

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 63

10<sup>th</sup> November 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, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX.  
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

## CONTENTS

To All Proletarians, to All Suppressed Peoples of the World!  
(Appeal of the E. C. C. I. on the X. Anniversary of the October Revolution.)

Lenin: To the Fallen in the October Revolution!

Stalin: On the International Character of the October Revolution.

### Politics.

Willi Schlamm: The Declaration of Bankruptcy of Hungarian Working Class.

R. Page Arnot: Local Elections in Great Britain.

A. I.: The Dread of the French Bourgeoisie of Fresh Elections.

Arvid Hansen: After the Elections in Norway.

### The Trial of Szanto and Comrades.

The Trial of Zoltan Szanto and Comrades.

### The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

André Marty: The Revolt of the French Black Sea Fleet.

Eugen Landler: The Russian Revolution and the Austro-Marxism.

J. B.: The October Revolution and the Near East.

### Ten Years Ago.

The Victory of the Proletarian Revolution.

The First Speech of Lenin after the Revolution.

The Day after the Victory.

S. Piontkovskiy: The S.R.'s in the October Day.

### Ten Years of Soviet Power.

N. J. Bukharin: Ten Years of Victorious Proletarian Revolution. (Conclusion.)

Sch. Eliava: Development of Socialism in the Georgian Soviet Republic.

P. F.: The Achievements of the Peasants in the Soviet Union.

A. Vishinsky: The Soviet Court.

## To All Proletarians, to All Suppressed Peoples of the World!

### Appeal of the E. C. C. I. on the X. Anniversary of the October Revolution

Moscow, 3rd November 1927.

Ten years ago the Russian proletariat, in close alliance with the many millions of peasantry oppressed by the landowners and by Tsarism, and supported by the army which had shed its blood in streams in the imperialist war, raised the banner of revolt against the factory owners, bankers and landowners over a sixth part of the world's surface.

When the imperialist war had reached its most intense point, the Russian proletariat overthrew the power of the exploiters with heroic élan. It turned its weapons against its own exploiters and called upon the workers and peasants who were wading in blood in the trenches to fraternise. The lost cause of the Paris Commune found a worthy successor in the Russian proletariat which continued its unfinished work.

In October 1917 the Russian proletariat, under the leadership of its Bolshevist Party, showed how imperialist wars can be ended by revolutionary means. By its revolutionary action, unparalleled in history, the Russian proletariat gave back to the millions of slaves their belief in the possibility of victorious insurrection, a belief that has been shaken by the bloody de-

feats of the proletariat in 1848 and in 1871. Thrones toppled and the crowns of Germany and Austria-Hungary rolled in the dust. The era of proletarian revolution and colonial insurrection began.

By its victory the Russian proletariat destroyed the treacherous legend of the international social democracy that a revolution on the part of a proletariat in a country surrounded by imperialist neighbours was doomed to defeat. The Party of the Bolsheviks, under its leader Lenin, opposed the social democratic policy of passivity and procrastination with a living act of revolutionary initiative.

Under the greatest difficulties, in a struggle against innumerable internal and external enemies, the Russian proletariat has defended the achievements of the revolution with its heart's blood, at a time when the revolution was treacherously abandoned by the whole "International" social democracy. Bare-footed, half-naked and hungry, decimated by epidemics and with a destroyed system of transport and a paralysed industry in their rear, the Russian workers and peasants in the ranks of the Red Army crushed the Vendée both internally and internationally. In the snowy wastes of Siberia, in the Steppes of the

Don, at the foot of the Crimean mountains and on the narrow peninsula of Perikop the victorious regiments of the Red army defeated and destroyed the bands of Koltchak, Denikin and Wrangel. The workers and peasants of the Soviet Union have suffered and survived much — the British expeditionary forces in the Murmansk district, the Czechoslovakians in Siberia, the French naval detachments in the Black Sea and the raid of the White Poles in 1920.

In the whole history of the world and in the class struggle of the proletariat it is difficult to find such heroism and self-sacrifice as that displayed by the Russian workers and peasants during the period of the civil war. Despite all the efforts of the capitalist world, despite all the assurances of the Mensheviks who prophesied the destruction of the proletarian dictatorship and sought to intimidate the international proletariat with the spectre of the counter-revolution and reaction which was to follow this destruction, the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union have defended and maintained this dictatorship against a whole world of bourgeois foes.

The period of civil war in Russia has given the whole world proletariat an example of how the struggle for the maintenance of the proletarian dictatorship must be fought under the most difficult circumstances of isolation, when the immediate victory of the working class in other countries cannot be expected.

But this same period has also shown that there is not and never can be an absolute isolation of the revolutionary proletariat. For the proletarian revolution in Russia has stirred up vast masses of the proletariat in other countries, and this fact assisted considerably in throwing off the chains of the Brest-Litovsk peace and prevented the interventionist powers from throttling the republic of labour. On the basis of the experiences of the Russian proletariat, the workers of Europe have been able to see the whole emptiness of the anarchist theories that the State power must be abolished after the victory of the proletariat. Only because the proletariat of Russia built up its own iron dictatorship after the defeat and the destruction of the old power and apparatus of the bourgeois State, in order to crush all the resistance on the part of the exploiters, only because the Russian proletariat created its own proletarian organs to exercise the revolutionary power, was the proletariat able to emerge as the victor from this most severe collision between the old world and the new.

But with this victory the tremendous exertion of the revolutionary will of the proletariat was not at an end. The old Tsarist power, the imperialist war and the civil war left the proletariat with a heritage of ruins. The salvation of the wasted country from hunger, cold and misery could only be carried out by the work of socialist construction. The Party of the proletarian dictatorship, under the leadership of Lenin, found the solution to the problem by clever manoeuvring. The New Economic Policy introduced by Lenin was not merely a retreat to a certain extent, it was also a means of marching forward anew by a more roundabout way to the victory of socialism.

Despite the technically backward basis of the Russian economic system, despite the tremendous rôle which poorly developed peasant agriculture played and still plays in the economic system of the country, the workers of the Soviet Union have shown during the last ten years that they are capable of building up socialism victoriously, that they are capable of winning just such tremendous victories upon the economic field as they had previously won in the civil war.

The Soviet Union has arisen from the destruction, chaos and waste of the war and the post-war period more quickly than the capitalist world. The economic system of the Soviet Union has already reached its pre-war level. After bringing the period of reconstruction to a successful end, the proletariat of the Soviet Union began to carry out the building up of socialism upon the basis of the industrialisation of the country.

New factories are springing out of the ground, technique is improving rapidly and even in the villages a wave of economic prosperity is making itself felt. Step by step private capitalism is being pressed out of its positions in industry and commerce by the socialist elements of the national economic system. The situation of the working class is slowly and steadily improving. Whilst the capitalists in the other countries are abolishing the eight-hour day, the Soviet Union proclaims its firm will to introduce the seven-hour day. The power stations on the Volchov and on the Svir, the building of the electrical power

station on the Dnieper, the building of the Semirechensk railway and many other examples, are all living milestones to the advancing creative work of the working class of the Soviet Union. In the economically backward republics of the Russian border districts which in the past were exploited by Tsarism as colonies for Russian industry, there are now independently working electrical power stations as in Avchalsk near Tiflis, and independently working textile factories like those in Bukhara etc. All these things are the tangible results of the socialist constructive work being carried on in the Soviet Union.

Before the eyes of the whole world proletariat, despite the slanders of the bourgeoisie and their social democratic lackeys of all shades, the Soviet Union, the country of socialist constructive work, is growing and acting as the gigantic lever of the world revolution. Millions of illiterate people in Russia were drawn into the great work of political and economic reconstruction ten years ago. The Soviets became the great schools of a new and ever-growing workers democracy. Ten years of proletarian dictatorship have shown that it is the most inclusive and complete form of workers democracy, a form that has never been seen and never will be seen in a capitalist country. The workers are people's commissars, leaders of the Red Army, directors of industry, controllers of the State apparatus. What other country can boast of such democracy? The proletariat of the Soviet Union has shown the workers and peasants, the oppressed colonial countries, the whole world that the workers can not only do without their capitalist masters, but that without them they can become the builders of a new and higher culture.

In the schools of the Soviet Union, which are filled with the children of workers and peasants, a new generation is growing up. It is being educated in the ideas of working class solidarity, respect for creative work, hatred against exploitation, rejection of the church and hatred against imperialist war. It is being educated to a deep and all-embracing devotion to the cause of socialism. The whole Soviet Union of the toilers, from the great towns and the immense factories down to the huts of the poorest peasants, is concentrating upon abolishing the heritage of illiteracy, upon overcoming the cultural backwardness which before the revolution held the whole country in its grip. The whole country is shaking with the urge to create, materially and mentally. It is as though some great current were sweeping across the vast areas of Russia, shaking the masses from their torpor and giving them creative energy. The old incentive of individual gain which was the mainstay of the capitalist system is dying, in its place is rising a powerful and ever-strengthening urge to create a socialist social order.

The great experience of the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union will embed itself deeply in the consciousness of the international working class. And when the power of capital is everywhere overthrown it will assist them to make their way along pioneer paths built by the proletariat of the Soviet Union under such tremendous difficulties, built with the muscles of its myriad arms and the life blood of its myriad hearts. The greatest lesson for the international working class however, is the glorious Leninist party of the Bolsheviks, the iron cohorts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party which led the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union to victory in the civil war and to success in the struggle for economic reconstruction. It stood by at the cradle of the Communist International in 1919, it placed its great experiences and its revolutionary traditions at the disposal of the revolutionary struggle of the international working class. All sections of the Comintern to-day are following in its ideological footsteps. Without the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its rich experience, the way of the world proletariat to victory would be more difficult and more tortuous.

Before the great bar of the international working class there stand at the moment, the living example of a decade of proletarian dictatorship and a decade of bourgeois efforts to stabilise capitalism.

When you, the workers of the imperialist countries, were forced into the trenches by the ruling class, when dirt and vermin festered your bloody wounds, when you hung entangled in the barbed wire, when you writhed with the poisonous gas in your lungs, you were told that the war was a war to end all war, and that upon its conclusion a reign of peace and justice would follow. You workers, you can now see that your pains and your sacrifices were useless. Never in history has humanity

stood nearer to more terrible wars than it stands to-day. The capitalist world is feverishly preparing for war. The military budgets are being increased, the armies are being mechanised and the destructive capacities of military technique have increased tremendously. The first rumblings and the first sparks of new wars are already with us.

Most threatening of all is the danger of a new counter-revolutionary war of the imperialist powers against the Soviet Union. The sword of the capitalist world is trembling in the scabbard to be drawn against the country where the proletariat has been victorious, where the workers are building up a new social system. Capitalism wishes to crush the strongest bulwark of the world revolution. Its very existence ties the hands of capitalism, for the existence of a proletarian State fills the international class struggle of the proletariat with new vigour. The spectre of world Bolshevism and the fear of the proletarian revolution are the reins which have held back the capitalist rulers of all countries from new world wars. To destroy this factor hostile to imperialist wars would mean to unleash all the elementary and destructive forces of capitalism.

The existence of the Soviet Union means that a firm stabilisation of capitalism is no longer possible. In no single country are the workers prepared to permit themselves to be led by the nose as the interests of capitalism demand. The existence of the Soviet Union affects the relation of forces between labour and capital upon an international scale to the advantage of the former. The great October Revolution in its living embodiment, the Soviet Union, is on the watch to assist the struggle of the international proletariat against its oppressors. It is the most powerful instrument for the emancipation of the workers from the yoke of capitalism that history ever put into the hands of an exploited and oppressed class.

The struggle of the classes in all countries, even in the most remote corners of the world, is insolubly connected with the fate of the Soviet Union. Was not the revolution in China connected with the fate of the first proletarian State in the world? World imperialism angrily attacked the Soviet Union after it had been successful, with the assistance of the Chinese bourgeoisie and with the aid of military intervention, in dealing a blow at the toiling masses. Those battleships which the imperialist robbers under the leadership of Great Britain sent against China, were also sent against the Soviet Union.

The raid upon the representation of the Soviet Union in China was connected by the threads of the counter-revolutionary conspiracy against the Soviet Union across Peking to London to the raid upon Arcos. The hand of the white guardist who killed Voikov was guided by the wirepullers of the murder in London. The campaign for the breaking off of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and France was and still is one of the links in the chain of the war which is being prepared against the Soviet Union.

If the capitalist world should succeed in its efforts to destroy this bulwark of the international proletariat in the struggle for its emancipation, if it should succeed in crushing this stronghold of the proletariat in its struggle against the offensive of capitalism, then humanity would be the witness of the most terrible reaction in history, a reaction not even to be compared with the bloody massacres committed upon insurrectionary workers in the past. For this reason the workers of the world, the oppressed and exploited of all countries must offer their own bodies as a barrier for the defence of the Soviet Union in the threatening hour when war approaches. They must stand together like a living wall for the defence of the Chinese working masses. They must remember that the defence of the Chinese revolution and of the Soviet Union is at the same time self-preservation for the workers against the offensive of capitalism. The defeat of the British miners was only the result of the attack of British imperialism upon revolutionary China. These two events served as the signal for the mobilisation of the reaction.

In the whole capitalist world the offensive of capital against the working class is going on. Where are the gains won by the workers after the imperialist war? The eight-hour day is being gradually abolished. In the overwhelming majority of the capitalist countries there has been a deterioration of the material position of the working class as compared with before the war. The attacks of the capitalists on the wages and conditions of the workers are becoming ever more brutal. A new strike wave is rolling up and the workers will have to fight with

great obstinacy for their daily bread and for every jug of milk for their children.

The working class is being robbed of those rights which it won for itself in decades of persistent struggle. In Great Britain a new law against the trades unions has been passed. In Italy all the unions with the exception of the fascist unions have been liquidated. In all countries fascism has raised its head. All capitalist countries are gradually adopting the system of mercenary armies to serve as reliable reserves for the bourgeoisie in striking down the proletariat. The rationalisation of production carried out by the bourgeoisie at the expense of the proletariat increases the rate of exploitation in the factories and at the same time throws hundreds of thousands of workers out of the process of production onto the unemployed market. Mass unemployment has become a permanent phenomenon.

The reaction is raging everywhere. White terror in Poland and in the Balkans etc., hard labour for revolutionary workers in France; every day the list of those flung into prison is growing. The army of those workers who have been killed or buried alive, with or without "trial" in capitalist "democracies" is rapidly growing. And the social democracy in all countries still calls upon the workers to support this democracy. For ten years since the war the social democracy has never tired of pointing out that the way of the proletarian dictatorship entails bloody sacrifices and deprivations and it has always put forward the way of bourgeois democracy as the method of the workers struggle for power.

The results of this policy are now before us. Firm as a rock stands the proletarian democracy in the Soviet Union. But is there one single country in the whole world where the proletariat has conquered and maintained power by democratic means?

In the revolutionary storm years of 1918 and 1919 the working masses in a whole series of countries forced power into the hands of the social democracy. Capitalism tottered to its fall. The masses were armed, they were dissatisfied with the existing state of things, their demands rose with every hour. An objective revolutionary situation existed for the seizure of power. In Germany and Austria-Hungary the social democracy held the majority in the councils. The bourgeoisie, to save itself from the indignation of the toiling masses, hid itself behind the back of the social democracy, and in the countries of Central Europe it abdicated power to the latter. In Germany, Austria and Poland "socialist" governments were formed.

Where are these governments? What are they doing? Have they not assisted the bourgeoisie to reconstruct its reactionary class power? What did the "labour government" of Great Britain give to the British workers? What price has the Italian proletariat been forced to pay for the treachery of the social democracy which refused to take over power in the days of 1920 when the State power lay in the streets?

#### Proletarians of Europe!

Consider these severe lessons of your defeats. Compare them with the history of the October Revolution in Russia which trod the path of the proletarian dictatorship. May the great lessons of October serve as an example for the revolutionary mobilisation of the working masses, for the fighting workers all over the world!

Strengthen your organisations, support yourselves upon the strong proletarian power in the Soviet Union! Strengthen the ranks of the Communist Parties in masses! Mobilise your forces for victorious revolutionary struggles! Smash the imperialist front, remember that behind you there is a staunch ally organised as a State, an ally that the Russian workers did not have when they overthrew the power of tsardom in 1917!

#### Social democratic workers!

Condemn the treachery of your social democratic leaders, raise your voices in protest against the slanderous attacks of your leaders upon the Soviet Union! Leave the ranks of the Party which has betrayed the interests of the workers and which is still betraying them! Stretch your hand to the workers of the Soviet Union who will grasp it in fraternal solidarity!

#### Workers of all capitalist countries!

Defend yourselves against the offensive of capitalism! Rise for a revolutionary struggle against your class enemies! In this way you can best defend the Soviet bulwark of the international proletariat.

Poor peasants! The tenth anniversary of the October revolution has refuted the social democratic slander according to which the peasantry can only play a reactionary role in the

revolution. The tenth anniversary shows that the proletariat together with the most influential sections of the peasantry can overthrow capitalism, and after its fall use their alliance for setting up a new and socialist order of society. The victory of the proletariat is your only guarantee against slavery and misery. Only an alliance with the proletariat can save you from being plundered by the capitalists and bankers. Learn from the lessons of the victorious October revolution and consolidate your fraternal alliance with the workers!

#### **Oppressed peoples of the colonial countries!**

The October Revolution and its tenth anniversary have solved the question of nationalities practically upon the basis of complete equality and fraternity amongst the peoples inhabiting the Soviet Union! The Soviet Union to-day is the picture of the future socialist state of the whole world in which there is no place either for economic or national exploitation. Think of it and remember that the October Revolution was, is and always will be the revolution of all the toilers, all the oppressed and all the exploited. Its tenth anniversary is the greatest victory

over world imperialism! Rise in fraternal unity with the workers of the capitalist countries against your exploiters! Break the chains and bonds in which world imperialism has cast you!

**Workers and peasants of revolutionary China!** Hold more firmly the banner of your insurrection against the imperialist robbers! Utilise the experience of the Russian revolution to organise armed defence against the counter-revolutionary forces in league with world imperialism, the forces of the Chinese bourgeoisie! Strengthen your revolutionary peasant organisations! Form everywhere strong illegal organisations of the Communist Party and the victory is yours!

**May the alliance of the toilers and the oppressed of the whole world under the leadership of the proletariat and its advance guard, the Communist International, grow and strengthen!**

**Long live the Great October Revolution!**

**Down with the instigators of Imperialist War against the Soviet Union!**

**Long live the insurrection of the workers of the whole world!**

## **To the Fallen in the October Revolution.**

### **Lenin's Speech on the First Anniversary of the October Revolution.**

Comrades! We unveil a memorial to the champions of the October Revolution of the year 1917. The best of the working masses gave up their lives when they commenced the revolt for the emancipation of the peoples from imperialism, for the cessation of the war between the peoples, for the overthrow of the rule of capital and for Socialism.

Comrades! The history of Russia in a whole number of decades in recent times shows us a long road of suffering for the revolutionaries. Thousands and thousands have perished in the fight against Tsarism. Their death has awakened new fighters, has aroused ever broader masses to the fight.

To the comrades who fell in the October days of last year was granted the great good fortune of victory. The greatest honour to which the revolutionary leaders of humanity aspired has fallen to them: This honour lies in the fact that over the bodies of the brave comrades who have fallen in the fight, equally fearless fighters have strode forwards, who by this heroism have assured victory to the masses.

The indignation of the workers is now boiling and seething in every country. In a whole number of countries the socialist workers' revolution is rising. Filled with rage and terror, the capitalists of the whole world are hastening to unite in order to suppress the insurrection. And the Socialist Soviet

Republic of Russia fills them with special hate. There is being prepared against us a campaign of the united capitalists of all countries, we are threatened with new battles, fresh sacrifices await us.

Comrades! We will honour the memory of the October fighters by swearing before this memorial to follow their example, to emulate their fearlessness, their heroism. May their slogan become our slogan, the slogan of the workers of all countries who entered on revolt! this slogan is: **Victory or Death!**

And with this slogan the champions of the International Socialist Revolution of the Proletariat will be unvanquishable.

## **On the International Character of the October Revolution.**

By J. Stalin.

The following article by Comrade Stalin has been received by telegraph, and certain passages have been incompletely transmitted. Ed.

The October Revolution is not only a revolution within "national limits". It is above all a revolution bearing an international stamp, a world revolution, for it means a fundamental change in the whole history of mankind, from the old capitalist world to the new socialist world.

The October Revolution differs in principle from all revolutions of the past. The aim which it sets itself is not the replacement of one form of exploitation by another, of one group of exploiters by another, but the abolition of all exploitation of man by man, the annihilation of all and every group of exploiters, the setting up of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the setting up of the power of the revolutionary class among all subjected classes which have arisen up to now, and organisation of a new, classless socialist society.

Precisely for this reason the victory of the October Revolution means a fundamental change in the history of humanity.

That is the reason why the October Revolution is a revolution bearing an international character, a world revolution.

Therein lies also the reason for the profound sympathy the subjugated classes of all peoples cherish for the October Revolution, in which they see the guarantee of their liberation.

A whole number of fundamental questions can be pointed out, upon the line of which the effect of the October Revolution upon the development of the revolutionary movement of the whole world proceeds:

1. The October Revolution is characterised in the first place by the fact that it broke through the front of world imperialism, overthrew the imperialist bourgeoisie in one of the biggest capitalist countries, and placed power in the hands of the socialist proletariat.

The class of the wage slaves, the class of the down-trodden, the class of the oppressed and exploited has for the first time in the history of humanity risen to be the ruling class, and by its example inspired the proletariat of all countries.

That means that the October Revolution opened a new epoch, an epoch of the proletarian revolutions in the imperialist countries. It has deprived the landowners and the capitalists of the means and instruments of production and converted them into social property, and by this means opposes social pro-

erty against bourgeois property. It has thereby exposed the lie of the capitalists regarding the inviolability, the sacredness and the permanency of bourgeois property.

It has wrested power from the bourgeoisie, deprived it of political rights, shattered the bourgeois State apparatus and handed over power to the Soviets, thereby opposing bourgeois Parliamentarism, as the capitalist democracy, with the socialist Soviet power, as the proletarian democracy. Lafargue was right when he said already in 1887, that on the day following the revolution "all former capitalists will lose the right to vote". The October Revolution thereby exposed the lie of the social democrats that a peaceful transition to socialism by bourgeois parliamentarism is possible.

But the October Revolution has not stopped short at this. It could not stop short at this. After shattering the old bourgeois order, it proceeded to build up the new socialist order. Ten years of the October Revolution are ten years of building up the Party, the trade unions, the Soviets, the co-operatives, the cultural organisations, transport and communications, industry and the Red Army.

The indubitable successes of the socialism of the Soviet Union on the field of construction have palpably shown that the proletariat can successfully rule a country without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie; can successfully conduct the whole national economy without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie; and that it can successfully build up socialism in spite of the capitalist environment. The old "theory" that the exploited cannot do without the exploiters, has now become the cardinal point of the political "philosophy" of the social democracy in general and of the social democratic policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie in particular. This "theory", which has assumed the character of a prejudice, constitutes to-day one of the most serious obstacles in the way of the revolutionary proletariat in the capitalist countries. One of the most important results of the October Revolution is the fact that it gave a deadly blow to this fallacious "theory".

Such generally known facts as the steady growth of communism in the capitalist countries, the increasing sympathy of the proletarians of all countries for the working class in the Soviet Union, and finally the flocking of workers' delegations to the land of the Soviets demonstrate beyond dispute that the seed scattered by the October Revolution is already beginning to bear fruit.

2. The October Revolution has shaken imperialism not only in the centres of its rule, in the "mother countries". It has also delivered its blow against the outworks of imperialism, as well as against its border districts, and undermined the rule of imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries.

The October Revolution, by overthrowing the landowners and capitalists, has broken the chain of national and colonial suppression and, without exception, liberated from this yoke all the subjugated peoples of this gigantic State. The proletariat cannot emancipate itself without emancipating the subjugated peoples. The October Revolution has accomplished these national and colonial revolutions in the Soviet Union not under the banner of national hostility and of collisions between the nationalities, but under the banner of mutual confidence and of fraternal rapprochement of the workers and peasants of the nationalities, not in the name of nationalism but in the name of internationalism.

Precisely for this reason the pariah peoples, the slave peoples have, for the first time in the history of humanity, risen to the level of peoples who are really free and really equal, and who have by their example infected the suppressed peoples of the whole world.

