse of the dictatorship. The police arrested our comrades in

order to prevent them from agitating for Communism, to prevent them from talking about Communism to little gatherings of workers meeting together in secret; the result of this interference is that our comrades have broadcast their views to millions of people throughout the whole country and that the police and legal system of Horthy's Hungary has been exposed before the whole world.

The chief point is, that the trial has shown that there is a Communist movement in Hungary; the Hungarian Communist Party is alive; indeed, it is alive and kicking in such a manner that the Communist International may well be proud of this section. In view of the suffering and humiliation experienced by the Hungarian Communist Party during the years succeeding the fall of the Hungarian Commune this fact may be proclaimed to-day triumphantly, especially by those who bore this suffering and humiliation and by those in sympathy with them. The Hungarian Communist Party has regained its prominent position among the Comintern, not in regard to the numerical strength of its members and voters, but to its Leninist training and temerity. Rákosi and Weinberger have by their courage and able conduct in this affair proved themselves to be real leaders, but a word has to be said for their companions in this case. The trial proved that the best, most courageous and morally steadfast proletarians, the chosen of the Hungarian revolutionary proletarians are members of the Hungarian Communist Party. They have behaved like heroes and have fought like lions and the proletarians among the accused showed that they have not only graduated in a school of courage but also in a school of mental culture; in their outspoken, plain proletarian revolutionary logic they held the advantage over the whole apparatus of prosecution. **The report of this trial should be published in book form so that Comintern may have a manual from which to learn how Communists should behave before a court.**

It must also be said that the accused belonging to the Vagi Party, also those who expressly declared that they were not adherents of the Communist International and who held views widely divergent from Communist ideas, conducted themselves in the court with dignity and courage and emulated our comrades in this direction. It was also evident that the best elements among the Social-Democratic workers of Hungary are sharply opposed to the leadership and policy of the Hungarian Social-Democratic Party. The fact that they have not moved further towards the Left is largely attributable to the circumstance that after the collapse of the dictatorship Hungary was shut off from all teaching of Communist views and, indeed, of views held by any Socialist of the Left. This tendency on the part of the Social-Democratic workers forced the Social-Democratic leaders to modify their attitude towards the Vagi people and also towards our comrades and to speak in the court as favourably as Social-Democratic leaders are capable of speaking under such circumstances. This does not alter the fact that the trial was also a tribunal in respect to the Hungarian Social-Democratic Party.

Despite the police supervision, we managed to some extent to get into touch with comrades and we learned that the trial has made a very deep impression upon the workers. The whole of the political interest of the Hungarian working-class turns upon this case. It was the first public appearance of Communists in Hungary after the collapse of the dictatorship and our presence did not fail to make its mark. The Hungarian working-class see that the Communist International did everything it could to prove to the revolutionary class-fighters before the court and, at the same time, to the whole tortured proletariat of Hungary the solidarity of the Communist world-proletariat. It was an impressive demonstration from the whole world of the fraternal solidarity against which the Hungarian proletariat has been for seven years hermetically sealed. From guarded and furtive indications of sympathy we could see what importance was attached to our presence in the court.

What we saw convinced us that Hungarian Communists are carrying on the fight outside the court also and that for every lighter who is put into prison a fresh one steps into the breach and that the ranks of the Hungarian Communist Party are formed out of the best proletarian elements and that they have been encouraged and strengthened by this trial.

We feel deeply the personal sacrifices involved in the trial, but it is gratifying to know that the record of the Rákosi-affair is the epic of the fight and victory of the Hungarian Communist Party.

Letters from Budapest to the "Inprecorr."

By Karl Kreibich (Budapest).

Comrade Kreibich was present at the proceedings up to the conclusion of the hearing of evidence. The previous Letters from Budapest to the "Inprecorr." were also written by him. Ed.

EIGHTH DAY OF PROCEEDINGS.

Budapest, Juli 22, 1926.

The cross-examination of witnesses is continued.

Gabriel Horovitz.

General Secretary of the Wood Workers Union and social democratic member of the Budapest town council, in reply to the question of the President, states that he does not exactly know what was the cause of the split between the Social Democratic Party and the Vági group. The Vienna Commission of the II. International decided that we must do everything in order to avoid a breach. But this had no result and therefore the leaders of the Vági group were expelled.

President: Did the Vági group have connections with the III. International?

Horovitz: No, only with Hungarian social democratic emigrants, as Buchinger, Garami, Kunfi, Garbai and Böhm.

President: Among them being also Landler?

Horovitz: Landler is not a social democrat, but so far as I know the Vági people had no connection with him.

President: Only so far as you know! Have the Vági people received financial support from abroad?

Horovitz: I do not know anything of this. But it is to be assumed that as their supporters were all unemployed, they did not pay any contributions.

Public Prosecutor: But you are acquainted with Vági. What sort of a man is he.

Horovitz: A respectable worker, honest-minded and sincere. He never expressed bolshevist opinions.

Public Prosecutor: Why then was he expelled from the Party?

Horovitz: Because he said and wrote in pamphlets that we have betrayed the Party and are lackeys of the government.

Public Prosecutor: You say that Böhm and Kunfi etc. are social democrats and not communists. But they were people's commissars during the dictatorship?

Horovitz: But they did not on that account cease to be social democrats. They served the Soviet government just as many bourgeois people served it.

Public Prosecutor: And were the Vági people without any connection with the III. International?

Horovitz: The leaders of the Vági group known to us certainly had no such connections; they were and remain social democrats. Whether any of their individual supporters were in contact with communists I do not know.

Defender Dr. Lengyel: To what body does the French Confederation du Travail belong?

Horovitz: To the II. International.

Dr. Lengyel: Does the Social Democratic Party also receive money from abroad?

Horovitz: No!

Dr. Lengyel: But they receive support during strikes.

Horovitz: The trade unions receive support from the Amsterdam Central out of the contributions of the workers.

Dr. Lengyel: What is the difference between the social democrats and the Communists?

Horovitz: The difference is in the question of pace. The social democrats are in favour of proceeding more slowly as regards achieving their final aim than the communists.

President: Are the social democrats in favour of the dictatorship or for a violent overthrow?

Horovitz: The social democrats are neither in favour of the dictatorship, nor of a violent overthrow nor for the destruction of the State.

The President has the last statement of Horovitz recorded word for word.

Defender Dr. Revesz: But you declare, as a social democrat, that you stand on the basis of the "Communist Manifesto". But this contains a passage to the effect that the forceful seizure of power from the bourgeoisie is aimed at:

Horovitz: I am aware of that. But here there is a difference between theory and practice.

Dr. Lengyel: It is said that you have denounced members of the Vági Party to the police.

Horovitz: I said nothing to the police other than what I have said here.

Dr. Lengyel: Who convened the Vienna Conference of the II. International at which the question of the Vági Party was to have been settled?

Horovitz: The Social Democratic Party and the Vági Party.

Dr. Lengyel: What was the object of the Congress?

Horovitz: To overcome the crisis and to restore peace to the Party. But it did not succeed in doing this.

Dr. Lengyel: Is it your usual practice to expel workers who make opposition?

Horovitz: No, but the Vági people infringed party discipline and ventured to make accusations against the Party Executive.

Dr. Lengyel: Then nobody is allowed to make decisive opposition?

Horovitz: Yes, but it was Vági's aim to remove the leaders and to take over the leadership himself.

Dr. Lengyel: Is a communist the same as a class fighter?

Horovitz: No.

Vági: Why was I expelled from the Party?

Horovitz: does not answer.

Vági: Do you know that there are social democratic parties abroad which are more radical than the Hungarian social democracy?

Horovitz: Yes.

Rákosi: Are you aware that the social democratic party has lost 64,000 members since May 1925?

Horovitz: That is not true. We only lost those who emigrated or committed suicide owing to poverty.

Rákosi: Is it a fact that, when so many workers were expelled from the Woodworkers' Union, police were posted before the entrance to the secretariat in order to protect the secretariat against the workers?

Horovitz: Yes.

Rákosi: Is it a fact that these police were paid with the money of the trade union?

Horovitz: Yes.

Rákosi: Have other trade unions called in the police to help them against the workers?

Horovitz: Yes, the Building Workers for example.

Hajdu (one of the accused): Is it true that Peidl was helpful to the Hungarian Government in its obtaining support from abroad?

President: I do not permit that question.

Gögös: Tell me, most worthy Mr. Horovitz...

President: I call you to order for that ironical expression!

Gögös: ... is it true that you informed the police over the telephone that we are communists?

Horovitz: That is not true.

Hajdu puts further questions to Horovitz regarding Peidl's conduct as a Minister, the law for the maintenance of order, the law for restoring the finances and as regards international obligations. All these questions were declared by the President to be impermissible.

Weinberger: Do you know that we Communists stand for a united trade union organisation and for the united front?

Horovitz: As regards the first part of your question, my reply is that I am aware of it, as regards the second part I am not convinced.

Weinberger: Has the Hungarian Social Democracy opposed the conclusion of a treaty with Russia?

