

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 6 No. 70

PRESS28th October 1926**CORRESPONDENCE**

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

CONTENTS**Leaders in Opposition.****Politics.**

Lenz: The Situation in Germany.

Ercoli: Signs of Crisis in Italian Fascism.

N. N.: The Elections to the District and Municipal Councils in Sweden.

China.

Tang Shin She: The Defeat of Sun Chuan Fang and its Results.

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

Decisions of the Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the C. P. S. U.

The Polbureau of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. on the Declaration of the Opposition.

Resolution of the Moscow Party Committee on the Declaration of the Opposition.

The Victory of the Party.

Resolution of the Berlin Functionaries of the C. P. of Germany on the Declaration of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U.

The Draft of the Trade Union Theses for the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

In the International.

The Presidium of the C. I. against Comrade Zinoviev Remaining at the Head of the Comintern.

Ninth Anniversary of the October Revolution.

Y. Yaroslavsky: The Peasant Policy of the C. P. S. U.

The Miners' Struggle in England.

Refutation of Polish Lies Regarding the Relief Action in the Soviet Union.

The Labour Movement.

P. Savin: "Indo-European Telegraph" Operators on Strike in the U. S. S. R.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

A. Lozovsky: On the Way to Trade Union Unity in the Countries of the Pacific.

The Trial of Boris Stefanov.

D. Fabian: For the Legalising of the C. P. of Roumania.

The White Terror.

Supreme Court of Massachusetts Refuses to Grant New Trial for Sacco and Vanzetti.

Rescue the Victims of the White Terror in Bulgaria!

The Youth Movement.

Agenda of the Enlarged Executive of the Y. C. I.

Labour and Science.

To the Memory of Professor Paul Kammerer.

Leaders in Opposition.*)

All the former oppositional groupings in the C. P. S. U., which have at one time or other been defeated, have for the moment formed themselves into an opposition block under the leadership of a number of old leaders — Comrades Trotzky, Zinoviev, Kamenev etc. To a certain extent as an artillery preparation for the approaching Party Conference, they undertook an attack against the Party organisation, appeared in a body at the meetings of nuclei and there attempted to force a discussion, regardless of the fact that the Party Conference and the Central Committee of the Party have emphatically con-

demned every attempt to shake the Party by a discussion of questions which have already been thoroughly discussed and finally settled by the decisions of the XIV. Party Congress and of the Plenum of the C. C.

The working masses of the Party showed great hostility towards and repudiated this flagrant violation of Party discipline. But among a few vacillating groups of intellectuals this behaviour of the opposition leaders created a certain amount of confusion. Here and there one could hear voices saying: "How could it come about that the "flower" of the Party intellectuals, in fact the majority of the old leaders, are in opposition, and how is it possible that comrades who wish to open the eyes of the Party with regard to its failings are not allowed to speak?" The open enemies of the Party, on their part, displayed an undisguised malicious joy and triumphantly exclaimed: the backbone of the Party is broken, that is the beginning of the end.

*) This article, which has just appeared in the German edition of "The Communist International" No 6, gives a clear and concise presentation of the essential points of dispute which to-day form the centre of interest. We desire in publishing this article to contribute to its having the widest possible publicity. Ed.

The vacillating intellectuals in the C. P. S. U. could be brought into confusion and the open enemies of the Party were able to triumph only because they have little knowledge of the history of the Bolshevik Party, because they do not grasp the specific character of this Party as well as its own fighting conditions and because they are incapable of taking into account the development which the Party has undergone.

Already at the very birth of the Bolshevik Party a fierce struggle arose over the question of "freedom of criticism", a formula behind which there lay concealed the demand for freedom for fractional groupings within the Party. Lenin wrote regarding this question in his book: "What is to be done?":

"... The great outcry which we are at present hearing, 'long live the freedom of criticism!', reminds one very much of the fable of the empty vat.

"We are marching as a small group, holding each other firmly by the hands, up steep and precipitous ways. We are surrounded on all sides by enemies and have to advance almost continually under their fire. We have united together according to voluntarily adopted decisions, namely, to fight against the enemies and not to fall into the nearby swamp, the inhabitants of which reproached us right from the beginning that we have formed ourselves into a special group and have chosen the way of struggle instead of the way of reconciliation. Now some of us are beginning to say: Come into this swamp! — If we seek to teach them better they reply: what backward people you are! You are not ashamed to deprive us of the liberty to summon you to a better way! — Very well gentlemen, you are free to call, even to go, wherever you wish, even into a swamp; we even believe that your proper place is in the swamp. We are even ready to help you to remove there. But let go our hands, do not cling to us and do not sully the great word 'freedom', for we are likewise 'free' to go where we wish, free not only to fight against the swamp, but also against those who turn back to the swamp!"

In these excellent and remarkable lines Lenin already in 1922 characterised in a striking manner the specific conditions of the fight of our Party and the inner Party policy arising therefrom. The Bolshevik Party was the first and only party in the Socialist International which immediately placed before itself the task of capturing the State power by a revolution to be carried out under the hegemony of the proletariat. This explains the enormous difficulties that it had to overcome, difficulties of which the other parties of the II. International scarcely ever dreamed. These parties were marching with even steps along a smooth way, while the Bolshevik Party had to accomplish a steep ascent and to make rapid and dangerous turns, which in the case of many party leaders would have brought on attacks of giddiness; and as the Party was surrounded by petty bourgeois elements, it only needed that the leaders should make a false step to the right or to the left, or even only to loose balance for a moment, in order to be plunged into the swamp of opportunism. Lenin, therefore, demanded from the Party an iron discipline and combatted in the most ruthless manner the least vacillations, no matter what past services may have been tendered the Party by those who displayed such vacillations.

Since the founding of the Bolshevik Party and right up to the last day of his life, Comrade Lenin always made very severe demands on the Party comrades, and he opposed in the most passionate manner all vacillations and deviations, even when these were committed by people who only yesterday occupied the most prominent position in the Party and even if only yesterday they were reckoned among his best fellow-fighters. This was the reason for the frequent crises of leadership in the Bolshevik Party which the social democratic philistines attributed to the cantankerous character of Lenin.

When in 1903 it came to a breach between Lenin on the one side and Plechanov and Martov on the other side over the interpretation of clause I of the Party statutes and the question came up for decision, whether every member of the Party has to do active Party work and has to submit to the discipline of the organisation, or whether it be sufficient if he recognises the programme of the Party and supports it, greater confusion was created in Russia in the ranks of the "Iskra" people, the true Bolsheviks, than that which has arisen at the present time among the present day conciliatory Bolsheviks by the differences

between the Central Committee and Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotzky. Comrade Kchychanovsky wrote in his memoirs "On Vladimir Ilitch" regarding this first Party split:

"Only the thought that, in spite of all our dissolved organisations there were working, beyond of the reach of political persecution, the brilliant group of six, consisting of Plechanov, Axelrod, Sassulitch, Lenin, Martov and Potresov, sustained us in these most difficult moments. One can judge oneself what a depressing effect there was made upon us by the news that the first result of the Party Conference in 1903 was a complete split of precisely this group of six."

Comrade Kchychanovsky who had gone abroad in order to mediate between the leaders who had come to loggerheads, said to Lenin:

"Just see, Comrade Lenin, how the matter is; all, literally all, are against you, and even those few persons who vote for you, do so, in my opinion, not so much out of inner conviction as out of personal attachment to you. As things are, you are fighting alone against all."

Comrade Lenin who had stood for the principle of iron discipline in the Party, in 1903 declared war on all who only yesterday were the recognised leaders of the Russian social democracy, who belonged to the "Magnificent group of six". In the first moment he stood alone, but only alone among the intellectual heads of the Party — the majority of the Party was with him — and we know that history proved him to be right and that, behind the dispute over clause I of the Party statutes there was concealed the fight between revolutionary socialism and reformism.

Exactly the same thing happened on the occasion of another turning point — after the defeat of the revolution in 1905. When the Tsarist government, by means of the decree of 6th of August on the National Duma, attempted to sidetrack the movement from the revolutionary course on to the rails of the monarchist constitution; when it was a question of choosing the next way of development of the revolution, the Bolsheviks issued the correct slogan of boycotting the Bulygina Duma. When, in 1907, it became apparent that the situation had changed and that the revolution had suffered a defeat at the first encounter, Comrade Lenin spoke against the boycott of the Duma. (See: N. Lenin "On the Congress of the III. Duma".) The majority of the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Bogdanov, a member of the C. C., who simply followed the law of inertia, was incapable of understanding the necessity for a change of tactics, for the necessity, under the new conditions, of making use of the tribune of the National Duma, and Lenin found himself in the minority at the Bolshevik Conference. But the Party soon became convinced that Lenin was right. Bogdanov, on the other hand, took refuge behind "Otsovism" and disregarded the will of the Party. What did Comrade Lenin do in these circumstances? He declared ruthless war on the "Otsovisists" and their leader Bogdanov" as the "hero of revolutionary phrases" and did not allow himself to be diverted by the fact that Bogdanov was only recently the most remarkable figure in the Bolshevik Party after Lenin, and was his staunchest fellow-fighter, nor by the fact that a whole number of Bolshevik leaders were on the side of Bogdanov. Thus we again have the picture of Lenin with the majority of the Party on the one side, and the oppositional leaders on the other side. And on this occasion, also, history declared Lenin to be right. The Otsovisists ended up by forming a block with the liquidators, with the right wing of the Mensheviks, and, after they had become a small disappearing sect of Bogdanov's, either withdrew from the arena or went over openly, like Alexinski did, into the camp of the counter-revolution.

As a result of the further development in the period of the February and October revolution, the Bolshevik Party had again to overcome severe crises at every sharp turn and every difficult ascent. It suffices to remember what resistance Comrade Lenin encountered in the person of Comrade Kamenev and others when he came forward in the year 1917 with his celebrated April theses which, as is known, even the "Pravda" would not print at first. We remember what opposition Lenin encountered on the part of Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, and what a thorough dressing down he gave "this pair of comrades" when in October he issued the slogan of seizing

power. It suffices further to enumerate the following crises: the opposition of the "Left Communists" at the time of the Brest-Litovsk Peace, the serious crisis in the Party on the occasion of the introduction of the New Economic Policy and during the discussion on the trade unions; further, the crisis on the occasion of the "shears" and finally, in connection with the "Lessons of October" of Comrade Trotzky and now, the last crisis in connection with the new opposition which has arisen as a result of the retarded pace of the revolution and of the transition from reconstruction of production to the building up of new instruments of production.

The task of the transition from the process of reconstruction to the new technical equipment of production is one of enormous difficulty. This transition to real socialist construction can in certain respects, only be compared, with the difficulty of seizing power in October. Both the Party and the working class have already become used to the exceedingly rapid rate of reconstruction of industry and the rapid increase of wages. Now, when the foundation capital must be renewed by means of extreme economy, it is necessary to reckon with a slower process of growth. Whilst production last year increased by 45%, this year it can only be increased by 14%, while wages for the moment can only be increased in the backward branches of production and for the more badly paid categories of workers. This difficult transition which can extend over a period of from three to five years, has given rise to lack of faith and pessimism on the part of some leaders who vacillated in October, and has led to the formation of the Opposition block under the hegemony of Comrade Trotzky, who never did believe in the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country.

To those comrades who are familiar with the history of the Bolshevik Party and the crisis of the Party leadership there is nothing new in the fact that a struggle has broken out between the Central Committee and certain comrades who only recently were recognised Party leaders; and this constitutes no reason in itself for any anxiety for the fate of the Party. The social democratic parties never experience such severe crises for the very simple reason that they do not have to overcome any great obstacles in their way, nor to make any dangerous and difficult ascents. As a matter of fact the basis of their tactics consists not in the revolutionary struggle, but in capitulation to the bourgeoisie, in opportunist adaption to any and every baseness. The situation is quite otherwise with the Bolshevik Party which is scaling the heavens, which has to conduct a desperate fight against a whole world of enemies armed to the teeth. In this struggle it is inevitable that some leaders in critical moments, are seized with attacks of giddiness.

In particular there must not be anything unexpected or surprising for the Party in the fact that Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotzky, who only recently stood at the head of the Party, are now in Opposition. Comrade Lenin taught the Party to study very attentively the career of every single member of the Party, and in particular the career of those who occupy responsible positions. The Party, however, is acquainted with the career of the above-mentioned comrades. We know what hesitation Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev displayed in the October days, how they — to use a word employed by Comrade Trotzky — proved "abortive" at the moment of seizing power. We must, therefore not be surprised that they have again relapsed into doubt and despondency, and that they conceal this despondency and doubt behind a Left revolutionary phrase at a moment when the Party has immediately taken up the extremely difficult task of constructing Socialism in a country surrounded by capitalist powers and at a time of the retardation of the progress of the world revolution. When Comrade Trotzky, in his "Lessons of October", magnified the former errors of Comrade Kamenev and Zinoviev into a whole menshevist deviation, he was wrong. He was even more wrong when he tried to impute these errors to the whole of the Central Committee of the Party. But as every Party member knows, these errors were actually committed, and could have fatal results if they had not, in good time, encountered the energetic resistance of Comrade Lenin and the majority of the Central Committee as well as of the Party standing behind him.

The same thing can be said, on the other hand, of Comrade Trotzky. We know that Trotzky's theory of "permanent revolution" and the underestimation of the role of the peasantry

connected with it would have resulted in the most serious defeat for the proletariat, if they had met with response. We know that Comrade Trotzky has not up to this day abandoned this theory which is contrary to Leninism, and we know further that Comrade Trotzky, who, contrary to Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev, in the moments of the strongest revolutionary upheaval is always at the top of his form and has not proved "abortive", vice versa, at the time of decline of the revolutionary wave, slides down to opportunism. This was the case after the defeat of the 1905 revolution, when he opposed the revolutionary slogans of the Bolsheviks with his own — the "petition campaign" and the slogan of the fight for the right of combination — whilst later, as organiser of the "August Block", he came forward with the liquidators. This was also the case after the ending of the civil war, when he, first on the occasion of the "shears" and then of "the threat of being drained by the big peasants (kulaks)", created a panic. We know, finally, that Comrade Trotzky, who always went with the masses during their spontaneous upheaval, never knit himself closely with the Party, and constantly underestimated the role of the Party, so that in the epoch between the first revolution and the Stolipin reaction he adopted a position "between the Parties", and in recent years inveighed against the "apparatus men" of the Party, against the strict Party discipline, and preached the freedom of groupings; that is, he actually attacked the very foundations of the Bolshevik Party.

The Party knows the exceedingly strong as well as the exceedingly weak sides of these leaders; the mere fact that they have committed great errors in such a complicated and difficult position in which our Party has to fight at present, would not have caused the Party to give them the sack. Comrade Lenin wrote in his book: "Infantile Sicknesses of Left Wing Communism":

"For the policy of the Party there applies — under appropriate alterations — that which applies for individual men. A clever person is not one who never makes any mistakes. There are not and never can be such people. A clever person is rather one, who does not make any great blunders and who knows how to correct them easily and quickly."

Unfortunately, however, the above-mentioned comrades "quickly corrected their mistakes" only as long as they worked side by side with Lenin who enjoyed an indisputable authority in the Party. After Lenin's death, however, they began to display their specific failures and their individualism which is peculiar to intellectuals, as well as their self-conceit. On the strength of their former revolutionary services and their long, immediate collaboration with Lenin, each of them became convinced that he is the legal successor of Lenin. They acted according to the motto: "The Party — I am the Party", and wanted to accord it absolute power only insofar as the Party complied with their will. When, however, they found themselves in the minority, they declared war on the Party, threatened to split it, began to set up an illegal fraction within its ranks, and finally combined into an unprincipled block with all the discontented elements within the Party who in one way or another had formerly felt the weight of the fist of the Party. In this it was for them a matter of indifference how far the various elements of this block, right up to the most recent past absolutely differed from each other; and they, even went so far to include in this block Medvedev and Shlapnikov, in spite of the latter's pure menshevist platform. Comrade Kamenev and Zinoviev, in addition to this, carried their lack of principle so far that, in order to be able to conduct a determined attack against the central bodies, they declared the whole of their former fight against Trotzkyism, carried on for years in the name of Leninism, to have been a misunderstanding.