That means that the October Revolution has opened a new epoch, an epoch of colonial revolutions which will be carried out by the suppressed peoples of the world in alliance with and under the leadership of the proletariat.

One of the most important results of the October Revolution is the fact that it has shown by deeds that the emancipated non-European peoples who have been drawn into the process of Soviet development, are capable of producing real advanced culture and real advanced civilisation which is in no way behind European culture and civilisation. The October Revolution has shown by deeds the possibility and practicability of the proletarian international method of liberating the subjugated peoples as the only correct method; it has shown by deeds the possibility and utility of the brotherly alliance of the workers and peasants

of the most varied peoples on the basis of free choice and internationalism.

The era of exploitation and subjugation of the colonial and dependent countries without revolt and resistance on their part is past.

There has commenced the era of emancipatory revolutions in the colonial and dependent countries, the era of the awakening of the proletariat of these countries, the era of its hegemony in the revolution.

3. The October Revolution, by shaking imperialism, has at the same time created in the first proletarian dictatorship a powerful, open centre of the international revolutionary movement, which the latter had never formerly possessed and around which it can now crystallise by organising the revolutionary united front of the proletariat and of the suppressed peoples of all countries against imperialism.

That means above all that the October Revolution has dealt world capitalism a deadly wound from which it will never recover. Just for this reason capitalism will never again win back that "balance", that "stabilisation" which it had before October.

That means that the October Revolution has also raised the fighting spirit of the suppressed peoples of the whole world to a certain height and compelled the ruling classes to reckon with them as a new and serious factor. If formerly there was no international open forum before which the hopes and aspirations of the suppressed classes could be demonstrated and formulated, there exists today such a forum in the first proletarian dictatorship. The destruction of this forum would for a long time darken the social and political life of the "advanced" countries with the cloud of unrestrained black reaction. Even the simple fact of the existence of the "Bolshevik State" curbs the black forces of reaction and facilitates the suppressed to fight for freedom.

This is the reason also for that fierce hatred which the exploiters of all countries cherish against the Bolsheviks. Just as at one time Paris was the place of refuge and school for the revolutionary representatives of the rising bourgeoisie, so today Moscow is the refuge and the school for the revolutionary representatives of the rising proletariat. Hatred against the Jacobins did not save feudalism from disaster. There cannot be the least doubt that hatred against the Bolsheviks will not save capitalism from its inevitable ruin.

The era of stability of capitalism is past, and there has gone with it the legend of the imperishableness of the bourgeois social order.

The era of the catastrophe of capitalism has dawned.

4. The October Revolution is not only a revolution in the sphere of economic, social and political relations, it is at the same time a revolution of the mind, a revolution of the ideology of the working class. The October Revolution was born and strengthened under the banner of Marxism, under the banner of the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the banner of Leninism, which is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution. It means, therefore, the victory of Marxism over reformism, the victory of Leninism over social democracy.

Formerly, before the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the social democrats were still able to parade under the banner of Marxism, without openly denying the dictatorship of the proletariat, without however doing the least thing to bring this idea nearer to realisation. For such an attitude on the part of social democracy did not mean any threat to capitalism.

Today, after the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, after everybody has seen with his own eyes whither Marxism leads and what its victory may mean, the social democracy can no longer flirt with the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat without creating a certain danger to capitalism. After it had long broken with the spirit of Marxism, it saw itself compelled to break also with the banner of Marxism and has openly and indisputably proceeded against the offspring of Marxism, against the October Revolution, against the first dictatorship of the proletariat in the world.

Between social democracy and Marxism there lies today an abyss. From now on the only bearer and stronghold of Marxism is Leninism, Communism.

The October Revolution has separated social democracy from Marxism and driven it into the camp of the immediate de-

enders of capitalism against the first proletarian dictatorship in the world. When the social democratic leaders abuse the "Soviet regime" and laud Parliamentary "democracy", they thereby wish to say that they are fighting and will fight for the re-establishment of capitalist conditions in the Soviet Union, for the maintenance of capitalist slavery in the "civilised" States. Present-day social democracy is an ideological support of capitalism. Lenin was indisputably right when he said that the present social democratic politicians "will, in the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, inevitably side with the Versailles against the Communards".

One cannot put an end to capitalism without putting an end to social democracy within the labour movement. Consequently, the era of the death of capitalism is at the same time the era of the death of social democracy in the labour movement.

The era of the rule of the Second International and of social democracy in the labour movement is at an end.

There has commenced the era of the rule of Leninism and the rule of the Third International.

## POLITICS

### The Declaration of the Bankruptcy of Austro-Marxism.

The Party Conference of the Austrian Social Democracy.

By Willi Schlämm (Vienna).

The Party Conference of Austrian Social Democracy represents an important turning point in the history of Austro-Marxism and — as the majority of the Austrian working class is under the lead of the S. D. party of Austria — at the same time of the Austrian proletariat.

This party conference was a veering round towards the Right, visible from afar, on the part of the "Leftest Social Democracy in the world", a veering to the Right which had to result necessarily in consequence of the unrelenting aggravation of class contradictions. As a matter of course, the Party Conference was completely under the spell of the great events on July 15th, not merely for the reason that the late of that rising placed before the proletariat — in a brutal way and quite deferentially than did the Linz programme — the question of the fight for power. To this must be added that the bourgeoisie in our country has become strong enough to dispense with the help of slow-working compromise in order to effect their policy; no longer do they need the "Left" phrases of their faithful Social Democracy, which rendered them priceless service at the time of the crisis of the system of bourgeois rule. The exacerbation of class contradictions and the development of the Austrian counter-revolution make it impossible for the S. D. P. of Austria to continue its sham radical policy of manoeuvring.

Not only is the bankruptcy of Austro-Marxism an open fact, it has even been admitted by its lords and masters. The S. D. P. of Austria is faced by the bitter disillusionment of an either-or, and is naturally choosing an open alliance with the bourgeoisie. This is the actual meaning of the last Party Conference of the S. D. P. of Austria!

The great sensation was the open advance of Renner's obviously Right group, and an even greater sensation was the victory of the latter at the Party Conference. Over night, Karl Renner, that apparently settled honest opportunist, has once more become the central figure of Austrian Social Democracy, even though Otto Bauer, for reasons which it is easy to understand, is still permitted to represent the party outwardly for a certain time. Renner carried off the victory over Otto Bauer, because the development of the S. D. P. in Austria demanded that the openly Right tendency be victorious over the "Left" phrase.

Immediately after the 15th of July, a deep-reaching crisis in the S. D. P. of Austria became evident. The party leaders were attacked on two sides; on the Left there was a vast Labour Opposition which however is only able very gradually to gain influence on that party which is organised to an almost unexampled degree and which therefore can, for the time being, only bring its influence to bear in the lowest units of the party and in the peripheral organisations. On the Right, there was a determined Opposition directed by experienced leading

elements, demanding that the social democratic policy should finally be cleared up by forming a coalition, an open alliance with the bourgeoisie. This Opposition, headed by Renner, openly declared in its official communications that it was entirely in agreement with the actual policy of the party leaders but that its phraseology still contained a lack of clearness and involved dangers which should be abolished.

Even before the Party Conference, expressions of opinion on the part of Renner were published in bourgeois papers to the effect that any ambiguity should finally be done away with and that the party should "unreservedly profess its adherence to Democracy, to the State and its being in favour of participation in the government". Quite shortly before the Party Conference a brochure by Dr. Oskar Trebitsch was issued by a bourgeois publishing firm, which was to be regarded as an authentic expression of the views of the Renner group; we quote from it:

"More audibly than ever, more zealously than ever we now (after July 15th) proclaim that we are in favour of the measures applied by Democracy, and implicitly with the policy of Democracy; we recommend coolheadedness and moderation . . . Democracy is not a method for conquering the power in the State, neither is it the best method for achieving this end, but it is the only possible method . . . Away with civil war; this is the slogan which should guide all our actions! . . . It seems to me, that, with regard to criticism from the Right, it is a matter of importance to emphasise the problematic nature of the defensive capacity . . . Let us at last calmly begin with isolating those among us who are incurable Radicals even at the risk of causing the Communist group of Austria to swell into a party. Unfortunately the Labour movement experienced this reduction of its forces throughout Europe, we have hitherto been the only exception. We may however conclude from the universality of this phenomenon that it is to a certain degree inevitable in the history of the human intellect. Let therefore take place in Austria what has taken place in all parts of Europe. . ."

A complete programme! Renner himself supplemented it in an essential point by proclaiming "the right of the working class to participate in the government" and by making the Coalition, which had up to then been described by the Austro-Marxists as a temporarily necessary evil, a cardinal political demand.

At first the party leaders represented the advance of the openly Right group as a private action of isolated functionaries. The Social Democratic "Evening" (Abend) announced on October 8th:

"Not a single member of Social Democracy, except perhaps Dr. Renner, still thinks of a coalition."

Then however, Otto Bauer tried with great cleverness to turn the advance to account for continuing his policy, by seizing hold of the longed-for opportunity to represent himself to the disillusioned masses of the workers once again, without any effort, as the "Left party leader".

"It is by no means my intention to decline any coalition for all times to come, I consider it extremely likely that we shall have to pass through such an intermediary stage in the transition from the sole rule of the bourgeoisie to the sole rule of the proletariat. . . It is, however, a hundred times better to proceed along a wrong path unitedly — mistakes may always be corrected later — than to divide ourselves for the sake of the right path."

This was the tenor of Bauer's speech; a deeply felt congruity with Renner's "right way", but with the fervent recommendation to mask it in order to avoid a split in the party. Note the remarkable point of view of the great "Marxist" that a wrong avenue may be followed without a split resulting from it!

Then Renner spoke. Not only did he develop the practical political programme sketched above, but also a complete revision of Marxism, and that with praiseworthy openness. He detached himself very decidedly from the combatants of July in Vienna as being "breakers of discipline who cannot justify themselves in the eyes of the whole of the Austrian proletariat".

We should like to quote the following passages from his exposition:

"We have seen that the working class has made a mistake (verbatim! W. S.), a mistake arising from lack of discipline. We must now re-examine our whole work of organisation. But there must be discipline above and below! . . ."

It should be spoken out clearly that a revolution is something impossible in Austria as far as we can see; this rhetoric pathos should therefore be abandoned. The former military and police State was exclusively an executive committee of the ruling class; this has however changed completely to-day. We have learned anew with regard to the State. In this respect it is to no purpose to refer to general quotations from Marx and Engels, collected here and there; the thing which matters is to understand what is new and peculiar. We still have to do (referring to Otto Bauer) with an old conception of socialism, which has been inspired with new life by Communism... Our duty is to train the workers to the positive revolutionary activity of administration in the State, the country, the provinces... It is childish to say: with 43.47 per cent or 49 per cent we are impotent and with exactly 51 per cent we are omnipotent... Coalition only shifts the class war from the ring of the street and of Parliament to the arena of the conference rooms of the ministry (!). Our class cannot be denied the right to participate in the power of the State; we should demand it as our due and not as a present from Seipel."

Such are the terms used by Bernstein and Hilferding at the Party Conference of "Left" Austro-Marxism! And yet — be it noted — Renner was backed by the majority, to the general astonishment; out of 24 speakers in the debate 13 declared themselves openly to be in favour of Renner, whilst Otto Bauer's most intimate friends, such as Friedrich Adler, Friedrich Austerlitz and Julius Deutsch were amongst his opponents. The overwhelming majority of the representatives of the organisation unmistakably took Karl Renner's side.

I should like to call special attention to the cynical remarks made by Karl Leuthner in the discussion which was more than a mere revision, remarks on "antiquated words from antiquated brochures" (by which he meant Marx' and Engels' teachings). In this connection it further deserves mention that Max Adler, on making an extremely timid attempt at holding high even to-day the old phrases of Austro-Marxism, was rebuked by the Party conference in a very strict manner.

To terminate the Party conference, a "uniting" formula was of course sought and found. It was not so very difficult to do so, as Bauer's group was essentially in agreement with Renner and only insisted on a masking formula which was readily agreed to by Renner who, on his part, wanted by no means to provoke a split in the party over night. Julius Deutsch announced this uniting formula even in the discussion when he declared that the quarrel about the coalition was unnecessary in view of the fact that there was no partner to join in the coalition. This correct recognition of the only difficulty of forming a coalition in Austria, i. e. Seipel's "strong hand", offered the Party conference the possibility of accepting Renner's point of view, without quite clearly and positively raising the demand for a coalition. The resolution which was passed unanimously therefore runs as follows:

"So long as the bourgeois parties think they can exclude Social Democracy of its adequate share in the power of the State, coalition is impossible... The Party conference calls on all those who wish to prevent civil war and to combat, in common with the working class, the system of government applied by the bourgeois Bloc.

America has once again been discovered; coalition is impossible unless the bourgeoisie wishes for it. Social Democracy however is not satisfied with this discovery but calls upon the "honest sections of the bourgeoisie which are against civil war" to join in the fight against the bourgeois Bloc, i. e. to create the parliamentary preliminary conditions for replacing the present government by a coalition.

The second culminating point of the resolution was the proclamation of the passivity of the proletariat with regard to the economic and political offensive of reaction:

No demonstration without a general decision! No strikes in undertakings of general importance without the consent of the whole of the trade union organisations (which is refused on principle. W. S.)!...

The Republican Defence Corps must exert all its efforts in order to prevent forcible collisions which Fascism wants as means of propaganda and as a pretext for its armament...

Only in a single case would the Social Democratic party resort to force, namely if reaction should try to overthrow the Democratic Republic... As early as in 1923 Social Democracy declared and has since then declared repeatedly that it was at any moment prepared to enter into serious negotiations with regard to disarmament."

With the said resolution, which was passed unanimously, the Party Conference accepted Renner's programme in a form which made it possible for Otto Bauer to support the programme. How zealously he intends to do so is already now being announced by the Social Democratic Press when it writes that "the old flag is flapping on the mast". How childish is the impression this talk makes, what cynical underestimation of the proletarian power of judgment does it express! Consider the course and the results of the Party Conference, read the triumphant headings of the reactionary Viennese Press: "Complete Defeat of Radicalism in the Socialist Camp". "The Victory of Commonsense" ("Neues Wiener Journal"), "A Breach in the Fortress of Radicalism" ("Neue Freie Presse"), "Peace Manifestation of the Workers" ("Der Tag").

Renner won the day. The resolution of the Party Conference to exclude all Social Democratic Russian delegates and all members of the Unity Committee from the party was a necessary counterpart to that victory. The brave voice of Pitzl, the Social Democratic Secretary of the Unity Committee was the only voice raised by the upright Left workers of the S. D. P. at that Party Conference.

The fact that the Party Conference rendered a victory of Renner possible, that it occasioned a sudden, open turn to the Right is, it is true, a consequence of July 15th, but it is not a true picture of actual conditions within the Social Democratic party of Austria. About 90 per cent of the party delegates numbering more than 400 were party officials and not a single worker from the bench spoke in the debate. The Party conference was a manifestation of the party apparatus. The aspect is somewhat different among the masses of the members! Nothing can be more characteristic of this than the fact that only one word was used as frequently as the word coalition, the fateful word of the split.

The capacity of holding together, it is true, is still very strong in that party which is full of traditions; its leaders will continue to try making Left gestures from time to time — although suppressed by Renner; the bourgeoisie is coming to its assistance by refusing, for the time being, to agree to a coalition and thus postponing the time of a more rapid unmasking of Social Democracy. All this has a retarding influence.

Nevertheless the split in the Social Democratic party of Austria is irresistibly approaching, for, even to-day, there are still within the party tens of thousands of reliable proletarian elements who only remained in the party, in spite of all the bad experience they made, because they were honestly convinced of its being a revolutionary party. This conviction was considerably shaken on July 15th. The last Party conference opened a period in the development of Social Democracy, which must necessarily lead to a violent encounter between the workers who tend towards the Left and the openly Reformist leaders.

The fact that the Communist Party of Austria will develop into a mass party is more than merely a risk which Renner's partisans take into the bargain; historical development demands it, the last Party Conference of Social Democracy in Austria has created further preliminary conditions for it and the activity of the Communist Party of Austria will hasten this development!

## Local Elections in Great Britain.

By R. Page Arnot (London).

The autumnal borough council elections shew for the fifth year in succession a net gain of seats by the Labour Party and a net loss by Liberals and Conservatives.

The figures are as follows:

England and Wales	Borough Council Elections			
	Gains	Losses	Net Gain	Net Loss
Conservative . . . . .	12	90	—	78
Liberal . . . . .	22	38	—	16
Labour . . . . .	133	22	111	—

These gains raised the number of boroughs with a Labour majority from seven to fourteen. These municipal election results are taken not as a measure of Labour control over Local Government authorities — that is as yet negligible — but as an electoral barometer by which to judge the parliamentary prospects of the Government. But the barometer has to be tapped by an expert hand. The deduction that a victory at the borough councils means a parliamentary victory to come has been falsified more than once, notably in 1924 when the Labour Party made gains in the local elections at the same time as it was beaten in the Parliamentary General Election. Nevertheless, this years' gains, taken in general, yield no satisfaction at any rate to the Baldwin Government.

What other significance is to be found in them? Let us examine the figures more closely. Altogether there are, exclusive of the county of London and of Scotland, 338 boroughs in England and Wales, one third of whose councillors have to be elected each year, so that something over two thousand seats can be contested. The figures given in the table are drawn from less than half the towns; and the number of contests shewn is not more than 750 out of the possible two thousand. However, it is not likely that the missing statistics (they are not collected by any Government authority) would if available reveal any additional big increase to labour. So that the gain this year of over one hundred is to be taken as a percentage alteration of the total number of seats in the councils of less than 2%. If we take the total gains of the last three years during the Baldwin regime they make a percentage alteration of less than 5 per cent. If we go further back and reckon the five years from 1920 to 1924 the gains and the losses nearly balance. At this rate, therefore, the "capture" of the municipalities is going to be a slow business.

Take it another way. At the present time there are only 14 out of the 338 boroughs controlled by the Labour Party; and only two county councils out of sixty-two.

"Slow but sure!" say the journalists of the Labour Party, and reckon that in a few more years they will by triennial increments of 5 per cent. alloy the pure capitalist composition of the councils with the Labour element until—say by 1950 at latest the boroughs will all have a Labour majority. On this glorious prospect some comments must be made. First the process depends on more than one factor. There is not only the growth of the Labour vote: there is also the continued abstention of the bourgeois vote.

Why do the bourgeoisie abstain from fighting, even from voting. Chiefly because the Labour Party has not done them any great harm wherever it has got into power. So why worry? In addition they can always use their control of the machinery of Government to hamper any inconveniently active Labour borough, were such a thing to happen. It is only in such a case as that of the Miners' Lockout that local government bodies can make themselves really dangerous to Baldwin by feeding the miners' wives and families: and immediately that happened, the Government passed a Bill with the utmost speed enabling them to depose elected persons sympathetic to the miners ("Never mind about 'Democracy!'" and replace them by officials. Apart from instance like that (when as a result the Labour Party gained 50 more victories than this year) the Labour councils have given the bourgeoisie no cause to be anxious.

The Labour process to power (or rather to majority) goes at a snail's pace. At this rate each new wild elephant will be thoroughly broken in by the tame elephants and taught to administer the boroughs in the old way and so earn the praise of their masters.

Truly, it is significant that the borough council elections continue to go against Baldwin: but it is more significant that they go at such a harmless pace, and bring up mainly the new generations of Labour lieutenants. For as the bourgeoisie grow more tolerant of the Labour councillors the working class will begin to loose patience with them.

## The Dread of the French Bourgeoisie of Fresh Elections.

On the Party Conference of the French Radical Socialists.

By A. J.

The election campaign for the general Chamber of Deputies' election which is to take place in the Spring of 1928 has already been entered upon. The largest party of the Chamber, the "Radical Party and Radical Socialist Party" — as it calls itself officially — is also hastening to make the preliminary conditions for the great contest as favourable as possible. It was necessary to find if not a party programme at least an election platform which is intended to ensure a parliamentary majority to the party. The party conference which took place at the end of October in the imposing premises of the "Salle Wagram" in Paris, was to have solved these difficult problems.

It was certainly no easy task even for the crafty routine politicians of the party to issue slogans suitable to catch the mass of the electors and at the same time to retain the favour of the big capitalists.

The petty bourgeois of the Radical party are sure to remember the same efforts made by their leaders exactly four years ago. The object in view was at that time to overthrow the reactionary National Bloc. What promises did the leaders of the radical staff not make at that time? A fight against the increase of prices, reduction of the turnover tax, amnesty for political prisoners, stabilisation of the franc, progressive taxation of the rich, social reforms etc. These radical election slogans roused such enthusiasm that it even spread to wide sections of the workers. The Bloc of the Left defeated the National Bloc. Poincaré was obliged to resign, Millerand was driven from the Elysee.

Hardly, however, had the "Radical" Government of the Bloc of the Left begun its rule under the presidency of Herriot, the Prime Minister, when the big fraud was unmasked. The increase of prices grew, taxes were increased, instead of restricting the duration of military service and instead of the pacifist promises there was war in Morocco and Syria, the maintenance of the occupation of the Ruhr, a sham amnesty, persecution of the class conscious workers etc.

The big bourgeoisie, however, was not even satisfied with these pledges of submission. The confidence of the Banks in the radical regime vanished, the inflation and its consequences brought the public revenue to the verge of bankruptcy. The Bloc of the Left which held the majority in the Chamber capitulated to the lords of finance and magnates of industry, who were calling for a strong hand. It was soon found in the person of Poincaré the leader of "National Unity".

Poincaré admitted the leaders of the Left Bloc into his Unity Cabinet. The regime of "National Unity" restored confidence in the financial situation. Poincaré, the Minister of Finance, drew up a Budget free from deficit. He took measures to stabilise the franc. He began paying debts. Briefly, he began to get his house in order. But by what sacrifices? Twelve milliards of new taxes (note that the taxes imposed on the wealthy classes were reduced), prolongation of the hours of work, rationalisation, unemployment, increase of prices, all lowered the standard of living of the workers. The petty bourgeoisie also suffered heavily from the burden of taxation and the decrease of consumption.

In this situation, the Radical party which had sold itself soul and body to the large bourgeoisie, wants to angle for the votes of the urban and rural citizens as an independent party. The discontent in the country is increased by a bad grape harvest and potato crop.

The Radical gentlemen are no longer making promises; they are now content with making general remarks. The resolution of Daladier, the Radical deputy, runs as follows: No election coalition with the Right. (The "National Unity" is a "form of transition" in parliamentary life.) Union with the "Republicans". Uniform school teaching. Just taxation. Measures against defraudation of the revenue. Stabilisation of the franc. Reduction of the discharge of debts. A real State supervision of the monopolies. Within the scope of this platform, the district organisations are in every way free to yield their place to an opponent in individual cases.



The fraud is evident. This sort of "radicalism" can be accepted by every "republican" Right party. It is quite obvious that the Radicals who want to remain in power, are anxious not to spoil things with the Right, i. e. with reaction on the part of the big capitalists. Caillaux, the representative of "Liberal" financial capital, laid special stress on this fact.

Although the Socialists are not even mentioned in the resolution, almost all the speakers emphasised the importance of acting in common with that party. The Radicals know very well that a collaboration with their socialist friends who helped them staunchly in their despicable betrayal of the working people would not give them away.

In a motion brought forward by Montigny, a partisan of Caillaux' collaboration with the League of Nations, a friendly approach between France and Germany and the maintenance of relations with the Soviet Union were demanded.

The attitude of the Congress towards the extreme Right of the party whose representative, Franklin-Bouillon, advocates the preservation of the "National Unity", is a characteristic feature. The point of view of the Right Opposition was combated by almost all the speakers, the policy of "National Unity" (i. e. the policy which is being carried on by the Radical party since the time Poincaré came into office) was most decidedly condemned and the demand for a determined social orientation towards the Left was generally raised.

At the same time however, all the speakers made violent attacks on the Communist Party. There was no difference of opinion with regard to the question of continuing the policy of persecution carried on by National Unity against the "real enemy". This fundamental attitude is tactically expressed in the election slogan. In case of a second ballot between a Communist and a reactionary candidate, the reactionary candidate should be elected! This is what the Radicals call: neither revolution nor reaction!

The above motions were passed unanimously — after Franklin-Bouillon had left the room with his seven adherents.

