

strongly held suspicions of the German Delegation that Comrade Zinoviev was still supporting the anti-Communist and anti-Party "Ultra-Left" group in Germany (Ruth Fischer-Schloem-Urbahns-Korsch). The renewed fractional activities of Comrade Zinoviev and the suggestion of Comrade Trotsky—unopposed by Comrade Zinoviev—at the last Plenum of the Russian Central Committee, to the effect that renewed support be given to this and similar groups, make it impossible to ignore the question of Comrade Zinoviev's position any longer.

4. The Political Bureau of the British Party, while continuing its own campaign of exposure of the so-called "Left Wingers" on the General Council as men who, at every critical moment during and since the General Strike, not only capitulated to the Right Wing but by their silence helped to screen them from the anger of the workers, is at one with the majority of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. in condemning the suggestion of the Opposition that the Russian trade unions should withdraw from the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council. This suggestion, if adopted, would have meant a particularly heavy blow at the cause of world trade union unity at the present time, when the British workers have had visible evidence of the futility and treachery of the Amsterdam International and its official supporters in Great Britain, by their obstruction and boycott of every action destined to help the miners. Such tactics, dictated either by despair or by an overestimate of the degree of revolutionisation of the British workers, come well enough from the emotional and confused armoury of Comrade Trotsky, the apostle of "permanent revolution", but they are not to be expected from the Chairman of the F. C. C. I.

5. A full report of the decisions of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. and of the events leading up to them, shall be made at the next session of the Central Committee of the British Party, and the present resolution laid before it for endorsement.

Statement of the Central Committee of the Workers (Communist) Party of America.

The Central Executive Committee of the Workers (Communist) Party, having considered the decisions of the plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party, makes the following declaration:

The Fourteenth Congress of our brother party, the All-Union Communist Party, considered the problems of Communist reconstruction of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics with a Leninist spirit and with Leninist thoroughness and decided on a correct policy for the development of a socialist economic system in the Soviet Union. The opposition, overwhelmingly defeated at this congress, merely voiced an unwholesome pessimism arising out of its loss of confidence in the revolutionary perseverance, tenacity and optimism of the industrial proletariat. This pessimism was expressed in unLeninist and leftist phrases culminating in prophecies of the "dire fate of the revolution".

The parties organized in the Communist International and our American Party among them, had hoped that in spite of its mistakes, the opposition, and its leader, Comrade Zinoviev, would at least preserve the indispensable Bolshevik discipline and accept the judgment of the party, and apply itself to the task of executing the decisions of the Fourteenth Congress of the All-Union Communist Party.

This hope was not well founded. The opposition proceeded to organize against the Central Committee and against the decisions of the Fourteenth congress. The organization of a faction within a Communist Party, at all times a dangerous act, becomes treasonable in a country where the Communist Party has led the proletariat to power and where dissension in the party becomes the center of hope for all enemies of the proletariat.

To preserve the unity of the All-Union Communist Party and to secure the unhampered execution of the policies of the party, the Central Committee through its plenary session, was forced to take strong disciplinary measures. The removal of Comrade Zinoviev from the Polit-Bureau and the exclusion of the candidate member, Comrade Lashevitch, from the Central Committee, decided upon the plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party, was fully justified by their breaches of discipline. These measures were necessary to secure and cement the unity and revolutionary efficiency of our brother party and to prevent the spreading of un-Leninist theories within the party. The measures taken will strengthen the Central Committee in its struggle against the liquidation of Leninism by Trotskyism, through the oppositional alliance between Zinoviev and Trotsky, and, finally, they will strengthen the All-Union Communist Party in its Leninist leadership of the Communist International.

The rapid disintegration of capitalism in Europe confronts our International with tremendous tasks. The unity and Leninist purity of the Communist International is the only guarantee for the proletariat, that these tasks will be met and victory will be achieved. Flirtation by the opposition within the All-Union Communist Party with left and right deviations alike, such as Urbahns in Germany, Souvarine in France, as best an unprincipled step suggest by factional aims, became under these conditions an act endangering the very revolution itself. The measures taken by the plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party against the opposition are therefore a step saying as much the unity and Leninist integrity of the Communist International as the unity and Leninist integrity of our brother party, the All-Union Communist Party.

The Central Executive Committee of the Workers (Communist) Party greets the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party in full solidarity with its measures against an opposition which threatened by its activities not only the unity but also the revolutionary achievements of the advance guard of the Russian and world proletariat.

Central Executive Committee,
Workers (Communist) Party.

C. E. Ruthenberg, General Secretary

To our Readers!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1,50 marks
Austria	2 (Austrian) Schillings
Norway	2 crowns
Sweden	1,50 crowns
Denmark	2 crowns

The subscription rate for other countries is three dollars (or equivalent in local currency) for six months.

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers besides the Regular Number.

Andreyev: Report on the Session of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris.

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 58

26th August 1926

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

CONTENTS

For the Struggle and the Victory of the British Coal Miners! Manifesto of the Communist International to the Communist Parties and to the Workers in All Countries.
Declaration of the Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions on the British Miners' Strike.
Politics.
N. Mermel: The Yugoslavian-Bulgarian Conflict and Willingness to go for a Colonial Conference.
In the Colonies.
Kim-Sa-Hom: A National Demonstration in Korea Against the Japanese Imperialists.

Résolution of the Weber Group in the C. P. of Germany on the Russian Question.
The Berlin "Rote Fahne" on the Resolution of the Weber Group.
MARXIST: Concerning the Platform of Comrade Weber.
For the Unity of the C. P. S. U.
N. Burkhardt: The Party and the Opposition Block. (Conclusion).
The C. C. of the C. P. of Norway to the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.
The Miners' Struggle in England.
The Session of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris. Report of Comrade Andreyev in the Extraordinary Plenary Session of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, August 12, 1926 I.
International Youth Day.

Declaration of the Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions on the British Miners' Strike.

For the Struggle and the Victory of the British Coal Miners! Manifesto of the Communist International to the Communist Parties and to the Workers in All Countries.

On May 12th, 1926, when the General Council, jointly with the Baldwin Government, established the British working class in the back by calling off the General Strike, the miners bravely declared that they will continue the fight. The British miners have kept their word. They are continuing their heroic struggle in spite of the fact that they are being opposed by the united front of the perfidious British bourgeoisie and of its conscious and unconscious lackeys.

The last weeks have proved particularly critical for the striking miners. In order to defeat the miners, there appeared upon the

stage the petty church people with their usual prattle about brotherhood and love. The aim of the church people is clear: They want to impose upon the miners the very programme of reduced wages and lowered living standards against which the miners have rebelled. The ruling classes of Great Britain, unable to defeat the miners in open fighting, have arrayed against them the subtle Bishops to use their shrewdness to overcome the mighty resistance of the miners. The miners' leaders, however, they proposed to the miners to accept the programme of the Bishops, which is essentially constitutes an attempt to cause a breach in the united front of the miners. But the masses of the miners realised the truth, and to the coaxing of the disorganised

as well as to the persuasion by their leaders, they clearly and emphatically declared:

"We will not surrender, but will fight to the victorious end." In the meantime the General Council of the British Trade Unions, as well as the whole of the Amsterdam International, have manifestly shown that they are deliberately and systematically preparing for a deal of the miners. The Amsterdam International cynically refuses to collect money for the maintenance of the starving families of the miners on the grounds that it was not asked to do so by the General Council. The General Council has wasted time in fruitless negotiations about a loan by the wealthy sections of the Amsterdam International, which did not blush in asking for usurious rates of interest and for material security in advancing a loan to the miners. This is the way the Amsterdam leaders understand the duty of solidarity.

As to the General Council itself, notwithstanding the complete failure of its loan negotiations, it still declined to discuss the question of assistance to the miners at the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee held at Paris on July 30-31, a conference specially called for this purpose upon the initiative of the U.S.S.R. Central Council of Trade Unions. While the sections of the Amsterdam International have played the role of usurers, the General Council, in turn, as a condition for its participation in rendering aid to the miners jointly with the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, demanded indulgence in all its sins and crimes committed towards the British and the world proletariat. At the Conference of July 30-31 the representatives of the General Council, upon instructions from the latter, arrogantly demanded from the revolutionary unions of the Soviet Union to retract their declaration in which the truth about the treachery of the General Council had been exposed before the toilers throughout the world.

Under these circumstances the fight of the miners acquires exceptional importance. The British miners are now the vanguard of the British proletariat, protecting its vital rights against the capitalist offensive. It is the task of the British workers to ensure at all costs the victory for the heroic fighters. They must see to it that the General Council shall not dare to wreck the Anglo-Russian Committee which had been founded by the will of the workers of England and of the Soviet Union, and which has for its aim the struggle for trade union unity against the capitalist offensive. At no time was this Committee so indispensable to the workers, and in the first place to the fighting miners.

Declaration of the Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions on the British Miners' Strike.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions claims to the British miners that it is not passing through its most critical period after more than three months of heroic struggle.

At home, in British, the mine owners, bourgeoisie and State are lined up against the miners. Come what may, the capitalists are determined to bring the miners to their knees. To this end the Government is passing legislation for the introduction of the eight-hour working day for the workers below ground; the Government is threatening the trade unions with new laws that will render null and void the right to strike, and is thereby preparing to break up the trade union movement. Municipal relief for the strikers is being reduced and in many localities completely stopped; Johnson-Hicks is carrying out mass arrests among the miners.

In order to carry disintegration into the united front of the miners, the coal-owners for their part are submitting district agreements in the hope of smashing the courageous, rock-firm army of the miners. Having broken that army into separate sections, the mine owners will tighten up their pressure along the whole front thrown up by the miners, and this will be immediately made use of by the entire bourgeoisie to undertake an attack against the whole working class. The "compromise"

as now it is the task of the British workers to compel the General Council and its delegation to the Anglo-Russian Committee to agree to direct and thorough-going aid to the striking coal miners; and should the General Council refuse such aid to the coal-miners, its new factory should be immediately exposed so as to replace its members by new people that are worthy of the calling of representatives of the British workers in the General Council of the British Trade Unions.

It is furthermore the duty of the British workers, as well as those of other countries, to form a solid wall of defence around the fighting miners and to protect them against British capital and the Conservative Government which, anticipating a victory over the miners, are already preparing blows for the workers in the other branches of British industry. The aid to the miners must be quick and efficacious. It must be raised in levies upon the wages of all the workers who are avowedly proletarians and the workers of the Soviet Union to the British miners must become an example for the workers of all countries.

Along with the organisation of the work of material aid to the miners, it is necessary right now to proceed to organise an embargo on coal transport. The stopping of the movement of coal shipments to British ports will mean a great triumph for the cause of solidarity, and real aid to the striking miners.

Sending ardent greetings to the British miners, the Communist International calls upon all the Communist Parties and upon the revolutionary workers throughout the world to increase tenfold their vigour in raising assistance for the miners. The victory of the miners, purchased at the price of joint actions by the advanced workers of all countries, will be the augury of the fighting alliance of all the workers against capitalism and against imperialism.

- Long live the struggle and the victory of the British coal miners!
 - Long live the aid of the workers of all countries to the British miners!
 - Long live the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie!
 - Long live Communism!
- The Executive Committee of the Communist International
Moscow, August 16, 1926.

memorandum of the Bishops is one of the methods adopted by Government and the employers to shake the miners' ranks.

In face of this constant presence of the bourgeoisie the behaviour of the working masses of the miners remains astonishingly militant. The fact that certain groups, including the miners' leaders, have wavered, the majority of the strikers turned down the Bishops' memorandum. Thereby the miners of Britain have proved to the world that they will remain in their old positions: "Not a penny off the pay, not a second on the day! National agreements only!"

But despite the furious attack of the entire British bourgeoisie victory would be secured for the miners were the trade union movement of Britain and the whole world to actively support the strikers. Yet in this direction we are witnessing a treachery and open sabotage on the part of the General Council, the Amsterdam International and its affiliated body, i.e. on the part of organisations designed to defend the interests of the working class, that is incredible in the history of the trade union movement.

No one any longer doubts but that the General Council broke the general strike at the very peak of that movement. No matter what excuses the General Council may make to the wor-

king class throughout the world, it cannot hide the fact that from the very beginning inside the General Council they were against the general strike and against the miners. It was only under tremendous pressure from the masses that the General Council adopted the miners' programme of demands. But as soon as it became plain that the carrying out of that programme of demands would require a determined and daring struggle along the whole front of the labour movement, the General Council shamefully sold the working class by taking their stand with the bourgeoisie, and proposed to the miners that they agree to the notorious Samuel memorandum which at bottom stood for the salvation of capitalism at the expense of the working class, at the expense of wage reductions for the miners.

By turning down that memorandum the mass of the mine workers condemned the General Council leaders. In order to escape being justly condemned, the General Council, by means of hypocritical promises to help the miners, moved that the Miners' Federation postpone the Conference of Executives appointed for June 25th. Having got their way in this matter, the General Council forthwith turned front against the miners. In name of the General Council Bromley published an article in which he tried to prove that for all the General Council's treachery the people to blame were the miners, and the General Council had never made any promise to support the miners' programme of demands.

A still more manifest instance of the General Council's treachery we see in the last meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris. As the resolution adopted by the Plenum of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union states, the British Delegation "refused to go into the question of the miners".

At a moment when an army of workers over a million strong were holding out against the incredible pressure of the united employers in spite of all threats; at a moment when distress among the three millions of the mine working masses had reached its highest point, the General Council refused to consider the question of helping the heroic fighters in Britain. Such a step is to be found nowhere in the history of the working class' strike struggle.

No less treacherous is the behaviour of the Amsterdam International and its affiliated bodies. Like the General Council it too immediately put a stop to the assistance for the strikers that had been begun as soon as it knew the general strike had been called off. Like the General Council, the Amsterdam International isolated itself from the miners and tried to isolate the latter from the rest of the working class. But the miners' strike confirmed and the need for help grew. And it is from this need that the Amsterdam International and its affiliated organisations want to extract the maximum material advantages. Amsterdam "nobly" proposed giving a loan, but demanded certain material securities for this loan from the miners. The Dutch Trade Union Federation headed by the "radical" Stenhuis is demanding 4% for the loan, whilst the General Federation of German Trade Unions headed by Leipart and Sassenbach whose business acumen is higher, is demanding 11%.

That is the way Amsterdam and its henchmen want to secure the prosperity of their funds by drawing on the blood of the miners out on strike, their funds being dearer to them than the interests of the British miners, than the interests of the spearhead of the working class.

The majority of the International Trade Secretariats have shown themselves no better in this strike. The Miners' International has most outrageously sabotaged all support whatsoever of the miners. Husemann, the President of the German miners, the most powerful section of the Miners' International, has concluded an agreement with the German mine owners. Britain's chief coal competitors on the continent, with a view to making the most out of the British strike. From Germany more than 4.5 million tons of coal have been imported into Britain. The British transport workers and railwaymen, as well as those on the continent, are transporting scab coal into the European ports and bringing it over for British industry.

The striking miners are thus surrounded by a close cordon consisting of the sabotage of the General Council and the Amsterdam International and its affiliated organisations on the one hand, while on the other they are faced with the solid front

of the united capitalists and bourgeoisie of Britain and the whole world.

Only those sections affiliated to the R.I.L.U. have fully carried out to the end their duty of international class solidarity. With unexampled enthusiasm, the revolutionary unions of the U.S.S.R. responded to the British miners' struggle by sending them a large measure of assistance to the amount of over 4.5 million roubles. The revolutionary unions of France and Czechoslovakia, and the revolutionary working masses of other countries have given what they can of their scanty resources to help the strikers. It is only from the R.I.L.U., its affiliated bodies, and all honest workers, that the British miners have met with moral and material support. That support they will have right to the end.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions appeals to all its organisations and to the whole international proletariat steadily to continue the collection of funds.

The British miners are fighting in the forward positions of the working class. The economic significance behind this tremendous struggle is that of struggle against the feudal organisation of industry. From the general class point of view, the British miners' struggle represents a reflection of the pressure of Capital which is threatening to go over to the general offensive not only in Britain but throughout the whole world. And any such offensive will mean not only a worsening of working conditions but also efforts to smash the entire trade union movement, will signify a strengthening of the reaction and a threat of fresh wars.

With their blood and with their need the British miners are advocating and defending the interests of the world proletariat.

One and all, help the striking miners!
The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions.

POLITICS

The Yugoslavian-Bulgarian Conflict.

By N. Mermel (Belgrade).

The collision of autonomist comitadchi at Kriva Palanka with a Servian detachment which occurred some weeks ago, gave rise to a great to-do in the irresponsible Yugoslavian Press. The belligerent tone of the Imperialist circles of Belgrade was accentuated. The Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes exploited this frontier incident, which was immeasurably overrated, to sound a great alarm in Europe, and believed, in view of the constant working up of public feeling and in the confidence reposed in the strength of the army, comparatively one of the strongest in Europe; that the moment had come to gain the ends, which they had in view for some considerable time: 1. To get hold of the rich coal-fields of Perak near the Yugoslavian-Bulgarian frontier; 2. to prevent Bulgaria from raising the loan, which she wants to float with the aid of England; 3. by means of agitation against the autonomist agents in Macedonia, to augment the terror regime, just on the eve of the local elections which are being held about this time in Macedonia, Servia and Montenegro, as these elections are of great importance.

But a check was experienced by the rulers in Belgrade, who from the beginning of the conflict had played the principal role.

It is known that the appetite of the Italian Fascists is insatiable. Mussolini is not contented with his claims in the Mediterranean, in Dalmatia and Albania. With England's approval, Italy is constantly increasing her power in the Balkans, and is aiming at becoming the European arbiter of affairs in that territory. The Bulgarian Foreign Minister, Buny, and the Prime Minister, Lippel, act upon indications from Rome. Italy intervened in Belgrade, England, too, intervened at the request of Italy with the Yugoslavian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Nisitchitch, in favour of Bulgaria. The tone and the

repeated interventions of the British Minister at Belgrade, Cinnard, were so constituted that the Serbs were obliged to yield. Regarding France, on whom the authorities in Belgrade placed so much reliance, this country could but follow the course of events passively, and, finally, to the great discomfiture and astonishment of the Serbian Government, France took the side of England and Italy. The explanation of France's recent passivity is to be found in her financial position; the stabilisation of which is at present her greatest concern.

This conflict proved that the policy of the Radical Party and of Nintichich has led to the complete isolation of Yugoslavia in Europe and that this isolation is the result of Italy's Balkan policy, a view the Opposition circles in Yugoslavia (the Democratic Party, L. Davidovich, Korochev, the Catholic Slovenian Party, etc.) are deriving hope.

Yugoslavia is not only isolated in Europe, the Bulgarian-Yugoslavian conflict proves that this is also the case in the Balkans. Towards the end of 1924, the feudal lords of Ahmed Zog, seized power in Albania with the material and moral support of Yugoslavia and her soldiers. The Democratic Government of Fan Noli were compelled to withdraw from the country. In return for this assistance, Pashich was given the Monastery of St. Naum and Vrnoshki, both important strategic points. But since that time Ahmed Zog has surrendered himself, body and soul, to the Italians and has sacrificed Yugoslavia without scruple.

In order to get a clear view of the relations of Roumania and Greece to Yugoslavia, it is only necessary to survey the attitude of these two countries during the recent conflict. It is characterised by hesitancy and vacillation. For these two countries are also acting under pressure exercised by England and Italy. Does not Salonica divide Greece from Yugoslavia? The Prime Minister of Roumania, Averescu, is under Italian influence.

The above reasons explain the delay in transmitting of the collective note of Yugoslavia and Greece to Bulgaria. It was presented on August 11th and its preparation cost a great deal of trouble. Its frailty is such that Yugoslavia had to present a note of her own, in which was demanded the surrender of those who were responsible for the war, and among them Protogeroff, a demand which has constantly been made since the end of the war.

In the note of Yugoslavia and Greece, the collective note is nothing more than a formality on the part of Yugoslavia, which country believes this necessary to the maintenance of its domestic and foreign prestige.

But this conflict again brings up the question of Macedonia. It moves that we may as well prepare ourselves for belligerent adventures which are being hatched in Belgrade, Sofia, Bukharest and Athens, though the controlling strings are manipulated in London, Rome and Paris.

The working class in the Balkans, as well as their vanguard, the Communist Parties, are aware that the Balkan question can only be solved by a Balkan Federation of Workers and Peasants. "Balkan Federation": that is the slogan of the Balkan proletarian and of the oppressed nations who desire to free themselves from the yoke of their oppressors.

For a Colonial Conference.

By Willi Münzenberg (Berlin)

In contrast to the II International, the III International has always paid the greatest attention to the movements in the colonial countries. This fact is one of the chief grounds for the hatred entertained by the Imperialist States, and more especially those with big colonial possessions, such as England, against Soviet Russia, which tolerates the seat of the III International in Moscow. For the first time since Karl Marx's death in the Communist Manifesto, the proud (imperialist) "Protectors of all countries' unity", an international workers association is yearly trying to unite the workers of all countries, the proletarians of the whole world, without distinction of colour and race, and weld them together in one big international community. The question of the colonial peoples has always occupied an important place at the congresses of the Communist International, in marked contrast to the Congress of the II Inter-

national in Marseilles, where this subject has been touched upon with great diffidence.