Of course, the Party will proceed with the most determined and Leninist methods against such "errors", as they shake the foundations of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But what is to be done if these oppositional leaders who formally violated the discipline of the Party, are right at bottom? ask timorous and sceptically inclined people who lack the necessary independence of thought and allow themselves to be blinded by illustrious names. Where — they ask — is the test for ascertaining the truth? Marxism, Leninism is no mere catechism which has simply to be learned by heart; it is a question of a method which one must understand how to apply. What gui-

rantee is there that this method is applied by the majority of the Central Committee, but not by Comrades Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Pjatakof, Radek etc.

In order to dispel the doubts of these Hamlets in the Party it is necessary before all to be helpful to them, to draw a critical analysis of the views put forward by the representatives of the Opposition in regard to their fundamental content. This has been done; the arguments of Comrade Trotsky and also of Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev, Sokolnikov and others, have already been pulled to pieces and refuted. If the Central Committee is at present against the opening of a discussion with the Opposition, and if the C. C. has the support of the overwhelming majority of the Party, and particularly of the workers in the Party in this decision, this is due to the fact that discussion in the Party has already taken place between the Central Committee and Comrade Trotsky and also Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, which ended with the defeat of the members of the Opposition. Since this discussion nothing new has occurred, either in the Party or in the country. The only new fact is that Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, who before the XIV. Party Conference had lost their balance, have in the meantime sunk a degree lower, down to Trozkyism, a fact which enables them, along with Comrade Trotsky, to apply the tactics of the "united front" against the Party. It is obvious that it is not worth while dragging the Party into a discussion, which would prevent the carrying out of the current daily tasks, solely in order to demonstrate once again that some comrades have not remained true to their principles.

But it seems that the vacillating and doubting elements have not learnt anything from the Party discussions. They put the question: Why should I believe Comrades Stalin, Bucharin, Rykov etc. more than Comrades Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Radek and Pjatakof? It is hard to deal with an argument which is based on faith. But if it comes to the worst, we can reply to this question: you have no cause "to believe" in Comrades Trotsky, Zinoviev and their like, because the new Opposition, which has been listened to attentively, has received unanimous condemnation by the Plenum of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission, which contain the best forces of our Party; because the new Opposition has been unanimously condemned by this Plenum consisting of 264 comrades who represent the highest embodiment of the entire experience of the Party and of practical Leninism; because the social composition of this highest Party body offers a better guarantee that the leadership of the Party is a Leninist leadership than do the formal talents of some oppositional leaders.

Those who judge the leadership of our Party solely from the brilliancy and the eloquence as well as the degree of learning of the Party leaders, are quite ignorant of the whole revolution accomplished by our Party and the working class in the last decade. These people underestimate the level of the advance-guard of the working class which has grown up in revolutionary struggles and under the socialist reconstruction, and which has accordingly changed the character of our whole Party leadership. In 1917 we had 23,000 members in the Party; in 1926 our Party numbered 592,000 members and 410,000 candidates; in 1917 the percentage of workers in the Party was 60.2; in 1926 this percentage has hardly altered. The workers at present comprise 62.6% of the membership and 51.5% of the candidates. The curve of the social composition of our Party leadership gives quite another picture. In 1917, of the 25 members and candidates of the C. C. 12% were workers; now, on the other hand, in 1926, of the 104 members and candidates of the C. C. 56.6% are workers. In the Central Control Commission the workers comprise 67.9% of the 266 members. On the average, therefore, the percentage of workers in our leading central bodies amounts to 63%. The percentage of the workers in the leading central bodies has, therefore, increased five-fold since the revolution, while the percentage of workers in the Party has remained practically unchanged. These figures show in a striking manner how the self-confidence of our advanced workers has increased and how rapidly the intellectual leaders in our Party are being replaced by proletarian leaders. It is true that these 63% of workers in our leading bodies possess far less mastery of language and of the pen than the intellectual leaders of the Party. On the other hand they possess a vast and many-sided Party experience in regard to civil war and in the sphere of socialist construction, they are far more closely connected with the working masses, they do not suffer from intellectual-individualism and are the best champions of Party discipline and of the unity of the Party.

When we bear in mind this rapid growth in the self-confidence of the advanced workers and the rapid proletarian permeation of our Party leadership connected with it, then we can say with firm conviction: Leninism has survived Lenin and will continue to survive him in our Party; the Party has therefore no reason to fear any opposition or any fractional undermining of its basis, even if numerous, former generally recognised leaders are coming forward as grave diggers of the Party.

We can say this with full certainty because our present Central Committee has already more than once had occasion to prove by deeds that the leadership of our Party is in reliable hands. Since Lenin's death our Party had been repeatedly confronted by great difficulties; and Comrade Trotsky who sought to play the role of saviour of the Party, raised the cry: You stand on the edge of the abyss! The Central Committee has, in all these cases, put these panic-mongers in their place, has emphatically rejected their rapidly concocted plans and lines of march and, with a firm hand, steered the ship of the Soviet government and of the Party past the dangerous cliffs. The overwhelming majority of the Party has perceived this and appreciated it. As a result the new attack of the Opposition was reduced to nothing by the determined defence of the Party. The Opposition calculated on the economic difficulties and laid their mines against the Central Committee; they accused the Central Committee of conducting an anti-proletarian policy, put forward demagogic slogans, promised the proletariat a rapid increase in wages and an even more rapid industrialisation of the country by increasing wholesale prices, by depriving the co-operatives of capital and introducing new taxes for the peasantry. These recipes which, as a matter of fact, would have led to higher prices for the working masses, to a destruction of the stability of the czervonetz and a cleavage between the proletariat and the peasantry, were hastily, and with demagogic intentions, concocted in the fraction kitchen. The Opposition however used these recipes as a pretext for demanding the opening of a discussion and to attempt to enforce this upon the workers' nuclei. The factory nuclei and the proletarians did not fall victims to this demagogy, but all replied like one man: we know your quack remedies and don't want to have anything to do with them. Enough of all this fractional talk! We demand the punishment of the splitters and demand of them that they submit to discipline and do not disturb us in our work.

That is the way in which the Party which has grown up to maturity, relegates the refractory leaders to their proper place and continues its advance.

POLITICS

The Situation in Germany.

By Lenz.

The underlying fact which one must bear in mind in order to understand the recent events in German politics, is the essential improvement in the economic situation of German capitalism, the undeniable increase in the power of German capitalism. It is only necessary to mention a few facts in order to prove this. The share-index of the German Statistical Office which at the commencement of the present year stood at about 25, reached in September the level of 39. The number of bankruptcies, which at the highest point of the crisis amounted to nearly 2000, had fallen in September to 467. That we are not dealing here with mere outward signs of prosperity partly determined by speculative factors, but with a real growth of German capital is shown, apart from the growing number of loans and issues placed on the home market, by the sums deposited in saving banks, which have increased from 1.6 milliard marks in 1925 to 2.6 milliard marks in August 1926.

The increase of production, it is true, is mostly confined at present to heavy industry, which is doing good business by supplying blackleg coal to England. The output of anthracite coal which in 1913 amounted to a monthly average of 11,750,000 tons, reached in July 1926 the record figures of 13 million tons (in April 1926 ten millions). The production of raw iron in September 1926 which amounted to 880,000 tons

has not, it is true, reached the 1913 level of 910,000 tons, but nevertheless is far higher than the crisis figure of 668,000 tons in April 1926. The number of trucks loaded on the German railways, which in 1913 amounted to 135,000 for the whole of pre-war Germany, and during the crisis in January 1926 declined to 101,800, has already exceeded the pre-war amount with 139,900 in September 1926, the Ruhr coal areas alone showing an increase of 5200.

Although the passing favourable conditions resulting from the absence of English production contribute in no small measure to the general improvement in conditions, it must not be forgotten that this improvement is undoubtedly due, in part, to the success of rationalisation for the bourgeoisie. For the last statistics of foreign trade for September 1926 there is to be seen that a favourable balance, it is true only amounting to 13 millions, was achieved by the increase in the exports of finished goods, although there was also a considerable increase in the imports of raw materials and semi-manufactured products. This change in the conditions of foreign trade shows that the German bourgeoisie is not only taking advantage of the temporary prosperity, but is reckoning on its continuance and its extension to other branches of industry (textile industry).

This growth in the economic power of German capital encounters those barriers represented by the political and economic dependence of Germany, the growing burdens of the Dawes Plan, the interest on foreign loans, the lack of colonies and surplus profits by export of capital, and the prevention of exports by the tariff policies of the competing countries. This last question is of particular importance because, hand in hand with the growing productive capacity, there is proceeding a shrinkage of the German home market. It is true the number of unemployed in receipt of benefit has shrunk from 2 million in January 1926 to 1,400,000 in September 1926, but as the number of unemployed workers who are deprived of benefit is continually growing and that with the commencement of Winter agriculture and building work will cease, it can be assumed that there will be mass unemployment amounting at least to 2 million. In addition to this there is the fact that, owing to the taxation policy which artificially promotes the accumulation of capital by relieving the big owners and placing heavier burdens on small incomes, the purchasing power of the peasants and of the middle classes in the towns will likewise be greatly reduced. In addition to this the cost of living, even according to the official index, has increased from 139.6 in April to 142.5 in August 1926. The increasing wealth of the German bourgeoisie is accompanied by the growing impoverishment of the working masses.

These are the inner contradictions of the capitalist development in Germany which compel the German bourgeoisie to conduct a ruthless, adventurous, imperialist foreign policy in order to create markets for the increased production and to improve the trade and payment balance by obtaining raw materials from its own colonial areas. The dependence of German capital upon American and English finance capital and the military weakness of Germany compel the German bourgeoisie to manoeuvre cautiously, to look round for support from more powerful allies, to take advantage of the differences between the imperialist powers and to avoid acute conflicts with powerful opponents.

That is the basis of Stresemann's policy of understanding which Germany has conducted at Geneva and Thoiry. Thanks to England's patronage, Germany has been accepted into the League of Nations and has been granted a seat in the Council of the League. But Germany has scarcely been accepted into the select society of imperialist robbers, when she is attempting, by a close co-operation with France, to free herself from dependence upon England and to weaken England's leadership in the League of Nations. The economic basis of the political understanding between Germany and France is the Continental Iron Cartel that has come about under the lead of German heavy industry. The evacuation of the occupied area is to be obtained by pledging railway bonds to the amount of perhaps one million marks for the purpose of stabilising the Franc at the cost of Germany.

These combinations are not yet accomplished facts. The business deal of Thoiry requires the sanction of the U.S.A., which has not yet been given. England, who for the time being has secured an ally in fascist Italy, will certainly do her utmost

to prevent the formation of a continental block directed against herself. She still has as a trump in her hand, the possibility of granting territorial and economic concessions in Eastern Europe in the event of Anglo-German co-operation against the Soviet Union, and has probably already played this trump at the meeting of German and English industrialists in Romsey which came about on the initiative of the British government.

As regards home politics the growing power of German capital is to be seen in the firm position of the bourgeois government, which is under the leadership of the German People's Party, the Party of German industrial capital. The Party Conference of the German People's Party which took place in Cologne at the beginning of October, showed that this Party, and its leader Stresemann, is the master of the inner-political situation. The cry of longing of the German nationalists who have abandoned their opposition to the League of Nations' policy and have, in numerous demonstrations, proclaimed their readiness to enter the government without conditions, was accepted with cool reserve. While the German Federation of Industry, at its meeting in Dresden through the mouth of Silverberg, the Coal magnate, made a formal offer of coalition to the Socialist Party of Germany, Stresemann contented himself with the statement that the S. P. G. would be allowed to take part in the government if it did not relapse "into the ideas of the class struggle".

In Prussia, on the other hand, the German People's Party directed all its efforts to entering again the Coalition government, at the head of which stands the social democrat Braun. The S. P. G. is doing all it can in order to comply with this wish. The Minister of the Interior, Severing, who is disliked by the Right Parties, had to resign and the Prussian government concluded with the Hohenzollern that shameful bargain according to which the late Emperor and his family receive 380,000 acres of land, 20 millions in hard cash, a dozen castles, and furniture and articles of value of every kind amounting at least to 240 million marks. This little present to the Hohenzollern can have no other object on the part of the S. P. G. than to secure the existence of the Prussian coalition and to prepare the way for the coalition on a national scale.

It is noteworthy that this gift of millions to the Hohenzollern, which was accompanied by the granting of the castle of Homburg as a residence for the ex-Kaiser, occurs at a time when the bourgeoisie is repeatedly acknowledging the republican form of State. Not only have the German Federation of Industry and the Party Conference of the German People's Party solemnly pronounced in favour of the Republican form of State, but we find even in the papers of the extreme Right Parties declarations against putchist attempts, against a restoration of the monarchy.

This acknowledgement of the Republic proceeds parallel with increased efforts to render the State more reactionary in its form, which efforts have the obvious object of securing the bourgeois rule still further and to deprive the proletariat of all political rights. The democratic Minister of the Interior, Külz, is preparing instructions for carrying out the exceptional article 48, under which a military State of siege can be proclaimed. In addition to this there is a law which, under the hypocritical pretext of defending the youth from "dirty and depraved" literature, places the press under a reactionary censorship. Contrary to the custom prevailing hitherto, a new press law will forbid members of parliament to register as responsible editors of newspapers, in order thereby to render possible the persecution of communist editors. A new law empowers the police agents to supervise meetings and delivers functionaries of the labour movement into the hands of the police by compelling them to inform the police beforehand of the holding of such meetings. The frequent prohibition of demonstrations and meetings, the firing by the police on unemployed workers in Breslau and upon demonstrating workers in Berlin, the continued terrorist sentences of the courts against communist workers — these are all indications of the same reactionary course by which it is intended to secure the political basis of the ruthless profiteering of the capitalist rationalisation.

On the other hand there are to be seen the first signs of an increasing revolutionising of the working masses. The strike of the Hamburg dockworkers was a determined defensive

struggle, under communist leadership, against the bourgeoisie, the forces of the State and the reformist trade union bureaucracy. The Congress of workers which is convened for the 3rd, 4th and 5th of December in Berlin, will show that broad masses have already grasped the necessity of a united struggle against the bourgeoisie. The shameful treachery practised by the Social Democratic Party of Germany in the Prussian Diet by their approval of the Hohenzollern robbery, in defiance of the movement for the expropriation of the ex-princes, has resulted in a broad and deep oppositional movement among the social democratic working class. The Berlin factory and trade union functionaries of the S. P. G., in a unanimously adopted resolution, demanded from the S. P. G. fraction a determined light against the Hohenzollern compromise. The same demand was raised by the functionaries in Frankfurt on Main. In Bochum the functionaries passed a vote of no-confidence. In a number of Berlin districts the workers refused to conduct the recruiting week for the S. P. G. In Stettin there have been wholesale withdrawals from the Reichsbanner. In Hamburg the S. P. G. distributed printed appeals calling on the workers to refrain from leaving the Party.

The S. P. G. leadership is obviously determined to follow the line of the imperialist policy of the bourgeoisie. The precondition for such an imperialist policy is the splitting of the working class into a small upper strata of workers employed in the factories and better paid than the average, on the one hand, and the great mass of the unemployed and the most brutally exploited workers on the other hand. It is the task of the C. P. of Germany to prevent such a splitting of the working class and to thwart the plans of the bourgeoisie and of the S. P. G.

Signs of Crisis in Italian Fascism.

By Ercoli (Rome).