There is no doubt as to the fact that the trend towards the Left on the part of the Radical Socialist party is to be attributed to the general and extreme discontent of the petty bourgeoisie, and to the progressive radicalisation of the masses of workers. It should be especially emphasised that the Communist Party of France and the C. G. T. U., owing to their mass activity, were in position to exercise strong influence on the workers and the petty bourgeoisie.

We may therefore hope that the latter will soon see through the "Left orientation" of the Radicals and will estimate it as it deserves.

## After the Elections in Norway.

By Arvid Hansen.

The elections to the Norwegian Storting on October 17th occasioned a great change in the relation of forces of the parties. The catastrophic decline of the Conservatives, the Government party, which lost 25 mandates (out of 54) and the tremendous rise of the Norwegian Labour party, which gained 25 mandates, are characteristic facts. The Liberal party also lost 5 mandates, whereas the Peasant party now holds a strengthened position with its increase of four mandates. The Communist Party, which did not set up candidates in all election districts, received 40,000 votes and 3 mandates as against 5 mandates at the last election, i. e. the Party records a certain, though not very considerable reduction.

The chief cause of the political bankruptcy of the Norwegian Conservatives is the economic situation. The masses of the working population refuse any longer to bear the burden of the Government's deflation policy. The industrial workers have already for a long time broken with the official bourgeois parties. The penalty laws directed against the trade unions could not but reinforce this attitude. But large numbers of small peasants, fishermen and civil servants also rebelled against the bourgeois parties, especially against the Conservatives. These masses voted chiefly for the united Labour party and not for the Communists.

The chief cause of the great victory which the Norwegian Labour party carried off at the election, is the proletarianisation

of the petty bourgeois masses of the population, which have by no means freed themselves from parliamentary, democratic illusions. There are however symptoms indicating that the sympathies of the real proletariat of Norway for the Communist Party are much stronger than is expressed in the election statistics.

The union between the Tranmael party and the "Social Democratic Labour party" of June 30th bore its fruit. To this must be added the moral and material support the Labour party was given by the Trade Union Federation and by a number of trade unions, further its far-reaching network of the Press and of agitation, and finally that the Norwegian Labour party is carrying on the most Left social democratic policy of opposition which exists in the world, much more cunningly even than do the Austrian Social Democrats. Instead of a 15th of July, as in Vienna, it had the famous "revolutionary" speech made by Madsen at the Russian Embassy in Oslo, which provided the entire bourgeois Press with an opportunity of branding the Labour party as a Communist, a "Moscow" party. The frontal attacks of the bourgeoisie on the Norwegian Labour party as being the main centre of communism in Norway, confused certain vacillating sections of the workers, who are in sympathy with the Communists, at the moment of voting and helped the Labour party to garner in a large number of votes of revolutionary workers.

In consequence of the election results, the alternative was given: either a bourgeois bloc or a Left bloc. At the first moment, the Conservative Press of Norway was panic-stricken. On no account should the ruling power pass into the hands of the Labour party, a bourgeois coalition must be formed at the eleventh hour. The central organ of the Labour party however lost no time in declaring officially that the Labour party was in favour of continuing the present financial policy. Thereupon, the Conservative papers felt almost reassured and stated that the question as to what party was formally victorious, i. e. what party was in power formally, was of minor significance if only the capitalist "policy of restoration" was carried on. In spite of this, agitation for a bourgeois bloc and a bourgeois bloc government was continued.

Neither is there any doubt that the impulse of expansion of industrial capital is at the back of the Fascist movement, which will develop with greater intensity after the election.

On the other hand, the Liberal party steered its course towards a parliamentary Left bloc with the United Labour party. This alternative is the most likely one with regard to the next period, be it in the form of direct participation of the Labour party in the government or in the form of political collaboration without formal participation of the Labour party in the government, which, for the time being, is more to be expected in view of the dread the revolutionary leanings of the workers inspire in the leaders. The central organ of the Liberals stated that

"the two neighbouring countries, Sweden and Denmark, had for a long time previously had their Labour Governments and that there was no reason for supposing that a government headed by Hornsrud would do more harm than Branting's or Thorson's government in Sweden or Stauning's government in Denmark".

The Liberal Press is making promises that it would objectively support a Labour government for reintroducing the State monopoly on corn and reducing customs duties and is of the opinion that, in the important question of the arbitration court, the Labour government would be able to bring its standpoint to bear with the help of the Conservatives.

With regard to the question of the government and the political prospects in general, there is the greatest dissension and variety of opinions in the ranks of the Norwegian Labour party (N. L. P.). Two main tendencies can be recorded. One of them is in favour of continuing the policy of opposition which is being followed with more or less consistency. These forces in the N. L. P. which are in favour of joining the Amsterdam International, are also the protagonists of the idea of taking over the government on the basis of the 60 mandates in Parliament, and that on the grounds that the Labour party is by far the strongest parliamentary group and that the working class has to choose between a Labour government and a reactionary semi-Fascist

Peasant government which is hostile to the workers. They hold the view that a Labour government ought to try to abolish the courts of arbitration by a round about way, namely by electing arbitrators from the ranks of the Labour movement, which would tend to interest the parliamentary representatives of the bourgeoisie in the abolition of those courts.

The opposite tendency, which is against the taking over of government and is under the intellectual lead of **Tranmael, Bull and Co.**, takes as its point of issue the idea of uniting the working class into one party which should carry on a consistent policy of opposition at least so long as it does not possess the majority in Parliament. The leaders of this group, which still predominates, openly declare that the Communist Parties in Western Europe can only exist and be maintained because the Social Democratic parties have carried on a policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie. Should the Norwegian Labour party change its course in the spirit of the European Social Democratic parties, the basis of a strong Communist Party, i. e. of a further "split" of the working class would present itself in Norway also.

Immediately after the election, Tranmael opened the factional fight against the Right wing of the Labour party in the question of the Amsterdam International. The defeat of the Right at the next Trade Union Congress in December of the present year is already a certainty. This means at the same time that the formation of the government by the Labour party will be postponed at least for the first year, unless a new, important political re-grouping takes place. With regard to the next prospects, only two alternatives come into consideration: a **Peasant government**, relying alternately on the Conservatives and the Liberals, or a **Liberal Government** which would chiefly rely on the Labour party.

The Norwegian Labour party will exert all its power to put a brake on the class war of the masses. It will try to direct attention to the prospects of the next election to the town councils in 1928 for improving the position of the workers by winning over for itself the majority of the workers in the municipalities. In 15 towns, among them the capital town of Oslo which is at the present moment still under the administration of the Conservatives, the parliamentary election showed the majority of votes to be in favour of the Labour party. The masses of workers, small peasants and fishermen are expecting certain material results from the last parliamentary election, from the great victory of the Labour party — which will undoubtedly fail to be realised.

As reward the **Peasant Party**, it has to some extent broadened its basis among the small peasants. The peasant party officially combats the invasion of foreign capital, but it is naturally in favour of Great Britain and against the Soviet Union, as are all other bourgeois parties of Norway. Externally, the Peasant party maintains an extremely hostile attitude towards the whole organised working class and especially towards the Communist movement. It is, however, by no means out of the question that the differences of opinion between the Peasant party and the Conservatives with regard to important questions of financial capitalism and foreign capital will be intensified and that, in consequence of this, an approach will be made between the Peasant party and the Liberals, especially if the Labour party should, during the whole three years' period of the Storting which has just been entered on, refuse to take over the responsibility of the administration of the capitalist State.

The **Communist Party of Norway** is faced by the difficult problem of how to overcome the deeply-rooted influence of the Centrist N. L. P. on the masses, in a new form, a new stage. This stage will very likely be above all a stage of the **Left Bloc**. The 400,000 votes of the "Labour party" are opposed by 40,000 votes of the C. P. N. The Norwegian Communists are faced by a united Labour party based on the collective affiliation of the trade unions which is only for the time being carrying on a Left policy of opposition against the bourgeoisie, against Amsterdam etc. in a country where the Trade Union Federation despatched an official delegation to the tenth anniversary of the Soviet Union after the breaking up of the Anglo-Russian Committee, in a country where the Social Democrats have hitherto not been in a position to fire on the workers. In

its new position, the Communist Party will be faced by tactical problems, which can only be solved in the right way by turning to account the manifold experience of the international labour movement.

The cleverest leaders of the Norwegian Labour party shun a Labour government because they realise that a Labour government would more rapidly expose their party than would anything else; they are afraid of this alternative, not because they are unwilling to help in stabilising and rationalising capitalism, but because they have a feeling that a "Labour Government" would destroy many illusions cherished by the masses concerning the role of the Norwegian Labour party. The Communists, however, have nothing to fear from such prospects or from the prospect of a "Left Bloc".

## THE TRIAL OF ZOLTAN SZANTO AND COMRADES

### The Trial of Zoltan Szanto and Comrades.

Eighth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, 27th October.

The cross-examination of Police Officer Schweinitzer is continued.

**Chairman:** Do you know anything regarding how the Communist Party of Hungary uninterruptedly preaches sedition in the army and in the "Levente" organisation?

**Schweinitzer:** I know that they continually agitate in front of the barracks and exercise grounds against the army and against war on the Soviet Union. I also know that the communists undermine discipline in the Levente organisations.

**Questioned by the Defence,** he declared that he derived his information from secret reports, but had no immediate knowledge of these matters.

**Counsel for the Defence, Professor Vambery.** Did you obtain these secret reports also from a foreign Soviet Mission? (loud laughter).

Thereupon Dr. **Nikolas Vamos** was called as a witness. He stated: I was an eye-witness of the most terrible brutalities. I saw men who had been brutally beaten and saw the pools of blood in the room where the accused were examined.

When the detectives **Robert Barkas, Pinter** and **Labadi** are cross-examined they all three declare that none of them had touched the accused. After their cross-examination there occurs a dramatic scene. **Szanto** and **Vagi** call upon the chairman to permit the various accused to state in the face of the detectives what tortures they had had to endure at their hands.

The chairman gives an evasive answer by saying out that the accused will have an opportunity of speaking regarding this matter.

The accused **Lowy** springs up and calls to **Pinter**: Just exert your memory and call to mind how you beat me until I fell unconscious, how you beat me on the soles of my feet and compelled me to dance.

**Pinter** (pale): I do not remember that.

**Lowy:** But I remember it, and the time will come when you also will remember it.

The Chairman refuses to allow him to speak further and threatens him with confinement in a dark cell.

The accused **Tiza:** You have tortured me; do not deny that you have not beaten anybody!

The accused **Rago:** You crowed with joy when I collapsed under the blows.

The chairman thereupon adjourns the proceedings until Friday.

### Ninth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, 28th October 1927.

In the process against Zoltan Szanto and his comrades the court has commenced to read the documents in the case. The "confession" of Eduard Rubin who was not present in court and who is said to have escaped, caused the greatest indignation as also did the reading of the photographic copies of the 90 forged documents. Eduard Rubin was tortured for four days, and at the end of that time he was bought and a protocol of 40 pages was dictated to him containing, inter alia, the invention that two couriers arrived regularly in Budapest from Moscow and brought the Vagi Party a weekly subsidy of a thousand dollars. Rubin was then released. Amongst the documents is the lying report of the police agent Heim, according to which Rubin, who was accompanied to the West Station on the 13th March 1927, manacled and surrounded by four detectives, freed himself and disappeared in the crowd. Following upon the reading of Rubin's protocol Zoltan Szanto rose and declared: Schweinitzer is a liar. Szanto was then called to order by the chairman.

Szanto: "I request the chairman of the court to place the fact on record that Schweinitzer declared upon oath that no examinations had taken place at night. The protocol of Rubin, however, shows that it was taken down after half past eleven at night, that is to say the examination began at that time. The protocol itself is at least thirty pages long, and the examination must therefore have lasted at least until five o'clock in the morning. That is the worth of a statement upon oath made by a Hungarian state official decorated with the Cross for services rendered. At the proceedings before the Exceptional Court I assumed that Rubin had been killed. Now I see that he was only taken from the society of decent people and turned into a police spy.

The chairman then called Szanto to order."

The accused Szerenyi: "For four long days Rubin was beaten and tortured. He is a little thin tailor's assistant. He was forced to stand for hours on one foot. And when he attempted to stand on the other, the police threatened him with a revolver and made him stand on one foot until he collapsed from exhaustion. He was then kicked so brutally that the blood ran from his mouth and nose. I was treated the same way. They wanted to buy me too. This filthy tactic of the police was successful in the case of Rubin. Rubin became the friend of Schweinitzer."

Vagi: "The Hungarian reaction is working with a torture chamber, with police brutalities alternating with police condescension, all with a view to manufacturing police spies."

After the reading of Rubin's protocol, the defending lawyer Szörke, stood up: "In connection with this scandalous protocol I wish to make a proposal to the court."

The chairman: "The defence must put forward its proposals together with the supplementary evidence."

The chairman then read a number of pamphlets and circulars of the Socialist Workers Party. One of the pamphlets declared that the peasants had been deceived in Hungary for a thousand years, that land had been promised them but never been given to them. The Socialist Workers Party would struggle to its last breath amidst the most terrible persecutions in order that the propertyless peasants should receive land and that the Bethlen system which deceives the people should be overthrown.

A second pamphlet declared that the Social Democracy Party of Hungary was the cheapest and most constant ally of Bethlen. For a few seats in Parliament it sold not only the revolutionary past of the Hungarian working class, not only the organisational freedom of the land workers and railwaymen, but also all the trade unions.

A third pamphlet declared that the white terror of the detachments was replaced in Hungary by an institutional white terror. Arbitrariness and brutality dominated just as in the first days of the white terror. Rakosi and his comrades, the communists and also the members of the Socialist Workers Party showed by the heroism before the courts that they could struggle against the system in prison also.

Chairman to Vagi: "Do you identify yourself with these statements?"

Vagi: "I was myself accused in that process, and I declared then that I identified myself with them and I declare once again now that I consider the Bethlen system to be a greater misfortune for the country than all the devastations of the Tartars."

The chairman called Vagi to order and then addressed Michel Szabo, the secretary of the Socialist Workers Party: "Do you identify yourself with these statements also?"

Szabo: "With my last breath."

The 90 photographs of the documents are then read.

The defending lawyer Dr. Szörke protested energetically that such obvious forgeries should be read in contradiction to all legal usages. The Hungarian process regulations admit only the reading of original documents in proceedings. Schweinitzer declares that he will not produce the originals, without telling the court why, or where the originals are. It is nothing extraordinary that the process regulations only permit the reading of originals. If photographs were accepted as evidence, then people could forge as much as they liked, for it is well-known that the graphological experts draw their conclusions from the finest nuances of handwriting. This cannot be done with certainty in connection with photographs. It is clear that for this reason photographs have been prepared from forged originals by the Budapest police or in the Vienna forgery workshop. It is a fairy tale that Schweinitzer or anyone else obtained these documents from a Soviet Embassy, for were that the case, Schweinitzer would only too readily produce the originals here. His appeal to professional secrecy is merely a deception. It is characteristic that nothing was said about these photographs either at the proceedings before the exceptional court or before the Senate. For it was clear to everyone that the use of such clumsy forgeries was in violation of the process regulations. Now, however, in the main proceedings, these documents are produced as the last hope of the prosecution after its whole indictment has fallen to pieces.

The chairman then declared that the court had decided to permit the reading of the documents and that in its verdict it would express its opinion concerning their admissibility as evidence. The ninety documents were then read. Some of them produced laughter in the court, particularly one document in which Moscow instructed the Chinese Kuomintang (via Hungary) to proceed immediately against Great Britain with armed force. Particular merriment was caused amongst the general public by a document according to which the Soviets were sending 96,000 gold roubles to the Socialist Workers Party for the elections, and instructing that one item in the budget should be 15,000 gold roubles for the electoral lists. (As is well-known in Hungary, the electoral list of a district costs 40 Pengo.) After the photos of the documents has been read, the chairman then adjourned the proceedings.

### Tenth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, 29th October, 1927.

At today's hearing a tremendous sensation was caused when the Counsel for the defence, Vambéry, produced the authorisation of Eduard Rubin, who had "disappeared", together with the verification of the Berlin Hungarian Embassy. Suddenly a messenger from the Cabinet of the Regent Horthy appeared and whispered something to the chairman of the Court, Szemak, whereupon the latter adjourned the proceedings for 15 minutes. Upon the re-opening of the proceedings the defence declared that Eduard Rubin, wanted to return to Hungary in order to appear before the court. He was, however, afraid, that the police would kill him. For the moment Rubin requests the court to permit him to present a protocol verified by the German Foreign Office, the president of the Berlin Criminal Court and by a Berlin lawyer.

Before the chairman had a chance to recover from his surprise, the lawyer for the defence, Szörke, had already made public in short the contents of the protocol. According to this protocol Eduard Rubin was first of all terribly beaten by the police, i. e. the police misused its official power, he was then bought as a police spy and various lies were dictated to

him and signed by him. The police then provided him with a false pass under the name of Eduard Roessler ("that is a forgery of official documents", remarked the defending lawyer). This false pass was made out in the presence of the chief of police, Schweinitzer. Not only the latter and the deputy police president Hetényi knew of this forged document, but also the public prosecutor Miskolczy. The police agent Heim was told off to accompany Rubin. Police inspector Zdeborzski visited him in Berlin and instructed him to watch the communist movement and in particular the Berlin Hungarian emigrants and to act as an agent provocateur. This police inspector urged him to do everything possible to obtain a position in the Berlin trade mission of the Soviet Union in order eventually to secure access to the Soviet Union itself. The protocol then describes in detail how the individual accused were tortured by the police, burnt with the lighted end of cigars, hung up by the feet and bastinadoed.

After the exposure of the police spy Rubin, Professor Rüstern Vambéry and Dr. Eugen Kiss for the defence proved that the documents presented by the police represented clumsy and badly organised forgeries.

The defence: "It is actually not our task to prove that the documents are forgeries, it is the task of the prosecutor to prove that they are genuine. It is however our duty to point out a few remarkable facts which show immediately that they can be nothing else but forgeries. In the Moscow budget for the elections, the Vagi Party is supposed to receive 15,000 gold roubles for the electoral lists. It is, however, a well-known fact that such lists cost 40 Pengoe. If Moscow were really so terribly stupid and flung its money about in this fashion, Soviet Russia would long ago have ceased to exist. Only the Hungarian police are capable of such foolishness, the same police who let Rubin escape under such remarkable circumstances. Another of these "genuine" documents shows clearly that the Chinese revolution is being conducted by Moscow via Budapest.

Even the blind can see that these photographic "copies" fabricated by the forgers workshop were not made for use as evidence in this process, but as a part of that campaign which Great Britain commenced in the February of this year against Soviet Russia when it raided Arcos.

It is generally known that such a forgers' workshop exists in Vienna. We demand that the police in Vienna be questioned concerning a forger who was arrested there in 1921 on the premises of the embassy when he was engaged in his work for such a forgers' workshop."

During the course of the process the chairman spoke of the material which had been confiscated by the police. Amongst the various things was a red handkerchief belonging to Maria Matta provided with the label "communist — hostile to the State".

The accused Julius Papp: The bloody shirts of Stefan Roth and Antal Tisza are not amongst those things I suppose?"

The accused was called to order by the Chairman.

Amongst the confiscated material is a child's printing set with rubber type. During his remarks the President was compelled to say: "That seems to have been a very serious and thorough search." Whereupon the prosecutor protested against the ironical tone of the President and pointed out how nerve-racking the work of the police was and how under such circumstances it was inevitable that excesses should occur here and there.

The President then occupied himself for two full hours with the articles in "Uj Marcius" (the official organ of the C. P.). One article dealt with the fact that in the Soviet Union only the toilers have the right of free assembly. In this connection the President asked the accused Lövy: "Now, what do you say to that? You protested that there was no freedom of assembly in Hungary, but you see, there is none in Russia either!"

Lövy: "You forget one small difference Mr. President. In Russia the toilers have the right of free assembly and only the drones have none. Whereas here in Hungary, the drones have the right of free assembly and the toilers not."

The accused was called to order by the President.

Lövy: "I only answered your question Mr. President."

The defence then presented 65 proposals in connection with the evidence offered by the police. Further the defence demanded the prosecution of the vice-police inspector Hetényi and of Schweinitzer in connection with the false pass issued to Rubin. The defence also demanded the prosecution of Detective inspector Heim in connection with the flight of Rubin. The defence also demanded that the Hungarian ambassador in Berlin Kanya be heard in connection with the support accorded to Rubin, the Public Prosecutor August Miskolczy in connection with his relations to Rubin.

Amidst great excitement the defence then demanded that the metal worker M. K. Geilinger, living at No. 12, Barcsay Court be heard. This latter is the brother-in-law of Hetényi and acted as the go-between for the correspondence between Hetényi and Rubin. Rubin sent a letter to his address in which he demanded new false papers from Hetényi in order to carry out his provocateur role in the communist movement and in order to get to Russia.

There was great excitement in the court when the junior Counsel for Defence, to the great surprise of everybody, presented two demands: 1. I demand that the exhibition protocol of the police be presented here. In this protocol there is not a word that the police had the right to keep the arrested 48 hours in custody. Schweinitzer said this under oath, but he committed Perjury. 2. The President asked the accused with surprise why they did not withdraw the confessions they had made to the police when they came before the public prosecutor. The President shook his head doubtfully when the accused declared that they did not wish to be given back to the claws of the police a second time. I demand that the so-called accompanying letters to the documents be read, as these prove that those accused who did not do exactly as they were told, were really handed over once again to the police.

Amidst great excitement the prosecutor rose and protested that the police were treated without respect. He would oppose the sensational proposals upon moral grounds. In particular he would oppose the proposal that Rubin's confession be accepted as evidence, for it would be immoral for the court to accept as evidence the confession of such an immoral person.

Speaking in the name of the defence, Vambéry answered the speech of the prosecutor: "Speaking of morality, one can hardly imagine anything more moral than the action of the police inspector Schweinitzer who swore upon oath here that Rubin had escaped from the escort of four detectives on the 4th March, whilst in fact, he, Schweinitzer, had prepared Rubin a false pass on the 13th March, the day before, given him 130 Pengoe, put him in the express to Berlin and kissed his hand to the new police spy off to new fields of activity, to the Soviet Union as an agent provocateur."

#### Eleventh Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, 2. November 1927.

The eleventh day of the proceedings. At 10 o'clock the President of the court read a decision according to which all the demands of the defence were rejected, neither the protocols that had been presented nor the protocol of Rubin would be permitted to be read.

The accused Glanz: "That is very natural, in this court only the products of the police forgers workshop are accepted as evidence, only they will be permitted to be read."

The President called him to order and sentenced him to one day's arrest in the dark cell as disciplinary punishment. After announcing the decision for the court the President called upon the prosecution. Amidst great noise and confusion the defence was heard protesting: "Shame", "Unheard of, for what reason", "Where are the reasons", "We demand to know the reason why!"

The President: "I will state the reasons in my verdict."

The defence declares that on account of this breach of the law on the part of the President, it will demand a declaration that the decisions of the court are null and void.

The prosecutor Lindeyer then commenced his speech for the prosecution. A few passages of the speech were remarkable:

"I recognise that communism is the greatest world historical process of the twentieth century. I recognise that it is an unavoidable historical process, but it is a dangerous and criminal process, and therefore I will fight it with fire and sword, with both fair means and foul, until I have destroyed it."

"Soviet Russia is not an ordered State. In Soviet Russia there is no production at all. Anarchy and uninterrupted civil war are dominant there. The population of Soviet Russia is suffering from hunger. The whole State power is held by a gang of criminals."

Accused Papp: "Where does he get all these lies from?"

The President then called Papp to order.

Prosecutor: "Not from those who make propaganda for Soviet Russia under instructions. Not from those who, for soviet money, visit Potemkin villages in auto swarms."

Accused Papp: "Oh, there are then at least swarms of autos in the Soviet desert." (laughter.)

The prosecutor then turned his attention to the accused Lövy. "Lövy declares that the communists to-day are persecuted

like one early Christians, but that under the leadership of the communists the proletariat would rise to power like the Christians did. I protest with all the indignation of my Christian soul against this comparison, for the early Christians were humble, they even kissed the hands of their persecutors, but the communists are proud and supercilious, even before the exceptional court and also here, they cry out that they are communists and that they will avenge the sufferings which the proletariat has to suffer." (Disturbance in the court and then laughter.)

The proecutor demanded a draconic sentence. After his abusive speech which lasted for three and a half hours, the President adjourned the court until Thursday the 3rd November. The speeches for the defence will follow.