Horovitz: On the contrary, we have agitated for it.

Weinberger: But Count Bethlen has...

President: We have nothing to do with that here.

Weinberger: You said on one occasion that the Social Democratic Party would suppress our Communist Youth Movement with every possible means.

Horovitz: That is not true. I was not even aware of your existence, nor did I know that Rákosi is here.

Palotás: Do you know that Social Democratic agitators receive very large sums on account of daily expenses when they are visiting the provinces?

President: I do not permit that question.

Szabó (one of the accused): Do you know that half a million land workers are starving in Hungary, whom the party allows to perish without troubling in any way about them?

Horovitz (very excited): Are we big landowners? How can we help it? Are you not aware of the decision of the Ministry of the Interior which renders impossible any work in this sphere?

President: I call the witness to order. You must not be so excited.

One of the accused: Can anybody be expelled from the trade unions merely because he is a communist, a syndicalist or an anarchist?

Horovitz: No.

Kovács (one of the accused): Is it not a fact that the "Nepszava" called us communists and also "Awakening Hungarians"?

President: We have nothing to do with that here.

The Mayor of Neupest, Dr. Semsey, and some other witnesses are now called, who declare Heinrich Hajdu (one of the accused) to be a well-conducted person holding high ideals; he was only engaged in cultural questions and had nothing to do with Bolshevism.

Agent Provocateur Ludwig Samuel.

Ernest Schön (a witness) had made incriminating statements to the Police, but now takes them all back. He is a member of the Vági Party. He was acquainted with the Agent Provocateur Samuel and was to have received letters for him, but not a single letter arrived. When the arrests were carried out Samuel said to the witness, "I shall not be arrested."

Weinberger: What role did you play in the "Singer-Putsch"?

President: I call you to order. We have nothing to do with that here.

Weinberger: Did you put up Samuel in your house?

Schön: No.

Weinberger: Did the Police Inspector put into your mouth the statement you made before the Police?

President: I forbid the witness to answer such a question.

Several workers are now called as witnesses to testify that the accused Dohány agitated for participation in the demonstration of the Vági Party which had been prohibited, and also agitated for violent resistance to the police. All the witnesses take back the incriminating statements alleged to have been made by them before the police and declare that they were taken down wrongly. Dohány only brought three flags with him, but did not say anything.

The President therefore asks the witness **Franz Rubin**, which is the real truth, what you said then or what you said today?

Rubin: Both. (Laughter).

Dohány: I propose that the witness be examined as to his mental condition. (Loud laughter).

A witness states that he saw how Dohány was ill-treated by the police. He was present at the arrest of Dohány.

President: We have nothing to do with that here.

Eugen Polgár (a witness): declares that nothing illegal was done by the Vági Party. They mainly discussed the class struggle.

Public Prosecutor: What do you mean by the class struggle?

Polgár: The defence of the interest of the workers and the endeavour to prevent the workers having to work for starvation wages.

Public Prosecutor: But the Social Democratic Party also stands on the basis of the class struggle, so that there was no need to leave this party.

Polgár: But the Social Democracy betrayed the workers and concluded a pact with the government.

Stefan Kis (a witness) takes back the statements he made to the police, on the ground that he had been pushed, beaten, bound and gagged, and placed in a solitary cell in order to compel him to say what the Police wanted him to say.

Paul Szekeres (another witness) also takes back the statements he made before the Police.

Alexander Spitzer, a painter, states that Dohány had the inscription written on his flag: Socialists advance."

NINTH DAY OF PROCEEDINGS

Budapest, July 24, 1926.

The first witness to be cross-examined today was the social-democratic member of parliament

Dr. Eduard Hébelt

a professor of the Academy of Law in Oedenburg. He took part in the deliberations of the Committee set up in Vienna by the II. International in 1924 for the purpose of examining the con-

ditions in the Hungarian social democracy. The Commission condemned the Pact entered into by the Party with the Hungarian government. The Pact was only excused by the fact that many members of the Party were imprisoned, while their families were suffering want and the Pact brought certain ameliorations. Only members of the II. International took part in these discussions. Even the Left socialists who condemned the Pact, as Bauer and Kunfi, have nothing to do with the III. International. Gönödör was only present as a journalist. Since then he has for long been in America.

President: Was anything spoken there with regard to affiliation to the 2^{1/2} International?

Dr. Hébelt: This International had ceased to exist, as it had been amalgamated with the II. International.

President: What is the final aim of the II. International?

Dr. Hébelt: The replacement of capitalism by a system of production in which there will be no exploitation and suppression of the proletariat.

President: What is the final aim of the Third International?

Dr. Hébelt: The rule of democracy.

President: What about the dictatorship?

Dr. Hébelt: That is only the form of government during the transition period. I am convinced that the dictatorship will in time be abolished in the Soviet Union and the organising of other parties be permitted. The difference between the two Internationals is only one of tactics.

The witness then states that he intervened in order that followers of the Vági Party should obtain passports so that they could attend the Vienna discussion of the II. International regarding the Hungarian Social Democracy.

Public Prosecutor: What are the relations between the I. International and the II. and III. Internationals?

Dr. Hébelt: It would require one with great knowledge of their history to go into that question. The I. International ceased to exist 60 years ago.

Public Prosecutor: What was the nature of the Pact between the Social Democracy and the government?

Dr. Hébelt: The Pact has already been made public. The aim of the government was that, in the elections, the social democracy should not cooperate with the bourgeois opposition, particularly with the Rassay Party (Democratic Party).

A Defender: Who was it that took the initiative in this Pact, the government or the Social Democracy?

Dr. Hébelt: Both parties desired it so that they both came together for this purpose.

Defender: Are you aware that the Social Democracy pledged itself under the Pact to break off all connections with the emigrants?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes, I know that.

Defender: Are you aware that by this Pact the Party surrendered important rights?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes.

Defender: Do you regard it as psychologically intelligible when, under these circumstances, anybody leaves the Party?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes.

Defender: Are you aware that the Vienna Commission of the II. International considered the pact to be incompatible with socialist morality?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes.

Defender Dr. Györy: Did the Party undertake in the Pact not to organise the railway workers, postal employees, land workers and tobacco workers?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes, otherwise we could not obtain the release of those imprisoned and interned.

Defender Dr. Györy: That is very important, because only the Party Conference was competent to decide such a question, but not the Party Executive.

Dr. Hébelt: Yes, that is what the Vienna Commission stated and it was also declared that the discontented elements should carry on their opposition within the Party and not withdraw from the Party.

Hajdu: Do you know that under this Pact the Party Executives could determine who should be released from internment and prison, and that the Party leadership could therefore leave inconvenient persons in prison?

Dr. Hébelt: I know nothing of this; I should have opposed it if I had had anything to say in the matter.

Hajdu: Do you know that the Party Executive made it impossible for us to do any work in the Party, as all our proposals were rejected?

Dr. Hébelt: But we social democrats are constantly outvoted in the National Assembly, we are always in the Minority, but we do not go over to the Czechoslovaks for that reason.

Hajdu: Are you aware that before the conclusion of the Pact by the government the Party Executive were granted privileges with regard to the cooperative movement?

Dr. Hébelt: I know nothing of that.

Several defenders ask Hébelt how he himself regards the secession of Vági.

Dr. Hébelt: I did not approve Vági's secession, but I found it quite understandable. As absolutism prevails in our country...

President: I beg your pardon!

Dr. Hébelt: ... I find it quite understandable, even if I do not agree, when anybody opposes the oppression with sharper and finally even with illegal means. The Vági Party, just as the Social Democracy, is striving for a transformation of relations and conditions. Between them and us there only exists the difference in the rate of procedure and in tactics. The Social Democracy is also a revolutionary Party, but it believes in evolution. We approve a revolutionary movement in principle. Every Party strives for power. We believe that every party should be free to proclaim its principles.

President: But only by legal means?

Defender Dr. Vámos: Is it not the fault of the government power and the form in which it is exercised when certain movements are regarded as illegal?

President: This question cannot be permitted.

Defender Dr. Admeto: Is there a difference between Communism and Bolshevism?

Dr. Hébelt: I do not find any difference.

Dr. Admeto: Is not Communism the theory and Bolshevism the practice?

Dr. Hébelt: In such case there would be no difference between Communism and Socialism.

Defender Dr. Györy: Have not the social-democratic parties also the collective method of production in their programme?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes.

Dr. Györy: Is the II. International also revolutionary?

Dr. Hébelt: In the question of the method of production it is revolutionary, but there is an enormous difference between violence and revolution. Revolution does not merely mean fighting with weapons. We want to obtain our ends by peaceful means. With us, unfortunately, we have concealed absolutism but in other states, as in Switzerland and England, democracy prevails. The social-democratic tactics have to adapt themselves to the conditions.

Defender Dr. Lengyel: Do you consider the accused as being participators in a revolutionary movement?

Dr. Hébelt: From the social democratic and human standpoint I condemn what they have done, because in our country they are put into prison as a result.