As guides to the political treatment of colonial questions, use is made of the theses, which Lenin published in the "Communist International" of June 1920, and which might be regarded as the basis of the attitude assumed by the Communist International. In these theses, as also later, in various guidelines adopted by International Congresses, it has rightly been pointed out that effort should be made to connect the social fight with the national-revolutionary liberation movements in the colonial countries. The Communist International does not reject on principle armed conflict. It may well happen that, in the interests of the development of proletarian revolution, the fights for freedom carried on by oppressed nations deserve our support.

This attitude was clearly and precisely formulated by the Communist International, in contrast to the sloppy slogans of Utopian bourgeois pacifists, who in their confusion are capable of going as far as the German pacifist Gerlach, who, in his "Welt am Montag" invoked victory for French arms, "against the wild hordes of the Rif Kabyles". If we support national-revolutionary movements, we naturally do so with the prospect and firm determination to carry the fight beyond the narrow bounds marked out by the Nationalist groups, not only to destroy foreign imperialism in the colonial countries but also to defeat native Capital which is in the course of development. A striking illustration of the advisability of this strategy is to be found in the Chinese fights of late years and their development.

Quite recently and chiefly in connection with the negotiations of Germany for her inclusion in the League of Nations, the question of the acquisition and restitution of German colonies has been brought up by Pan-German circles. Various groups of colony enthusiasts are carrying on, with the tacit agreement and support of the Government, an extensive propaganda for new German colonial possessions. The Press of the Right and hundreds of provincial papers are creating the desire for colonies and dozens of retired plantation owners and retired naval captains are touring the country and giving time-light lectures to interest the masses in the colonial idea. Propagandist methods are also employed. On the cardboard table-mats in the beer-houses, for example, such mottoes as "If we have no colonies, Germany can procure no raw materials", may be seen.

This propaganda, which has been carried so far by Dr. Schacht, the President of the Reichsbank, that he has proposed to float colonial companies with English and French groups of capitalists and which is said to have led to the participation of the German Bank in an English company for the exploitation of the Turkish oil wells, has provoked resistance on the part of various supporters of the Left and especially of pacifist groups. Among others, the League for Human Rights has protested repeatedly against the agitation for colonies. Recently there was formed in Germany the League Against Atrocities and Oppression in the Colonies. According to its statutes, the League has assumed the task of disclosing to the widest circles of the population the true character of colonial policy and its effect upon the oppressed colonial peoples and periodically to organise international lectures of representatives of colonial peoples.

One of the most important steps which the League has taken is the effort to convoke in the course of the present year an international conference which shall unite the representatives of numerous colonial and semi-colonial countries, as well as the representatives of organisations in all States which are sympathetically inclined towards the endeavours of colonial peoples. According to the form of invitation, the conference shall occupy itself with the following tasks:

1. Report concerning imperial oppression in the colonies. Representatives of various countries will speak upon this subject.
2. The liberation movements in the colonies and their support by the workers' organisations in the capitalist countries.
3. The co-ordination of the national liberation fights and the social fights in the colonial countries.
4. Development of the League into a big international organisation for the purpose of supporting the liberation movements in the colonies.

If possible, the conference will be held in November in Brussels. The League has nominated a provisional committee for the purpose of arranging this conference and getting into touch with colonial organisations and parties. Numerous organisations have already communicated their approval of the conference and several have even nominated delegates to the conference.

Below we quote the most interesting of these communications:

In response to the first circular, a telegraphic declaration was received from the Government of the South China Republic:

"We are in agreement with your program and believe that a solidarity movement is necessary everywhere. Kindly let us know the particulars."

The following declaration, also from Canton, came to hand from the Central Executive of the Kuo Min Tang-Party:

"In accordance with your request, we nominate Mr. Lian as our duly authorised representative at the International Anti-Imperialist Conference. Long live the unity of all who are oppressed! Central Executive of the Kuo Min Tang-Party."

A great number of favourable declarations from India, Egypt, the Sudan, South Africa, also from the West African and American Negro Congresses, show the immense interest for the proposed Colonial Conference which has been aroused in all colonial countries. If the Conference can be convened on the lines proposed and the agenda can be adhered to and a connection can be established in the individual countries between the striving Socialist organisations and the national liberation movements, the Conference may, despite the pacifist deviations which may be anticipated, fulfill a great and general task for the further development of the colonial liberation fight. The proposed conference and the League which has been founded therefore, deserve the support and collaboration of the whole of the revolutionary working class.

IN THE COLONIES

A National Anti-Japanese Demonstration in Korea.

By Kim-Sa-Hom.

The last Emperor of Korea, I-Van, who died on April 26th in Seoul, was one of those responsible for the annexation of Korea by the Japanese. It is not surprising that he enjoyed no popularity in Korea. The ingenious notion occurred to the Japanese Government of exploiting his death by preparing a magnificent funeral arranged with the aid of the Japanese Imperialist Government to the whole world of the "reconciliation" between the oppressed Koreans and the oppressors, the Japanese Imperialists. They wished to show their concern for the people of Korea and at the same time undertake a further effort towards a reconciliation with the native nobility and a portion of the intellectuals. This plan was frustrated by the Communists and the supporters of the national liberation movement on June 10th by means of a well prepared demonstration about which the Japanese police were fully informed and against which they used every means in their power, including arrest and maltreatment. That is the form which the reconciliation took. Since the revolutionary events of March 1919 and the defeat which the liberation movement then suffered, this demonstration is the first public action of the National Party now in course of formation. It is a turning point.

We have already mentioned the fact that the death of the emperor was to have been exploited for certain purposes by the Japanese Imperialists. As a matter of fact, however, it was the signal for a general offensive of the national and economically oppressed broad masses of Korea. Immediately the news of the death spread, two organisations formed and declared national mourning. The Japanese General Governor sounded the alarm in the fear that the long suppressed hatred would find expression in overt anti-Japanese actions. Arrests were made

throughout the country. The exact number of the arrests is not known, but it appears probable from report to hand that many thousands were arrested.

The national mourning was observed also by the students, who, in response to the reprisals of the Japanese and Japanese teachers began a strike which led to fresh arrests.

How bitter the feeling of the population of Korea was, and still is, can be judged by the fact that a Korean planned to assassinate the General Governor, Saito, though he mistook for him the president of the Korean branch of the Japanese Fascist Society, Takayama, whom he killed. In addition he wounded Sato, one of the presiding members of the Korean-Japanese Company. The Japanese Fascists replied to the assassination with an armed demonstration and this further gave rise to counter-action on the part of the journalists and lawyers of Korea. They protested to the Japanese Government against the attitude of the Fascists and succeeded in getting the order passed to the Fascists to keep in the background. The reprisals of the police, however, continued throughout May and June.

One week before the demonstration, the Japanese police captured a great part of the Communist proclamations, which were being printed in an illegal printing works, and as a result many Communists and members of the Communist Youth were arrested. Still, about 50,000 proclamations were distributed to explain to the population the purpose of the demonstration and the slogans used.

The whole of the Japanese police force was gathered at the funeral to protect it from the demonstrators. This was, however, not accomplished. The storm troops of the demonstration armed with leaflets, got into the funeral procession. When a certain signal was given the leaflets were distributed. The cry arose: "Down with the Japanese Imperialist! Set the political prisoners free! Withdraw the Japanese troops and police! We demand the rights of a free people!" Addresses were given by speakers, shouldered by the crowd, and, according to the whole of the Korean Press, they got a most sympathetic hearing from the masses. The crowds protected the speakers from the detectives who wished to arrest them.

At the same time as the political demonstration in Seoul, official processions were also held in other big towns, and at these too leaflets were distributed. During the funeral in Seoul more than 200 arrests were made by the police.

The Japanese police, who fully recognise the significance of the existence of a closely knit Communist Party organisation for the further development of the national liberation movement in Korea, regard the death of the emperor as a turning point. The Communist Party had been completely dissolved and that it would never be formed again, etc. They further endeavoured to represent the demonstration as a purely Communist affair, in order to create a split between the Communists and the intellectuals of the national revolutionaries. They will be successful in neither of these things.

The demonstration proved that the movement has reached an advanced stage of development, that the Communists are well established among the masses of the workers and the peasants and that all the supporters of the national liberation movement are co-operating in common actions along an unbroken national revolutionary front. It further shows that the illusions, upon which the action of the year 1919 was based and which consisted of relying on the support of Wilson and hoping for the liberation of Korea by the Conference of Versailles, have now completely disappeared.

The necessary circumstances for a revolutionary movement in Korea are provided by the social-political relations which have been created by the Japanese forces of occupation. The economic development of Korea has led to the formation of a young native working class, which is being exploited according to the time-honoured colonial system. The position of the Korean workers is indescribable. They have a working day of 12 to 13 hours, and there are absolutely no holidays and no safety contrivances. As Maslov and Ruff Fackler have formed a

The position of the peasants is even worse. About 77% of them have very little or no land at all of their own. They are compelled to lease from the Japanese landowners and the stock company concerns the land of which later has been

them. More than half of the arable land is in the hands of Japanese. The rent amounts to 60% to 70% of the harvest. In addition to this the farmers have to submit to a tremendous burden of taxation, compulsory enlistment in public service, the raids of the usurers and, in many cases, unpaid labour for the land-owner.

It must further be stated that the intellectuals and the petty bourgeoisie also suffer severely under the political and cultural oppression exercised by the Japanese. Even in the schools and in the various public the Japanese carry out their programme ruthlessly.

The most active elements in the struggle of the working masses of Korea are the workers and the farmers, who in 1925 organised a total of 300 actions, in which 91,000 farming families took part. The organising of the workers is also greatly advanced. Upon the initiative of the Communists the so-called Workers' and Peasants' Congress of Korea was held in April 1925 and attended by the various Women's and Youth organisations, as well as by representatives of socialistic circles. The weakness of the Korean revolutionary movement lies in the numerous political factions and the fact that they are but loosely in touch with the masses. To this cause must be attributed the recent growth of the terrorist movement.

The left wing of the national-revolutionary movement has been trying hard during the past year to do away with the factions and combine the available strength. There arose the young Communist Party, which has already been recognised by the C. I. and whose vital force has been shown on several occasions, including the demonstration of June 10th. The other groups in sympathy with the C. I. will no doubt consolidate in the course of the fight and form a united left wing. The fact is a very important one that through this demonstration the ground has been prepared for a broad mass movement, not, of course, under the leadership of the Communist party, but under the banner of the national liberation movement and under the leadership of the revolutionary intellectuals. The Korean Communists must do their best to promote the formation of this organisation.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Expulsion of A. Maslov and Ruth Fischer from the Communist Party of Germany.

The Central Committee of the C. P. of Germany has passed the following resolution:

A. Maslov and Ruth Fischer are expelled from the Communist Party of Germany.

Grounds:

1. Upon the initiative of Maslov-Fischer a block was created by the Maslov-Fischer group, Korsch and several others; a block which can only be designated a conspiracy against the Party.
2. The Korsch group, which held the ideologic leadership in this block, represents a distinctly counter-revolutionary platform. While this platform has not yet resolved upon the last inevitable steps in regard to interior policy, in exterior policy it already represents the extreme Right Wing Social Democratic standpoint. During the period of preparation of the Capital's attack upon the Soviet Union and of the new Imperialist direction taken by Germany, Korsch assisted these offensive tendencies in that he described the Proletarian State as a Capitalistic State. He deprecated the idea of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and, by that action, he set himself on the other side of the bar.
3. Maslov and Ruth Fischer have formed an alliance with this renegade Korsch against the Party and against the Communist International. They not only formed an ideologic relation with Korsch in allowing Korsch to develop his counter-revolutionary, Right Wing, Kautskyan thoughts as a guiding principle, but they also concluded an organic alliance with a group,

which, in the words of Korsch, "will not shrink from spitting the Party."

4. In the light of these treacherous aims we must also regard the former steps taken by Maslov and Ruth Fischer repeated breach of discipline, deceiving the Comintern, cowardly and worthy behaviour before the court (Maslov).

5. For the purpose of preparing and putting into action the disruptive intentions, Ruth Fischer and Maslov, together with several others, organised a faction, whose activity they endeavoured to extend to many district organisations of the Party.

Ruth Fischer and Maslov have shown by their alliance with Korsch as also by the methods of their factional work that the immediate purpose of their policy is the disruption of the C. P. of Germany.

6. The numerous endeavours made by the Central Committee to induce Maslov and Ruth Fischer by persuasion and appealing to them as Party comrades to induce them to return to the principles of the Party, have all been fruitless. The Party cannot allow itself to be hindered by a small group of disruptionists in the execution of its serious tasks. For this reason, expulsion is necessary.

Berlin, August 19th, 1926.

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany concerning the Affair of Lossau and Loquingen.

Lossau and Loquingen are expelled from the Communist Party of Germany and requested to relinquish at once their seats in the Prussian Parliament.

IN THE COLONIES

Lossau and Loquingen declare themselves, and act in the Party as adherents of the expelled workers' betrayer, Korsch. They organise Korsch factions in the Party and refuse, despite repeated warning from the Central Committee, to give up their party-destroying activity.

Berlin, 19. August 19th, 1926.

Resolution of the Weber Group in the Communist Party of Germany on the Russian Question.

The Wedding Opposition (Wedding, a proletarian district of Berlin, Ed.) has issued the following declaration concerning the crisis in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which has recently expressed itself by the re-calling of various prominent leaders of the opposition, etc.:

In our resolution upon the decisions of the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. of the 20th of January 1926 we declared ourselves in agreement with the oppositional platform of the Leningrad organisation as represented by Comrades Zinoviev, Krupskaya, etc.

The recrudescence of the Russian Party conflict has corroborated our opinion that the controversial questions, which were raised at the time could not be abolished by the mechanical suppression of the opposition on the part of the Stalin Central Committee, but that these questions should be submitted to an extensive discussion inside the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

The attempts of the Central Committee of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. and the E. C. C. I. to deny the survival of the opposition after the XIV. Party Congress, the struggle against

a system which is typified by the Bukharin slogan "Enrich yourselves!" and finds its timely expression in Stalinism, is being continued subteraneously with undiminished intensity.

In this struggle the Leningrad opposition rejects inter alia the affirmation of the possibility of Socialism in one country alone and stands for the undiminished promotion of the revolutionary movement in the other countries in the closest connection with the work of socialist reconstruction in Russia until the triumph of Socialism through the victory of the world revolution, and against the idealisation of the present situation of Russian state industry as "logically socialist".

For a characterisation, without illusions, of the Russian state industry as a "logically socialist type but not yet purely socialist".

Against the exaggeration of the N. E. P. as it was expressed in a particularly crass form by the phrase, "Enrich yourselves!" and in practice for instance through the new national laws, through commodity exchange, free commerce, etc.

For the limitation of the N. E. P. to the tasks set to it by Lenin.

Against any of all loosening of the dictatorship of the proletariat in relation to the town and village bourgeoisie through the extension of the Soviet democracy.

For the maintenance, or, as the case may be, extension of the privileged situation of the industrial proletariat and the village poor, in the proletarian Soviet State.

Against the predominance of non-proletarian elements in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

For the speediest recruitment for the Russian party cadres from the ranks of the industrial workers and the village poor as the natural enemies of capitalism in town and country.

Against the wrong inner policy of the Party which expresses itself in the application of suppressive measures (limitation of the freedom of discussion, punitive measures, etc.).

For the extension of the inner Party democracy and the utilisation of all comrades without consideration to their Party tactical position in the responsible work of the Party, and for the abolition of all prohibition of discussion, etc.

The Wedding Left Wing will support all tendencies which carry on the struggle against Stalinism upon the basis of the opposition at the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

The Wedding opposition which carries on an energetic struggle against opportunism inside the Communist Party of Germany, and which is well aware of the damaging effect of an artificial and mechanically constructed majority by the Party apparatus, appeals to the whole membership of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. to alter the fatal political and inner Party policy as quickly as possible and thus abolish the danger of a Party split.

The Wedding Left Wing of the Communist Party of Germany protests sharply against the telegram of the Political Bureau of its Party expressing its approval with the measures of the Central Committee of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. This telegram is an attempt to place both the Plenum of the Central Committee and also the whole Party membership with a fait accompli and represents an unjustified assumption of authority. The membership must finally make an end of this misuse of their confidence and discipline and use their own proletarian judgment in place of the monopoly of opinion of the Party apparatus.

The questions in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. are of the greatest importance for the whole Comintern. For this reason the Central Committee of the C. P. of Germany must finally see to it that the Party membership receive exact and objective information and that a fundamental discussion upon these problems with parallel speeches of Russian oppositional comrades be immediately opened in the Party.

The Central Committee of the German Communist Party in session declares itself to be in agreement with the above and demands the immediate withdrawal of all punitive measures against Zinoviev and the other comrades of the opposition.

Weber.

The Berlin "Rote Fahne" on the Resolution of the Weber Group.

The above resolution was presented by Comrade Weber as a joint platform for the various tendencies in the "Left Wing Opposition" in the last session of the Central Committee. In the present discussion between the majority of the Communist Party and the Ultralefts, it is of particular importance to determine whether the opposition is really a "Left Wing". As is known, there have already been many groups in the revolutionary working class movement calling themselves "Left Wing" but in reality embodying a Right Wing, anti-revolutionary policy. There is, for instance, the K. A. P. D. (Communist Workers Party of Germany), an anarcho-syndicalist group which broke away from the Communist Party of Germany at the Congress of the Party in Heidelberg in 1919, Ed., of which every Berlin worker knows that it is an instrument of the counter-revolution. A little while ago Korsch and Schwarz were expelled from the German Party. In the few weeks since their expulsion they have already exposed themselves as open renegades. They are directing the sharpest attacks against the Communist Party in their informational organ "Communist (?) Policy". All these small groups call themselves "Left Wing" but all Communist workers knew long ago that in reality they carry on an Ultraright Wing policy.

The Platform of our Party opposition in the Russian question also claims the right to be recognised as "Left Wing". Let us examine whether there is any justification for this.

1. The Denial of the Possibility of Socialism in one Country alone.

As early as the days of the imperialist war Lenin wrote that it was a reactionary dream to imagine that the proletarian revolution would win its victory over the whole world simultaneously.

Just as the capitalist world is not evenly developed, so is the way of the proletarian revolution not straight, but uneven. This law of the irregularity of capitalist development determines that the proletarian revolution can first of all only succeed in one country or in a few countries. It was victorious in October 1917 in the territory of the one-time Czarist Russia, the present Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. In the October days the Russian working class fought under the banner of Socialism. In the five years of civil war it suffered, starved and was finally victorious under this slogan and for the building up of a socialist economic order.

Leninism has always adopted the standpoint that the building up of Socialism inside the borders of one country is possible if the victorious proletariat of this country receives the support of the revolutionary workers of the other countries. Naturally, the building up of Socialism is not the work of a few years; it demands decades of hard struggles. It is only then possible when the dominating working class is successful in subordinating all other sections of the toilers to the socialist economic policy. The problem of the building up of Socialism consists in the Soviet Union and it will be the same in all other countries, in connecting the millions of peasants with the economic key positions of the proletarian state. The essence of the N. E. P. consists in the struggle of the socialist economic forms with the capitalist elements for the leadership of the peasantry.

In this direction the Russian proletariat has already achieved the greatest successes. In the economic year 1924/25 the proletarian state controlled a capital sum to the value of 11,700 million roubles, the cooperatives 500 million roubles, all other capital sums in the hands of private capitalists and peasants amounted to a total of 7,500 million roubles. Heavy industry and the railway net are 97% socialised. The share of private capital in internal commerce sank to 50.3 per cent in the first half year 1923/24, in the second half year 1923/24, it sank to 34 per cent and in the year 1924/25 to 26.3 per cent. These figures alone, which can be very much extended, show a growth of the socialist economic elements in comparison to the non-socialist. All the facts, all the objective results of the New Economic Policy show the progressive development of the socialist economic forms and the pressing back of the capitalist economic forms.

These economic facts fall together with the political development of the consciousness of the working class which is directing its attention more and more to the Soviet Union. Hundreds of Social Democratic and non-Party workers' delegations, which have visited the Soviet Union (at this moment there is a German workers' delegation there) have returned with the firm conviction that Socialism is being built up in the Soviet Union.

The Ultraleft comrades, however, have issued the slogan: "Rejection of the Affirmation of the Possibility of Socialism in one Country alone". As, however, according to the Leninist theory of the proletarian revolution and according to the simplest human estimation, the proletariat will only be able to advance another stage of the world revolution in a reasonable time in one or in several countries, this contention is worth just as much as the simple denial of the possibility of Socialism altogether. This opinion expresses the greatest disbelief in the proletarian revolution and despair of the victory of socialism. This standpoint is neither Left Wing nor revolutionary, it is not even socialist. It is a definite anti-socialist point of view against which every Communist must struggle.

2. The "Loosening of the Proletarian Dictatorship"

Weber's resolution speaks of a "loosening of the dictatorship of the proletariat in relation to the town and village bourgeoisie through the extension of the Soviet democracy." This contention is also in complete contradiction to the real facts. The dictatorship of the proletariat will exist all the more firmly and unshakably, according to the degree with which it is bound to all toilers and the stronger the participation of all toilers in its realisation, in the exercise of the Soviet Power and in the practical work of the Soviets.

