

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 56

6th October 1927

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

CONTENTS

Tang Shin She: The Victorious Advance of the Revolutionary Troops on Canton.

The Tasks of the Chinese Revolution ("Pravda").

Politics.

Bela Kun: After the "Hungarian" Victory at Geneva.

Jack Carney: The Irish Free State Elections.

Fritz Ruck: The Hindenburg Day.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

* A. Andreyev: The Break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the Tasks of the Soviet Trade Unions (Conclusion).

Economics.

S. Perevoznikov: Revival in Industry and Wage Struggles in Germany.

The Labour Movement.

Hajama: The Proletariat of Japan in the Struggle against the Capitalist Offensive.

Guido Saraceno: The Economic Struggles of the Italian Workers.

In the Colonies.

Wang: Fresh Crimes of French Imperialism in Indo-China.

Union of Soviet Republics.

N. Semashko: The Working Women of the Soviet Union and the Protection of Health.

Documents.

Declaration of the E.C.C.I. on the Maslow-Ruth Fischer Group.

For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.

Expulsion of Comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch from the E. C. of the C. I.

The "Pravda" on the Expulsion of Comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch.

Decision of the Presidium of the M. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. in Regard to the illegal anti-Party Printing Works of the Trotzkyite Opposition.

Decision of the Presidium of the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. re Expulsion of twelve Party Comrades.

The Opposition has Once More Deceived the Party.

Obituary.

W. Reesema: Hermann Gorter.

Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.

Appeal of the Y. C. L. of the Soviet Union for the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.

Ten Years Ago.

The Government will forcible suppress the Peasant Disturbances.

The Programme of the New Russian Government.

Speech by Comrade Trotzky on the "Democratic Conference".

V. I. Lenin: Mistakes Made by Our Party.

Chronicle of Events.

Ten Years of Soviet Power.

L. F. W.: The Development of Wages in the Soviet Union.

Johannes Wertheim: The Criminal-Policy of the Soviet Union.

The Victorious Advance of the Revolutionary Troops on Canton.

By Tang Shin She.

The important harbour town of Swatow and the exceedingly rich and strategically very important district of the Eastern river of the provinces of Kwantung are in the hands of the revolutionary troops, who are co-operating with workers and peasants. This favourable circumstance renders possible the direct advance on the capital town of Canton, in which the workers have been attempting for some months past to overthrow the counter-revolutionary regime by means of revolts. The revolutionaries had decided in July last, after the treachery of the Wuhan Kuomintang leaders who had placed themselves in the service of the militarist Tang Sen Dji, to make the province of Kwantung again the revolutionary centre. Today the greater part of the province is already in their hands. One can say that Kwantung is again the revolutionary centre.

Swatow was a main military stronghold of the fighting forces of Chiang Kai-shek. Here there were permanently stationed his main troops, the first army corps. With the capture of Swatow by the revolutionary troops this army was annihilated. In addition, two of the best divisions of the Kwantung military ruler Li Dji Sin were crushed. As a result, Chiang Kai-shek has no longer any basis whatever in Kwantung, and Li Dji Sin, the dictator of Canton, is faced with defeat.

The capture of Swatow will greatly increase the insurrectionary movements of the workers and peasants in South China. In the provinces of Kwangsi, Hunan, and Hupeh numerous partisan troops have been formed, and these are holding possession of many villages and towns and are even threatening the two capital towns Changsha and Wuchang. General Tang

Sen Dji is no longer able to maintain order in his territory. The capture of Swatow will again increase the fighting spirit of the masses, and Tang Sen Dji will no longer be able to maintain his position in Central China.

What is the situation as regards the treacherous generals who still claim to belong to the revolutionary front? After the resignation of Chiang Kai-shek a fierce quarrel broke out between the Wuhan general Tang Sen Dji, and the Nanking generals Li Tsung Yin and Ho Yen Tchen. Although Li Tsung Yin was the instigator of the resignation of Chiang Kai-shek and of the policy of reconciliation between Nanking and Wuhan, Tang Sen Dji has appropriated to himself the Anhwei territory occupied by Li Tsung Yin and compelled the latter's troops to take up a position at the Northern front against Sun Chuan Fang. The two former mutually hostile generals Li Tsung Yin and Ho Yen Chen have now united against Tang Sen Dji. As a result the last named has retired from Nanking to Wuhan.

After Tang Sen Dji had abandoned his plans of attack on Nanking the Nanking generals again began to fight against each other. These quarrels are waged round the question of the possession of Shanghai. After the treachery of Chiang Kai-shek in April last, Shanghai found itself in the hands of the Li Tsung Yin group. But Chiang Kai-shek soon seized possession of the town. This was the actual reason why Li Tsung Yin strove to bring about the resignation of Chiang Kai-shek. Having attained this aim, Li Tsung Yin again made himself master of Shanghai. Ho Yen Chen's troops have now again taken a part of Shanghai. An armed fight between these two generals for the possession of the town is by no means impossible.

Apart from the crisis among the generals in the Wuhan and Nanking group, the civil leaders of the two Kuomintang tendencies are conducting a fierce feud against each other. Before the resignation of Chiang Kai-shek a fierce fight was proceeding in the Nanking camp between the so-called Nanking and Shanghai (Chi-San group) centrals. When, after the resignation of Chiang Kai-shek, the Nanking group demanded as a condition of reunion the resignation of Wang Chin Wei, the latter attempted to win over to himself the old Right Wingers, the Chin San group. At the last Nanking Conference not only the Nankingers and Wuhaners united, but they were also joined by the Shanghai Right Wingers. An Extraordinary Committee, standing above the party and the government, was formed, consisting of six persons from each of the three tendencies and six representatives of the generals, among the latter being a representative of Feng Yu Hsiang and a representative of the model governor Yen Shi San. The great coalition, from the

old to the youngest Right Wingers, of course left nothing remaining of the teachings of Sun Yat Sen.

Wang Chin Wei, who had completely capitulated to the Right, could not even take up his office in the Nanking government. Shortly before the official Nanking meeting he was obliged to disappear from Shanghai. The other so-called Left Kuomintang people, as Professor Kuo Min Yu, George Tchu etc. were likewise unable to come forward, as the Nankingers described them as "being suspected of communism". Of the Wuhan group only the old Right Sun Fo and the aristocrat Tang Yen Kai took part in the Conference.

The Nanking unity conference, therefore, brought about neither an understanding between the generals nor between the Party leaders. The only results are the complete liquidation of the so-called Left group of Wang Chin Wei and the commencement of struggles between the generals and the Right party leaders. All the means and tricks employed to deceive the masses have proved futile. The masses have therefore turned their backs on all the Right Wingers and are following the Left Kuomintang and the Communist Party who are going together with the workers and peasants. In the districts of Wuhan and Nanking, especially in Shanghai and Hankow, a new wave of strikes has broken out.

The wave of strikes and the capture of Swatow by the revolutionary troops have caused the imperialists to institute a fresh campaign of incitement against revolutionary China. The Japanese have caused 30 revolutionary Chinese to be arrested in Dalny; in Pinchowfu, in the neighbourhood of the Southern Manchurian railway, they shot 51 miners during a strike. The English are bombarding the coast of Kwantung, under the pretext of wishing to destroy pirates. They now intend to organise a punitive expedition against Swatow in the interest of Li Dji Chin. As on the occasion of every advance of the Chinese revolution, the imperialists will also this time employ every means in order to crush the revolutionaries. The sole circumstance distinguishing the present from former occasions is that this time the imperialists will have the support not only of the compradores and Northern generals, but also of the whole bourgeoisie and the Southern generals.

But also on the revolutionary side there exists a difference as compared with former times: the masses do not need first to be organised for the movement, but the millions of organised masses will at once take up the fight against their oppressors, the imperialists, the Chinese bourgeoisie and the militarists.

The Tasks of the Chinese Revolution.

Leading Article of "Pravda", 30. 9. 1927.

After the Southern revolutionary army had achieved important successes, it became perfectly clear that there would be a new revolutionary élan in China. Contrary to the preceding revolutionary élan, this one did not originate in towns, in centres of the industrial proletariat where counter-revolution has for the time being gained the upper hand, but in the peasant guerilla movement and in those revolutionary divisions of the former Canton Army which are winning victories with the help of the peasant risings over the oppressors of the Chinese people.

On the territory of the southern revolutionary army, power is now in the hands of the Revolutionary Committee. This revolutionary Committee which, according to telegraphic communication, consists of five people embodies the first organisation of the revolutionary National power of workers, peasants and revolutionary urban petty bourgeoisie, (artisans, etc.). Such is the class character of this power whatever be its forms which can and must undergo a change in future. We, as Marxists and Leninists must take note of this class character.

The form of revolutionary power is not the product of abstract reasoning, it cannot be "invented", it comes into being in the process of struggle and corresponds with the revolutionary tasks at the concrete moment of the birth of the new power. At present these tasks of the struggle consist above all in the organisation of the revolutionary military campaign, in overcoming the resistance of the counter-revolutionaries on the

territory of the southern army and in relentless liquidation of all relics of feudal oppression on the revolutionary territory and carrying out energetically agrarian revolution. The Revolutionary Committee is the most suitable form of power for the fulfilment of these tasks.

The Kuomintang organisation, as a form of revolutionary power, expressed the correlation of class forces in the first stages of the national revolution, when the workers and peasants were still making common cause with the national bourgeoisie. This stage was absolutely necessary, it had to be gone through by the workers and peasants before they could understand their separate class tasks and parted company with the bourgeoisie.

It was not enough for more advanced Communists to foresee from the beginning the coming treachery of the bourgeoisie. This could not yet be grasped by the mass forces of revolution. The reserves of revolution who gain their revolutionary class-consciousness only by their own experience in the struggle.

When the bourgeoisie had betrayed the workers and peasants and had shown itself in its true colours, the Communist Party was confronted by the following task: to be able to lead against the bourgeoisie all that was revolutionary and honest within the Kuomintang organisations. At that stage of the movement, the Chinese Communist Party could not achieve this by creating Soviets, for this was not a stage of offensive, but of retreat in the revolutionary movement, not a stage of élan and victory, but delay and defeat in the revolutionary move-

ment. During such a stage one could not aim at the creation of new organisations, of Soviets; it was essential to struggle for the capture of the masses within the old organisations, particularly within the Kuomintang and also in the trade unions, peasant unions, in the army and in other mass organisations, beginning at the same time to propagate the Soviet slogan in order to begin to organise Soviets as soon as there was another revolutionary élan. The task of the Party was to do its utmost to get away from the bourgeoisie and to bring over to its own side the revolutionary section of the Kuomintang rank and file, to rouse against the bourgeois counter-revolution the peasant unions, to organise resistance to counter-revolutionaries through the workers' trade union, etc. These tasks were carried out by the Communist Party to the best of its ability.

A new phase of revolutionary élan is heralded in China, the trend and issue of which one cannot yet foretell. But one thing is already certain: that the Chinese Communist Party is as before the only political organisation capable of leading the revolutionary movement. A Left revolutionary Kuomintang as an independent revolutionary mass force has not materialised; all that was really revolutionary in it is following the Communist Party.

The fact that the movement of the masses is entering upon the new phase of the Chinese revolution not under the leadership of some new Kuomintang organisation, but under the direct leadership of the proletarian Communist Party is eloquent proof of the strength of the Chinese proletariat on the one hand and of the weakness of the independent political tendencies of the Chinese petty bourgeois democracy at the present moment on the other hand.

It is of course not out of the question that Left revolutionary elements of the Kuomintang will organise themselves into political bodies of some kind quite independent of the Communist Party of China. It goes without saying that the latter will endeavour to form a bloc with them instead of repulsing them. But the C. P. of China is certainly not going to form a common organisation with them on the basis of relations which existed in the Kuomintang. The Kuomintang form of bloc between the proletariat and the bourgeois-democratic elements has shown its inadequacy in the trend of the Chinese Revolution, all the historical possibilities of such a bloc have been exhausted. At present, under certain conditions, an "external" bloc is still possible, but the time is past for an "internal" bloc.

As revolution spreads to industrial centres it will be possible to create there Soviets of workers', soldiers' and artisans' deputies on which the new revolutionary government or governments will rest in the beginning, if they will spring up at first in various parts of South China at a distance from each other. The Soviet slogan, from being a propaganda slogan must develop into an action slogan. As to the Chinese countryside the so-called peasant unions have shown their worth as revolutionary organisations, and all power should go to them in these districts, of course under the control of revolutionary committees. These peasant unions and committees must be converted into Soviets of peasant deputies and their business must be to rouse as large sections as possible of the Chinese peasantry for revolution.

The tasks of the new power are tasks of Anti-Imperialist Revolutionary-Dictatorship. Socialist tasks do not yet directly confront this power. It would be of course very dangerous to take one's notion of the tasks of revolution entirely from good books written by the preceptors and leaders of socialism about other, about former revolutions. When in 1917 the great Revolution in Russia roused millions of workers to political life, Lenin did not get his notion of revolutionary tasks solely from old books, from what had been written by Bolsheviks of the revolution of 1905 or by Marx on the French revolutions. The rule which he tried to instil in the mind of the Party was: accurate appreciation of concrete actuality, ability to find one's way in the complicated practical situation during the given stage of revolution. He was wont to say in regard to some so-called "old Bolsheviks" who clung to the old revolutionary theories: "Theory, my friends, is grey, but the eternal tree of life is green".

Therefore, the new revolutionary government which is being formed in South China must reject all scholastic and all "theoretical" Talmudism and must be guided by the principle: one must do that which leads to the victory of the revolution, and this means that one must first of all awaken the

masses leaving it to the creative initiative of all toilers to carry out energetically agrarian revolution, confiscate land, abolish all feudal privileges gaining thereby the allegiance of large sections of peasants, crush relentlessly all counter-revolutionaries, confiscate in towns the property of people supporting counter-revolution, impose taxes on the big bourgeoisie to satisfy the immediate needs of the army, etc., etc.

Zig-zags must always be expected in revolution, defeats and failure of all kind are possible. This applies also to the Southern Revolutionary Army. However, this army differs from all Chinese armies past and present by the fact that it is connected with the peasant masses, that it has been able to make the peasant detachments rally around it, that it has set itself the task of developing and accomplishing the agrarian revolution. This constitutes the enormous strength and enormous historical importance of the Southern Revolutionary Army. It is true that there are still in this army heterogeneous elements not sufficiently permeated with the interests and aspirations of the toiling masses and capable of doing harm to the movement under certain circumstances. Therefore, the most important task in connection with army leadership is a thorough democratisation of its composition, increase of the proportional weight and role in it of workers and peasants, establishment of close contact between the army and the masses. The system of army control and administration must be reorganised to the effect that the leading role in it should rest with the revolutionary peasants and workers, which will guard the army against all sorts of "surprises" which are so frequent in Chinese conditions.

Given correct leadership and a bold course in the development of the agrarian revolution, the Southern Revolutionary Army will accomplish a great historical task as the first army of Chinese workers and peasants who have united their forces and efforts in the struggle against all oppressors and exploiters, foreign as well as native.

POLITICS

After the "Hungarian" Victory at Geneva.

By Bela Kun (Moscow).

That which is now happening in Hungarian foreign and home politics, that which the legal Hungarian press is now writing, is all intended to serve one purpose: to harness Hungary to the cart of the war policy of English imperialism against the Soviet Union. That is the policy of the Hungarian Prime Minister Bethlen. That is the policy of the whole of the non-working portion of Hungarian society. But it is also the policy — one must admit this — of a portion of the working masses which follows the bourgeois parties or marches in the ranks, which are becoming continually thinner, of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party. This war policy is dished up in various forms, all of which have one thing in common: the endeavour to secure a revision of the peace treaty of Trianon.

The foreign political defeat which the Bethlen government recently sustained in the Hungarian-Roumanian agrarian dispute has by no means damped down the agitation on behalf of the Anglo-Italian orientation and war incitement against the Soviet Union. The ruling classes in Hungary know that the only real foreign policy at present for that little country which is at the same time an object and subject of imperialism, is a war policy, a policy that stakes everything on war. Therefore, behind the gnashing of teeth with which public opinion of the Hungarian ruling classes received Chamberlain's speech and his entire attitude in connection with the Hungarian-Roumanian agrarian dispute in Geneva, there is still a certain understanding that Chamberlain could not, at the present moment, when the threads of war preparations are still entangled, injure the interests of Roumania. He could not do this, as Roumania lies in the first line of fire of the anti-Soviet front.

The Hungarian ruling classes console themselves with the thought that even if Chamberlain could not side with the Hungarian landed proprietors as against Roumania, nevertheless a considerable portion of English public opinion, from

the extreme fascist Lord Rothermere up to J. H. Thomas, sides with them in the question of Trianon. They are therefore for the time being directing the point of the revision of the Treaty of Trianon in the first place against Czechoslovakia. The idea of this action is clear: Czechoslovakia does not immediately border on the Soviet Union; in Czechoslovakia there are much larger organised forces under the leadership of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia which are in movement against war than in the other South East European States; and in addition there is still proceeding in Czechoslovakia the fight for leadership between English and French diplomacy. That is the reason why Czechoslovakia has, for the time being, become the centre point of the attacks of Hungarian nationalism, although the immediate interests of the Hungarian big landowners have been injured most by Roumania.

The whole Hungarian bourgeoisie is prepared to deliver over the country as cannon fodder for the aims of English imperialism against the Soviet Union in return for the mere promise of the revision of the treaty of Trianon. It does so in the knowledge that in the coming war against the Soviet Union, England will not pay anything for neutrality, but that it will reward at the cost of the neutral States those vassal States which actively participate in the war against the Soviet Union.