The introduction of the death penalty in Italy is an act of fear which is determined by the constant succession of attempts on Mussolini's life. In the course of nine months, three attempts have been made to assassinate the "Duce". The first attempt has not yet been explained and there still exists some doubt as to whether it was not a case of provocation. On the second and third occasions, Mussolini had an extremely narrow escape. Since the attempts are beginning to follow one another in such regular succession, it is difficult to say that any one of them will be the last. On the contrary, we may assume with considerable certainty, that the first three attempts will be followed by others. Anyone who knows what Fascism in Italy has been and what it has on its conscience, will easily understand the grounds for this certainty. Fascism has sown so much abhorrence and hatred that it is quite natural if "avengers" arise from the masses of the embittered people. Italian people anyhow tend to act individually. The introduction of the death penalty is thus a kind of "legal Terror" with the purpose of counteracting this danger. It is however extremely doubtful whether these measures will have the desired effect.

After the third attempt on his life, Mussolini spoke for the first time, in an address to the Black-Shirts, on dangers threatening the Fascist regime. Never before had he made use of such words. Always, and especially after the attempts on his life, he had made a point of proclaiming loudly that the regime was "secure", "firmly established", "most firmly established", "indestructible" etc. As a matter of fact however, there are to-day unmistakable signs that the situation, not only in Italy in general but also in Fascism, is becoming more and more acute.

Since Fascism came into power, but especially in the last two years, it has carried on a policy exclusively in the interest of a block which financial capital, the great industrialists and the agrarians have formed round Fascism. The policy of Fascism has been not only a policy of class but a policy in the service of the most greedy and parasitic strata of the bourgeoisie. The consequence of this policy seemed at first to be a development of production. Capital, freed from all fetters, threw itself into industrial undertakings, hoping to achieve profits far beyond the

usual rate. The investment of capital increased in an extraordinary measure.

It was however only a case of declusive bloom and of a purely external growth. As a matter of fact, both were to a certain extent a consequence of the progressive depreciation of the currency and moreover, if they were to be effective, demanded large markets. The home market of Italy however has been brought to the brink of ruin by the action of Fascism itself — which, in order to stabilise State finances and to achieve a redistribution of wealth in favour of the plutocratic groups, has brought distress on the middle classes and thrust the poorer classes into a condition of despair by giving the industrialists a free hand to reduce wages and lengthen the hours of work. Foreign markets on the other hand, have yet to be won by Italy.

The chief branches of industry are faced by a crisis. It is anticipated that within a few months enormous masses of workers will be turned on to the streets. Bankruptcies are multiplying at a catastrophic rate. The process of expropriating the middle classes for the benefit of the plutocracy is continuing systematically. The masses of the people are compelled to restrict their consumption more and more and have to eat black bread as in war time. What is left of the reconstruction which Fascism has tried to effect?

Two things remain: on the one hand the system of blackmail and intimidation which was introduced in order to suppress all freedom of movement among the working class and, on the other hand, the phrases and plans of imperialist expansion. Both of these are indispensable to Fascism.

A matter of absolute necessity is the enslavement of the working class and the peasants by suppressing class organisations, by prohibiting strikes, by abolishing the independence of the Municipalities, the freedom of the Press, the right of assembly etc. Nothing but the enslavement of the working class enables the large industrialists and the large agrarians to develop their policy of stabilisation. But this is not all proceeding smoothly. The pressure which is exercised on the masses, calls forth a reaction from them, a very perceptible trend towards the Left. For the moment there is certainly no immediate prospect of movements on a large scale, but nevertheless the outlook for Fascism is anything but promising.

A second necessity is that of making use of pompous nationalist phraseology and of proclaiming great plans of expansion. Imperialistic bragging is a necessity which has been forced on Fascism by its petty bourgeois origin and by the precarious situation in which it finds itself at present. Whilst carrying on activities which are entirely for the benefit of the large bourgeoisie, it must keep the social strata from which it originated, attached to itself by doping them with high-sounding phrases. How long will the nationalist intoxication be able to prevent the petty bourgeoisie resisting a policy which deprives it at the same time of comfort and of the illusion of power?

This brings us to one of the most delicate questions, the crisis in the Fascist party itself, a crisis which continues inexorably in spite of Mussolini's efforts. Fascism, having made it impossible for any Opposition group to express itself, and having made itself the only political organisation in the country, is now experiencing the revival of opposition within its own bosom. On the one side is the large bourgeoisie, on the other the petty bourgeoisie. On the one side are the Fascist bands in the service of the agrarians and the plutocracy, on the other side are the old Fascist programme and the old Fascist groups with their old Fascist tendencies. On the one side are the industrialists and on the other side the so-called corporations of workers. On the one side is a group of bankers, on the other side the group of their opponents.

The crisis has developed so far that within the Fascist party itself all system of democracy has had to be abolished. Even in its local bodies, the party is directed by functionaries who are nominated by the Government. The meetings of members have been deprived of all right of action. The crisis however is assuming serious forms. At the time of the last attempt on Mussolini's life, the two branches of Fascism came to an armed conflict with one another in Trieste, which lasted for two whole days and made it necessary to proclaim martial law. In Rome, the Fascist bands of the opposition made an attack on the premises of the police administration.

These are in brief outline, some of the factors in the Italian

situation, which undoubtedly prompted Mussolini to announce that the Fascist regime is threatened by dangers. Has Mussolini any plan for removing these dangers? There can be no doubt that he has one, and this plan is being carried out. It consists in embittered intensification of the regime of terror, of oppression, of the systematic application of force against the masses in order to prevent them taking decisive action for the purpose of altering the situation. The re-introduction of capital punishment is part of this plan. It characterises the terror which is assuming legal forms.

The proletariat and the peasants of Italy are becoming more and more convinced of the fact that the death penalty must be executed on the Fascist regime and that they have received a call to execute it. The vanguard of the working class, the Communist party of Italy, is steeled and strong enough to pursue its path relentlessly, even in the face of the new threats.

The Elections to the District and Municipal Councils in Sweden.

By N. N. (Stockholm).

The elections of members to the District Councils in Sweden have now been concluded. The task of the District Councils consists in discussing and deciding the special affairs of the districts and to form the electoral bodies for the elections to the First Chamber of Parliament. The elections are held every four years. Only those are entitled to vote who have reached the age of 27 years; for other elections the age is 23 years. In addition to the fact that those between 24 and 27 are thus deprived of their votes, there is a further disenfranchisement of the working class owing to the existence of a large number of unemployed, so that the number of electors is again considerably reduced. Thus the district elections do not offer any indication of the political influence of the Communists.

Since the preceding District elections which took place in 1922, the Communist Party has passed through the crisis which arose as a result of Hoeglund and his followers going over to the social democracy. As a result of this crisis the Communist Party suffered heavily throughout the whole country. But in no place were the Hoeglund people successful in taking over with them the whole organisation to the social democracy. In some places, however, the organisations were destroyed, a greater or smaller number of the members going with Hoeglund. The districts in Norbotten were the least affected by this crisis, while Central Sweden was the most severely hit. In addition to this, there were the ruthless attacks to which our Party was exposed on the part of our opponents, and not the least of the social democracy. The social democracy believed that they had completely annihilated our Party.

The Party is now able to record that the confidence of the mass of the electors in it is as great as it was in the year 1922. The prophecies of this social democrats and of the bourgeoisie as to the annihilation of the Communist movement have not been fulfilled. In a number of Districts our Party polled a considerably greater number of votes. That is particularly the case in Norbotten, where the increase amounts to 80%, in the Stockholm district with an increase of 75%, and in the Districts of Kalmar, Göteborg, Bohus and Jämtland, where the Party did not take part in the elections in 1922. In other Districts there are losses to record. This is due to the fact that in these districts we were not able to rebuild the organisations which were destroyed during the Hoeglund crisis. The result of the elections proves that at any rate there is everywhere a sound basis for Communism.

At this year's elections our Party polled 37,726 votes — there were a great number of constituencies where we did not put forward candidates — against 37,701 in the year 1922. We obtained 14 seats. Apart from this there were some additional hundred votes cast for the Communist lists, but as an election pact had been concluded with the social democrats, according to non-official returns a number of the Communist votes are reckoned along with the social democratic votes.

The social democrats polled 461,026 votes and obtained 444 seats, the bourgeois Left polled 206,817 votes and obtained 181 seats, the Peasant Party 171,635 votes and 163 seats, while the Right Parties polled 324,346 votes and obtained 324 seats. Only half

of the electorate went to the poll. Of those who took part in the elections 3% voted for the Communists, 38.5% for the social democrats, 17% for the bourgeois Left, 14.5% for the Peasant Party and 27% for the Right Parties.

The anomalous election system has worked greatly to the disadvantage of the Communists with regard to the distribution of seats. According to the number of votes polled we ought to have had 34 seats, that is 20 less than we actually received.

In 5 districts out of a total of 24 in the whole country the Communist Party did not put forward its own lists of candidates. In 13 districts the Party only took part in the elections in a number of constituencies.

The Party is strongest in the district of Norbotten where we received 7,628 votes, or 26.4%, representing an increase of 3,349 votes. This is followed by the districts of Gäddede with 4,720 votes, Wärrland with 4,356, Kopperberg with 4,211, Stockholm with 3,554 and Westernorrland with 3,421.

The municipal elections which took place at the same time, provide a better picture of the strength of the Communist Party in the country. In a number of municipalities no elections were held, with the result that the picture is not complete. In some municipalities we can even record magnificent progress. In two municipalities in Norbotten the Communists obtained the majority, in some we are stronger than or equally as strong as the social democrats, and in many municipalities the Communists have obtained considerable minorities or are able to turn the scale between the social democrats and the bourgeoisie. According to the returns to date the Communists have obtained 419 seats on 109 municipal councils. As the returns are not yet complete it is not possible to give exact figures as to the total of the votes polled by our Party.

It is the task of our Party between now and the year 1928, when the elections to the Second Chamber will be held, to continue its organisatory work. The impression that is gained from the municipal elections is that the Communist movement enjoys sympathy among the workers, but that a great number of our organisations were not able to make the best use of this sympathy.

CHINA

The Defeat of Sun Chuan Fang and its Results.

By Tang Shin She.

Sun Chuan Fang, the last hope of the imperialists, who at the end of September wished to undertake an attack from Kiukiang upon Wuchang in order to unite there with the remainder of the troops of Wu Pei Fu, and who at the same time planned an attack from Fukien upon Swatow for the purpose of establishing contact with the bandits of Chen Shui Minge, who have repeatedly attempted to create disturbances among the population, has sustained a decisive defeat. His plans aimed at finally crushing the victorious Canton Army and the Kuo Min Government. But before he was able to commence his attacks, one of his Generals in South Fukien deserted him, whilst in Central Fukien various Generals who up to then had formed the so-called People's Troops, united under the flag of the Kuomintang in order to fight along with the Canton Government against the Governor of Fukien, a supporter of Sun Chuan Fang. In addition to this, a fleet at Amoy, which as a matter of fact has for long had contact with the Canton Government, adopted a very indefinite attitude towards Sun Chuan Fang. As a result of all this nothing came of the offensive in Fukien. On the contrary, Sun was obliged to take up a defensive position: On the Kiukiang front, where Sun Chuan Fang had gone personally, things turned out no less disagreeably. The rest of Wu Pei Fu's troops, after being besieged in Wuchang for a month, were forced to surrender; all the officers were taken prisoner. The Kuomintang forces who thus had their hands free, were thereupon able to proceed to Kiukiang and have surrounded the town. But that is not all. In Chekiang, from whence Sun Chuan Fang was able to dominate the five provinces, the civil governor with 20,000 soldiers is opposing Sun Chuan Fang and, according to the latest newspaper reports, has allied himself with

the Canton army and has already occupied a great stretch of the Nignpo-Shanghai railway line. Shanghai is therefore now in danger. In this situation it seems certain that still more supporters of Sun Chuan Fang in other provinces will desert him, the more so as a section of them have for long been discontented with him. A further danger for Sun Chuan Fang consists in the fact that **Chang Tsung Chang**, the governor of Shantung, whom Sun continually intended to attack, will now make use of the opportunity in order to undertake an attack against the latter in his capital, **Nanking**. Nothing can save Sun Chuan Fang from this more than embarrassing situation than flight abroad.

Wu Pei Fu, after his flight from Hankow, proceeded to the North along the Hankow—Peking line. Arrived in Honan his troops there — consisting of what was originally the 2nd People's Army — are mutinying against him. Under the command of **General Fang Tsung Chu** who is occupying a large area in South Honan, they went over again to the People's Army. As a result it became impossible for **Wu Pei Fu** to remain in Sinyang (South Honan); he was compelled to flee to Chanchow (North Honan). North of Honan he has completely lost his position; his troops have been driven out from Chihai to North Honan and in Peking **Chang Tso Lin** caused all **Wu Pei Fu**'s troops to be disbanded. In the meantime **Wu Pei Fu** himself has grown considerably wiser. When **Chang Tso Lin** recently offered him his help, he flatly refused it, because he knew that what **Chang Tso Lin** really desired was to crush him completely. As a measure of help he only asked to be supplied with war material and demanded of **Chang Tso Lin** that he should proceed with his fleet from **Tsingtao** and **Chingwangtao** to Canton in order to destroy the headquarters of the Reds. In view of the fact that **Tsingtao** is a great distance from Canton and that the fleet is a very small one, it would be impossible to carry out such a plan, of which fact **Wu Pei Fu** is of course quite aware. **Chang Tso Lin**, in return, gave **Wu Pei Fu** the good advice to attack the People's Army in **Shensi**. A portion of **Wu Pei Fu**'s army have been in **Shensi** for several months and are endeavouring to capture the capital of this province, **Sianfu**, from the rest of the troops of the 2nd and 3rd People's Armies. Vain endeavour! Already at the end of August a part of the People's Army marched into North **Shensi** while another portion, proceeding through **Kansu** via **Pingliang**, has arrived in Central **Shensi**. This bars **Wu Pei Fu**'s way to the West. There is only one way out left to him: to proceed to **Kiangsu** and join **Sun Chuan Fang**; and **Chang Tsung Chang**, the governor of **Shantung**, can easily prevent him doing even this.

Before the civil governor of **Chekiang** renounced his allegiance to **Sun Chuan Fang**, the followers of **Wu Pei Fu** had striven for the consolidation of the **Chili** Party. One proposal put forward was to make **Sun Chuan Fang** the leader of the **Chili** Party in place of **Wu Pei Fu**; another was to set up **Tsao Kun** as leader. A third proposal was to the effect that a big **Pei Yang Party** should be created, i. e. that the **Chili**, the **Anfu** and the **Mukden** party should be combined into one. A final proposal aimed at the founding of a **Shantung Party**, i. e., co-operation between **Sun Chuan Fang**, **Chang Tsung Chang** and **Chin Yun Ngo**. The two last plans mainly emanate from **Chin Yun Ngo**, a powerful under-General of **Wu Pei Fu**. They chiefly represent the interests of **Chang Tso Lin**. As a matter of fact — apart from the higher leaders — the troops of **Chin Yun Ngo** are to be counted to the People's armies, because they originally belonged to the 2nd and 3rd **Kuo Min** Armies. It is quite certain to-day that the formation of a **Shantung** or a great **Pei Yang Party** is impossible, for the brother of **Chin Yun Ngo**, a former Prime Minister, has eagerly worked for this, but without success. It is becoming more and more probable that the **Chin Yun Ngo** troops will go over to the People's Army; some sections of them are revolting almost every day. The whole 2nd and 3rd **Kuomintang** armies which were formerly dissolved, are displaying a tendency to unite again.