Just before going to press we received news that the expected vindictive verdict and sentences had been pronounced. The chief accused, Comrade Zoltan Szanto, has been condemned to eight years and six months imprisonment and Stefan Vagi to four years and six months imprisonment. 36 of the accused have been found guilty and sentences have been pronounced amounting in all to 70 years 11 months and 28 days imprisonment. Ed.

## THE EFFECT OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION ABROAD

### The Revolt of the French Black Sea Fleet.

By Andre Marty (Paris).

Comrade A. Marty's article, which we here publish, was handed over to us as early as on August 10th 1927, e. e. shortly before his arrest. Ed.

Contrary to the widely-held view, the "Black Sea Revolt" was not merely an act of mutiny of the crew of the French war-ships, which had been sent to the Black Sea in 1919. It was far more extensive in character, for it included the mutiny of the French troops of occupation in South Ukraine and in the Crimea (February to May 1919), the revolts of the crew of the French war-ships in the Black Sea (April to July 1919), the revolt of the French sailors on the ships outside the Black Sea and in the ports (June to August 1919). As the revolts in the Black Sea however were the most important ones, they gave the name to the whole movement which was roused by French intervention in Russia.

#### The Causes.

The causes of the revolts are not only to be looked for in the conditions of living of the troops and the crews of the ships. As a matter of fact, the soldiers and sailors in the Black Sea and in Russia were very badly fed, very badly housed and insufficiently clothed in a cold climate, they rarely got furlough and rarely received letters; they were therefore longing for demobilisation. Nevertheless their position was more favourable than was that of their comrades in the trenches of the Vardar or in the submarines. The miserable material conditions in which they found themselves, were only favourable preliminary conditions for revolutionary action and, above all, they were of decisive significance in respect of the spirit of their demands.

The two essential causes of the revolts were the resumption of war and the moral influence of the October revolution.

Even in the eyes of the most naive soldiers, the armistice with Bulgaria, with Turkey and soon after that with the Central Powers had one quite simple and clear meaning: the termination of war. But behold! hardly had the transport of the 156th division left Salonica and been disembarked in Odessa on December 18th 1918, than the French troops were already engaged in lively combats of the volunteers against Petljura's troops. The roar of guns and the salvos were heard quite distinctly from the warships which were riding at anchor in the roads and cleared for action.

War has then begun once more! The constant skirmishes which followed the landing of the troops simply made on them

the impression that, although war had come to an end in France, it was here once more resumed. These were the first seeds of discontent which developed more and more.

On the other hand the soldiers and sailors wanted to know with whom they were actually at war. They succeeded at last in getting into touch with Russian workers. They learnt from pamphlets and newspapers published in French what kind of persons these Bolsheviki are. At the same time they are more or less well informed about the action taken by the revolutionary minority in France. Soldiers returning from furlough and above all the lately recruited troops sent as reinforcements, took with them "The Wave", issued by Brison, a "fighting newspaper" of the socialist minority which appeared weekly and every single number of which often passed through hundreds of hands. The socialist interventions in the Chamber on December 29th and 30th 1918 (Alexandre Blanc, Cachin, Brison), and chiefly that on March 24th 1919 (Lafont, Cachin, Mayeras) and in June 1919 (Cachin, Lafont) roused a powerful response. Almost all the soldiers of the army in the Orient belonged to regiments which had been recalled from the French front because of their "evil spirit". Thanks to the afflux of reserves the sailors were extremely irritated against their incapable and absurdly reactionary officers. At first they found the Bolsheviki sympathetic, then they became their friends. Discussions were held everywhere on Bolshevism and on revolution.

The General Staff made every effort to maintain the "morale" among the troops. They spread the most fantastical stories about the Bolsheviki, stories about children who had been eaten up, prisoners who had been cut to pieces etc. They were received with mockery. The General Staff went further; propagandists were shot and hanged. Jeanne Labourbe and ten other comrades, five of them women, were murdered by French officers in the night of March 1st. This cruel deed taught caution, but action developed more and more.

The French "police" tortures prisoners, for instance Lastochin, President of the Party Committee of the Bolsheviki, Satjai; Rear-Admiral Legay bombards Cherson and slaughters more than 100 women and children. These events increase the indignation which prevails. It was a frequent occurrence in Odessa that French soldiers tore off their medals and threw them to the ground in a fury when they witnessed Russian workers being taken to prison.

At the beginning of February, the disintegration of the army reached a serious degree, towards the end of March it had developed so far that even non-commissioned officers were infected with it. Some of them chiefly those in charge of train-

ning soldiers, sympathise with the Russian revolution, others are full of indignation against the government which they hold responsible for the disintegration in the army. A single example: **Cottin's** attempt on **Clemenceau's** life was greeted with passionate enthusiasm by the soldiers and sailors.

In this way, hatred of warfare and the luminous example of the Russian revolution disintegrated a victorious army in a few weeks.

#### Facts.

In February, the territory of the Ukraine under occupation extended from Tiraspol on the Dniester to the Black Sea, that is to the territory of Cherson and Nikolaiev. The front forms approximately a curve the centre of which is Odessa. The whole of the Crimea is occupied; the troops are composed of French, Greeks, Poles, Serbs and volunteers. In Sebastopol there is an English division. **Bertelot**, the General in command, has his quarters in Bucharest and is endeavouring to effect a general mobilisation of Roumania. General **d'Anselme** holds the command in Odessa.

The revolt developed in three essential phases:

1. **Refusal to march.** A number of battalions refused to advance against the Red Army, the Red Guards and the Red partisans. A few examples: On January 30th one battalion of the 58th Infantry regiment and two battalions of the Alpine regiment left Bender in Bessarabia in order to take possession of Tiraspol which was occupied by the Red Guards. They marched off under vehement protests on the part of the infantry who reproached the artillery with obeying orders.

At the first rattling of the machine gun salvos, the 58th regiment refused to fight and withdrew, carrying the artillery with it. When, after Tiraspol had been taken by other troops, they were again ordered to march into that town, they only did so under the condition that there would be no fighting and that the whole General Staff should be in the first carriage. The machine guns were placed at the doors of the other carriages in order to prevent any treachery on the part of the officers. Later, the regiment was disarmed and sent to Morocco. Events of this kind occurred repeatedly in various places. The French troops, which sometimes succeeded in carrying with them Greek troops and others, refused to advance against the "Reds" and, as for instance on the occasion of the attack on Odessa on April 3rd, to mount the guns.

But the time had already come when the soldiers were no longer satisfied with refusing to obey orders. A corps of the 7th regiment of engineers received their officers with gun fire. It could only be persuaded with great difficulty to follow the army which was retreating on Akkerman. On April 5th, Odessa was evacuated. Whole units of troops, surrounded by Greek troops, left the town, singing the "International". The troops arrived in Akkerman in complete dissolution. Officers of high rank and generals left the town in great haste on ships or motor-cars.

2. **The Black Sea Revolt.** The sailors were witnesses of the complete disorder prevailing on the occasion of the evacuation of Odessa on April 5th. Even on board the warships discipline ceased to exist. Complete disintegration had taken place. On almost all the ships, the non-commissioned machine-gun officers made common cause with the crew, many non-commissioned warrant officers remained neutral.

No longer did they stop at the refusal to march, open revolt took place, the General Staff was asked to direct the fleet back to France and this demand was supported by threats. This was the second stage.

On April 16th, at midnight, I was arrested in Galatz (Roumania) together with three other sailors, amongst them **Badina**, as I was just returning to the torpedo-boat "Protet" of which I was the chief mechanic. I was coming back from a secret meeting. We had come from Odessa a few days ago and had formed the plan of capturing the first ship standing in the offing and taking it back to Odessa. We wanted to find out there in what way it would be possible to persuade a whole section of the Black Sea fleet to return to France. The conspiracy had just been betrayed "in time" by three police agents.

Three days later however, on the evening of April 19th, a revolt broke out on board the dreadnought "France", which was riding at anchor in front of Sebastopol, where shots had been fired on two days (April 16th and 17th) on the Red Army from

armoured cruisers. A group of mutineers took possession of a steamer armed with a 37 mm gun and tried to win over one armoured cruiser after the other for united action. On the next day, April 20th — Easter Sunday — the crews of the men-of-war "France" and "Jean Bart" solemnly hoisted the red flag on the mast of the bowsprit, at 8 a. m., whilst they sung the "International".

There was great agitation on all the ships. Meetings of sailors. In the afternoon, at 3 p. m., an imposing demonstration of French sailors in common with Russian workers engaged in the general strike, took place in the main streets of the town. Enthusiasm beyond all description prevailed. Just at that time, at 3/30 p. m., the Greek sailors and some sailors of the "Jean Bart" opened fire on those taking part in the demonstration in the Norskaja street, by order of the Army Commander, Colonel **Trousseau**. A large number of persons were killed and wounded; among the dead were five workers and a young girl. Almost at the same time, the red flag was hoisted on the mainmast of "France". The effect was an extraordinary one. Unprecedented disorder prevailed everywhere. The troops in the fortress left, the sailors threw the ammunition-boxes and machine-guns into the sea, singing the revolutionary song "Down with war and with the tyrants."

On the next day they demanded that the squadron should depart before April 28th. The war ships left the Black Sea one after the other in order to return to France, "Jean Bart" alone remained for another month at the gates of Constantinople. Revolutionary demonstrations of the crew in the town were an almost daily occurrence.

On April 23rd I was taken on board the "Waldeck-Rousseau", which was threatening Odessa, this town being in the hands of the Soviets. I succeeded in getting into touch with the crew. On April 27th, at 12 o'clock — I had been taken away from the ship by surprise an hour ago in order to be transported into a prison in Constantinople — the crew of the "Waldeck-Rousseau" mutinied and hoisted the red flag. The torpedo-destroyer "Fauconneau" joined in the movement, an ultimatum was put to the Admiral to the effect that they wanted either to return to France immediately or to enter the port of Odessa. The Admiral yielded.

At about the same time the crew of the fire-ship threw their commander overboard.

Similar demonstrations and movements took place on all the warships in the course of the months of April to July. The last ship which mutinied on July 30th in view of Odessa was the "Touarez".

3. **Towards insurrection.** In spite of strict censorship being exercised by the government, the warships which returned to France one after the other brought detailed news of the Russian revolution and of the mutinies. A new phase was then entered upon. It was no longer a case of revolts, attempts were made to bring about insurrection. Almost everywhere, sailors' committees were formed spontaneously which worked more or less secretly and were connected with revolutionary labour groups. The first preparations for insurrection were made.

Agitation developed with particular strength in Toulon. In spite of the condition of siege being declared in that town, the sailors tried to meet in the Sailors' Home and, finding it closed, held a meeting on an open place in the town. **Lacaze**, Vice-Admiral, was obliged to flee from them. On June 11th, powerful demonstrations were held in the town. The flag-ship, a dreadnought of the name of "Provence" refused to put to sea and to set out to the Black Sea. The following demands were raised: All mutineers of the Black Sea should be set free! An end should be put to intervention with Russia! Immediate demobilisation! — A sailors' committee tried to transform itself into a revolutionary committee by endeavouring to expand with the help of soldiers and dock workers. Mounted gendarmes and cavalry took steps to disperse the demonstrators and, above all, to prevent them storming the naval prison. The sailors, being unarmed, were overpowered.

Scenes of similar vehemence also occurred in Brest and, to a lesser degree, in the other ports. On June 19th, the armed cruiser "Voltaire" refused to leave Bizerta and to sail for the Black Sea. On other warships also, reports received on events in Russia occasioned great demonstrations, not only in France

but also in very remote places, for instance in Itea (Greece) where the cruiser "Guichen" was at anchor and on board the cruiser "D'Estrees" in Vladivostok.

The government only succeeded in checking this mighty movement by organising a mass demobilisation and the rapid disarming of numerous men-of-war.

In the meantime, the trials of the mutineers had begun on June 11th in Constantinople and Cattaro against the mutineers of the "Protet" and of the "Waldeck-Rousseau". The response was such, that the first trial had to be postponed to July 4th and that the government, in order to proceed with the other trials, had to wait until demobilisation was sufficiently advanced (September). Many of the accused showed great firmness of character during the trials.

#### Characteristic Features of the Revolt.

Two specially characteristic features of the revolt can be clearly distinguished:

1. **The overwhelming majority of the soldiers and sailors was still under democratic influence.** This became particularly evident in the first two phases of the revolt. The sailors and soldiers revolted above all because they were indignant at war being carried on against Russia, although "France was not at war" with that country, war being therefore "against the Constitution". These were the chief arguments which the mutineers used in their defence before the court martial. Some of them also pointed out that the French revolution of 1789 had proclaimed the right to insurrection in cases of infringement of the Constitution.

Only a small number of the leading men possessed real class consciousness. In the measure, however, as the mutiny movement developed, this class consciousness spread further and further among the masses. Many sailors showed so much intrepidity, energy and cold-bloodedness that they would have succeeded in leading the whole fleet into a revolutionary fight had they been inspired by Lenin's lucid theory. Their ideology however was confused, many of them tried to "convince" the officers, they accepted their demobilisation in order later to be arrested as ringleaders on the first occasion which offered itself.

The fact that the sailors joined in the fight inspired the whole nation with intensified acrimony. The crews of the "Protet" and of the "Waldeck-Rousseau" were at a loss whether to return to France or enter the port of Odessa, i. e. join in the revolution. In the period of 20th to 22nd of April, the crew on board the warship "France" was prepared to reply to any attempt to bring colonial troops on board by cannon fire. The crew was in possession of the guns and ammunition; they turned the muzzles of their 305 millimeter guns on an English armoured cruiser which threatened them. Nevertheless they did not comply with the slogan of the Russian workers calling upon them to arm themselves and to fire on Headquarters. On the contrary, a large number of them preached peace, cautioning against "unnecessary deeds of violence", "as the right was on our side".

The third phase is characterised by an undeniable class movement: mass meetings, attempts to proceed in unison with the workers, demonstrations in common with the workers, threats that cannonades would be directed against the authorities, attempts to set free political prisoners etc. This class movement was choked off by demobilisation and long-period furloughs which were followed by numerous arrests.

The Black Sea revolt thus shows ideologically a far-reaching analogy to the military mutinies in Russia in 1905, especially to the rising of the Black Sea fleet in Sebastopol on November 11th.

2. **The revolt of the Black Sea fleet was a mass movement.** Individual refusals to obey orders occurred very seldom, as it had become clear that individual action was absurd. The agitators, the ringleaders, directed all their efforts towards achieving a collective movement. Neither, with the exception of a single case, that of the armoured cruiser "Diderot", did acts of sabotage occur. It is therefore a gross forgery of facts to represent the mutinies as acts of one person or of several individual persons.

What was lacking, was both a clear ideology and organisation. Almost all the revolutionary soldiers and sailors were under the influence of the socialist minority, whose tendency found expression in the paper "The Wave". This newspaper deviated from Leninism in essential points, but it nevertheless exercised a propelling influence; its slogans were exactly followed in the mutiny.

On the other hand, no real organisation existed; this could of course only have been illegal. Revolutionary groups existed, it is true, on the individual warships, but they had no general plan of action, there was no harmonious guidance and no connection between the separate groups. On the "Waldeck-Rousseau" alone an organisation existed which included over the half of the crew and had been formed with a view to economic demands. This was the "Brotherhood of the Mariners" from whose midst a secret committee had arisen. This also explains how it came about that the revolt broke out on the said cruiser only four days after I had been confined there.

This absence of organisation and of connection between the revolutionary elements of the fleet made it possible for the government to shatter easily a movement of such extent.

#### The Consequences.

1. **French imperialism was forced to relax the grasp with which it was throttling the October revolution.** It could not set its own troops against the Russian revolution and had to resort to mercenaries, the Wrangels, Denikins and their gang. Only in this way was it in a position to continue its work in favour of international capitalism. These White Guardist troops, however, were by no means a match for the Red Army.

This then is a decisive result of the Black Sea revolt. In this way the workers and peasants of France gave very active support to the October revolution. They rendered an extremely valuable service to their brothers who were engaged in a mortal combat for power, in that they disabled the powerful military apparatus of France.

2. **The Black Sea revolt made the October revolution known among broad strata of the French population.**

The court martials of the army and navy passed sentences of many hundreds of years imprisonment for mutiny. As early as at the end of 1919, a group of ex-sailors formed a "Committee for the Defence of the Sailors" in Paris, which engineered a powerful campaign of agitation. From 1922 onwards, the Communist Party took the lead in this campaign and imparted to it so much impetus that the government was finally compelled to release one mutineer after the other from prison. (Since the Summer of 1923.)

3. **The Black Sea revolt was a concrete example proving that it is possible to check an imperialist war or at least to delay it.** In France, where anti-militarism is extremely popular among broad strata of the workers and peasants, the revolt was a concrete example of how it is possible to conduct the various currents of anti-militarism into one revolutionary channel. The workers and peasants can learn from it how it is possible, by combining mass movements with the activity of mobilised soldiers, to prevent an offensive war against the Soviet Union and, in certain circumstances, to turn it into civil war against the bourgeoisie of their own country.

4. **The revolt of the Black Sea fleet created a really revolutionary movement in the French navy.**

The eleven demonstrations which took place in 1925 in the Mediterranean fleet against the Morocco war, the revolts on July 15th and 16th and on August 8th 1927 in the military prison of Toulon, in which many sailors were imprisoned on account of their political attitude — these and other events bear witness to the fact that the revolutionary spirit, the spirit of Kronstadt is living and will continue to live in the hearts of the young proletarian sailors.

Jeanne Labourbe and the other proletarian heroes who fell in Odessa and Sebastopol, did not sacrifice their lives in vain.

# The Russian Revolution and the Hungarian Working Class.

By Eugen Landler.

The Hungarian working-class, who were fighting against the despotism of finance-capitalists, and landed proprietors, did not watch with sufficient attention the fights of the Russian working class, who were struggling against Tsarist despotism. The attention of Hungarian Social Democracy was directed towards Austria and Germany, towards Viktor Adler and Kautsky.

For the Party of the Hungarian working class the "Democratic revolution" and the "general franchise" alone constituted so-called "burning questions". They had no idea that in the scorned fraction fights of Russian Social Democracy the questions of the modern revolutionary proletarian movement in general received a final answer.

During the war there came the disappointment in the "sacred" principles of German and Austrian Social-Democracy. Scheidemann, Adler and Kautsky threw themselves with the whole of their authority on to the side of the imperialists. At the beginning of 1917 Hungarian Labour began to look in a different direction and to turn to Russia for leadership and instruction.

That year was the year in which the big political mass movement began in Hungary. In that year there began the vehement stage of the mass movements in Hungary, which in August, 1919, found its temporary conclusion. Instead of the "destructive pacifism" of the peace-loving intellectuals there began the great mass fight of the workers for peace, against imperialist war, but at the same time also against the whole of Austro-Hungarian despotism and against the dictatorship of the system of the landed proprietors and big bourgeoisie set up by finance-capitalism in Hungary. The masses started to move. They were no longer firmly under the control of the Scheidemanns of the Hungarian party leadership; they had already entered the magic circle of the Russian revolution.

The news of the collapse of Tsarism had a revolutionising effect in Hungary. Hungarian labour had always remained true to the traditions of the May celebration. But during the war the functionaries of the working class tried in vain to have May 1st celebrated; the bureaucrats of party and trade union always managed to prevent this; in 1917 the Russian Spring suddenly swept all obstacles out of the way. In 1917 May 1st once more became a Labour celebration in Hungary, and on May 2nd the Hungarian workers in all the factories struck for one day as a demonstration for peace. In May, 1917, a big strike movement set in, even though all the larger works were under military supervision and every strike was classed under the Emergency Law as a revolt.

Tisza fell on May 2rd, 1917, and when it became clear to the workers that the new cabinet was sabotaging the establishment of the new franchise, the class-conscious workers in the factories began in Autumn 1917 to speak of the necessity of creating Worker Councils.

The Hungarian workers had at that time not yet clearly recognised the difference between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks. In the victory of November 7th they saw chiefly the victory of the purely workers government over the coalition government. But this was sufficient for the Hungarian workers, who from the very first moment throw themselves instinctively and completely on to the side of the Bolsheviks. When the news was received that, contrary to the war policy of Kerenski, the Bolsheviks energetically demanded the termination of the war of the imperialist robbers, there were only two names popular among the Hungarian proletarians: Lenin and Krylenko.

The first proclamation "to All!" worked like a revelation in Hungary. There was scarcely a country in which the workers took up with greater earnestness the revolutionary solidarity, which the Russian workers requested of their European comrades. The tremendous spontaneous general strike, which lasted several days at the time of the Brest Peace, and which is without parallel in the history of the Hungarian Labour movement was a convincing confirmation thereof. When the workers in the factories read the great opening speech, which Trotzky made in Brest, a revolutionary fever seized the Hungarian proletariat. When, during the negotiations in Brest, General Hoffmann started to clank his sword, the Hungarian workers rose like one man. About 300,000 proletarians took part in

the ten meetings improvised in Budapest and out of hundreds of thousands of mouths there issued the cry: **Long live Soviet Russia! Down with General Hoffmann! Down with the imperialist war! Long live the Worker Councils!**

The January strike in Hungary differed from the Vienna January strike in that the driving force of the strike in Hungary was solidarity with the proletarian dictatorship in Russia. The slogan of general suffrage was later foisted on the workers by the leaders.

It is characteristic that on the occasion when the party leaders presented a deputation of workers to Prime Minister **Wekerle**, not only did the members of the deputation speak of the franchise, they also energetically demanded that the Hungarian Government should do everything possible to get General Hoffmann recalled from the peace negotiations. After the party executive had with great effort succeeded in bringing the strike to an end, at all meetings and in all trade unions, without distinction, it had to meet great difficulty on the question of General Hoffmann. Great masses of workers continued the strike. In demanding the withdrawal of General Hoffmann their concern was for Soviet Russia, for they knew that General Hoffmann was an incarnation of the imperialist war of plunder.

For the first time in the history of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party the Party Executive was obliged to resign under the pressure of mass feeling, under pressure of the discontent which followed the breaking off of the strike.

After the January strike, the idea of worker councils became still more popular. Though only in secret, though only in narrow circles, the workers in the factories began to form worker councils. In several regiments, too, attempts were made to form Soldiers' Councils.

The embitterment of the workers on account of the Executive's treachery in January in no way signified that the revolutionary feelings of the workers had in any way abated or that the feeling of solidarity in respect of the Russian proletarian dictatorship had diminished. When the Social-Democratic Executive's ally, Minister of Justice **Vászonyi**, held in Parliament his notorious anti-Bolshevik speech, in which he besmirched Soviet Russia and threatened to "stamp out Bolshevism", there arose in the factories such spontaneous indignation that at the extraordinary Party Conference the official representative of the Executive was compelled to stigmatise the allied Minister in the most brutal way.

The prelude of the general strike in June was that the gendarmery shot into the crowd gathered before the building of the machine factory of the Hungarian Railways and killed five workers. The official investigation ascertained that the crowd had cheered for Soviet Russia and the revolution. After this blood bath the proletariat of Budapest marched in tens of thousands to Parliament, which was protected by soldiers and machine guns, with the slogan: "**Let's follow Soviet Russia's example!**"

During the six-day general strike 500 workers were arrested and of these several were charged with "**demonstrating for Soviet Russia and promoting victory for the enemy!**"

In the general strike in June the slogan for the formation of Worker Councils had already been openly used as one of the chief demands, and nothing is more characteristic of the villainy on the part of the Social-Democratic Party Executive than the fact that at the conclusion of the strike they abused this most popular slogan, the slogan of the Worker Councils. The Executive of Hungarian Social Democracy had learned its lesson during the January strike. It did not dare terminate in its own name the revolutionary general strike. It formed out of the most reliable leaders and employees of the trade unions "Worker Councils", who then signed the appeal to terminate the strike.

In the second half of the year 1918 the Hungarian Press spread the most hair-raising stories of the "reign of terror" of the Bolsheviks. The Hungarian workers, however, did not for a moment believe these lies. They looked to Soviet Russia as to an ideal and felt every blow delivered by the counter-revolution against Soviet Russia as though it were a blow dealt to themselves. Up to the collapse of the war the chief organ



of Hungarian Social-Democracy, "Népszava", did not dare publish a single attack upon Soviet Russia or Bolshevism.

November 7th, 1917, the triumphant proletarian dictatorship, contributed more than anything else to the revolutionising of the Hungarian proletariat. The Hungarian workers had felt all the suffering of the Russian proletariat during 1917/18, and in spite of the treachery of their own leaders had participated at a distance of many thousand kilometres in the successful fights of their Russian brothers.