The Hungarian petty bourgeois democracy now also stands for the revision of Trianon, as this slogan has become the slogan of participation in the war against the Soviet Union. It does not dissociate itself from the national united front, but only from the revision of the Trianon treaty by means of a war. But the Social Democratic Party only rejects a war with the Succession States. It does not mention, however, that the whole Rothermere action means nothing else but the non-official action of official English diplomacy for drawing Hungary into the into-Soviet front. The Hungarian Social Democracy does not in any way oppose the Rothermere action; some of its representatives even support it. The Hungarian Social Democracy, in addition to the revision of the Treaty of Trianon, submits the following conditions as the price of its support of the war against the Soviet Union: moderation of reaction, secret ballot, milder treatment with regard to right of combination and meeting for the Social Democracy. Even in these conditions it does not differ from a portion of the bourgeoisie, as even in the government party voices are heard declaring that a "liberal-democratic" policy must be pursued if Hungary is to win the public opinion of the "Democracies" of Western Europe for the revision of the Treaty of Trianon. As regards the "Democracies" of the other countries, the spokesmen of Hungarian "democracy" found an echo only in the Czechisch Social Democratic Party. The Czechish social democrats did this, in order, in the interest of their own bourgeoisie, to divert attention from the actual question: from the question of the right of self-determination of the people. At the meetings held against the Rothermere action they declared that they would be inclined to negotiate with a democratic Hungary on the question of the revision of the Treaty of Trianon. These gentlemen are worthy companions of the Hungarian social democratic leaders when it comes to supporting their own bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party of Hungary has sharply opposed the action of Rothermere and the revision of the Trianon Treaty in the form demanded by the ruling classes. The C. P. of Hungary of course does not abandon the revolutionary slogan of the right of the Hungarian people to self-determination; but it had to oppose the present action and slogan, as it is the standard for the rallying for the war against the Soviet Union. The Hungarian government does not deny that it wishes to buy the revision of the Treaty of Trianon with the blood of Hungarian and Russian workers and peasants. At the same time there is being raised not only the demand that the Hungarians who are pining under the foreign yoke shall bow again under the Hungarian yoke, but also the demand that foreign peoples, particularly the Slovaks and the Ukrainians of Carpathian-Russia, shall again submit to Hungarian oppression. The answer of the Hungarian Communists cannot be anything else but the sharpest attack against Hungarian imperialism, the demand for the right of self-determination of the nations in face of Hungarian imperialist aspirations.

But the Rothermere action must not be underestimated in the present situation. Nobody should be deceived by the "dif-

ferent attitudes" of English public opinion regarding the question of the frontiers of the Succession States, by the contradictory declarations of the official and non-official agents of English foreign policy. By various methods they are all serving the one aim: the preparation of the war against the Soviet Union, the mobilising of the peoples of South Eastern Europe for this war.

The Irish Free State Elections.

By Jack Carney.

With the hope that a general election would find all other political parties unprepared, William Cosgrave, president of the Irish Free State, suddenly decided to call a general election. The election was fought with much bitterness and the result is just the same; the Free State Government holds office by a bare majority of six votes out of 152. The parties, with their strength, before and after the general election are:

	Before	Now
Government Party	47	61
De Valera Party	43	57
Labour Party	22	13
National League	8	2
Sinn Fein	5	0
Independents	18	12
Communist	0	1
Farmers	11	6

The parties are expected to line up as follows:

For Government		Against Government	
Government Party	61	De Valera Party	57
Farmers	6	Labour Party	13
Independents	12	National League	2
		Communist	1
For Government		79	
Against Government		73	

What do these parties represent? Behind the **Government Party** are the interests of the ruling class, rich farmers, etc.

Behind the **De Valera Party** are the small business men, the poor farmers, etc. The **Independents** represent varied interests, but can be depended upon to vote with the government on all fundamental questions. The **Irish Labour Party** was for the Government. It tried to make a coalition with the Government, having failed, it tried to win out on a coalition with the **De Valera Party**. A deputy failed to vote and the coalition went smash. The **National League** represent the old Nationalist Party. It lives on the traditions of the past. It has neither funds nor following. Its leader, Captain **Redmond**, is elected because of his father, the late John Redmond, former leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the British House of Commons. His father was immensely popular. The Irish people love their leaders — after they are dead. They show their gratitude to John Redmond by giving his son a job.

The election was fought out in the newspapers, with the exception of those parties who had not the funds to spend. Advertising in the newspapers cost £ 100 per page. "New Era", a paper privately circulated among bankers, financiers, etc. declared that the election was mainly centering around the issue of **American finance versus British finance**. American finance seeks to penetrate Ireland, to cultivate the friendship of the Irish as a diplomatic preparatory measure for the future. British finance threw its weight behind the **Government Party**. Behind the **De Valera party** was American finance.

Immediately following the election, the **Cork Chamber of Commerce**, an important body of Irish employers, called a unity conference with a view to securing unity between the Government and the Valera Parties. The movement failed to reach an agreement, due to the attitude of the Government Party in refusing to attend the conference and a declaration by leaders of the **De Valera party** that they would not unite with any pro-British elements.

The employing elements behind the Government Party are imperialist in outlook. They are for the British Empire. The employing elements behind the De Valera Party want high tariffs because they suffer from the competition of British combines. The Government is against tariffs; the De Valera party is for tariffs. The farmers supporting the Government make their profits out of cattle-raising, which are sold in foreign markets. They are against tariffs. The farmers who support De Valera are for tariffs because they depend upon the sale of agricultural products, wheat, butter, etc. They want tariffs. Unity within the immediate future is impossible.

The Irish Labour Party suffered heavy reverses. Its leader, Thomas Johnson, and the leader of the industrial movement, William O'Brien, went down to bitter defeat. The Labour Party lost ten seats out of 22 and gained one seat in the North. The Irish Labour Party has based its policies upon class collaboration. On the industrial field it has carried them out to the extent of scabbing on other unions. It has supported the Government. When M. Kevin O'Higgins, Minister of Justice, was killed, its leaders rushed to the Government and offered to go into a coalition. In other words they were prepared to enter into an anti-Republican bloc. The Government refused to accept their offer. The Labour Party then offered to join with the Republicans and fight the Government. A deputy got lost and his vote killed all hope of a coalition to beat the Government. The Irish Labour Party is not a party in the true sense of the word. It is a clique of officials. It candidates are selected by officials. It dare not advertise its meetings; it holds them in unexpected places, always sure of receiving ample publicity in the columns of the capitalist press. Through the political and industrial policies of the Irish Labour Party the labour movement of Ireland, has lost thousands of members. The writer talked with Cabinet ministers, employers and British army officers on the day of the counting of votes. They were all gravely concerned with the condition of the leader of the Irish Labour Party. They were more sorry at his defeat than that of any other candidate. Johnson had served them well.

For the first time in Irish politics Communist candidates stood for election. If the candidates had endeavoured to conceal the fact that they were Communists the capitalist press made sure that the electors knew they were voting for candidates who were Communists out and out. Robert Stewart, William Gallacher and S. Saklatvala, members of the British Communist Party, came across and assisted the Irish Worker League, section of the Comintern. The Communist candidates polled 13,000 votes. Jim Larkin, founder of the Irish Worker League, ran third out of sixteen candidates, beating strong candidates like the deputy leader of the De Valera Party. The Irish Worker League was handicapped through lack of finance. It was unable to send one written appeal to the electors. The capitalist press completely ignored the work and meetings of the I. W. L. Yet its meetings were the largest ever held in Dublin. There was one meeting held in the slums that shook the feelings of enemies and friends alike. Picture two high tenements, with nearly two thousands families living in them. Add to this an immense throng that followed to the meeting. There were ten thousand workers, and there they stood. Like a mighty roar, symbolical of the awakening of Irish labour, rose the cheers of the crowd. This meeting was typical of many more meetings. The Government party rushed around with motor cars, free beer, free tea and sugar, in an attempt to stem the tide of feeling that was rising in support of the Communist candidates. But the Dublin working class knew Larkin. They had grown tired and were despairing of anything being done to alleviate their condition, — then came the Irish Worker League. In the country the Irish Worker League had to face the leader of the Irish Labour Party, in addition the two major parties — Government Party and De Valera Party. The League was on virgin soil. It had to cover over 100 square miles of country where there were no real means of transport. Its speakers were addressing three and four meetings per night, and six on Sunday. It polled over two thousand votes. Furthermore, it defeated the leader of the Irish Labour Party — a victory in itself. One could go on describing the elections. The Irish Worker League elected one candidate — James Larkin. That was what it did during the elections.

The elections were used in the main to rally the forces of Irish labour. Without a unified labour movement there can be no hope of any real success. The victory of Jim Larkin

has been the means of arousing the workers and peasants throughout Ireland. An appeal is being sent out to all trade unions, trades and workers' councils for a unity conference. A strong, virile, militant labour movement in Ireland will follow the work of the League. On the political field a strong political organisation is being organised. It is expected within the next few weeks that there will be active groups throughout the whole of Ireland. A united labour movement, industrially and politically, of the workers and peasants of Ireland is the work of the Irish Worker League. The elections laid the groundwork of the success of that movement.

The Hindenburg Day.

By Fritz Rück (Berlin).

The outward impression of the great rally on the occasion of the 80th birthday of Hindenburg was that of a nationalist carnival, at which were to be seen members of military organisations with heroic breasts laden with medals, ribbons and decorations, modest black-red-gold cockades of isolated members of the Reichsbanner (Republican Defence Corps) and enthusiastic Republicans; at which all the paraphernalia of the old Kaiser regime were mixed with the signs and emblems of the Republic. All sections of the "people", with the exception of the revolutionary minded workers, stood in ranks before a field-marshal of a lost war, of whom his colleagues relate: "At last we did not even tell him where the various army corps stood"; before the President of a Republic which is the expression of the concentrated will to power of the big bourgeoisie. But precisely in view of this will to power one must not allow the outward impression of the rally to deceive one as to its serious political import.

In the person of Hindenburg there are united the traditions of the semi-absolutist Hohenzollern imperialism of the pre-war time with the political aims of the new German imperialism. That is the basis of the "non-party" enthusiasm on the occasion of Hindenburg's birthday. If some old spinsters cried out: "It is just like the Kaiser's birthday", the predominating sentiment of the crowd was: "We do not need a king, because we have one already".

It is because he constitutes a link between yesterday and today that Hindenburg is so valuable to the counter-revolution. He is old enough not to desire to play an independent political role (even if he could); he does what he is told, and when he does nothing and he is not told to do anything, he still helps to create that inner front against the revolution and for imperialist aspirations. His office and his person have become the signboard of counter-revolution and of a new German imperialism. His speech at Tannenberg was not an outburst of feeling of an old man, as Stresemann claimed when he saw that he had gone too far, but the open acknowledgment of the bourgeois bloc for the imperialist policy of the war time, the indication of the "flashing sword" which the German bourgeoisie will by no means allow to grow rusty in the pacifist sheath of the reparation policy.

The birthday festival was nothing else but the imperialist election rally of the bourgeois bloc, the setting up of the national front. The attitude of the Social Democratic Party to the bourgeois bloc cannot be better expressed than by the fact that not only its Ministers and Police Presidents, Braun, Grzezinsky, Zörgiebel, not only the President of the Reichstag Löbe, but also the social democratic Reichstag and Diet fractions offered their congratulations. That Hörsing and the leaders of the Reichsbanner handed over to Hindenburg an artistically drawn up address is the visible expression of the fact that the Reichsbanner constitutes a part of the imperialist front, and that it will play an active role in the coming attack on the Soviet Union.

Thus Hindenburg's birthday festival became the greatest demonstration up of now of all the powers of the past and present standing on the basis of capitalist private property.

The bourgeoisie needs such demonstrations in order to fetter the petty bourgeoisie, whose very existence is threatened by the real policy of the bourgeois bloc, by the bonds of feeling and tradition to the imperialist policy. If this birthday shows the complete abandonment of every independent democratic policy by the petty bourgeois parties, their subordination to the command of big capital, their kowtowing to the powers

of the past which were overthrown in the revolution, their alignment in the national front, by which they are preparing a far greater political bankruptcy than they suffered in November 1918, it shows at the same time that the only serious force which is conducting a fight against the new German imperialism is the revolutionary working class and its leader the Communist Party.

It is true the Communist counter-demonstrations could not equal in power and extent the official birthday set out. But the fact that in spite of the prohibition of the counter-demonstration and in spite of unheard-of brutal conduct on the part of the police, who had been instructed to stifle every voice of protest, thousands of workers demonstrated their will to fight against the ruling system, is a sign that there exists today in Germany a strong revolutionary centre of power which is fulfilling its task of rallying the working masses against the bourgeois bloc and the Hindenburg policy, of resisting the imperialist war policy and preparing the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

Birthday festivals usually result in bad headaches the next morning. The policy of the bourgeois bloc sees to it every day that the participators in the Hindenburg rally will soon realise the real content hidden behind the patriotic flag-wagging. The Communist Party will, by broad agitation, by stirring up the working masses, by exposing the servile behaviour of the social democratic leaders before the national hero, mobilise the masses for the fight.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the Tasks of the Soviet Trade Unions.

Report Delivered to the Meeting of the Functionaries of the Railway Workers' Union in Moscow.

By A. Andreyew.

(Conclusion.)

Why have the leaders of the General Council proved strong enough just at the present time to break up the A. R. C.?

Why was it possible just at the present time to break up the A. R. C., why is it that the leaders of the General Council were not able to do this a year ago? It seems to me that in order to obtain an answer to the question why the General Council was able to break up the A. R. C. precisely at the present time, two facts must be grasped: firstly, the difference between those conditions under which the A. R. C. was created and the present conditions under which it has been broken up; and secondly, the role of the leaders of the English trade union movement.

What was the state of affairs at the time the A. R. C. was formed? I repeat, the A. R. C. was not by any means created as a result of a desire on the part of the leaders. Hicks, Purcell or Thomas would never have aimed at the setting up of the A. R. C., for this is contrary to their whole reformist nature; they were driven by the masses.

The A. R. C. was set up in the year 1925. What was the situation in England at that time? At that time the labour movement was advancing, it was growing, it felt within it an increase of power; the masses demanded that connections be established with us; the working class was preparing for fights against the capitalists. The struggle of the miners was preparing; conflicts were arising in other branches of industry. In a word, the labour movement was recovering after the war; it was experiencing a revival; the number of trade union members was increasing (it has now fallen from five to four millions). The working masses were beginning to speak another language, they submitted other demands to their leaders, and therefore there was demanded of the leaders something other than that policy which they had conducted hitherto.

Hence the so-called Left wing, with Purcell, Hicks and other leaders at the head, began to make its appearance in the

English labour movement. If these old leaders had not moved a little to the Left, there would have arisen a discrepancy between the growth of the labour movement and the old leaders, who do not wish to submit to this movement, who are against this movement. The most far seeing of these leaders, therefore, began at the same time to move to the Left, to change colour somewhat, to make use of Left phrases regarding the fight against capital and establishing connections with us. In short, they began to adapt themselves to the growing labour movement. That is the cause of the formation of a Left majority in the General Council of the trade unions. Hence the coquetting of these "Left" leaders of the English trade union movement with us; the journeys to Moscow, to the Soviet Union in order to increase their own authority in the eyes of the masses and to wash away their old sins.

When the delegation of the English trade unions paid us a visit in the year 1924, we proposed to them that they form a sort of Joint Committee with us. It was our proposal, the proposal of the trade unions of the Soviet Union, to form the A. R. C. The English agreed to the formation of the A. R. C.; and not only did they agree to it, but they agreed to and signed along with us a somewhat decisive revolutionary declaration in the question of war, fight against capital etc. In 1925 there took place the Congress at Scarborough, and at this Congress fairly revolutionary decisions were adopted on the fight against war etc.

But this attitude of the leaders of the General Council, this swing to the Left on their part, only lasted until it came to the General Strike in England, when it was necessary to place themselves at the head of the fighting proletariat and to conduct this movement; when it came to an open collision between labour and capital; when a general strike was proclaimed in England. From this moment on the nature of the leaders of the English trade union leaders, the nature of reformism, reveals itself. The leaders were frightened at the upsurge of the class movement of the English working masses and betrayed the movement both at the time of the General strike and at the time of the miners' struggle. From this moment on there sets in the movement of the leaders to the Right and their return to the old reformist traditions.

The fight of the miners was crushed with the aid of the leaders of the General Council, and the bourgeoisie took advantage of this defeat of the miners in order to pass the anti-trade union act, which has been adopted and has already come into force. The so-called "Left" leaders of the English trade unions who have concluded an agreement with us now began to go to the Right, and one can now hardly distinguish a Right-winger from a former Left-winger. There now exists no difference between them. The present era of the English trade union movement, the present stage of development of the leaders of the English trade unions, is therefore a return to the old traditions, to the "Black Fridays" and a breach with all that which was revolutionary in the English trade union movement in the last two or three years.

We believe, however, that this temporary retrogression of the English trade union movement does not in any way mean a swing to the Right on the part of the masses. The struggle of the miners ended in a defeat. This defeat, however, was a defeat not only of the miners but of the whole British trade union movement. This defeat has immediately affected the position of the workers in other branches of industry. The exceptional law against the trade unions, against strikes, which the government has passed almost without hindrance in Parliament, means that the working class does not now possess the force to offer resistance to reaction; that the working class is at present crushed, that it does not now possess the forces to offer resistance to its leaders and its immediate class enemies. But it would be wrong to conclude from this that the working class has gone to the Right. Nothing of the sort. This is to be seen from the growth of the influence of our Communist Party in the English labour movement.

Herein lies the difference between the situation when the A. R. C. was created and the situation when the A. R. C. was broken up. The Congress that recently took place likewise means a breach with all those decisions adopted at the Scarborough Conference with all the decisions of various trade union congresses etc. The Congress at Edinburgh is in im-

mediate contradiction to the Congress of 1925. It was not for nothing that at the last Congress a special resolution was adopted on so-called "industrial peace". What is the meaning of that? It means calling for the cessation of the class struggle between the capitalists and the workers. Such a resolution could not have been carried in the year 1925. At that time directly opposite resolutions were adopted. The Congress at Edinburgh has, by its decisions, buried all revolutionary attempts which the English trade union movement had undertaken in recent times.