What is the **Pei Yang Party**? It is an old Chinese military clique which was founded by the monarchist President **Yuan She Kai**. During the lifetime of **Yuan She Kai** it served all the imperialists. After his death in 1916 it split into two sections: into the **Anfu** Party, inclining to Japan, and into the **Chili** Party, inclining to England. This **Pei Yang Party** is chiefly responsible for all the undesirable conditions in China after the revolution of 1911: the civil war, the suppression of the working masses, the indescribable sufferings of the population. Owing to the defeat of the two chief leaders, **Tuan She Sui** and **Wu Pei Fu**,

the **Pei Yang Party** has been liquidated. In China to-day there is only one choice: either to join the **Mukden** clique consisting of robbers and bandits, the hirelings of Japan, or to support the **Canton** or **People's** Armies who are fighting for the revolution.

How will the situation develop between **Chang Tso Lin**'s clique and the revolutionary armies? As far as can be seen at present it seems probable that the latter will soon be masters of the whole of China. The **Canton** government will before long remove its headquarters to Central China as a Central **Kuomintang** government. It is **Chang Tso Lin**'s intention to leave **Manchuria** and, with the aid of the remnants of the **Pei Yang Party** and on the basis of the National Assembly planned by **Tuan She Sui**, get himself "elected" President of China. The chief editor of the **Canton "Ming Kuo I Pao"** (Central Organ of the **Kuomintang**), Professor **Chen Shi Sui**, wrote a leading article on this question on the 23rd September in which, he stated:

"After the annihilation of **Wu Pei Fu** there are only two forces left over: **Chang Tso Lin** in the North and the **Kuomintang** government in the South. We could only recognise **Chang Tso Lin** under the following conditions:

1. If he complied with the demands of the population, peace could be immediately brought about between the Northern and Southern forces.

2. During this time of peace economic construction must begin in both camps and law and order maintained.

3. **Chang Tso Lin** must pledge himself not to do anything that would injure the interests of the **Kuomintang**."

It is the object of these conditions to prevent **Chang Tso Lin** giving aid to **Wu Pei Fu**, and to give the revolutionary government the possibility of establishing itself in the newly captured districts and to undertake constructive work there. **Japan**, which is aiming at the partition of China, would not be disinclined towards such a plan, and therefore **Chang Tso Lin** has no objections to raise.

Such a breathing space would save the **Chang Tso Lin** clique and the Japanese imperialists in China. The financial crisis and the inflation fever in **Manchuria** have assumed the most serious forms and have become almost unbearable. Such a crisis — there are over half a milliard uncovered paper notes in circulation — could not, of course, be solved by just shooting a few bankers. For **Japan** there exists not only the danger of its lackey, **Chang Tso Lin**, being annihilated, but what is still worse, of suffering an enormous loss of capital. **Japan** has invested a milliard yen in **Manchuria**. When **Chang Tso Lin** caused various bankers to be executed, the entire bourgeois press unanimously called upon the government to warn **Chang Tso Lin** and to demand of him that he cease military actions and renounce the policy of **Peking**. The fact that the **Kuomintang** wishes to have its rule recognised over the whole of North China accords with the desires of **Chang Tso Lin**. There is therefore every prospect of this idea being carried out. **Chang Tso Lin** recently declared his new programme to be "Love of the People and love of native country!" This means that he is adopting a policy of reconciliation, probably in order to become president. Nevertheless this is a wiser policy than his former one of opposition to the Reds.

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

Decisions of the Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, October 24, 1926.

On the 23rd October there was held a meeting of the Combined Plenum of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Plenum confirmed in the main points the theses of Comrade **Rykov** on the "Economic Situation and the Tasks of the Party" which have been approved by the Politbureau of the C. C., the theses of Comrade **Tomsky** on the "Results of the Work and the future Tasks of the Trade Unions" and decided to submit these theses to the XV. Party Conference. The Plenum confirmed the agenda of the XV. Party Conference which has

already been published in the press and supplemented it by the question of the Opposition and the inner-Party situation and appointed Comrade Stalin to speak on this question.

After acceptance of the reports of Comrade Molotov of the Politbureau of the C. C. and of Comrade Yaroslavsky of the C. C. C. on the inner-Party situation in connection with the fractional activity and the violation of Party discipline on the part of a number of members of the C. C., the Plenum adopted the following decision:

1. The Plenum of the C. C. and of the C. C. C., in view of the violation of Party discipline by the members of the C. C. Comrades Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Pjatakov, Jewdokimov, Sokolnikov and Smilga and by the candidate for the C. C., the woman Comrade Nikolajeva, censures all these comrades and points out to them the impermissibility of such behaviour on the part of members of a leading Party organ.

2. As Comrade Zinoviev does not represent the line of the C. P. S. U. in the Communist International and, as a result of his leading fractional activity in the Comintern, has lost the confidence of a number of Communist Parties (C. P. of Germany, C. P. of Great Britain, C. P. of France, and the Workers' Party of America), the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission consider it to be impossible for Comrade Zinoviev to continue work in the Comintern.

3. In view of the leading fractional activity of Comrades Trotsky and Kamenev after the July Plenum of the C. C. and of the C. C. C., the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. resolves to remove Comrade Trotsky from his position as member of the Political Bureau of the C. C. and Comrade Kamenev from his position as candidate of the Political Bureau of the C. C.

On the decision of the Plenum the first candidate of the C. C., Comrade Oracholashvili was appointed member of the C. C. in place of the late Comrade Dzershinsky.

The Politbureau of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. on the Declaration of the Opposition.

Moscow, 20th October 1926.

The session of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which accepted the already published declaration of the opposition, passed the following resolution before accepting the final text of the declaration:

"The politbureau points out to the comrades of the opposition that to-day's decision of the politbureau ratifying the corrections of comrades Bucharin and Molotov to the latest text of the opposition is not binding (or as comrade Trotsky expresses it, is no command of the Central Committee) for the oppositional comrades who have signed the declaration. It is for these comrades themselves to decide whether this or that correction ratified by the politbureau to their declaration is acceptable or not."

Resolution of the Moscow Party Committee on the Declaration of the Opposition.

Moscow, 20th October 1926.

The plenum of the Moscow Party Committee after hearing a report upon the internal Party situation adopted a resolution stressing the fact that the retreat of the opposition was caused by the powerful unity of the whole Party. The resolution which points out that the opposition has not abandoned its ideology says: "Not merely the organisational, but also the ideological unity upon the basis of Leninism is necessary for our Party. The organisational unity can only be unshakeable if it is based upon a firm ideological unity. For this reason the Plenum considers it necessary to continue the persistent work for the enlightenment of the Party members concerning the ideological nature of the opposition and its opinions."

The Plenum calls upon all Party members to do everything in their power to expose the unbolshhevik nature of the programme set up by the opposition, a programme which it has not yet abandoned. It is the task of the Party to liquidate completely the antibolshhevik vacillations caused in the Party by the opposition. The plenum declares itself in agreement with the

decisions of the Central Committee which aim at the preservation and consolidation of the unity of the Party and recommends the Central Committee to take the necessary organisational measures against the members of the Central Committee who have violated Party discipline in order to ensure in the future for a continued fruitful activity for the Central Committee the Party the country and the international working class movement.

The Victory of the Party.

Leading article of the "Pravda".

Moscow, October 20th, 1926.

The communiqué of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the declaration signed by the leaders of the opposition must be regarded as important historical documents.

Both of these documents of October 16th have an extremely great political significance. Their significance consists in the fact that they are evidence of the complete victory of the party over the united opposition. They show the complete and obvious political defeat of the opposition, a defeat recognised by the whole party and by the opposition itself. The opposition which had commenced a struggle against the party and against its Leninist leadership and which attempted to undermine the unity of the Bolshevik ranks, has been defeated. The victory of the party is all the more important because it was gained not merely over one single oppositional tendency, but over a block, an organised alliance of all the oppositional groups and fractions. In 1921 the anarcho-sindicalist deviation, the so-called "workers opposition" was defeated under the leadership of Lenin. It was the tendency of Shlapnikov and Medvedyev which was then condemned and which later deteriorated into pure Menshevism. At the same time the errors of Comrade Trotsky were condemned. In 1923 and 1924 the party won a victory over Trotskyism which was characterised as a petty bourgeois tendency towards a revision of Leninism. The 14th party congress shattered and condemned the "new opposition", but now a victory has been won over the oppositional block as a whole, over all the groupings together which had established a united front in the struggle against the Central Committee of the party and threatened the latter with disruption.

The united opposition has been destroyed! The party has won! The unity of the party has been saved! The party remains unshakable! The whole party rose like one man to defend the Leninist Central Committee. It surrounded it with an impenetrable armour and inflicted an annihilating defeat upon the disruptive work of the opposition.

The honours of victory must go completely to the communist proletarians. They played the decisive role in the struggle for the unity of the party. Their class instinct enabled them to perceive the Unbolshhevik character of the opposition. They grasped immediately whither the fractional work of the opposition must lead. The communists from the benches were able without any legendary "pressure of the apparatus", to repulse the attack of the opposition. They refused to take up the discussion forced upon them. The simple voices of the proletarians won a victory over the parliamentary eloquence of the most prominent leaders of the opposition. Shame on the disruptors! Do not interrupt us in our work! Hands off the Central Committee! These cries echoed from factory to factory, from nucleus to nucleus, from the "Aviopribor" to the "Red Putilov Works". The opposition was compelled to capitulate before the attacks of the Bolshevik workers of Leningrad and Moscow.

The leaders of the opposition have made the historic "declaration" of the 16th of October. They made this declaration absolutely of their own free will, without any pressure or "command" of the Central Committee. The protocol of the session of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the 16th of October reads:

"The Polit Bureau points out to the comrades of the opposition that today's decision of the Polit Bureau ratifying the corrections made by Comrades Bucharin and Molotov to the text of the declaration of the opposition is not binding, or, as Comrade Trotsky expresses it, is no command of the Central Committee, for the oppositional comrades who have signed the declaration. It is for these comrades themselves to decide whether this or that correction

ratified by the Polit Bureau to their declaration is acceptable or not."

The "declaration" is a voluntary confession of the comrades of the opposition that they have made a number of mistakes. It contains a number of undertakings on their part towards the party.

The opposition had violated decisions of the party, its congresses, its Central Committee and its Central Control Commission. The opposition now admits violations of party discipline and undertakes to "subordinate itself unconditionally" to all the decisions of the party.

The opposition had led a fractional struggle against the party. The opposition now undertakes to cease all forms of fractional struggle and to liquidate all fractional groupings.

The opposition had compared the Bolshevik 14th party congress in Moscow with the Stockholm party congress, that is to say it had directly threatened our ranks with disruption. Now the opposition had abandoned this analogy with Stockholm and declared it to be incorrect.

The opposition had adopted as its basis the theory and practice of the freedom of fractions and groupings within the party. It had adopted the slogan "Freedom for all groupings". The opposition now admits that such theory and practice contradicts the basic principles of Leninism and undertakes to carry out the decisions of the party with regard to the inadmissibility of fractions.

The opposition had not considered it necessary to draw a dividing line between itself and the ideas of the renegade Ossovsky. The opposition had voted against the expulsion of Ossovsky from the party. Now, however, the opposition dissociates itself from the "anti-Leninist" ideas of Ossovsky.

The opposition had defended the Shlapnikov-Medvedyev group and stood in one block with it. The representative of the opposition, Comrade Zinoviev, had refused to write a polemic against the right Menshevik platform of Medvedyev, because he considered it to be "left". Now, however, the opposition condemns the ideas of Medvedyev and Shlapnikov.

The opposition had flirted systematically with the ultra-left and ultra-right groupings in the Comintern. The petty bourgeois social democrats of the Korsch type hid and still hide themselves behind its "authority", in order to carry on their work against the staff of the world revolution, to carry on a campaign against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and against the Soviet Union itself from this cover. Now, however, the opposition forswears solidarity with individuals who have broken with communism and with fractional groupings inside the Comintern. It now dissociates itself from the leaders of the ultra-left fractions which are really opportunist fractions, led by the expelled members of the Comintern, Maslov and Ruth Fischer. The party together with its Central Committee accepts with satisfaction a declaration of the opposition according to which it will cease its fractional work and in which it admits its mistakes and undertakes from now on to abandon its unbolshevistic behaviour.

The party will carefully observe that all the undertakings of the opposition towards the party are fulfilled. The party expects that the opposition will honestly keep all its voluntary promises. The party will not permit for one moment any new attempts at a discussion, any new violations of party discipline, or any new attempts to undermine the work of the party. The opposition is now aware of the clear and firm will of the whole party.

The party will continue in the future as it has done in the past, to carry on a merciless ideological campaign against the basic principles of the opposition which the latter has not yet abandoned. The party will preserve the ideological Leninist purity of its programme and its tactics like the apple of its eye and protect its programme against any impurities from the petty bourgeois Trotzkyist "workers opposition" elements. The most important task of the party is now as before to interpret the basic principles of Leninism, to carry them into the masses and to sharpen our valuable ideological weapons in the struggle against petty bourgeois oppositional deviations. Our task is to lead an ideological struggle against the opposition, to communicate the lessons of October 1926 to the party masses and at the same time to devote the greatest possible strength to the daily work for the building up of socialism in our country.

The party has won! Despite everything it has remained united. What a howl of joy the enemies of the revolution, the foreign bankers and capitalists, the prostitutes of the capitalist press, set up when they heard of the "conflicts" inside the C. P.

of the U. S. S. R.! How great was their joy when they heard the disruptive threats of the opposition! The only hope, the last chance of the enemies of the Communist International and the Soviet Union is for an increase of the differences inside the ranks of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. In their opinion a growth of the internal conflicts in our party will lead to the undermining of our unity, to the splitting of our ranks and to the destruction of the proletarian dictatorship. But their last hope has been shattered. A realisation of the malevolent hopes of all enemies of the Soviet Union and the proletarian dictatorship were, however, not destined to be realised. The party has remained united and will continue to be united in the future. The powerful Leninist Communist Party of the Soviet Union has won its victory because the Bolshevik workers rallied round it like an army in defence of its unity!

Resolution of the Berlin Functionaries of the C. P. of Germany on the Declaration of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U.

At the meeting of Party Functionaries of the Berlin-Brandenburg organisations of the C. P. of Germany held on the 20th October last, the following resolution was adopted by 469 votes against 92 with four abstentions.

"This meeting of the responsible Party Workers of the C. P. of Germany in Greater Berlin, welcome with pleasure and satisfaction the victory of the C. P. of the Soviet Union and its Leninist Central Committee over the unprincipled block of the oppositional groupings. We particularly congratulate the members of the Party nuclei of the C. P. of the Soviet Union who unitedly and unanimously repelled the attack, which was in defiance of all discipline, upon the unity of the Party. We declare:

1. The capitulation of the Opposition is only due to the unshakable bolshevist firmness of our Russian brother Party and its leadership.

2. The declaration of the Opposition not only means their submission to the discipline of the Party and of the Comintern but illustrates the complete ideological bankruptcy of the Opposition leaders, Comrades Zinoviev and Trotzky.

3. The Opposition declares on the one hand the decisions of the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. to be absolutely binding and their readiness to submit to them and carry them out, while on the other hand they declare that the Opposition continue to stand upon the basis of their former views. We therefore welcome the declaration of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. that the ideological struggle against the errors of principle of the opposition will be continued and all measures adopted that the minimum attained for securing the Party unity shall be actually carried out.

4. It is to be seen from the Communiqué of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. and also from the Declaration of the Opposition, that the leadership of the Opposition not only had fractional relations with Comrades Urbahns and Weber, but also with the renegade Maslov and Ruth Fischer who have been expelled from the Party. We condemn in the sharpest manner the violation of the discipline of the Communist World Party by the leaders of the Opposition.

5. In the C. P. of Germany, too, the final guarantee for maintaining the unity of the Party and safeguarding the revolutionary Party work can only be created by completely over-coming all fractions and groupings. The oppositional leadership of the Urbahns-Scholem-Weber Group is working under the direct control of Maslov and Ruth Fischer to split the Party and to undermine its daily struggle by every fractional means. The meeting calls upon the Central Committee to adopt all measures to stop the criminal fraction work of this group, in order that the Party can devote all its forces, in a united and unbroken front, to the great tasks of the fight against reformism and the dictatorship of capital.