The aim of the Soviet democracy is to draw ever newer strata of the workers and peasants into the practical work of the proletarian state. A number of measures were adopted to this end, as for instance, the extension of the eligibility of all Soviet organs, the transition from compulsory methods to methods of conviction, etc. The Soviet democracy consolidates the proletarian dictatorship. Every deviation from the Soviet democracy must lead in the present situation to an estrangement of the masses from the Soviet state, to a bureaucracy in the state apparatus, in other words, to a loosening of the proletarian dictatorship. This would be the practical result of the standpoint of the opposition. In this connection also, the opposition is not "Left Wing", but definitely Right Wing.

3. The Unity of the Bolshevik Party

The resolution of Comrade Weber is rich in energetic expressions against the "application of mechanical suppressive measures" for the utilisation of all groupings in the party leadership. For this reason the opposition protests against the removal of Comrade Zinoviev from the Politbureau. For every worker who is not content with phrases, but who thinks over the situation, it is clear that the Bolshevik Party can only retain its leading role in a country of 120 million inhabitants, suppress all hostile forces, lead the masses and build up Socialism, if it carries out its policy unitedly and determinedly.

The proletarian dictatorship is not bourgeois democracy. The proletarian dictatorship means proletarian democracy, but it represents at the same time a merciless struggle against the bourgeoisie, the ruthless suppression of all freedom of opinion and freedom of discussion for the one-time ruling classes. The admission of capitalist economic forms to a certain degree brings with it a permanent danger of a recrudescence of counter-revolutionary political groups. Any building of factions inside the ruling Communist Party means a spur to the appearance of anti-proletarian groups in the country. Fractional freedom inside the Bolshevik Party would be the beginning of freedom for all parties in the country. The shaking of the unity of the Bolshevik Party would be the most dangerous shaking of the Soviet Power, the most dangerous "loosening of the proletarian dictatorship". When in 1924 Comrade Trotsky commended his oppositional attack against Leninism, Comrade Zinoviev wrote:

"Comrade Trotsky has become the medium through which the petty bourgeois elements show themselves inside our Party. The whole character of his attacks and his whole historical past show that this is true. In his struggle against the Party he has become in our country a symbol of every thing which is directed against our Party."

Today comrade Zinoviev has the same standpoint and belongs to the same faction as comrade Trotsky. He leads at Trotsky's side the fractional struggle against the Leninist leadership of the Party. His group is playing the same role as that of the Trotsky group in 1924 and against which he warned them at the time. His group has become the symbol of everything which is directed against the Bolshevik Party. The Bolshevik Party would surrender its own position and abandon the dictatorship of the Proletariat if it did not adopt the sharpest measures to defend the unity of the Party against the attacks of the new and united opposition. It dare not permit fractional struggle. It must remove the responsible leaders of the fractional struggle from the higher Party leadership if it is not to sacrifice its own basic principles. The standpoint of the opposition betrays the struggle of the bourgeois elements for the introduction of bourgeois democracy. It is not useful to the revolutionary proletariat, but to the anti-proletarian groupings. For this reason it is not a Left Wing opposition, but a Right Wing one.

4. The "Leningrad Opposition"

The Ultraleft resolution declares itself to be in agreement with the "Leningrad organisation". This sentence is very misleading for the Party. The Leningrad organisation never stood upon the standpoint of the oppositional groups. Comrade Zinoviev was elected to the Party Congress of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. because he had solemnly declared that he stood upon the same basis as the Central Committee and that he was only fighting against deviations from the policy of the Central Committee. Despite this, however, Comrade Zinoviev delivered a Co-Report to that of the Central Committee at the 14th Party Congress. In the most important questions he left the line of the Party. After the Party Congress he proceeded to set up a general militant platform against the whole policy of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

Immediately after the Party Congress, the Leningrad Party organisation severely condemned the actions of the opposition. After the XIV. Party Congress there followed the reporting campaign in January of this year. 72,967 Communists, that is to say, 85% of the membership of the Leningrad organisation, took part in the Party meetings in Leningrad which voted upon the decisions of the Party Congress. Of these, 70,389 or 96% voted for the Central Committee, 2,244 voted for the opposition, that is to say, 3.2%. 344 votes were withheld, that is to say less than 0.5%. 90% of the Leningrad active Communists stood and stand behind the policy of the Central Committee. They are fighting against the opposition. This 2,244 are for the most part Party officials who have been disavowed in their factory work.

It is these Party officials with whom our German comrades are in agreement. They have the right to agree with these officials, but our German Ultralefts must not make the misleading statement that it is the opinion of the "Leningrad organisation" with which they are in agreement. The standpoint of the Leningrad organisation is that of the whole Bolshevik Party and of the whole Communist International, that is the standpoint in favour of the struggle for Socialism against the anti-socialist pessimism of the opposition.

Concerning the Platform of Comrade Weber.

By Marxist

The "Platform" of Comrade Weber which was published in the "Rote Fahne", Berlin, on August 14th must be carefully studied. It is a model example for all trite and banal platforms. The triteness of its political thinking, even of its thoughts altogether, can only have a damaging effect for politics. Let us attempt to analyse Weber's resolution in order to show all workers and particularly Left Wingers, how far removed the platform of Comrade Weber is from Leninism and how near it is to political banality.

The Division of Forces inside the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or upon what does the Fire of the Opposition direct itself.

It is very interesting to see how Comrade Weber conceals the basic facts of party life in the Soviet Union from the Left Wing workers in Germany. Why does the resolution of Weber make no mention of the block formed by the "Leningrad" (!) Opposition with Trotsky? Why is there no mention of the block together with the so-called "Workers' Opposition" (which would be more correctly termed the opposition against the workers)? Why is there no mention of the fact that at the present time a block of all the nuances which Lenin always opposed is leading the struggle in the name of the whole opposition under the hegemony of Trotskyism (which the V. Congress, which the Ultra-Left always quotes so readily, declared to be a "petty bourgeois deviation")? Is it worthy of a revolutionary to shout like a madman against Trotskyism for a whole year and then suddenly and with a face as though nothing had happened, march under the ideological yoke of Trotskyism?

No, dear Comrades, the line of Communist policy is not woven in this fashion, and the best weaver (The German translation of weaver is Weber. The writer has allowed himself a pun. Ed.) would soon go bankrupt if he continued to work in this fashion.

What is the division of forces inside the C. P. of the Soviet Union? This question must receive a serious answer and not a childish one: All the important facts must be quoted and not the most important facts concealed.

Our Russian brother party is the greatest political factor in the political life of the world in general and of the world proletariat in particular. It is without doubt open to the dangers of degeneration. Only a philistine could deny this. The only question is how these dangers express themselves.

Unless we wish to talk uselessly of the individual mistakes of this or that comrade (particularly when those mistakes have been long ago corrected) but instead upon general tendencies, upon the whole system of opportunism, we must discuss first of all the tendency of the one time "Workers' Opposition".

It is a fact that this group terms our European Communist Parties "a horde of petty bourgeois good-for-nothings living at the cost of the Russian workers".

It is a fact that it wishes to liquidate the Comintern.

It is a fact that it is opposed to the necessary criticism of Noske and the Noskites.

It is a fact that it proposes a unification with the Social Democracy and Amsterdam.

It is a fact that it wishes to liquidate the R. I. L. U.

It is a fact that upon the basis of a somewhat more logical estimation of the socialist state industry than that of Weber, it wishes to hand this industry over to foreign capital.

It is a fact that as far as the peasantry is concerned it declares that only capitalist methods can be used.

It is a fact that it does not regard the present Soviet State as a form of the proletarian dictatorship.

It is therefore also a fact that the Workers' Opposition group represents an almost hundred per cent Menshevism.

Why is there no single word about this in Weber's platform?

Why is there not the faintest sign of any sort of criticism, even the mildest or most loyal criticism (although "loyalty" to Menshevik deviations can in no way be termed a Bolshevik virtue)?

Why? Because the "Workers' Opposition" is in the same company as the "Leningrad" (how stupid this term in this connection sounds!) opposition.

Weber and his comrades are here faithfully copying the usual policy of Comrades Trotsky who was always a great master in the art of pursuing a Right Wing policy under Left Wing phrases.

The Russian opposition conceals and disguises the tremendous opportunist sins of the "Workers' Opposition", and the faithful Weber does the same. That assists the logic of the opposition: The group which stands farthest to the Right, the Menshevik group, is covered with the seeming red oppositional mantle.

The initiative in the struggle against this group belongs to the Central Committee of the Russian Party. This class opportunist group is, however, a section of the opposition "Even a blind sow can find an acorn" said Marx once referring to the bourgeois scholars. Even a Menshevik can understand that here there are friends of Menshevism. The "Socialist Messenger", the organ of the Russian Mensheviks in Berlin, has already taken the above named group to its breast.

But Weber is silent. Weber covers them. Weber conceals this tendency. Weber covers the worst forms of Menshevism.

One can perhaps object: We are badly informed, we don't believe that such contentions concerning the "Workers' Opposition" are true, etc. That sounds funny, but we will accept it as an argument. But why, even in this case, not say that in a conditional form? For instance: "If it is true, that the 'Workers' Opposition' has defended this and that opinion, then that is Menshevism, which is not reconcilable with the Communist Party".

Why is that not done? Why have Weber and his comrades no interest in doing this? Why do they not examine this side of the question?

Because the "Workers' Opposition" belongs to the opposition!

But where are their principles? Where is the revolutionary ideology there? Where is the honest endeavour to solve the matter? It has all disappeared. These comrades cover their opportunist almost Menshevik companions. That is, however, no policy, but the lowest form of politics.

Comrade Weber has naturally also heard of another tendency which was represented by a certain Ossovsky, a one-time member of the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany, in the Russian Party. This Ossovsky drew up a platform (also a "platform") in which he contended that the capitalist interests should be represented inside the Russian Party or the other parties should be legalised. Ossovsky himself was a member of the opposition (we now learn that he has been expelled from the Party despite the fact that he was defended by the opposition). He was, as we see, nothing but a propagandist of bourgeois democracy.

But why is Weber silent about that? Why does he not sound the alarm in this case? For the same reason as the Russian opposition: The fellow was a member of this opposition!

Now to a third question of a similar nature: The hegemony of Trotskyism in the opposition is not to be denied. It is a fact that the "Leningrad" opposition and Trotskyism granted one another a mutual amnesty.

Why does Comrade Weber write nothing about this? Or why does he not propose the liquidation of the resolutions of the V. World Congress?

We need not even discuss other peculiar cases, for instance, the fact that the Russian opposition propose to rehabilitate Right renegades like Souvarine. These are only small matters. We will discuss only important political questions.

To sum up: The fire of the Russian opposition is not directed against a Right danger, but it is directed against the Party which ruthlessly fights against the real Right danger within its ranks.

Every Left Wing worker should ask Comrade Weber:

1. Is he prepared to condemn the "Workers' Opposition"? Yes or no?

2. Is he prepared to condemn such propaganda as that of Ossovsky? Yes or no?

3. Is he prepared to continue to support the resolution of the V. Congress upon Trotskyism or does he wish to reject this resolution as "out of date"? Yes or no?

4. Is he prepared to demand that the Russian opposition loosen all bonds with such allies? Yes or no?

If Comrade Weber is not prepared to fulfil these minimum demands, he will prove by his refusal that he obstinately covers the Right danger. He will expose himself as a promoter of processes of degeneration within the Russian Party.

Naturally the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will not die of them. The opposition in general and the "Workers' Opposition" as a part of this opposition has only very little influence. The Party is as strong and consolidated as ever. But our Left Wing workers will, it is to be hoped, grasp the real significance of Comrade Weber's support of the Russian opposition.

The Internationalism of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Question of the Possibility of Socialist Reconstruction in one Country Alone

The Weber resolution proclaims: "In this struggle (against the Central Committee of the Russian Party, Marxist,) the Leninist Opposition opposes *inter alia* the affirmation of the possibility of socialism in one country alone and declares itself for the undiminished promotion of the revolutionary movements in other countries..."

The suggestion is contained here that the C. P. of the Soviet Union is opposed to the promotion of the revolutionary movements in the "other countries" and that it is developing "nationally". The above quotation can only have this significance.

Let us commence with the question of internationalism. It must first of all be observed that the nationalist and opportunist orientation is to be found in the "Workers' Opposition" (your allies, dear comrade!). As far as the Russian Party is concerned, it is the most international party of the Comintern.

Is the C. P. of the Soviet Union perhaps to be condemned because it recognises the relative stabilisation and adapts its policy to it?

To this we can only answer: The C. P. of the Soviet Union is not by any means of the same opinion as, for instance Maslov (also one of your allies!). As you remember Maslov declared before a bourgeois court that the revolutionary perspective in Germany was postponed for decades. The C. P. of the Soviet Union has never held such an opinion. Because it is accustomed to carry on its policy not in accordance with the wishes of the bourgeoisie (respectively with the wishes of its courts), but in accordance with reality!

It is the normal custom of the bourgeois and the Social Democrats to represent the Russian Party as "nationally limited". The whole bourgeoisie and individuals like Kautsky see in the eastern policy of the Party nothing but the continuation of Tsarist policy. But Churchill and his friends say exactly the same! It is their only consolation. But when a revolutionary quotes this nonsense, that is a very sad symptom: Bourgeois influence is still so strong that even good revolutionaries fall under the yoke of bourgeois ideology!

We ask, where is the "plan" of the Russian Party to hamper the international working class movement? Perhaps in the fact that the Russian Party has carried through a splendid campaign to support the British workers? The workers of the Soviet Union have collected millions of roubles, and are still collecting them, under the leadership of the Communist Party. If, for instance Comrade Weber had done only a small fraction of that in the Ruhr district, it would have been much more favourable to the "undiminished promotion of the revolutionary movement in other countries", than when he attacks the Russian Party.

Unfortunately, not everything is perfect in Russia. The working masses are still poor, the effects of the war, the civil war and the intervention were too great. But under the leadership of the Party they are doing everything possible. In the light of reality all the talk about "national limitation" is terribly

silly. Let Professor Korsch "explain" why the "party of the kulaks" makes such great sacrifices in order to assist the British workers? Anyone who "condemns" the Russian Party along these lines must have lost all sense of shame.

Now to the question of Socialist reconstruction. Is this reconstruction possible, before the proletariat of other countries has seized power, or it is impossible on account of the backwardness of the country? The Social Democracy was and still is of the latter opinion (see also Kautsky). As a matter of fact, those comrades who in November 1917 in Russia were against the insurrection and urged a coalition with the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, were also of this opinion. Comrade Trotsky also was of this opinion in a rather peculiar form. On the one hand he was in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the other hand, however, he contended that without state assistance from the victorious Western proletariat, the proletarian dictatorship must necessarily be destroyed under the pressure of the peasants whom he at one time described as the "counterrevolutionary allies of the Bolsheviks". On the other hand Lenin was for the insurrection and against the ideas of Trotsky. This opportunist position is now "knewly" polished up, and people believe that something new is being discovered!

If socialist reconstruction was impossible before the victorious revolution in the west, then the Russian party should destroy the Soviet power and hand the power over into the hands of the bourgeoisie, a very "revolutionary" proposal.

If, however, the possibility of reconstruction exists today, and the successes are there, the party can continue. And where—dear critic—is the limit? Such a limit absolutely does not exist. It would be therefore very much better if Comrade Weber would cease chewing and chewing this opportunistic nonsense and leave this work to the old Social Democratic cows.

Another question is the tempo of the development. The Soviet Union will naturally advance much more quickly if it receives proletarian assistance in the form of proletarian state aid.

Another question is that of the political guarantees for reconstruction in Russia. At the present time there is no certain guarantee against the possibility of a successful armed capitalist intervention. A victory of the proletariat in other countries would be the only thing to offer such a guarantee. But no one denies that.

So much for the question of "socialism in one country alone", or better "the possibility of socialist reconstruction in one country alone".

The opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has by no means a revolutionary standpoint. It represents a rotten scepticism with so great a fear in the face of difficulties that it even denies the task and the possibilities of work. For that reason, unfortunately, one often hears tendencies which smack very much of Social Democracy.

Would it not be better for revolutionaries to finish with this game? We think so. What does Comrade Weber think?

II.

The Question of the NEP.

We have seen that Comrade Weber denies the possibility of socialist reconstruction in one country alone (for that is the thing aimed at), but he does not draw the logical conclusion from this. These conclusions, however, are "conclusions" with a Social Democratic nature. To deny the possibility to construct socialism in the Soviet Union before the victorious revolution in the West, means nothing less than to deny the whole work of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and if one thinks thoroughly over the matter, then it leads to a denial of the possibility of the proletarian dictatorship as a permanent phenomenon. Many oppositional prophets, these specialists in black prophesy, have already worked out the necessary theses. But this America was discovered by Paul Levi long ago.

And so it is with Weber in the other question, in the question of the NEP. We must, however, unfortunately place on record the fact that here Comrade Weber is still more confused.

What has the resolution of Comrade Weber got to say about this question:

"Against the exaggeration of the NEP, in the particularly crass form expressed by the term 'Enrich yourselves!'"

and in practice by the new national laws for commodity exchange, free commerce, etc.

To limit the NEP, to the tasks set for it by Lenin."

These are the objects of Weber.

Here we must request permission to make a quite general remark. Unfortunately our Party is used to methods of discussion of which one can say: "Where ideas are lacking, words enough can be found." One has got unused to studying problems carefully. One has learnt, however, to manipulate very adroitly with high-sounding phrases, very often without thinking what actually is behind them. Some have even forgotten the most elementary demands to be put to a serious politician. Ruth Fischer, for instance, has her own geography according to which Bad Kissingen is in Berlin and Vienna; she has also her own form of medical science practiced chiefly in fractional meetings; she also has her own news agency which informs her that the ten hour day has been introduced in the Soviet Union; she also has her own "politics" which contend that the "reaction" is consolidating itself in the proletarian state.

The circus-like tricks of Ruth Fischer are really not to be taken seriously. It is much worse, however, when workers of a "logical socialist type" like Comrade Weber fall into this marsh of carelessness and superficiality. That is really a serious danger.

Now to the question itself. Comrade Weber is "for the limitation of the NEP, to the tasks set for it by Lenin". That is excellent, and we are in entire agreement with this, just as is the majority of the C. P. of the U.S.S.R. But why does Comrade Weber conceal the chief conflict in the Russian Party concerning this question? And why does he say nothing concerning the tasks which Lenin set for the NEP? This is, indeed, the whole root of the problem!

Let us see what actually were the tasks of the NEP, as set by Lenin.

For us there can be no doubt that the ultimate task even here was the victory of socialism, the victory of the proletariat. According to Lenin's conception the NEP is in the beginning a retreat, but then a reorganisation of the proletarian ranks (new lines of struggle, abolition of war communism, struggle under the conditions established by market relations, etc.) and then an economic proletarian offensive (the permanently growing role of the socialist elements in the total economy of the country). Does this offensive exclude the NEP? By no means! Exactly the contrary, that is the most important component of the NEP. The whole significance of the NEP manoeuvre consists in this. And it was just about this that the whole struggle in the Russian Party was caused. The opposition had and still has a very strong tendency to regard the NEP, exclusively as a retreat which will last until the victory of the proletarian revolution in Western Europe.

Was that the standpoint of Lenin? By no means! It is generally known that as early as the Genoa Conference Lenin issued the slogan "Stop the retreat!"

Comrade Weber must really honestly think over the situation: Either he recognises the successes of the socialist reconstruction in the last few years or not.

If he does not recognise them, if he believes that the socialist elements are not growing as quickly as the capitalist elements, then he simply adopts a Social Democratic standpoint and nothing else. Because the fact of economic growth in general is no longer denied by anyone. In the Berlin Zoological Garden there is a "giant donkey from Barcelona". Even this sort of "politician" probably recognises that economy in the Soviet Union taken as a whole is growing very quickly. That which is specifically Social Democratic or even bourgeois in this, is the contention that the general economic successes are above all to be placed to the credit of the capitalist elements and that the state economy is being ever more forced into the background.

Every left wing worker should ask Comrade Weber, what is the distinction between him and the Social Democrats in this question. The answer must be clear and honest.

It is interesting to note that this standpoint is not even the standpoint of the Social Democratic workers, but that of the Social Democratic leaders. The workers' delegations speak another language. Do you understand, Comrade Weber, what that actually means?

But perhaps the Social Democracy estimates the situation in Russia correctly? Perhaps it is, unfortunately, correct in this

question? Speaking "purely theoretically", one can put the problem in this way:

But first of all one must for instance refute the figures given by Bukharin in his pamphlet against Kautsky. Please attempt it, dear comrades!

We may add here the following: In his last speech (Fourth Congress of the Comintern) Comrade Lenin saw a success for the Russian Party in the fact that the Soviet government was able to place 20,000,000 roubles at the disposal of industry. Next year, however, the sum will be approximately 1,000,000,000 roubles.

And secondly, if Comrade Weber is nevertheless of another opinion, then he must openly recognise the correctness in principle of the Social Democratic estimation. It will then at least be clear where Comrade Weber really stands, either Right or Left.

We have assumed conditionally that Comrade Weber denies the socialist successes of the Soviet Power, or the Communist Party of the Soviet Union respectively.

Let us assume, however, that he recognises these successes. What would that mean?