President: We have nothing to do with that here!

Dr. Hébelt: But I do not hold the opinion that the accused have worked with a view to a terrorist upheaval.

President: It is for the court to judge this question. Theoretical debates are not permitted here.

A Defender: What is your attitude regarding terror?

Dr. Hébelt: Speaking generally I consider the employment of terror in certain cases justified, but we are against its being employed.

President: Is your remark that the Social Democracy follows peaceful methods, but nevertheless wishes to achieve Communism, your private opinion or is that the programme of the Party?

Dr. Hébelt: My private opinion.

President: That statement must be taken down!

A Defender: Do you consider Weiszhausz to be a socialist?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes.

A Defender: How is it possible that the dictatorship prevails in Russia?

President: This question is not permitted!

Defender Dr. Révész: Are there social democratic parties abroad which are more radical than the Hungarian?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes.

A Defender: Do you agree with the aims of the accused to establish a legal Communist Party in Hungary?

Dr. Hébelt: The standpoint of our Party is that every political tendency should be permitted.

Dr. Lengyel: There took place in Eerlin a Conference having as its aim the cooperation of the II. and III. Internationals. There-

fore the social democrats and communists are not unconditional enemies?

Dr. Hébelt: At this Conference it was a question of the unity of the trade union International, but apart from this they are hostile to each other.

Dr. Lengyel: Is it not all the better for the bourgeois society the more the II. and III. Internationals quarrel with each other?

Dr. Hébelt: Unfortunately this is so, and Vági and his people, although they are social democrats, have worked against us.

Vági: You know me very well: was I a socialist or a communist?

Dr. Hébelt: A socialist of the purest water.

Public Prosecutor: I wonder that you now give Vági such a fine character. Why then was the Vági group expelled?

Dr. Hébelt: Because they fought against the Party with terrorist means.

Vági: Tell me in detail, with what terrorist means I fought against the Party?

Dr. Hébelt: I withdraw this expression. I meant to say not with violent but with very disagreeable means.

Vági: Do you know that on the occasion of my expulsion I was treated in a most unfair manner, and that I was not even allowed to hear the statements of the witnesses brought against me?

Dr. Hébelt: I do not know the details, I was ill at that time and in Switzerland.

Vági: Do you consider it possible to solve the social problem in capitalist society?

Dr. Hébelt: No.

Vági: On whose side stands the majority of the working class?

Dr. Hébelt: On the side of the Hungarian Social Democracy. The future will decide as to which party is in the right.

Comrade Rákosi: What in your opinion is the reason that the social democrats are allowed to carry on legal agitation and party activity and not the communists?

Dr. Hébelt: Because the communists are considered to be more dangerous.

Comrade Rákosi: If, as you say, in our fight against each other the bourgeois society is the laughing third Party, why does the bourgeoisie bring us before the court instead of leaving us to fight against you?

Dr. Hébelt does not answer.

Comrade Rákosi: Do you know that Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were murdered on the order of the social democratic Minister Noske?

Dr. Hébelt: I do not know that.

Comrade Rákosi: You say that in other countries there is democracy. But in England a State of Emergency has existed for months past, and in Paris the government is demanding full dictatorial powers. Are you aware of that?

Dr. Hébelt: Yes.

Comrade Rákosi: Then democracy does not prevail there?

Dr. Hébelt: At any rate more than in Hungary!

President: That is of no interest to us.

Comrade Rákosi: Are you aware that the social democrats took part in Koltchak's counter-revolution?

Dr. Hébelt: I only know that Struve sided with Koltchak.

Comrade Weinberger: What is the difference in Czechoslovakia, for example, between the parliamentary work of the Communists and that of the social democrats?

Dr. Hébelt: The communists shout more. (Laughter.)

Comrade Weinberger: You have acted as defender in many communist trials. Was there a single case where arms were found?

Dr. Hébelt: No.

Comrade Weinberger: That is what I wished to ascertain.

Gögös: Are there cases where the bourgeoisie dispersed the parliament when the radical parties obtained a majority?

President: This question is not permitted.

Gögös: What would the social democrats do if the government dissolved their party?

President: I do not allow this question either.

Witness Georg Bruck

states regarding the accused Grohovsky, that the latter always worked in the Social Democratic Party in the most disinterested and unselfish manner, demanded no expenses for his work, and in the factory in which he worked, refused to accept increase

in wages when it was offered to him, declaring that he would only accept general increase of wages for all the workers.

Other witnesses also gave the best testimony regarding the character of some of the accused.

Witness Alexander Pap

says that Grohovsky stated in a speech that the Vági Party must take care that they are not taken for "Awakening Hungarians" or communists.

Public Prosecutor: Do you know that in the 19th Party Organisation there were only communists?

Pap: I do not know that.

A Defender: I declare that none of the accused belonged to the 19th organisation. What is the meaning of this question?

Public Prosecutor does not reply.

Police Officer Ladislaus Varga

is now called as a witness. He maintains on oath that the police protocols were drawn up on the basis of statements of the accused, without the latter being influenced in any way or ill-treated.

Comrade Rákosi: Were you present at the examinations or when the protocols were being dictated?

Varga: The police officers dictated them from notes which they took during the examinations.

Comrade Rákosi: How were the reports of the detectives made use of?

Varga: They only served as a basis.

Comrade Weinberger: How is it then that Schweinitzer's "notes taken during the examinations" correspond word for word with the notes of the detectives?

Varga: But the protocols were drawn up on the basis of the statements of the accused.

Comrade Weinberger: Do you know that Dr. Schweinitzer added to my protocol the lying sentence: the Vági people are communists and were in connection with Bela Kun.

President: I call the accused to order for this expression!

Comrade Weinberger: Do you know that I threatened to denounce Dr. Schweinitzer for giving false reports and that this sentence was then struck out of the protocol?

Varga: I know nothing of that.

Comrade Weinberger: Did the examination of individual accused take place in the presence of the rest of the accused?

Varga: No, the others in the meantime were taken down to the basement.

Comrade Weinberger: That is what I wanted to get at, because consequently the witness cannot know whether the other accused were mishandled in the meantime.

Police officer Stefan Harangozó

was present at the taking down of the protocols of some of the most important of the accused. He did not know whether the protocols were taken down immediately after the arrests or later. In any case he denied on oath that any ill-treatment took place. During the examinations Dr. Schweinitzer walked through the various rooms, which are next to each other.

Defender Dr. Györy enters a plea of nullity against the evidence of the witness being confirmed by oath, because he declared on oath that Gögös showed no sign of ill-treatment, while the medical certificate contained the contrary.

With this the hearing of witnesses was concluded. Various written statements were now read, including the statements of the crown witness of the police and the Public Prosecutor,

Police spy Ludwig Samuel

who is supposed to have "escaped".

Defender Dr. Lengyel protests most energetically against this statement being read. Samuel is one of the accused. Samuel was allowed to go free without any order of the court. He can be brought before the court as he is staying in Budapest. In such cases the Penal Code does not permit the reading of statements, that is contrary to law.

The Senate nevertheless orders the reading of the statement dated 2nd of October 1925. From this document it transpires that the whole indictment is built up exclusively on Samuel's statements. The evidence contained in the indictment is taken word for word from this statement.

After the reading of this document Dr. Lengyel protests against the court considering it as evidence. A hiring of the police has the greatest interest to make lying reports in order to obtain state money from the police, as his merits will only be recognised in this way. Disinterested reports are not paid for, and it is therefore clear that these reports, having regard to their immoral origin, cannot have any validity as evidence. It would be very bad for social morality, which serves as the basis for the verdict of the court, if the only ground for this verdict was this immoral document. It was also proved during the proceedings that most of statements in this document are lies. The police let Samuel go free and obtained a position for him. Should Samuel, or his reports figure as evidence, it would mean that the Public Prosecutor or the police have the right to influence their witnesses by bribery. Under such circumstances this document must be disregarded, as being completely contrary to law and immoral.

The President read for hours from the pamphlets edited and published by the Socialist Labour Party. The Defence declare that the majority of these books and pamphlets were published in ten thousands of copies months ago, and that the Public Prosecutor never brought forward any charge on account of these writings. It is contrary to law if one desires now with the help of these writings to place the rope round the neck of the accused.

There followed the reading of the statements of Irma Mendel who was arrested at the same time as Rákosi but was immediately released. Irma Mendel, a former member of the Socialist Labour Party, maintains that the accused Juhasz delivered a communist speech in a meeting, and that Juhasz was known as a dangerous Bolshevik from Russia. The Defence prove by means of documents that the accused Juhasz was never a prisoner of war in Russia, and in fact was never in Russia at any time. The verbatim report of the speech of Juhasz was also produced, and it was shown that it contained nothing in any way inciting.

In conclusion the President read a letter which the social democratic member of the German Reichstag, Dr. Kurt Rosenfeld, addressed to the President of the Senate. In this letter Dr. Kurt Rosenfeld affirms, on the ground of his conversation with Otto Bauer and Siegmund Kunfi, that during the Vienna negotiations of the II. International the delegates from the Hungarian social democratic opposition declared themselves unreservedly to be socialists.