What is the explanation for the present increased reactionary character of the leaders of the English trade union movement? How can one understand a situation in which Smith, the President of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, who only recently was the leader of the miners' fight, has now become an enemy of the Soviet Union and delivers program speeches against our trade unions? This phenomenon is to a considerable extent to be explained by the fact that the leaders fear the capture of positions by the growing Communist movement. We know that at the present time, in a whole number of coal fields, thanks to the correct policy and tactics of the Communists in England, the trade union leadership consists of supporters of the revolutionary Minority and the Communists. In a number of trade union leaderships of various coal fields Communists occupy the post of secretary, which was never the case before. The Communists are now beginning gradually to extend their influence, are beginning gradually to capture leading positions in the trade union movement, in spite of the opposition of the leaders of the Labour Party.

This is a circumstance which greatly terrifies the present trade union leaders. They are afraid of their jobs which they have occupied for decades. This fear is to be specially noticed among the present miners' leaders, as the gradual seizure of trade union positions by the Communists is most noticeable among the miners. The swing to the Right of the leaders, the transformation of some of them into outspoken reactionaries, is seen most strikingly in the miners' union. Herein lies, to some extent, the explanation for the decision of the leaders to break with the revolutionary traditions of the movement of the last years.

A Warning against Fresh Deceptions.

It may be that, even after the break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee, those who voted for the break, those who drew up the plans for breaking the alliance with us, those same leaders who organised all this treacherous work, will begin to "repent", to declare that they have "made mistakes", etc., and will pretend to be our friends.

On the part of Hicks, who was President of the Congress, Purcell, and the other so-called "Left" (who are now just as Right Wing as J. H. Thomas), we shall probably have an attempt to greet us in connection with the Tenth Anniversary of the November Revolution. Probably they will praise our achievements, and so forth.

Possibly, in order to whitewash themselves a little after the criminal decision to break, they will make an attempt to come to the U. S. S. R. and once again pass themselves off in the eyes of the British workers as our friends. In connection with very many leaders we have seen such things in the past; a man does something dirty in England, and then comes over to us, in order that all his sins may be forgiven. It may be that, after this new act of treachery, some General Councillors will also try to apply these antics: Over there they have betrayed the workers and made a mess, and then they come to Moscow, or make a few speeches about us, and thus whitewash themselves, and again become "friends" of the U. S. S. R.

Such tactics are possible, and they would be quite in keeping with the practice of the present leaders of the General Council. The Soviet Government, of course, cannot refuse to admit anyone who is not an actual spy. We cannot refuse them admittance, but we must specially warn the British workers to beware of new deceptions.

There has already appeared in the Press an interview with Hicks, the Chairman of the General Council. In this interview Hicks states that the break is a break, but we still remain friends of the Russians, and have nothing against even meeting the Russians. You can see to what depths of baseness the present leaders of the General Council can sink; yesterday

they passed a resolution to break off relations, and thereby helped Chamberlain, while to-day they go on with their trickery. Against this new trickery we must warn the British workers in every possible way.

The Amsterdamites Triumph.

It need not be said that the break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee is at the same time a victory for the Amsterdam International. We must clearly recognise this, because the A. R. C. was a wedge in the Amsterdam International, a thorn in the flesh of the Amsterdam International.

What tasks had the Amsterdam International set itself in regard to us hitherto? It wanted two things: (1) that we mechanically recognise all the principles of the Amsterdam International, and (2) enter it automatically without any demands on our part. It has not succeeded in this, as we did not and will not agree to this, because we do not believe that this is the realisation of actual unity. If, however, the Amsterdam International will not succeed in achieving this aim, it is striving for a second object, namely to isolate us, because our connection with the International working class is dangerous for the existence of the Amsterdam International itself. And it goes without saying that the breaking up of the A. R. C. is to a certain extent a victory for the Amsterdamites.

What does the Amsterdam International represent? The Congress of this International took place recently at Paris. At this Congress the representatives of the English trade unions came forward with somewhat Left speeches. They maintained that it is necessary to keep up friendship with the Russians, that one must strive for actual unity. At the opening of the Congress a particularly Left speech was delivered by Purcell, the former President of the Amsterdam International. All these Left speeches are, according to their very nature, thoroughly hypocritical. For what do they mean in face of the fact of the destruction of the A. R. C.? We must expose and lay bare this hypocrisy. There is no sincerity behind these Left phrases of the representatives of the General Council at the Congress of the Amsterdam International. It is merely political trickery and fraud.

What is Amsterdam? It seems to me that the last Congress of Amsterdam constituted an answer to this question. What did we see at this Congress? This Congress showed two things: firstly that the heads of the reformist trade unions are finally and incurably rotten in their internal fight for jobs. A splendid proof of this was furnished by what took place at the last Congress of the Amsterdam International at Paris, where various groups and persons went to the absolute limit in quarrels among themselves and mutual mud-slinging. We must do everything in order that every worker shall realise how rotten this organisation is, how incapable it is of fighting for the interests of the working class.

The second thing this Congress showed is that Amsterdam is a reflection of the League of Nations; that Amsterdam is not an independent organisation, but an appendage of the League of Nations; that that which is proceeding in the League of Nations, that struggle which takes place between various groups of capitalists for influence in the League of Nations, is also proceeding in the Amsterdam International.

What happened at the last Congress? There took place a fight of various groups to retain influence in this International. The Germans fought in order finally to oust the English. The English delivered Left speeches in order to oust the Germans etc. Capitalist Germany is endeavouring through its reformist trade unions to consolidate its positions in the Amsterdam International, and it has succeeded in doing this. At the Paris Congress the Germans were, to a considerable extent, the victors. And the representatives of the trade unions of the other countries are doing nothing else but fulfilling the orders of their national bourgeoisie, in order to have the Amsterdam International under their influence and to realise their own plans.

That is something rotten, it is a reflection of the League of Nations, but is not an international defence of the interests of the working-class. One can say quite openly that in the Amsterdam International there exist neither Right nor Left. They are all the same. They are absolutely incapable of conducting the

fight for the interests of the working class, and our task consists of exposing the whole rottenness and the hostility of this organisation towards the class interests of the proletariat.

Reformism is still strong for the time being. We must recognise this without any underestimation. Wherein lies the strength of this reformism? Wherein lies the strength of its leaders in the European and American trade union movement. It is based upon a certain stabilisation of capitalism itself, for example in Germany, which thanks to the Dawes Plan has gone ahead and surpassed the pre-war level of its industry. On the other hand the strength of reformism in other countries in which there is no adequate stabilisation of capitalism rests upon the shattering of the working class, for example in England, where the strength of the reformist trade union apparatus is based upon a temporary decline of the labour movement.

And finally, it is our task to expose and criticise still more energetically the treachery of the present leaders of the reformist trade union movement, and especially the leaders of the General Council.

That is our answer to their machinations. It is good that they seized the initiative for breaking up the A. R. C. This will create a greater clarity in the question: who is guilty? It is good that the bourgeoisie is now applauding the leaders of the General Council. This will help the workers to perceive that when their class enemy applauds there is something wrong. They will understand the more easily who has betrayed their interests. If, however, Chamberlain, Baldwin, the Amsterdamites and the General Council believe that by breaking-up the A. R. C. they have isolated us and destroyed our connections with the rest of the European labour movement and with the English workers, then they are tremendously mistaken. They can destroy diplomatic connections with us, they can break up the A. R. C., but nobody will succeed in destroying those connections which have been created between our workers and the English workers.

That which our workers have done during the general strike, during the struggle of the English miners, that aid which our workers have given the English workers, this will never be forgotten. This can never be erased from the memory of the English workers. If the English working class is at present not yet strong enough in order to call their leaders to order, to call them to account for the fresh treachery, for breaking friendship with us, we do not doubt that the English working class will in the near future rise up and call their leaders to account. We do not doubt that that which our Russian workers have done for the English workers will be paid back with compound interest by the English working class. If a difficult time should come for us — and this is quite possible — then we do not doubt that the English working class will prove their friendship, over the heads and against the will of their leaders.

We must declare at the same time, however, that the durability of this force is not so great. We have facts before us such as the strike in England, the powerful movement of the revolutionary Minority in England; such an event as the revolt in Vienna which almost developed into a revolution; such an event as the demonstrations of hundred of thousands of workers in Germany under the leadership of the Communist Party, as the victory of the Red Front Fighters over the Steelhelmets; such an event as the wave of labour demonstrations, strikes and protests on the occasion of the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti, etc.

All these are not chance facts, they all characterise the mood of the working class.

Our Tasks.

Our task consists, in spite of the fresh treachery of the leaders of the General Council, in pursuing our tactics of the united front. The English leaders of the General Council have broken up the A. R. C.; we, however, will continue our tactics of the united front. We are prepared to come to an agreement with any trade union organisation of any country in order to combine together the efforts in the fight against the offensive of capital. We are prepared to conduct a fight against the imperialist war danger, to conduct a real fight for the unity of the international trade union movement. We will stand consistently on this platform; we will continue our line for the unity of the

working class front, and are prepared, on this basis, to come to an understanding with any reformist organisation willing to come to an understanding with us on such a platform.

We will strive with all means for the unity of the international trade union movement. Our trade unions will reply to the attempts of the reformist leaders of Amsterdam and of the General Council to isolate us from the international and from the English labour movement by strengthening their international work, and will use all means and possibilities to this end. The leaders do not wish any understanding with us; we will continue this tactic of the united front over the heads of these leaders and against their wish. We will conduct it from below by means of contact with the masses, with their subordinate organisations etc.

It is our task to keep seriously in mind the strengthening of our work in the Red trade Union International, to lend the R. I. L. U. more of the forces and experience of our trade unions, to increase the importance of the R. I. L. U. as a fighting organisation. Our trade unions must become the most active force in the R. I. L. U.

Further, it is our task to strengthen our international connections with the masses. The leaders of reformism may break with us. We must establish connections through the working masses by means of workers delegations. We have not yet by a long way done everything in this direction. More than a hundred delegations of all sorts, comprising some thousand of workers, have visited us. We must maintain constant connections, constant relations with these workers' delegations; we must make these workers' delegations the starting point abroad of the fight for unity, in order that they shall not disperse there but shall remain a clenched fist with the help of which we can conduct the work for unity. It is certain that fresh delegations will visit our country for the anniversary of the October Revolution. We must make use of them in order to strengthen our connections, to fill up the breach which the leaders of the General Council have made, by establishing connections with the masses etc.

And finally, it is our task to expose and criticise still more energetically the treachery of the present leaders of the reformist trade union movement, and especially the leaders of the General Council.

That is our answer to their machinations. It is good that they seized the initiative for breaking up the A. R. C. This will create a greater clarity in the question: who is guilty? It is good that the bourgeoisie is now applauding the leaders of the General Council. This will help the workers to perceive that when their class enemy applauds there is something wrong. They will understand the more easily who has betrayed their interests. If, however, Chamberlain, Baldwin, the Amsterdamites and the General Council believe that by breaking-up the A. R. C. they have isolated us and destroyed our connections with the rest of the European labour movement and with the English workers, then they are tremendously mistaken. They can destroy diplomatic connections with us, they can break up the A. R. C., but nobody will succeed in destroying those connections which have been created between our workers and the English workers.

That which our workers have done during the general strike, during the struggle of the English miners, that aid which our workers have given the English workers, this will never be forgotten. This can never be erased from the memory of the English workers. If the English working class is at present not yet strong enough in order to call their leaders to order, to call them to account for the fresh treachery, for breaking friendship with us, we do not doubt that the English working class will in the near future rise up and call their leaders to account. We do not doubt that that which our Russian workers have done for the English workers will be paid back with compound interest by the English working class. If a difficult time should come for us — and this is quite possible, — then we do not doubt that the English working class will prove their friendship, over the heads and against the will of their leaders.

ECONOMICS

Revival in Industry and Wage Struggles in Germany.

By S. Perevoznikov.

An economic revival, such as has not been known since the end of the imperialist war, is going on in Germany. The easing of the economic crisis, first beginning to show itself in the first half of 1926 during the British mining lock-out, has crystallised this year as an indubitable revival of industry and the whole of national economy. A great increase in output, increased exports of manufactured articles, lessening unemployment and the accumulation of fresh capital within the country — these infallible symptoms of economic progress — have marked the last six months in Germany.

In the principal industries (with the exception of coal) this year's output is much higher than that of the preceding year and has already overtaken pre-war standards. Thus the output of cast-iron up to July 1927 is 148% higher than that for the same period in 1926 and a 108% higher than it was in 1913. The output of steel was 139.5% in excess of that for last year and 135% higher than that in 1913. The daily output of foundries for the current year is about 1600 tons higher than that in the pre-war period. Engineering concerns are working at full capacity, as is also the building industry. The boom is not limited to the industries producing machinery and implements, but extends to the production of commodities in wide demand. Despite certain financial difficulties the German textile industry is working up to 90% of capacity. The cotton mills have orders up to the end of the year, and cloth mills until the beginning of next year. A great many textile concerns have orders which will keep them going up to the middle of 1928.

The fact, in itself of no small importance, that the number of unemployed in receipt of unemployment benefit has fallen from 1,800,000 in January last to 500,000 in August, testifies to the rapidity with which this industrial revival developed. This fall in unemployment assisted the economic boom by enlarging the scope of the home market, the real basis of the present revival in German industry.

The German capitalists are endeavouring to realise their profits from the economic boom as rapidly as possible. They know perfectly well that the future economic progress of Germany will come up against insurmountable obstacles. While the German capitalists outlived the acute crises of foregoing years with the help of foreign capital, while concentration and rationalisation of industry created the prerequisites for increased output, the question of markets nevertheless remains the fundamental and unsolved problem. Germany requires new markets for her increasing output. The German capitalists know that those capitalist countries which are most powerful in a military sense, are not going to surrender them these markets. Faced by a coming slump they are feverishly accumulating direct profits from the present boom: distributing dividends, increasing the capital of limited companies, etc. The German capitalists have already cashed the economic boom for solid money.

The case of the workers is quite different. The German workers, under the influence of the reformists, offered no resistance to the introduction of rationalisation in industry, hoping that the economic boom would raise the living standards of the working class. "Rationalisation will lead to the improvement of national economy and thus ease the onerous conditions of the working class" — with the help of this slogan the reformists during the early days of the introduction of rationalisation were able to bind a considerable section of the German working class to the victorious chariot wheels of "their own" bourgeoisie.

It has now become perfectly clear that this slogan of the reformists was just as illusory and ruinous for the working class as the rest of their policy during and after the imperialist war. The revival in industry caused no raising of the living standards of the working class. Not a single one of its demands

has been fulfilled, and none of its hopes of benefits to be incurred through the economic boom has been justified.

The principal demands of the German working class were: a diminution in hours and an increase in pay. In the principal industries working hours have not been shortened, and even in cases in which a certain curtailing of overtime has been effected, the capitalists have exacted in exchange an incredible concentration during working hours and general labour intensification. The new Bill on working hours provides for a 10 hour day and a 57 hour week. In some districts (Zollengen, Nuremberg) in which the workers themselves established a de facto 8 hour day, the employers managed to get it abolished during the boom. It goes without saying that the reformists are still sabotaging the struggle for the 8 hour day; from 1924 to 1926 they postponed it until "suitable economic circumstances" should arise, now they are shirking the struggle so as not to "injure the prosperity of national economy". The desire of the reformists to struggle for shorter hours is weakening in proportion to the intensification of the capitalists' resistance to the 8 hour day.

The wage question is seen in a slightly different light. The wave of strikes and lockouts sweeping over the whole country in the first half of this year brought about certain wage increases, fluctuating according to district and industry from 5 to 50%. While obstinately resisting shorter hours the capitalists hoped to ingratiate the workers by a slight increase in wages. At the same time they endeavoured to conclude wage contracts for the longest possible term to guarantee themselves against further conflicts in industry. Despite the warning of the revolutionary opposition the trade union bureaucrats consented to the conclusion of long-term wage contracts, boasting at the same time of having achieved the "maximum" concessions possible from the capitalists, making the term of contracts but a secondary consideration. The reformists further endeavoured to profit by a certain rise in wages to strengthen their position in the trade unions still more, advertising theirs as the "only true" leadership in the trade unions.

The situation, however, rapidly and radically changed. The increase in wages has now been neutralised by the steady growth in the cost of living. By August the increase in the cost of commodities in wide demand was already greater than the increase in wages. Thus, it will be seen that the only result of the campaign for higher wages was that wages not only did not go up but actually fell. The following comparative data will serve as an illustration:

	Wage increase during last eight months (per hour)	Increase in cost of living
Locksmiths	7 pfs. (from 1.12 m. to 1.19 m.)	Bread 14%
Masons	7 pfs. (from 1.24 m. to 1.32 m.)	Sugar 18%
Copper workers	6 pfs. (from 1.19 m. to 1.25 m.)	Potatoes 200%
Tramway employees	6 pfs. (from 0.90 m. to 0.95 m.)	Meat 16%

The German working class is once more confronted with the urgent question of the struggle for the increase of real wages. This struggle has begun to develop with fresh energy during the last few weeks. The Berlin and Zollengen workers in the metal, mining, bootmaking, railway, and textile industries, the workers in the middle German bitumine district and the workers in other industries are imperatively presenting demands for an increase in real wages. The workers are heavily handicapped in this struggle by the long-term wage contracts already concluded and the famous policy of "loyalty to contracts", maintained by the reformist trade unions.

The present stage of the German workers' struggle is incomparably more important than any previous wage struggle. The disillusioned masses are joining the struggle to a considerable extent. The German working class has had yet another opportunity of seeing that the policy of "collaboration and contracts" with the capitalists are profitable only for these latter, and catastrophic for themselves. The fact that great masses of the working class have received practical proof of the falseness of the reformists' statements as to an economic boom in itself entailing "higher standards for the masses" is bound to intensify the struggle. This intensification will also be increased by the fact that the German capitalists, who are passing from a boom phase to fresh crises, are bound to put up a bitter fight against the workers' demands.