That would destroy his position completely. "How?", we will be asked. Very simply, because:

1. If one recognises absolute and relative (that is to say in relation to the capitalist elements) socialist successes, then by this one recognises also the already existing offensive of the proletariat along the lines of the NEP.

2. If one recognises that, then one recognises the incorrectness of the oppositional standpoint (the estimation of the NEP, as almost exclusively a retreat).

3. On the other hand one recognises with this the economic and technical possibility of socialist reconstruction in Russia.

We must particularly stress the last point. The successes of socialism in the Soviet Union mean a continuous growth of socialism in this country. That is as clear as the sun. Therefore:

If for instance, this year the Soviet Union finishes its economic balance with a plus for socialism, then it enters the next year with a better weapon in its hand. When we have the better weapon, then the results will be proportionally better, etc. Once again arises the question: Where is the limit (the economic limit) of this process? We repeat once again: There is no such limit. The question of a guarantee against an armed intervention of foreign capitalism is, however, different. There is only one guarantee against this, and that is the international revolution of the proletariat, or at least a revolution in several important European countries. And that is also recognised by everybody.

Therefore, as far as the estimation of the situation in Russia is concerned, there can in principle only be two standpoints, either a Communist or a Social Democratic-bourgeois one. There is no "third" standpoint.

The denial of the possibility of socialist reconstruction (a very fine "discovery" in the tenth year of the proletarian dictatorship) is bound up with the denial of the offensive along the lines of the NEP. Let the Russians sit peacefully on their posteriors and "wait" until the world revolution breaks out. O, what a "Marxist", what a "Leninist" point of view is put forward by the gossip of the old women of both sexes! O, how "Left" is such an ideology!

We now come to the question of the "exaggeration of the NEP". As far as the slogan: "Enrich yourselves!" is concerned, Comrade Weber must be well acquainted with the real facts of the case. He certainly won't, at least, we hope not, repeat after the Royal Belgian Minister Emile Vandervelde: "Communists, enrich yourselves!"

With this slogan Comrade Bukharin only wanted to say the following:

Formerly there were considerable remnants of war communism in the country. The estates were periodically divided amongst the poor peasants and nothing further. The struggle against the kulaks was not carried on by opposing them with the economic organisation of the middle peasants and the village poor (co-operatives, etc.) but almost exclusively with administrative measures. The mass of the peasants therefore developed their economy very slowly. The motives of development were hindered. The class struggle developed almost exclusively upon the basis of the division

This situation was intolerable. It was the cause of the very slow commodity exchange. It hindered also the accumulation in the state industry, this basis of socialism. The peasant masses should receive a spur for the development of their economy in order to be able to lead the struggle against the kulaks upon the basis of the general growth, in order to promote the commodity exchange in the country, to utilise it more for the state industry, and to assist the village poor, not with speeches, but with money, machines, etc. (through the increasing taxation of the kulaks and in particular through the means which would come in in greater sums together with a quicker growth of commodity exchange). Bukharin said to the peasants: "Develop your economy, enrich yourselves!" The latter expression was politically false, was withdrawn and was recognised as wrong by all (by Bukharin himself). Why therefore all the noise about it so late in the day?

And now we come to the "practice" which, in the words of Weber is expressed by the new national laws, in commodity exchange, in free commerce, etc.

What "new national laws" may we ask. With this only one thing can be meant: The decisions of the 14th Party Conference. The Party did not vote upon any "other laws". (We are not speaking here of the very small matters). Here a certain change of direction was carried into effect.

But all these comrades who later became the opposition voted at the 14th Conference for these laws. If Comrade Weber protests against these decisions, then he protests also against this vote. It would seem that here lack of information has really played a part and here is perhaps the extenuating circumstance.

But to regard the problem from such a point of view is in any case a little untimely. There are other problems to solve in the Soviet Union. To extend the economic organisation of the poor and middle peasants, to organise the village poor, to gather the agricultural workers together and the most necessary of all to develop industry. Let the critics talk, the Russian Party will work!

In conclusion, if Comrade Weber recognises the successes of socialism in the Soviet Union, then he destroys his own platform, and if he does not recognize it, then he places himself upon Social Democratic ground. That is the situation. The only correct thing to do would be to recognise the successes of socialism and to characterise the platform as an error. That would really be a solution and actually the only solution.

III. The Russian State, Industry, the "Loosening of the Dictatorship" and other matters.

Against the idealisation of the present state of Russian industry as logically socialist.

For a characterisation of the Russian state industry without illusions as a "logical socialist type" but not yet purely socialist, says the thesis of Comrade Weber. This point is the easiest of all to settle.

Firstly: What does Comrade Weber actually mean when he stresses this fine nuance? Does he want to say that our state industry is not yet complete socialism, that it still bears the marks of the transitional period?

If so, then there is absolutely no quarrel here. For it would be quite absurd to assume that the structure would remain as it is at present.

Secondly Comrade Weber conceals and disguises from the Left Wing proletarians that the discussion inside the Soviet Union upon this question takes a different line. Namely the opposition has the tendency of calling the state industry state capitalist. It was only in the course of the discussion that it was compelled to abandon this conception more or less. Every Left Wing worker should call upon Comrade Weber to condemn the estimation of the state industry of the Soviet Union as capitalist (state capitalist).

It must be openly said that such a standpoint leads in point of facts to Menshevism. But instead of saying that outright, Comrade Weber formulates his resolution so that it widens the impression that the Russian Party does not understand that the state industry still shows signs of the transitional period. But that it really inadmissible, Comrade Weber. That is not the

way to conduct a discussion, that is not the way to clear the matter up. On the contrary, that produces a still greater confusion, which, we believe and hope, is also not in the interest of Comrade Weber.

In this connection, there is also the question of the characterisation of the Soviet Economy as a whole. Here, for instance, Comrade Zinoviev quite definitely holds the opinion that state capitalism is dominant in Russia. The Party Majority describes the Soviet economy as a whole as a transitional economy in which the state industry expresses socialist productive relations and the mass of peasant economies (without the kulak economy) embodies simple commodity production, and private capital and the kulaks embody the private economic elements, whilst the concessions, etc. represent the state capitalist elements. This latter is a completely correct estimation. Why is there no word about these matters in Weber's resolution?

After Comrade Weber has thus "settled" the question of the state industry, he proceeds to the question of the state itself. The platform declares:

"Against any or all loosening of the dictatorship of the proletariat towards the town and village bourgeoisie through the extension of the Soviet democracy, etc.

For the maintenance of the case may be, extension of the privileged position of the industrial proletariat and the village poor in the proletarian Soviet State."

But this formulation itself is completely confused. The "loosening of the dictatorship" and the "extension of the Soviet democracy" are here used as interchangeable terms. This is everything but a precise, clear and Marxist formulation. What must one actually fight against? Against the tendency to give the franchise to the bourgeoisie in town and country? The power of the proletariat is not yet so consolidated that one could, for instance, proclaim a general franchise in the Soviets (although Lenin had set up this task for the future). At the present time it is necessary to consolidate the power of the proletariat by amalgamating the proletarian forces, raising proletarian activity, consolidating the block with the middle peasantry and increasing the forces of the village poor. Therefore against political concessions to the town and village bourgeoisie.

The question of the Soviet democracy is different. The Soviet democracy can be "extended" without extending the number of voters (or de jure voters). In proportion as the party works more intensely, will the Soviet Democracy be extended. In proportion to the intensification of the activity of the masses will the Soviet Democracy be extended. In proportion to the reduction of the number of indifferent proletarians and working peasants, will the Soviet Democracy be extended, etc.

Here is a simple example: During war communism the Soviet Democracy in Russia (just as the party democracy) was in many cases practically limited; in many places the Plenum of the Soviets was replaced by the executives and the latter very often replaced by the presidiums, sometimes not by elected Revkoms (revolutionary committees) which also possessed military powers, but by Revkoms sent from the center, in many places there were no regular elections, etc. Now there is, however, once again, an "extension of the Soviet Democracy" namely the policy of "vitalising the Soviets" the energetic drawing in of the masses (the proletarian and peasant masses) to the process of the work of reconstruction. To protest against this vitalisation would mean to adopt the standpoint of the bureaucrats. Naturally, the leading role of the party must not only remain, but it must be even consolidated. But the method of consolidating this role, and with it the proletarian dictatorship, must now be more from conviction than from force.

Work demands much greater efforts from the party, much greater qualifications from the party officials, etc., but that all only expresses the fact that the whole movement is now upon a higher level.

History is playing a very humorous game with the opposition in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R., and also with Comrade Weber. These people have proclaimed a holy war against bureaucracy, and in actual fact bureaucracy is one of the worst enemies of the party of the Soviets, of the proletariat.

But where is this bureaucracy in the Soviet Union to be mostly found?

In the state economic organisations, where the whole apparatus is very clumsy, immoderately large, etc. The opposition

however, proposes upon the economic field the policy of increasing prices (in order to "support" industry). We believe that everyone, even Weber, will be able to grasp that with such a policy which guarantees prices monopolistically, the economic apparatus would really degenerate, really decay. On the one hand they have declared war against bureaucracy and on the other hand they pursue, in actuality, a bureaucratic policy.

It is the same with the question of the "political" state apparatus. If one protests against the vitalisation of the Soviets (or if one struggles against the "extension of the Soviet Democracy" at all), then in reality one is leading a struggle against the drawing in of the masses and supporting the worst forms of bureaucracy.

The monopolistic position of the governing Communist Party is bound up with many dangers for this party. One of these dangers is that of degeneration by losing touch with the masses. If, for instance, a Communist thinks only of his privileges and believes that he can do what he likes, if he does not always try to win the masses, but instead fears the masses, if he does not attempt to convince them, but only wishes to command them, then he is a bad communist, even although he has the term world revolution a thousand times a minute in his mouth. (Another danger is that the Party becomes too "democratic" and forgets its leading role).

In these two extremely important points the opposition is in words in favour of an energetic struggle against bureaucracy, but in deeds it supports the bureaucratic tendencies.

Let us, however, proceed further to analyse Weber's platform. Comrade Weber touches also inner Party questions from an organisational standpoint. His resolution says:

"Against the preponderance of non-proletarian elements in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. For a speedy recruiting of the Russian party cadres with industrial workers and the village poor as the natural enemies of the capitalists in town and village.

Against the wrong inner party course in the application of suppressive measures, (the limitation of the freedom of discussion, punitive measures, etc.).

For the extension of the inner party democracy and the utilisation of all comrades without distinction as to their party tactical position in the responsible work of the party, for the abolition of all prohibitions of discussion, etc."

Let us see the first few sentences. Everyone who is a communist must naturally be in favour of the first sentence. As far as the second sentence is concerned, this is in the general line, but corrected. The whole question consists in whether this directive is to be applied cleverly or stupidly, and it seems to us that Comrade Weber did not know with what problem the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. is faced.

With the growth of industry the proletariat also grows. The whole skilled working class is engaged in the process of production. There even exists a lack of skilled workers. On the other hand there is already a rather large percentage of quite new workers. In some industrial districts (for instance in the mining districts) 30, 40, and even 50 per cent of the whole working class can be counted to these new strata of workers. These are peasants and peasant sons who have still a peasant psychology. They are politically and culturally not yet trained. Can they be "speedily" "immediately" drawn into the Party? That would be an absurd and stupid policy. The Party is the vanguard of the class, and not the class as a whole. One cannot delude the Party in this way, a more clever policy must be pursued. The Party must 1) remain a mass party and 2) remain always in connection with the non-party masses. To turn our Party "as quickly as possible" into a party in which there are peasants under a proletarian cover, peasants who are actually being transformed into proletarians but who have not yet been so transformed, would mean to destroy the proletarian character of our Party. So much for the problem of the composition of our Party.

Now we can proceed, thank god, to the last point, to the question of Party democracy. Here we can content ourselves with the following remark:

Comrade Weber is really a lucky person. Here also he does not touch the most difficult problem. Naturally, he is opposed to "organisational measures"! He is naturally for all possible freedom. "Freedom" is something very beautiful.

But why do you not deal with the problem of fractions, Comrade Weber? That is exactly the "controversial question". The "organisational measures" in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. were directed against the fractionists. Why is that concealed?

The Resolution upon Inner Party Democracy (which was written by Bukharin) was adopted at the X. Party Congress. At the same time the Resolution of Lenin upon the Unity of the Party and strictly forbidding fractions was accepted. Lenin was of the opinion that in such cases very severe "measures" should be adopted, even that of expulsion from the Party. Comrade Zinoviev afterwards spoke very often about the fact that the Party would never tolerate fractions and that fractions would mean for Russia the greatest danger and would bring with them the splitting of the state apparatus, of the army, etc. All leading Russian comrades protested against Trotskyism in the organisational question. And the Russian party is completely right when it maintains Lenin's tradition against the opinions of Trotsky and the Trotskyed Zinoviev.

Where does the Road Lead?

We had finished our task of analysing the platform of Comrade Weber when we received the circular of Korsch.

It is now perfectly clear why Weber conceals so many things, why so many attempts are made to cover up opportunism, etc. Comrade Weber has got into the net of Korsch and company and their agents Maslov and Fischer. Also a block! A block with renegades! A pleasant picture! A "Left" orientation! Every Left Wing worker can now see where the road is leading and perhaps comrade Weber will understand where he (the "vacillating element", as Korsch called him), is being dragged.

The "Russian question" has not become an international question accidentally. The dividing line between revolution and counter-revolution, between Social Democratic treachery and Communism, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is drawn in general according to the attitude of the Soviet Union. All "high politics" of the workers parties depend upon this. And what do we see? What standpoint does Korsch take, the new leader of the block?

Without in the least being ashamed of himself, he represents the "pure" (at the same time impure) standpoint of the Social Democracy.

Concerning the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R., Korsch wrote (in the draft of the resolution of January 24):

"In the peasant question the Party Congress ratified and stressed the Party course which from the year 1921 together with the leadership of the internal and external state policy had been based to an ever greater degree upon the needs and interests of the peasantry and in particular of the propertied peasantry (middle peasants and kulaks)."

Under the influence of this development the whole character of the Soviet state economically, politically and culturally has gradually changed.

Despite the generally recognised recrudescence and intensification of class contradictions in the village and in the town, the forms of the dictatorship were more and more milder and at the same time the hegemony of the proletariat in the workers' and peasants' state ever more weakened.

Compare with this the statements of Levi in the "Leipziger Volkszeitung" of July 30, 1920:

"We were of the opinion that the special workers' interests and finally socialism itself were in contradiction with the existence of peasant property, that the identity of peasants' and workers' interests was only apparent and that the further development of the Russian revolution would intensify this contradiction and expose it clearly to all eyes. We consider the idea of a solidarity of interest to be only a coalition idea in another form. If Marxism has a shadow of justification, if history works dialectically, then this contradiction ought to destroy the idea of coalition in Russia just as it has already destroyed it in Germany. The Bolsheviks, however, thought that one could dispose of this contradiction by firm party discipline, by accepting theses, by holding discussions and passing unity resolutions, in short, as that is done in other places."

For us, however, who are in Western Europe and can see the things from afar, it is clear: We stand by the opposition. It may be that they are only forced, it may be from quite different motives, but a section of the old guard of the Bolsheviks and obviously the workers in Russia, are finding their way out of the coalition confusion back to the basic principles of Marxism. Perhaps they have all sinned in the NEP: But here also the world court will not ask the reasons. The fact is that in Russia once again an independent, anti-capitalist class struggle movement is beginning."

Compare this with the organ of the murderers of Liebknecht, the "Vorwaerts", Nr. 1728:

"The Russian peasant is being revealed ever more clearly as the real gainer from the Russian revolution, the Russian peasant who permits the Communist Party to rule today, but who forces the whole policy of the Soviet Government into the train of a definite private capitalist peasant policy by his growing economic strength, a policy which is socially and politically in the sharpest contradiction to the working class."

Is this not everywhere the same estimation? Where is the difference between Korsch, Levi and the "Vorwaerts"? The same attitude, the same "estimation of the situation in Russia".

The following sentence from the circular of Korsch which was published in the "Rote Fahne", Berlin, at the time, is still more typical:

"We stress as the most important that for instance the Wedding resolution declares the Russian state industry to be a 'logical socialist type, but not yet purely socialist'. Against, must be said that this state industry must be characterised as 'purely capitalist'."

Here we must say to the Left Wing workers:

Think it over thoroughly. Think over what Mr. Korsch has to say! Take care and take care again!

In fact, industry in "Russia" is "purely capitalist". What does that mean? That can only mean that this industry is the property of the capitalist class. That is the only meaning this sentence can have. But the industry is the property of the Soviet State. The conclusion to be drawn as clearly as two and two make four, is that the State also is "purely capitalist".

But if that is so, it follows that:

1. The external policy of the Soviet State, for instance in the East, is a policy of imperialist robbery, and not the support of the revolution.
2. The sympathy for the British workers is nothing but a bourgeois corruption of the British working class by the Russian capitalist state from the point of view of capitalist competition.
3. The Red Army is not the army of the proletariat, but the army of a newly resurrected Russian capitalism.
4. The role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the Comintern is the role of a carrier of bourgeois poison to the world proletariat, etc.

One must also conclude that it is the duty of all revolutionaries to organise an insurrection against this capitalist Soviet government. And as bourgeois democracy is nevertheless better than the purely dictatorial form of capitalist dominance, the working class of Russia must also fight for this democracy.

Should an intervention be organised against the Soviet Union then, this is nothing but a war between capitalist powers. In the interior the proletariat does not need to defend this capitalist fatherland, and similarly the Western European proletariat does not need to interfere in this conflict.

These are the logical conclusions from Korsch's premises. And that is just the criminal attitude of Kautsky!

And that is to where our Left Wing workers are now being driven! It is a shame and a crime.

Comrade Zinoviev at one time stated against Korsch:

"We have many times pointed out that the Ultra Left group, composed of intellectuals, is actually a group of petty bourgeois revolutionaries. We admit that we called them rather roughly petty bourgeois gone mad. The com-

rades felt themselves insulted, and Scholem and Rosenberg asked: 'Are we really petty bourgeois gone mad?'

But, Comrades, think of the affair Katz who was expelled by the party. The stink bomb has exploded and poisoned the air. From where does this heavy atmosphere come which remained after the Katz affair? It comes from the fact that we have had to deal with a petty bourgeois group. I have not at all the intention to discredit these comrades personally, but politically the fact remains that they are a group of petty bourgeois revolutionaries. That was the reason for the real petty bourgeois aroma spread by the Katz affair.

How was it possible to really take Katz seriously for a Left Wing revolutionary? Ten minutes conversation would have been sufficient to convince any one that he was a petty bourgeois gone mad. Comrade Engel! I address myself to you and tell you quite plainly that every worker who leans towards the side of Katz or Korsch, is lost to the proletarian revolution. You must impress it upon your minds, that a Party which organised individuals of the Katz type would not even be a K. A. P. D., but a caricature of a K. A. P. D. (K. A. P. D. = Communist Workers' Party of Germany, Ed.)

He was completely right!

But it is not the "workers" but a "worker" like Maslov who is now plotting a conspiracy against the Party with the renegade Korsch? That cannot be tolerated. The Left Wing workers will see that Korsch and Maslov are leading them directly to Kautsky directly to the bourgeoisie.

The Social Democratic leaders are already losing the ground under their feet. Many workers journey to Russia, see the truth and go Left. Now an attempt is being made to get the Left Communist workers to take up the standpoint of Noske. The Social Democratic leadership is not in a position to say that everything is going to rack and ruin in Russia. For this reason it sets up the perverse and false perspective that in Russia capitalism is winning the upper hand.

Heine once said: "A muzzled dog barks through his hind quarters. Roundabout thinking poisons the air still worse as perfidiousness of expression."

Workers! Be on your guard against this barking!

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

The Party and the Opposition Block.

By N. Bukharin.

The Ideological Differences Between the Party and the Opposition.

After this brief sketch of our present position, we pass on to the questions raised in part in the C. C. Plenum by the comrades of the opposition, in part outside of the Plenum in connection with the work of the Plenum, or appearing in the utterance of other oppositional writers, journalists, theoreticians, and political economists. I shall classify remarks on the questions in accordance with the main problems confronting our Party at the present time, from the correct estimation of which our policy, our political standpoint, and the conclusions which we as leaders of the policy of the Party must draw for the immediate future from the present situation, depend in the present time.

Economic Policy in its Relations to the Industrialisation of the Country.

I shall first deal with the problem which I should like to name the problem of economic policy in its connection with industrialisation. I shall endeavour, though briefly, to dissect those theses of the oppositional comrades which express in their totality the system of the views of the opposition and their economic platform, and to compare these with the standpoint of the whole Party.

The first thesis advanced by the opposition is the assertion that our industry is retrogressing, and that the disproportion

between agriculture and city industry is increasing, to the detriment of city industry. I settled with this thesis to a great extent in my introductory remarks. It is characteristic of an opposition to paint the situation in exaggeratedly dark colors, but there should be limits to this process. However, the comrades of the opposition maintain that our industry is falling behind agriculture, that it is not developing so rapidly as agriculture, and that the policy pursued by our Party and the policy of the majority of the C. C. are to blame for this.