Thereupon the President adjourned the proceedings until Monday.

X.

Tenth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, July 26, 1926.

Today the hearing of evidence was concluded. A number of written statements were read which the police claimed to have "found" on the accused. Other documents read by the President were the theses and statutes of the III. International, the theses on democracy and dictatorship, the 21 points and the thesis on bolshevisation. The rest of the police "evidence", consisting of anonymous reports of spies etc., were read, among them being the police reports of the speeches delivered by Vági on various occasions. Regarding one of the reports Vági declared: I only referred to historical facts, and do not withdraw a single word. Imperialist policy follows the aim of securing for capitalism a greater sphere of exploitation.

The Public Prosecutor withdraws the charges against: Emerich Natár, Gisela Polgár, Johanna Bruck, Paul Szekeres, Ernst Schön, Stefan Kis, Josef Kis, Emerich Földi, Alexander Piovarcik, Maria Kureli, Johann Mogyoró, Eugen Spitzer, Alexander Spitzer, Georg Nagy, Stefan Pödör.

The proceedings against these are dropped.

Passages from the writings of Bela Kun are read. Further, an article by Rákosi in "Uj Marcius", the scientific review of the Hungarian Communists, and decisions of the Communist International.

Comrade Rákosi declares that only isolated sentences, torn from their context, have been read from Kun's writings. As regards the decisions of the Communist International, those particularly concerning Hungary passed in the years 1925 and 1926 have not been read.

The Public Prosecutor submits "Letters", "police documents" and newspaper articles, by which he seeks to prove that the followers of Vági were in connection with communists abroad.

Defender Dr. Lengyel protests that, as evidence regarding

the aims of the Communist International, there are only submitted the decisions of the two world congresses of 1919 and 1920 and extracts' torn from their context, from the writings of Bela Kun. He calls attention to later decisions which protest against the Peace of Trianon and in which the Communists in Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Jugoslavia are pledged to oppose the violation of the right of self-determination of the Hungarian Minorities. He demands the reading of further decisions and further passages from the writings of Bela Kun, Zinoviev and Stalin.

Defender Dr. Györy moves that the whole of the writings be read, from which only fragments have been read. He further moves the cross-examination of the chief of the police Wetzel, who maintains in a letter the statements attributed to the witness Horowitz, which the latter now denies.

Defender Dr. Bárdoly moves the examination of witnesses as to the reason why the accused went on hunger strike.

Defender Dr. Vámos protests against the Public Prosecutor bringing forward as a charge the action of the Vági Party for the Commercial Treaty with Soviet Russia. This Party was acting on the same lines as the government of Bethlen, which had concluded this Treaty but did not secure its ratification.

Defender Dr. Admeto moves that the protocol of the proceedings of the Special Court be read.

Defender Dr. Revesz states that the medical certificate of his client, Gancz, is not available. He also demands the hearing of witnesses who could give evidence regarding some of his clients.

Comrade Rákosi moves that the Communist member of parliament from Prague, Kreibich, who is present in court, may be cross-examined as to how far the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia can legally exercise their activity and whether his membership of the E. C. of the C. I. has resulted in his being persecuted by the police of the courts.

Comrade Weinberger challenges the correctness of the "reports" submitted by the Public Prosecutor regarding "secret decisions of the C. I." and calls attention to the forged Zinoviev Letter.

After a long consultation the President announces the rejection of most of the proposals regarding evidence, and in the first place the rejection of all further hearing of witnesses. Only a few further readings are allowed, among them being those from the work of Stalin: "Lenin and Leninism".

SPECIAL TELEGRAPHIC REPORTS TO THE "INPRECORR".

Eleventh Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, July 27, 1926.

At to-day's proceedings there took place the reading of the theses of the III. International proposed by the Defence. In addition, two detectives were cross-examined who stated that they were present as official witnesses during the examination of the accused by the police, that they were present the whole time during the cross-examination of all the accused, that in no single case was force used, but the accused made their statements voluntarily. The Defenders protested against the statements of the detectives being accepted as made on oath. They pointed out that the police practised brutalities. It is also proved by documents that the detectives made false statements. The court, in spite of this, defends the detectives.

Following this the articles of Bela Kun, Rákosi and Landler, published in the "Uj Marcius", were read. A motion of the defenders was also accepted that the speeches made by Stefan Vági and Alexander Weiszhausz on the occasion of the founding of the Socialist Labour Party be read in full.

Vági declares, that the assertions he made in his speech that the white terror had thrown 70,000 proletarians into prison, were based on the statements of Chief Public Prosecutor Vági. He stands by everything he said in his speech, among other things, that the irredentism of the big landowners and of the capitalists was solely for the purpose of securing a greater sphere of exploitation. He also stands by that passage of his speech in which he declared that it is his firm conviction that the Hungarian proletariat will no longer endure the heavy oppression and that this suppression will very soon lead to an open outbreak.

Weiszhausz likewise declares that he fully abides by the statements in his speech. In no other country in Europe has reaction raged so furiously as in Hungary, and the expressions

used by him to characterise the conditions in Hungary were too mild.

The proposal of the accused **Weinberger** and of the Defence, that the General Secretary of the Federation of Hungarian Manufacturers, **Max Fenyő**, and the former Foreign Minister **Gustav Gratz** be cross-examined regarding the Treaty with Soviet Russia, is rejected. The court also rejects the proposal of the Defence that the court institute an investigation as to whether the statements **Gabriel Horowitz** made to the police, in which he denounced the accused, or the statements he made before the court, in which he tried to excuse himself, are true.

The Public Prosecutor, Dr. Miskolcszy

now delivers his speech for the Prosecution.

"The Court has to decide regarding three questions. The accused belonging to the communist group have, without exception, confessed that they are communists. By this they have committed a punishable act, and the court has only to decide regarding the degree of punishment. The second question is, whether the **Vági** group, no matter whether they are communists or not, have by their actions infringed the exceptional law for the Defence of the State."

The Public Prosecutor admits that he cannot prove that the communists made any preparations for an armed revolt. There is no doubt, however, that the communists have always endeavoured to bring about an upheaval, and this is so in the present case. The Communists are thieves, robbers and incendiaries. The Communist Party recruits its members from the lowest, most dangerous and questionable elements of the working class. A practical proof of this is the fact that the Russian Communist Party, as **Rákosi** himself admitted, has only 600,000 members.

Comrade **Ráposi** interjects: "That is ridiculous, I said that along with the Youth they have 3 million members!"

The President calls Comrade **Rákosi** to order and threatens him with severe punishment.

The Public Prosecutor continues: "The Hungarian Communist Party consists of such elements, and it is clear that such elements fight only with violent means and only for a dictatorship of the proletariat, and are in no way idealists but materialists in the narrowest sense of the word."

The excitement with which the Public Prosecutor speaks increases to a real outburst of fury when he comes to speak of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary. He says: "The sole morality of the dictatorship of the proletariat is immorality. The accused still glorify this dictatorship, a proof that they are fighting for the destruction of the bourgeois State and for the dictatorship of the proletariat." It would therefore be suicide for the Hungarian social order to recognise the legality of the Communist Party of Hungary. This legality would mean a *carte blanche* for the hooligans.

As regards the members of the Socialist Labour Party, they maintain that they are not communists, but adopt the standpoint of consistent class war. Whoever in Hungary even utters the word class war is a traitor to his country. Whether the accused of the **Vági** Party are communists or not, all their actions prove that their aim was the overthrow of the present order of society, and so they are also guilty.

When the socialist theory has suffered shipwreck, in the whole world, one must use fire and sword to prevent anyone in Hungary being able to carry on propaganda for this theory. That the socialist theory has suffered shipwreck is shown most clearly by the case of the **MacDonald** government. **MacDonald** did not attempt to do anything against capital, but at the same time he did not do anything in the interest of the proletariat, so that he practically proved that the socialist theory is nothing else than a fraud. When **Vági** and his comrades maintain that they stand on the basis of consistent class war and of revolutionary Marxism, then they are supporting the communists in Hungary. Although it has been proved in the whole world that the Communist Party is the Party of the lowest dregs, and therefore the working class in all the countries of Western Europe turn with loathing from the Communists. (Great excitement and protests from the accused.)

The President calls to order and threatens all the accused with severest punishment.

"That the **Vági** group", continues the Public Prosecutor, "has committed punishable acts, is proved among other things by the fact that they organised terrorist groups. If, for the time

being, these are only used in order to protect their meetings, it is nevertheless quite certain that they would be used later in list Labour Party in order to strengthen their own organisation, order to overthrow the bourgeois society. The **Vági** group must have known that the Communists would make use of the Socialist but the **Vági** group willingly tolerated this, because they wished, in fact, to base themselves on the mob. It is useless for some leaders of the Socialist Labour Party to maintain that they are theoretically trained and intelligent people. **Vági** speaks in such a manner that even his fellow accused cannot understand him."