The latest conflicts have been distinguished by the greatest stubbornness. The strike of 25,000 textile workers in a North German cloth concern went on for two months. In reply to the demand of the Cologne metalworkers for higher wages, the employers formed a united front to lock out 22,000 workers. The strike in the big firm of Birmann in Berlin was complicated by the interference of the Employers' Union, forcing the firm to hold out. In Zollengen the employers refused to hold any negotiations with the trade unions so long as the latter afforded assistance to the strikers. All this shows that the German capitalists intend to root out a movement dangerous to themselves.

The present struggle for wages in Germany is of great importance not only for German workers. The German capitalists are in advance of those in other countries as regards rationalisation, and the workers in other capitalist countries may profit by the example of Germany in understanding that capitalist rationalisation and its consequences, of extending and shouldering of the workers. To the revolutionary oppositions in the German trade unions falls the honourable role of being in the front ranks of the toiling masses, in the struggle against capitalist rationalisation and its consequences, of extending and intensifying this struggle, of inspiring by their example the workers in other capitalist countries to come to grips with capitalist rationalisation — and this role will be honourably played by them.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Proletariat of Japan in the Struggle Against the Capitalist Offensive.

By Hajama.

The economic crisis which Japan has been passing through since 1920 and which had begun to assume a milder form in 1925 and 1926, has again become more serious in the past few months and assumed extremely alarming proportions. The general cause of the crisis in Japan is the disproportion between the gigantic development of Japanese industry and the demand for Japanese wares. Japan is now a gigantic factory working up foreign war materials into marketable goods (Japan possesses no raw materials of her own). These goods are exported to countries in which they have to face severe competition on the part of other industrial countries which oust the Japanese goods.

The crisis in Japan has lately been intensified by the revolution in China, which considerably affected the Chinese market, the most important one for Japanese wares.

In the last few months, a number of Banks in Japan (about 30, large and small ones), as well as commercial and industrial undertakings linked up with them, have collapsed, among them big concerns such as Susuki, Kawasaki and others.

The crisis continues to rage and is constantly spreading to new branches of Japanese industry, such as the cotton industry, cement, sugar, paper and other industries. The number of industrial undertakings which have collapsed is constantly growing. The factories which are working up materials are taking every measure in their power to avoid this sad fate. In order to attain this end, they are, on the one hand, endeavouring to maintain the falling prices of their products by restricting production, on the other hand they do all they can to reduce the cost price by rationalising production. Needless to say the Japanese capitalists are trying to lay all the burden of reduction and rationalisation on the shoulders of the Japanese proletariat. At the present moment an offensive of capital against the working class is going on in Japan such as has never been seen before.

The Japanese proletariat is suffering above all from the wholesale dismissal of workers which is taking place in almost every branch of industry. The following facts bear witness to the extent of these wholesale dismissals.

The industrial concern "Dainichon Dzenkoku Boseki Rengokai", which embraces 80% of the whole of the Japanese

textile industry, resolved to cut down its production by 15% and closed a number of factories, whilst in the others production was reduced to a far greater extent, in some factories even to as much as 50%. Thousands of workers of both sexes lost their means of livelihood.

The concern "Rokugokai", possessing 60 factories in various branches of industry in the district of Tokio and Yokohama, also resolved to cut down production and has resorted to wholesale dismissal of workers in a number of undertakings. The other factories belonging to this concern are also preparing for wholesale dismissals but, in order to avoid unrest among the workers, they are dismissing their hands, for the time being, in small groups of eight to ten men.

The newspaper "Musansja" ("The Proletarian") reports that the reduction made in the Rokugokai factories will soon reach a gigantic figure.

The ship-building work Kawasaki have already dismissed 3000 workers and 500 employees; the dismissal of an equal number, if not of more, is to be anticipated.

Even very profitable undertakings, such as the tramway system of Tokio, are making use of the general offensive of capital against the working class and are proceeding with wholesale dismissals in the course of rationalisation. At the end of July 250 workers were dismissed.

The employers, however, do not confine themselves to the dismissal of workers. They are also reducing wages, prolonging the hours of work whilst at the same time they reduce the number of working days, introducing piece-work, keeping back the wages or paying once a month instead of twice, worsening all the conditions of labour etc.

How does the Japanese proletariat react to this offensive of capitalism? In general the Japanese workers offer a fairly active resistance to the attack of the capitalists. Unfortunately, the Japanese proletariat is still weak as regards organisation and, owing to political disunity, its organisations, both the political and trade union ones, are split up into three groups hostile to one another. These are the Right, the Left and the Centre parties. The absence of a united front is very detrimental to the struggle of the Japanese workers.

As was to be expected, the Left revolutionary wing of the Japanese proletariat, the "Workers' and Peasant Party" ("Rodonominto") and the revolutionary trade union league ("Hyogikai") display the greatest activity. They responded to the attack of capital by organising a mass movement on a large scale with a view to forming factory committees in the factories and calling conferences of factory delegates in the towns and districts. The campaign carried on by the Hyogikai and Rodonominto resulted in the formation of organising committees for calling conferences of factory delegates throughout the country. The said conferences were thereupon held and formed the basis for the organisation of the factory committees. There is hardly any district in which conferences of this kind have not taken place. They have got hold of the workers of most of the factories in the districts in question. The movement of the factory committees suddenly assumed a mass character and has greatly helped in raising the authority of the Left trade unions and the Left proletarian party in the opinion of the working masses.

Although the Reformist and Centre trade unions opposed the movement of the factory committees on the grounds that this movement was not in accord with the trade union movement as a whole, was a competitor of the latter and threatened its destruction, all the workers of some concerns who were members of the Centre and even of the Reformist trade unions joined in the movement of the factory committees and took an active part in the conferences of the factory delegates.

In order to give a clear idea of the slogans set up by these conferences, we quote the demands made by the conferences of the factory committees of the concerns which are in the hands of the above-named company Rokugokai, conferences which represent about 30,000 workers. On August 8th a conference of delegates from these factories took place, the members of which partly belong to the Left trade unions, partly to the Sodomei (federation of Reformist unions), the majority of whom are, however, not yet organised; the con-

ference raised the following demands: "No more dismissals, three months' wages as compensation to those who are dismissed, a bonus for the years of work to the amount equal to the wages of one to three months, the inadmissibility of a reduction of wages in connection with the reduction of production, the fixing of a minimum daily wage to the amount of 2½ yen; they demand further, that casual workers be included in the category of those who are permanently employed, that the costs of social insurance be borne by the employers, that a law concerning unemployment pay be issued without delay.

The employers and the police who assist them are carrying on a violent struggle against the factory committees' movement and against calling conferences of delegates. The police dispersed the delegates, arrested their leaders etc. Thus, for instance, in the big industrial centre of Osaka, the police twice broke up the conference of the factory committees. The same thing happened in other places. The reprisals of the Government did not, however, deter the Left trade unions and the Workers' and Peasants' party from continuing their struggle. These organisations called a conference of all proletarian organisations of Osaka on August 8th, at which the methods of repulsing the offensive of capital were discussed. They intend to call a conference of all proletarian organisations throughout the country at which the same question is to be dealt with.

In view of the pressure exercised on them by the mass of the workers, the trade unions of the Centre which are grouped around the Nichon Romoto party and even the Reformist Trade Union Federation, Sodomei, cannot keep aloof from the fight against the offensive of capital. The Centrists hold the view that the movement for the formation of factory committees is "harmful and impractical" and resolved that it would be preferable to carry on a campaign directly against the reduction of wages and against the dismissal of workers. For this purpose they founded the "League against Reduction of Wages and Dismissals" which is to carry on this campaign. The Sodomei and the Reformist party Siakai Minsjuto are also carrying on a campaign against the closing down of factories, the restriction of production and the refusal to grant unemployment benefit. But neither the Centrists nor the Reformists succeeded in displaying so wide-spread an activity as did the Left elements of the Japanese Labour movement.

In all places the employers are making every effort to break down the resistance of the workers. In the case of dismissals, they try in the first place to get rid of the most class-conscious and active workers, the members of trade unions etc. In the past few months a large number of strikes took place in Japan which were caused by the dismissal of trade union members. The police are also endeavouring to render the labour movement "harmless" by means of numerous arrests which, lately, have assumed a mass character. The activity of the Japanese workers, however, has already spread so far that the opposing forces find it difficult to break the fight of the proletariat and arrest the workers' movement against the offensive of capital.

The Economic Struggles of the Italian Workers.

By Guido Saraceno.

In the last three years the struggles of the workers in Europe against Capital have shown a tendency to decline; for the reformists have done everything in order to realise a policy of compromise with the employers. In those places where, as in England for instance, tremendous labour conflicts developed, they were systematically throttled by the reformists.

A comparison of the struggles of the Italian workers against Capital which have taken place under the fascist regime with the struggles in the other countries of Europe shows that the economic fight of the Italian workers was and is, both in its depth and breadth, equal to that of the proletariat in the other countries. The following table, which is taken from the fascist paper, "Right of Labour", issued by the Corporation Ministry, gives some official figures as to the economic struggle of the Italian workers.

Number of disputes.

Year	Strikes	Lock-outs	Various conflicts	Total
1912	108	4	4	116
1913	118	1	0	119
1914	105	8	2	115
1915	70	7	3	80
1916	218	2	7	227
1917	458	8	9	475
1918	668	10	30	708
1919	414	10	16	440
1920	455	9	22	486
1921	302	22	23	347
1922	354	11	27	392
1923	192	6	8	206
1924	238	11	12	261
1925	211	15	13	239

The falling off in the number of labour conflicts in the years 1918 to 1922 is not a phenomenon confined to Italy. For the rest, as one can see from the table, the fascist "balance" exceeds by far the pre-war "balance". Even under the most fearful terror the number of conflicts between capital and Labour is still two to three times higher than before the war. It should also be noted that the number of lock-outs has more than doubled in the last few years. This is in part due to the fact that the fascist régime renders the employers more bold in their attitude towards the workers.

One can say therefore, that in spite of everything the resistance of the workers has not weakened.

The fascist figures that have been published do not give particulars for the year 1926. That is that year in which the fascist government suppressed the entire liberty of the Labour Movement and dissolved the trade unions in order to be able to check the counter-attack of the workers which was becoming more tenacious. The year 1926 was the year of the fiercest economic struggles of the Italian proletariat, to which fascism replied with a still greater wave of terror. While in all the other countries the period from 1925 to 1926 is marked by a falling curve of Labour conflicts, in Italy it is marked by a rising curve.

We give below an extract from the paper issued by the Corporation Ministry from which we have already quoted.

Lost Working Days.

Year	Employers	Workers	Lost Working Days
1912	789	9,980	292,100
1913	204	9,591	303,300
1914	247	14,385	620,500
1915	110	5,119	83,000
1916	499	20,711	474,700
1917	1424	46,701	1,108,800
1918	2689	61,223	1,436,400
1919	2363	81,041	2,295,900
1920	2954	139,039	8,942,500
1921	2322	49,712	2,663,300
1922	1260	75,679	2,674,600
1923	799	102,896	6,907,400
1924	877	23,976	1,204,500
1925	1577	145,778	2,559,700

An examination of this table shows, firstly that the Italian workers taking part in economic struggles are far and away more numerous than before the war, secondly that in 1926 their number increased extraordinarily in comparison with 1925, and thirdly, as regards the number of lost working days, a proportionately big increase is to be seen. It is worth noting that in the "red" year 1919 the number of lost working days is less than in 1925, i. e. during the fascist terror. In view of the fact that in the year 1919 only 81,041 workers took part in strikes, while in 1925 their number amounted to 145,748, it follows that the strikes in 1919 lasted longer, while those taking place under the fascist regime are "settled" after a short time. The fascist government supports the employers in every way and persecutes the strikers in the most brutal manner. In spite of this strikes are still being carried on. The class struggle is extending. If one compares the number of lost working days in Italy in the year 1925/26 with those in other

countries, as for instance in England and Germany, then one again arrives at the result that while in the other countries they have fallen, in Italy they have increased.

In the year 1927, as one can already ascertain, at least one hundred thousand workers have come into action. The most important strike, both as regards its extent and the number of workers involved, was the strike in the rice fields of Vercelli-Novare which lasted three days (29th June to 1st July).

We arrive at the following conclusions:

1. Fascism is just as incapable as international reformism to suppress the class struggle of the workers against the employers.
2. In spite of everything the economic fight of the Italian proletariat against the employers has lost nothing in revolutionary energy.
3. The whole of the years 1925 and 1926 are years of powerful awakening of the working class.

Class collaboration, which is so warmly advocated by M. Thomas, the president of the International Labour Office, and which is being practised according to fascist methods by Signor Rossoni (a one-time syndicalist), the president of the fascist corporation, must give way before the historical necessity of the revolutionary class struggle. The workers of all countries will become more and more convinced that reformism is, at bottom, nothing else but a pacemaker of fascism.

IN THE COLONIES

Fresh Crimes of French Imperialism in Indo-China.

By Wang.

After French imperialism took possession of the New Hebrides, the native population of these isles was almost exterminated through alcohol, venereal diseases and forced labour, the scourges with which the carriers of "civilisation" visited the colonial countries. This has been admitted officially in the French Parliament by Deputy Archambault, reporter upon the colonial budget.

The native population is almost wiped out. The soil of the islands, however, remains very fertile. It promises rich profits to the French colonists. As, however, they cannot themselves cultivate the plantations, they need slaves for doing this, and they are now obtaining these slaves from Indo-China.

In former times, the method of recruiting solved the difficulty. The workers and peasants of Indo-China, who had been ruined by enormous taxation and were at a loss how to keep themselves going, were allured by the promise of high wages and took ship for the "Land of Promise". But they were not able either to stand the cruel treatment they had to endure on the part of the planters or the tropical diseases. As a result, most of them perished. Since that time the natives of Indo-China have refused to emigrate to the French Polynesian plantations, preferring to starve to death in their own country.

The French imperialists are now beginning to resort to criminal measures in order to supply their plantations with hands. Firstly, the French colonists demand that the functionaries of the French administration in Indo-China, who work hand in hand with them, should force the Indo-Chinese villages to put a certain number of coolies at the disposal of the planters. If the villages do not obey these orders at once, penalties are inflicted on them. Another method of the colonists is that of lending money to the Indo-Chinese who are constantly suffering the most horrible want, nay famine, in order later, when they are unable to pay their debts, to have them arrested and compelled by brute force to embark for Australia. A third method of brute force is the following: they pretend to employ coolies at some work or other on board a ship, and when they are once aboard they are suddenly chained, locked up in the hold of the ship which is about to put to sea and transported to the islands. Fourthly, they deceive the Indo-Chinese who are out of work by promising them work in an adjacent province. When their victims are safely on board, they change the course of the ship. Finally, they simply carry off the Indo-Chinese by force or by craft and transport them to the New Hebrides in iron cages.

On board the ship, the Indo-Chinese are stowed away in dark and airless cells. They are kept like animals, nay, worse than animals. They get hardly any food and drink. Those who fall ill, are simply thrown overboard "to prevent their infecting the others". They are constantly guarded by armed men. After arrival on the islands, they are interned in a camp. This camp is a sort of slave market. The planters go there to inspect the victims, to select and buy them. In order to induce them to get their wives to join them, these latter are graciously permitted to bring their children with them; when, however, the women have gone on board with their children, it frequently happens that the children are simply thrown overboard "in order to get rid of superfluous mouths". This is what actually happened to the Tonkinese.

In July of the current year a ship entered the port of Townsville. There were 400 Indo-Chinese on board who had been locked up in cells in the dark hold of the ship. The Chinese of Townsville, who had found out what cargo the ship was carrying, tried to come to the rescue of the victims, but they were prevented from helping them by the armed guards on the ship. In an appeal which got into the hands of the Chinese and was published in the "Daily Standard", the unhappy Indo-Chinese reported that they had been drugged with poisoned cigarettes. In an unconscious condition, they were carried off to the French concession of Kwangchowwan and placed on board ship. In their cells they suffered terribly from hunger and thirst. They were cruelly ill-treated by their guards. Sick persons were simply thrown overboard. The barrels of machine guns were constantly directed on them.

When these facts became known, the Board of Missionaries in Melbourne raised a protest. J. B. Jaffray, a missionary, informed the "Daily Standard" that there were at present more than 5000 Tonkinese in the New Hebrides who had been transported there in this barbarous way, and that a ship with a similar human freight arrives every three or four months.

The workers and Chinese of Townsville organised a meeting in order to protest against these new and infamous crimes of the French colonists, in order to show the victims their solidarity and to demand that the Australian Government should take suitable measures to stop the slave trade between the Australian port and the New Hebrides.

Such are the heroic deeds of the French imperialists for the cause of civilisation.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS

The Working Women of the Soviet Union and the Protection of Health.

By N. Semashko.

On the 10th October there will be held in the Soviet Union the Congress of the women members of the village, district and town Soviets. In the following article Comrade Semashko deals with the significance of this congress from the point of view of maternity and child welfare. Ed.

The All-Union Working and Peasant Women's Congress will no doubt give an impetus to the further development of self-activity among women. Already now we can say that women are becoming more and more active in all branches of work. This process is bound to be accelerated by the Congress.

There is one sphere in which women's self-activity is given a great natural scope — work for the protection of national health. That women are particularly interested in this work is shown by the fact that there is a strong desire among them to become doctors: in medical colleges women already constitute more than half of the students, and in some medical faculties they constitute up to 70% of the students. This is eloquent testimony to the women's strong desire for medical knowledge.

But of still greater social importance is the fact that women, and first of all working and peasant women, are drawn into actual work connected with the organisation of protection of national health. Work connected with protection of mother-

hood and childhood is at present not only in medical, but in ordinary working and peasant women's hands. It is significant that one of the best and oldest managers of protection of motherhood and childhood departments is an Ivanovo-Voznesensk weaver, Comrade Shustova. Moreover, 601 peasant women became last summer managers of village creches. Such direct control over work connected with the protection of motherhood and childhood on the part of working and peasant women is rather the rule than the exception.