As early as 1923, during the discussion on the price policy, our Central Committee was accused of so acting that industry remained backward as compared with agriculture, and in particular it was accused of a price policy detracting from the necessary growth of our industry. But you will remember, comrades, that facts have confuted these accusations. During the first economic year following the discussion of 1923, our industry made a spring forward of 60%. In the following year there was another advance of 40%. Our industry developed with amazing rapidity. This thesis of retrogression in industry is based in the first place on incorrect figures. At the beginning of this report I put the question in a positive form, and you have seen that the total balance is undoubtedly in favour of the growth of industry as compared with agriculture.

The second thesis advanced by the opposition in the sphere of economic politics, in their relation to the industrialisation of the country, is the thesis that we must now carry on a greatly intensified industrial policy, this to be accomplished in the first place by increasing the prices of our industrial products. Comrade Pyatkov, speaking in the Plenum on behalf of the opposition, spoke in favour of a rise in the factory prices of our industrial products, the rise to be actuated by our state economic organs; in his opinion this is one of the measures which has to be taken. These comrades are of the opinion that it would lead to a more intensive industrialisation of the country if we were to pursue a policy excluding reductions in prices, and aiming rather at increased prices for the products of our industry, and even at higher wholesale and factory prices.

We believe this policy to be entirely wrong, and we cannot agree to its pursuance. One reason why we cannot accede to it is the fact that a rise in the prices of our industrial products, consumed as these are for the most part in the towns, would involve a change in real wages, so that such a rise would endanger us both with regard to wages and with regard to the stability of the currency. And we cannot accede to this policy, because it would not only fail to help us to overcome the main evil of our industrial organisation, the evil of bureaucracy, the evil of unwieldiness, of enormous costs entailed both in the industries themselves and in the trade apparatus, the evil of irrational organisation of work but it would make it even more difficult for us to rectify another category of our sins, those represented by the weakest points of our industry. Were we to accustom our industry and our economic organs to a higher price policy just at this juncture, then our economic functionaries would not move a finger towards the improvement of the whole organisation itself, towards the diminution of unproductive tasks, and for rational working arrangements, decreased working expenses, reduction of costs of production, improvement of quality, etc.

Every monopoly runs a certain danger of rusting, of resting on its laurels. The private capitalist and private owner is constantly being spurred onward by competition; if Peter works badly and has great working expenses, whilst Paul manages at less expense, then Paul beats Peter. But if we, who have practically all big industry in our hands, who have a state super-monopoly and own all essentials, do not stimulate the leading staff of our industry to cheapen production, and to produce on more rational lines, then indeed we have arrived at the prerequisite stage for the rusting of our industry on the basis of its monopoly. That which is actualised by competition (which does not exist, or exists in a very slight degree among us) in a capitalist state, we must attain by conscious pressure under the impetus of the needs of the masses: produce better and cheaper, supply better goods, supply cheap goods!

If our price policy deviates from this principle, then we shall not fulfil Lenin's behest that our industry is to supply the peasant with cheaper goods than capitalism has done; we are more likely to find ourselves in a position in which the workers, and a thousand times more the peasants will say to us: "What has been the object of the whole matter, if your

economics lead to higher prices for your industrial products? You understand nothing of economics."

We must prove in actual practice that we understand economics very well indeed, and must thus devote our main attention to a policy of steady reductions in prices, actualised by reducing the costs of production and by creating better order in our state economic machinery. I stated, above, when analysing the question of private economics, that the private capitalist contrives to keep his capital in quicker circulation, that his working expenses are lower, that he works with greater thrift etc. and that our apparatus is unwieldy; that its capital circulates slower, that its working costs are enormous etc. This depresses us if we are not to stand aside before the capitalist, and if we are to make progress ourselves, to improve the quality of our products, to cheapen our goods, to develop the economic alliance with the peasantry, then we must exert our utmost endeavours for the reduction of prices, not for their increase.

The opposition is of the opinion that its policy of higher prices would ensure more rapid growth for industry, but we are of the opinion that this view is entirely wrong, an illusion, a self-deception. The policy of high and rising prices would lead on the contrary to stagnation and rust in our industry. Our industry would rest on its laurels and trust in being able to cover everything out of the state exchequer. It would do nothing for its advancement, for its development, or for the attainment of a position as progressive technical and economic factor in our economics.

The third thesis which must be analysed in connection with this, or must at least be mentioned, is the thesis of the danger threatening us from private capital. I dealt with this thesis in my introductory remarks. I assumed the most favourable estimates on private capitalist profits to be correct, and am confident of having proved that even these most favourable calculations show no signs of that threatened private capitalist danger which is supposed to be hanging over our heads.

The fourth thesis, finally, advanced by the comrades of the opposition, is the assertion that our state organs are almost completely degenerated, that they have become entirely detached from the masses, and that the state, economic, trade union, and co-operative organs, as also the Party organs and above all the state economic organs, are joining forces with the NEP-men, the kulaks (rich peasantry), etc. To this I must observe: It is true that through the fault of our bureaucracy there is a tendency to such degeneration among us; this cannot be contested. But we must contest with the utmost decision and energy the suggestion that our state industry is already degenerated, that it no longer represents the industry of the working class. This is an assertion towards which the oppositional comrades are steering, and they have very nearly ventured to express it outright.

Our industry is the state socialist industry of the working class, but it has fallen a victim to the bureaucratic spirit. This is our definition. The fight against bureaucracy must therefore form one of our leading tasks, and here we must unfold ever increasing energy. But still we are very far from a position which would justify the comrades of the opposition in advancing such a thesis.

The Peasantry Question.

This is how matters stand with regard to the first problem -- the problem of economic policy in its relations to the industrialisation of our country. I now pass to the second problem, one of most decisive importance to the problem of the peasantry, and to the economic aspect of this problem.

When we attack this question first from its theoretical side, one point stands forth conspicuously and I draw your attention to it because it represents, so to speak, the springboard from which the "New Opposition" takes its leap when solving this or that question in connection with the peasantry. This is the manner in which private capital and peasantry are identified with one another, and agricultural economics confused with capitalist economics. Private economics are regarded as identical with private capitalist economics, and there is a lack of comprehension of the fact that there can be such a thing as non-capitalist private undertakings. The discussion of the XIV Party Congress dealt with all this, but it has not been so completely formulated until now.

I must first of all draw your attention to a theoretical compilation of all oppositional proposals, ideas, assertions, theses, etc., to comrade Preobrazhensky's book "On the New Economy". Here the economics of our country are regarded as follows: On one side we have state economics, on the other private economics and nothing besides. Private capitalist economics, the economics of the small peasantry, and every kind of private economic undertaking — among the poor peasantry, the middle peasantry, etc. — are all thrown together.

It need scarcely be emphasized that this standpoint is entirely wrong. When Lenin asked "Who is going to defeat whom?" we the capitalists or the capitalists us, he put the question from the viewpoint of: Who is going to win over the peasantry? Shall we win over the main mass of the peasantry, or will the capitalists do it? In Lenin's conceptions the peasantry played chiefly the rôle of an object subject to the influences of the opposing class forces. And when we put the question of "Who is going to defeat whom?" the answer will be essentially decided by the question of who succeeds in drawing over the peasantry to his side, for the struggle between the working class and the capitalist is a struggle for the peasantry. It is thus entirely absurd, and flatly contradicts Lenin's standpoint, when private capitalist economics are identified with agricultural economics in all their various strata.

This brings us to the second question of this series of peasant problems: the question of "pumping over" means from agricultural sources, and from private economic undertakings, into industry and into state economics. This is no simple question. It is perfectly clear that our state industry cannot obtain the means for its expansion solely from the work done by the working class within this state industry itself, and that it must necessarily draw on the non-industrial reservoir for the means to support and expand industry. One of the resources upon which we must draw is the peasantry. The peasantry must take its share in helping the state to build up a socialist state of industry, and thus the tax revenues, the industrial profits on the goods which we sell to the peasantry, and other various revenues, are drawn to a certain extent from the peasantry.

It would be entirely wrong to say industry should develop solely upon what is produced within this industry itself. On the contrary, the whole question is: How much can we take away from the peasantry, to what extent and by what methods can we accomplish the pumping over process, what are the limits of the pumping over, and how shall we calculate in order to arrive at favourable results? This is the question. Here lies the difference between us and the opposition, a difference which may be defined by saying that the comrades of the opposition are in favour of an immoderate amount of pumping over, and are desirous of putting so severe a pressure upon the peasantry that in our opinion the result would be economically irrational and politically unallowable. We do not in the least hold the standpoint that we are against "this pumping over, but our calculations are more sober, we confine ourselves to measures economically and politically adapted to their purpose.

If we look at the matter with the eyes of comrade Preobrazhensky and a number of other comrades, who do not notice the difference between private capitalist economics and peasantry economics, then it is only natural that anxiety as to the limits to be observed appears to be entirely superfluous, since we deprive the private capitalist of everything which we possibly can and only permit his continued existence as a possible milch-cow for the future. But we cannot adopt the same attitude towards the peasantry as to the private capitalists. We cannot find a common formula applicable alike to the middle peasant, the rich farmer, and the poor of the villages, as comrade Preobrazhensky would like to do. This is not the right way to put the question. Theoretical standpoints such as this lead us to different conclusions in practical politics as in other things.

The opposition proposes: Sell as dearly as possible. In selling goods at higher prices to the peasant, you are taking more from him. "Take more!" — this is the whole wisdom of the opposition. The formulation laid down by one of the comrades of the opposition, comrade Ossovsky, in an article which we published as discussion article in the "Bolshevik", consists of the statement that we are now taking less from the peasantry than the Czar did. We should take more, and all evils will vanish from among us. But we must not judge like this, nor merely

because it would be inconsistent with our policy with respect to the peasants, but because it is incorrect from the standpoint of economic adaptedness to purpose, it is a naive illusion, a self-deception. It is ridiculous to suppose that our industry could develop with maximum rapidity under such circumstances.

Let us take a rough example. This year we could take ten times as much from the peasants as we are actually doing, and invest this in industry. But what would happen next year? Next year our agriculture would be worth nothing, we should have no raw materials, no cotton, no export grains, etc. At the same time industry receives an enormous influx of capital, everything which we can possibly squeeze out of the peasants. It would be nonsense to believe that this would secure the most rapid speed possible in the development of industry; obviously the first result would be a narrowing down of our markets, an absence of buyers.

I have chosen a rough example intentionally, but it serves to show that the maximum speed of development of our industry is by no means guaranteed by the maximum sum extracted from the peasantry. The matter is not so simple as all that. If we take less today, we thereby promote accumulation in agriculture, and ensure for ourselves a greater demand tomorrow for the products of our industry. If we secure higher gains for agriculture, this will enable us to take more next year than we could last. We thus secure for ourselves a still greater increase of revenue for the following year, and this revenue we can employ in our industry. This policy naturally involves a somewhat slower rate of speed this year, but will be compensated later by a rapid rise in the curve of our development. But if we adopt the policy of the opposition, we fly to a high summit of capital investment during the first year, only to fall the more inevitably, and probably with a very abrupt drop. We can by no means guarantee our progress by these means. The policy pursued by the C. C. is adapted to the actualisation of our industrial development. The policy recommended by the opposition would not only plunge us into a series of political difficulties, but would retard and destroy the speed of progress of industry.

Now to the third question, which I have already discussed in my positive consideration of the situation. The comrades of the opposition exaggerate, most, tragically the differentiation within the peasantry, and thus they constantly tend to fall into the mistake of ignoring the middle peasant, they devote too little attention to the question of the rôle of the middle peasantry to the question of the co-operatives, etc. In connection with this aspect of the peasant question they have further failed to grasp the problem of the transformation to be undergone in the economics of the peasantry, the problem of the guidance of the peasants into other systems of work and other paths of development, their guidance into socialist methods through the agency of the co-operatives, and through the growing influence of the organs of the proletarian dictatorship on the economics of the middle peasantry. This question plays an extremely important part in our discussion. It is expressed in various combinations, forms the basis of various differences, and remains one of those fundamental bones of contention between the great majority of the C. C. and the leaders of the opposition.

The Social Character of the Soviet State.

Let us now turn to the third problem, the problem of the power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the policy of the proletarian dictatorship within our country. You may perhaps ask: Has this question then become a matter of contention in our Party? And yet it is true, the opposition has made even this question a matter of contention. Even in this question it has begun to express its doubts in a series of attacks and assertions. At first it was only the character of our socialist industry which was made the subject of doubt, then came the doubt as to the correctness of our tactics in the peasant question, and now the character, the class character of our Soviet power in our country is being questioned. This is another step in the development of the oppositional idea, another step away from the true Leninist standpoint.

Comrade Trotsky, in one of his speeches at the Plenum of the C. C. advanced the thesis of the "extremely non-proletarian character" of the Soviet power existing in our country. When the peasant question came under discussion in connection

with the results of the elections, the opposition stated that we are threatened by a deviation in the direction of the rich peasantry, and demanded decisive intervention on the part of the Party, in order to prevent any further shifting in a safe already far from proletarian.

It must be observed that the idea that our state is not a workers' state, that it is no longer the state of proletarian dictatorship, is gaining continual ground in oppositional circles. It might be thought that this sentence simply escaped from comrade Trotsky in the heat of discussion. This is possible; but in this case it would have been his duty to withdraw the assertion afterwards. This was the more necessary that I drew attention, in my speech at the Plenum of the C. C. to this sentence, as something entirely foreign to us.

I repeat that it is possible for comrade Trotsky to have made this assertion in the heat of the discussion. But this sentence does not stand alone. An article will appear in the next number of the "Bolshevik", by comrade Ossovsky of the opposition. I have already made mention of another article of his in the "Bolshevik" in which he maintained that we should not by any means take less from the peasants than Czarism and the landowners took. Comrades, you must accord more attention to this question, for you will well be able to grasp that the question of the character of our state power is to us the central question. Have we a proletarian dictatorship or have we not? All other questions decidedly depend on this one, for if we have no proletarian dictatorship, this proletarian dictatorship must be actualised. And then we have to clear out of the way every obstacle hampering the realisation of this proletarian dictatorship.

Comrade Ossovsky writes:

"It would be well for us at the present moment to recollect the words spoken by comrade Lenin at the session of the Communist fraction of the VIII. Soviet Congress. He said that our state is not a workers' state, but a workers' and peasants' state. It is only now, six years later, that it becomes comprehensible why comrade Bukharin is by no means able to draw the conclusions rising from the fact that our state is no workers' state, but a workers' and peasants' state. The Lenin view of the workers' and peasants' state assumes a certain inevitable distance between this state and the state consisting of the proletariat and to a certain extent of the peasantry. The attempts to ignore the inevitable distance between the workers' and peasants' state and the proletariat are likely to be disastrous to the proletarian revolution."

This, translated into ordinary language, means: We have no proletarian dictatorship, our state is not a workers' state, but a workers' and peasants' state; the proletariat must however defend its interests, and must thus oppose to a certain extent this workers' and peasants' state. Thus if the proletarian Party wants to remain a proletarian Party, it must contend to some degree against the Soviet power. One thing must be said first of all, that it is becoming the fashion to try and find support in Lenin's authority for all kinds of nonsense, and those who do this, think it is going to cost them nothing, and that they may practise this art as long as they choose.

Here comrade Ossovsky directs his fire upon the Lenin grasped the fact that our state is a workers' and peasants' state. Bukharin fails to grasp it. And since Bukharin is well known to be an adherent of the majority of the C. C. it is only natural that the C. C. comprehends nothing of this question, and is thus pursuing a policy which, as comrade Ossovsky points out, can become extremely disastrous from the standpoint of proletarian revolution. First of all, I must challenge the testimony, and utterly reject this reference to comrade Lenin as witness, of rather. I myself call upon him as witness, in order to prove that comrade Ossovsky is entirely in the wrong, and that his standpoint leads in reality to conclusions disastrous to proletarian revolution.

The following was written by comrade Lenin, (Complete works, Vol. 181, in the article "The crisis in the Party", page 33, Russian) with reference to the trade union discussion:

"When dealing with the discussion of 30 December, I must correct an error of mine. I said that: 'Our state is in reality not a workers' state, but a workers' and peasants' state.' Comrade Bukharin, at once interpreted: 'What kind of a state?' In reply I referred to the VIII. Soviet Congress

then just concluded. Now, when reading the report on the discussion, I see that I was wrong, and comrade Bukharin is right. I should have said that: 'The workers' state is an abstraction, and yet we have in reality a workers' state, but firstly with the peculiarity that it is not the proletarian but the peasant population which preponderates in the country, and secondly it is a workers' state accompanied by bureaucratic distortion.'

This is surely perfectly clear, and comrade Ossovsky ought to have known that Lenin wrote this. Lenin here states directly, when speaking of the character of the state power, "We have a workers' government, but the peasantry is in the majority in the country." Right! "We have a workers' state, but accompanied by bureaucratic distortion." Right! Thus our proletarian dictatorship, our workers' state, has the peculiarities of working in an agricultural country and of having its state apparatus burdened with various bureaucratic aberrations.

This is perfectly true. But what is the class character of the state? It is a workers' state. To state that our state is not a workers' state, that it is already semi-bourgeois, is to assert that our state is already in a condition of degeneration, and to throw doubts upon the existence of the proletarian dictatorship in our country. And where comrade Ossovsky says this in so many words in a printed essay, comrade Trotsky expresses the same in his sentence on the "extremely non-proletarian character" of our state. If this really were the case, it would be a very serious matter indeed. If we really had no proletarian dictatorship, then we should have to pursue a very different line, and our Party, in so far as it is a proletarian Party, would obviously place questions on the agenda aiming at a radical purging of the present Soviet power. Could it be otherwise? This is the first thesis.

The Rumour of the Bureaucratic Degeneration of the Soviets.

This brings us to the thesis of the degeneration of our whole state apparatus, and of the deviation of our policy, and of the policy of the present Soviet state, from the interests of the broad proletarian masses. Comrade Kameney has declared in so many words:

"The line you take is departing from the line of proletarian revolution, and is deserting more and more the interests of the broad proletarian masses."

This is entirely in harmony with the idea that "our state has an extremely non-proletarian character", and with Ossovsky's assertion that we have no workers' state. It harmonises entirely with the whispers and rumours on the degeneration of the Soviet power at present occupying so much of the time of "pro-now-Soviet" ("Smyenoyekhovzy") elements and various other liberal opponents of our policy. The opposition has pointed out that the numerous bureaucratic groups in our state apparatus are complemented by the equally numerous bureaucratic groups in the economic organs, the co-operatives, the trade unions, etc. It would thus seem that the whole of the groups composing our apparatus have practically nothing in common with the interests of the broad masses.

We have been believing in our simplicity that our Party is the vanguard of the proletariat, but now it turns out that it is a bureaucratic clique, entirely detached from the masses. We believe the Soviet power to represent a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it appears that all we have is an extremely non-proletarian state, headed by a completely degenerated caste. The logical continuance of this train of thought is bound to lead sooner or later to the idea of the overthrow of the Soviet power — it can lead nowhere else.

And I repeat: Were I personally convinced that the situation among us has reached a point at which we have no longer a dictatorship of the working class, and we are being ruled by an oligarchy detaching itself from the interests of the broad masses, then my only conclusion would be that of Kautsky: Overthrow of the ruling power. Our comrades of the opposition have not yet reached this logical conclusion, and are not likely to. I for my part believe that the "God" of the Bolsheviks will yet stay their steps in time, and this will be an excellent thing from the standpoint of the interests of the Party. But we should be very dense indeed if we did not comprehend that this remarkable ideological development takes a straight line in this direction.

The Rinnour of the Submerging of the Soviets in the Peasant Petty Bourgeoisie.

There is another assertion of the opposition which tends in the same direction, the thesis that whilst our upper stratum, the Party, the Soviet power, the state and economic organs, are all submerged in a bureaucracy opposed to the interests of the working class, at the same time our subordinate Soviet organs are being submerged in the peasant petty bourgeoisie. The comrades take the election results and say: "Look, there are peasants in the village Soviets, and there will be more and more of them here - this is the way in which the Soviets are being vitalised". The upper stories of our building are being flooded by a bureaucratic clique, the lower stories by the petty bourgeoisie, and nothing but complete catastrophe is to be seen on both sides. The two waves will close over our heads and we shall suffocate.

This thesis of the submerging of our village Soviets under a flood of peasants is truly a pearl of creative thought on the part of the new opposition. The opposition appears to imagine it possible to govern an agricultural country in such manner that the working class non-existent in the village is still to maintain a numerical ascendancy. How can anyone imagine that the industrial proletariat is to have the majority in the village Soviets? Anyone who can arrive at such an idea must truly have a cabbage in place of a head. (Applause.)

Everyone in possession of even the most elementary political knowledge is aware that the Soviet power and the apparatus of our Soviet state represent a special system actually composed of several stories. No other than comrade Zinoviev has often told us, with the greatest enthusiasm, that the non-Party peasants should be induced to participate. To participate in what? In the Soviets. Do we suffer from the fact that the principle of vitalising the village Soviets has led to the election of non-Party peasants to the Soviets? I am of the opinion that we do not suffer in the least from this. Where is the laboratory in which we convert the peasantry, overcome their individual psychology, induce them to follow us, educate them to co-operate with us in the Soviets, and lead them on the proletarian and socialist road? This is best done in the Soviets. And now we are told that the peasant is to be forced into a dark room - he may learn over the wireless. This is nonsense. We convert the peasant by actual practice, we induce him to follow our lead, to help us to secure the proletarian line.