All the accused make interjections; some spring up excitedly from their seats. They call out: "Every worker understands him, he speaks the language of the proletariat."

The President calls the accused to order.

The Public Prosecutor continues: "The demand for the recognition of Soviet Russia alone represents a punishable act. Hungary has never recognised Soviet Russia and never will recognise it. Hungary is in a State of war with Russia, and it is treason to the country when the accused laud Soviet Russia.

The Public Prosecutor calls to mind the "cruel deeds" of the Hungarian proletarian dictatorship, and demands that the chief accused be treated with the utmost rigour of the law. The chief accused cannot plead extenuating circumstances. **Rákosi** and **Weinberger** admit themselves to be so-called professional revolutionaries. Against such people even the severest punishment is too mild. Particularly damning is the fact that the chief accused carried on propaganda for Soviet Russia and betrayed their own country. For the rest of the accused he allows as a mitigating circumstance the fact that they have already been severely punished by the social democratic Party having excluded them, and that by this expulsion they were driven in a revolutionary direction.

After the speech of the Public Prosecutor, which lasted for three hours, the Defence requests that the proceedings be adjourned till tomorrow. The President accepts this proposal.

Twelfth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, July 28, 1926.

The whole of today's proceedings were occupied by the speech of the Defender **Dr. Zoltan Lengyel**.

Defender Dr. Lengyel

began his speech with the statement that the eyes of the whole world are turned to this trial. Already at the first proceedings before the Special court, the labour movement of the whole world, no matter whether social democrats or communists, showed the greatest interest for this trial and the working class everywhere protested against the brutal manner in which this trial has been conducted. At the head of the protest movement there stood **MacDonald** and **Vandervelde**, Professor **Einstein** and **Romain Rolland**, the most prominent figures of European politics, science and art. And if we defend Hungary here and energetically protest against any intervention from abroad and demand that this trial shall be conducted solely according to Hungarian law, nevertheless this interest shown abroad is a fact which we cannot simply ignore.

Under such circumstances it is a provocation of foreign countries, and particularly of the public opinion of the working class abroad, when the Public Prosecutor describes communists as bandits, robbers and betrayers of their country. And it is, in particular, a provocation of the Communist Party of Russia, which rules this powerful country, which has overthrown Tsarism, the hereditary enemy of every movement for freedom and the suppressor of the Hungarian fight for freedom of the year 1849. "Does the Public Prosecutor perchance wish to see Tsarism restored? For the Public Prosecutor must clearly realise that the overthrow of the Soviets can only be followed by Tsarism.

What a piece of irresponsibility and lack of tact it is, to speak, under the cloak of patriotism, in such a manner regarding Russia and the Communist Party of Russia, when the Soviets and the III. International led by the Communist Party, alone in the whole world energetically raised their voices against the Peace of Trianon, when Soviet Russia is the only State which does not recognise the League of Nations which was set up on a basis of robbery. The III. International stands firmly for the principle of the right of self-determination of the nations, and the V. World Congress of the III. International expressly declared

that in the successor States the fight must be carried on for the right of self-determination of the nationalities, even up to the demand for the right to complete separation. Soviet Russia is the deadly enemy of every imperialism, but particularly, of Roumanian imperialism. I have already once declared, and I repeat it in order that the Public Prosecutor may learn something from it, that whoever is the enemy of my enemy is my friend. When we think of all this, it shows the greatest possible lack of tact when the Public Prosecutor speaks in such language regarding Soviet Russia, the III. International and the Communist Parties belonging to it. It is one thing to fight against certain tendencies which are directed against bourgeois society, and another thing to rail again these tendencies in the most unbridled manner.

In England, America, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland and in all the cultural States, the Communists can have legal organisations. It is not true that the Communist Party is prohibited in America and in Switzerland, and I do not know where the Public Prosecutor got hold of this idea. In most States the communists have a considerable representation in parliament. I am far from maintaining that this development would be desirable for us, who belong to the bourgeois class. Nevertheless it places the whole Hungarian legal procedure in peculiar and unfavourable light when these questions are dealt with in such a manner as the Public Prosecutor has dealt with them.

In the year 1924 the Bethlen government concluded a Treaty with Soviet Russia, which provided for the recognition of Soviet Russia. This Treaty has not been ratified up to now. But since that time it has always been Hungary that has constantly demanded postponement of the ratification. Dr. Lengyel then reads details from declarations of Tibor Eckhard, Eugen Rákosi, Josef Sztérényi and other prominent politicians, all of whom emphasise that Hungary must incline towards Soviet Russia. It is ridiculous here, where the court has to pronounce a judgement on the accused, to pass judgement on a fifth of the world in the form of a shameful speech on the part of the Public Prosecutor.

Soviet Russia has been developing recently at a tremendous rate. Today even the most powerful States in the world no longer think of making an intervention against Russia.

Russia has left behind the period of war-communism and is now endeavouring to build up the socialist State, without however thereby threatening the capitalist States. The whole world understands this development. It is only the Public Prosecutor who does not understand this and, with his limited Hungarian outlook, feels himself especially called upon to provoke this powerful Russia upon which Hungary is dependent. The whole world is full of enemies of Hungary, and our neighbours rejoice when, by abusing Russia and by attempting to rouse public opinion against Russia, we wish to set up a terrible dam against the flood of Bolshevism. But even if this dam should be set up it would not be a dam against Bolshevism, but it would be a dam against Hungary's strivings for freedom. Hungarian prisoners of war have in their time fought for Soviet Russia, and Russia will never forget what acts of cruelty have been committed by the Czechoslovakian legionaries led by Gajda.

The government will not thank the Public Prosecutor for his speech, and I believe that no superior authority will associate itself with the speech of the Public Prosecutor. We must all defend our native soil. We should, however, not continually provoke Soviet Russia, for should Russia once join our enemies, then the Hungarian nation would be swept from the face of the earth.

After this first part of Dr. Lengyel's speech which lasted for three hours, the President ordered half an hour's pause.

POLITICS

Current Political Forces in England.

By R. Palme-Dutt (London).

The fourteen weeks continuance of the miners' struggle is producing profound social and political effects in England. As the next few days may see important changes in the situation, it may be of value to summarise the results already reached, which show:

First, that the heroic resistance of the miners has already saved and rallied the spirit of the whole working

class from the reaction which would normally have followed the debacle of May 12th;

Second, that the class situation in England is more intense than it was at the beginning of the General Strike.

The economic losses resultant from the stoppage are very heavy. Up to July 16, they have been estimated by the Liberal shipowner, Runciman, as totalling £148,000,000, of which he attributes £30,000,000 to the General Strike, and £118,000,000 to the Coal Stoppage; of the latter figure, £63,000,000 is put down as losses in the Export Trade. This total is equivalent to one third of the estimated total national income for the period in question; the Export Trade loss is equivalent to two thirds of the Export Trade for the period in question. These losses cannot be made good by the bourgeoisie within the existing capitalist economic organisation, save at the expense of the workers; the only line of solution, the line of nationalisation, is closed to them for political reasons, which lead them to shrink from even endeavouring any serious reorganisation for fear of breaking up their own ranks; and therefore they are compelled to intensify the attack on wages and hours, and to prepare for intensified class struggle in front.

A consolidation of the bourgeois forces on a front of open reaction and class-war has followed as the inevitable result of the General Council's betrayal. This has appeared in the so-called capitulation of Baldwin to Churchill, Birkenhead, Joynson-Hicks and the Extreme Right. The role of Baldwin as the "friend of Labour" is laid on one side, to the horror and indignation of the reformist leaders who declare themselves to have been duped. In reality the roles of Baldwin and of Churchill are two sides of a single shield; and the hour of the breaking up of the working class ranks by the General Council is inevitably the hour for the bourgeoisie to push forward their offensive to the uttermost without concealment both at home and abroad. This offensive has taken the following forms:

1. **Against the Miners.** The terms have been successively raised, in proportion as the General Council has more and more completely abandoned and attacked the miners, and the refusal of an embargo on coal has led to the unhampered import and distribution of coal. First, the Samuel Memorandum, promising no immediate revision of wages; second, the Prime Minister's terms, demanding an immediate reduction of wages; third, the repudiation of the Samuel Report; fourth, the Eight Hours Act, plus heavy wage reductions, and opening of the pits on July 12 for the miners to return individually without reference to the Miners' Federation. All these offensives have failed completely. The latest attempt is a return to the method of negotiation and promises—through the Churches this time.

2. **Against Trade Union rights.** Legislation is semi-officially announced to restrict trade union rights, prohibit strikes save after a ballot under government control, prohibit unofficial strikes, restrict picketing and possibly attack the political levy. All this is still under consideration.

3. **Victimisation and Imprisonment.** The Emergency Powers are maintained now for the third month in succession; sentences on revolutionary workers continue; workers active in the General Strike are refused to be taken back, and the Trade Unions have bound themselves by their Agreements not to help them.