6. We express the firm conviction that the oppositional comrades will draw the lessons from the happenings in our Russian brother Party, that fractions and groupings are incompatible with the nature of the Communist Party and that every true Communist must place above everything else the revolutionary character and the unity of the Party."

The Draft of the Trade Union Theses for the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 22nd October 1926.

The theses of Comrade Tomsky for the XV. Party congress which have been ratified by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. declare that the line of the Central Council of soviet labour unions with regard to the British miners struggle and in its relations to the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress was correct.

The theses support the decision of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. to reject the politically damaging and in principle false proposal of the opposition to disrupt the **Anglo-Russian Committee**. As the theses point out, such a proposal would mean to pursue a policy of with-drawing the communists from the trade unions and from the trade union organs. The communists are in the minority in the unions, and to call upon them to leave the unions would be doing the leaders of the General Council a favour, and would justify indirectly the policy of the opponents of trade union unity, in particular the leaders of the **Amsterdam International**.

The theses declare approval of the clear and open criticism of those who betrayed the general strike and declare themselves in favour of a continuation of the energetic assistance for the fighting British miners. They point out that the lessons of the general strike and of the offensive of capitalism which is fighting against the working class to bring about a stabilisation, have clearly proved the growing class-consciousness of the western European working class, its increasing disappointment with the reformist methods of struggle and its growing sympathy towards the working class of the Soviet Union and towards the work of socialist reconstruction in the Soviet Union. At the same time the reformist leaders are reacting to the leftward swing of the masses to a still greater degree in the expulsion of revolutionary workers from the trade unions and by introducing more and more the American methods of class-collaboration.

The task of the labour unions of the U. S. S. R. is to give the working class abroad all-round brotherly assistance in its struggle against the attacks of capitalism. The labour unions of the U. S. S. R. must increase their assistance and do everything in their power to free the workers abroad from the influence of the reformist leaders.

The theses recommend a continuation of the activity for the maintenance of fraternal bonds with the west European working class through workers delegations to the Soviet Union. They recommend the Central Council of soviet labour unions to continue its support of these workers delegations as far as possible.

Finally, the theses appeal to the communist fraction in the Central Council of soviet labour unions to strengthen the activity inside the **Red International of Labour Unions**. The theses express approval of the work done up to the present by the Central Council under the leadership of the Central Committee of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the struggle for the unity of the international trade union movement.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Presidium of the C. I. against Comrade Zinoviev Remaining at the Head of the Comintern.

Moscow, October 25th, 1926.

At the Plenum of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the 23rd of October, a delegation of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, consisting of representatives of the Communist Parties of Germany, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Great Britain, the United States of America, Poland, India, Japan and Finland, submitted the following declaration on the question of Comrade Zinoviev remaining at his post in the E. C. C. I.:

"In view of the anti-Leninist line of the Opposition Block in the C. P. S. U., in view of the leading role which Comrade Zinoviev played as chairman of the Communist International in the carrying out of this false line, in view of the monstrous disorganisatory fraction work of the Op-

position Block, unprecedented in the history of the Bolshevik Party, and in view of the extension of this fractional activity by Comrade Zinoviev into the ranks of the Communist International, the Delegation of the E. C. C. I. at the combined Plenum of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U., in accordance with the decisions of the most important sections of the Comintern, considers it impossible for Comrade Zinoviev to continue to remain and to work at the head of the Comintern."

This declaration was unanimously confirmed at today's meeting of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. and signed by all representatives of the foreign Communist Parties present. There follow the signatures of the members of the E. C. C. I. and of the representatives of the Communist Parties:

Geschke, Remmele, Neumann, Zetkin (Germany); Cremet, Treint (France); Murphy (Great Britain); Ercoli (Italy); Smerai, Zapotocky, Stern (Czechoslovakia); Duncan, Browder, Pepper (America); Katayama (Japan); Tchai (China); Roy (India); Bogucki, Turjanski (Poland); Sillen (Sweden); Badulescu (Roumania); Ferdi (Turkey); Kausinnen, Manner (Finland); Angaretis, Mitzkievitch (Lithuania); Anvelt (Esthonia); Codovilla (Argentina); Gyptner, Mehring, Gorkic (Young Communist International).

THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

The Peasant Policy of the C. P. S. U.

By Y. Yaroslavsky.

One of the most difficult tasks in constructive Socialism in the Soviet Union is the building up of Socialism out in the country districts. The fact that the Soviet Union is predominantly a peasant and petty bourgeois country has caused some of our comrades to vacillate in the questions involved in the insurrection of 1917, with the result that a number of comrades fail to grasp the real relations between proletariat and peasantry, and underestimate the peasantry as an ally of the proletariat. The well known theory of permanent revolution, held by the Trotskyists — Lenin designated this theory "the frightful Left theory of permanent revolution" — had its source in a description of Left criticism exercised on the relations between our Party and the peasantry.

Comrade Trotsky regarded the peasantry as a counter-revolutionary ally of the proletariat. He held it to be inevitable that "on the day after the Revolution" (Preface to "1905"), "hostile contentions" would arise between the proletariat and the "broad masses of the peasantry", with whose aid the proletariat came into power. Whilst at the time of the bourgeois democratic upheaval we made it our endeavour to neutralise that section of the peasantry which was well disposed towards us, our policy with respect to the middle peasantry has nevertheless invariably been an effort to form an alliance with them (Lenin). This was emphasised by Lenin as early as 11. December 1918, in his speech at the First National Congress of the village poor committees.

Lenin emphasised that this alliance would be the result of an understanding. He could see beforehand that the middle peasantry, who "are neither enemies of the proletariat nor enemies of Socialism", are naturally irresolute, and will not go over to Socialism until the necessity of doing so is proved to them by a permanent and convincing proof taken from actual practice.

How is it possible to demonstrate to the middle peasantry, that is, the main force of the peasantry, that it is "necessary to go over to Socialism?"

"It need not be said that the middle peasantry are not to be convinced by theoretical considerations or propaganda speeches. We do not calculate on this. They will be convinced by means of the example and united action of the working section of the peasantry, by means of the alliance between these working peasants and the proletariat. We calculate upon a slow and gradual conversion, induced by a series of transition measures bringing about an understanding between the proletarian and socialist section of

the population, between the communists who are conducting a determined fight against every form of capitalism, and the middle peasantry."

What are these measures to be? The first measures must be that of aid to the middle peasantry. Lenin frequently pointed out that too little aid has been given in this direction, and that we should seek to alleviate and improve the conditions of living of the middle peasantry. Lenin warned the Party especially against the error of confusing the middle peasantry with the kulaks (rich peasantry):

"The confusion of the middle peasantry with the kulaks, the application to the middle peasantry of measures intended to combat the kulaks, signifies not only a violation of all the decrees issued by the Soviet power, and of the whole policy of the Soviet power, but a violation of all those fundamental principles of Communism which indicate an understanding between the proletariat and the middle peasantry, during the period of decisive proletarian struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, as one of the prerequisites for the painless transition to the abolition of all exploitation."

Thus the resolution passed by our Party with reference to our relations to the middle peasantry emphasises that:

"the middle peasantry is not to be counted among the exploiters, for they do not derive profits from the labour of others. A class of small producers such as these can lose nothing through Socialism."

The C. P. of the Soviet Union, in its policy with respect to the peasantry, has been guided solely by the principles followed by Lenin in our communist policy. All the measures taken with regard to the poor peasantry, to the middle peasantry, and to the kulaks, are based on that estimation of these categories which was formed by Lenin, and with him by our whole Party. This does not, however, mean that there has invariably been complete unanimity of opinion in our Party on these questions.

As early as the Tenth Party Conference acute differences of opinion arose on the peasant question. At that time we had to repulse an attack from the "Left", from the so-called "workers' opposition".

At that time the "workers' opposition" issued its well-known manifesto — Comrade A. Kollontay's pamphlet: "The Workers' Opposition" — in which it was asserted that our Party was not pursuing any definite proletarian class line. In this pamphlet we read:

"The economic backwardness of Russia, and the fact that the peasantry predominate, leads to this confusion, and inevitably induces the practical policy of the Party to deviate from its straight line of principle and theory. The Party, at the head of a Soviet State of mixed social composition, has to calculate, whether it will or not, with the demands of the mujik as an economic factor, with his petty bourgeois prejudices, and with his aversion to Communism."

The "Workers' Opposition" maintained that the class character of our line of action has frequently been distorted by this alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry:

"And we in Soviet Russia are forced to convince ourselves and the whole working class that the petty bourgeoisie, the philistine class (not to mention the peasantry of the type of the productive and work-loving middle peasant), can all live together excellently under the common banner of: "All power to the Soviets," and we forget that the interests of the workers inevitably clash, in practical daily life, with the interests of the peasants and small citizens whose mentality is confused with petty bourgeois psychology, and who "distort and destroy the class character of Soviet policy" in various ways

Much indignation was recently aroused in our Party by the publication of an article by a certain Ossovsky. This article is an openly Menshevist and liquidatory document. Ossovsky expresses the opinion (and is, we regret to say, supported by some of the leaders of the new opposition) that the C. P. of the

Soviet Union is a "protector of the capitalist elements of our economics".

But this characterisation of our Party does not emanate from Ossovsky alone. Ossovsky understands, under the conception "capitalist elements of our economics", mainly the peasantry. To him the peasant is not a small producer, but a capitalist employer. This characterisation of our Party as a Party pursuing a non-proletarian policy has already been made by the "workers' opposition". In the above-mentioned pamphlet by Comrade A. Kollontay we find the following passage:

"The definite class policy of our Party is being transformed, during the process of identification of the Party with the State apparatus of the Soviets, more and more into a policy standing above the various classes, and this transformation represents nothing more nor less than an adaption on the part of the leading organs to the multifarious and conflicting interests of the multifarious categories of the population. This adaptation leads unavoidably to vacillations, to inconstancy, to deviations, and to errors. It suffices to mention the zigzag path pursued by our policy with regard to the peasantry, which has led us from a course directed to the rural poor to a course directed towards the work-loving peasant landowner.

However much this course may demonstrate the political common sense and statesmanship of our leading stratum, the later impartial historian, forming an estimate of our rule, will none the less point out that here we have already a "dangerous and serious deviation from the class line", a tendency to "adaptability", to veering with the wind."

The Left critics in the new opposition accuse our Party of a grave deviation in 1926, and allege that this deviation amounts to a defence of the kulaks. We see that this accusation is copied from that "frightful workers' opposition" now inclining to the liquidatory standpoint. In 1920 and 1921 the "workers' opposition" accused Lenin and the Party led by him of a dangerous deviation from the class line in the peasant question. At that time Comrade Kollontay maintained that the policy of our Party represented "the results between the interests of three groups of the population", and was thus a policy of opportunism. However, if the C. P. of the Soviet Union is now accused of slipping into opportunism in the peasant question, we may console ourselves by remembering that Lenin was accused of the same sin. In this question we are in no bad company, whilst our critics often deviate quite openly from Leninism.

What, indeed, were the accusations brought against Lenin by the "workers' opposition" in 1920, 1921 and 1922? In a speech by Comrade Medvedev we find the instructions given by our Party for economic work severely criticised. In the instructions laid down by the Party we find the following:

"It should be regarded as the most important and unavoidable task, incumbent upon all economic organs, to attain definite success, in the shortest possible space of time, in the work of supplying the peasantry with a large quantity of the goods required for the promotion of agriculture and the improvement of the conditions of living among the working peasantry... This aim must not be disregarded by any industrial administrative organ whatever... The improvement of the position of the workers must be made subordinate to this aim, to the end that all workers' organisations, especially the trade unions, may be obliged to carry forward the work of restoration in such a manner that the needs of the peasantry are rapidly and completely satisfied, as the increased wages and improved conditions of living among the industrial workers depends immediately upon the extent of the success attained in striving towards this goal. And to this goal again the activities of the People's Commissariat for Finance must be made subordinate."

In other words, Lenin thus held the maintenance of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry to be of first importance. Comrade Lenin wrote that our industry must be adapted to the needs of the peasant markets, and that the activities of a great number, if not all, State organs should be directed to this goal. Lenin was of the opinion that the limits

of capitalist development under the Nep. should be set by the needs of the peasantry. At the Eleventh Party Conference he said:

"We are admitting capitalism, but only within the limits required by the peasantry."

It was precisely this standpoint of Lenin's which was the object of "Left" criticism from the "workers' opposition"; and at that time Lenin was obliged to give the signal: Fire against the left.

It is not merely a question of a slogan invented by Comrade Stalin after the XIV. Party Conference. No, Comrade Stalin and the whole of our Party observed at the XIV. Party Conference a relapse into those ideas which had already made their appearance at the X. and XI. Party Conferences. At that time these false views were voiced by the "workers' opposition", whilst now we hear these accusations against the Leninist C. C., and against the Party (in a somewhat more up to date and abbreviated form) from the mouths of the Trotskyists, and from comrades who only recently defended the Leninist line. But in all essentials both the former and the present criticism represent attacks on the Leninist standpoint, on the Leninist attitude towards the peasant question, and we react to this criticism as Lenin reacted to it.

Our Party has also been criticised from the Left by the "Workers' Truth" group, an insignificant group of intellectuals which was formed in our Party in the Autumn of 1921 as a result of that feeling of disappointment which took possession of the less steadfast elements of our Party after the temporary retreat involved in the introduction of the Nep..

It is characteristic that this group, though comprising less than 20 persons — and few of these functionaries — boasted of enormous success. Whilst the "workers' group" gathered around Myasnikov in 1921/23 made frequent reference to its tens of thousands of adherents, though in reality, these only numbered a few dozen, the "Workers' Truth" group was able to claim even this lesser number of adherents. What this group has been may be seen from their declaration addressed to the Polit. Bureau of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union on 1. January 1924, in which the leaders of this group wrote some "bitter truths" about themselves:

"The counter-revolutionary character of this standpoint is visible with the naked eye. It oozes from every pore. Here Left phraseology conceals not only typically Menshevik opportunism, but dogmatism, doctrinarianism, and confused lack of thought. It is bad service which the "Workers' Truth" renders the labour movement. It represents the most shameful and dangerous tendency of all, that of the separation of the Russian C. P. and the Soviet power from the working class. This can profit only the enemies of the revolution."

The "Workers' Truth" represents a certain definite political viewpoint, an objectionable and Menshevikistically distorted viewpoint."

Thus the "Workers' Truth" wrote about itself, declaring this to be the unvarnished truth about the "Workers' Truth", and that it must openly acknowledge before the Party these "truths bitter to itself". And this Rightest of all Right groups in the Party, declaring that the Communists in free Soviet Russia represented the new bourgeoisie, criticised at that time our Leninist Party from the Left. This is the destiny of our "Left" critics. What was the attitude of this "Left" group to the peasant question? In the two numbers of the periodical "Workers' Truth" which appeared, and in the various appeals which this group issued, we find no mention of the peasantry. Only when the question of a pamphlet for the masses was raised in June 1923, a member of this group suggested that a passage be introduced dealing with the poorest peasantry. He substantiated this proposal by stating that many workers are connected with the rural districts, and the peasant policy carried on by the Soviet government neglects the interests of the rural poor. Thus as early as 1923 we were accused of deviating in favour of the kulaks.

But at that time the leaders of our policy were Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, etc. And in this question these comrades had no differences with the Party. Thus the accusations now brought against the Bolshevik Party by these comrades, the accusations that our party is neglecting the interests of the poor peasantry, are copied from the accusations brought

against Lenin by the "workers' opposition" of 1921, and from the "Workers' Truth" of 1923, which raised the same criticisms against the Leninist Party.