More and more reports were received concerning that act of the Hungarian Labour movement which had been played many hundreds of kilometres, aye, even many thousands of kilometres, from Hungary. The workers in captivity succeeded in uniting under the red flag of the international proletarian revolution thousands of interned peasants. They joined in the fights along the Russian revolutionary front, which extended many hundreds of kilometres. For the first time after the Socialist peasant revolts, which took place in the Hungarian lowlands in the nineties, the Hungarian worker and the Hungarian peasant once more found themselves united in a common fight in the divisions of the Red Guard of the Siberian Steppe.

The leaders and organisers of the prisoner-of-war movement endeavoured to range organisatorily, politically and ideologically in the Bolshevik Party the members of the national sections formed by prisoners of war. That stratum of leaders trained in this prison-of-war movement and converted to the Bolshevik theory and practice of the social revolution became the champions of the resurrection of the Hungarian revolutionary Labour movement. This is the group through which the Russian and Hungarian Labour movements came into touch. This is the group through which the history of that section of

the Russian revolution also became a section of the Hungarian Labour movement.

It was in vain that the collapse in the year 1918 brought about the "complete democracy". As was natural, when at the end of 1918 the Communist Party of Hungary was formed, it had on its side the sympathy of that worker masses, who in a number of fights during 1917 had given proof of their willingness to make sacrifices and of their revolutionary conviction. The advanced sections of the Hungarian proletariat entered the fight alongside the Party: for Soviet Russia, for Soviet Hungary, for the dictatorship of the Hungarian proletariat.

A few months more and communication between the Russian revolution and the Hungarian Labour movement was established, not only through ties of mass sympathy, not only through the organisations of the rapidly developing Communist Party, but through the roar of cannon. The red Soviet flag appeared on the Theiss, in Kassa and in Salgotarjan. The gentlemen of Versailles were frightened and big plans for military operations against the Soviet Union found their way into the desks of the politicians. Court was paid to Austrian and Czech Social Democracy. "Barriers around the Bolshevik danger zone" — the only plan of salvation. In the meanwhile, the Russian army succeeded in bringing its whole force to bear upon the destruction of its most dangerous enemies, Kolshak's white bands, upon the reconquering of the Siberian grain lands and of the Caucasian coal and naphtha fields.

In this way communication between the Russian Revolution and the Hungarian working class was established, a way in which the workers of no other country have followed the proletariat of Hungary — the way of armed alliance.

## The October Revolution and the Near East.

By J. B.

For the various peoples of the Ottoman Empire 1917 was a fateful year. The imperialist world-war had converted the countries of the Near East into one of the many battlefields on which the struggle for world dominion in that year entered upon its decisive stage. The population of Mesopotamia and Syria, of Northern Arabia and Palestine was immediately drawn into the events of the war: terrible suffering, starvation, plagues, devastation were the concomitants of the war for the peasants and the urban population of these countries. The weak national movement, which received a fresh impetus as a result of the hardships suffered by the people during war-time, found itself jammed between the devil and the deep sea: on the one hand, it was suppressed by means of forms of reprisal dating from the Middle Ages and exercised by the Turkish Pashas and German generals; on the other hand, it was in danger of being exploited for the imperialistic purposes of the Entente.

For the Entente powers — England, France, Russia — had long before the end of the war divided up among themselves the countries and peoples of the Ottoman Empire: an agreement dated in the year 1915 provided for the allocation of Mesopotamia and Northern Arabia to England, Syria and Cilicia to France and a large portion of Anatolia, Trebizond, Erzerum, as also the whole of Kurdistan as far as the Mesopotamian frontier, to Russia. Among the parties contending for power and influence in the Near East Tsarist Russia was a constant factor whose imperialistic appetite had been only further whetted through the war and its alliance with England. Just as was the case with other imperialists, the Tsarist monasteries and endowments, missions and charitable institutions, priests and traders served as pioneers for the realisation of expansionist aims.

The February Revolution took over the traditions of Tsarism in relation to Russian policy in the Near East and continued the policy of a closer and more intimate connection with British imperialism. The secret treaties relating to various territorial concessions were amended in favour of Russia, and in exchange "democratic" Russia gave its consent to a number of new British combinations, such as the Balfour Declaration. Expansion at the cost of Turkey, i. e. the enslavement of the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire, was one of the main

pillars of the policy of the Provisional Government.

When the October Revolution swept aside this arch-imperialistic government with its mask of democratic phrases, one of its first actions was the publication of the secret treaties found in the archives. In this manner the peoples of the Near East learned of the scandalous Sykes-Picot Agreement of the year 1916, which — while the Arabs were promised in proclamations and negotiations full rights of self-determination and national independence — divided their territories among the parties to the imperialistic adventure. In tearing up the imperialistic agreements, disclosing the intrigues of the imperialists, renouncing the privileges and "capitulations" extorted from the various peoples, the Soviet power converted the conception of "Russia" from a menacing, tyrannising spectre into a State organisation to which suppressed nations might look for help and support.

As was only to be expected, the Anglo-French imperialists did everything they could to minimise the overwhelming impression made by the October Revolution upon the countries of the Near East. The whole machinery of imperialistic calumny and misinterpretation was brought into play in order to paint in the darkest of hues conditions in "Bolshevist Russia". No demagogy, no fantastic and malicious legends were too bad to be used in deprecation of the Bolsheviks and to represent them as the enemies of mankind. The imperialist agents took particular pains to exploit for their own purposes the religious prejudices of the population. In order that there should be no obstruction to the circulation of lies, the imperialists saw to it that the former very lively intercourse between Russia and the Near East was completely suspended. No Russian ship, no Russian subject (with the exception of attested White Guards), no Russian newspaper was, until quite recently, allowed to enter Egypt, Syria, etc. In the eyes of the imperialistic authorities sympathies for Bolshevism or for the Russian Revolution were in themselves criminal.

All this however, was unable to prevent the constant growth of these sympathies. The imperialistic oppression which was felt all the more keenly by the native population of countries separated from the Ottoman Empire and subjected to Anglo-French dominion, because it was in marked contrast to all the promises of freedom made during the war, resulted

in a reinforcement of the revolutionary tendency. The oppressed peoples looked for allies in their fight for freedom. The fight waged by Mustapha Kemal, which, as was plainly apparent, would never have been successful without the friendship of the Soviet Power, the example of Persia, which, thanks to the support it got from the Bolshevist State, was able to save itself from British rapacity, the exemplary solution of the national question in the Soviet Union showed the national-revolutionary movement where the true friends of national liberty are to be found. The Communist movement, the development of which could not be prevented even by the draconic measures of the imperialists, furthermore showed that real national liberty was only to be achieved through the emancipation of the working masses after the fashion of the October Revolution.

Thus little by little the ring of isolation drawn by the imperialists around the October Revolution and its ideas was broken through. In addition, as the Workers' and Peasants' State grew in economic power, the economic blockade, which had been carried on for years, became impracticable. Trade

missions of "Arcos" were opened in Syria, Palestine and Egypt, and in a comparatively short time "Russian business" became so popular that... the French and English authorities promptly deported the missions without making use of any pretexts. However, at the present time, after the Anglo-Soviet rupture and while the agitation against the Soviet Union is again at its height, the Egyptian Government has been compelled under the pressure of an economic situation, which found expression in Parliament and in the producers' associations, to resume direct trade with the Soviet Union.

Throughout the world and especially in the countries of the Near East, which feel the direct and burdensome pressure of British imperialism, the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution will be a day of celebration and of expression of the solidarity of the masses with the work of the Russian proletariat. The slogan: "Hands off Soviet Russia" will resound in these British colonies and prove to Chamberlain that the ideas of the October Revolution have penetrated to every corner of his world empire.

# TEN YEARS AGO

## The Victory of the Proletarian Revolution.

### FALL OF THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT.

#### The First Reports.

London, 7th November. Reuter reports that the Bolsheviki have Petrograd in their hands and have arrested the ministers. The leader of the movement, Lenin, demanded an immediate armistice and peace.

The conflict between the Government and the Workers' and Soldiers' Council became more acute during the course of the night and early this morning. The action of the Bolsheviki developed rather rapidly. The telegraph is already in their hands.

Petrograd, 7th November. (Reuter.) A detachment of marines under the command of the Revolutionary Committee of the Bolsheviki occupied the business premises of the official Petrograd Telegraph Agency, the Central Telegraph Office, the State Bank and the Maria Palace where the Council of the Republic meets, the sittings of which body were suspended in view of the situation.

#### The First Proclamation of the Victorious Proletariat of Petrograd.

##### To the Citizens of Russia!

The Provisional Government is deposed. The State Power has passed into the hands of the organ of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the Military Revolutionary Committee, which stands at the head of the Petrograd proletariat and garrison.

The cause for which the people were fighting: immediate proposal of a democratic peace, abolition of landlord property-rights over the land, labour control over production, creation of a Soviet Government — that cause is securely achieved.

Long live the Revolution of the Workers, Soldiers and Peasants!

The Military Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

#### The Extraordinary Session of the Petrograd Soviet on 6th November.

Petrograd, 6th November. Many delegates to the Soviet Congress were present at to-day's extraordinary meeting of the Petrograd Soviet. Trotzky delivered the report on the political situation.

He related the history of the conflict between the staff of the Petrograd Military District and the military revolutionary

Committee and told of a number of attempts of the Provisional government to send troops to Petrograd against the Revolution. The Military Revolutionary Committee, however, had paralysed all these attempts.

"We are not afraid of taking over the responsibility for the defence of the revolutionary order in the town. Today the Military Revolutionary Committee declared to the population of Petrograd that the Petrograd Soviet of workers and soldiers' delegates takes over the protection of revolutionary order against counter-revolution and against pogrom-raids".

Today we were waited upon by a delegation of the municipal administration in order to inquire of us what is our attitude towards defending the town. They see that the government has no longer any power or force. We replied to the delegation of the municipality that we are prepared, in the interest of revolutionary order, to bring our activity into harmony with the activity of the municipal council. The delegation addressed further questions to us regarding the revolt, to which we replied what we have already often said. We have no need to alter our words: "All power to the Soviets!", that is our slogan. In the next epoch, the epoch of the Soviet Congress, this slogan must be realised. Whether this slogan leads to revolt depends not only and not so very much upon the Soviets, but much rather upon those who retain state power in their hands against the united will of the people.

The Military Revolutionary Committee has not arisen as an organ of revolt but as the organ of "self-defence of the revolution". When we saw that the Kerensky government wished to remove the revolutionary troops from Petrograd, then we decided not to permit this. When this government suppressed two newspapers in Petrograd which had enormous influence upon the Petrograd proletariat and garrison, then we said that we cannot tolerate the throttling of free speech and determined to continue to issue the newspapers by providing a military protection of their printing works.

"Is that an insurrection", asked Trotzky?

We have a State power which does not trust the people and in which the people has no confidence. The government mobilised the yunkers and ordered the cruiser "Aurora" to take to the open sea. Why did the government do this? Because the crew of the cruiser "Aurora" consists of revolutionary sailors. The government tried to send them away, but the sailors addressed themselves to the Military Revolutionary Committee, and the "Aurora" has not left the harbour.

Tomorrow the Soviet Congress will be opened. If the Congress declares that it will organise power, that will mean that the

people which has freed itself from the power of the counter-revolutionary government convenes its Congress and establishes its power. If, however, the present sham power makes the attempt to maintain itself, then the masses of the people, who are organised and armed, will offer it determined resistance. And the stronger the attacks of the government, the stronger will be this resistance.

On the relation of the Bolsheviks to the Left S. R.'s Trotsky declared that of the 5 members in the Bureau of the Military Revolutionary Committee two are Left S. R.'s. They are working very well and no differences of opinion on principle divide them from the Bolsheviks. They declared today that the fraction of the Left S. R.'s leaves the Preliminary Parliament and sends its representatives into the Military Revolutionary Committee. "And thus we have found each other in the fight against the common enemy, the counter-revolution." (Loud applause.)

#### The Decisive Attack of the Petrograd Proletariat.

Petrograd, 7th November. Tonight the Military Revolutionary Committee proceeded to open attack. At 2 a. m. the troops of the Military Revolutionary Committee occupied the Nikolai railway station, the Baltic railway station, the electricity works and various bridges.

At 3.30 a. m. the cruiser "Aurora" steamed in and fired at the Nikolai bridge. The junkers who were defending the bridge retired, the sailors occupied the bridge and placed armoured cars there.

At 6 a. m. 40 sailors took possession of the State bank.

#### Occupation of the Telephone Exchange.

Petrograd, 7th November. At 7 a. m. the revolutionary troops occupied the telephone exchange; the Winter Palace and the Military Staff were cut off. The revolutionary troops occupied also the Palace bridge. At 8 o'clock they captured the Warsaw railway station and the "Birshevaya Vjedomosti" printing works.

#### The Kronstadt Sailors Hasten to Aid.

Petrograd, 7th November. At 2 a. m. 5000 sailors arrived from Kronstadt. Antonov-Ovsjenko welcomed the sailors and placed them at the disposal of the Military Revolutionary Committee.

#### Panic in the General Staff of the Army.

Petrograd, 7th November. The successes of the Military Revolutionary Committee caused Kerensky and Kononov to go once again to the staff of the military district, where a panic broke out. A delegation of the junkers who defended the Winter Palace reported that they had received an ultimatum from the Military Revolutionary Committee summoning them to leave the Palace. The junkers told the staff that "they are prepared to fulfil their duty to the end, if only there is any hope of reinforcements". Thereupon Kerensky, along with officers, drove to the front in motor cars (one of which was the motor of the American Embassy), bearing the American flag, in order to retch troops.

#### The Cossacks refuse to fire on the Bolsheviks.

Petrograd, 7th November. The Petrograd Cossack troops, after receiving orders from Kerensky, asked the staff whether the infantry would also take part in the action. They declared afterwards that they did not wish to be living targets, and refused to perform military service against the Bolsheviks.

#### The Revolutionaries are Released from Prison.

Petrograd, 7th November. On the order of the Military Revolutionary Committee, the Bolsheviks who have been kept in prison since the July revolts were released. A number of officers who would not submit to the Military Revolutionary Committee were arrested.

#### The Reactionary Press is Gagged.

Petrograd, 7th November. The troops of the Military Revolutionary Committee occupied the printing works of the "Russkaya Volja" and confiscated the stocks of paper found there. The workers and employees of the printing works were called upon to work according to the directions of the Military Revolutionary Committee. 100,000 copies of the regular number of the "Rabotchy Putj" were printed and sent to the front.

## THE SWAN SONG OF THE GOVERNMENT.

### Appeal to the Population.

Citizens! Save the fatherland, the Republic and your freedom. Maniacs have raised the revolt against the only governmental power chosen by the people, the Revolutionary government.

The members of the Provisional government fulfil their duty, remain at their post, and continue to work for the good of the fatherland, the re-establishment of order and the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, future sovereign of Russia and all the Russian peoples.

Citizens! You must support the Provisional government. You must strengthen its authority. You must oppose these maniacs, with whom are joined all enemies of liberty and order, and the followers of the Tsarist regime, in order to wreck the Constituent Assembly, destroy the conquests of the Revolution and the future of our dear fatherland.

Citizens! Organise around the Provisional Government for the defence of its temporary authority, in the name of order and the happiness of all peoples of our great fatherland.

### The End of the Preliminary Parliament.

Petrograd, 7th November. At 12 o'clock to-day the troops of the Military Revolutionary Committee surrounded the Maria Palace. The armoured motor car "Olieg" of the Military Revolutionary Committee was drawn up at the corner of the Vossnesensky Prospect. At 1 a. m. the Palace was occupied and the Preliminary Parliament meeting there was ordered to leave the premises immediately. The members of the Preliminary Parliament left the premises under protest. The chairman of the Preliminary Parliament Axentiev in closing the Parliament declared that the day of the next meeting would be made known by means of placards. This, however, was the last meeting of the Preliminary Parliament. At the same time the work of the Committee for Convening the Constituent Assembly, which was also meeting in the Maria Palace, also ceased.

### The Bolsheviks Occupy the Winter Palace and Arrest the Government.

Petrograd, 7th November. The supply of bread being conveyed to the Winter Palace was held up by the troops of the Military Revolutionary Committee. The government troops in the Winter Palace went without their dinner. Of the 6 armoured cars in the Winter Palace five went over to the side of the Military Revolutionary Committee and only one remained to defend the Winter Palace. At 6 o'clock in the evening the troops of the Military Revolutionary Committee entered the Winter Palace. At 2 a. m. next morning the revolutionaries were in entire possession of the Winter Palace. Antonov-Ovsjenko arrested the government.

### The Petrograd Soviet Announces the Overthrow of the Provisional Government.

Petrograd, 7th November. The Extraordinary Session of the Petrograd Soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies was opened at 2.30 in the afternoon under the chairmanship of Trotsky. Trotsky declared amidst loud applause that the Provisional government no longer exists, the Preliminary Parliament has been dispersed, a number of government offices occupied, the political prisoners released and the army at the front had been informed by telegraph of the overthrow of the government and the approaching setting up of a new power; the fate of the Winter Palace must be decided in a few minutes.

Lenin, who appeared for the first time at an open meeting, amidst tremendous applause delivered a speech on the tasks of the Soviet Power. After Lenin there spoke Lunatcharsky and Zinoviev.

After a short discussion the meeting adopted the following resolution, moved by Volodarsky:

"The Petrograd Soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies, saluting the victorious revolution of the Petrograd proletariat and garrison, particularly emphasises the unity, organisation, discipline and complete co-operation shown by the masses in this rising; rarely has less blood been spilt and rarely has an insurrection proceeded so well.

"The Soviet expresses its firm conviction that the workers and peasants' government which, as the government of the

Soviets, will be created by the revolution, and which will assure the industrial proletariat of the support of the entire mass of poor peasants, will march firmly towards Socialism, the only means by which the country can be spared the miseries and unheard-of horrors of war.

"The new Workers' and Peasants' Government will propose immediately a just and democratic peace to all the belligerent countries.

"It will suppress immediately the great landed property and transfer the land to the peasants. It will establish workers' control over production and distribution of manufactured products, and will set up a general control over the banks, which it will transform into a State monopoly.

"The Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies calls upon the workers and peasants of Russia to support with all their energy and all their devotion the proletarian revolution. The Soviet expresses its conviction that the city workers, allies of the poor peasants, will assure complete revolutionary order, indispensable to the victory of Socialism. The Soviet is convinced that the proletariat of the countries of Western Europe will aid us in conducting the cause of Socialism to a real and lasting victory."

#### The Mensheviks "Repudiate Responsibility".

In the name of the representatives of the Menshevik fraction of the Petrograd Soviet — Weinstein, Brojdo and Liber — it was declared that the fraction of the Mensheviks "repudiate all responsibility for the consequences of the conspiracy. The fraction, in agreement with the C. C. of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (Mensheviks), declares its withdrawal from the Presidium and the Executive Committee of the Soviet". (Isvestyia No. 207/208.)

## The First Speech of Lenin after the Revolution.

Comrades!

The workers' and peasants' revolution, of the necessity of which the Bolsheviks have always spoken, is accomplished.

What significance has this workers' and peasants' revolution? The significance of this revolution consists above all in the fact that we have a Soviet government: our own organ of power, without any participation of the bourgeoisie. The suppressed masses themselves will constitute the power. The old State apparatus will be shattered to its foundation and a new administrative apparatus will be created in the shape of the Soviet organisations.

There now commences a new epoch in the history of Russia. The present third Russian revolution must ultimately lead to the victory of Socialism. One of our next tasks is the immediate liquidation of the war. But in order to be able to fight against this war, which is closely bound up with the present capitalist order, it is obvious that capital itself must be fought.

In this cause the international labour movement, which is already beginning to rise in Italy, England and Germany, will hasten to our aid.

The just and immediate peace which we have proposed to international democracy will everywhere arouse an enthusiastic response among the masses of the international proletariat. In order to strengthen this confidence of the proletariat, all secret treaties must be immediately published.

In Russia a great part of the peasantry has said: "Enough of playing with the capitalists. We shall go with the workers! We are winning the confidence of the peasants with a decree abolishing private property in land. The peasants will understand that they will find well-being in alliance with the working class. We shall introduce a real workers' control of production. We have now learnt to work in firm fellowship together. That is proved by the revolution which has been accomplished. We have at our disposal that force of a mass organisation which will vanquish everything and lead the proletariat to world revolution.

In Russia we must now engage in building up the proletarian socialist State.

Long live the Socialist World Revolution!

## The Day After the Victory.

### Formation of the Council of People's Commissars.

The All-Russian Congress of workers, soldiers' and peasants' deputies resolves:

Until the meeting of the Constituent Assembly, a provisional workers' and peasants' government is formed, which shall be named the Council of People's Commissars.

The administration of the different branches of State activity shall be entrusted to commissions, the composition of which shall be regulated to ensure the carrying out of the programme of the Congress, in close union with the mass organisations of working men, sailors, soldiers, peasants and employees. The government is vested in a collegium, made up of the chairman of these commissions, that is to say, the Council of People's Commissars.

Control over the activities of the People's Commissars and the right to replace them, shall belong to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers, Peasants and Soldiers' Deputies, and its Central Executive Committee.

At the present moment the Council of People's Commissars shall consist of the following persons:

President of the Council: Vladimir Uljanov (Lenin).

Interior: A. Rykov.

Agriculture: V. P. Miljutin.

Labour: A. G. Shljapnikov.

Military and Naval Affairs: a committee composed of V. A. Ovsjenko (Antonov), N. V. Krylenko and F. M. Dybenko.

Commerce and Industry: V. P. Nogin.

Education: A. V. Lunatcharsky.

Finance: I. I. Skortsov (Stepanov).

Foreign Affairs: L. D. Bronstein (Trotzky).

Justice: G. E. Oppokov (Lomov).

Supplies: E. A. Teodorovitch.

Post and Telegraph: N. P. Avilov (Glebov).

Chairman for Nationalities: I. W. Djougashvili (Stalin).

The post of People's Commissar for Railways is to be filled later.

### The All-Russian Soviet Congress in Favour of Power to the Soviets, Immediate Peace and Confiscation of the Land.

Petrograd, 8th November. Yesterday evening at 10-40 there was opened in Smolny the Second All-Russian Soviet Congress. Dan, who opened the Congress in the name of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, pointed to the extraordinary circumstances in which the Congress met.

In accordance with the numerical strength of the parties there were elected to the Presidium 14 Bolsheviks and 7 Left S.R.'s. The Right S.R.'s and the Mensheviks refused to take part in the Presidium. The Presidium was supplemented by the representatives of the Ukrainian Socialist Party. Kamenev was elected as chairman.

Martov, in the name of the Mensheviks-Internationalists, proposed that the Congress pronounce itself in favour of a peaceful solution of the present crisis by the creation of a general democratic government and that it elect a delegation for the purpose of conducting negotiations.

Trotzky, on the other hand, introduced a resolution condemning the activity of the compromising parties and congratulating the Petrograd workers, soldiers and peasants on their successful action.

The Left S. R. 's spoke against the resolution of Trotzky and for a revolutionary united front; the Mensheviks-Internationalists and the Zionists who joined them left the Congress.

\* \* \*

Petrograd, 8th November. At 9 o'clock this evening the Second and last session of the All-Russian Soviet Congress was opened, at which was decided the questions of peace, the land and the setting up of a provisional workers' and peasants' government, i. e. the Soviet of People's Commissars.

At the beginning of the session Kamenev declared that the death penalty has been abolished, the political prisoners released, the arrested members of the land committees set free and that measures had been adopted for the arrest of Kerensky.

Lenin spoke on the question of peace, and moved the adoption of the decree on peace (see text below). He emphasised

that the Congress must address itself to the "governments and the peoples" of the belligerent countries, for to ignore the governments would delay the possibility of concluding peace. "In order to deprive the enemies of the possibility of saying that their conditions are quite different and therefore they will not enter into any negotiations with us — we must not submit our demands (peace without annexations and indemnities) as an ultimatum."

The decree on peace was unanimously adopted by the Congress. Lenin received an ovation, the meeting sang the "International" and, in memory of the victims of the revolution, the funeral march.

On the second item on the agenda: the immediate abolition of the private property of the landowners in the land, Lenin spoke. He proposed the decree on the land, based on the 242 peasant instructions. The decree (text of which see below), which puts an end to the rule of the landowners and hands over the land to the peasants who cultivate it, was adopted by all votes against one and 8 abstentions.