4. **Poor Law and Local Government.** Conditions of relief are still further hardened. At the same time a very significant attack is made on the Labour conquest of local authorities by new legislation enabling the central State authority to supersede an elected local authority by state officials: this has already been done in the case of West Ham where there is a left labour majority.

5. **Attack on the Soviet Union.** The June 12 Note to the Soviet Government is accompanied by heavy propaganda for a break of relations; the Ministers, Churchill and Birkenhead, despite the Cabinet decision to wait, make public speeches for a break, which are subsequently accepted as authoritative by the Government. The question of the attack becomes the question of opportunity.

This Government policy of extreme reaction is not being carried through without a cost. The appearance of State impartiality has been thrown aside; and the open emergence of the Government as the representative of the coalowners and of lower wages has aroused wider masses of workers, and also large sections of the petty bourgeoisie than ever before, as has

been shown by the whole series of recent bye-elections, where Labour victories over the Government candidates have been recorded with overwhelming majorities of 4000, 6000 and 9000. It is estimated that a dissolution and election at this moment would probably result in a Conservative collapse, and even a possible Labour majority.

Sensing this situation, Lloyd George, still the cleverest politician of the bourgeoisie, has been carrying through a significant manoeuvre of preparation for a possible Liberal or Liberal-Labour revival. This role of Lloyd George is the only apparent break in the bourgeois front at the present moment. During the General Strike Lloyd George had calculated on an indecisive conflict (he had not expected the sudden collapse of the General Council), and had endeavoured to appear as an exponent of compromise. For this crime, once victory had been won, the other Liberal leaders, Asquith, Grey, Simon etc., immediately turned on him and sought to drive him out of political life; but the attempt failed and has only served to show Lloyd George's effective mastery (the funds are in his hands) of what remains of the Liberal Party. Since then Lloyd George has pursued his approach to Labour, i. e. the Right Wing Labour leaders, more conspicuously than ever. With his programme of "Coal and Power" capitalist reconstruction, and his Land policy, he has combined a crude reproduction of "Labour" propaganda, attacks on the monopoly of wealth and on slums, appeals to Christ and equality, sympathy to the miners, attacks on the Communists etc. It is clear that some form of alliance of Liberalism and Right Wing Labour is being prepared as the alternative, when the time comes, to canalise off the growing popular discontent with the Conservative Government. But the weakness of all these attempts to revive Liberalism, whether through Lloyd George, or through MacDonald and Snowden, is that they are completely unable to place themselves in relation to the growingly intensified class struggle and the consequent transformation taking place in the working class movement.

The Labour Party and General Council leadership, having refused to lead the workers against the Government, can now only conduct a sham comedy of protest against the reaction of Baldwin, while in practice driven further and further to the Right. The Labour Party in Parliament has spent its endeavours on petty and very slight disturbances, personal attacks on Baldwin as a Hypocrite and Betrayer of the Nation's Trust ("instead of acting as Trustee for the Nation, he is acting as Agent for the Colliery Owners" — Daily Herald, 16/6/26), small exposures of coal shares held by Baldwin etc: anything except a real campaign to lead the workers and the miners' struggle and fight for the downfall of the Government. The General Council has issued a Manifesto calling in the most general terms for resistance to the reactionary policy of the Government ("The Labour Movement must offer the most determined resistance to this policy" "the General Council warns the Government" "the Trade Union Movement is not broken"), but offering no concrete forms for such resistance (in the actual struggle save financial aid, and refusing the one weapon demanded by the miners — the embargo on blackleg coal).

In practice the attention of the reformist leadership has been concentrated on the inner fight against the working class revolt. The General Council has first postponed indefinitely the Special Conference to which it was to have rendered account, has then induced the Miners' leaders to sign a treaty of silence with regard to the past, has thereafter come out with a Report which consists of a complete and shameless attack on the Miners for refusing to surrender, and has finally completed its journey to the Right by endeavouring to break off the Anglo-Russian Committee.

By these measures the existing reformist leadership are separating themselves more and more completely from the masses, who are moving in an entirely opposite direction. The spirit of the workers has been shown most clearly in the great demonstrations of the miners that have welcomed Cook in every part of the country: demonstrations of ten thousand, twenty thousand and thirty thousand men, gathering into each centre and echoing with a single will the cry of no surrender and no reductions, without a solitary hand or voice in opposition. No suggestion of surrender could receive a hearing: the one miners' leader, Varley, who had suggested the acceptance of a reduction, was howled down in his own coalfield. "Is it a crime" asked his colleague, Spencer, a Labour M. P., "to suggest

a settlement of the dispute?" "Yes" came back the unhesitating answer.

But the example of the miners, as well as the open coercive measures of the Baldwin Government, has aroused the whole working class, although they are shackled from effective action by the trade union discipline of the reformist leaders. The sweeping wave of feeling that is developing is most clearly shown in the bye elections already referred to, and which form an unbroken stream. On the eve of the General Strike, after the miners' wage-cuts had been posted, came the Bothwell bye-election, where a previous Labour majority of 3000 was doubled and became 6000, and East Ham, where a Conservative majority of 1000 was turned into a labour majority of 1600. Immediately after the General Strike, when the press was proclaiming the Baldwin Government as the saviour of the nation and the most popular government in history, came North Hammersmith, where a Conservative majority of 2000 was turned into a Labour majority of 3600. Last week came Wallsend, where a previous Labour majority of 1600 became 9000.

This wave of working class feeling finds no leadership in the Parliamentary Labour Party or the General Council. The only new leadership before the working class is expressed through the Communist Party and the Minority Movement. The result is a very striking expansion of these since the General Strike. In the few weeks that have elapsed, 4000 workers have joined the Communist Party — equal to half the previous membership of the Party, and a sensational figure for English conditions. The circulation of the party organ has risen to 70,000. Local labour parties and trades councils are moving to closer unity with the Communists. The London Trades Council, the largest and foremost of the Trade Councils, at its Annual Conference just held, has elected a Communist, Vaughan, as Chairman, besides passing resolutions on the lines of Communist policy in current questions of the strike (demand for embargo on coal, protest against General Council etc.)

All this shows that, beneath the hardening of the Labour bureaucracy to the Right, and the reaction of the Baldwin Government, a profound process is taking place in the working class. What began, even in the first days of the General Strike, as simply a wage-struggle in the consciousness of the majority of the workers, is widening out by the experience of the past thirteen weeks, by the action of the Government and its strike-breaking forces, and the inaction of the leadership, into a growing consciousness of class struggle, of struggle against the Government and of struggle against the reformist leadership.

The Situation in Belgium.

By P. B. (Brussels).

The economic situation in Belgium is very critical, with the result that the political situation is decidedly disturbed and offers the possibility of great surprises.

The Belgian bourgeoisie, represented by the Poulet-Vandervelde government, is attempting to restore the shaken finances of Belgium at the cost of the working class.

The Belgian working class had, as a matter of fact, cherished illusions regarding the stabilisation. It is also not to be denied that the great majority of the workers of Belgium are still under the influence of the Belgian social democratic Labour Party. What wonder, therefore, is it that the workers are given over to illusions, when this party welcomed loans as a blessing from heaven?

The disappointment, therefore, will now be the more bitter the more the franc falls, the more all the social democratic promises prove deceitful, and the more prices increase and the cost of living rises without a corresponding increase in wages.

Although the catholic-socialist ministry of Poulet-Vandervelde had a sufficiently broad basis in the country, although the socialists could count to a considerable extent, and still can, upon the workers, and the catholics upon the rural population, the Poulet-Vandervelde government were compelled, as they were incapable of dealing with the situation, to proclaim themselves bankrupt. After a crisis lasting a week, a new cabinet under the leadership of the liberal reactionary Jaspars was formed, consisting of "financial technicians", or more correctly said, of bankers, speculators and five social democrats, with the indispensable Vandervelde as Foreign Minister.

For the second time since 1914 we are witnessing the spectacle of a government of the "Union Sacrée" (Sacred Union). In 1914 it was a question of defending all the interests and the native country of the bourgeoisie. To-day it is a question of defending the rascalties of the bourgeoisie and dragging along the burdens left by the war. To-day, as in 1914, the social democrats do not hesitate to betray the cause of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie in the name and in the interest of the native country. And thus the social democracy is again to-day, at a moment of the most serious and greatest responsibility, proceeding to take part in the government.

The social democratic leaders are pledging the whole of the interests of the working class to the "Union Sacrée", at the very moment when the proletariat is beginning to recognise that it is precisely the "Union Sacrée" that will fail to bring a stable valuta, or at least wages that increase with the cost of living. The social democracy is playing the role of a great party, with very little prospect of success, at a period which is far removed from 1914. But what can it do otherwise, now that it is once caught in the machinery of the bourgeois State?