The structure of our Soviet machinery is as follows: There are supreme, middle, and subordinate organs. At the top there is a very powerful cadre, working under the leadership of our proletarian Party, and composed in the main of Party members. The further we proceed downwards, the more non-Party participants we find and in the villages we find the structure supported by non-Party peasants who have hastened to our aid. We gradually introduce the non-Party peasants, who represent a petty bourgeois stratum, into the lower stories. We are secure in our firm proletarian leadership, and influence the peasants in our own way, introduce them into our system of work, teach them to work in the new way, and induce them to take part in the work of socialist construction. In this way the peasantry is guided by the proletariat. And when we admit the peasantry into the lower stories of the Soviet power, this is a necessary prerequisite towards the guidance of the peasantry by the proletariat.

We may take another example of the same kind, but from the experience of another country, for the purpose of refuting the clever assertions of our remarkable opposition. There is England for instance. England too has carried on imperialist war. As is generally known, Lloyd George, a bourgeois prime minister, admitted Henderson to his cabinet as representative of the working class and the trade unions. The same kind of thing has occurred in other countries. Now tell me this: is there a single Marxist who can maintain that at that time the English state was a bourgeois proletarian state just because Henderson was in the government? It need not be said that such an assertion would be absolute idiocy. You know who made this assertion. It was the opportunists. They said: Now Henderson is a minister, and since he is a minister, this signifies a fresh epoch in the development of capitalism, the workers share the power, and we have no longer a bourgeois imperialist state, but something quite different. The proletarian dictatorship is being judged by the opposition essentially in the same manner.

When Lloyd George admitted Henderson into his cabinet, England did not cease for a moment to be a bourgeois imperialist state. Why? For a very simple reason. Because the bourgeoisie had sought out Henderson and his like for the purpose of transforming the ideology of the working class, and making the workers amenable to bourgeois ideology. Henderson fulfilled the task set him by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie was enabled to take the working class in tow for the time being, and thus the nomination of Henderson as minister was the line on which the bourgeoisie drew the working class behind it, without altering the class character of their bourgeois power by a hair's breadth. They simply took their class antagonist in tow.

But in our case the greater part of the peasantry is not our class enemy, it is our ally, and when we admit these peasants into the apparatus of our state administration, and thus induce them to follow us, then it is surely a remarkable state of mind which can maintain that, because we do this, we have no workers' state, but some schismatic petty bourgeois two-class state, etc. and that therefore we have to conclude it to be our duty to protect the purely proletarian ranks against the Soviet state.

The root of the theoretical error of the opposition lies in the fact that these comrades fail to understand that the proletarian dictatorship must admit its class allies to the organs of the dictatorship if it is to convert these allies to its standpoint, to guide them, and to lead them into the socialist path in the interests of what was to Lenin the supreme principle of the proletarian dictatorship, i. e. of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

This is the real definition of the standpoint. And if the existence of a proletarian dictatorship in our country is doubted because we have no industrial proletariat in the villages and in the village Soviets, because we have no industrial proletarians in our organs in places where not even a magnifying glass can discover a proletarian at all, then this simply means that the main task incumbent upon the proletarian dictatorship, the task of inducing the poor peasantry and the great mass of the middle peasantry to take part in the work of actualising a socialist state of society, has not been properly grasped. This lack of comprehension is a striking example of that lack of faith in the possibility of the actualisation of socialism in our country, of that lack of understanding for the methods towards this actualisation, which was discussed in such decisive terms at the XIV. Party Congress.

The Results of the Election Campaign.

In this connection I must say a few words on the recent Soviet election campaign.

The last election campaign is the first which we have carried out without recourse to administrative pressure. We have applied new methods for the first time, and have transferred our preponderant attention to gaining the convictions of the voters and to exercising an ideological influence over them, and thus the various strata to whom our constitution accords the suffrage, enjoyed a greater amount of freedom at this election. What was the result of the elections? The result was that in the villages the proportion of communists elected was lessened, and that elements have thus been admitted to the village Soviets, and in part to the city Soviets, which have hitherto been practically suppressed. This circumstance has given our opposition the opportunity to maintain that this is evidence of our becoming submerged in the petty bourgeoisie, and that the pressure put upon us by the petty bourgeoisie is here expressed by the machine of state slipping from the proletarian rails.

To this the following may be observed: In the first place very many comrades have observed the following in the provinces: If there have been fewer communists elected to the village Soviets (than at the last election) and in many places this is doubtless the case, those communists who have been elected this time, are supported by the whole village, whilst hitherto they have only been nominally elected, and in actual fact they were simply appointed, and possessed no authority among the villagers. It is true that there were more communists last time, but these communists had no contact with the masses and did not lead the masses. But at the present moment, when we are drawing the total balance of our Soviet elections, we may confidently state that even where only a small proportion of communists have been elected to the lower stories of our Soviet building, this does not signify any weakening of our growth, but is rather an expression of our growth, the proof that we

are basing our leadership upon ideological conviction. One comrade backed up by his whole village is worth ten communists standing alone.

Every great manoeuvre, and every considerable change of course, incurs expenses and renders a regrouping necessary. When we declared at the XIV. Party Conference that a regrouping had become necessary, some of our comrades lost their heads. They did not know what to do. Some abandoned their own Party opinions and yielded to the pressure exercised by others. Other again completely lost their bearings and did not know which way to turn. The real regrouping did not begin until after a considerable time. It is true that we have admitted a great number of peasants into the peasant Soviets without bringing them everywhere sufficiently under our influence at the same time. This has been our minus. We have not been able to rearrange our ranks with sufficient speed, but still we had to take the first step in this direction, we had to change our course in order to advance more rapidly upon the new path. There is really nothing terrible about this. Our ranks now rearranged, we are now beginning to influence fresh masses hitherto not quite within our reach.

At one time Comrade Zinoviev proposed that non-Party conferences should be held, and a newspaper published for the non-Party peasant fraction, whilst Comrade Sokolnikov demanded the legalisation of the Mensheviks and of the S. R. They made these proposals when they felt the ground somewhat insecure beneath their feet. They were prepared to abandon any position because the villages actually were grumbling against the Soviet power at that time. But when we make a carefully calculated evaluation, calmly and collectedly, without learning anything, and strictly calculating the proportions, then they shriek that we are slipping down. We are not slipping down, we are establishing the proletarian dictatorship more firmly, and tomorrow we shall establish it more firmly still, if we do not deviate from the line which we are now following, but pursue a correct policy.

In concluding my remarks on the problem of our power, I repeat and emphasise that even if the opposition had no doubts of the class character of our power at the time of the XIV. Party Congress, there is now an undeniable tone of doubt, of scepticism, of disbelief in the proletarian character of our power.

From the Idea of Freedom for Groups to the Idea of Political Democracy in the whole Country.

I now pass on to the fourth problem, the problem of Party mechanism in the system of the proletarian dictatorship. You are aware that up to now we Leninists have regarded the unity and coherence of our Party as the first prerequisite for the maintenance and firmer establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. We Leninists have always imagined that the proletarian dictatorship can only be secure in our country, if our Party plays its role properly, and when this Party is in the first place the sole party in our country, that is, when the legal existence of other parties is made impossible, and in the second place the Party is consistent in its structure, that is, represents a structure excluding any independent and autonomous groups, fractions, organised currents, etc.

I shall not remind you, Comrades, of the expenditure of energy, the many words and the many gestures, which we have witnessed from Comrade Zinoviev, from this very platform, in his efforts to demonstrate this elementary Leninist truth. And now this has all changed at one blow. Now the whole opposition, the whole oppositional block - Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Krupskaya, etc. - demands freedom for fractions, within the Party. The first signal for this change of front was given by Comrade Zinoviev from the platform of our XIV. Party Congress. As you will know, Comrade Zinoviev declared on this occasion that we should call upon all former oppositional groups to share the leadership of the Party. This germ has since developed, not merely into a bud, but into a full blown, if not particularly sweet smelling and aromatic flower. (Laughter.)

It must be observed that if the opposition now insists on having our Party reconstructed on a basis permitting a freedom to form groups and fractions, some of the comrades of the opposition are arriving at conclusions of which we must take careful note: if we want to know which way the wind is blowing Comrade Ossovsky, of whom we have already spoken

as a member of the opposition, pronounces the following judgment in the article quoted: In our country there is no unity of economic interests. The working class has its interests, and the peasant class has its interests, differing somewhat. And then there are private capitalists in the Union, again a third group of interests. But we have only one Party. And if we have only one Party, and will not legalise other parties, then we must arrange matters so that there can be elements within our Party itself who represent capitalist interests. I am telling you all this in my own words, but comrade Ossovsky writes in a learned language as follows:

"The positive solution of this question (that is, the question of the unity of our Party) would not be difficult if we had not to prove the possibility of the unity of a party not the only legal one". (That is, if there were other parties as well.) "We should then be the sole ruling Party, but not the only party in the country. It is a much more complicated matter to prove the possibility of absolute unity in the sole legal party in a country containing extremely multitudinous economic tendencies. No-one denies that our economic include spheres in which capitalist spirit of enterprise could play a positive rôle. In this case the Party, remaining a united and sole party, has to actually protect all the interests in the country, including those of capitalist enterprises."

These are the super-clever theoretical arguments with which Comrade Ossovsky seeks to justify the demand for freedom to form fractions. If you want to one party only in the country, he says, and there are various interests to be considered, then strive to give "freedom" to those who protect the interests of the rich peasantry and the capitalists. It is difficult to defend the interests of the rich peasantry and the capitalists within the confines of our Party constitution. Let us open the door, and you will have a fraction of NEP-men, a fraction of the petty bourgeoisie, and all this together will be called the C. P. S. U. Then the dictatorship will flourish in our country, for then the Party will correspond to a workers' and peasants' state. Strictly speaking, we could go even further in the same direction. Presently he will be saying: "Workers', Peasants' and NEP-men's State". Then everything will be in the best of order. Workers'-Peasants'-NEP-men's State, Workers'-Peasants'-NEP-men's Party, one sole Party in the whole country, and everything in perfect order. (Laughter.) You will now understand what lies at the bottom of all this. The fractional groups in our Party are naturally based upon various social currents, and if we permit the formation of fractional groups, if we permit the existence of fractions, then the next stage will be nothing more nor less than the legalisation of other parties.

An example: There is a Medvedev fraction, whose standpoint has been made known to you in an article published in the "Pravda". (See "Inprecorr" Vol 6, Nr. 54, 29th July 1926, p. 904, "The Right Danger in our Party".) Comrade Medvedev demands that our state industry be placed in the hands of the concession capitalists, and that the Comintern and the R. I. U. be liquidated; he demands immediate affiliation to the Amsterdam International; he demands the cessation of all discussion on the peasantry, for the peasantry is - the "dreary village". This is a well-developed Menshevik programme.

We are told that we should grant freedom to this legitimate view, to this fraction. Do they not call themselves, seriously, the "Workers' Opposition"? It does not matter that they want to dissolve the Comintern and perform other revolutionary wonders; all this signifies nothing if only they call themselves the "Workers' Opposition."

Let us assume that we permit the existence of these fractions, and that our Party includes a legally recognised Medvedev fraction. Then the Mensheviks would next come to us and say: We ask for nothing more, at present we only want what Medvedev wants: close the Comintern, destroy the Red International of Labour Unions, pursue a policy of extensive concessions, and ignore the peasant, for why should you bother with him. They would say to us: "Why will you not legalise us, since there is already one such legal fraction in your Party?" It is obvious that we should then have to legalise the Mensheviks. If we legalise such a fraction as this in the Party, we legalise by this another party, and if we legalise another party, then we are truly slipping down from the line of proletarian dictatorship to the line of political democracy. That is, to the line so long advocated by the Mensheviks, by Kautsky, by the S. R. and by many others of our political enemies.

It is to be observed that oppositional circles seem to like to dally with the idea of two parties. This same Ossovsky prophesies that we shall have two parties in the immediate future, both which will call themselves communist at first: One party which will be in favour of withdrawal from the Anglo-Russian Committee and will stand for a very "international standpoint", and another party which imagines that socialism can be built up in our country alone, a sort of "national-communist" party. This entertaining of the idea of two parties has already become extremely popular in oppositional circles. The standpoint taken by the opposition on the freedom to form groups and fractions as one step on the road to this idea, which in its actual essence is the idea of the justification of a split in the Party.

This is in our opinion the fourth fundamental problem dealt with at the Plenum of the C. C., and I believe that the opposition has here too wandered completely from the path of the ABC of Leninism with respect to the importance and the character of the Party in our country, and from the ABC of Lenin's teaching on the organisational character of our united and sole Party.

Results and Conclusions.

In what Direction is the Ideology of the Opposition Developing?

Comrades, I now come to the question which must have occurred to every one of you: In what direction is the ideology of the opposition developing, what is its ideological marching route, where is it going? I must refer once more to Medvedev's standpoint, but shall not repeat its outlines, as these are already well known to you.

It was not for nothing that the central organ of our Party entitled its article against Medvedev's standpoint: "The Right Danger in our Party". Nobody with ordinary common sense can deny that the extreme Right is represented in our Party by a group of the one-time Workers' Opposition, for it is impossible to imagine a more extreme Right in the sphere of international revolutionary politics than a standpoint in favour of the liquidation of the Comintern, a standpoint which names the West European Communist parties a "rabble of petty bourgeois lackeys" living "on Russian gold", which demands the liquidation of the Red International of Labour Unions, the abandonment of our socialist industry to foreign capital, etc. This standpoint inclines further to the Right than any other in our Party, strictly speaking, it is ideologically already quite outside of our Party. And we must never forget that the present opposition, which represents a block comprising various oppositional currents, includes as one constituent the group around comrade Medvedev. The opposition has given us no sensible reply to our repeated requests to turn aside from the Medvedev standpoint, at least at the Plenum of the C. C., and join hands with us for a determined attack upon it.

But this is not all: About a year ago a group of comrades commissioned Comrade Zinoviev to write an article against a letter in which Medvedev explained his viewpoint, and to publish this article in the names of a number of comrades. Comrade Zinoviev did not execute this commission. When he was asked at the C. C. Plenum why he did not fulfil this duty, he replied literally: "Since you are directing your fire against the Left, I did not think it suitable to attack the Left comrade Medvedev." Thus Comrade Zinoviev regards the standpoint of comrade as a "Left" standpoint. Thus it would appear that, if Medvedev is of the "Left", then Comrade Zinoviev stands to the Right of him. I do not know what is to be thought of this logical conclusion. In reality Comrade Zinoviev is of course not Right of Comrade Medvedev. This is happily not yet the case, but if we regard the ideological position of the various oppositional groups, objectively and without consideration of persons, we can find an ideological bridge connecting the components of the opposition block.

What does Medvedev Write on the Peasantry Question?

"It is foolish" — he writes, — "to suppose that the economic position of the small peasant can now be saved; it is inevitably doomed to decay and to complete extermination. It is mere petty bourgeois Utopianism to believe that there can be any uplift in peasant economics."

This is what we all said under the capitalist regime. But to speak like this under the conditions furnished by the proletarian dictatorship is to accept a standpoint widely differing from the Leninist. Comrade Medvedev comes to the conclusion that there is no use in troubling about the "dreary" village. For him the peasantry is represented by this pseudonym of the "dreary village". Why should we, real proletarians, trouble ourselves about the "dreary villages" (or with the "stupid rabble" in the Comintern)? Let us rather give our industry to the concession capitalists, in order that we may earn a few more pence. Such is the weak, flaccid, trade unionist countenance which peers forth from behind this platform. But when the comrades of the new opposition maintain that the differentiation in the peasantry has made such strides that the middle peasant comes scarcely in question, or when Comrade Preobrazhensky fails to observe the difference between private capitalist and peasant economics, then we have here an undoubted ideological relationship to Medvedev. These two standpoints are not identical, but they are ideologically related.

If our opposition throws doubts on the socialist character of our state industry, and Comrade Medvedev attaches so little importance to this socialist character of our industry that he is prepared to abandon this industry to the concession capitalists, this is the second bridge connecting the ideology of the two groups.

If Comrade Medvedev does not believe that we have a proletarian dictatorship, and is of the opinion that it is the task of the proletarian organisation to exercise pressure upon the state, and at the same time we find other comrades of the opposition letting slip such sentences as that on the "extremely non-proletarian character" of our state, then we have here the third ideological bridge between the group of oppositional comrades and the group around Comrade Medvedev, which latter group may be said to be leading the way as "vanguard" of the whole oppositional block.

If Medvedev believes that our Party is rotten, that it has run off the rails of proletarian policy, and Comrade Kamenev asserts that our policy deviates from the interests of the broad masses of the workers, again this ideological similarity forms a bridge, the fourth uniting these two groups with one another. All deviations begin in this manner and lead in their later development to entirely anti-Bolshevist conclusions. This is where the collective opposition and the Medvedev group are ideologically related.

We shall be told that the most far-reaching, revolting and evil-smelling proposition made by Medvedev is that for the liquidation of the Comintern, whilst there is nothing similar to be found in either Zinoviev's or Trotsky's utterances. This is true, for the present. We should be the first to thank destiny were it to remain true for ever. But if the opposition continues on its present path, it may still lead to such a crisis. Ossovsky so often mentioned an adherent of Comrade Trotsky — has already hinted at this conclusion. He writes approximately as follows: "Our Party, the C.P.S.U., is exposed to the pressure of various forms of economics, etc. (Here we must recollect what has already been said above on the representation of capitalist elements.) Consequently it must renounce its role as leader of the Communist International."

Let us think this thought to its logical conclusion: If the C.P.S.U. does not renounce its rôle, this means that in no case will it lead the Comintern further on the path of revolution. This means that its "degeneration" will involve the degeneration of the Comintern. The ultra-Left in Germany are already saying this today. Their conclusion is the necessity of creating a IV. International. What will our opposition say when it maintains that our Party has fallen away from the line of revolution, and yet it still remains the leader of the Comintern? In this case the opposition will begin to declare loudly that the Comintern has fallen away from the proletarian path with the Russian Party. The further development of the views of the opposition will then be along the line of a false, neglectful and declinatory attitude towards the Comintern.

I repeat: We shall be the first to thank destiny if this does not come to pass. We shall be the first to be pleased. But if it is not to happen, then the opposition must leave the path of destruction which it is now treading. It must pause and think whether its ideology is leading it.

The Opposition at an Intermediate Station — on the Platform of Trotskyism.

What is the ideological current thus developing in the opposition? The current is tending in the direction of Shlyapnikov and Medvedev, it is becoming a completely liquidatory tendency on the basis of disbelief in the building up of socialism in our country. At the present moment the opposition is resting at an intermediate station, called Trotskyism. The official ideology of the whole opposition in its totality — including Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev, Krupskaya, etc. — is obviously that of open Trotskyism.

At the time when we prophesied that the matter would end in Trotskyism, we were not believed by many comrades, members of the opposition. They said: That will never be the case. You will remember how Zinoviev rose up against Trotsky, what thunders he called down upon him, both at home and in the foreign Party press. How many pamphlets were written by Zinoviev, Salutzky, Esalarov, Kanatchikov, and a large number of other comrades, many of them somewhat evil-smelling pamphlets, which aggravated the question to a point to which it should never have been brought. But now Comrade Trotsky has become the ideological leader of this whole oppositional group, whilst neither Comrade Zinoviev nor Comrade Kamenev has a single independent idea. They come forward with common declarations, with a common standpoint, with common signatures; and the main point is that all the ideas contained in these utterances are the ideas of Comrade Trotsky.

This is in accordance with the facts. I have already described these ideas. Whose opinion is the present opinion held by the opposition in the peasantry question? It is Comrade Trotsky's opinion. I have detailed our differences in questions of economic policy; I have described Comrade Preobrazhensky's standpoint. Whose standpoint is this? It is Trotsky's standpoint, which has borne away the victory in the opposition, whilst Zinoviev and Kamenev have capitulated before it.

And in the question of organisation, in the question of granting the freedom to form groups and fractions — whose are the views defended here by the opposition? It need not be said that these are Trotsky's views, for he has brood for them for decades. These are views which Trotsky expounded in 1923/24, at the same time as his demand for freedom of groups and fractions.

Comrade Zinoviev, at a Moscow Functionaries' Meeting, held on 31 December 1924, spoke as follows:

"We therefore beg you, the Moscow organisation, to give us a clear and unequivocal answer (the subject dealt with was the discussion with Trotsky). If you believe the time to have come for legalising the fractions and groups, say so openly. (Thus spoke comrade Zinoviev in 1923 and 1924.) We do not believe that this time has come yet, or that it will come at all during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It cannot come, for this is a question bound up with the freedom of the press and the political rights of the whole of the non-proletarian strata of the population, etc. Those who do not grasp this do not understand anything whatever of the whole situation. It is our attitude towards the peasantry which is involved. We cannot permit a schism in the Party, for we should thereby permit a split in the state."

The slightest disorder in the Party takes immediate effect upon the whole apparatus of state. This is being discussed by both the specialists and the other categories of employees. Schism in the Party inevitably engenders schism in the whole state apparatus. Thus the question of fractions is a question of life and death to the Party.