This is but natural: protection of motherhood and childhood would be of enormous interest to women and particularly mothers even if it were kept in narrow medical bounds. But as practised here this work assumes enormous social importance. Our institutions for the protection of motherhood and childhood are at the service of women in multitudinous ways, they help her to solve the most difficult problems of life. Women come to our consultation rooms to get legal advice in case of family difficulties; they come also to get advice in connection with the bringing up of children; deserted and homeless women know that they and their children will find in our consultation rooms a refuge, useful advice and kind treatment. Social help for women plays as big a role in our institutions as medical help.

That is why reports on protection of motherhood and childhood are so popular at women's meetings; that is why women from the bench and peasant women from the plough are so interested in this subject. We are justly proud of our success in regard to the development and extension of institutions for the protection of motherhood and childhood in towns and even in villages. We are glad to be able to say that although we had not very much support from the centre last summer, our network of village summer creches reached 6000 throughout the U. S. S. R.; we hope to increase this figure considerably this year. But there would have been no such success to place on record in the towns if working women had not done their share; there would have been no such rapid success in the villages if it had not been for the help and participation of conscious peasant women.

But even this small and simple institution — creches in the villages while the women are doing field work —, how enormously important it is not only from the medical, but also from the social-cultural viewpoint! Village creches not only help us to liquidate that accursed heritage of Tsarism — abnormally high infantile mortality; they are also a school for peasant women where they learn to bring up children, to overcome time-honoured prejudices and superstitions and to build up a healthy family and social life. It is of course true that creches are important because they save the life and health of the 20 or 30 babies to whom they give shelter. But they are even more important by being a convincing example and an object lesson to all the surrounding villages in the matter of bringing up children and getting rid of quack doctors, priest rule and belief in the devil. All pedagogues tell us that an object lesson is much more convincing than theoretical arguments. Creches are schools of the new social order.

Institutions for the protection of motherhood and childhood are of particular importance in national regions, above all to Eastern women. There, consultation rooms are the gates through which these women who have been enslaved for ages enter into a more conscious and free life. To the timid and enslaved women of the East it is more difficult and risky than to western women to go to a club; but it is much easier, simpler and more natural to go to a women's consultation room. That is why these institutions are so loved and respected, particularly in national regions; that is why local quack and witch doctors, etc. are, as they say themselves, more afraid of these institutions than of judicial courts.

We have already a fairly big network of these institutions in factories and works, and some success has also been achieved in this direction in villages. According to statistics the practical result of this work is, rapidly decreasing mortality (from 26% under the Tsar, to 21% including the countryside in 1926). But it is self-evident that this network and these successes are not enough; what are 6000 and even 8000 village creches for a rural population 100,000,000 strong.

This work must be extended. There should not be a single factory or works of any size without an institution for the protection of motherhood and childhood. There should not be a single volost without at least summer creches.

There is no doubt whatever that the forthcoming congress, which will raise the activity and self-confidence of working and peasant women, will give an impetus to this work. Working and peasant women will pay attention to this work in proportion to its social-political importance.

DOCUMENTS

Declaration of the E. C. C. I. on the Maslov-Ruth Fischer Group.

In reply to the declaration of the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group addressed to the E. C. C. I. and signed by 17 former members of the Party*) among them being Maslov, Ruth Fischer, Scholem and Urbahns, the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. declares:

The signatories, who are now demanding their re-admission into the Communist International, cannot be accepted. The E. C. C. I. emphatically rejects similar proposals on the part of renegades of the Communist movement.

The Maslov group, which undertakes in its declaration to defend "the first country of proletarian dictatorship, the U. S. S. R.", is in reality doing everything possible to discredit the country of the Soviets, the Soviet power and the leading Communist Party, thereby supporting the furious attack of world imperialism on the Soviet Union.

This group of disrupters who have broken with the Party and who for a time had direct organisatory connection with open counter-revolutionaries such as Korsch, who have already organised their "Party" and their parliamentary fraction, make a hypocritical declaration on their fight for unity and at the same time insult the Communist workers by writing:

"The real question is the fight over two lines of policy, both on a Russian and international scale, over two lines which are incompatible and irreconcilable, no matter what organisatory compromises may be reached for the time being."

("Die Fahne des Kommunismus", No. 23, p. 90.)

That is the way in which the group of political bankrupts propose a "compromise" between themselves and the Communist International, while at the same time they maintain that between the Communist International and themselves there lies an ideological chasm. The Communist International admits that this last statement is correct, as there can be nothing in common between the fight for the proletarian dictatorship and the attack on the proletarian dictatorship; between organising the Comintern and disorganising it; between the orientation to the revolution and the orientation to a decade of "law and order"; between the policy of the fight against the international bourgeoisie which is proceeding against the Soviet Union, and the policy of cloaking the "Western orientation" of the German bourgeoisie; between honest service to the proletarian revolution and flunkey-like grovelling before the bourgeois courts. The Communist International values every honest proletarian, but it emphatically rejects the extortions of the group of renegades who are seeking "an organisatory compromise". The Communist International is of the opinion that these extortions constitute a contemptible manoeuvre on the part of politicians who, according to their own confession, have nothing in common with the Communist International.

This two-tongued policy, which the Communist International has stigmatised on former occasions, is now being continued by the Maslov group. The whole political past of Maslov is a fight against Leninism — now he declares himself to be an orthodox Leninist. The whole activity of his group, is the activity of disrupters — this group is now unfurling the flag of unity. The whole political import of the existence of this group is to help the attacks of the bourgeoisie on the Soviet Union — this group now declares its readiness to defend the Soviet Union. The Maslov group has not yet, in the columns of its organ, justified in the eyes of the proletariat its miserable behaviour before the court, where

*) Bartels, Deutschmann, Ruth Fischer, Grylewicz, Hesse, Joko, Kögler, Maslov, Mätzchen, Gustav Müller, Schlecht, Schimanski, Scholem, Urbahns, Wischeropp.

it directly delivered over illegal workers of the Comintern to the police, — and now it affirms its fidelity to unity. And at the same time as it declares itself to be in favour of unity, it proclaims the complete irreconcilability of the "political lines".

The E. C. C. I. places on record:

Already in the year 1925, in the Open Letter to the German Communist Party, the Maslov ideology was characterised as the cloaking of the "new orientation of the bourgeoisie" (to the West against the Soviet Union); there it was directly stated that "the so-called ultra-Left tendency is often only a cloak for the social democratic reformist "Levittist" moods, which threaten to become a direct betrayal of the international working class".

Some months after the Open Letter the VI. Plenum of the E. C. C. I., which worked under the leadership of Zinoviev, adopted a resolution which speaks of the ideology of Maslov as the "defeatist mood of the ruined petty bourgeoisie", and Comrade Zinoviev himself spoke of the "bankruptcy" of the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group.

In the same resolution Ruth Fischer was directly accused of having a common ideology with Korsch.

"in her low estimation of the German labour movement, in her anti-Bolshevist attitude to the Russian Revolution and to the international policy of the Soviet State, in the spreading of disintegrating legends of the alleged "swing to the Right", i. e. opportunist degeneration of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern".

This judgment of the Comintern, which at that time was still under the leadership of Comrade Zinoviev, was completely confirmed. If the Russian opposition is now subsequently taking the Maslov group under its protection, then it is only a symptom of the depths to which the Russian Opposition itself has sunk ideologically, but is by no means an argument for the re-acceptance of the morally and politically bankrupts, the slanderers of the Soviet Union, of the C. P. S. U. and of the C. I., of people whom the VII. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. characterised as "agents of the class enemy" and against whom the Plenum called "to fight just as ruthlessly as against all other social traitors".

In the sense of the foregoing the E. C. C. I. decides to reject the application of the 17 renegades for re-acceptance into the C. I.

Presidium of the E. C. C. I.

17th September 1927.

FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

Expulsion of Comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch from the E. C. of the C. I.

Moscow, 1st October 1927.

The "Pravda" publishes the following communication of the joint session of the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. and the International Control Commission concerning the expulsion of comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch from the Executive Committee of the Communist International:

To all sections of the Communist International!

At its session in May 1927 the VIII plenum of the E. C. of the C. I. adopted a decision in the question of the Opposition "forbidding comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch to continue the leadership of the fractional struggle" and empowering the "Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. together with the International Control Commission to expel the comrades mentioned from the E. C. of the C. I. should they not cease the struggle".

The period since the plenary session in May shows that the warning given to comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch was not taken to heart. The Opposition answered this categorical prohibition of the fractional struggle with a bitter attack upon the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. and upon the Communist International and by new attempts to destroy the unity of the Leninist ranks both in the Soviet Union and on an international scale.

Called before the August plenary session of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R., the Opposition undertook once again to cease its illegal fractional work against the Party, just as it had done in its declaration of the 16th October 1926. This new undertaking was given under the direct threat of the expulsion of the leaders of the Opposition, comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch from the Central Committee of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

However, after a few days, the declaration of the 8th August suffered the same fate as that of the declaration of the 16th October. The Opposition flagrantly violated the undertaking it had made to its own Party and to the whole International and thus made the further membership of comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch of the E. C. of the C. I. finally impossible.

Despite the undertaking given by the Opposition at the August plenary session of the C. C. and the C. C. C., the Opposition openly continued to form its organisational centres, an action which is essentially nothing but an attempt to form the nucleus of a Trotzkyist Party side by side with the Leninist C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

At the same time the Opposition is seeking to maintain its connections with the various renegade groups abroad, for instance, the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group in Germany, the Souvarine group in France etc. The disruptive work in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. is thus supplemented by the disruptive work in the Comintern. Apart from the threat to build a new Party outside the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. and against it, there is the threat to build a new "IV. International" outside and against the Comintern.

In a moment when the international situation of the Soviet Union has become considerably more precarious, when the first workers and peasants State is threatened with the danger of war by the international imperialists, the Opposition has formed an open bloc with the worst dregs of the international working class movement which rub shoulders with the open counter-revolution and spread poisonous slanders and lies against the Soviet Union amongst the ranks of the European workers and attempt to cripple the will of the workers to defend the Soviet Union by phrases about the "Thermidor", "Degeneration", "Kulakism" etc.

Despite the complete bankruptcy of these groups, as illustrated inter alia by the recent election results in Hamburg-Altona where the ultra-left wing allies of the Opposition in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. only succeeded in raising a little over 300 votes, the Opposition still insists in placing these bankrupt petty bourgeois against the "degenerated" Communist International as the only really revolutionary Leninist organisation.

The Opposition, which uses the ultra-left and right wing renegades (Maslov and Souvarine) abroad as its mouthpiece, continues inside the Soviet Union to spread with growing persistence and shamelessness, conscious lies about the leadership of the Comintern and the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. The Opposition deliberately spreads lies concerning an alleged preparedness of the C. C. of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. to surrender the monopoly of foreign trade, it deliberately spreads lies concerning the attitude of the C. C. in connection with the question of foreign debts, in connection with alleged concessions to the Kulaks, concerning the policy of the Comintern in China.

Despite the decision of the August plenary session of the C. C. of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. to open the discussion a month before the opening of the XV. Party Congress, a decision which the Opposition undertook to respect, the Opposition demands the immediate opening of the discussion and is making the greatest efforts to achieve this by violence, despite all Party decisions to the contrary.

The discovery which has been made recently of a secret printing press of the Opposition shows particularly clearly how far the Opposition has drifted away from the Party and the Comintern. At the same time it became known that in founding this printing establishment the Opposition had not hesitated to utilise the services of non-Party bourgeois intellectuals who were in connection with politically suspicious and openly anti-soviet elements.

Whether it intends to or not, the Opposition is thus becoming not merely ideologically, but also organisationally the central point for the crystallisation of all those hostile strata which cannot reconcile themselves with the proletarian dictatorship and which are working for its overthrow.

Called to account by the session of the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. on the 27th September, Comrades Trotsky and Vouyovitch made statements which were really nothing but a new and great stride from the Communist International and from Leninism towards Maslov and Souvarine.

Answering the charge of maliciously violating Party discipline comrade Trotsky declared openly that the discipline of the bolshevist Party was not binding for him.

In his speech he said inter alia:

"Bureaucratic discipline upon the basis of a wrong policy is not an instrument for unity, but an instrument making for the disorganisation and the undermining of the Party."

It is quite natural that comrade Trotsky refused to subordinate himself to the proletarian discipline characterised by him in this fashion. He therefore did not consider it at all necessary to protect comrades Serebriakov, Preobrazhensky and Sharov who according to their own statements were the organisers of the anti-Party printing establishment. Comrade Trotsky openly declared before the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. that these comrades in their policy stood miles above those who sought to cover their crimes with Party discipline. People who organise secret printing shops with the assistance of bourgeois intellectuals to fight against the Party are declared to be politically far superior to those who watch over the unity of the Party, who observe the elementary principles of Party discipline without which the Party and the Communist International could not exist as the fighting organisations of the working class.

Such a standpoint towards the discipline of the Party is of course related closely to a very definite attitude against the Party and against the Comintern. Neither the Party nor the Comintern as the supreme organs of the revolutionary proletariat were mentioned in the speech of comrade Trotsky. In sweet harmony with the yellow bourgeois press, the world organisation of the revolutionary proletariat, the Comintern and its leading section, the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. are declared to be a crowd following like sheep the leadership of individuals like comrades Stalin and Bucharin.

"To-day", declared comrade Trotsky, "no single organisation discusses and adopts decisions, it only carries out decisions. Even the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. is no exception."

In its declaration at the August plenary session the Opposition abandoned its theory of the so-called "Thermidor". Comrade Trotsky however, did not in the least feel himself hindered from using once again the pleasant sounding phrases "Thermidor course" and "Bonapartist forgeries". Further, the leading bodies of the Comintern and the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. were directly accused of "usurpation".

"The Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I.", declared Trotsky, "receives its mandate for one year. The arbitrary lengthening of this mandate is usurpation". Trotsky further declared:

"Above all other questions is that of the organisational maintenance of the Stalin Bucharin group."

By characterising in this manner the leading organs of the communist movement and by justifying their open refusal to subordinate themselves to Party discipline. Comrades Trotsky and Vouyovitch thus declare in advance that the decisions of the XV. Party Congress and of the VI. Congress of the Comintern will in no way be binding for them.

"The apparatus", declared Trotsky, "prepares the congress with its own workers who are previously told off for this work and who are to give the leadership of this apparatus the mandate for the continuation of this work."

The Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. does not consider it necessary to analyse once again in this communication the

politically renegade type of argumentation which comrades Trotsky and Vouyovitch have attempted to develop despite the fact that they have been condemned many times by the Party and by the Comintern for what has been termed a social democratic deviation. However, the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. cannot ignore the open and contemptuous designation of the organisation of the communist proletariat as a crowd of voting cattle, nor the open proclamation that the undermining of the unity of the Party is the greatest heroism, nor the attempted justification and the promise to continue the practise of anti-Party printing establishments.

The Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. considers the further presence of comrades Trotsky and Vouyovitch in the E. C. of the C. I. to be impossible, more particularly as these comrades term it usurpatory and which they bitterly oppose with the assistance of renegade appeals abroad, secret printing establishment in the Soviet Union, by the organisation of illegal centres and by malicious slanders.

In order to maintain the unity of the Leninist ranks of the Comintern and to fight the disruptive work of the Opposition, and realising that all possible warnings have already been exhausted and that it would be dangerous and inadmissible not to apply organisation measures, the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. together with the International Control Commission in its session of the 27th September 1927, unanimously decides, upon the basis of the above mentioned decision of the VII. plenary session of the E. C. of the C. I., to expel comrades Trotsky and Vouyovitch from the E. C. of the C. I.

The "Pravda" on the Expulsion of Comrades Trotsky and Vouyovitch from the E. C. of the C. I.

Moscow, 1st October 1927.

The "Pravda" of the 1st October declares in a leading article that the organisation of a secret printing establishment for the struggle against the Party is a fact unparalleled in the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This crime is the work of the whole Trotsky Opposition whose leaders must take the whole political responsibility for it. The leaders of the Opposition do not even try to evade the responsibility, for comrades Preobrazhensky, Serebriakov and Scharov and three other representatives of the Opposition declare openly in an official document addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party that they are "the organisers of the matter and that they undertake the full political responsibility for it". And Comrade Trotsky came forward as their defender.

Te "Pravda" declares that without a doubt the Party will call upon the leaders of the opposition to account for their actions. Upon the basis of documents of the Trotsky Opposition dated 1923 the "Pravda" proves that the struggle of the Opposition is directed against the Party regime laid down and led by Lenin.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will without doubt approve unanimously of the decision of the E. C. of the C. I. to expel the disrupters. If anyone undertakes actions which are not compatible with membership of the Communist Party, then he cannot remain a member of a leading body of the Communist International. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been founded, built up and trained by Lenin. It was Lenin who built up the Party regime upon the basis of those principles which were laid down long before the entry of Trotsky into the Party and which were maintained, not by accident, but in a bitter struggle against Menshevism and in particular against Troztkism.

"The Party will allow no one to alter its Leninist regime. No one can enter our Party in order to impose his own statutes upon it. Those to whom the "boots of Lenin" seem too small must choose: either they continue their disruptive work against the Bolshevist Party and thus lose the right to be called Bolsheviks, or they will remain inside the ranks of the Party and subordinate themselves unconditionally to the decisions of the Party and its leading organs by immediately ceasing all fractional activity."

Decision of the Presidium of the M. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. in Regard to the Illegal anti-Party Printing Works of the Trotzkyite Opposition.

"Pravda", Sept. 29-1927.

At the session of September 26 and 28-1927, the Presidium of the Moscow Control Commission of the C. P. S. U. (b), dealt with the case of the following Party members, who belong to the Trotzkyite Opposition: Z. M. Gerdovsky, V. A. Vorobiev, Y. O. Okhotnikov, V. Y. Rabinovitch, S. E. Dvoress, M. U. Karin, S. E. Kaplinsky, V. A. Vladimirov, S. L. Zeidmann, H. M. Pevzner, B. N. Guttman, M. P. Maximov, S. P. Mratchkovsky, D. E. Zverev, charged with establishing, together with non-Party and bourgeois intellectuals, an underground anti-Party organisation which has its own illegal printing works and which works for the disruption of unity in the C. P. S. U. (b), and for the formation of a new Party.