Although the social democrats are in the government, Belgian Fascism, in the garb of the "National Legion", is increasing its preparations to set up armed detachments in order to be able to strike at a favourable moment. Signs of activity are already to be seen. They have also carried out attacks. At demonstrations and meetings the fascists behave in a thoroughly military fashion, and not only that, the fascist reaction is proceeding from words to deeds. And all this in a country in which five social democrats are in the government, and where there exists a thoroughly effective and strong trade union and political organisation which is the pride of the second International.

It is true that proletarian Defence Corps are being organised, but how far it is really intended to carry on an actual fight against fascism can be judged from the fact that the Communists are being expelled from these Defence Corps.

It is true the social democratic press and the leaders of the trade unions are carrying on an agitation against fascism, but only with phrases and with the object of diverting the attention of the workers from the development of the social democratic policy, which is linked up with the government. And whilst, on the one hand, they make a great outcry, on the other hand they give fascism the possibility of organising and arming itself, and expel from the Defence Corps the Communists who are ready and eager to carry on a real fight against fascism.

The Communist Party of Belgium is still a young Party, but nevertheless it has recently made considerable progress and greatly increased its influence in the factories. It is working with all its energy in order to make plain to the masses of the proletariat the two-faced attitude of the social democracy, and to bring together the whole of the Belgian working class in a united front against fascism and against the policy of the "Union Sacrée", which, in spite of all the fine speeches, permits fascism to become stronger. In addition to this, our Party is conducting an energetic campaign for a sliding wage-scale and in order that the results of the collapse of the Franc shall be borne by the capitalists and not by the working population.

The Imperialists in the Orient.

By F. Raskolnikov.

During the last few months, the efforts of world imperialism have been crowned with partial success in a number of Oriental countries. The defeat of Abd el Krim in Morocco, Chang Tso Lin's victory and the defeat of the people's armies in China, the strengthening of English influence in Persia, the concessions made by Turkey in the Mosul question — all these are inseparable links of one and the same chain.

In reality, our enemies' achievements are gained at the price of fulminant, incessant growth of internal contradictions, which are causing the decay of world imperialism.

It might have been thought that the victory of France in the first colonial war after the world slaughter, the destruction of the Riffs in Morocco and the victory over the Druses in Syria, whose revolt is on the decline, would have opened up wide prospects of further expansion of French imperialism. In reality

however, the victory of France in her colonial wars is accompanied by a serious weakening of her international position. France has in the East literally no one on whom to rely. Before our very eyes, an Anglo-Italian Bloc is coming into being, which will take the lead not only in Africa, not only on the Mediterranean coast, but in the whole of the Near East. This Bloc, the idea of which was obviously conceived at the autumn conference between Chamberlain and Mussolini is a weapon aimed at France and France alone. The colonial policy of Fascist Italy is assuming more and more the aggressive character of belligerent imperialism.

The chief aim of Mussolini's policy in the East is Tunis. Nominally Tunis is a French colony, but in actual fact Italy exercises the strongest economic influence over it. It is well-known that there is no unemployment in France. On the contrary, an elementary influx of foreign workers from Italy, Poland and other countries has been going on for the last few years. On the other hand, the enormous increase of Italy's population, which has already reached 40.5 million, thus exceeding that of France by more than a million, drives many thousands emigrants abroad every year. The consequence is that Tunis is now no longer being colonised by France, but by Italy. To every 40,000 Frenchmen in Tunis there are 100,000 Italian subjects. The wealth of the soil of Tunis is being bought up wholesale by the Italian bourgeoisie. The land which passes into the hands of Italian owners, is cultivated by Italian agricultural workers who come, as they always have done, from Sicily.

Its economic significance makes Tunis an extremely important, strategically important, point both for France and for Italy. Being separated from Sicily by a distance of only ninety miles, Tunis can, by means of long-distance guns, divide the Mediterranean into two parts and reduce the significance of the Adriatic to that of an inland sea. The Washington Conference stipulated that the numerical strength of the French and Italian navies should be equal. In view of the fact that the whole Italian navy is concentrated in the waters of the Mediterranean, whilst the chief force of the French navy is in the Atlantic Ocean, Italy has an actual preponderance in the Mediterranean. This circumstance alone is enough to stimulate Italian imperialism to thirst for the offensive.

Other complications, adding to the Franco-Italian contradictions, are arising in Abyssinia. Leaving the Negro Republic Liberia out of account, Abyssinia is the only formally independent State in Africa which comprises a large and comparatively thinly populated territory. Abyssinia has only 5 million inhabitants; it can absorb a large number of Italian immigrants. From the economic point of view, Abyssinia is rich in gold, silver and iron. Taken as a whole, this whets the appetite of the Knights of Italian Fascism. Should Abyssinia be throttled and divided up, England would leave the Eastern part to Italy and seize the Western part for herself, in order to have control of the sources of the Blue Nile and to be able to carry out her vast plans of irrigation. The division of Abyssinia which is contained sub rosa in the Anglo-Italian agreement, snatches the dainty morsel from France and creates an immediate danger for the French colonies in North Africa.

The termination of the war with the Riffs gives rise to new difficulties in France. Apart from the fact that the guerilla war of individual rebellious tribes against French imperialism will continue, the conflicting interests of France and Spain are only now, in spite of the subjugation of Abd el Krim, becoming evident in their fight for Morocco, which is artificially divided into spheres of interest. Finally Algeria will be colonised by Spain just as Tunis is colonised by Italy. Also in this fight Spain will receive the support of the Anglo-Italian imperialist Bloc.

Relations between England and France are obviously becoming more acute. The chief points of dissension are:

1. The fight for markets. As regards imports and exports, England holds the first place, not only in her own colonies Mesopotamia, Palestine and Trans-Jordania but also in trade with the French colony of Syria.

2. The fight for territorial conquest. England is endeavouring to lay hands on at least part of Syria and claims especially Djebel Drus where a revolt against French imperialism is at present going on.

3. The fight for the Hedjas railway which connects Damascus with Mecca and Medina. The ownership of this railway

is at present in three different hands. The line **Damascus—Ebra** is in the hands of **France**, **Ebra—Amann—Maana** in the hands of **England** and **Maana—Mecca—Medina** in the hands of the **Sultan Ibn Saud**, the ruler of the **Arabian States Hedjas** and **Nedjed**. The greater part of the shares are held in **France**. **England** is endeavouring to take possession of these railways.

4. The rivalry for influence over the **Sultan Ibn Saud**, who is beginning to play a more and more important part in the **Arabian Orient**.

5. The rivalry in armaments. The **English Mediterranean fleet** is three times as strong as the **French** and twice as strong as the **French** and **Italian** together.

6. The fight for the **Mosul petroleum** and for influence over **Turkey**. The termination of the revolt of the **Druses** will bring **France** face to face with **England** and intensify still further their dissensions in the **Near East**.

At the same time, in the **Far East**, **Japanese industry** is supplanting the **French** in **Indo-China**. **American imperialism**, which does not care for externals but knows how to take deeper and deeper root, has quite imperceptibly established its influence over **Tahiti** and the **Marquesas Islands**, the **French colonies** in the **Pacific Ocean**.

France's efforts to gain the sympathies of the **Mohammedan world** ended in a fiasco. The brutal suppression of the **Syrian insurrection**, especially the destruction of **Damascus**, alienated even the **Mohammedan bourgeois circles** from **France**. Neither did her coquetting with **Turkey** lead to anything after the fact was known that "**la belle France**" had betrayed **Turkey's** interests in the **Mosul question**.

The imperialists owe their success largely to imperialism having won over the upper strata of the native bourgeoisie in many countries.

The so-called moderates in **India**, **Ziwar Pasha** and his adherents in **Egypt**, the **Compradores** and some of the imperialists in **China**, the **Jewish big bourgeoisie** in **Palestine**, the **Christian native bourgeoisie** in **Syria**, the **Progressive People's Party** in **Turkey**, the **Anglophiles** in **Persia** — are all representatives of the richest and most powerful strata of the national bourgeoisie who have formed a coalition with world imperialism against the revolutionary movement in their own country.

World imperialism understands how to make its way to the hearts of the native bourgeoisie by economic concessions, by the introduction of protective tariffs and interesting them in operations of export and import, by distributing ministerial seats and other posts, and in this way to create a social basis within the country in question in order to gain a footing both politically and economically. This process is going on most intensively in the advanced countries of the Orient, such as **India** and **China**, where capitalism is developing, the working class growing and the revolutionary crisis approaching maturity. For these reasons a split in the **National Congress** and the **Swaraj party** in **India** is historically inevitable. Up to the present, this party only unites the big bourgeois elements, which tend to come to an understanding with the **English Government**, with the revolutionary nationalist petty bourgeoisie.

British imperialism in **India** has succeeded, not only in winning to its side a considerable part of the large bourgeoisie, but also in fanning artificially the national hatred between **Hindus** and **Mohammedans**. We know from our experience of the **Czarist policy** of colonisation in **Trans-Caucasia**, how clever **Czarism** was at setting the national groups by the ears against one another with the help of the police. We need only recall the **Armenian-Moslem massacres** in **Baku** and in other towns of the present **Soviet Aserbeidjan**.