It must be observed that the "Workers' Truth" deemed itself to be even more "Left". Thus the secretary of this group, the woman comrade Ivanova (F. Schutzkever) declared at the above-mentioned session in June 1923 (I quote from the minutes of the meeting) that she did not consider it necessary to introduce a passage dealing with our relations to the peasantry. "The peasantry", she declared, "is invariably an important factor at the moment of revolutionary insurrection (Canon fodder)". Here we have the arch-Left standpoint in the peasant question.

It is true that neither the Trotskyists nor the new opposition have ever reached such an ultra-idiotic standpoint, such an extremely detrimental standpoint, in the peasant question, nor will they do so. But we must not forget that the Trotskyists — and this has been frequently pointed out by Comrade Lenin, and also by Comrades Krupskaya, Zinoviev, and Kamenev — have been characterised by just this underestimation of the peasantry, this false standpoint with regard to the peasantry. And since the new opposition is performing an evolution in the direction of Trotskyism nearly all along the line, there is doubtless a danger of its running off the rails in this direction. It would be superfluous to prove that Lenin would have decidedly opposed such Left tendencies, and that he would have declared for the necessity of directing our fire against the Left.

Another extremely characteristic point is the fact that neither the "Workers' Truth" nor the "workers' opposition" furnish that positive estimate of the co-operatives which we find in our Party. We know in what esteem Lenin held the co-operatives. In 1923 he wrote a special article on the co-operatives — this was his swan song — in which he expressed the opinion that the sole great task yet before us was to bring the population into the co-operatives. In this article Lenin asks:

"Is not the power of the State over all important means of production, the State power in the hands of the proletariat, the alliance between this proletariat and the many millions of small and smallest peasants, the secure leading rôle held by this proletariat over the peasantry, etc. — is this not all that is necessary to make out of the co-operatives, out of the co-operatives alone, which we have hitherto treated as petty shopkeeping affairs, and may continue to treat thus in certain respects even under our new economic policy, to make out of the co-operatives alone the means of building up the complete structure of the socialist state of society? This is not yet the finished structure of the socialist state of society, but it is everything necessary and sufficient for building the structure." (The emphasis is mine. Y. Y.)

This article of Lenin's leaves no room for doubt that Lenin regarded the co-operatives, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and under the rule of the Soviet state over all the main means of production, as an adequate medium for the building up of a socialist state of society. And this question — the question of the degree of importance of the co-operatives in the Soviet states — represents one of the fundamental questions of our whole peasant policy. We must place on record that neither the "Workers' Opposition" nor the "Workers' Truth" have ever had the slightest conception of the importance of the co-operatives.

The manner in which the "Workers' Opposition" regards this question now, in the autumn of 1926, may be seen from an article by the leader of this opposition, Comrade Schlyapnikov, published in the last number of the "Bolshevik", in which he declares that "even the co-operatives are unable to lend any substantial aid to the enormous masses of the rural poor". Thus the "Workers' opposition" is still of the opinion that the co-operatives do not constitute the road to Socialism. In a statement of the standpoint of the "Workers' opposition", contained in the recently published "Letter from Baku" from the pen of that other leader of the "Workers' Opposition", Comrade Medvedyev, there is not a single word about the co-operatives, just as there is not a single word about the co-operatives in the "Workers' Truth".

It is especially important to note that the new opposition, too, is inclined to depreciate the importance of the co-operatives as a medium towards constructive Socialism, and even to forget the co-operatives altogether when making important statements. This is especially worthy of note in face of the fact that the

criticism expressed by this new opposition consists of an endeavour to prove that we are sadly lacking in socialist elements, and of most melancholy descriptions of the triumphal march of capital through the Soviet Union (in which criticism they vie with our class enemies).

* * *

It may however be maintained that all this may be very true with regard to both the "Workers' Opposition" and the "Workers' Truth", but that at the present time neither the "Workers' Opposition" nor the "Workers' Truth" plays any part of importance. The "Workers' Opposition" has sunk to the extremest Right liquidatory standpoint. But we still continue to accord attention to these groups, for the reason that a certain analogy — even though it cannot be called a similarity — presses itself upon our notice between the "Workers' Opposition" and the "Workers' Truth" on the one hand, and the "new opposition" on the other. And for the rest the new opposition comprises both the "Workers' Opposition" and certain fragments of the "Workers' Truth".

The "Left" criticism exercised by the new opposition against the standpoint represented by our Party in the peasant question is in itself a revision of Leninism. Comrades **Zinoviev**, **Kamenev**, and other comrades, revise not only the standpoint which they themselves have represented during the last few years, but they revise the standpoint of Leninism. We only need take the question of our relations to the well-to-do peasantry. The statements of the new opposition frequently contain accusations against the Party majority, alleging deviations in favour of the kulak, or insufficient combating of such deviations. But it was Comrade **Zinoviev** who on the 24. May 1924, at the XIII. Party Conference of the C. P. of the Soviet Union stated regarding this question:

"With us there is a lot of talk about the kulak. Care must however be taken to avoid errors in two directions: 1. In making concessions to the kulak, and 2., in labelling as kulaks peasants who are not kulaks at all. We must not call every peasant a kulak who is fairly well-to-do and able to live well. Our People's Commissar for Agriculture, Comrade **Smirov**, is right in saying that many comrades swerve from the right line in this."
Thus Comrade **Zinoviev** in 1924.

And in January 1926 the whole "new opposition" arms with the utmost haste against the People's Commissar for Agriculture, Comrade **Smirov**, and accuses him of a deviation in favour of the kulaks. We must direct the attention of the comrades in our brother Parties to the fact that at the present time Comrade **A. I. Smirov** (member of the C. C.) is being made the target of the attacks from Comrades **Zinoviev**, **Kamenev**, and the whole "new opposition", by whom he is alleged to represent a kulak deviation.

It is the lack of principle implied in this change of front, and at the same time the adherence to the principle of falling away from Leninism, which comprise that danger which has induced Comrade **Stalin** to issue the order: Fire against the Left!

At that time Comrade **Zinoviev** declared that we must not "put pressure on all peasants who are, living comfortably and working their farms properly. There is no question whatever of completely crushing the kulak".

But in 1926 we are told precisely the contrary, and are pressed to "crush the kulak completely". And Comrade **Stalin** was right in calling attention, at the XIV. Party Conference, to this extreme vacillation and inconstancy in the attitude of such a leader as Comrade **Zinoviev** in the peasantry question:

"A few facts with regard to Comrade **Zinoviev's** vacillations in the peasant question: In 1924 comrade **Zinoviev** recommended, in the Plenum of the C. C., the policy of the organisation of non-Party peasant fractions in the metropolis and in the provinces, with a weekly periodical. This motion was rejected. Some time previously, Comrade **Zinoviev** even boasted of having swerved into a peasant deviation. At the XII. Party Conference, for instance, he observed:

"If I am told that I have deviated in the direction of the peasantry, I reply: Yes, and not only must we "deviate"

in the direction of the peasantry and their economic needs, but we must bow down and even kneel before the economic needs of these peasants who march behind our proletariat?"

Then, as soon as the peasantry began to be more prosperous, Comrade **Zinoviev** made a change of front, began to cast suspicion on the middle peasantry, and announced the slogan of neutralisation. Later on he performed still another evolution, demanded in all essentials a revision of the decisions of the XIV. Conference (in the article entitled "The Philosophy of the Epoch), accused almost the whole of the Central Committee of making a peasant deviation, and commenced a decided attack on the middle peasantry. Finally, at the time of the XIV. Party Conference, he again made a change of front, turning once more to the alliance with the middle peasantry. And perhaps will again boast that he is ready to "bend the knee" before the peasantry.

What guarantee have we that Comrade **Zinoviev** will not change front again a few times?

But all this hopping about, comrades, is not politics (Laughter and applause). This is hysteria, and not politics! (Voice: hear! hear!)

Comrade **Stalin's** speech pointed out a number of facts characterising the contradictions in the standpoint of the "new opposition". On the one hand the representatives of this opposition accuse us of neglecting the interests of the poor peasantry, and on the other hand they themselves propose and carry out measures directed against the poor peasantry. Comrade **Stalin** informed the Party Conference of a fact relating to the attitude adopted towards the poor peasantry by Comrade **Sokolnikov**, an alleged sworn defender of the village poor:

"The People's Commissar for Finances for the Russian Soviet Republic, Comrade **Milyutin**, recently decided to remit the tax on small peasant farms upon which the tax due amounted to less than one rouble, the more that the administrative costs of collecting this tax come to almost as much as the tax itself. But what does Comrade **Sokolnikov**, this sworn defender of the poor peasantry, do in his capacity of People's Commissary of Finance for the Soviet Union? He cancels the decision of Comrade **Milyutin**. The result is the receipt of a number of protests from 15 Government Committees. But comrade **Sokolnikov** sticks obstinately to his standpoint. It required the pressure of the C. C. to induce Comrade **Sokolnikov** to withdraw his order. And this is what Comrade **Sokolnikov** calls defending the interests of the poor peasantry."

We are well acquainted with Lenin's standpoint on the subject of the middle peasantry. And yet the "Leningrad Pravda" accused us, during the discussions preceding the XIV. Party Conference and during the XIV. Party Conference, of standing for some special "middle peasant Bolshevism".

It is perfectly clear to the Party that this signifies a departure from Leninism, and that fire must be opened against such dodging about, such vacillations, and such mental confusion, as are evidenced by the new opposition in the peasant question. If the criticism of the new opposition comes from the "Left", then it is obvious that the fire of the Party must be directed against the Left, for this "Left policy" drives the Party to the Right, drives the masses of the middle peasantry into the arms of the kulaks, and separates and repels great masses of the peasantry from the proletariat.

* * *

A few words on the decisions of the XIV. Party Conference. We are now being told that at the XIV. Party Conference we made concessions to the kulaks in the question of leasing land, and in the question of wage workers. Comrade **Kamenev** declared that anyone who maintains that the lease facilities and the employment of wage workers in agriculture are concessions to the middle peasantry, conceals actual facts and misrepresents matters, since, as a matter of fact the concessions have been granted to the kulaks.

At the XIV. Party Conference Comrade **Stalin** asked the new opposition why they voted at the time for the decision of the XIV. National Conference, if these measure signified con-

cessions to the kulak. Comrade Kamenev, in his opening speech of the XIV. National Conference, if these measures signified **concession of the productive forces in the village** is that general slogan the application of which is bound to lead to the firmer establishment of the power of our Union, and of the alliance between the workers and the peasants”.

“The removal of all obstacles in the way of the development of productive forces in the countryside, the disappearance of every vestige of war communism from the village, the abandonment of those administrative methods inconsistent with the development of the productive forces of the rural districts, and finally the finding of honest Soviet functionaries for the village administrative apparatus — these are the concrete tasks now confronting us, and waiting to be solved by our Conference.”

Is there one word in all this about our intentions of making concessions to the kulak? It may be seen from this quotation that Comrade Kamenev himself, as also the whole XIV. National Conference, the XIV. Party Congress, and the whole Party, regarded these measures as **“that general slogan the application of which is bound to lead to the firmer establishment of the power of our Union, and of the alliance between the workers and peasants”**.

But this is not all. In his concluding speech Comrade Kamenev declared:

“It would be an error to heal the process now going on in the country by those means which have been designated at this Conference, it is true by only one speaker, as kindling class warfare among the peasantry.”

What is this but **fire against the Left**? At the XIV. National Conference the representatives of the new opposition even supported all such measures as those permitting the lease of land, and the Conference decided that:

“our economic policy demands that economic intercourse should be developed to the utmost in every branch of economics, both in town and country... Thanks to the more rapid traffic in goods, the speed of accumulation will increase in every sphere of national economy, accompanied by an ever greater absolute and relative growth of the socialist elements of economics.”

Thus comrade Stalin was perfectly right in pointing out that the assertion which has been made, to the effect that at the XIV. National Conference we made a concession to the kulak and not to the peasantry, is a slander against the Party, and an attack on the Nep.

* * *

Let us now return to that passage in comrade Stalin's speech in which he gives us the slogan of: **“Fire against the Left”**. It is true that a section of our comrades has underestimated the kulak danger. Of this there is no doubt whatever. No one contends that we should not combat this underestimation. But the line of policy proposed by the new opposition has been that line involving the arousing of class war among the peasantry which was so severely condemned by Kamenev at the XIV. National Conference. In October 1925 Comrade Stalin pointed out that the new oppositional line was dangerous for the Party, for it led precisely

“to the arousing of class warfare among the peasantry, and to a return to the policy of war communism, and consequently to civil war with its resultant destruction of the whole of our constructive work and the abandonment of Lenin's co-operative plans for combining millions of peasant farms in the system of socialist construction.”

Comrade Stalin further pointed out that the Party is but little prepared for a struggle against such trends of thought. There can scarcely be a few dozen comrades in our Party who are inclined to defend the kulak, and the interests of the kulak.

It is however much more difficult to pursue a correct policy with reference to the main mass of the peasantry. Thus the Party was in agreement with Comrade Stalin when he stated that:

“the Party must fight against both deviations, but none the less concentrate its fire on that deviation which underestimates the middle peasantry.”

The far-reaching significance of an underestimation of the middle peasantry may be seen in the series of extremely dangerous proposals made by the opposition.

What are the aims of the present action of the opposition? The new opposition is pushing an extreme **“Left”** plan of super-industrialisation into the foreground, but this plan ignores the economic possibilities of our country, and involves such a pressure upon the peasantry that its execution would involve the utter destruction of our peasant policy. The new opposition demands **higher prices for industrial products**. Such a rise in prices would inevitably increase the discontent of many millions of peasants entirely dependent on agriculture for their living. The peasants would be forced to raise the price of agricultural products. This would again inevitably react in the first place on the workers' wages, and would force us to raise these wages higher than it is actually possible for us to do. This would lead to renewed disparity between the prices of agricultural and industrial products, and to the dissolution of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. These are proposals involving the greatest of all dangers, the danger of destroying our whole policy. Thus the slogan of **“Fire against the Left”** means the maintenance of the alliance between the proletariat and the main mass of the peasantry.

We have seen that an extreme **“Left”** opposition criticised the Party even during Lenin's lifetime, and accused Lenin of opportunism. At that time our Party concentrated its fire against the Left leaders, and stigmatised them as representatives of petty bourgeois ideas. We have seen that the Menshevik group of the **“Workers' Truth”** criticised us from the **“Left”**. This group was expelled from our Party. In 1926 we find ourselves confronted by a fresh **“Left”** campaign. Other people, with another basis, with another past, and with much greater authority, are making a renewed attempt to **“correct”** the line of the Party from the **“Left”**. We see the same deviations, the same failure to grasp Leninist policy, the same underestimation of the middle peasantry, the same incautious treatment of the alliance between the proletariat and the main mass of the peasantry, the same attempt at destroying this alliance. This is the reason why we are fighting with such intense earnestness on this question. Here the fundamental questions of our revolution are involved, here the fundamental interests of the proletarian dictatorship are at stake.

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

Refutation of Polish Lies Regarding the Relief Action in the Soviet Union.

Moscow, 21st October 1926.

Recently the Polish press has published reports according to which the Soviet government has prohibited the soviet labour unions to dispatch money to the British miners.

These completely fabricated reports represent a further attempt to revive in a new form the old stories about the alleged interference of the soviet government in the support action in aid of the British miners.

The labour unions of the U.S.S.R. are free in all their actions. No one can prevent them fulfilling their duty of international proletarian solidarity. The Soviet union is not a capitalist country in which such interferences with the rights of the unions is possible.

The collections for the British miners are being continued everywhere. 500,000 further roubles have been dispatched recently, making a sum total of 882,000 pounds sterling which have been sent to the British workers. This fact refutes most effectively the inventions of the Polish press.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

„Indo-European Telegraph” Operators on Strike in the U. S. R.

By P. Savin (Chief of Org. Dept. C. C. Postal Union).

The British Indo-European Telegraph Company known as the "Indo" possesses the line linking up London with India and Persia. The line passes through Germany and Poland, farther on through the territory of the U. S. S. R. where there are several telegraph stations (in Odessa, Berdichev, Tiflis etc.), and then from the Julfah on to Persia.