The Presidium of the M. C. C. declares it to be an established fact that the aforesaid members of the Party carried on, for several months, already before the Joint Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C. (August 8th 1927), illegal disruptive work against the Party together with bourgeois intellectuals, some of whom, as has been ascertained, are connected with decidedly anti-Soviet elements.

The Presidium of the M. C. C. declares it to be an established fact that this underground disruptive anti-Party activity of the Opposition, far from ceasing after the Joint Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C. and the well known "declaration" of the Trotzkyite Opposition on August 8th 1927, in which the Opposition "decisively and categorically condemns the policy of disruption" promises that "it will carry out all the decisions of the C. P. S. U. and its C. C.", and declares that "it is prepared to do everything in its power to eliminate all fractional elements", has on the contrary increased and become more acute.

In regard to the members of the C. P. S. U. (b) who have been called to account for participating in this illegal anti-Party organisation, the Presidium of the M. C. C. declares it to be an established fact that:

1. **Gerdovsky Zenon Martselianovitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1917, formerly of the army, at present employee of a Soviet institution, secured through a certain Domianov (non-Party) a flat in the Vishniakov Pereculok and set up in it an illegal printing press. For printing and duplicating oppositional material in this secret flat Gerdovsky engaged the following non-Party people: Stepanovs, Langer, Stcherbakov and others who indiscriminately duplicated secret Party documents as well as anti-Party documents.

2. **Vorobev Vladimir Alexanderovitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1914, a journalist. Being in charge of the duplicating of anti-Party documents, he engaged for this work a non-Party intellectual, Stcherbakov, the son of a manufacturer; Vorobev gave Stcherbakov for duplication secret and anti-Party material which he duplicated indiscriminately as many as he liked. Vorobev gave money to Stcherbakov for the duplication of this material. Comrade Vorobev refused to answer the questions of the M. C. C.: from whom he received and amongst whom he distributed the documents duplicated by Stcherbakov, but deposited in the M. C. C. a declaration in which he (Comrade Vorobev) says that in his fractional work he "had recourse to inadmissible methods."

3. **Okhotnikov, Yakov Osipovitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1916, formerly of the army. He was directly in charge of the secret flat and the illegal printing press.

4. **Rabinovitch, Vladimir Yakovlevitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1924, employee in a Soviet institution. He stole a permit for the purchase of a duplicator given to the All-Union Soviet of trade unions, and bought together with the non-Party Stcherbakov a duplicator for the illegal printing press.

5. **Dvoress, Sergei Emantuilovitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1919, employee of a Soviet institution. Knowing of the existence of the secret flat and the illegal printing press,

he was the connecting link between the non-Party intellectuals and the members of the C. P. S. U. (b), who were employed in duplicating anti-Party documents.

6. **Karin, Mikhael Yulevitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1917, employee of a Soviet institution. He supplied the non-Party elements employed in the illegal printing press with the necessary paper for the duplication of material printed in the printing press, knowing full well to what use the paper was to be put.

7. **Kaplinskaya, Sara Isakovna**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1921, a doctor. She brought to the non-Party Stcherbakov the duplicated leaflet (in 9 copies) "the Red Army and Navy" which contains libellous anti-Party aspersions against the Red Army and Navy.

8 and 9. **Vladimirov, Vladimir Abramovitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1918, an intelligentsia-lecturer, and **(Vladimirovs Zeidmann, Sara Lvovna**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1917, formerly a seamstress. They lent their flat to non-Party people who hectographed secret Party documents, and also all sorts of anti-Party documents.

10. **Pebzner, H. I.**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1920, formerly of the Army, at present an employee of a Soviet institution. Together with his wife, Znamenskaya, a member of the L. Y. C. L. S. U., he participated in the work of the illegal printing press.

11. **Guttman, Vera Nikolievna**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1918, employee in a Soviet institution, being in the know in regard to the illegal printing press, she acted as connecting link between the people employed in the illegal printing press and non-Party intellectuals and members of the C. P. S. U. (b). She brought to the printing press material for printing and duplicating, and lent her flat for illegal meetings.

12. **Maximov, Maxim Petrovitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1921, formerly of the Army, at present cinema stage manager. Being in the know in regard to the illegal printing press, he served as connecting link in regard to the duplication and distribution of illegal publications.

13. **Mratchkovsky, Sergei Vitalievitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1905, a working class element, formerly of the Army, at present President of the Trust "Gosshvevmachins". He was the manager of the illegal printing press, and supplied the non-Party bourgeois intellectuals employed there with secret Party and anti-Party documents for their duplication. He made use of non-Party minor employees of the Trust in the struggle against the Party, giving them anti-Party documents to duplicate.

14. **Zverev, Daniel Yevdckimovitch**, member of the C. P. S. U. (b) since 1917, employed in an Army warehouse. He took an active part in the organisation and also the work of the illegal printing press. He carried on an underground anti-Party disruptive activity, and at the same time, he paraded in the nucleus and before upper Party organs as a supporter of the policy of the Party.

As these comrades, far from evidencing any wish, when summoned to the M. C. C., to make good their offence against the Lenin-Party, showed by their whole conduct in the Presidium of the M. C. C. and by their statements that they are determined to continue to infringe the dictates of the Party and its unity, the Presidium of the M. C. C. (C. P. S. U. (b)) resolved in accordance with the decision of the Tenth Party Congress and the last Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C. to expel from the Party for disruptive fractional work directed against the unity of the C. P. S. U. (b).

1. Z. M. Gerdovsky, 2. V. A. Vorobev, 3. Y. O. Okhotnikov, 4. V. Y. Rabinovitch, 5. S. E. Dvoress, 6. M. U. Karin, 7. S. I. Kaplinskaya, 8. V. A. Vladimirov, 9. S. L. Zeidman, 10. H. M. Pevzner, 11. V. N. Guttman, 12. V. P. Maximov, 13. S. V. Mratchkovsky, 14. D. E. Zverev

To place this decision of the M. C. C. before the C. C. for final endorsement.

Presidium of the Moscow Control Commission of the C. P. S. U. (b).

September 28, 1927.

Decision of the Presidium of the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. re Expulsion of Twelve Party Comrades.

The Presidium of the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. (b) ascertains that regardless of the Opposition declarations of October 16th 1926 and August 8th 1927, in which the Opposition pledged itself to stop its factional activities, regardless of the decision of the Joint Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C., which "obliges the Opposition immediately to dissolve its faction, and calls upon all organisations and all members of our Party, to take all measures towards the unconditional liquidation of factionalism, factional activity and factional groups", the Party members, Comrades Gerdovsky Z. M., Vorobiev V. A., Okhotnikov Y. O., Rabinovitch V. Y., Dvores S. E., Karin M. U., Kaplinskaya S. I., Vladimirov V. A., Zeidmann S. L., Pevzner H. M., Guttman V. N., Maximov M. P., Mratchkovsky S. V., Zveriev D. E., belonging to the Trotsky Opposition, have grossly violated the decisions of Party Congresses, Conferences and Plenums of the C. C., concerning Party unity and the cessation of factional activity.

Finding that all accusations of factional activity directed against Party unity and towards the formation of another Party, made by the Presidium of the M. C. C., against the above enumerated Comrades, have been fully confirmed, the Presidium of the C. C. C. resolves:

a) The decision of the Presidium of the M. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. (b) of September 26th and 28th 1927, concerning the expulsion of Comrades Gerdovsky Z. M., Vorobiev V. A., Rabinovitch V. Y., Dvores S. E., Karin M. U., Kaplinskaya S. I., Zeidmann S. L., Pevzner H. M., Guttman V. N., Maximov M. P., Mratchkovsky S. V., and Zveriev D. E., from the Party is hereby confirmed.

b) The decision of the Presidium of the M. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. (b) concerning the expulsion of Comrade Okhotnikov Y. O., from the Party be recognised as correct; however, taking into consideration the explanation given by him at the Session of the Presidium of the C. C. C., he should be left within the ranks of the C. P. S. U. (b), severely censuring him and giving him a warning that the slightest repetition on his part of factional activity, will place him outside of the Party.

c) Taking into consideration Comrade Vladimirov's statement at the Session of the Presidium of the C. C. C., that his room was given, by his wife Comrade Zeidmann S. L., in his absence, to non-Party people, for the purpose of printing secret Party documents on a hectograph, Comrade Vladimirov V. A. should remain within the Party, cancelling the decision of the Presidium of the M. C. C., and be strictly censured for refusing to inform the C. C. C. as to who used his room in detriment to the Party.

Presidium of the Central Control Commission
of the C. P. S. U. (b).

The Opposition has Once More Deceived the Party.

"Rabotchaya Moskva", 29. 9. 27.

In spite of the repeated declarations of the Opposition made on August 8th at the last joint Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. in which it once more recognised the inadmissibility of fractional struggle and promised to the Party to dissolve its fractional organisations, one can see by the decision of the Presidium of the M. C. C. published today that the Opposition has once more grossly deceived the Party. Far from keeping its promise, the Opposition has gone even further than before in its fractional struggle against the Leninist unity of the Party.

As seen by the decision of the Presidium of the M. C. C., the group of Party members now expelled from the Party did not limit itself to fractional agitation, propagation of its "platforms", but organised together with non-Party intellectuals an underground organisation. This organisation set up an illegal printing press which published oppositional anti-Party literature and duplicated secret Party documents.

This is no longer a fraction, but the embryo of a new Party.

No one has written and spoken so much at one time as the present leaders of the Opposition, Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, re the formation of fractions under the regime of proletarian dictatorship being a step towards the formation of

another Party, a step towards open struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat. Will they have enough courage now to tell the Party that they were lying to the Party, that they dissociate themselves from everything they wrote or spoke before? They do not have enough courage for this and they prefer condemning in a hypocritical manner their own fractional work while encouraging at the same time by their actions the more consistent and bold among their companions in opposition to form another party. How can they expect, having allied themselves with Comrade Trotsky, that the Party and the working class of the U. S. S. R. will believe them even for a moment? The ink is not yet dry on the last declaration of the Opposition leaders in which they acknowledge the crime they committed against the Party, and already their companions, the so-called "rank and file" workers are taking the next step from fractional struggle to the formation of another Party. These "cadres of cadres" of the Opposition draw into their underground organisation bourgeois swindlers and entrust them with responsible functions, elements among whom are also people who are connected with the counter-revolutionary White Guard organisation.

The Opposition has rapidly gone the whole round: from stubborn refusal to acknowledge a small error, via fractional struggle to work connected with the establishment of another Party. It is inevitable that in the trend of this rapid development, the fruit of this initiated struggle will be utilised by "third parties" who, awake or asleep, see disruption and disintegration of the ruling Party and weakening of the proletarian dictatorship.

But the Opposition as well as these "third parties" have left out of account one thing: in the tenth year of revolution the proletariat which is building up socialism should sum up not its defeats but its victories. This being so, the victorious proletariat is certainly not inclined to listen to petty bourgeois demagoguery which reckons on temporary difficulties and a few shortcomings. It is on the contrary determined to weld together its ranks in order to send about for their business anyone who in some way or other is trying to undermine the stronghold which it has captured.

During this time the Opposition has not only been unable to secure a single new follower from workers' ranks, even those who by some chance or other found their way to the Opposition camp, are leaving it one after the other and are returning into the ranks of their own Lenin Party. But the acquisition of "collaborators" and sympathisers in the ranks of bourgeois intellectuals is only one more indication of the true character of the Opposition and a sign that they, the members of the Opposition, will come to an inglorious end if they do not bethink themselves. This end will be: transformation into an organising centre for anything which cannot get reconciled to proletarian dictatorship and proletarian revolution, a going over to the other side of the proletarian barricade. In that case the working class will fling them aside just as at one time it flung aside the Mensheviks and S. R's.

Do Opposition members want this? Let them give a straightforward answer. The Party and the working class are awaiting this answer.

OBITUARY

Hermann Gorter.

By W. Reesema.

On September 15th the Dutch poet and Marxist theorist, Hermann Gorter, died suddenly in Brussels at the age of 63.

From the year 1897 Hermann Gorter played an important part in the Dutch Labour movement and, during the world war and the first years of the Russian revolution, he was prominent in the international movement. Together with Anton Pannekoek (Horner) he led that "Dutch-Marxist school", which in the years 1919 to 1921 opposed Leninist tactics, was defeated at the Second World Congress and organised the Communist Labour Party opposition to the Comintern.

In spite of this, Gorter never became a pronounced and active opponent of the Russian revolution. After the year 1921, when he had published his "Open letter to Lenin", wherein he

formulated his political views for the last time, and when his C. L. P. hopes had been destroyed, he withdrew from political life. The last five years of his life he devoted to a voluminous Socialist poem, which, however, remained uncompleted.

When in the year 1897 Hermann Gorter entered the Dutch Social-Democratic Labour Party, he was not only a distinguished poet — his poem "May", published in the year 1889, revolutionised Dutch poetry and is one of the most beautiful works in world literature — by thoroughly studying the Marxist literature he had prepared himself conscientiously for the approaching fights.

Through his indefatigable propagandist activity, his cogent popularising of the Marxist theory, his keen attacks upon bourgeois opponents he won the greatest respect among the masses of the party and soon took up a leading role.

The monthly review founded in the year 1897 by him, Henriette Roland-Holst and Anton Pannekoek, "De Nieuwe Tijd" ("The New Time"), waged from the very beginning a systematic fight against the opportunism and revisionism so characteristic of the leaders of the S. D. L. P. During the decade 1897 to 1907 there rallied around the paper hundreds of young and active party comrades, a nucleus of workers, who in the year 1907 founded the weekly newspaper "De Tribune" and who are still the backbone of the C. P. of Holland.

The Marxist opposition, whose leader and best speaker was Gorter, was defeated at the Party Congresses from 1901 to 1909 by the opportunists under the leadership of Troelstra. In the year 1909 the Congress of the S. D. L. P. expelled the editors of the "Tribune" from the party. Gorter became one of the founders of the Marxist S. D. P. From 1909 to 1904 he exerted his whole strength in fighting against the reformism, whose treacherous role in the world-war he foresaw.

The war period was the best and most creative portion of Gorter's life. With burning indictment he stigmatised the treason of the reformists: He employed all his power as a propagandist in gathering together the proletarian vanguard for the coming world revolution. In the year 1915 he published his brochure "World War, Social Democracy and Opportunism", which was illegally distributed in Germany and of which Lenin wrote in the year 1916 "The Dutch Marxist Hermann Gorter is thoroughly and absolutely right".

From the beginning Gorter took the standpoint of the Zimmerwald left wing, and in the years 1915 to 1918 he stood wholly and entirely for Leninist tactics. Through his indefatigable activity he not only succeeded in extending the foundation in Holland for the Communist Party and in providing the German comrades with sound theoretic support, he also created in Indonesia a foundation for the development of a Communist Party.

The Russian revolution was for him the sign of the approaching end of world imperialism. But when the revolution began to triumph a change took place in his views. Gorter had not fully comprehended the Leninist theory of the leading role of the Communist Party. He did not recognise the value and the constant necessity for the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry during the period of transition.

From 1919 onwards Gorter displayed more and more the typical attitude of the Ultra-Left, the danger of which for the further development of the revolution in the West Lenin recognised immediately and countered sharply in his brochure "Radicicalism, the infantile sickness of Communism". In Gorter's subsequent writings of the years 1920/21, in his "Open Letter to Lenin" and "The Moscow International" we find the germs of all the utterances of the Ultra-Left in Western Europe. From the year 1921 on, Gorter, however, remained silent and no longer carried on the fight against the Russian revolution.

The significance of Hermann Gorter in the development of Communism in Holland, in Flanders and in Indonesia has been very important indeed. His theoretic writings of the years 1910 to 1918, such as "Historical Materialism", "Class Morals", "Communism", his translations of the Communist Manifesto, Kautsky's "Foundations of Christianity" and of Lenin's "State and Revolution" constitute a valuable gift to the revolutionaries of Holland, Flanders and Java.

Regarding Hermann Gorter's merits as an artist and as a proletarian poet, unfortunately only his Dutch comrades are as yet in a position to form a judgment. Of his numerous, powerful and trenchant poems fired with his hate of Capitalism and his love for the proletariat only "A Little Epic" has been translated into German.

The memory of Herman Gorter, that admirable man, that ardent hater of bourgeois capitalistic society and valiant, honest champion of world revolution could best be honoured by making his poems accessible to the proletariat of the world.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Appeal of the Y. C. L. of the Soviet Union for the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.

Brothers! Comrades!

The Tenth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution is approaching. Ten years ago the Russian proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party overthrew the rule of capitalists and big landowners, established the Soviet power, nationalised land and socialised factories, mines and banks.

The Russian Revolution put an end to the imperialist world war.

Considering that the working class of the Soviet Union has shown to the whole world that one can exist without the bourgeoisie, and considering that it is going on successfully with socialist constructive work, the danger of an imperialist war against the Soviet Union is more real now than ever before. The imperialists are openly preparing for an offensive war against the Soviet Union.

Social Democratic leaders go to the working class with the story that the Soviet Union is not marching towards socialism but towards capitalism and that our State is not a proletarian State.

Social Democratic leaders, who play everywhere the role of lackeys to the capitalists, are spreading this lie because they want to stay the growth of sympathy for the Soviet Union within the working class, and because they want to pave the way to another imperialist war against us.

The workers' delegations who visited our country have seen that in spite of all difficulties the working class here is following enthusiastically the path of victorious socialist construction. The young workers' delegations have seen the tender protection given by the workers' state to the growing generation of workers and peasants.

Comrades! Young workers! In what capitalist countries have young workers a 4 or 6-hour day?

Where do they have a 4-weeks holiday with full pay? Where can they go to rest homes free of charge? Where do young workers get training and education in factory schools on a socialist basis?

Where does the working youth get the vote at the age of 18?