In **China**, world imperialism succeeds in finding support not only from the **Compradores** who play the part of intermediaries between the imperialists and the so-called Chinese militarists. The militarists are not isolated; they are not mere pawns in the hands of the imperialists, but each of them reflects the interests of certain social strata. **Chang Tso Lin** for instance relies on the support of the feudal landed proprietors of the three northern provinces which together form **Manchuria**. **Wu Pei Fu** is the spokesman of the interests of the Chinese big bourgeoisie, to whom the textile factories belong. Two years ago, the **Canton Government** was nothing but a militarist group with **Sun Yat Sen** at its head. In the process of further development, the **Kuomintang**, which defends the interests of the petty

bourgeoisie with revolutionary tendencies, crystallised itself out of this group.

In recent times the greatest victory of the imperialists in **China** has been the agreement between **Chang Tso Lin** and **Wu Pei Fu**. The conference which recently took place between them, aimed at forming a Cabinet out of their united forces, which is a necessity for both, if they wish to obtain a foreign loan.

The alliance between **Chang Tso Lin** and **Wu Pei Fu** against the people's armies is the highest achievement of reaction. But this pact will not be of long duration. Before long the **Coalition Government**, which was patched together in great haste by the victorious cliques of generals, will collapse like a house built of cards. **Chang Tso Lin** and **Wu Pei Fu** have, from time immemorial, been opponents who hate one another to the death. As recently as in the autumn of 1924, **Chang Tso Lin** conducted the overthrow of the **Chili Government** and forced **Wu Pei Fu** to save himself by fleeing from **Peking**. Thus these two "allies" harbour the greatest suspicion of one another.

There are however deeper causes than their reciprocal personal hatred, which stand in the way of a permanent understanding between these militarists. They represent the interests of different classes of society, between which reconciliation is impossible at the present stage. **Chang Tso Lin** is supported by **Japan**, whilst **Wu Pei Fu** is backed by **England**. The interests of these imperialist Powers in **China** are full of irreconcilable contradictions which exclude the possibility of a lasting understanding.

Furthermore, **Wu Pei Fu** has actually no military force at his disposal. He only has small cadres for the protection of his own person and a few thousand bayonets. The military agreement between **Chang Tso Lin** and **Wu Pei Fu** as to a common attack on the people's armies is therefore disadvantageous for the former, as in this case the whole burden of the war will fall on the **Mukden troops**, whilst the spoils of war will have to be divided. Apart from this, the people's armies have not the least intention of handing over their spoils of war, for they have preserved their full vigour, are in the neighbourhood of **Peking** and are now even marching against the province of **Chansi**. The first people's army under **Feng Yu Siang**, which has preserved its military organisation and discipline, is in particularly good condition. The victory of **Anglo-American imperialism** in **China** is therefore quite relative and uncertain.

Passing on to **Persia**, we must admit that in that country **English influence** has gained in strength. At the elections, the **Anglophile elements** carried off the victory. **Wossug Ud Doule**, a pronounced **Anglophile** will apparently soon become **Prime Minister**. It was he who was responsible for the treaty of enslavement to **England**, which was concluded in 1919 but was fortunately not ratified by the **Persian Parliament**.

Even though, however, **Wossug** should come into power, his policy, for external, objective reasons, will not be of so vehemently **Anglophile** a character as was the case in 1919 and 1920. Firstly, **Persia** is not the same as it was five or six years ago; **Persia** is no longer the weak, disunited country, occupied by foreign troops, which it was immediately after the great war. Secondly, **Persia's** northern neighbour, the **Soviet Union**, has during these years, become a powerful State which has entered into close economic relations with **Persia** and has, by peaceful means, gained political authority among the classes which count in **Persia**. Thirdly and finally, **Wossug's** rule will be under the control of **Reza Khan**, who cannot be described as a friend of **England**, as he is an advocate of the independence of **Persia** and of the policy of reform. **Reza Khan** came into power in the fight against the feudal agrarians; he undermined their economic power and made the semi-independent feudal landed proprietors subject to the power of the centralised apparatus of State.

The policy of reform in **Persia** is advancing steadily. Considering the backward, patriarchal conditions of the country, these progressive reforms mark an important step forwards in the economic development of **Persia** along the path of its transformation from a semi-feudal to a semi-capitalist State. Reforms in internal policy and manoeuvres in foreign policy between imperialist **England** and the **Soviet Union** are the lines along which **Reza's** activities will advance in the immediate future.

The **Turkish Government**, which has all along maintained an intransigent attitude in the **Mosul question**, recently con-

cluded a treaty with **England**, which practically amounts to **Turkey renouncing all claims to Mosul**. This is an undoubted triumph for English politics; it does not however give grounds for drawing the conclusion that from now onwards Turkey will continue to hold an Anglophile course in her politics.

The Turkey of **Kemal Pasha** will continue to be a friend of the **Soviet Union** and an enemy of imperialism. Turkey was compelled to make concessions in the Mosul question because it needs a breathing space, because it wishes to avoid a war in which it would be opposed not only by the **English navy** but also by the allied forces of the **Italian and Greek armies**. The **Mosul Agreement** is a kind of **Brest-Litovsk**; it does not settle Anglo-Turkish disagreements. Turkey will never be content with the final loss of Mosul. The disease which has been driven inwards, will only shatter and destroy Anglo-Turkish relations more than ever.

The **Caliphate Conference**, which was summoned by the English in **Cairo** in order to get the Egyptian **King Fuad** chosen as Caliph, ended in failure. In **Afghanistan**, England's attempts to make capital out of the **Urta-Tugaj** conflict came to nothing. In **Turkey**, the conspiracy against **Mustapha Kemal Pasha** failed.

We must thus form the conclusion that the imperialists do meet with a certain amount of success, but the mighty conflicts of the interests of the imperialist robbers and the elements of contradiction in their victories, in consequence of the growing national movement for liberation, create wide, promising prospects.

In recent times a process of strong orientation towards the **Left** of the national revolutionary parties in the East can be noticed. The "**Istiklal**" party in **Syria**, the **Watanists** in **Mesopotamia** and the **Left wing** of the **Swarajists** in **India** reflect these growing tendencies.

THE WHITE TERROR

Pilsudski's Murderous Government Refuses to Grant an Amnesty.

By K. L. (Warsaw).

Pilsudski, the dictator of the large landed proprietors and capitalists of Poland, has at last replied to the general demand for the release of the political prisoners in Poland. His answer is in the **negative**.

This answer was contained in the Government Declaration read in the **Seim** by **Bartel**, Pilsudski's Prime Minister on the 19th inst.

Mr. Bartel observed a cynical silence when voices were raised in the ranks of the **Communists**, of the radical peasant

deputies and of the **Ukranian and White Russian** deputies, demanding the release of the political prisoners.

Mr. Bartel on the contrary declared that the Government "would decidedly oppose all attempts which threaten the interests of the State".

This provocative statement indicates that the Pilsudski Government has not the least intention of changing its attitude towards the **Communists** or towards those who are fighting against national oppression. All of them are, from the point of view of Pilsudski and of the landed proprietors, capitalists and leaders of the **P. P. S.**, people who "threaten the interests of the State". Like all the previous governments, Pilsudski's Government will continue to thrust into prison and murder the **Communists** and the **Ukranian and White Russian** peasants.

This policy of the **White Terror** is all the more necessary for the Pilsudski Government, because it hopes in this way to destroy the remains of political distrust of Pilsudski which exists in the possessing class of Poland. It will convince the **Black Reaction**, which compares Pilsudski with **Kerenski**, that it is **Mussolini** or **Zankoff** whom the most recent dictator in Poland takes as his pattern.

At the same time the Government is trying to rouse deceptive illusions, for the Polish Government is promising that in the second half of 1926 it will rescind the verdicts for political crimes committed — before April 1st 1923! The majority of those who are sentenced before that date (the date when East Galicia was conceded to Poland) have already been released from prison, in so far as they had not perished behind the prison bars. At the same time those who have been arrested during the last three years must remain in prison, but it is just during these last years that the wholesale **White Terror** has raged in **West Ukraine** and **West White Russia**.

This is one reason why the promise to rescind the verdicts is valueless; the second reason is that the Government intends only to grant individual pardons at the suggestion of the public prosecutors. The public prosecutors of the worthy Polish Republic are a band of blood-thirsty sadistic defenders of the bourgeois order, and the Pilsudski Government which relies on their recommendations, is certain that, among the thousands of prisoners, only a few exceptions will come into consideration for the amnesty.

The renewed refusal of the murderous Pilsudski Government to grant an amnesty is a challenge to the masses of Polish workers and peasants who are fighting for bread and freedom. This challenge will only strengthen the fight of the masses for the liberation of the political prisoners from the prisons of the bourgeoisie and the large landowners, the fight against Pilsudski and the **White Terror**.

The international proletariat must reinforce the action which it is taking against the **White Terror** in Poland out of fraternal solidarity with the Polish workers and peasants.