The Company in question, has held its concession, granted by the Russian Imperial Government, since 1873. The line did not function during the Revolution, as the Company did not consider it opportune to begin its exploitation at the close of the Civil War, particularly in the Ukraine. It was only in 1922, that the Board of the Company approached the Soviet Government regarding the matter of again taking over the line and cable connecting the U. S. S. R. with Turkey. A concession agreement was concluded the same year that provided for mutual benefits to both the concessionaires and the U. S. S. R. Government.

During the time the concession has been in force no complaints can be made by the Company regarding any inaccurate observance of the conditions subscribed to by the Soviet Government. On the contrary, the Company was able to develop its activities very rapidly thanks to the broad measures of assistance extended by the People's Commissariats of Posts and Telegraphs. Neither could the Company make any complaint in regard to bad relations with the Soviet Postal Workers' Union during the period covered by the General Collective Agreement which expired on November 1st, 1925.

Since the expiration of the said agreement the Central Committee of the Postal Workers' Union has been negotiating for nine months with the Indo Company about concluding a fresh collective agreement. During these nine months the policy of the Company's representative has been to drag out the negotiations, always bringing up various new proposals regarding points in the agreement already settled, and delaying his replies to the proposals of the Union Co.

As a result of these lengthy negotiations, on July 13th 1926 the following principal demands of the Union were still outstanding: 1. to give a 20% cost of living bonus to all workers on the line, the same to be retrospective as from the date of the Agreement's expiring; this bonus not to be paid to employees in Odessa, Berdichev, Tiflis, and Kerch, the employees in these towns being already in possession of a cost of living bonus amounting to 33 $\frac{1}{2}$ %. 2. To pay all employees going out on the line to effect minor repairs and the like in accordance with the Code of Labour Laws in force in the U. S. S. R. The Union C. C. was determined to insist on these demands, as they had been unanimously backed by all the "Indo" employees.

With a view to a peaceful settlement, the Union C. C. suggested that the "Indo" management should submit the points at issue to the consideration of an arbitration court, and intimated its willingness to abide by the findings of the Court. The management, however, showed no anxiety to settle the matter in this way, and the only thing left for the Union to do was to call a general strike of the workers on the "Indo" line.

On August 20th Mr. Cunningham, the Company's chief representative in Moscow, was asked by the Union to give a final answer to its proposals, and was at the same time advised that should no satisfactory answer be forthcoming a strike would be declared on that section of the line passing through the U. S. S. R.

The Moscow representative did not get the consent demanded from the London Board by the date fixed by the Union. At midnight on August 22nd, therefore, all work on the "Indo" line -- from the Polish to the Persian border -- came to a stop on the call of the strike committee. The strike involved not only the operators but also the men employed in the repair shops and garages of the Company, the supply of electric energy being also cut off.

Right up to the last moment the Company representatives, both in Moscow and Odessa, the main station on the line, refused to believe in the possibility of any strike taking place. Even after the declaration of the strike Mr. Cunningham wrote

the Council of People's Commissars on the 24th of August "regretting" what he opined was the quite unwarranted demands pressed by the Union. He wrote that the "Indo" Company considered the situation that had arisen as contrary to the spirit of the concession, and asked the Council to put its interpretation on the concession agreement concluded by the Company in a spirit of common sense and good will with a view to laying down conditions that would not make it impossible for the Company to continue working in the U. S. S. R.

These naive gentlemen completely lost sight of the trifling fact that it is the right of the Soviet Trade unions freely to advocate their demands with all the means at their disposal, including the strike weapon, and their complete independence, as a workers' organisation, from the organs of the Soviet Power.

Having received an explanation to the effect that the Commissariat could not meddle in the dispute that had arisen between the Company and the Union and that the Union was entitled to act in the matter as it deemed most fit, the "Indo" management began spreading rumours among the workers making out that the Union was preventing the Company from carrying out its normal activities and that it would therefore have to stop running the line altogether and give up the concession. This sort of provocation was supported by many European bourgeois papers which did their best to convince their readers, that it was impossible for a capitalist to do normal business in Soviet Russia, and that the strike had been declared not by the trade union, but by the Soviet Government. The issue of the strike and the conclusion of a normal collective agreement proved, however, the falseness of the news dished up by the bourgeois press regarding the "Indo" strike.

During the 49 days that the strike lasted the management did nothing at all to open negotiations with the Union about settling the dispute, although the Union did not decline to consider the Company's proposals regarding the points on which no agreement had been reached prior to the strike.

The result was that the Company held steadily to one definite tactic: to make a concession on one point and then move two fresh proposals worsening the workers' conditions on points that had been considered as agreed on before the strike ever took place.

Notwithstanding, all the strikers stood firm, being unanimous in their demands, and carried on without a single case of blacklegging for the whole 49 days of the strike.

It became daily clearer for the Company that it would have to submit to the Union's proposals in view of the firm organised resistance to any degradation of working conditions.

October 9th the Management agreed to the final point outstanding between it and the Union, submitting to the Union's demand.

As the result of their 49 days' strike the "Indo-European Telegraph" employees succeeded in getting their following chief demands satisfied:

1. A 15% cost of living bonus to all employees who had not been receiving the same since October 1st, 1925, the same to be paid retrospectively as from October 1st, 1925. Said bonus, and also the 33 $\frac{1}{2}$ % bonus being paid before the strike in the 5 big towns already mentioned, to hold good for three years, to September 30th, 1929.

2. The rates fixed for "Indo" employees on 30th September 1926 shall be increased in the same ratio as average wages for P. C. P. T. employees as they may be increased from time to time. Said wage increases shall be paid the "Indo" employees at the same time as introduced for P. C. P. T. employees.

3. Employees going out on the line to effect repairs entailing the covering of more than 9 kilometres shall be paid travelling allowances in accordance with the regulations regarding the same laid down by the People's Commissariat of Labour.

4. All strikers shall be paid for the time they were on strike this to include flat rate, rent bonus, and cost of living bonus. Employees scheduled to work Sundays shall obtain an additional bonus, special bonus shall be paid to employees doing repairs.

5. The Company to undertake to grant holiday leave, prior to restarting telegraphic operations in 1926, to all employees who would otherwise have had such leave had they not been on strike.

6. No victimisation to be undertaken by the Company against persons either taking part in the strike or directing the strike in their respective localities.

7. The Company to allocate 2,250 roubles annually to a special fund provide spa cures for its employees.

This strike which thus closed with victory for the Union, has demonstrated to the "Indo-European Telegraph Company" that in the U. S. S. R. a trade union can successfully conduct a lengthy struggle for improving the conditions of its members. The Union showed its ability to organise the membership during the strike and to inspire them not to allow a single case of blacklegging to occur.

This example of firmness, unanimity and unity displayed by the members of this Soviet trade union should serve as a warning to all employers and concessionaires who think they can build up their own prosperity in the U. S. S. R. at the expense of the toilers.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

On the Way to Trade Union Unity in the Countries of the Pacific.

By A. Lozovsky.

On the initiative of the trade unions of Australia, and mainly of the New South Wales Trades Council, a Congress of the Trade Unions of the countries of the Pacific was convened in Sydney for the end of July last. Invitations to this Congress were issued to the trade unions of China, Japan, the Soviet Union, India, South Africa, Java, the Islands in the Pacific, and to South America, Canada, the United States and Great Britain.

This action on the part of the trade unions of Australia was the result of the decision of the II. Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions on the necessity of establishing trade union unity in the countries of the Pacific. In convening this Conference the Australian comrades somewhat underestimated the question of distances. They sent out their invitations in February and fixed the time for holding the Congress at the end of July. As they feared that they would not succeed in getting into contact with the organisations in question they in some instances sent their own representatives to convey invitations. At the time fixed for the Conference the situation was as follows:

All letters and telegrams addressed to the Left trade unions in Japan had been sent back by the Japanese police; in Japan only the reformist trade unions received the invitations, but the reformist trade union leader, Bundshi Suzuki replied that he could not attend the Conference as Australian legislation was directed against yellow workers. The Indian Trades Union Congress heartily welcomed the convening of the Congress but could not take part in it as the time was too short. The trade unions of Indonesia, China and of the Soviet Union and some of the trade unions of Mexico, pronounced themselves to be in favour of the Congress, but owing to the enormous distances and the difficulties caused by the police, and in certain cases owing to financial difficulties, it was impossible for all those organisations who wished to take part in the Conference to send their delegation in good time.

When the representative of the Red International of Labour Unions and of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union came to the Conference, it appeared from the reports of the delegates sent by the Australian trade unions that the Congress could not take place at the time originally fixed. The delegates present (Australia, R. I. L. U., A. U. C. T. U., Minority Movement, New Zealand), after become acquainted with all the material and discussing the situation that has arisen, adopted the following decision:

"In view of the impossibility of many delegates arriving in good time and in view of the difficulties of a general nature connected with the convocation of a Conference in Sydney, the preliminary Workers' Conference of the workers of the Pacific Ocean have decided:

1. To postpone the convening of the Conference to the 1st May 1927 and to hold the Conference in Canton immediately after the Trades Union Congress of China has been held.

2. To enter into negotiations with the Chinese trade union federation regarding the question of jointly carrying

out the preparatory work for the convening of the Conference.

3. To submit the following agenda: a) report of the organisation Committee; b) reports of the delegates from the various countries; c) the International Labour Movement and the situation in the countries of the Pacific; d) the activity of the trade unions and the fighting tasks in the Far East (legalising of the trade unions, social legislation); e) questions of emigration, of the coloured workers etc.; f) organisational questions, methods of contact etc.; g) election of a trade union secretariat for the countries of the Pacific."

We consider the new arrangements for holding the Congress, both as regards time and place, to be quite correct. To unite the workers of the countries of the Pacific is one of the most important historical tasks of the immediate future. It is hardly necessary to point out that the Pacific Ocean will in the near future be the scene of tremendous encounters and conflicts, which can only be prevented by a close union of the workers of all countries of the Pacific. It was for this reason that the Red International of Labour Unions, already in the year 1922, raised the question of bringing together the workers' organisations of all the countries of the Pacific. And it was for this reason that the trade unions of Australia quite rightly took up the initiative in this question.

It must be mentioned that the trade unions of Australia clearly perceive those difficulties which the labour organisations of the countries of the Pacific are bound to encounter in the near future, and that they are therefore endeavouring to do everything that lies in their power in this respect. Very characteristic and deserving the greatest attention in this connection is the decision of the 3rd Trades Union Congress of Australia, which was held at the beginning of August 1926 in Sydney, in the question of international trade union unity. This decision is as follows:

"In view of the fact that:

1. competition and the struggle for markets and sources of raw material in the countries of the Pacific Ocean — the last resort of the decaying capitalist system of the world — are becoming more intense;

2. that competition in armaments by sea and land will, if it is not prevented by an active and class conscious labour movement, inevitably lead to a new war;

3. that the labour movement is split internationally and in many countries also on a national scale, whilst the capitalist forces directed against the workers are undergoing a tremendous process of concentration;

4. that the revolutionary labour movement in the Far East, particularly in China, is growing and thereby greatly altering the situation of the countries of the Pacific,

the 3rd Trades Congress of Australia resolves:

1. to take active part in the struggle for establishing trade union unity on an international scale, and to urge the convocation of an international Unity Congress of all trade unions;

2. to elect delegates to attend the Trades Union Conference of the countries of the Pacific which is to be held on the 1st May 1927 in Canton;

3. to direct an appeal to the workers of all countries of the Pacific, pointing out the necessity of uniting all forces in the fight against international capitalism and against preparations for war;

4. to send a message of congratulation to the awakening working class of China and to their trade unions;

5. to accept the invitation of the All Union Council of Trade unions to send in the near future an official delegation to the Soviet Union."

This resolution bears witness to the high political level of the trade unions of Australia. Many European leaders of the Amsterdam International, including Purcell, have not yet arrived at such an understanding of the immediate tasks of the International Labour Movement, and instead of the slogan of a world Congress, issue the slogan of the "entry" of the trade unions of the Soviet Union into the Amsterdam International.

The Trade Union Federation of China, at its meeting of 10th September in Canton, confirmed the decisions adopted by the preliminary Conference and decided to do everything necessary for the approaching Trade Union Congress of the countries of the Pacific. The Presidium of the Central Council of

the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union decided at its meeting of 6th October to take part in this Congress of the trade unions of the countries of the Pacific, in view of the extreme importance which the unity of the trade unions of the countries of the Pacific Ocean will have for the establishment of international trade unity and for the fight against imperialism.

It is the task of all labour organisations, both of those which are affiliated to the Red International of Labour Unions and those which are outside it, to do everything in their power in order, by means of the unity of the Trade Unions of all countries of the Pacific, to set up a bulwark against imperialism and, along with the trade unions of the new countries and of the new Continent, to establish an all-embracing Trade Union International which will be capable of fighting.

It would be childish not to see the enormous difficulties that lie in the way of the unity of the Labour Movement of the countries of the Pacific. It suffices to point to the antagonisms that have been called forth by the treatment of the yellow races by the imperialists. It suffices to call attention to the different standards of culture, to the exceptional laws against the coloured races, to the hostility of the white workers towards the workers with a lower standard of living and to the whole medley of national, racial and religious antagonisms at present prevailing in the Pacific countries. The difficulties are very great, but they will be overcome, for we are following the way which will lead to their practical solution. And that is the chief thing...

THE TRIAL OF BORIS STEFANOV

For the Legalising of the C. P. of Roumania.

By D. Fabian (Bucharest).

Only a few days divide us from the comedy of the trial by the Roumanian oligarchy of Boris Stefanov and his fellow-accused. The Roumanian oligarchy whose dirty hands are still stained with the blood of the heroic revolutionary, Pavel Tkachenko, wish to send Boris Stefanov and five workers and students to long years of imprisonment in the vile prisons of Roumania. This band of foul murderers, in its fury that the international proletariat has stayed the arm of the Siguranza murderers in good time to prevent the murder of Stefanov which has already been decided upon, is now endeavouring to get rid of him by means of a speedy and savage sentence.

The trial of Boris Stefanov, just as was the trial of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Roumania in June 1925, will be a trial against the Communist Party and against the whole proletariat of Roumania. And in this trial the accused will come forward as inexorable accusers on behalf of the martyred and suppressed working people of Roumania.

In this trial the question will be raised of the suppression of the C. P. of Roumania, which has been carried out in open violation of the Constitution of Roumania. The Public Prosecutor himself will be compelled to show how all the accused were forced by this arbitrary act to continue their activity for the Roumanian proletariat in secret.

Against the accusations of "plotting against the security of the State", the accused will have the opportunity to show how the Siguranza are continually concocting and inventing fresh conspiracies. How dozens of innocent workers are arrested and forced by means of torture to make the most absurd "confessions". The accused will be able to show that the institution of the Siguranza, which swallows up enormous sums derived from the taxation of the workers, would have to close down if there were no more "conspiracies"; if it had to be admitted that the Communist movement is a mass movement, which has no necessity to meet in small conventicles and hatch conspiracies but is fighting by means of mass action for the interest of the workers, peasants and suppressed national minorities of Roumania.

The majority of the accused have already figured as accused in the trial of the Central Committee, but, like Boris Stefanov, did not attend the proceedings nor the pronouncing of the verdict. This failure to attend the court martial proceedings is recorded against the accused as a damning crime. The accused will be able to point out that according to the existing laws the military courts are not competent to judge them, and even if they were, their arbitrary and unlawful procedure up to now justifies anybody in refusing to attend such courts.

One of the most serious charges concerns "connection with a hostile government and intention to summon a hostile army into the country". The only support to this charge is that the accused are said to be connected with the Communist International. This charge will, on the one hand, show the workers of Roumania that it is intended to rob them of the most elementary rights of international connection with their class brothers in other countries, while on the other hand it will show to the workers of all countries how much credit can be given to the peace asseverations of the Roumanian Foreign Minister and to what extent the oligarchic government of Roumania is burning with hatred against Soviet Russia.