Thus comrade Zinoviev spoke against Trotsky. But today it is he who is contending for fractions and groups. He has forgotten everything and appears to consider all that he said so recently on 11 December 1924 as empty chatter.

Trotskyism is and remains at bottom to a great extent a Left utopia in the European, that is, opportunist and Marxist, anti-communistic spirit.

Then what Comrade Zinoviev wrote on Trotskyism in another place he writes:

"It has often been said that all the misfortunes of the Party started from the Tenth Party Congress."

Why this? It was precisely the X Party Congress which declared such a discussion within the Party to be superfluous.

"The policy of the X Party Congress is the policy of Leninism. The attack made by Comrade Trotsky against the fundamentals of Bolshevik policy, against the fundamentals of Leninism, on the basis of the balance drawn by the X Party Congress with respect to the freedom of fractions and groups, cannot be acknowledged as right". And so forth.

Thus comrade Zinoviev wrote at one time. And now all this has been thrown upon the dustheap. Now all this is forgotten. It was spoken with the greatest enthusiasm, but is none the less forgotten. Trotsky remains as victor in the block established on the basis of withdrawal to a distance from Lenin's ideological principles, though it was Zinoviev who designated Trotsky's standpoint as nothing more nor less than a variety of Menshevism containing nuances fundamentally hostile to Bolshevism, etc. etc.

The Ideological Sources of the Opposition Block.

Let us turn to the question of the ideological sources from which the opposition block derives its ideas. I am of the opinion that the bed-rock foundation of the ideology of the opposition block in all its constituents, is actually, as seen at the XIV. Party Congress, disbelief, or at best doubt, of the possibility of building up socialism in our country, and I maintain that this arises out of the former viewpoint held by all the representatives of the present opposition block.

This for instance in Comrade Trotsky's case his lack of faith is associated with his conviction that if international revolution is not victorious, then the counter-revolutionary peasantry are inevitably bound to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the fundamental standpoint developed by him in his theory of permanent revolution, and is the standpoint from which he has not departed.

In the case of Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev their lack of faith is a part of their past; at the time of the October revolution they thought that we, as sole Party backed by the proletariat, were not capable of coping with the tasks imposed by power.

And then comes the "Workers' Opposition": Here again I must remind you of a fact which many of us have forgotten. One of the deserters at the time of the October revolution was Comrade Shlyapnikov; he left his post at this turning point. He was People's Commissary at that time, and sent in his resignation. It may of course be assumed that he did not do this on his own initiative, but probably after consultation with those sharing his views.

The three main elements of the present block have shown by their historical past that their estimate of the class forces in our country is such that they doubt the possibility of the working class, under the leadership of our Party, proving capable of drawing the mighty wagon of our backward country out of the bog into which it has fallen. These are the first and deepest sources of the ideology of the present opposition block.

The Party will not Permit a Fractional Split.

I think it will now be fairly plain to you why the opposition has had recourse to such unheard of action as that leading to the affair of Comrade Lashevitch and others. (I shall not enter into the nature of this affair here since it is as well known to you as to me — the decisions of the Party will be published). The steps taken by these oppositional comrades have led to a violation of Party discipline perfectly unheard of in the history of the Party, and it has been possible that a candidate to the Politburo with the unqualified approval of members of the Politburo has been held in mass meetings in the forest against the Party, and has been cursed by the Party, for the purpose of overthrowing the present leaders of the C.C. of the Party, and of creating a new organisation actually representing the germ of a new Party whose influence was to extend over the whole country.

Comrades, I shall not here demonstrate to you the entirely criminal character of such action from the standpoint of the Party. This seems to me entirely superfluous. You all understand it without explanation. But I honestly want to understand how it could come about. I think it has been made possible because these comrades, as regards ideology, have fallen away from the line of the Party to such an extent, and are internally so completely convinced that without them the Party will fall over a precipice, slip from the proletarian pathway, and drive the country to the verge of the abyss, that they feel themselves impelled to grasp at any available means — they rush into the forest and cry for "help". This is the only possible subjective justification for them.

But from the standpoint of the Party there is no justification. The Central Committee and the Central Control Commission have been faced by the fact that a number of comrades, including some holding extremely responsible positions, had actually taken such steps as the convocation of an illegal meeting against the Party and its leaders. Were we to tolerate such actions, our Party would cease to exist tomorrow as a Leninist Party. We cannot tolerate this. We say to these comrades: Defend your principles, declare your standpoint, speak in the Party meetings, but if you take to the forest, if you will not reply to our questions, if you refuse to make statements before the Control Commission, if you choose the method of organising a new Party within our Party, the method of illegal organisation, then we shall fight you relentlessly. But we shall not let matters go so far as this Comrade Zinoviev was perfectly right, two years ago, when he said that the question of schism in the Party is a matter of life and death to the Party and to the proletarian dictatorship.

The danger is somewhat lessened by the fact that the comrades of the opposition have only in their imagination the masses of the proletariat behind them. In reality they will continue to be more and more like generals without armies, or admirals of the Swiss fleet. (Laughter and applause.) This will come about the more rapidly as the Party itself attacks the work of enlightenment more energetically, and steels its own ideology.

This work of enlightenment is the leading point on our agenda. This is the first task to which we must devote attention.

The opposition is speculating upon various possibilities. It is speculating upon our economic difficulties. It is speculating upon the fact that we suffer many shortcomings in our present life, that many different trends of feeling have arisen among the workers during the past year, and will probably be followed by many others. And finally, it is speculating on the supposition that the present Central Committee will not be capable of leading the Party without them, the highly gifted supermen. The opposition believes that we shall break down under a task too difficult for us. But we, comrades, are confident that if the opposition will not help us to lead the party, then we shall do it without them. (Enthusiastic applause.)

We Shall Overcome the Difficulties, Remove the Excesses. Correct the Errors.

We are confident, comrades, that however difficult our economic position is at times, still our economic prospects are good, and the excellent crops which we shall have this year will make it possible for us to really overcome the economic difficulties being undergone by the country at the present juncture. And we are even more confident that we shall be successful in leading both our Party and our country forward on the broad road of development. There are none so blind as those who will not see. There are many who believe the situation to be still the same among us as it was at the beginning of the revolution, when anyone able to write an article with correct spelling could consider himself a Party leader. Since then a new generation has sprung up. We have a new generation of functionaries in the provinces, we are supported on all sides by thousands of hands, and we stake confidently upon this magnificent collective power of our Party. We are fully convinced that we shall win. (Enthusiastic applause.)

The present opposition, like every other opposition which has hitherto arisen in our Party, and like even those oppositional

groups which contend against our Party, outside of its ranks, has a certain foothold upon which it bases its position. Were we to live in Paradise, and had we no faults whatever, so that everything worked at a hundred per cent rate of smoothness, then there would be no foothold for an opposition. I have often made this observation, and am not ashamed to bring it forward again here. During the rising at Kronstadt in the spring of 1921 the armed counter-revolutionary opposition was again based on a rational idea, for a certain disorder had found its way amongst us, and things had occurred which demanded a corresponding reaction on our part. This reaction consisted of the introduction of free trade, in the cessation of grain requisitions, etc., etc. And if there were no bureaucracy among us at the present time, if wages were not still so low in a number of branches of production, and if the village poor had not to live under bad conditions, then the opposition would have no ground under its feet.

Of course, every opposition in the Party exploits our faults. The whole point of the question lies in what is criticised, and in how and why the criticism is exercised.

When the comrades of the opposition declare: "Bureaucracy is strangling you," then we reply: "Yes, bureaucracy is an excessive very detrimental to us." But when they go further and say: "Your state has ceased to be a state of the proletarian dictatorship, it is a state of bureaucrats who have nothing in common with the masses," then we reply: "That is not true; we refute this criticism as a slander against our workers' state."

If we are criticised and told: "This has not been done and that has not been done," and if we are criticised for the purpose of making capital for the formation of a faction, instead of for the purpose of helping us to remedy our faults, if we are criticised in enormous exaggerations, if our Party and the Soviet power are slandered, if individual errors, individual mistakes, and individual weaknesses in our state and our Party apparatus are multiplied a thousandfold, if a faction platform is formed of these, and if the critics do not help us to overcome the real inconsistencies and difficulties, but take the opportunity to fry their own faction, fish, then we take up arms against such a criticism, for this is no capable help coming to aid us to overcome our deficiencies, but a system of repeated attempts to shake the unity of the Party, and to attain the legalisation of other Parties by means of factions and groups. This is a falling away from the proletarian line, even if it is not acknowledged as such.

The opposition, after making several accusations against the C. C. of the Party, maintained that the Party should learn the following lessons from the election campaign: 1. Real industrialisation; 2. real organisation of the poor peasantry; 3. real alliance with the main mass of the middle peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat; 4. real fight against bureaucracy; 5. real inner Party democracy. It would thus appear that our industrialisation is not real, apparently we only assert that we are building new factories, whilst in reality they do not exist. It appears that we are not organising the poor peasantry, that we have no real alliance with the middle peasantry, that only the opposition proposes a real alliance, etc., etc. The opposition gives a false testimony against our whole policy, and believes that it alone is creating something "real" whilst all that we have done and are doing is fundamentally wrong.

We however are straightforward enough to believe that those persons who contend in the crudest form against a current in our Party, one day, only to let themselves be borne on this current, the next, who today proclaim the question of faction to be a matter of death to the Party, and tomorrow a matter of life, we believe that these elements have found their way into "real" Leninism to a certain extent, on false passports.

I must tell you a funny story. In oppositional circles Comrade Zinoviev's book on Leninism has been regarded as a hundred per cent gospel. This will be known to you. A considerable part of this book was directed against comrade Trotsky. But now comrade Zinoviev, for the sake of the book with comrade Trotsky, for the sake of the realisation of real Leninism, has let this book fall under the table, and is not having a further edition published. This is the way they treat the principles of Leninism. Not merely a word which might have slipped out accidentally, but the "gospel" of Leninism.

Our Tasks.

In conclusion a few words on the tasks now facing us. In economic politics our main task is to steer an efficient course towards industrialisation, to seek means for the acceleration of the speed of development for our industry. Our next task, in view of the coming autumn, consists of inquiring into the possibility of a rise in real wages, especially in the wages of those categories of workers whose wages have not kept pace with the others. Although we were unable to fulfil this task a few months ago, it is certain that if we now succeed in manoeuvring our exports skilfully, in bringing in our grain properly and selling it well, etc., we shall be in a position by the autumn to raise the real value of wages. This must be carefully considered and calculated a hundred times, but we must make preparations for it.

The next measure to be taken in our labour policy must be to combat the excrescences which have grown up about the saving regime. In some places the necessity of saving has been so interpreted that the workers have been deprived of water to make tea with, with the result that there have been small revolts here and there in the provinces. This is not a regime of saving, but a caricature, a perfectly criminal caricature of a regime of saving. Our C. C. or its Secretariat must send an explanatory letter to the organisations on this subject. One of our main tasks all over the country must be the combat against the bureaucratism which is throttling us. I may remind you that one of the main thoughts in comrade Dzershinsky's last speech, held just before his death and directed against the opposition, was a declaration of determined war against the immobility, the unwieldiness, and the bureaucratism of our apparatus, against conditions which oblige an urgent matter to pass through the hands of ten to twenty authorities before it can be decided upon and executed. Here we have still a great deal to do, and here the collective endeavours of many workers' hands and heads is truly necessary.

And finally, I am of the opinion that in the sphere of inner Party politics we must not only carry on this direct struggle against factions and groups, but at the same time we must strive more energetically for inner Party democracy. We must enlighten the mass of the Party at any price, strengthen and steel its ideology, and do this in the firm conviction that the line pursued by the majority of the Party is right. This is one of the greatest tasks.

The Communist Party is the mainspring of the state administration of our great country. We are entering the autumn season faced by extremely complicated tasks. We must manoeuvre with our grain prices, and manoeuvre in such a manner that we bring in the largest possible quantity of grain. We must export and sell this grain on advantageous terms, and upon this basis we have to arrange our programme of production, and find our way to a certain improvement in the housing question, the wages question, etc. We begin with these operations every year almost simultaneously with the realisation of the harvest. A very great deal depends upon how these operations are begun. They are almost determinative for the results of a whole economic year. And though we have our hands full with this great practical task, still we must increase our activity in the work of strengthening the ideology of the whole of the Party members, of closing the ranks of the Party on the basis of a definite political standpoint. May every member of the Party know and realise that the majority of the C. C. has a clearly defined standpoint, one for which it stands, which it continues, and which serves as rule for its guidance of the Party.

We are not adherents of Party methods which maintain one thing today, and something diametrically opposite tomorrow, which declare a crusade against deviations today, and submit to the lead of these deviations tomorrow. We have our line of policy, and we follow it consistently. We shall continue to stand for this line, to fight for it, to lead the Party unwaveringly by it, and we are firmly convinced that the whole Party — with the Leningrad organisation, which has always been and always will be a pillar of the C. C. in the front rank — will pursue this line in every respect. The most important point is: the struggle for the right political line; everything else depends upon this, everything else is determined by the struggle for the right political line. Our line is actually a Leninist political line, from which we never deviate, for which we fight without ceasing, and which will be the means of leading us to victory. (Prolonged applause.)

The C. C. of the C. P. of Norway to the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has received the following telegram from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Norway:

"The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Norway has received the report upon the decisions of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with regard to the new opposition. The C. C. of the C. P. of Norway expresses its unconditional agreement with the decisions for the preservation of the unity of the C. P. of the Soviet Union and for the protection of the creative work in the Soviet Union.

Conscious that the iron unity of the Party is the most important factor for the preservation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the C. C. of the C. P. of Norway expresses its complete solidarity with the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union and its activity in defence of the achievements of the revolution and for the final victory of the world revolution."

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

The Session of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris.

(Report of Comrade Andreyev in the Extraordinary Plenary Session of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, August 12, 1926.)

Comrades!

The Session of the Anglo-Russian Committee could not be opened, as originally arranged, on the 26th, but only on the 30th of July. In accordance with the request of the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress the session was postponed until this date. The British delegation was composed as follows: Pugh, the chairman of the General Council; Citrine, its secretary; Purcell, Hicks, and Findley. Our delegation consisted of Comrades Andreyev, Dogadov, Melnitchansky, Lepse, Schwarz and the translator Varotzky.

The Exchange of Letters with the General Council upon the Calling of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Before I describe the course of the session of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris, and report upon its most important points, I wish to refer to the exchange of letters with the General Council concerning the calling of the Anglo-Russian Committee. You are aware that the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union took the initiative in calling together the Anglo-Russian Committee. The first telegram which it addressed to the General Council concerning the calling together of this committee was worded as follows:

"In connection with the decision of the General Council to raise once again the question of supporting the miners, the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union proposes to call the Anglo-Russian Committee as quickly as possible to this end. This is particularly necessary in consequence of the intensified struggle of all the forces of the bourgeoisie against the miners. The representatives of the Miners' Union of the U. S. S. R. who are in Berlin, have been informed that individual leaders of the British miners are in agreement with the miners of the Soviet Union that it is necessary and desirable to call together the Anglo-Russian Committee."

We then received a telegraphic answer from the Secretary of the General Council Citrine as follows:

"Received your telegram. Will discuss matter with committee, and answer as soon as possible."

We received this telegram on June 29, however, up to 3rd of July we were not informed as to whether the General Council was in agreement with the calling together of the Anglo-Russian Committee or not. Our Central Council therefore sent a second telegram, the conclusion of which reads as follows:

... (I.F.A. speedy decision of the General Council concerning the calling together of the Anglo-Russian Committee is necessary both in the interest of the struggle for the unity of the international trade union movement as also for the successful outcome of the fight of the British workers.)

At the same time the Conference of the Russian and British miners adopted a resolution calling urgently for a meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee. We then received a telegram from the General Council informing us that it was in agreement with the calling together of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris for July 20. This telegram arrived on July 17. After its arrival we heard that it was the intention of the General Council to place the question of the conclusion of the international events in connection with the problems of unity on the agenda for the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee. But neither in the first nor in the second telegram nor in the third proposal concerning the agenda was any objection made to the proposal of our Central Council that the Anglo-Russian Committee should discuss ways and means to organise assistance for the miners.

The Sabotage of the General Council and the Amsterdam International

I have referred to this exchange of letters in order to prove that the directions and the wishes of our Central Council were concerned in sending the delegation with questions in relation to the support of the British miners and that in this exchange of letters the General Council made no objection to a discussion of this question. The necessity of discussing this question came from the situation in which the miners found themselves. The struggle at the time of the opening session of the Anglo-Russian Committee was in a situation in which victory was possible but only upon condition that the strikers received a maximum amount of support from the international proletariat and that the attitude of the General Council towards the miners struggle was changed. A victory for the miners was only thinkable upon these conditions.

In other words, the struggle had entered a critical phase which made necessary the greatest possible mobilisation of the international proletariat, because the miners were literally surrounded and were being fought with all and any means. All the resources of the state have been mobilised in order to defeat the strikers. The parliament was mobilised to abolish the seven hour day British justice was mobilised to sentence the best representatives of the miners, the police were mobilised in order to strangle the strike, and finally, the churchmen were called upon the scene in order to exercise pressure upon the miners from all sides. The encirclement of the miners by their opponents, by their direct class enemies, was and still is accompanied by a passivity, by something even greater, by the silent sabotage of the General Council. The leaders of the General Council are, to our knowledge, extremely dissatisfied and exasperated because the miners did not obey their decision to break off the struggle.

Instead of placing itself on the side of the miners and supporting them completely, this Central Organ of the British Trade Union movement continues to talk about discipline to the miners and continues its silent sabotage of their struggle and thus isolates them to a still greater extent.

What is the situation with regard to international support? The British unions are still affiliated to the International Federation of Trade Unions in Amsterdam. What has this International done in order to organise the support for the British miners? Up to the present it has done nothing. Indeed, it has sabotaged all efforts in the most shameful manner. Concerning the so-called organisation of assistance from Amsterdam we are aware of the following which has already been reported in our press. In the name of the I.F.T.U. Sassenbach published a circular in which he proposed to the individual organisations affiliated to the Amsterdam International to break off the collection in order to prevent confusion and because it was necessary to give collective assistance.

We of the I.F.T.U. propose to grant a loan to the British Trade Unions which will cover the so-called support of the international proletariat.

Comrades, in the last moment before its departure from Paris, our delegation learned how this assistance from Amsterdam ended. We know that Sassenbach appeared at a session of the General Council in order to come to an agreement concerning

a loan for the British trade unions. But there was no unity concerning the loan. Why? Because the I.F.T.U. demanded material guarantees for the loan which the General Council was not in a position to give, and therefore the I.F.T.U. refused to give the loan. That is an example of how this International to which the British trade unions are affiliated, supports the heroic struggle of the 1,200,000 British miners who have now been fighting for over three months.

The same standpoint is taken up by the leaders of the International Federation of Miners who up till now have done nothing to assist their striking members. When the representatives of the Miners' Union of the U. S. S. R. attempted to open up negotiations for the organisation of international assistance for the miners, when they attempted to present their case to the Executive Session of the International Miners' Federation which was held a short while ago, they were refused entrance to the session. Other Trade Internationals took up the same attitude. The leaders both of the International Secretariats and also of the I.F.T.U. without exception sabotaged the struggle of the British workers.

The Treacherous Nature of Reformism

That is the state of affairs in the various countries. I wish to quote only two examples which show the character of reformism very clearly. The Dutch Trade Union Federation demanded during the course of the negotiations for a loan interest of four per cent (Interruption: "Shylocks!").

But that is only a small matter. There are worse things to come. The German Trade Union Federation (A. D. G. B.) is a rich organisation; it could well afford to give the British miners some support. The A. D. G. B. demanded interest amounting to from nine to ten per cent for a loan to the British trade unions. (Interruption: "Profiteers!") Certainly, one may take up the attitude: Business is business. But one may under no circumstances call that international solidarity. The right name for that is reformism, which sets the interests of the trade union treasury higher than the victory of the proletariat in such a struggle as is now being fought out in England. Here is shown the treacherous character of reformism in its full ugliness.

How is it with the collections for the British miners? As far as our information goes, 600,000 pounds sterling have been collected in all. From this a part has been collected in England and the rest in the other countries. From the total the Russian workers have supplied 450,000 pounds sterling, that is to say, considerably more than two thirds of the total support for the British miners has come from the Russian workers.

These figures show how badly the international solidarity and the international support action for the British miners have been organised. We Russian trade unionists do not record these figures because we wish to boast about how much we have collected; we recognise that this was our proletarian class duty and no service. We quote these figures in order to prove on the basis of facts how ineffective the international support campaign is and how it is being sabotaged by the present leaders of the reformist trade union movement.

Added to this there is the fact that in some countries the miners are working overtime, they are forced to by the mine owners in order to supply England with the necessary coal surplus, and that the transport of coal is continuing without hindrance, and that the transport workers and railwaymen in Great Britain transport the strike breaking coal from abroad into the industrial districts. On top of this comes the encirclement by the enemy, the direct pressure of the state apparatus, the apparatus of capitalism, the apparatus of the church, the silent sabotage of the General Council, the direct sabotage of the International Federation of Trade Unions and of the international secretariats and even, and above that, the unhindered export of coal to Great Britain. All this gives one an idea of the critical situation in which the struggle of the British miners finds itself. It was this which our delegation under the instructions of our Central Council attempted to prove to the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The struggle about the agenda.