On the last item on the agenda; question of power, the Bolsheviks brought in the following resolution:

"For the administration of the State until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, a provisional workers' and peasants government is set up, called the 'Council of People's Commissars.'"

Avilov in the name of the united Internationalists, and Karelin in the name of the Left S. R. 's pointed to the difficulties confronting the new power and the necessity of a reconciliation with the dispersed sections of democracy. Trotsky refuted the criticism of Avilov and Karelin, whereupon the Congress adopted the decree on the setting up of the Council of People's Commissars.

A hundred members were elected to the new central committee of the Soviet, 70 of whom are Bolsheviks.

### The First Measures.

#### The Old Government Commissars are Removed.

Petrograd, 8th November: "The All-Russian Soviet Congress decided that all arrested members of land committees be immediately set free. The Commissars who arrested them are to be arrested. From this moment all power belongs to the Soviets. The Commissars of the Provisional government are removed. The Presidents of the various local Soviets are invited to enter into direct relations with the revolutionary government."

#### The Death Penalty Abolished at the Front.

"The death penalty at the front imposed by Kerensky is abolished. Complete freedom of agitation is established at the front. All soldiers and revolutionary officers who have been arrested on account of so-called political crimes are immediately released.

#### The Ministers Arrested.

The former Ministers, Kononov, Kishkin, Terechenko, Maljantovitch and Nikitin have been arrested by the Military Revolutionary Committee. Kerensky has fled. All army organisations are instructed to take immediate steps to arrest Kerensky and to convey him to Petrograd. All help rendered Kerensky will be regarded as a serious crime against the State."

#### The Sabotage by the State Officials.

Petrograd, 8th November. The members of the staffs of the Ministers of the former provisional government have formed the "small ministerial councils" and decided not to carry out the instructions of the Soviet power. The officials of the Finance Ministry have adopted the proposal of the bank consortium according to which all officials are granted three months pay in the event of their not obtaining a position in the State apparatus of the Soviet Power.

## Decree on Peace.

### Proclamation to the Peoples' and Governments of all belligerent Nations.

The Workers' and Peasants' Government, created by the revolution of November 6th and 7th and based on the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, proposes to all

the belligerent peoples and to their governments to begin immediately negotiations for a just and democratic peace.

The government means by a just and democratic peace, which is desired by the immense majority of the workers and the labouring classes, exhausted and depleted by the war, — that peace which the Russian workers and peasants, after having struck down the Tsarist monarchy, have not ceased to demand categorically — immediate peace without annexations (that is to say, without conquest of foreign territory, without forcible annexation of other nationalities), and without indemnities.

The Government of Russia proposes to all the belligerent peoples immediately to conclude such a peace, by showing themselves willing to enter upon the decisive steps of negotiations aiming at such a peace, at once, without the slightest delay, before the definitive ratification of all the conditions of such a peace by all the authorised assemblies of the people of all countries and of all nationalities.

By annexation or conquest of foreign territory, the government means — conformably to the conception of democratic rights in general and the rights of the working class in particular — all union to a great and strong State of a small or weak nationality, without the voluntary, clear and precise expression of its consent and desire; whatever be the moment when such an annexation by force was accomplished, whatever be the degree of civilisation of the nation annexed by force or maintained outside the frontiers of another State, no matter if that nation be in Europe or in the far countries across the sea.

If any nation is retained by force within the limits of another State; if, in spite of the desire expressed by it (it matters little if that desire be expressed by the press, by popular meetings, decisions of political parties, or by disorders and riots against national oppression), that nation is not given the right of deciding by free vote — without the slightest constraint, after the complete departure of the armed forces of the nation which has annexed it or wishes to annex it or is stronger in general — the form of its national and political organisation, such a union constitutes an annexation — that is to say, conquest and an act of violence.

To continue this war in order to permit the strong, rich nations to divide among themselves the weak and conquered nationalities is considered by the Government the greatest possible crime against humanity; and the Government solemnly proclaims its decision to sign a treaty of peace which will put an end to this war upon the above conditions, equally fair for all nationalities without exception.

The Government abolishes secret diplomacy, expressing before the whole country its firm decision to conduct all the negotiations in the light of day before the people, and will proceed immediately to the full publication of all secret treaties confirmed or concluded by the government of landowners and capitalists, from March until November 7th, 1917. All the clauses of the secret treaties which, as occur in a majority of cases, have for their object to procure advantages and privileges for Russian capitalists, to maintain or augment the annexations of the Russian imperialists, are denounced by the Government immediately and without discussion.

In proposing to all governments and all peoples to engage in public negotiations for peace, the Government declares itself ready to carry on these negotiations by telegraph, by post or by pourparlers between the representatives of the different countries, or at a Conference of these representatives. To facilitate these pourparlers the Government appoints its authorised representatives in the neutral countries.

The Government proposes to all the governments and to the peoples of all the belligerent countries to conclude an immediate armistice, at the same time suggesting that the armistice ought to last three months, during which time it is perfectly possible not only to hold the necessary pourparlers between the representatives of all the nations and nationalities without exception drawn into the war or forced to take part in it, but also to convoke authorised assemblies of representatives of the people of all countries, for the purpose of the definite acceptance of the conditions of peace.

In addressing this offer of peace to the governments and to the peoples of all the belligerent countries, the Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia addresses equally and in particular the class-conscious workers of the

three most advanced nations of mankind and which are at the same time the three most important nations taking part in the present war — England, France and Germany. The workers of these countries have rendered the greatest services to the cause of progress and of Socialism. The splendid examples of the Chartist Movement in England, the series of revolutions, of world-wide historical significance, accomplished by the French proletariat — and finally, in Germany, the historic struggle against the Exceptional Laws, an example for the workers of the whole world of prolonged and stubborn action, and the creation of the formidable organisations of German proletarians — all these models of proletarian heroism, these monuments of history, are for us a sure guarantee that the workers of these countries will understand the duty imposed upon them to liberate humanity from the horrors and consequences of war; and that these workers, by decisive, energetic and continued action, will help us to bring to a successful conclusion the cause of peace — and at the same time, the cause of the liberation of the exploited working masses from all slavery and exploitation.

### The Decree on the Land.

1. All private ownership of land is abolished immediately without compensation.

2. All landowners' estates, and all lands belonging to the dynasty, to the monasteries, church lands, with all their live stock and inventoried property, buildings and all appurtenances, are transferred to the disposition of the local Land Committees and the district Soviets of Peasants' Deputies until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly.

3. Any damage whatever done to the confiscated property which from now on belongs to the whole People, is regarded as a serious crime, punishable by the revolutionary tribunals. The district Soviets of Peasants' Deputies shall take all necessary measures for the observance of the strictest order during the taking over of the landowners' estates, for the determination of the dimensions of the plots of land and which of them are subject to confiscation, for the drawing up of an inventory of the entire confiscated property, and for the strictest revolutionary protection of all the farming property on the land, with all buildings, implements, stocks of cattle, stores of food etc., passing into the hands of the People.

4. For guidance during the carrying out of the great land reforms until their final decision by the Constituent Assembly, there shall serve the following peasant instructions, drawn up on the basis of 242 local peasant instructions by the editorial board of the "Isvestia of the All-Russian Soviet of Peasants' Deputies", and published in No. 88 of the said "Isvestia" (Petrograd, No. 88, August 19th, 1917).

#### On the Land.

The Land Question can only be decided by the legislative assembly (Constituent) of the whole people.

The most equitable solution of the Land Question should be as follows:

1. The right of private ownership of land is abolished for ever; land cannot be sold, nor leased, nor mortgaged, nor alienated in any way. All dominical lands, lands attached to titles, lands belonging to the Emperor's cabinet, to monasteries, churches, possession lands, entailed lands, private estates, communal lands, peasant freeholds, and others, are confiscated without compensation, and become national property, and are placed at the disposal of the workers who cultivate them.

Those who suffer hardship by reason of this social transformation of the rights of property are entitled to public aid during the time necessary for them to adapt themselves to the new conditions of existence.

2. All riches beneath the earth — ores, oil, coal, salt etc. — as well as forests and waters having a national importance, become the exclusive property of the State — all minor streams, lakes and forests are placed in the hands of the community, on condition of their being managed by the local organs of government.

3. All plots of land scientifically cultivated — gardens, plantations, nurseries, seed-plots, green-houses and others — shall not be divided, but transformed into model farms, and pass into the hands of the State or of the local authorities,

according to their size and importance.

Buildings, communal land and villages with their private gardens and their orchards remain in the hands of their present owners; the dimensions of these plots and the rate of taxes for their use shall be fixed by law.

4. All studs, governmental and private cattle-breeding and poultry-breeding establishments, and others are confiscated and become national property, and are transferred either to the State or to the local authorities according to their size and importance.

All questions of compensation for the above are within the competence of the Constituent Assembly.

5. All inventoried agricultural property of the confiscated lands, machinery and live-stock are transferred without compensation to the State or the municipality according to their quantity and importance.

The confiscation of such machinery and live-stock shall not apply to the small properties of peasants.

6. The right to use the land is granted to all citizens, without distinction of sex, who wish to work the land themselves, with the help of their families or in co-operation, and only so long as they are able to cultivate it. No hired labour is permitted.

In the event of the incapacity for work of a member of the commune for a period of three years, the commune shall be bound to render him assistance during this time by working his land in common.

Farmers who through old age or sickness have permanently lost the capacity to work the land themselves, shall surrender their land and receive instead a government pension.

7. The use of the land should be equalised — that is to say, the land shall be divided among the workers according to local conditions, the unit of labour and the need of the individual.

The way in which land is to be used is to be left perfectly free: as homesteads, as farms, by commune, by partnerships, as the villages and settlements may decide.

8. All land upon its confiscation is pooled in the general People's Land Fund. Its distribution among the workers is carried out by the local and central organs of administration, beginning with the village democratic organisations and ending with the central provincial institutions.

The Land Fund is subject to periodical redistribution according to the increase of population and the development of productivity and rural economy.

In case of alteration of the boundaries of allotments, the original centre of the allotment remains intact.

The lands of persons retiring from the community revert to the Land Fund; provided that near relatives of the persons retiring, or friends nominated by them, shall have preference in the redistribution of these lands.

When lands revert to the land Fund, the money expended on manuring or improving the land, which has not been exhausted, shall be re-imbursed.

If in some localities the Land Fund is insufficient to satisfy the local population, the surplus population should emigrate to other districts. The organisation of the emigration, as well as the cost thereof and the providing of emigrants with the necessary machinery and live-stock, shall be the business of the State.

The emigration shall be carried out in the following order: first, the peasants without land who express their wish to emigrate; then the undesirable members of the community, deserters etc. and finally, by drawing lots on agreement.

Everything contained in these instructions, being the expression of the indisputable will of the great majority of conscious peasants of Russia, is declared to be temporary law, and until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, becomes effective immediately so far as is possible, and in some parts of it gradually, as will be determined by the District Soviets of Peasants' Deputies.

The land of simple peasants and Cossacks is not confiscated.

The President of the Council of People's Commissars.

Vladimir Uljanov (Lenin).

## The S. R.'s in the October Days.

By Piontkovsky (Moscow).

When the proletariat and the peasantry proclaimed at the II. Soviet Congress the capture of governmental power by the Soviets, the Right S.Rs. refused to recognise that government. They declared that the II. Soviet Congress was not a congress, that it had no authority and that it had not been correctly convened. They left the hall and called upon all organisations to fight against the Bolsheviks. In the evening of October 25 (7th November), the S.R. faction presented its resolution to the Soviets in which it is declared that the capture of power by the proletariat and the peasantry "is a crime against the nation and against the revolution".

The S.Rs. called upon all the revolutionary forces of the country to organise in defence of the revolution. They declared the proclamation of the Soviet Government a mad and criminal step and pronounced unauthoritative the Congress which proclaimed the transition of power to the Soviets, the S.Rs. so doing then left the hall. On leaving they said:

"Owing to the fact that there is an insufficient number of representatives from the front and the local Soviets, the fraction declares the Congress to be invalid and withdraws from it."

On October 27 and 27 (8th and 9th November), the S.Rs. carried on an energetic campaign against the new government of the proletariat and the peasantry. They hastened to put all responsibility for what had taken place on the Bolsheviks and to call upon all organisations to fight against the unfolding dictatorship of the proletariat. On the 26th (8th November), the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party issued a manifesto declaring to the workers, peasants and soldiers:

"You have been criminally and vilely deceived. The government was captured only by the Bolsheviks... The voice of the toiling peasantry was not heard. The usurpation of power was perpetrated by the Bolsheviks. This will bring ruin to the country. It will cause hunger and misery. It will bring about a civil war. It will deliver Russia into the hands of Germany. It will deprive the peasants of their land.

"The Bolsheviks will bring about the closing down of factories, they will cause unemployment and starvation. They promise you immediate peace and gave you a new revolution which no one recognises, neither friends nor foes. The embassies are leaving, the Bolsheviks have given a free hand to the allies to make peace with Germany at the expense of Russia. You were promised immediate peace but instead they will bring you a new war at the front and a new civil war in the country.

"You were promised land and freedom but the counter-revolution will take the opportunity of the anarchy created by the Bolsheviks and will deprive you of land and freedom."

The only way out the S.Rs. could suggest to the proletariat and the peasantry was the overthrow of the newly organised Workers' and Peasants' Government. The only solution they could find was the creation of a revolutionary democratic government and the rallying to the "Committee for the Salvation of the country and of revolution".

It declared the October Revolution criminal and launched a vigorous war against it, by lending authority to the formation of the "Committee of Salvation" whose task was to fight against the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry by resorting to every means.

As soon as the Soviet Government was proclaimed a representative of the Council of the Republic and member of the Central Executive Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party, Avksentiev went to Buchanan the British Ambassador, on November 9th to assure him that the capture of power by the Bolsheviks is only a temporary affair and that the Bolsheviks will disappear and be isolated within a few days. According to Buchanan, Avksentiev assured him that the Bolsheviks can only hold out for a few days, that they are already absolutely isolated, that the forces which are expected from Pskov will most likely arrive within a few days. In a word, a member of the Central Committee of the S.Rs. did everything in his power almost the first day of the October Revolution to secure

the support of the British bourgeoisie in the struggle against the proletariat and the peasantry.

He assured the British Ambassador that the Bolsheviks will be smashed and destroyed. Buchanan said in his memoirs that he could not share the firm belief of Avksentiev. Buchanan was visited also by representatives of other groups. On November 7th Buchanan was visited by Tchaikovsky and Skobeliev. The S.Rs. were the first to visit him. After their attempt to make an alliance with the friendly allies, the bourgeoisie of England and France, the S.Rs. tried to organise an energetic struggle also against the new Soviet Government.

Gatz, member of the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party and Feit, were sent to Krasnov's forces. Kerensky and many other militant S.Rs. were among those forces. The S.Rs. supported the Committees of Salvation in every possible way and appealed to soldiers who belonged to them not to help the Bolsheviks in their struggle for the Soviet Government. The Social Revolutionary Party forbade all Social Revolutionary soldiers of Petrograd and suburbs to help the Bolsheviks and appealed to the soldiers particularly to those sympathising with them. They tried to utilise the popularity of their party in undermining the military ranks of the Revolution.

By a special decree of their Party they ordered their members in the army not to obey instructions unless they are approved orally or in writing by the Petrograd Military Commission of the Social-Revolutionary Party. On October 27th (9th November) the Central Committee instructed its organisations to give

"full support to the military organisation, commissaries and officers in the final liquidation of the mad contrivance".

This was how they designated the Soviet Government. The Central Committee expelled those who, in one form or another, supported the Soviet Government. All Party members who supported the Government and did not withdraw from the II. Congress of Soviets or did not come out against the Bolsheviks were expelled from the Party by the Central Committee.

The Party endeavoured to utilise its popularity gained by its past deeds, in the fight against the Bolsheviks, the proletariat and the peasantry. The struggle carried on by the Cossacks and the counter-revolutionary officers was organised and guided by the S. R.'s. They, as well as the Mensheviks were plotting against the Bolsheviks, were trying to isolate them and to force them to give up power. Failing that, the Social-Revolutionary Party declared on November 3rd. (16th November) its complete rupture with the Bolsheviks, the abandonment of any hope to settle the conflict peacefully. It declared a relentless, irreconcilable and persistent struggle against the Soviet Government and the Bolsheviks.

The "Dielo Naroda" wrote in its issue of November 3. (16th November) 1917 in an article "Our Tasks", as follows:

"The Social-Revolutionary Party, by refusing to collaborate with the Bolsheviks, automatically joins the ranks of the opposition as it does not fight on the side of those workers and soldiers who are temporarily following the Bolsheviks. It must fight and break the Dictatorship and expose its internal falseness before Democracy."

On November 3rd. (16th November) the S. R.'s definitely joined the enemies of the Proletarian Revolution. In all their measures, in all acts against the October Revolution, during the period of October, November, December and in all subsequent acts to this very day, the S. R.'s took an energetic part. The Social-Revolutionary party appealed to all its organisations to fight against the Bolsheviks and to organise armed forces. On November 3. (16th November) the S. R.'s proceeded with the organisation of plots and terrorist groups to annihilate the Bolshevik leaders. By a special decision of November 14. (27th November) 1917 the Social-Revolutionary Party formulated all demands and aims on behalf of which it entered upon the struggle against the Bolsheviks. It demanded the removal of the Soviet Government and the establishment of the Socialist government with representatives of those parties which were in favour of the S. R.'s programme.

By declaring a relentless struggle against the Bolsheviks, the party made it its task to fight for a Provisional Government which was to exist until the Constituent Assembly. That Government was to be responsible to the "Peoples Council" which was to be represented by members of the old Soviet Executive.

the fraction which withdraw from the II. Soviet Congress, delegates from the Soviet of Peasant Deputies, representatives of the Municipal Administration, representatives of the Railway Workers' Union, the Postal Telegraph Workers, the Trade Unions.

The S. R.'s wanted a government of all those groups, sections and organisations, which acted jointly with them in the October Days against the October Revolution. It wanted a government of those who were in the Committee of National and Revolutionary Safety and who ran from Petrograd to Gatchina and vice versa. It wanted a government of those who supported the Junkers and those who tried in a thousand different ways to disorganise the ranks of the workers and soliders of Petrograd.

That Provisional Government was supposed to pass a series of reforms, dissolve the Military Revolutionary Committee, establish "Civil Liberties", and convene the Constituent Assembly by a certain date. On October 27th (9th November) one of the great leaders of the Social Revolutionaries, Zenzinov, declared the Bolsheviks to be enemies of the people. In an article "Who Are They?" Zenzinov wrote:

"They call themselves defenders of the people, but in reality they are the enemies of the people who violate them and shed their blood. A nation which is fighting for freedom and revolution must turn away from them; it must answer their appeals by condemnation. The sooner the ranks of those who realise that the Bolsheviks are but usurpers and violators would be formed, the sooner will that mad and criminal adventure which ruins the country and the revolution be overcome. We appeal to all to give concerted resistance to the Bolsheviks. They have nothing in common with the people."

This is an amazing article. By proclaiming the October Revolution a betrayal of the workers' cause, by declaring an irreconcilable war against it, by advancing the task of isolating the Bolsheviks and destroying them, the S. R.'s achieved one thing and that is that the proletariat and the peasants supported the Bolsheviks en masse. The moment the S. R.'s proclaimed the Bolsheviks to be traitors to the people, they themselves were guilty of treason. The moment that they appealed for the complete isolation of the Bolsheviks, the proletariat and

the peasantry isolated them. The Social-Revolutionaries passed their own death sentence in those October Days.

In his article "Who Are They", Zenzinov gave a clear and vivid description, not of the Bolsheviks as was his intention to do, but of his own party and its activities. Zenzinov's appeals to break away from the enemies of the people were fully realised by the proletariat and the peasantry.

Nobody followed the S. R.'s in "October" or after.

## Chronicle of Events.

November 6.

The government declares the Military Revolutionary Committee to be unlawful.

The Staff of the Petrograd Military District adopts measures to fight against the Military Revolutionary Committee.

The Mensheviks declare themselves to be against the revolt and in favour of the government combating the revolt by military means.

In the night of 6th to 7th November the Military Revolutionary Committee goes over to the offensive.

November 7.

The troops of the Military Revolutionary Committee occupy the railway stations, the electricity works, various bridges, the telegraph office, the telephone exchange and various government offices. No resistance is offered.

The Cossacks refuse to fire on the insurgents.

Kerensky, in a car carrying the American flag, drives from Petrograd to the front in order to fetch troops.

The Petrograd Soviet declares the overthrow of the government.

Lenin speaks for the first time at the Petrograd Soviet.

The Bolsheviks are released from prison. The front is informed by telegraph of the events in Petrograd and the victory of the proletarian revolution.

The Bolsheviks occupy the Winter Palace and arrest the government.

At 10—40 p. m. the Second All-Russian Soviet Congress is opened in the Smolny Institute.

# TEN YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

## Ten Years of Victorious Proletarian Revolution.

Report of Comrade Bukharin at the VII Trade Union Congress of the Moscow Gouvernement on October. 12th, 1927.

(Conclusion.)

By N. Bukharin.

### IV. THE MOST IMPORTANT RESULTS OF THE PAST DECADE IN FIGURES.

What is the aspect of our affairs since the introduction of the New Economic Policy? I shall read out the most important returns. In the year 1921/22, the gross proceeds of industrial goods stood at 1344 millions of pre-war roubles, in 1922/23 at 2156 millions, in 1923/24 at 2583 millions, in 1924/25 at 3917 millions, in 1925/26 at 5731 millions, and in 1926/27 at 6637 millions. Can we therefore be said to be abandoning our positions? Is our industry declining? Nothing of the sort. We are systematically advancing.

The output of rolled metals figured in thousands of tons at 256 in 1921/22, at 476 in 1922/23, at 690 in 1923/24, at 1390 in 1924/25, at 2250 in 1925/26, and at 2592 in 1926/27. Here again we are advancing.

The working output of a workman, expressed in pre-war roubles, amounted in 1921/22 to 1081, in 1922/23 to 1292, in the following year to 1507, after that to 2013, then to 2279, and finally to 2495.

The number of workers in the "census" industries, expressed in thousands, was 1243 in 1921/22, 1445 in 1922/23, 1617 in 1923/24, 1794 in the following year, 2288 in the year after that, and 2488 in 1926/27.

Here again we have thus an uninterrupted progress to record.

The average wage in goods-roubles stood at 8.84 in 1921/22, then at 13.45, 18.48, 22.72, and 25.44 respectively, and finally at 28.82 in 1926/27.

These figures should suffice to demonstrate that we are advancing. It is impossible to dispute this, since it is an established fact. It is brought against us that we are progressing less rapidly in industry than in agriculture. In reply we need but point out that — to mention only the most important figures — the capital invested in industry was seen at the commencement of the economic year 1926/27 to have risen in the last three years by 28 per cent., while the fundamental capital of agriculture had increased by only 10 per cent.; as regards the capital invested, industry has thus risen by double as much as agriculture.



Why is it of so much importance that this should be established? Because the entire attitude of the doubters, of our open opponents and luke-warm friends consists in the following argument: "In your industry you are advancing at a snail's pace, while the small agricultural holders are making more progress. You affirm that industry and the working class is the main thing, the decisive factor, the commanding position, and the very basis of Socialism; industry must take the lead of agriculture, and yet it is taking longer to grow than agriculture." The facts, however, prove the contrary, viz. that in regard both to production and to the capital invested and its importance, industry is growing faster than agriculture.

Special importance attaches to our progress, which, if not exceptional, is certainly substantial, in such branches as were at a great disadvantage in pre-war times, e. g. electricity. Elektrification is the basis of our Socialist construction. Lenin's plan of elektrification is what we have fought for and what we are determined to complete. In the year 1925, the output capacity of our power stations in thousands of kilowatts was 1349, in 1926 it was 1440, in 1927 1690 and for 1928 provision has been made for 2130.

The annual amount of electrical energy distributed by the great power stations figured as follows in thousands of kilowatt-hours: 431 in 1913, as against 1900, or five times as much as before the war, in 1927. This is a most significant fact. We have at our disposal five times as great an amount of energy as before the war. The number of power-works in the open country has increased elevenfold, and their output capacity as much as seventeenfold. The absolute number of these works is 858.

The number of farms supplied with electricity, about 98,000, is not great, but before the war there was no elektrification in the country at all, save for small local plant here and there for the requirements of the estates and farms of the large landowners.