In this trial again the unending series of official murders will be exposed, along with the horrible swamp of official corruption and the endless chain of violations of all "liberties and rights of citizen and people" by those who are called upon to safeguard them. This trial will show clearly to the workers of the whole world how a bourgeois government disregards and tramples upon its own laws when its class interests are at stake.

The heroic fight of the accused in the court, however, is already doomed to failure if the international proletariat does not intervene in good time and support the struggle. Just as did the Rakosi trial, this trial will raise the question of legalising the Communist Party as well as all revolutionary organisations of the proletariat. It is now up to the international proletariat to expedite the solution of this question in a sense favourable to the working population of Roumania. It can do this if it writes on its banners the following slogans:

Fight against the White Terror, against the torturing and mishandling of the prisoners and against the Siguranza murderers in Roumania!

Fight for the observance of the fundamental laws in Roumania which lay down the right to hold meetings, freedom of the press and right of combination of the Roumanian proletariat!

Fight against the Exceptional Laws under which the signing of "The International" is punished by five years' imprisonment!

Fight for the right of self-determination of the suppressed nationalities in Roumania!

Fight for a general political and military amnesty, and fight for the complete legality of the C. P. of Roumania as well as of all other proletarian organisations in Roumania!

THE WHITE TERROR

Supreme Court of Massachusetts Refuses to Grant New Trial to Sacco and Vanzetti.

Bourgeois papers publish the news that the Supreme Court of Massachusetts has rejected the application for the rehearing of the trial for murder of the workers Sacco and Vanzetti.

This decision of the court means the confirmation of the death sentence on Sacco and Vanzetti. And now nothing more stands in the way of it being carried out. The only legal course still open is the granting of a pardon by Governor Fuller of Massachusetts.

Sacco and Vanzetti are therefore to be executed in spite of the indisputable proofs of their innocence, and in spite of the repeated powerful mass protests of the international working class. The American bourgeoisie fears a new trial, for the monstrous judicial plot that was forged in Massachusetts would thereby be rendered more clear than this was already the case in the proceedings on the question of a new trial. At these proceedings the following new facts were established, first, the murderer and robber Madeiros confessed under oath that he was a member of a band of bank robbers who committed the murder. Sacco and Vanzetti had nothing whatever to do with the deed or its perpetrators, Madeiros is to be executed on the 29th of October, and thus the most important witness for the Defence will be got out of the way. Secondly: the government of the United States which has officially refused to accept any responsibility for the case of Sacco and Vanzetti, has in reality been the driving force in the preparation of the judicial plot, and in the archives of the Minister of Justice there are still today documentary proofs of the innocence of Sacco and Vanzetti. These facts are contained in the statements made under oath of the former agents of justice Letherman and Weyland.

All these proofs of innocence have not been able to influence the American Court in its decision to bring Sacco and Vanzetti to the electric chair. The International working class which has already so often by powerful protests prevented the planned murder, must this time, raise its voice more quickly and more powerfully than ever before. Every moment is precious! Rescue Sacco and Vanzetti!

Rescue the Victims of the White Terror in Bulgaria!

To the Young Communist League and the Revolutionary Youth of Bulgaria.

Moscow, 8th October 1926.

Dear Comrades!

It is already two years since the revolutionary workers of the whole world, and among them also the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League, are following attentively the struggle of the Bulgarian Communists and Young Communists unexampled in its heroism and revolutionary devotion. Great was the sorrow and sympathy of the Young Communist League of the U.S.S.R. with the Bulgarian comrades because their organisation was dismembered and tens of the best Young Communists were brutally murdered in 1925, but great too was the joy over the news that for the last few months the Bulgarian Communist League has again been revived. True slowly, with great difficulty, nevertheless the Bulgarian Y.C.L. is again re-gaining its influence on the working youth, strengthening it by legal organisational forms (mass meetings of the working youth in connection with May 1st), as well as illegal.

The news about renewed persecutions of the Bulgarian revolutionists which fell this time with all its force on the youth, called forth great commotion among the Young Communists of the U.S.S.R. Again tens of the best Young Communists are being arrested, they are being subjected to most painful tortures, and being tortured to death. The bloody Liapchev proved himself to be a worthy successor to his predecessor Tsankov.

In the face of such brutal destruction of the heroic fighters for the cause of the liberation of the proletariat, the Leninist Young Communist League and the working and peasant youth of the U.S.S.R. call upon the revolutionary proletariat and the youth of the whole world to protest against the unheard of insolence of the Bulgarian government and the police.

The L.Y.C.L. and the toiling youth of the U.S.S.R. send their hearty revolutionary greetings to the Young Communist League and the workers and peasant youth of Bulgaria, and express their sincere belief that also the latest outrageous crimes of the Bulgarian hangmen, as well as their previous beastly acts, will not stop the victoriously developing revolutionary movement of Bulgaria. In days of oppression and persecution, Bulgarian Young Communist Leaguers remember, that the youth of the Soviet Union is always heart and soul with you.

Down with the bloody terror of the Tsankov successors!

Long live the heroic struggle of the Bulgarian revolutionists!

Long live the proletarian revolution of Bulgaria and the whole world!

With revolutionary fraternal greetings.

In the name of Workers and Peasant Youth and the Leninist

Young Communist League of the U.S.S.R.

Secretary E. C. L. Y. C. L. Chaplin.

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

Agenda of the Enlarged Executive of the Y. C. I.

The following is the Agenda of the Enlarged Executive Sitting of the Young Communist International which has been convened for 10th November 1926:

1. Attitude to the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International.
2. Report of the Presidium and the next tasks of the Y. C. I. (Lominadse). — organisation report upon the activity of the Executive (Gyptner).
3. Report on the Leninist Young Communist League of the Soviet Union.

4. Questions of Programme (Schatzkin).
5. The Youth organisations of our Opponents (Gorkic).
6. The Reorganisation of the League (Mehring).
7. The Statutes of the Y. C. I.
8. Questions of the Leagues.

LABOUR AND SCIENCE

To the Memory of Prof. Paul Kammerer.

From the Presidium of the Communist Academy of the Soviet Union.

We have received a wire telling us of the suicide of the eminent, great biologist Prof. P. Kammerer, who put an end to his life in Vienna, shortly before his intended departure for the Soviet Union, where he was equipping a laboratory for his world-famed work in the question of heredity at the Communist Academy.

"To the memory of the victim of European science" — thus might run the title of this memorial of the life and death of a scholar who was driven to his death by the caste-feeling of mental obscurantism and conservatism of his "colleagues". These "colleagues" united in persecuting a scholar who had the courage fearlessly to stand up for his scientific point of view and to uphold his materialist view of life regardless of religious and idealistic prejudices. Kammerer's farewell letter before he left this world is a heart-rending human document.

Paul Kammerer was born in 1880 and was a pupil of Prof. B. Hachek in Vienna. Even as a young man he drew attention to himself by a series of scientific investigations and since then he had undertaken a great deal of extremely remarkable research work in the various fields of biological science (the transmission of acquired characteristics, regeneration, hybridism, questions of sex, variability etc.)

Many of Kammerer's treatises, which are written in brilliant and extraordinarily clear language, have become widely famous. His book "General Biology" is certainly the most brilliant work in this domain of recent times (translated into Russian in 1925 by the State printing works of the Soviet Union). His "Riddle of Heredity" and "Death and Immortality" have also appeared in Russian.

Kammerer's experiments with regard to the inheritance of acquired characteristics have achieved specially great fame. In his theoretical views, Kammerer was one of the leaders of the so-called mechano-Lamarchism, the materialist deviation from Lamarchism, i. e. that biological point of view which places in the foreground the effect of environment, the changes which take place under its direct influence. The decisive question in this case was that of transmission to the offspring of changes which had occurred in the parent organism as the result of some external influence.

Kammerer was an enthusiastic protagonist of the heredity of acquired characteristics and, by his experiments, contributed more than any other scientist to the establishment of this theory. Kammerer's investigations as to the heredity of changed colouring in the salamander and his experiments with "Alytes" (a species of toad) and Ascidiæ are famous throughout the world and their publication evoked embittered polemics. The opponents of the heredity of acquired characteristics tried in every way to discredit Kammerer's experiments; many of his experiments were repeated and some scientists, in repeating them, found exactly opposite results, with the consequence that the dispute was fanned into fresh flames.

The objective arguments were, in the course of time, more and more replaced by personal attacks and, as early as in 1913, Kammerer was accused of dishonesty and was abused in every imaginable way by his scientific opponents. The young scientist of European reputation was deprived of his laboratory, he could obtain no professorial chair, although year by year an increasing number of confirmations of his experiments were received from all parts of the world. He was denied any advancement, although Prof. Pzribram, the Director of the institute in Vienna, where Kammerer worked, confirmed the trustworthiness of Kammerer's experiments in a categorical manner and only reserved his opinion as to the possibility of there being other theoretical interpretations.

The reasons for the embitterment of his opponents are outside the field of a purely scientific dispute. There can be no

doubt that some of Kammerer's opponents, amongst them some materialists, have a right to claim purely scientific grounds for their opposition. It is not however they who give the tone to the campaign against Kammerer, but those dominant strata of European and American science who — consciously or unconsciously — subordinate scientific questions to their general view of life, whilst subordinating the latter to the interests of the ruling bourgeoisie.

Sometimes under the banner of an open criticism of Darwin, sometimes under the mask of defending him from deviations towards Lamarckism, vitalist opinions are maintained according to which the evolution both of the species and of the individual is in the end a variety of forms of manifestation of the internal "entelechy".

Kammerer opposed all such attempts and his experiments refuted them most decidedly. Wherever he appeared before the public, he maintained a consistently "monistic", i. e. materialistic point of view. This is what official science could not pardon. This is why they banished him from chairs of science and from laboratories. The leading motif of the attacks directed against Kammerer sprang from the innermost nature of the view of life of modern bourgeois science — from a vitalist view of life arising from the period of decay, from the fear of the possible triumph of materialism.

It was towards the Soviet Union that the persecuted Kammerer turned his gaze. He was no politician, although his ideal was always the progress of mankind based on labour, on the definite defeat of clericalism in any form. He was no politician but he always showed genuine sympathy for the socialist construction in our country.

When the Communist Academy of the Soviet Union founded in 1925 a section for exact and natural sciences, it approached Kammerer with the proposal to establish a biological institute for the purposes of his research, where he would have the possibility of carrying on his experiments. We did not, by the invitation we issued to Kammerer, declare in advance our solidarity with his theory, but we regarded it as essential that it should be experimentally tested under the control of Kammerer himself. Kammerer gladly accepted this proposal and came to Moscow where he was received with honour not only by the adherents of his theory (E. S. Smirnov, B. S. Kusin, J. M. Wermel etc.) but also by all the scientists of Moscow, even by those who were his opponents.

At last everything was in working order, his assistants began to work, while Prof. Kammerer himself went to Vienna in July of this year in order to buy the necessary apparatus etc. for his laboratory with the money granted by the Academy and to despatch his library to Moscow.

As was to be expected, the fact of Kammerer taking up his abode in the Soviet Union was the signal for renewed attacks against him. "Sympathy" for Kammerer allied itself with "sympathy" for the Soviet Union.

In August of the current year, an article by a certain Dr. Noble appeared in the London Journal "Nature", in which Kammerer was accused of imposture. This accusation is of particular weight because it is supported by the re-examination of the preparation of an animal specimen which at one time had been the object of Kammerer's experiments and had until now been preserved in Vienna. It came to light that instead of the callosities which — according to Kammerer — had developed in the "Alytes", there was nothing to be seen but a hypodermic injection of Indian ink! Although in the same number of the journal, an article by Professor Pzibram, Director of the Institute was published, in which he again confirms Kammerer's honesty, although in one of the following numbers a scientist of such repute as MacBride gave exact testimony that he had at the time seen the callosities and the sections through them, and although it is clear that the condition of a long-dead animal which has recently been tampered with by some unknown person cannot disprove the irrefutable results of experiments made on the living object — the news of the indisputable evidence of Kammerer's alleged "dishonesty" spread like wildfire throughout the scientific world.

At first Kammerer met the attacks with calm dignity; he corresponded with his Moscow assistants about the preliminaries for repeating his experiments on the "Alytes" and worked at a reply intended for publication. When however the flood-tide of the malicious joy of his opponents rose higher and higher, when at the Naturalists' Congress the accusation was repeated and

intensified, when he began to doubt even the support of those who had hitherto been his friends, he came to the end of his forces. The fight which had lasted for more than ten years had undermined his courage. Had he been in our midst at that time, our true comradely support might have saved him. It seems however that he did not meet with it in sufficient degree in Vienna — on the eve of his departure for Moscow he put an end to his life.

We reproduce below in unabbreviated form Kammerer's letter of farewell. The original will appear — in German — in "Wjestnik Kommunistitscheskoj Akademii" ("The Messenger of the Communist Academy"):

Wien XII/5, Auhofstrasse 239. — 22. IX. 1926.

To the Presidium of the Communist Academy, Moscow.

Honoured Comrades and Colleagues,

Presumably you all know of the attack directed against me by Dr. Noble in "Nature" (London) of August 7th 1926. The attack is based on an examination of my record specimen of Alytes with oestrus callosities which Noble, with the consent of Prof. Pzibram and myself, made at the Vienna Institute for biological research.

The chief factor in the accusation is an artificial colouration, apparently with Indian ink, by which the black discoloration of the skin in the region where the callosities have developed is said to have been artificially produced. It would thus be a case of an imposture which will presumably be laid at my door alone.

After reading the attack, I went to the Institute for Biological Research in order once more to look at the suspected object. I found that Dr. Noble's statements were absolutely correct; indeed there were other objects (blackened salamanders) in which my results had evidently been "improved" post mortem. Who, apart from myself, could have had any interest in producing such impostures, can only be faintly surmised; at any rate it is certain that in this way my whole life's work is placed in question.

In view of these facts I can no longer regard myself as the right person to accept your call, although I had nothing to do with these falsifications of my record specimens. At the same time I am completely unable to bear this frustration of my life's work and I hope I shall have the courage and power to put an end to my life to-morrow.

I have not stopped the packing of my belongings which is already taking place; for in the first place it would excite the attention of my family who must not suspect anything until my plan has been carried through, and secondly it is my absolute wish, and this is my last disposition, that the Communist Academy in Moscow should receive my library and thus be compensated for everything it has spent on me to no purpose.

Finally, I wish my warmest expression of farewell to be conveyed to the following amongst my friends:

Otto Julevitsch Schmidt, Jelgeni Sergejvitsch Smirnov and his wife Nina, Julius Wermel, Boris Sergejvitsch Kusin, Dr. Levitt, M. S. Navaschin senior and junior, M.M. and B. M. Zevadovsky and Miss Ariadne Rossolimo, Kossino.

Begging you to forgive me for all the inconveniences to which I have put you,

Yours faithfully

(signed) Paul Kammerer.

Paul Kammerer, the talented and courageous scientist and materialist is no more. His death will cause severe pangs not only to those who share his views but also to all honest scientists in whom a scientific conscience is still alive. To the honour of Russian science be it said, that all Russian biologists were deeply moved by his death and that all Kammerer's adherents as well as his scientific opponents, are equally indignant at the campaign of persecution which was the cause of his death.

Kammerer's work, his experiments, will be carried on by his followers in the laboratory of the Communist Academy. Kammerer was one of the rare advanced materialists amongst the bourgeois scientists of Europe. Our country will, on its path to Socialism, produce a number of scientific investigators who have issued from the ranks of the proletariat and for whom materialism is an undisputed view of life. In their collective work they will follow in the footsteps of the illustrious solitary champions whose memory will continue to live in the hearts of the coming generation.

The Presidium of the Communist Academy.