We attempted to place this question as the first and most important point upon the agenda of the Session of the Anglo-Russian Committee. How was the Session opened? It appears to me that it would be better first of all to read the letter that

Comrade Tomsky sent to the Anglo-Russian Committee as an excuse for his absence. The letter reads as follows:

"Dear Comrades,

Extreme overwork and its consequences force me to take two months convalescence ordered by the doctors and this to my great regret prevents me from taking part in this most important and historical session of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the tasks and affairs of which have always been dear to me.

This enforced absence is particularly hard upon me because in my opinion this session of the Anglo-Russian Committee will have an extraordinarily important international significance. The eyes of two camps will be fixed upon this session, however, with directly contradictory hopes and wishes. Not only the workers of our country, but also all friends of international trade union unity expect and hope that the Anglo-Russian Committee will not merely remain unshaken, but that it will extend its work and give the necessary support to the fighting section of the British proletariat, the miners, and thus consolidate the brotherly alliance between the workers of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union which it embodies.

The bourgeoisie, its press and its supporters expect the opposite, and this is expressed particularly clearly in the British bourgeois press.

Naturally, I hope together with our workers that the differences of opinion which exist between us in connection with the heroic struggle of the British miners, will not disturb our co-operative work. I hope that the wishes of our enemies will not be fulfilled, that the fraternal alliance of the workers of both countries will grow and strengthen and that the Anglo-Russian Committee will act as the vanguard in the struggle against imperialist wars, against the offensive of capitalism and for the realisation of international trade union unity.

I am convinced that any absence will in no way affect the work of the committee because my Comrades Andreyev, Dogadov, Melnichansky, Lopse, and Schwarz are in agreement with me on all questions.

Expressing once again my great regret that I cannot participate in your work and wishing the committee fullest success,

I am, with comradely greetings,

M. Tomsky."

The letter of comrade Tomsky points out that the most important question of the moment is the support of the miners. The speeches of the official representatives of the General Council, however, are couched in a different line. The chief point in the speech of the chairman of the General Council, Pugh, in which he particularly stressed that he spoke in the name of the General Council, was the rejection of the agenda agreed to between us and the General Council by telegram. The aim of his speech was to place the question of the declaration of the General Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union in the foreground, and in this way to cover up a retreat from the question which our Soviet delegation had proposed. In other words, the aim was to avoid the question of supporting the British miners. This strategy which in our opinion was previously carefully thought out and prepared by the chief representative of the Right Wing in the General Council, Thomas, was fully supported by the so-called Left Wingers. The whole British delegation was absolutely united, there was not a shadow of any difference of opinion.

What arguments did they use? The chief argument of the British delegation was the following: The British strike, so they declared, was a purely national strike, a purely national phenomenon. With our declaration, however, in which we criticised the General Council, we had interfered in the internal affairs of the British trade union movement. They further declared that they wanted no orders from outside, no directives from outside, and no criticism. In their opinion the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union had violated the friendly and fraternal relations with the British Trade Union movement. Allegedly we had during the General Strike based our opinion upon completely incorrect information. That is the most important argument with which the British delegation operated. Judging from a purely proletarian point of view, is it possible to call this a pure proletarian policy? In no way.

The Struggle of the British Miners is an Affair for the International Proletariat

Let us examine the first argument: The strike was a national phenomenon. We have already pointed out that the British strike and the lock-out of the miners were events in connection with the offensive of capitalism against the working class of almost all countries, and which extended far beyond national frontiers. The British strike had without doubt an international significance, for should the struggle of the miners end with a defeat, that will create a dangerous precedence, one must then expect a still more energetic offensive of capitalism in all countries. Besides the British strike there was the lock-out in Norway. During the session of the Anglo-Russian Committee the dockers in France were locked out, and the news came that the British dockers were similarly threatened with a lock-out.

From this one can see perfectly clearly that the class enemies of the workers are impatiently awaiting the defeat of the British miners in order to advance with determination along the whole front. For this reason one cannot regard the British strike as a national phenomenon. It is absurd to declare that the criticism exercised by the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union was an interference in the internal affairs of the British trade union movement. One thing is certain: A victory for the workers in such a great conflict as the miners' struggle in Great Britain is only possible on an international scale and with a maximum of support on the part of the international proletariat. Only under these conditions is victory thinkable. It is therefore ridiculous to speak of an interference of our part.

We have not interfered in the internal British matters, in the internal affairs of the British trade union movement. We gave the British trade union movement no directives and no orders, we were very far removed from that.

We only made use of our historic right to criticise. The constitution of the Anglo-Russian Committee and its former decisions declare that a rifted front is created between the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union and the Trade Unions of Great Britain in the struggle against the offensive of capital. This was clearly laid down in the resolutions of the Committee. There were, however, no decisions declaring that both parties agree not to criticise each other. For this reason the representatives of the General Council can in no way declare that we have violated the agreement made inside the Anglo-Russian Committee. We have the right to criticise, because our working class movement just as the British trade union movement is a section of the international working class movement and because of the international character of the working class movement it had and has the right to criticise the leaders of the individual sections of the working class movement.

When we entered the Anglo-Russian Committee, we were by no means of the opinion that we then became absolutely of the same opinion with the other party to the Committee. This was so from the very beginning. The British section, the General Council, on the one hand, and our trade unions, on the other, had from the very beginning different principles in dealing with the basic problems of the struggle for socialism, and that is also the case today. But even under these circumstances we managed to find a common language in order to work out a common line to achieve the unity of the trade union movement. We, the representatives of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, never demanded from the other side that it sympathise with us a hundred per cent and that one may not demand from us either. We had therefore a complete right to make that criticism in which our Central Council analysed the British events and the attitude of the General Council.

Have we not been criticised? Has not our comrades' union movement been criticised? We have been criticised both by Amsterdam and by the leaders of the various national federations. Have we, however, ever protested to the leaders of the trade unions that this constituted an interference in our internal affairs? We have never said that, because that would have been a logical impossibility. What does interference in internal affairs mean in the international working class movement? When we were attacked and criticised, we answered coolly and logically, whether we were right or wrong, or whether our opponents were right or wrong. Consider the situation in 1918 and 1919 when the workers in other countries had not yet sufficiently grasped what was going on in our country and when we were

being criticised from various sides. We never said that people were interfering in our internal affairs and we will not say it in the future either, because we know that we, the workers of the U. S. S. R., are not engaged alone upon our own work, but upon the work of the whole international working class movement. That is the situation.

The British working class movement is a section of the international working class movement, and when this section is engaged in a struggle with the class enemy, then we cannot remain indifferent. A trade union movement which remained indifferent in the face of such a collision between labour and capital as that we can observe in Great Britain now, is worthless. Every worker in the U. S. S. R. was immediately aware of the relation between himself and the events in Great Britain.

We Termed the Attitude of the General Council Treacherous.

Every worker in the U. S. S. R. realised that this great movement the victory or defeat of which would determine the fate of the whole international working class movement, should not be allowed to remain without material and moral support. For this reason we hurried from the first day of the conflict to give the fighting miners material and moral support. We have proved this by deeds.

On the other hand, when this gigantic movement developed into a movement still more gigantic, the general strike to defend the miners and their just demands for a maintenance of their standard of living, and when this movement so promising a victory was liquidated by the leaders of the British trade unions and the miners were isolated, we could not remain indifferent to such treachery. We used our rights to the utmost. The General Council and its representatives have not the right to regard our criticism as an interference in their internal affairs. We could not remain indifferent when the General Council refused the assistance organised by our workers through collections for the strikers in Great Britain. We could not remain indifferent when the General Council made an agreement with the Conservative Government which gave absolutely no guarantee in connection with the lifting of the miners lock-out. The General Council trusted the word of honour of the government. The Conservative government needed nothing else in order to smash the movement.

I repeat, could we remain indifferent? Under no circumstances. The general strike was declared in support of the miners and their just demands and what happened? In consequence of the tactics and policy of the leaders of the General Council the miners are at present isolated. Could we remain indifferent towards this attitude? No, we could not. When the general strike ended for the individual trade unions by the leaders such as Thomas signing shameful conditions declaring that they would never again lead a strike of solidarity without previous agreement with the employers, that they recognised the strike of solidarity as a mistake, then we were not able to remain calm in face of these shameful agreements. We could under no circumstances remain indifferent. Under these circumstances what was to be said of the attitude of the General Council? What expression should we use in order to characterise the attitude of the General Council? We, with our proletarian class frankness which distinguishes our trade union movement, found and could find no other term but "treachery" (Applause).

Anybody versed in the traditions of diplomacy may invent various phrases, but our trade unions which are foreign to traditional diplomacy, call things by their right names. We could not term the attitude of the General Council anything but treacherous (Interruption: "They will all be made Knights of the Garter!").

The Result of the "Brave Struggle" of the General Council is a Limitation of the Coalition Rights of the Workers.

After our criticism in the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee Purcell attempted to justify his position. I quote from his speech:

"We ended this economic conflict according to the tradition of the British trade union movement, that is to say, when the strike had reached its culmination. (What a culmination?) No one had any idea that this strike was declared with revolutionary intentions; it was declared to protect the miners. In my opinion, when we led this strike, not cowardice, but courage was shown. During the whole

course of the strike we were not cowardly, but courageous. True, a small mistake was made in connection with the financial assistance of Russia; there were, however, circumstances, which explained this mistake."

The most important point of this quotation is the statement that the general strike was declared to protect the miners. What sort of protection was this, however? The miners were isolated, they were betrayed by the General Council. Today one can only term the attitude of the General Council, after seeing the attitude of the British delegation to the session of the Anglo-Russian Committee, silent sabotage. They declared the general strike to protect the miners. But has not a law been adopted in the British parliament introducing the eight hour day for the miners? Is not the General Council partly responsible for this? This must be placed upon its account, for if the general strike had been continued, with the general enthusiasm of the British working class, so in our firm opinion there would have been no eight hour day law. But a further law is now being worked out in concerning the Trade Unions. This is similarly a result of the "clever" and "courageous" tactic of the General Council for the protection of the miners. The result of this "courageous" protection is the draft bill concerning the trade unions which is to attempt to limit the political rights of the British workers.

What does this law provide? It provides first of all that strikes may only be declared after a secret general vote under control of the government, which in essence means nothing else but the abolition of the right to strike in Great Britain. That is the significance of this law. It further prohibits the trade unions to place pickets. Everything is concentrated upon the one point: to introduce a regime in England prohibiting the workers to fight for their rights with the strike weapon. That is the significance of this law. Further, it prohibits directly strikes in governmental undertakings. It even provides for the interference of the bourgeois state in the apportionment of the membership dues in the trade unions.

That is the result of the "courageous" struggle which the General Council conducted to protect the interests of the miners. Altogether this answers splendidly the assurances of Purcell who tells us that they were right. To this must be added that the bourgeois press of Great Britain (not without the support of Thomas and the Right Wingers in the General Council) is preparing the ground for an emulation of the American unions by the British unions, that is to say, a state of affairs in which the capitalists are the arbiters in the unions and the trade union leaders simply their servants. The British press is preparing the ground energetically and not without a certain amount of participation by the present leaders of the trade unions who fear the class struggle above all and who have almost been frightened to death by the events of the general strike. This all shows perfectly clearly how "splendid" and "courageous" the tactic of the General Council in its class defence against the offensive of capitalism was.

The General Council has Violated the Principles of International Solidarity.

We are told that the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union have "violated the friendly and fraternal relations to the British trade union movement". Let us examine this statement. When the proclamation of the general strike was made known in the Soviet Union, we were all witnesses to the enthusiasm with which the broad masses of our working class commenced to carry through the decisions concerning the material and moral aid for the British general strike. The workers' coppers were collected in order to support this great struggle of the British proletariat. How was this enthusiasm of our workers returned? We received a cold and polite answer of the General Council refusing the support on the ground that our assistance could be wrongly interpreted. That happened at a time when need was already beginning to make itself felt in Great Britain, for the leaders of the British trade unions have themselves declared that they began the struggle without material preparations, and that there were not sufficient means in the trade union treasuries. There was therefore at that time a great need for material assistance, although we received the answer of the General Council that it was considered impossible to accept our assistance.

Was that not a blow against the strike? That was the first blow. Was this rejection of the material assistance of the pro-

letariat of the Soviet Union in accordance with the principles of international solidarity? In no way. Was that not a violation of the friendly relations with our trade union movement which were established by the Anglo-Russian Committee in order that a common struggle might be carried on against capitalism? Was that not a scolding of our workers? We must say that this act of the General Council was a violation of the principles of international solidarity and showed a contempt for the enthusiasm of the broad masses of our workers. They have interferred with the friendly and fraternal relation between the British and the Soviet Unions, not we.

The rejection of the support of the Russian workers in cold and polite diplomatic tone was met with a howl of triumph by our capitalist enemies, by the bourgeois press, etc., whilst the British and Russian workers hardly knew what to say about it. If one speaks of loyalty, was it not the duty of the General Council, before rejecting this money, to get into contact with us, perhaps even to call the Anglo-Russian Committee together. They did not do this, however. The General Council was the first to violate the friendly and fraternal relations between the trade union movements of two great countries.

We were interested to know why the money of the Russian workers was not accepted and we put this question without any beating about the bush. We received the answer that an acceptance might have been wrongly interpreted by the government as a bribery of the strikers in Great Britain.

That smells of everything else, only not of courage and heroism which, according to Purcell, the General Council showed during the strike. Indeed it smells much more of cowardice.

We were told we had based ourselves on false information. If we were false informed, then it was the duty of our friends, the leaders of the General Council, to correct us and to supply us with reliable information. We were told that we received false information, and we were asked why we did not ask the General Council, etc. This, however, would have been a direct interference in the internal affairs of the British trade union movement and that we did not want and did not dare. If our British friends saw that we were receiving incorrect information, they should have assisted us by giving us reliable information. Hicks and Purcell handed us an official declaration at the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee, with the following contents:

"To Grigory Melnichansky.

Dear Comrade,

We have deliberately not answered the false contentions and suggestions made in the international press concerning our attitude during the recent general strike in Great Britain, and reprinted in a section of the British press. We have withheld our answer until the calling of the Anglo-Russian Committee on the assumption that at such a conference we could discuss together two questions in order to come to a clear understanding concerning them:

- a) The sources of information upon which such contentions and suggestions were based.
- b) The degree of accuracy which may be ascribed to such contentions and suggestions.

The Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee is now sitting and we wish to make the following declaration with regard to two points:

1. The remark ascribed to George Hicks concerning the 'damned Russian money' is absolutely incorrect.
2. The other statements that A. Purcell and G. Hicks voted for a 10 per cent reduction in wages and recommended the representatives of the miners of Great Britain to accept this 10 per cent reduction, is a phantastic invention which could only be a production of a sick mind, and against which we categorically declare that it is a lie.

We feel it our duty towards our fellow-workers to deny the accusations mentioned above completely, and we believe that this denial will free their heads from the other two stupid contentions.

With comradely greetings, yours for the cause of international trade union unity.

George Hicks A. A. Purcell."

(To be concluded.)

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH DAY

Manifesto of the Executive Committee of the Communist Youth International.

To the Young Workers and Young Peasants of the Whole World.

Comrades and Brothers,

On September 5th, 1926, the proletarian youth of all countries will celebrate for the twelfth time International Youth Day, the mobilisation day of the strength of the working youth in the fight against the bourgeoisie, against Imperialist wars, against the oppression of youth and against Social Democratic treachery.

On this day, our first thought will be for the heroic proletariat of England, which was betrayed by the Right and Left leaders in the General Council of the Trade Unions, by the Amsterdam International, by the whole international Social Democracy and also by the Socialist Youth International. No matter which way the coal-miners' strike may end, the general strike and the strike of the English miners, which has continued now for a number of months, are the greatest events of recent years in the life of the international proletariat. Our first call on the Twelfth International Youth Day must therefore be:

Down with the English and International betrayers of the General Strike!

Active support for the English workers!

The English Conservatives want (take by the throat) not only the workers in their country; they wish to do the same to the First Proletarian State, the Soviet Union. By means of the coup d'Etat in May, Pilsudski, a sworn enemy of the Soviet Republic and quite openly an agent of the English Government, has come into power in Poland.

Under directions from Chamberlain and Churchill, he is mobilising troops on the Lithuanian frontier, endeavouring to form an alliance of the Baltic border States against the Soviet Union, while carrying on a strong agitation against the Russian proletariat while a second attack upon the citadel of the international proletariat is in course of preparation. This is the ground of our second slogan:

Down with the preparations for the attack upon the Soviet Union!

Down with the military adventures of Chamberlain and Pilsudski!

Long live the Soviet Republic the stronghold of the world proletariat!

Not only in Eastern Europe, but in the whole world, the bourgeoisie is preparing with tremendous energy for a new war. Armaments are being increased on land, on sea and in the air. The greatest scientists and technicians are working on new destructive inventions. Antagonism between Imperialist States, which cannot be resolved by a League of Nations existing only on paper, must again be resolved by appeal to arms as was the case in 1914.

The wars in China, Syria and Morocco, the preparations of the military adventure in Poland, the return to power of Poincaré-la-Guerre, etc. — these are signs of the approaching world war. Millions of young workers and peasants are again to be used as cannon fodder. The adult and juvenile Social Democrats are trying to divert the attention of the workers from the growing danger by keeping alive among them the illusion that disarmament is possible, by cloaking the marauding League of Nations and by confining themselves to empty talk of peace and good-will. The young workers and peasants of all countries must be on their guard. For this reason another cry on International Youth Day will be:

Down with the imperialist wars that are being prepared for! Long live revolutionary work among the troops!

Long live the revolutionary fight for the freedom of the oppressed nations!

The bourgeoisie is trying to convert the temporary and partial stabilisation of Capitalism into a permanent and complete one at the cost of the working class and its rising generation...

Shorter hours for young workers!

For a living wage!

For adequate provision for the unemployed!

Thousands of our best fighters in Hungary, Poland, Italy, Germany, England, America, in the Balkans and in other States are still suffering confinement in jail...

Release Rakosi, Weinberger and comrades!

War upon Fascism and the White Terror!

We are prepared to join the young workers who still belong to the ranks of Social Democracy, in a fight against war, against Fascism and against the economic stress among the young...

For the united front of the young workers!

The young workers' delegations, which have visited Soviet Russia, despite the sabotage on the part of the Social Democratic...

leaders, have convinced themselves that the young workers in the Soviet Union enjoy, despite all difficulties, a four to six hour working day, four weeks holiday with pay, a living wage...

For the fight against the bourgeoisie, the young workers must be organised and consolidated under the leadership of those organisations which really defend their vital interests...

Therefore:

Every class-conscious young worker, every enlightened young peasant must be a member of the Communist Youth League.

We summon you to the fight under the banner of the C. Y. L.

All turn up for the demonstration on September 5th!

Long live the International Youth Day!

Long live the world revolution!

The Executive Committee of the Communist Youth International

Moscow, August 16th, 1926.

To our Readers!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Imprecori" are as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Country and Subscription Rate. Includes England (2 sh.), America (50 cents), Germany (1.50 marks), Austria (2 Austrian Schillings), Norway (2 crowns), Sweden (1.50 crowns), Denmark (2 crowns).

The subscription rate for other countries is three dollars (or equivalent in local currency) for six months.

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers besides the Regular Number.

Editor: Dr. Johannes Wertheim, Vienna, VIII., Albertgasse 26.

Proprietor, Publisher and responsible Editor: Dr. Johannes Wertheim, Vienna, VIII., Albertgasse 26.

Printer: "Die Presse", Vienna, IX., Berggasse 31.

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol 6, No. 59

31st 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 60, Schleichgassl 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Imprekor, Vienna.

Economics and Economic Policy in the II. Quarter of 1926.

(Concluded up to 18. July 1926)

I. General Section.

During the last quarter economic conditions have again varied greatly in the different capitalist countries.

In the United States the spring depression has now repeated for the fourth time in the last five years.

In England the miners' strike has done great damage to economic life and has brought whole branches of industry specially heavy industry - practically to a standstill.

The falling off of coal and iron production in Europe has revived heavy industry in all the countries of Europe.

It is precisely in the coal and iron industry that chronic depression has been most severe and thus the English lockout has had a favourable effect upon economic conditions on the continent.

Apart from the effect of the coal strike, there is no improvement to be recorded in economic conditions in Europe.

In Germany in particular the anticipated or pretended results of rationalisation in productive methods have not been realised.

It is characteristic that in a part, where seasonal employment does not play so great a part in the labour market, unemployment is increasing from week to week.

CONTENTS

- 1) Unemployment. 2) Currency Problems. 3) The International Debts. 4) The International Effects of the English Coal Strike.

II. SPECIAL SECTION.

- a) Germany b) Poland. c) France. d) Italy. e) England. f) United States.

withstood the crisis, and are continuing to an ever greater extent in the capitalist concerns, has somewhat improved, the position of the working class has worsened.

In countries where there is an inflation at the present time - France, Belgium, Italy - the currency has passed through many fluctuations.

During the next few months we may expect increased prosperity in the heavy industrial countries of the continent of Europe, and England's production gets under way again.

In political economy the increased tariffs in Germany are of great importance. The joint exploitation of the home markets by