The number of workers has doubled since the year 1921/22, now amounting to 106.5 per cent. of the pre-war number.

What is the use of trying to refute these facts and figures? Any attempt to do so must resort to trickery, as was the case in the arguments of Kolesnikov. But you cannot found a policy on trickery. The facts I have cited are familiar to every worker, though it is also very well known that in comparison with the giant tasks still before us, these achievements are no more than initial steps.

I am also in possession of some total results regarding the comparative rate of our economic development. Our industry is developing, undoubtedly. But is it developing faster than private capital; is our commerce developing faster than private commerce? Private trade, the private shops and stores, and their turnover are also growing. And which grows faster? I shall here cite some data which permit of no doubt that it is we that are developing faster and beating our competitors.

If we compare the percentage proportion of the gross output of the State and co-operative industry (including the small industries) with the gross output of private industry, we shall see that the gross production in our own hands amounted in 1924/25 to 81.3 per cent., in 1925/26 to 83.7 per cent., and in 1926/27 to 85.9 per cent. of the total. While our percentage share increases, that of our opponents continues to decline; on the one hand 81.3, on the other hand 18.7; for us 83.7, for them 16.3; for us 85.9, for them 14.1. Next year it will be 87.3 for us and 12.7 for them.

If we take only the State census industries, the corresponding figures are as follows: 95.8 per cent. in 1924/25, the same again in 1925/26, 97.5 per cent. in 1926/27, and 97.8 per cent. in 1927/28.

We have thus an uninterputed increase in the trade in our own hands, not only in the sense that we shall next year have more factories than this year, but also in the sense that our share in production is increasing as compared with the share of private capital; both are growing, but we are growing faster than they.

In regard to the goods turnover, we had at the beginning of the New Economic Policy no results worthy of mention to record at all; we were cheated and robbed on all sides. Now every year shows an increase of our share in the goods turnover, the year 1925/26 shows an increase of 68 per cent., the year 1926/27 one of 32 per cent. and the current year one of 19 per cent. Each year is better than the one before it. In

1925/26, private capital had an increase of 44 per cent. in comparison with our 68 per cent. In 1926/27, our increase stood at more than 32 per cent., while private trade showed a decline of 10 per cent. because we are advancing against it from all sides. For next year, an increase of our goods turnover of 19.8 per cent. is provided for.

In view of all these indications, the following argument can still be brought forward against us: True, you have ousted private capital. Well and good. Nor has industry broken down. But you advance very slowly and that is your ruin.

In the beginning we really did advance very slowly indeed. In the years 1920 and 1921, we at times not only advanced slowly, but even went back very often. Now, however, the rate of development of our industry surpasses the rate of industrial development in America and in the former Tsarist Russia at times of industrial prosperity. In this connection, moreover, it was a characteristic fact in Tsarist Russia that the rapid development of industry was based on the importation of tremendous quantities of capital from abroad in the form of loans, consortiums, and the like. We, on the other hand, develop our industry without the help of foreign means; indeed, we are in conflict with the international capitalist economy. Added to this, our economy has experienced the most acute period of disintegration, from which we have only just emerged, in spite of which we have in the last two years been progressing at a rate which puts all records of industrial development into the shade. This is a historical fact of the utmost importance.

Comrades, in the process of our Socialistic construction we are bound to meet with great obstacles; sometimes we stumble, make mistakes, reveal grave deficiencies, and produce anomalies.

There are plenty of shortcomings. In our organism there are a quantity of preposterous abuses and evils. There can be no doubt about that, but those comrades who declare that the Bolsheviks should rather contemplate their faults than their merits, are altogether wrong.

In this connection the following remark be made. If a Social Democratic worker or a worker without class-consciousness comes to us — one of those that cannot see the forest for the very quantity of trees, that fails to see our great achievements on account of certain deficiencies — and we tell him nothing of the Socialist industry, nothing of the manner in which we emerged from poverty, if we refrain from telling him that in this country the power is in the hands of the workers, if we tell him nothing of all this, but only describe the lot of the destitute children, of cases of bribery and other shortcomings, we should be giving him so distorted a picture that he would very likely run away. That would be exceedingly stupid. There must be moderation in everything and everything must be taken in a just proportion.

Imagine yourselves working in the G. P. U., without being told that in such-and-such a place workers are engaged in a festive reception of their Communist leaders, that in such-and-such a place the proletarian organisation is on the increase, and imagine only such messages being delivered as speak of a counter-revolutionary band having been formed at such-and-such a place, a factory having somewhere or other been set on fire by scoundrels — messages in short such as are mainly received by the workers of the G. P. U. Now, if we were to think according to the above receipt, such reports might, e. g., be "generalised" as follows: "So that is what it looks like in Soviet Russia, that is what happens among you, nothing but evils." This, it is true, was a picture reflecting well-known facts, but what is characteristic about it is that it covers only one side of the matter and not all that might be said on the subject.

We have a number of shortcomings; that is true enough. But if the real state of affairs is to be reflected, we must not only consider the bad side but also the good. Just look how the enemies of the revolution distort the truth about us. They take all the evil they can find, exaggerate it unduly, and then report it. About two years ago one of our American opponents made extracts from our own journals, among them the "Ekonomicheskaya Shisny"; he selected cases of embezzlement, bribery, robbery in the co-operatives, and the like, put these things together, mentioned nothing else, and published the collection in the form of a book. What conclusions could be drawn from such a work? Naturally nothing else than that our country was a country of madness, scoundrelism, theft, and so on, which is after all rather a misrepresentation. (Laughter.)

If we were to set up the principle of speaking, on this tenth anniversary of the October revolution, only of our shortcomings and not of our merits, it would be far from wise. I am of opinion that we must draw the balance, i. e. mention what is good and what is bad, or negative in the country. Backed and encouraged by what we have accomplished, we shall in a just estimation of our own forces, fight our enemies with all energy and pull down all the barriers obstructing our path. Is this not the only right attitude towards this question? Of course it is; it is the only practical, the only Bolshevik attitude.

And now a few words as to the situation in the villages. In our villages we witness the advance of the kulak. True again, comrades, but in so far as we possess any at all reliable statistical data — and in an estimation of the position we must stick to such statistics — we can but see that the process of differentiation in the Soviet village is advancing along very peculiar lines. Under the capitalist regime the peasantry in the village was differentiated, comprising small groups of kulaks on the one hand and poor peasants and numerous semi-proletarian elements on the other, while the middle peasant disappeared.

And what do our present statistics show us in regard to the peculiarities of village development? Let us look at the indications of the so-called "dynamic censuses" (the annual censuses in one and the same settlement). From the indications regarding the supplementary regions it appears that between 1922 and 1925 the number of farms devoid of horses receded by 1.6 per cent., while the percentage of the bigger groups with three or more head of cattle increased by 0.2 per cent. In the surplus regions the percentage of farms without horses receded in the same period by 2.8 per cent., while the percentage of farms with several horses increased by 0.2 per cent. For the year 1926 no total returns are available for individual regions, but the figures for separate sub-divisions in general show the same tendency of development.

In the Northern Caucasus, the comparative indications show a regress in the number of horseless farms by 4.7 per cent. between 1925 and 1926, alongside a simultaneous increase in the number of farms with several horses each by 3.1 per cent. In the Ukraine, the number of farms without horses dropped from 1922 to 1925 by 1.4 per cent., while the number of farms with several horses each grew by 0.5 per cent. In Siberia, the number of farms without horses showed a certain stability, while there was some decrease in the number of farms with several horses.

Although, therefore, a quite undeniable and rather pronounced process of differentiation is in progress in our rural districts in the growth of rural capitalism on the kulak farms on the one hand and the ousting of the poorer elements from agriculture on the other, this process of differentiation has in our case a characteristic peculiarity, in that the middling groups in general fail to disappear or to lose in economic and social importance. The horseless farms develop, albeit slowly. In this connection it should be mentioned that co-operative farming is developing satisfactorily.

I shall now pass to the discussion of certain results of Socialist construction and of the difficulties still confronting us.

## V. ON CERTAIN RESULTS OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION.

In ascertaining the results of our economic policy, we must first answer a very serious and important question already raised by Lenin, viz. the question "Who whom?" I should like to observe that at present the question "Who whom?" does not exactly occupy the position it did when Lenin first raised it; firstly because we are now attacking the enemy, and secondly because we are attacking him with a tremendous preponderance of forces on our side.

What was the state of affairs in our country when Lenin raised that question? What was the state of the great industries? We had so-and-so many factories, so-and-so many workshops, but half the workers had gone into the country, while the other half were turning out cigar-lighters; the big industries were practically at a standstill. Is this true, or isn't it? Certainly is. We had nationalised banks, but what was there inside them? We had millions of money. Almost every one of us was a multi-millionaire. (Laughter.) Each of us carried a few dozen or even hundreds of millions about with

him, but their value was practically nil. You naturally remember that very well.

And how was the state of commerce at the time when Lenin told us to "learn to trade"? Every one knows that. Even in the Government offices the private middle-men came and went; it not infrequently happened that in some State institute or other a passing middle-man would carry out at one door the State property he had acquired, only to bring it back again at the other door and resell it to the State. Is it true that we had so little experience as economists and business men? It is perfectly true.

At the time the situation was such that we had juridical property rights in the means of production, but that production itself was not yet in progress and we were fleeced by the swarms of private middle-men, who understood trading better than we did, who cheated us and, on the strength of private property rights, did business with the peasants. Then the question as to whether these swarms of locusts would overwhelm us was the most imminent danger. At that time elements such as those were in a position, in collaboration with private trade, to strangle us entirely. We were helpless at the brink of an ocean, attacked on all sides; our factories and workshops, shops and banks were empty.

Can it be said that matters are similar to-day? To-day factories and workshops are furnished with all they need; they are in full swing; they have exceeded the pre-war standard. The banks have their requisite contents; there is a stable currency. Do you remember how it was four years ago, in the autumn of 1923, when we had got so far with our currency that nobody could be found to accept it, when nothing more could be bought for our notes and the peasants used them as wall-paper? At that time potatoes, boots, galoshes, were ten thousand times dearer than millions of this money.

To-day things are altogether different. We have learnt to trade. The factories and workshops have been consolidated; in wholesale and retail trade we play a prominent part; in the last few years we have ousted private commerce from a whole number of fields in which it once was prominent. We have ousted it from the grain trade; the leather trade is almost entirely in our hands. We have forced it to cede one position after another. The co-operative movement, too, has acquired great importance among us. The factories, the transport system, the co-operatives, credit together with the banks, the currency circulation, all are in our hands. Are our relations with the small traders the same to-day as they once were? Naturally they are not. And therefore it is rank nonsense to say that they are, and that the question of "Who whom?" is just as it then was.

But what do our opponents say? Our opponents say: Things are worse now than they were then. And what do the representatives of the opposition in our Party, who were always inclined to vacillate and are vacillating now, say? They say that formerly there was a proletarian dictatorship — now, however, there is a "Thermidor"; formerly the state of affairs was good — now it is bad; formerly, they allege, it was not so easy for the peasants to tread us down as to-day.

That, however, is absolute nonsense!

In the last years of the New Economic Policy we may be said to have entered upon a new stage of development, in which our industry became the actually leading factor of all economic life in the Union and in which we are gradually getting to the point of directing the scattered peasant economy in the way of electrification, whereby we shall save the peasantry from what Marx calls the "idiocy of country life".

At the beginning of War Communism we introduced the system of monopolies, among them the grain monopoly, without possessing the power of carrying out the work properly. We then repealed the policy of economic force, but thanks to our organisation we have now on the basis of the New Economic Policy, concentrated the entire trade in the hands of the State and the co-operatives by means of the grain-provision organs. This means that we have in fact realised the grain monopoly in another form. Thanks to the fact that we could make this movement of circumvention we are thus approaching systematic economy after having learnt to govern the elementary laws of the market.

I ask, how could that happen, and why did it happen? I shall have to give the answer as briefly as possible.

The first presumption for all success is our Socialist nationalisation of the factories, of the land, of the banks, etc. The

second is the possibility of conducting a systematic economy on this basis; true, this was not possible all at once, and we now see what a mistake we made in this respect too, we see that a new system cannot be introduced overnight. Life has brought about gradual changes and improvements and now we shall approach the elaboration of a more or less definite five-year plan for the development of our economy.

The control figures are at present a more realistic item for us than they were before, and therefore, in spite of many abuses, in spite of procrastination, and in spite of bureaucracy, we can, thanks to our systematised economy, effect much economy; thanks to a systematised economy we are better able to distribute the productive forces of the country, thanks to the same factor we supply our Socialist industry with ample materials; all this we owe to the advantage of an unprecedented concentration of the means of production. We obstinately pursue the welding of our entire economy into an incomparably powerful economic organ, and this growth is the growth of Socialism. That is our greatest advantage, even at a time when we have not yet completely ripened to Socialism. Thanks to such welding of our entire economy we can get forward faster.

Finally, I think it one of the greatest peculiarities of our system, a peculiarity which many fail to understand, but which gives us the possibility of quicker progress than prevails in the capitalist countries (though owing to their former great progress we are undeniably not on a level with them) — I think it a great peculiarity, I repeat, that the relations between town and country are fundamentally different here from what they are in capitalist countries.

There is no country with such relations between town and country as we have here. In every capitalist country industry is adapted to the requirements of militarism, to the demands of the ruling classes, the landowners, capitalists, and the like: it may be said that in the capitalist system industry in general turns its back on agriculture. Therefore there can be no rapid fertilisation of the latter by the former.

Here, however, the land owning class has been destroyed, the bourgeoisie has been ousted from its dominating positions; our industry turns towards the villages, and by fertilising this tremendous economic territory we are accelerating the rate of our development.

Thanks to the fact that we possess the dictatorship of the Socialist proletariat, we have, in the face of unheard-of difficulties, been carrying out a price-reduction policy; and however high our price level is we must admit that, if the bourgeoisie were in our place with all the nationalised branches of production in its hands, the price reduction could not have been effected at all. Although some of our "friends" are crying out that we have not achieved any successes, we are conducting, and with good results, a decisive fight for the reduction of prices and shall continue to do so.

Finally, the masses play a decisive rôle in the problem of our economic development.

All these peculiarities, therefore, nationalisation, systematised economy, the changed relations between town and country, the reduction of prices, and the immediate participation of the masses, are characteristic of our development, giving us great advantages and being reflected in our quicker growth.

## VI. ON THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION.

In turning to the difficulties we have to face I must admit at once that they are truly enormous.

The first difficulty of an economic nature is the problem of surplus population in the rural districts and unemployment in the cities. The foundations of this unemployment are not such as would arise under the general laws of capitalist accumulation; to affirm that is rank nonsense. The basis of our unemployment is the inherited poverty of our villages, from which it emanates. By reason of all the rural districts have suffered, by reason of all we have experienced through economic disorder, by reason of our backwardness, we have a tremendous number of surplus workers in the villages and consequently also in the towns, seeing that the redundant population of the former converges to the latter and there become the source of lasting difficulties.

The extension of our industry does not keep pace with the growth of unemployment originating from the rural districts, and in this regard we must clearly recognise that, so long as we fail to abolish unemployment in the villages, we shall fail to eliminate the evil in general. Certain "economists" solve this problem very "simply". They suggest that we so far extend our industry as to absorb the unemployed, but even approximate calculations have proved that the extensions in question would have to be so great that no sane person could possibly demand them. Nor can unemployment be eliminated through an increase in the rates for Social insurance, since, apart from other more specific difficulties, this would cause yet more unemployed to converge from the villages to the towns.

In view of unemployment, of the maintenance of our proletariat, and of the development of our industry and economy in general, we must carry out a whole series of measures rendering it possible to keep the country population to the soil.

If this problem is to be treated in a liberal way, steps must be taken towards the industrialisation of agriculture, towards the extension of industry to the working-up of agricultural products, the preparation of meat preserves, the manufacture of starch and syrup, the working-up of potatoes, the production of vegetable oils, the output of milk-products, the drying of vegetables, etc.

To this end the farms must be developed with a more pronounced system of specialisation. The tractor cannot be introduced everywhere, its use is most recommendable in the case of extensive farms. As a preparation for more intensive culture, a number of measures, such as drainage, irrigation, and the like, would have to be carried out.

It is in this direction, along the line of the industrialisation of agriculture, that we must proceed; otherwise we shall never master the difficulties, which must be gradually removed.

One of the main difficulties is the lack of capital. We are often reproached with desiring to raise the missing capital at the cost of the people. There is, however, no other possible calculation. True, we shall tap the kulak and the Nep-man, but the chief and decisive source of wealth is the work of the people, so that the sooner the idea is dropped that we can acquire great sums from no-one knows where, the better it will be. It is only from our own means, from the work of the people, the work of the workers and peasants, that we can raise money; it is only in this way that the question can be solved, and it is fully apparent that the present shortage of capital can only be eliminated in such a manner, apart from possible revenue from abroad. We must take all steps to augment the development of production and of our productive forces.

The tremendous difficulties remaining not only consist in the fact that we are in danger of an attack; they have also great economic importance. At present, for instance, there is in a whole number of towns of all sizes a shortage of barley, flour, sugar, and other commodities of daily use. Why should this want exist in our times? It is the result of the unusual demand that set in in connection with the rumour of a danger of war; people have begun to hoard goods, to fill chests and trunks with all sorts of things, meal, biscuits, etc. The excess demand has grown considerable, and the result is difficulties, not all immediately apparent, but also such of a larger and more general nature, not only difficulties caused by the dearth of certain commodities in town and country, but also far-reaching economic difficulties.

Thus we intended recently to export a certain quantity of wheat, but the home demand, increased by such extraordinary purchases as above mentioned, absorbed too great a quantity. We therefore export less, but can in consequence also import less, so that both the export and the import programme have had to be slightly restricted and may thus be said to be disorganised. The result is, again, that difficulties of a "warlike" character have an immediate influence on the economy of the country (the currency, foreign orders, etc.). The Germans, who were a short while back granting us credits, are now, under British pressure, making all sorts of difficulties. The attitude of France and Great Britain in this respect is well known to you. We were in connection with a number of Austrian firms. The British capitalists, however, began to bully certain firms because they had business relations with us. We have undoubtedly to face a series of great difficulties.

In the most elementary affairs of daily life, such as the housing question, there are also the greatest difficulties to be encountered by the whole working class.

Without going here into further detail in regard to the obstacles besetting our path, I should like to draw your attention to the matter of our general class directives.

#### VII. ON THE INCREASE OF PRESSURE ON THE CAPITALIST ELEMENTS.

In my opinion it is beneath the dignity of our Party to reply to the accusation that we desire to liquidate the foreign trade monopoly (only political rogues resort to such methods), that the Comintern wishes to give up its support of the Chinese revolution, which only cowardly liars can assert, that we intend to encourage the kulaks, an idea worthy of political charlatans, and that we intend to pay back the war debts, a suggestion to which I have already replied. Such calumnious accusations can only be started by people who are becoming, or have already become, enemies of our Party.

I shall not trouble to refute all these mean, stupid, idiotic, and libellous accusations. But if we treat the matter in a serious political spirit, we are indeed faced with the problem, as to how the Communist Party, and with it the Soviet State, is to shape its policy in the present situation. What has happened of late? You all know very well that on the occasion of the 14th Party Conference and of the last party congress of the Communist Party, new tactics were resolved for our policy regarding the village.

We have accorded the middle peasants a series of facilitations by which the kulak has in some degree also been given the possibility to "bestir himself", but it was not for the sake of the kulak, but rather of the middle peasant, that these facilitations were introduced, just as in 1921 free trade was introduced not for the sake of the capitalists, but in the interest of the peasants, though the capitalists also profited thereby.

The question thus arises as to whether any change has come about since the date of the 14th party congress and 14th party conference, and subsequent to the respective measures effected by the Soviet Government under the guidance of our Party. Certainly a change has come about.

How was the situation at the time? There was then a certain crisis in the relations of the proletariat to the main mass of the peasantry, i. e. the middle peasantry. You know that there was considerable discontent among the peasants with the proletarian dictatorship. You know that in the villages and in the open country the ideas of the peasant unions had in some parts become popular. That was the reason why there was opposition to our lower Soviet organs and why some worker and peasant correspondents were killed. The murder of the heads of circuit executive committees and peasant correspondents, in itself no rare occurrence, reflected the discontent of the middle peasants, almost all of whom began to range themselves behind the kulaks.

By our action resolved on at the 14th party congress and 14th party conference, we gained definite, and in general satisfactory, results. We may declare openly that in our country the union between the proletarian dictatorship and the main body of the middling peasantry was never before so close as it is to-day.

Should we now sacrifice this alliance and spoil our relations with the middle peasant class by pushing them to the wall? By no means. We must support the middling peasant and increase our influence by all possible means. For it is just because we have consolidated our alliance with the middling peasant, it is just because we have made great progress in the co-operatives, in the process of commodity circulation, in commerce and in industry, it is just because we are bound to the middling peasant by closer ties than ever before, that we can now attempt a move in the direction of increased pressure on the kulaks and the bourgeois elements. This is a move that must be made and in the spirit of which we must carry out the preparatory work for the Party Congress.

It would be sinful and criminal if we were to dissolve or impair the alliance with the middling peasant. We know there was formerly a tendency in the Party to underestimate the importance of this peasant class. We have overcome this tendency.

We have preserved and consolidated our alliance with this class for the reason that our economic basis has widened and because of the consolidation of our Soviet Union. We have now more economic possibilities, we are now politically stronger and can therefore undertake a systematic and energetic attack on the capitalist elements, and in the first line against the kulaks.

In carrying out these attacks, we must prudently consider every step we take; we must not become hysterical, but act with confidence and circumspection. We are in a position to undertake this step and to increase our attacks mainly because the directives set up at the 14th party conference and 14th party congress have proved to be correct, and because the execution of the programme has strengthened our alliance with the middling peasants and consolidated the position of the proletariat in the villages. One link in the chain of our policy is connected with the other. Supported by the village poor, by the matured political and economic forces of our Union and our Party, we now can and must co-operate with the middling peasants in a forced attack on the capitalist elements in general and the kulaks in particular.

#### VIII. ON THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE TRANSITION TO THE SEVEN-HOUR WORKING DAY AND ON RATIONALISATION AND DISCIPLINE.

I wish still to speak about one problem which in the first place refers to the working class. We are fully clear as to the class strategy and class tactics to be observed in the coming period and also to the policy to be pursued towards the opponents of the working class within the country. This, however, requires a completely clear attitude towards the question of compactness, consolidation, and the raising of our own class to a higher cultural level.

We are of opinion that the time has come to raise the question of a slow but sure transition to shorter working hours. Whereas in the capitalist countries the eight-hour day has been abolished and turned into a nine and ten-hour day, and that even in Great Britain, we must envisage a shortening of the working day, though naturally without any reduction in wages.

This question is of the very greatest importance from various points of view. It cannot be solved all at once; there is much preparatory work to be done first. The change to the seven-hour working day will not only mean the creation of better material and other conditions of life for the workers occupied in production; if reasonably carried out, the change may even lead to an increased working output and afford certain possibilities in the way of diminishing unemployment.

Such a reform will also cause a great increase in the sympathies enjoyed by the Soviet Union among the West-European working class.

The seven-hour working day will confront the trade unions and the working class with new tasks. Comrades, we must be alive to the fact that we are engaged in a competition with the capitalist system. Finally one or the other of us will have to surrender, either international capitalism or we ourselves.

We must take into account that our task embodies an enhanced productivity of work, a better management of production, the development of the productive forces of the country.

I shall quite clearly and openly express my opinion on this subject if I say that no coquetting with any tendencies such as may have been maintained within the working class towards backward technics, backward working methods, and a slow and servile spirit — that no concessions in this direction on the part of the class-conscious portion of the working class can be countenanced for a single moment.

In a whole series of branches of production we still find a slavish pace of work. Just look how houses are painted and repaired in this country, beginning with the highly respectable building in which we are now assembled; just look how roads are repaired. Look how the paving is repaired here in Moscow, and how our new tramway lines are laid, for instance the line to the Serpouchov lock. It was laid 18 months ago and is already completely done for. And not only here, but in a whole series of other regions too, there is the same miserable method of working.

We must understand that it is for us to remodel our own natures, to work fewer hours but to work better. It will be more advantageous for us, and this is my personal conviction, to work less but to work better. We must accustom ourselves to become skilled workers by our own efforts.