Where can the working youth participate in the administration of the state?

Where have high schools and universities become schools of the working youth?

All these are achievements of the October Revolution for the working youth, and they are a reality in our country.

We do not conceal the defects which still exist (relics of destitution, unemployment backwardness, etc.). But only enemies of the proletariat can rejoice at this and refuse to notice because of these defects that which is most important: that the balance of the last 10 years shows that proletarian revolution and construction of socialism are progressing.

Brothers! Comrades!

On behalf of the working and peasant youth of the Soviet Union we suggest that you should send delegations of the working youth to the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, November 7.

Elect delegations in enterprises and at young workers' conferences.

We will give a hearty welcome to representatives of the proletarian youth of all countries, we will treat them as our dear guests, comrades and class brothers.

Long live the alliance of the working youth of the whole world!

Let the workers of the whole world gain a victory over their enemies, the capitalists!

C. C. of the LYCLSU.

Moscow, September 21st. 1927.

TEN YEARS AGO

The Government will forcibly Suppress the Peasant Disturbances.

Petrograd, 13th October. There took place in the Winter Palace a Ministerial Council which dealt exclusively with the anarchy in the country. All the members of the government were unanimous that the peasants' disturbances must be combated with the sharpest means. The army and the government authorities shall be instructed to proceed in the severest manner against the anarchy, and not even shrink from employing military force.

The Allied Powers Demand Further War Victims.

Petrograd, 13th October. The Conference which took place at headquarters under the presidency of Kerensky and in presence of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, for War and Navy, and also the Chief of the Staff, Commander-in-Chief and of the new Russian Ambassador to France, Maklakov, dealt, in view of the inter-Allied Conference in France, with the question of the renewal of the fighting capacity of the Russian army and adopted the following resolution: To improve the discipline in the army, and for this purpose the soldiers have to be systematically enlightened and the military-technical progress resulting in the present war both on the Russian and the Western front must be taken in view; further, strict rules regarding the home service of the soldiers and their training, which must be conducted with all possible energy.

The Insurrectionary Movement in Tashkent Spreading.

Petrograd, 4th October. Two companies of soldiers arrived in Tashkent today. Both are on the side of the government. The Soviet of the workers and soldiers deputies has, as it threatened, declared the general strike, and at 5 o'clock in the evening the tramways, electricity works and printing works went on strike. The town is in complete darkness. Nalikin, the Provisional Commander and President of the Turkestan Committee declared a state of siege in Tashkent, prohibited demonstrations, meetings etc. After the declaration of the state of siege, the junkers of the military school occupied the State bank, the electricity works, telegraph and printing works. In spite of this the electricity works could not be set working as the machines are damaged.

The Executive is keeping the lead of the insurrectionary movement in its hands.

The railwaymen's committee of the Tashkent railway declared that the Turkestan railwaymen will not take part in the strike, as in this case Tashkent would starve.

The directory, with Kerensky at its head, decided to continue to an increased extent the severe measures for suppressing the disturbances in Tashkent.

The Bolsheviki oust the S. R. from the Factory Councils.

Petrograd, 9th October. The Bolshevik slogans are the only ones to which the workers follow. More and more workers are joining the Bolsheviki in the new elections of factory councils, Soviets etc.

In the Lessner factory, where in September the S. Rs. were still in the majority, the factory committee was newly elected; 835 votes were cast, of which 471 were given for the Bolsheviki, 186 for non-party, 155 for S. R's., 23 for the Mensheviki. There are now 6 Bolsheviki, 3 non-party and 2 S. Rs. in the factory committee.

In the factory "Stary Parviajen" the S. Rs. demanded six seats for themselves in the factory council; the Bolsheviki proposed to give them four seats. The S. Rs. did not agree to this. After the elections it was seen that out of 2100 votes the Bolsheviki polled 1800, the S. Rs. about 300, so that the S. Rs.

only obtained 2 seats on the factory committee consisting of 13 members.

At new elections of the "Dynamo" factory the Bolsheviki polled 50 per cent more votes than the S. Rs., who up to now had had decisive influence in the factory. Many workers who formerly belonged to the Mensheviki and S. Rs. have joined the Party of the Bolsheviki and declared that they have been repulsed by the compromising policy of the S. Rs. and Mensheviki.

Towards the Second Soviet Congress.

Petrograd, 6th October. At the meeting of the Central Executive of the Soviets Trotzky made the proposal that the attitude of the Central Executive with regard to the preliminary Parliament organised by the "Democratic Conference" should be discussed now. Trotzky submitted a resolution according to which the Central Executive shall not transfer its property or its political influence to any other organisation until the opening of the Soviet Congress.

Martov and Abramovitch spoke against Trotzky's proposal. Abramovitch proposed the following resolution: "After hearing the discussion on the question submitted by Comrade Trotzky, the Conference proceeds to next business." Martov and Dan proposed: "The Conference considers it a matter of course that the disposition of the organisation of the Central Executive Committee and its functions rests with the All-Russian Soviet Congress and therefore proceeds to next business". The resolution of Trotzky declared: "The Conference after hearing the proposal that the Central Executive Committee should maintain all its functions and organs up to the Soviet Congress, considers such a proposal as indispensable and proceeds to deal with the question of the All-Russian Soviet Congress."

The resolution of Martov and Dan was adopted.

In the discussion on the question of the second Soviet Congress the representatives of the Bolshevik fraction pointed out that the Central Executive Committee had up to now been too much occupied with forming a coalition of democracy and the Cadets and had not done anything for the convocation of the Soviet Congress. Various people suggested that the convocation of the Soviet Congress should be left in the hands of the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets, and that the date of the Congress should be fixed for the 15th October.

After a lengthy discussion the convocation of the Soviet Congress by the Central Executive Committee was fixed for the 20th October.

At the conclusion of the meeting the following resolution was adopted: "The Central Executive Committee calls upon the War Minister Werchovsky to restore at once the freedom of propaganda in the army and to secure the inviolability of the representatives of all parties at the front."

Punitive Expedition against Tashkent.

Petrograd, 11th October. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The punitive detachment of General Korovnitzenko has arrived in Tashkent, occupied the "Freedom House", the headquarters of the insurgents, searched the premises of the workers' and soldiers' Council and arrested the Governor nominated by it, as well as the members of the revolutionary committee.

Wholesale Unemployment in the Petrograd and Moscow Districts.

Petrograd, 10. October. According to statements of the Labour Ministry, in the period from 1st July to 15th September 25,000 workers have become unemployed owing to the closing down of many factories and the restriction of production in the Petrograd district (chiefly in Petrograd itself).

In the Moscow district about 50 undertakings have closed down, as a result of which 50,000 workers have lost their employment, among them being 70 to 75% women, as most

of these undertakings are textile factories in which women are chiefly employed.

Strikes and Economic Difficulties.

Baku, 11. October. (Report of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The general strike of the workers and employees in the petrol industry of the whole district has begun under the lead of a chief Committee and district committees of the insurgents; the town is quiet.

The Victims of Reaction in the Army are Protesting.

Petrograd, 12th October. "Rabotchi Puti" publishes a letter which the Soviet of Minsk has received from soldiers confined in the Minsk prison: "We have been imprisoned — write the soldiers — because we protested against the arbitrary imprisonment of our regiment committee, arranged an armed demonstration against the Cossacks who fired with artillery on our regiment without any reason, and finally because we refused to recognise the decree imposing the death penalty... We are the victims of the justice of Tsarist generals... We know that we still have friends. That are you, comrades workers and soldiers, who defend our rights in the soviets... It is from you alone that we expect assistance."

The Programme of the New Russian Government.

Petrograd, 11th October. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The newly formed Russian government addresses a long grammatical declaration to the population. In the introduction the declaration refers to the new disturbances which have broken out in the country. "The wind of anarchy is blowing through our country, the pressure of the exterior enemy is growing". The government considers it its task to rule the country "without any new upheaval" until the Constituent Assembly, which will have absolute power in the country and to which the solution of all the great questions shall be left over. The second section of the declaration, dealing with the war and peace policy of the government, is as follows:

"Full of the conviction that only the general peace will enable our country to develop all its creative forces, the government will unceasingly pursue an active foreign policy in the spirit of the democratic principles which have been proclaimed by the Russian Revolution and have become a national affair, and it will aim at a general peace without annexations. In complete agreement with the Allies, the government will participate in the near future in a Conference of the Allied Powers, at which it will be represented, in addition to its ordinary Ambassadors, by a personality enjoying the special confidence of the democratic organisations. At this Conference, along with the solution of the questions of the common war of the Allies, our representatives will attempt to come to an agreement with the Allied Powers on the basis of the principles proclaimed by the Russian Revolution. The government will employ all its forces in order to support the common cause of the Allies, to defend the country and energetically oppose any undertaking to capture the land of other nations and any attempt to impose upon Russia the will of another nation, and it will endeavour to drive the hostile troops from Russia."

The third part of the government declaration deals with the restoration of the fighting capacity of the army. Emphasis is laid on the restoration of the necessary military discipline; the discharge of the older soldiers, and the distribution of food by the co-operatives is promised.

The last part of the government declaration comprises its economic, social and financial programme. With regard to the agrarian question, the government is of the opinion that the relations between the landowners and the peasants and the question of the possession of land can be settled by the agricultural committees which may deal with the exploitation of the soil in order to render it more profitable, without, however, disturbing the present relations of property.

Socialist Victory at the Finnish Diet Elections.

Helsingfors, 11th October. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) According to preliminary statistics the final result of the diet elections will be the following: Social Democrats 92 seats, Bourgeois Bloc 64, Agrarian Party 26, Swedish Party 17 and 1 Laplander.

Speech by Comrade Trotzky on the "Democratic Conference".

Delivered before the Petrograd Soviet on October 4th, 1917.

Comrades, I own that I am surprised at the reasons advanced by the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries for refuting the principle of "All power to the Soviets!" (A voice: "It is a principle introduced from Germany!")

Comrade Trotzky: No, comrades, this principle is not introduced from Germany, but the interruption I have just heard is an echo of espionage. (Laughter, loud applause.)

Consider, comrades, the arguments advanced. Do they not remind you of the arguments put forward by the reaction against general suffrage in the times before the revolution? "How can you", they asked, "give any such suffrage to the dull and illiterate masses?" — "How can you", is now the query of Comrade Kaplan, "demand that all power should be given to the Soviets, considering the ignorance of our peasants and of many of the soldiers?"

It is, therefore, a repetition of the same old argument against our principle. True, the power was never yet in our hands. Now we are told we have no "experience", we shall probably make mistakes at first... In time we shall learn how to govern our country. But if we do not seize the power now, we shall continue to be inexperienced. Give the people the power, and they will learn how to employ it.

Why did none of the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries protest, when universal suffrage was introduced?

Comrades. At the elections for the municipal administration and the Soviets all the votes were cast in favour of us and of the Social Revolutionaries, with whose Left wing we are on increasingly good terms. The same is the case at all the other elections. The people therefore entrust the power to the Socialist parties. Shall we hand over the power to the bourgeoisie, as suggested in the "Democratic Conference"? That would be a criminal lack of faith in our own strength.

In this country the Socialists of the different parties are distinct from one another not so much by their programme as rather by the manner in which that programme is realised. But programmes only exist so that they may be realised as fully as possible. Therein lies our task. If we hand over the power to the bourgeoisie, of what good are our programmes?

We are told that we isolate ourselves in our endeavours to realise our programme as fully as possible. Yes, we isolate ourselves from all that seek a compromise with the bourgeoisie. But we do not isolate ourselves at all from the people. In all revolutionary organisations we are in the majority, while the Mensheviks are estranging themselves more and more from the masses.

Zeretelli, for instance, left our Soviet and was then obliged to seek the support of the Central Executive Committee, which is less active than the Soviet, having been elected at the Congress by the backward provincial Soviets of that time.

But even in the Central Executive Committee Zeretelli's suggestion as to a coalition with the Cadets failed signally, and now he is attempting to find the support of the co-operatives, town administrations, and Semstvos. He goes farther and farther to the Right and separates himself more and more from the masses.

There are said to be no more than four Cadets in the "Democratic Conference". Yes, comrades, four avowed Cadets, and dozens of other Cadets who hide their true sentiments.

The members of the co-operatives affirm that they have been elected by millions. That is true. But they have been elected for co-operative work and not for politics. That is why they do not reflect the political attitude of their electors. For political purposes, the Soviets were elected, and every one knows how the majority was procured there.

Comrades, we have put an end to autocracy, because we would not brook the authority of a single person. But behind our backs it is being set up again. It is intended, as Zeretelli has it in his resolution, that the "Democratic Conference" "co-operate" with Kerensky in the establishment of authority. In the same resolution it is announced that the Government must recognise the Provisional Parliament. The "Conference" was not convoked so that authority should recognise the revolutionary people, but so that the revolutionary people should recognise authority.

Such a line of argument must be discerned very clearly, for it might easily set back the entire Russian revolution.

We have protested, for what we want is an authority answerable to ourselves, for which reason it must also be created by us. A curious situation arose. Zeretelli acknowledged to have drawn up the resolution himself and then suggested that we should vote for it.

We did not quit the Democratic Conference because Zeretelli had offended us, but because he acted as though we were going to vote for his resolution. Had we done so, we must have been swept from all corners with a broom. We thought it necessary to declare most emphatically that we could not vote for that power that had been suggested to us. For what was at stake was no less than the revolutionary power, the fate of the entire revolution. We determined strictly to safeguard the interests of the revolutionary people, for this is for us our most sacred mission.

We Bolsheviki are told that we desire to have the whole power in our own hands. What is there curious in that? There is no party that does not aspire to power. What is a party at all? It is a group of persons aspiring to power so as to realise their programme. A party not desiring power is not worthy of the name of party. If it is true that the majority of the Soviets do not aspire to power, it is obvious that the Soviets have not yet sufficiently purged their ranks. (Applause.) This purging must be carried out at once.

Comrade Brojdo accuses us of aspiring to power, and of trusting to chance for success. He says there has never yet been any Soviet power and queries whether we shall be equal to it when it comes.

True, I answer, there never has been any Soviet power, but then, neither was there any Republic in Russia before February 28th. Have we therefore committed an error?

We have tested the authority of the coalition and it is obvious, that, however doubtful the capacity of a uniform authority may still appear, we are at any rate convinced that the authority of the coalition is incapable.

Comrade Brojdo tells you that the entire democracy is assembled at Moscow. Was it really entire? There were no Bolsheviki in the Moscow State Conference. That was why the 600,000 Moscow workers struck, protesting against such a conference, and the delegates had to go on foot from the station to the great theatre. (Laughter.) Who is nearer and dearer to us, the delegates or the Moscow workers?

We prefer to unite with the workers.

Zeretelli meanwhile has preferred to unite with the members of the co-operatives, with the Semstvos, and the like. He left the proletarian Soviet, and by way of the Central Executive Committee he went still further to the Right and can now join hands with Bublikov.

That is the line chosen by Zeretelli, from the proletariat to the liberal bourgeoisie. It isolates him completely from the ranks from which he emanated.

Only a party which faces questions with determination can weld together the entire revolutionary democracy. We are not afraid of isolating ourselves from the highest strata; we are only afraid to isolate ourselves from the proletariat.

We repudiate any compromise. It is only thus that we shall vanquish all foes and establish freedom and concord among our people. (Prolonged applause.)

Mistakes Made by Our Party.

By N. Lenin.

The more we reflect on the significance of the so-called "Democratic Conference", the more attentively we consider it sideways — the saying goes that a clearer view is obtained from the side — the greater is our conviction that our party committed a mistake when it attended this conference. We ought to have boycotted it. Some will probably say: What is the good of raising this question now? What is past cannot be recovered. This objection to our tactics of yesterday would however be wrong. We have always rejected the tactics of "from one day to the next" and, being Marxists, we could not but reject them. We cannot be satisfied with calculations applying to the minute or the day. We should keep ourselves under permanent control, we should study the chain of political events as a whole, in its connection and in its results. By analysing the mistakes of yesterday we learn how to avoid the mistakes of to-day and to-morrow.

In our country the new revolution is growing up, the revolution of the other classes (as compared to those which effected the revolution against Tsarism). The latter was a revolution of the proletariat, the peasantry and the bourgeoisie in alliance with Anglo-French financial capital, against Tsarism.

The revolution which is now maturing is that of the proletariat and of the majority of the peasants, namely the poor peasants, against the bourgeoisie, against their ally, Anglo-French financial capital and against their system of government which is headed by Bonapartist Kerensky.

We shall not now enlarge upon facts nor waste time with proving that the new revolution is growing up, for, if we judge by the articles of our central organ "Rabochij Putj", the Party has already explained its views on this point. The growing up of the new revolution is a phenomenon which has apparently been generally recognised by the Party. An enumeration of the facts regarding this growth is of course still incomplete and will form the theme of other articles.

At the present moment it is more important to devote the greatest attention to the class difference between the former and the new revolution, the examination of our political situation and of our duties, further of the standpoint of this fundamental phenomenon, the relation between the classes. At the time of the first revolution, the vanguard was formed by the workers and soldiers, i. e. the proletariat and the leading strata of the peasantry. This vanguard not only carried with it many of the worst, the vacillating elements of the petty bourgeoisie (we should like to recall the vacillations of the Mensheviki and Trudoviki in regard to the republic), but also the monarchist party of the Cadets, the Liberal bourgeoisie and transformed it into a republican bourgeoisie. How is it that a transformation of this kind was possible? The reason is that economic supremacy means everything to the bourgeoisie, whereas the form of political rule is a secondary matter to them. The bourgeoisie can dominate in the republic, its rule in the republic is even firmer in that this political form does not disturb the bourgeoisie through changes in the government or in the grouping of the ruling parties.

Of course, the bourgeoisie is in favour of monarchy and will always be so, for the more relentless military protection of capital by the monarchist apparatus is more obvious and "nearer" to all capitalists and landed proprietors. Under strong pressure "from below" however, the bourgeoisie has always "come to an arrangement" with the republic, provided only that it could maintain its economic supremacy.