Even at the present time we have in this country quite a number of thoroughly Russian traditions. We have still a peculiar type of people, slackers, that like to poke one another in the ribs, drink tea together, empty a bottle in each other's company, and, in short, play the part of "regular good fellows", "thorough good Russian people". This form of ideal ought to be mentally shot. Such people do not suit our times. Such people are of no use to us, and the working class must not cultivate that kind of "good fellow", but rather create quite a different type of person, one that thinks, that works quickly and precisely, considers well every step he takes, an energetic, fresh individual, sound in body and mind, energetic in his work. That is the new type we need. That is the type we must have at all costs. Capitalism, American capitalism e. g., has educated its workers by driving them through a barbarous speeding up mill; in spite of all technical advantages the worker is done for at the age of 35. I have seen with my own eyes how such people, when returning home on the street-car from their work, sit there like idiots, chewing their chewing gum. Capitalism has thus educated its working forces; it has realised great output results by placing inordinate burdens on the workers. It has achieved this by its own particular methods, the methods of the knout and of excessive working hours.

We cannot employ such methods, we must choose other methods than these. We must choose the path of a rationalisation of our output on the basis of a shortening of working hours. The necessary presumption, however, is that the working class, and in the first place the trade unions, must come to realise the best organisation of work, the best organisation of working discipline, to realise more reasonable relations between the means of production and their own labour power.

I have spoken at some length on this subject, because it must ultimately confront every class-conscious worker as the question of all questions. Routine still means very much in this country; it represents a fear of anything new, and very often you may hear it said that it would be much better to leave all things as they are; why should we offend our comrades by drawing their attention to their own laziness? That is all nonsense, a remnant of the rotten old times, which we must get rid of as soon as ever we can. Here we must again emphasise the other side of the question, the increase of our unity, our organisation, and our collaboration.

Further, we must also attain a whole series of improvements in our relations to the working peasantry, especially the poorer sections among them.

I shall now pass to the final section of my report.

## IX. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

We have set ourselves the very heavy task of preparing and ensuring the victory of the world revolution. It is wrong to say and to believe that the building up of Socialism in our country is what might be called a "national" task. We have never thought so and have never treated the matter in this light. We have always considered ourselves a part of the world revolution, and shall continue to do so. By still greater victories than that of October 1917, we shall prove that our revolutionary cause is the cause of the world revolution. We have set ourselves the task of overcoming the various classes. This is a task we have only just begun to solve. We have still to record our first successes therein. We have only just begun to remodel the peasantry by means of the Red Army and the co-operatives.

We have announced the principle that every cook must help to administer the State, and we have recruited enormous masses of the proletariat and in part of the peasantry to take part in this administration. This, however, is but a drop in the ocean in comparison with what still remains to be done. We have destroyed the bourgeois monopoly of culture, but as yet only a very minute fraction of the working class has passed through a proper school, let alone a university.

In an economic respect we are faced with the necessity of new qualification, and even the Volchostroy, the Dneprostroy, and the Svirstroy will, when they are completed, represent no more than very small steps, the very first steps on the road to tremendous electrical construction. We have the co-operative system in our own hands. But we are only just beginning to organise the peasants in productive co-operatives. We have now passed the pre-war level and are building up a new industry, but we have only just begun to give it a new technical basis.

We have begun the struggle against bureaucracy, have already drawn a large section of the working class and a fairly large part of the peasantry into the administration, but we are still faced by an ocean of work in this connection.

In regard to culture, too, we have no more than made the very first steps. Many persons have now acquired knowledge such as was altogether beyond their reach before. We have put an end to the narrowness of the rural districts and industrial suburbs. The horizon of the workers and peasants has widened in comparison to former times in a quite unforeseen degree. But these are merely the initial steps in comparison with the great tasks still awaiting us.

We may draw the balance of our ten years of existence as the dictatorship of the working class and as international revolutionaries. We need not be ashamed of our work. We know that the working class of our country will be eulogised by coming generations, as pioneers, as the vanguard and first accomplisher of the destiny of the Socialist world revolution. We know our flag is the flag of the world revolution and will continue to be so; we also know very well that we shall be victorious and shall prove worthy of the deeds we have already achieved, if only we observe certain elementary facts and presumptions, which we have maintained throughout the period of our revolution and during the entire existence of our Party.

These presumptions are in the first place the greatest degree of organisation, the unity of our working class, their trade union organisations, our reliance on the poor population of the villages and our alliance with the middling peasants, as also the guidance of the entire peasantry by the working class with the help of the middle peasantry. The chief presumption of this again is the guidance of the working class by our Party. The next and most important presumption is the absolute unity of our Party. This whole chain of presumptions must never be broken.

We here declare that our Party engages to resist ruthlessly any one, whoever it be, who attempts to break any of the links in this chain, whether it be our relations with the working class, or those between the working class and the peasants, or those between the Party and the trade unions, or the trade unions and the working class, and that because it would mean our inevitable ruin if any one of the links in this chain, which guarantees our certain victory, should give way.

We shall, however, not experience anything of the sort, for the force of the working class have increased instead of decreased, and because the forces of the working class in the West are also not decreasing, but increasing, while, despite all the talk of Ustrvalov and the other Smenovechovzy about an imminent weakening of our organisation, there is in reality no such possibility, but rather the certainty of a great work of Socialist construction, in which ever larger numbers of the population are taking part, people who have seen the old Tsarist regime, who have experienced the epoch of civil war, and who have fought under the red flags on all fronts. They see that out of a deep and seemingly bottomless pit we are again emerging, they feel the growth of our power in spite of the abuses and shortcomings in our midst. The workers and the working masses therefore join our ranks and support our Party which is occupying its old positions just as fearlessly as of yore.

The workers are for our Party, as the Party of our proletariat and of the international proletariat, as the party of international rebellion and international upheaval, for which they are ready to fight to the last drop of blood. (Prolonged applause.)

# Development of Socialism in the Georgian Soviet Republic.

By Sch. Eliava.

Until the revolution of 1917, Georgia was divided into separate administrative units (Gouvernements) of the Russian Empire. It did not exist as a separate organism. Like the whole of Trans-Caucasia, it served the Russian Empire as a strategic basis for the execution of imperialist expansion in the direction of Turkey and Persia and at the same time as a colony with a view to the object of plundering its natural resources.

The development of the economic and cultural forces of the country was not only not promoted, but was artificially kept down.

In its place, the Tsarist regime foisted on the country many officials, military officers, clergymen and missionaries from aristocratic or bourgeois circles, all of whom were imbued with national and chauvinistic ideals. The activity of the entire State apparatus, the police, the church, the schools and other institutions, was directed towards creating an antagonism among the racially mixed population of Georgia and the whole of Trans-Caucasia.

The February revolution of 1917 changed practically nothing in the general conditions of Trans-Caucasia. The Russian officials were replaced by such of local origin, but otherwise all remained unchanged.

Georgia was turned into a colony of European imperialism; the entire activity of the "independent democratic" Government culminated in the sending of delegations to European courts with a view to receiving recognition, and stood under the political and economic pressure of the troops of occupation and the high commissioners of the Entente countries (Great Britain, France, and Italy), who had the support of the leaders of the Second International.

It was not until Soviet power was established that the actual liberation of the Georgian nation came about; it was only then that advantageous preconditions of economic and cultural development began to obtain.

What was then the inheritance which the Soviet State in this instance took over from its predecessors, the Mensheviks? What it took over was an utterly disorderly, ruined, and exploited economy, a completely impoverished peasantry with the question of land distribution yet unsolved, a pronouncedly hungry and half-naked working class with works at a standstill, a dislocated transport and traffic system, a complicated and thoroughly aggravated national question, an unsolved state of affairs as regards the relations of Church and State, and a system of brigandage spread all over the country.

All these questions we have politically solved. We have put an absolute stop to what remained of the exploitation of the land by landowners and to the hostilities among the nationalities in Georgia and all Trans-Caucasia. We have unexceptionally carried out our Soviet law of the national insurance of workers; we have completely deprived the church and clergy of all State positions, and have organised the Georgian Red Army, which is at present a sufficiently formidable body to maintain order in the country and in case of emergency to defend our Socialist realm in co-operation with the Russian, Armenian, and Turkish sections of our Army.

The development of the individual branches of economy is characterised in agriculture by the active construction of irrigation plants, by the reclamation of the swamps of Poti, Kobal, and Abchasia, by the distribution of agricultural machinery and tractors among the peasant population, by the organisation of an agricultural credit system, by the development of the tea-plantations (in the course of the next five years, 20,000 hectares will be planted), by the restoration and enlargement of the area under cotton, by the improvement of the entire system of viticulture by the introduction of more active and scientific methods, by the promotion of silkworm cultivation and the wholesale organisation of cotton husking, by the restoration of the tobacco plantations and the further development of this branch of industry, by the creation of experimental plantations, and by the institution of agricultural relief measures.

In the realm of industrial activity, with the inception of Soviet power, factories and workshops have been erected for exploiting and working-up the inexhaustible stocks of all kinds of raw materials. In the short period of seven years since the

establishment of Soviet authority, the following textile factories have been erected and put into operation in Georgia: a cloth factory at Kutais, silk-yarn factories in Choni, Osurgetia, and Televa. At Tiflis a gigantic cloth factory is in the course of construction, with a prospective output capacity of one million metres of cloth per annum. Cotton combing works have been erected at Shoulaver, Kutais, Karajasy, and Gali. In the timber industry, the round-wood furniture factory at Marali, with an output capacity of 600 dozen chairs daily, was erected and put into operation. At Borshom and Batoum frame-factories were erected, and at Shangoni, Ksheti, Bayba, Bagdad, and other places saw-mills have been started. At Batoum, a petroleum refinery is being established, close to the Kaspi railway station a cement factory, at Kutais a rolling-mill, in the Achalalak and Dushet districts cheese-works, and in the Sonak region ham-curing works.

Since the year 1923/24, we have been in a position to realise results; before that there was a period of active preparation. While the big industries alone occupied 8027 workers in 1923/24 and 9838 in 1924/25, this number rose in 1925/26 to 14,362. Production has increased threefold.

Furthermore, we have organised in Georgia and in all Trans-Caucasia a magnificent systematic work of electrification on the strength of the tremendous supplies of "white coal". We have erected a series of electrical water-power works, the most important of which is that erected in the vicinity of Tiflis, with a provisional current-power of 20,000 h. p. and the possibility of being extended to double that force. Of the electricity works erected with a current-power of 50 to 150 h. p., we may mention the following: Achalkalak, Achsalzik, Koni, Zchinval, Shot, and Onij. The construction of the electricity water-power works at Abash, with a current of 2400 h. p., is approaching completion; these works will be put into operation on the tenth anniversary of the October revolution. The water-power works at Adjarishal, with a strength of 7500 h. p., will supply the Batoum district with current and is to be completed next year.

In 1927 the construction of the Rion electricity works was begun; these are provisionally to have a strength of 30,000 h. p., but will later be developed to double that figure, supplying the industrial districts of Kutais, Tkvibul, and Tchiaturi with current, besides furnishing current for the requirements of the mountain-pass region.

Besides the construction of factories, workshops, and electricity works, we are also restoring old roads and building new. A railway branch-line has been laid from the Kotasebi station as far as Osurgatia, while the Black Sea coast-line has been continued as far as Sugdidi, traffic being taken up all along the line.

As regards cultural work (schools, theatres, cinemas, literature, music, painting, sculpture, etc.), it may be said that the Georgian nation never experienced such cultural achievements as under Soviet authority.

Georgia's national literature has begun to flourish under Soviet rule. To-day there is in Georgia no renowned writer whose works are not printed. The schools are sufficiently supplied with lesson-books and other means of instruction. It was only now, under Soviet rule, that Marx's "Capital" first appeared in the Georgian tongue; similarly, Lenin's works have been published. The Georgian national theatre has attained a level never realised heretofore, thanks to the aid accorded it both by the Soviet authorities and by the Soviet public. If art was formerly a monopoly of certain privileged persons, we have brought it within the reach of the broad masses of the population. We have made it accessible to all. The Soviet authorities have established an academy of art. Dozens of new writers have emerged from among the broad masses of workers and peasants.

Alongside of the Georgian national culture, that of the Abchasians, Ossetes, and Adjarians are developing on a broad basis. The products of popular literature are now being collected.

In the past, the Abchasians and Anjarians could never have dreamt of securing a free development for their national cul-

ture. Prior to the establishment of Soviet authority there were in Abchasia 146 schools, while there are at present 270 and 8 kindergartens. In Adjaristan there were formerly 16 schools; now there are 122. In both of these republics, colleges have been erected for agriculture, pedagogics, and industry, respectively. Such institutions did not exist in the past.

If we consider that this tremendous work was effected in seven years under the most disadvantageous circumstances,

while we were surrounded by outside enemies and hampered by the sabotage of the intelligentsia and the petty-bourgeois parties and quite particularly that of the Mensheviks, it will be apparent what a glorious future awaits Georgia, a future which can, however, only be guaranteed by the Georgian Communists with the help and support of the victorious Russian workers and the working masses of the Soviet Union under the immediate guidance of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

## The Achievements of the Peasants in the Soviet Union.

By P. F. . . . . r.

The figures quoted in the following article are taken from two pamphlets published by the "Viva" publishing house and entitled respectively "The Truth about the Russian Village" and "Village Talk of the Peasants in the Russia of To-day". Ed.

Ten years of Soviet power, ten years of the Smytchka, i. e. the close alliance of the working class with the peasantry, under the hegemony of the former, have brought about an upheaval in the country such as the peasants, exploited to the very marrow of their bones by Tsarism, had never dreamt of seeing. The Bolsheviks, and Lenin in particular, recognised that a promotion of the interests of the peasantry was a vital question for the existence of the Soviet State and thus of the working class itself. It is from this decisive point of view that the policy of the Soviets has been conducted both in town and in the country.

Ten years ago, in the year 1917, it was only the Bolsheviks who advocated the unrestricted principle of "The Land for the Peasants". In the Russia of former times, 130 million peasants (83 per cent. of the population) owned 139 million desyatines (or hectares) or 65 per cent. of the total area. On the other hand, 150,000 nobles possessed no less than 35 per cent. of the area. The result of this state of affairs was a tremendous shortage of land and exorbitant ground rents payable by the peasants, to say nothing at all of the heavy socage and the like. The landlords squeezed out a yearly 450 millions of rent, on which they could live in luxury. Added to this there was the expenditure of the peasants for the purpose of acquiring land, which also amounted to about 200 million roubles per annum.

The October revolution did away with the big landlords. On the very next day after the October revolution, the two most decisive questions for the peasants, the question of peace and that of the land, were solved in their fullest interest. The landed proprietors were expropriated without compensation, the landed property of the nobility, the crown, and the church passing into the hands of the Soviet State with all that appertained to it. The Soviet State allotted to the peasants 100 million desyatines of ground of a value of 13,400 million gold roubles, reckoned at average pre-war prices. This allotment was at the same time a redistribution of the peasant property, the kulaks being deprived of 50 million desyatines, which was allotted to the poor peasants. At present, 96.5 per cent. of the land belongs to the peasants, 2.5 per cent. being State property, and 0.5 per cent. being in the hands of peasant communities. Furthermore, the October revolution brought the peasantry some 21 million desyatines of forest-land. (In 1925, the State handed over to the village communities, which were devoid of forest property, 13 million desyatines of forest-land.)

Thus the October revolution at a blow liberated the peasantry from the yearly tributes due to the landlords, but at the same time it likewise liberated them from the enormous onus of interest due on internal and external loans, as also from mortgage liabilities exorbitant taxation, and the like. The peasantry was thus relieved of an onus aggregating as much as 37,500 million gold roubles per annum.

In questions of taxation, too, we see a tremendous difference between the past and the present. In pre-war times, the tax onus on the peasantry amounted to 1485 million gold roubles, or 18 gold roubles per head of the population; now the peasants do not even pay a quarter of this amount, i. e. no more than 4 roubles per head. The Soviet Union is endeavouring, moreover, to relieve the poor peasant undertakings of the necessity of paying any uniform agricultural tax at all. Hitherto,

25 per cent. of the peasant farms were exempted from this tax; by the manifesto of the Central Executive Committee this percentage has now risen to 35 per cent., so that some sections of the middle peasantry are also exempted. The main weight of taxation thus affects the kulaks.

While Tsarism endeavoured to keep the peasantry in ignorance, the Soviet Government has done all in its power to raise the peasants out of their illiteracy, and to give them an all-round gratuitous education.

The political achievements of the peasants became apparent immediately after the October revolution, but in view of the war and civil war periods it was not until 5 or 6 years ago that the economic advantages really came to the fore.

In Tsarist Russia, the peasants were deprived of the most rudimentary political rights. In Soviet Russia it is they who, together with the workers and by means of the Soviets, exercise the political power; while the formerly privileged exploiters and oppressors, the landowners, capitalists, and nobles, are devoid of all political rights.

In the villages themselves, the Soviets are the highest authorities. Their practical activity is in general effected by means of the commissions for various branches of labour. With a view to recruiting the peasants to work, general village assemblies are regularly held under the guidance of the Soviets. There is also a growing tendency to include the peasant women in the organs of Soviet Authority; and this has met with success, for every year the percentage of peasant women who take part in Soviet administrative work grows.

While one-time Russia took everything from the peasants and gave them nothing in return, the state of affairs in Soviet Russia is altogether different. The agricultural tax in one district of the Moscow Government, e. g., amounted to not quite 86,000 roubles, which sum was repaid almost wholly to the peasants in the form of expenses for popular education, hospitals, administration, etc. Almost 50 per cent. of the sum, i. e. about 42,700 roubles, was spent on popular education alone.

The Soviet State promotes peasant farming to the utmost of its power. It had accorded, and still accords, aid in various forms against elementary catastrophes, such as famine, inundations, and the like. In particular, the State and the credit co-operatives grant extensive credit to the poor and middle peasants so as to enable them to provide themselves with the most necessary implements and so forth. In all respects, the Soviet State may be said to promote the industrialisation and improvement of agriculture. The output of agricultural machinery in the Soviet Union rose from a value of 19 million roubles in 1923/24 to 28 million roubles in 1926/27. The tractor plays an ever increasing rôle. Ten years ago, the Russian peasant knew nothing of this means of ploughing.

The Soviets Government does its utmost to promote the agricultural co-operatives, the most important pace-makers for Socialist economy in the village. In the course of the existence of co-operatives, the activity of which does not, strictly speaking, extend over more than the last five years, great success has been achieved; the co-operatives now comprise about 7 million peasant farms. The case is similar as regards the consumers' co-operatives, the membership of which more than doubled between October 1st, 1924 and May 1st, 1927.

The cultural and educational work in the country has acquired gigantic dimensions. This may be illustrated by a few

figures: In the period from 1920 to 1923, 2,400,000 persons were raised from a state of illiteracy, in 1924 about 910,890 persons, in 1925 926,077 persons, and in 1926 roughly 900,000. The editions of the newspapers in the country rose from 150,000 in 1923 to 1,678,000 in 1925. The number of libraries has doubled in the course of the last three years; in 1926 there were 6414 stationary and 13,726 itinerant libraries.

## The Soviet Court.

By A. Vishinsky (Principal of the First Moscow State University).

The chief task of the Soviet court is derived from the class character of the entire Soviet government system and consists in the protection of the conquests of the October revolution, in the defence of the rights and interests of the toiling masses — both individually and collectively — in teaching the toilers the Soviet laws in the spirit of Socialist construction and finally, in the realisation of revolutionary law in private and property relations between citizens.

However, this task of the Soviet court is far from being the most important task. The private and property relations between citizens are secondary relations as compared with the main object which requires especial attention.

It is not mere chance of course, that article I of the Constitution of the U. S. S. R. gives foremost importance to the task of "defending the conquests of the proletarian revolution, the Worker and Peasant Government and the laws established by it".

This determines in an absolute definite sense also another problem, the problem of the nature of the court. There can be no doubt that the nature of the court is a class nature, and that the court is an organ of class rule, an instrument of administration in the system of the class State.

The chief task of the court as an organ of defence of the class interests of the given ruling class determines also the composition of the court, the constitution of the court relations, the legal relations between the parties before the court, and many details of the court procedure. Let us take the composition of the court from the point of view of class adherents of its agents. Every court reflects by its composition the domination of a definite class. In Russia the pre-revolutionary court was primarily a court of the nobility spoilt somewhat by bourgeois elements. The European and American court is thoroughly permeated with representatives of the ruling classes. The participation in the court of the so-called people's element (juries, etc.) in bourgeois courts actually amounts to the drawing in of "reliable" philistine and well-to-do sections of the population. For instance the German court of laymen does not admit people who live in the given precincts less than two years or people who themselves or members of their family have received material aid in the course of the preceding three years from public funds (§ 33 „Gerichts-verfassungsgesetz“ 1925). The celebrated British court as was observed even in the 60's of the last century by James Stephens, a famous lawyer, comprised its juries of shopkeepers, burghers and well-to-do peasants.

The Soviet court is also a class court. According to the data of the government of the R. S. F. S. R., given to the XIII. Congress of Soviets (1927) the people's judges of the R. S. F. S. R. are of the following class composition: 85% are workers and peasants. The magistrates constitute 73% of the workers and peasants and prosecutors 63% workers and peasants. As far as the juries are concerned, at least 90% of them are workers and peasants.

People can act in all these capacities only if they have the franchise on the basis of the Soviet Constitution.

At the basis of all court procedures there is the correct understanding of the tasks which stand before the State.

The judge is the incarnation of the court. He can only perform his function properly and play his proper role if he can meet all the requirements which the government demands from it as its organ.

The question of the so-called independence and irremovability of the judges arise. The old school regarded this problem in an entirely different light. It spoke of the independence of the judge from governmental interference and of the judge

The Soviet model-farms, the collective irrigation plant, the grain-cleaning plant and the technical installations of all kinds play an extraordinary rôle in the development of agriculture.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is well aware that up to now no more than the initial steps have been taken. But these steps already guarantee the systematic development of economy, and beyond it of Socialism, in the open country.

following his own policy or being outside of the sphere of politics.

"No matter what may happen in the country, whether in time of war or peace, in time of rest or unrest, the court remains unchanged, the physician cures, the teacher teaches and the judge judges." (V. M. Hessen "On the Court.")

The non-political judge is the ideal of creative wisdom of the lawyers of the old school.

Reality never knew such courts or judges being independent of all politics. No government in the world would suffer an independent judge. There is no doubt also that a situation in which a government would be unable to remove an undesirable judge is impossible. The so-called independence and irremovability of a judge is an extremely conditional and relative conception. In the history of England, the irremovability of judges in the 17th and 18th centuries was nothing else but an instrument in the hands of parliament to check the power of the king. Behind this irremovability was hidden the right of the parliament to remove undesirable judges. Irremovability for one side proved to be removability for the other....

Repudiating in this manner the principle of independence and consequently the principle of irremovability of judges, Soviet law, however, proclaims its own conception of this independence. Independence from one's own government and one's own class is impossible. There can be no such independent judge and there is none. But independence from the numerous influences which frequently affect through the channels of different activity of the different social elements does exist. The Soviet court is independent of personal, local and similar influences. Five years ago Lenin brought forward the necessity of fighting for revolutionary law and socialist culture in our general socialist constructive work. In his famous letter on the system of prosecution, Lenin pointed out that the so-called local influences are one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of the establishment of law and culture. Lenin issued the warning of the necessity to organise a proper prosecution system which also includes the different courts — independent of these influences.

Soviet law, therefore does know independence, but it is absolutely different from the independence of bourgeois law. Where are the guarantees of court independence in the Soviet sense of that word? The best guarantee is: 1. the correct structure of the entire court system and 2. the proper selection of people.

Not everyone in the U. S. S. R. can be called upon to perform the duties of the court. Apart from the conditions stipulated by the Constitution, one must possess certain qualifications laid down by law. These qualifications are of a socio-political character: a certain standing in the work among labour and peasant social, political and trade union organisations. At the same time, Soviet law does not allow any arbitrary removal of judges by biased decisions of local authorities. Judges on a provincial scale can be recalled or replaced only through court in a disciplinary order and with the sanction of the People's Commissariat of Justice. The Soviet law does not permit any biased local action on the matter.

The Soviet court is built on the principle of dependence upon its class and removability on decisions of authorised government organs and it is a court of the toilers both in its composition and ideology. It is called upon to be a powerful instrument of the proletarian revolution in its fight for the great ideals of Communism.... It performs this task with honour and unflinchingly, clearing the ground for successful Socialist construction.