At the present moment the proletariat and the poor peasantry, i. e. the majority of the people stand in such a relation to the bourgeoisie and "allied" imperialism (more correctly: world imperialism) that they cannot "carry with them" the bourgeoisie. In addition to this, the leading members of the petty bourgeoisie and the wealthy strata of democratic petty bourgeoisie are openly against the new revolution. This fact is so obvious that it is unnecessary to dwell on it. Messrs. Liber, Dan, Zeretelli and Chernov show this with absolute clearness.

The relation between the classes has changed. This is an essential fact.

The classes in question, however, stand "on opposite sides of the barricade".

*) From the Diary of a Publicist 5. October.

This is the most important fact.

This and this **alone** is the scientific basis on which to discuss a new revolution which, speaking theoretically and putting the question in the abstract, could proceed in a legal form, for instance if the Constituent Assembly called by the bourgeoisie were to result in a majority against the bourgeoisie, a majority of the parties of the workers and poor peasants.

The objective relation between the classes, the economic and political part they play within the existing representative bodies and outside them; the development or decline of revolution, the relation between the means of fight outside Parliament and in Parliament — these are the chief factors, the objective factors which must be taken into consideration in order to arrive by deduction at the tactics of boycott or participation, not arbitrarily, not according to "sympathy", but in a Marxist way.

Experiences gained in our revolution show in a telling way how the question of boycott should be dealt with from the Marxist point of view.

Why was the boycott of the Bulygin Duma the right tactics?

For the reason that it was in keeping with the objective conditions of the general forces and their development. It provided the slogan of the growing revolution for the overthrow of the old established power which summoned a compromising body in order to divert the people from revolution. The said body (the Bulygin Duma) was a vile fraud and could not therefore open up to parliamentarism prospects of serious "solidification". The fighting means of the proletariat and the peasantry outside Parliament have proved to be superior in strength.

The correct tactics of the boycott of the Bulygin Duma which reckoned with the objective situation, resulted from these factors.

Why did the tactics of the boycott of the 3rd Duma prove to be wrong?

For the reason that they only relied on the "severity" of the slogan of the boycott and the antipathy to the rude reaction of the "Stable" of June 3rd. The objective situation on the other hand was such that revolution was constantly on the decline. The parliamentary opposition (even within the "Stable") might have been of great importance for its development, for at that time there were hardly any means of propaganda, agitation and organisation or none at all outside Parliament. On the other hand, the uncouth reaction of the 3rd National Duma did not prevent it from being an organ of actual class relations, i. e. of Stolypin's union between monarchy and bourgeoisie. The country had to overcome this new relation between the classes.

From these factors resulted the correct tactics which reckon with conditions as they actually are, the tactics of attending the 3rd Duma.

It suffices to reflect on the lessons offered by these experiences, on the conditions of the Marxist judgment of the question of boycott or participation in order to become convinced that the tactics of attending the "Democratic Conference", the "Democratic Soviet" or the preliminary Parliament have been a serious mistake.

On the one hand, the new revolution is growing. The struggle is growing more violent. The extra-parliamentary means of propaganda, agitation and organisation assume enormous dimensions. The "Parliamentary" platform in the present preliminary Parliament has but little significance. On the other hand, this preliminary Parliament does not give expression to any new grouping of the classes, nor is it of any use to them; the peasantry for instance is worse represented than in the existing bodies (the Soviets of the peasant deputies). By its whole nature, the preliminary Parliament is a Bonapartist fraud, not only in the sense that the composition of the Zeretelli and Bulygin Duma was patched up and forged by the filthy gang of Liber, Dan, Zeretelli and Chernov in common with Kerensky & Co., but also in a deeper sense, i. e. that the only significance of the preliminary Parliament is to deceive the masses, to delude the workers and peasants and distract them from the new, growing revolution, and to throw dust in the eyes of the suppressed classes. The old garb, which has been tried on, worn out and tattered by the coalition with the bourgeoisie, is replaced by a new one (i. e. the bourgeoisie is converting Messrs. Zeretelli & Co.

into clowns, who are to help to subjugate the people to imperialism and imperialist war).

We are weak at the present moment, said the Tsar to his feudal landowners in June 1907. — The wave of the workers' and peasant revolution is rising. Our power is shaken. We must deceive the grey masses.

We are weak at the present moment, says the present Tsar, the Bonapartist Kerensky to the Cadets, the non-party Smith and Jones, Plechanov, Breshkovskaia etc. Our power is shaken. The wave of the workers' and peasants' revolution against the bourgeoisie is rising. We must deceive democracy, we must dye with fresh colours the fester's dress worn by the S. R. and Mensheviks, the "leaders of revolutionary democracy", our dear friends Zeretelli and Chernov since May 6th 1917. It will not be difficult to take them in with the preliminary Parliament.

We are strong at the present moment, said the Tsar to his feudal landowners in June 1907. — The wave of the workers' and peasants' revolution is retiring. We cannot, however, maintain our power in the old manner, deceit is not enough. We need a new policy in the country, we need a new economic and political bloc with Gutchkov and Miljukov, with the bourgeoisie.

In order better to grasp the objective reasons for the boycott tactics, we must recall three situations: August 1905, September 1917 and June 1907. The suppressed classes have indeed always been deceived by the oppressors, but the significance of the fraud was different at different historical moments. Tactics cannot merely be founded on the fact that oppressors deceive the people; we must determine the tactics more exactly by analysing the class conditions and the development of the struggle in Parliament and outside Parliament as a whole.

The tactics of attending the preliminary Parliament are wrong, they are not in keeping with the objective class conditions, the objective conditions of the moment.

We ought to have boycotted the "Democratic Conference", we, all of us, made a mistake in failing to do so. We shall make good this mistake if only we have the firm will to side with the revolutionary fight of the masses, if only we reflect earnestly on the objective reasons for tactics.

We must boycott the preliminary Parliament. We must get into close touch with the Soviets of the workers', soldiers' and peasants' deputies, the trade union leagues, the masses in general. We must win them over to join in the fight. We must give them correct and clear slogans: smash Kerensky's Bonapartist gang with their patched up preliminary Parliament, with the Duma of Zeretelli and Bulygin. Even after the Kornilov affair the Mensheviks and S. R. s. refused to accept our compromise which was that they should in a peaceful way transfer the power into the hands of the Soviets (at that time we did not have the majority in the Soviets); they sunk back into the slough of their deceitful chaffering with the Cadets. Down with the Mensheviks and the S. R. s! For a relentless fight against them! They must be mercilessly driven out of all revolutionary organisations; no negotiations, no dealings with the friends of Kishkin, the friends of Kornilov's landowners and capitalists!

Chronicle of Events.

October 4.

The "Democratic Conference" decides to set up the "Democratic Soviet".

October 5.

The "Democratic Conference" declares itself in favour of "peace without annexations and indemnities".

October 6.

The Central Strike Committee of the railwaymen decides on a strike by 19 votes against 16. The general railway strike begins at midnight.

October 7.

Great Meeting of women garment workers under Bolshevik slogans.

The All-Russian Textile Workers' Conference discusses the wage question.

October 8.

Trotsky is elected President of the Petrograd Soviet. The Petrograd Trade Union Council states that the Petrograd district already numbers 50 unions with 450,000 members.

TEN YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

Development of Wages in the Soviet Union.*)

By L. F. W.

If we wish to ascertain what the Soviet power has hitherto achieved in the matter of wages, we must naturally in the first place consider as a basis of comparison the wage level of the last pre-war year, 1913, and that of the economic year 1923/24, the first year after the transition from partial payment in kind to an absolute money wage.

In the latter year, therefore, we find the wages of labour in the more important branches of production still on a fairly low level in comparison with pre-war times, though the lowest stage had already long been surpassed. The wage level of 1923/24 may be characterised by the following figures.

	Average Monthly Wage in Gold Roubles	Real Wage in Percent Prop. to 1913
Metal Industrie	37.99	52.0
Textile Industry	30.97	86.9
Mining	32.19	46.5
Chemical Industry	34.90	82.4
Leather Industry	50.58	97.3
Foodstuffs Industry	45.45	110.3
Paper Industry	34.99	99.2
Timber Industry	39.89	84.5
Average of Total Industry	35.19	67.1

In the year 1923/24 it was thus only in the foodstuffs industry that the pre-war wage level had been regained; in the other branches the wage level still fell far short of pre-war conditions. In the last economic year, 1926/27, however, the situation is altogether different.

	Average Monthly Wage in Gold Roubles	Real Wage in Percent Prop. in 1913
Metal Industry	67.13	82.5
Textile Industry	48.17	119.2
Mining	54.97	72.7
Chemical Industry	55.90	120.5
Leather Industry	69.03	120.8
Foodstuffs Industry	65.45	152.8
Paper Industry	50.54	125.8
Timber Industry	54.84	104.7
Average of Total Industry	57.40	99.0

Many great categories of workers are therefore already in receipt of 20 per cent. more wages than was the case in pre-war times, while the average of all industrial wages has also practically reached the pre-war level. It should be pointed out that the above figures refer to actual money wages; other advantages (such as social insurance, defrayed wholly by the Government or private employer, or various facilities in the payment of communal services, etc.) are likewise important factors in the material budget of the Soviet worker, representing a money value of more than one fifth of the total wage.

In examining the above table, we cannot but remark the low percentage, in comparison with pre-war times, of the wages paid to the miners and metal-workers, seeing that the workers of other categories have all far surpassed the pre-war level. If we consider the absolute figures, however, we shall see that this apparent inequality really represents a levelling-up of the great pre-war differences between the workers of individual industries. The 82.5 per cent. of the metal industry, e. g., actually represent 67.13 gold roubles, while the 152.8 per cent. of the foodstuff workers corresponds to a monthly wage of 65.45 gold roubles.

*) The numeric material has been derived mainly from the "Control Figures" of the State Planning Commission for 1926/27 and from such of the control figures for 1927/28 as have already been published in draft form.

The policy of the Soviet authorities has therefore already made considerable progress in standardising the average wages of the individual branches of industry. There is, however, another relation in which there are still pronounced differences, for there is still a considerable discrepancy between the wages of skilled and those of unskilled workers. The reason of this difference lies partly in the entire structure of Soviet economy (technical backwardness, etc.) and partly in the lack of highly qualified workers together with a relative abundance of unskilled labour.

In this connection the Soviet authority could not proceed to adopt any effective measures until the industrial and economic development of the Soviet Union had already reached a certain stage. It is only in the most recent times that it has been found possible to make a great step forward in the direction not only of the absolute but also of the relative improvement of the wages of unskilled workers and the badly-paid categories of workers in general. It is a fact that the latest wage-appreciation campaign paid special attention to the interests of the poorly paid categories of workers. Henceforth this levelling policy will be consistently pursued. In view of the constant advance in the standard of living for all workers, the policy in question consists not so much in a mechanical standardisation of the various wage levels, as in a more rapid rise of wages for such categories of labour as were hitherto poorly paid than for the qualified and better-paid classes. In illustration we may refer to the wage-appreciation plans envisaged for the economic year 1927/28, no less than 130 million roubles being provided in the control figures for the improvement of the wages of industrial workers. Apart from a general wage appreciation, 30 millions of the above sum have been earmarked exclusively for the improvement of the wages of the worst-paid categories of workers, representing about one third of the total of industrial workers. The average money wage level, moreover, is to advance next year by about 6.5 per cent., which with a successful continuation of the price-curtalement campaign will be tantamount to an actual wage increase of 11 or 12 per cent.

Every further increase in the actual wage level is intimately bound up with the increase in the productivity of labour, and that in both directions. All economic development of the proletarian State entails an improvement in the well-being of the working class. And it is only natural that in a proletarian economy the growth of the productivity of labour should represent the essential and only real source of higher wages. This intimate connection between the development of wages and the productivity of labour is the main symptom of that fundamental class difference which exists between the rationalisation of production in the Soviet Union and that in the capitalist countries.

Finally, a comparison between the present wages and those of pre-war times must also take the following point into consideration. Under capitalism, the new capital invested with a view to the increase of production represents part of the capitalist profit, which the capitalist chooses to employ not for his personal use but as a means of enhancing his profits by extending the possibility of output. In the proletarian State, on the other hand, the capital invested in the State industry is part of the wealth of the working class and the working population in general. That part of the profits of State industry which is used not for the immediate improvement of wages but for extending production, can therefore also be counted to the income of the proletariat, "saved", so to say, by the proletariat for its own future benefit. Seen from this standpoint, the fact that the money wages of the industrial labourer in the Soviet Union have surpassed their pre-war level acquires a materially greater significance.

The Criminal-Policy of the Soviet Union.

By Johannes Wertheim.

The Vienna-Berlin Publishing Concern for Literature and Politics will shortly be issuing under the above title, a pamphlet by N. Krylenko, Procurator General, covering, besides the organisation of penal law in Soviet Russia before and after 1922, the fundamental principles of the philosophy of penal law in the Soviet Union. We outline below the main ideas of this important criminal-political publication.

The entire bourgeois world is anxious to propagate the assertion that no "justice" whatever exists in the proletarian State of the Soviet Union, where allegedly only "illegality" and "arbitrary power" prevail. The tribunals of the Soviet Union are made out to be nothing better than servile tools in the hands of the Government. An enumeration of the fundamental principles by which the tribunals of the Soviet Union are guided will show how little truth there is in these assertions of the capitalist world.

January 1st, 1927, saw the introduction of the new penal code of the Soviet Union, representing an improvement on the penal laws that came into force in the year 1922. It is the authoritative code for the tribunals of the R. S. F. R. S., the largest portion of the Soviet Union. Already at the close of 1918, the first law was promulgated as to the organisation of the Soviet tribunals, but at that time the tribunals were proceeding without employing specially written laws. The State relied exclusively on the revolutionary conscience of the workers and peasants entrusted with the exercise of judicial duties. The history of the first five years of proletarian power showed that this confidence was fully justified.

The chief difference between the tribunals of the Soviet Union and those of the bourgeois States lies in the fact that in the Soviet Union only active workers can act as judges or justices, since according to the constitution of the Soviet Union they alone are in possession of political rights.

At the head of each of the people's tribunals there is a popular judge, elected for the period of one year by the Soviet of workers' and peasants' deputies. Assisted by two workers or peasants, a certain number of whom are chosen by the working population for each section of the tribunal, this judge decides all matters according to the laws and to his own conscience. Last year there were more than 500,000 workers and peasants acting as members of the tribunals to assist the popular judges.

It is the aim of penal legislation in the Soviet Union to protect the working inhabitants of the Socialist State and the legal institutions prevailing there against all acts (crimes) endangering society, by applying against the culprits such measures of social protection as are provided in the penal code of the Soviet Union. Bourgeois legislators speak of justice as an idea in itself and conceal the fact that their class tribunals defend their State and the "order" set up by the bourgeoisie, cruelly persecuting all those that venture to attack their bourgeois rule and their bourgeois system. The proletarian tribunal affords protection against acts or persons endangering society and threatening to harm the proletarian State. Nobody can be called to account in the Soviet Union for acts that do not endanger society. This second principle marks the main difference between penal legislation in the Soviet Union and that in all bourgeois States. In the capitalist State the existing order of the capitalistic system is protected, while in the Soviet Union any act injuring the social order is declared to be dangerous to the State.

Penal legislation in the Soviet Union has completely put an end to all that tended to obscure the idea of "justice", just as it has abandoned the idea of "punishment". Indeed, the Soviet Union does not regard it as its task to punish, its endeavour being merely to adopt "measures of social defence", by the aid of which the new State of workers is to be protected against such acts of native or foreign citizens as are dangerous to society. As such are considered: counter-revolutionary transgressions or crimes directed against the revolution and the State authority established thereby; crimes disturbing the established order of administration; offences against the law for the protection of property; official delinquencies, such as the violation of duty by a public official; economic transgressions directed against the economic structure of the Soviet Union; military offences; and transgressions against the person or health of a fellow-creature.

The measures of social defence aim in the first place at preventing the repetition of anti-social acts by a former culprit and, secondly, the committal of such acts by others. The culprit himself must be adapted to the conditions of social life in the workers' State, provided he is amenable to such improvement. This adaptation is effected by accustoming the person in question to work. The law of the Soviet Union, however, categorically forbids such persons to be subjected to physical suffering or to anything liable to impair their human dignity. There are therefore in the Soviet Union no prisons in which the term of punishment becomes a physical torment, as is the case in the capitalist States. The entire prison system of the Soviet Union is based on the principle of collective work on the part of the inmates, the criminal-policy of the Soviet Union endeavouring in as many cases as possible to give the sentence the form of compulsory labour without an actual loss of liberty. Sentence of death is passed only on the class enemies of the revolution, i. e. persons in whose case there is no hope of reform. It is merely an exceptional means for the protection of the State against such as threaten the foundation of Soviet power and the Soviet State.

The Soviet penal law recognises the following measures:

1. Measures of legal correction. 2. Measures of medical treatment. 3. Measures of a pedagogic nature. The tribunals are obliged to treat each individual case separately and to pay special attention to aggravating or extenuating circumstances. It is considered as an aggravating circumstance if a transgression is committed with a view to the re-establishment of bourgeois rule. On the other hand, it would be an extenuating circumstance if it were proved that a transgression was committed under pressure or by reason of an official or material dependence. The tribunals are empowered to pass a conditional sentence for a definite term.

While the capitalist law persecutes workers for strikes directed against their employers and also proceeds against the trade unions, the Soviet penal law contains an enactment to the effect that any infringement of the laws regulating labour, or of the laws on labour protection and social insurance by the employers, will be followed by prosecution. Similarly, an infringement by the employers of the collective contracts entered into with the trade unions or an interference with the legal activity of the factory councils is considered and treated as a crime. The penal law of the Soviet Union, moreover, may declare any act to be counter-revolutionary if it is directed against any other workers' State, even if the State in question does not belong to Soviet Union.

Thus the legislation of the Soviet Union is based on the interests of the workers of the entire world.