

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 14

11th February 1925

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.

C O N T E N T S

Otto: The Era of Provocation.

Politics

- G. Zinoviev: Proletariat and Peasantry. II.
A. Katz: The League of Nations and the Opium-Trade.
Arthur Rosenberg: The Attempt to Throttle the C. P. of Germany.
The "Pravda" on the German Tcheka Trial.
S. (München): Ebert-Barmat-Auer — a Corruption Trial of the German Republic.
I. A m t e r: Mr. Abramovitch Comes to Town.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement

- Minnie Birch: The National Conference of the English Minority Movement.
Andres Nin: The Right Amsterdamers against Trade Union Unity.

In the International

- Stalin: The Foundations of the Policy of the C. P. of Russia.

In the Camp of our Enemies

- Eugen Landler: The II. International and the Hungarian Party Dispute.

The Labour Movement

- D. Antoschkin: The Congress of the Trade Union of the Soviet and Commercial Employees of the Soviet Union.

Union of Soviet Republics

- The Conference for the Work among the Peasant Women.
Vladimir Gavrilov: Progress in Culture among the Railwaymen.

The Peasant International

- The Mexican Farmers Join the Peasant International.

Workers' Correspondence

- Letter from a Russian Textile Worker.

The Era of Provocation.

By Otto.

The trial of the "German Tcheka" will be held in a few days before the High State Court in Leipsig.

History repeats itself. The darkest ages of the "witchcraft trials" and of the Inquisition are returning.

The brutal cruelties of the Jesuits in the time of the Inquisition were practised in the name of God, in the "service of the Saviour". Now the inquisitors are social democrats and republicans, the inquisition chamber is the "High State Court", the crucifix the Republic!

As the proletariat could not be beaten in open fight, the bourgeoisie sends spy after spy, provocateur after provocateur to harass the retreating proletariat in order to weaken the last forces which it still possesses. It practises the same policy when the revolutionary mood among the masses is rising, in order to bring about a premature outbreak.

The Inquisition and the persecution of heretics in the middle ages was the deliberate provocation on the part of the church against discontent, in order thereby to divert the mood of the masses which was directed against the arbitrary rule of the church.

And always when a revolution has been crushed, weaklings will be found in the ranks of the proletariat who, in order to save themselves, will betray their brothers. The bourgeoisie

makes the best use of the situation in order to smuggle its conscious provocateurs and spies into the disordered ranks of the proletariat.

For the modern republican inquisition it is an easy thing to find among the proletarians, who have been demoralised and weakened by the twelve hour day and war, by hunger and social democracy, those who are weak and base enough to betray their class for a few pieces of silver.

The Russian proletariat, which has the greatest revolutionary traditions, can point to hundreds of cases in which the beasts of the "Black Hundreds" smuggled hundreds of provocateurs into the ranks of the proletariat.

Almost every worker is familiar with the history of the greatest provocateur of the Russian revolutionary movement, Asev, who as a member of the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party organised acts of terror, but before they were carried out delivered over his fellow-conspirators into the hands of the jailers, or at the same time carried out attempts against those members of the dynasty who were in disfavour with the "Ochрана", in order thereby to increase the confidence of the Party in him. There is also the case of the notorious provocateur Malinovsky, a member of the social democratic Duma fraction. Malinovsky was arrested on account of his revolutionary activity, then released and, as a provocateur, was the means of hundreds of members of the social democratic

Party of Russia being banished to Siberia. Among other things he was instructed by the police to organise a split in the social democratic Duma fraction.

All of us are familiar with the Beilis trial, with the great Jewish pogroms in Russia which were undertaken by the "Black Hundreds" in order to provoke the growing discontent of the peasants and workers and thereby to divert it into other channels.

We can mention the case of Bogroff, who, having been exposed by his comrades as a provocateur, in order to save himself, carried out the assassination of Stolypin and was then hanged by the police.

Everybody is familiar with the famous Blau trial in Germany. After the provocateur Blau had rendered good service to the police in the Spartacus fights at the beginning of the year 1919, the police, desiring to get rid of him, had him murdered and attributed this murder to the Communist Party.

Or, in order to quote examples from other countries we may cite the case of the Hungarian provocateur Nánásy, who as member of the illegal military organisation of the Party betrayed the names and addresses of leading functionaries of the Party to the police, and thereby rendered it possible for the social democrats at the commencement of the year 1919 to arrest all the functionaries of the Communist Party.

The Lettish provocateur Liciets betrayed the trade union organisation of Lettland in smuggling false money (with the knowledge of the social democratic party secretary Bruno Kalnia) into the cash boxes of the trade unions, and then had house-searches carried out in order to be able to claim that the false money had come from Russia.

The Esthonian provocateur Linkhorst betrayed the leader of the Esthonian proletariat Kingisepp, who was then condemned to death by the social democrat Einbund.

The English bourgeoisie, when it wished to put an end to the career of MacDonald as Premier, made use of the forged Zinoviev letter. The wave of provocation is sweeping over every country.

Germany, which in this connection stands "über alles", is preparing its great Tcheka-trial. The most deeply laid provocation plan hitherto known in the history of class struggles. It is a matter of course that the social democrats of Germany have more experience in this respect than the social democrats of other countries. But the latter will catch up to their German comrades in time.

But even this criminal plot will bear good fruit for the proletariat. The proletariat will learn a great deal from the great Tcheka trial. Many a social democratic worker who still follows its lead will turn from it in disgust.

The organised proletariat, which has grown rich in experience, will not allow itself to be misled and diverted from its struggle by provocateurs. It will carry on an organised defence against this wave of provocation organised by the enemies of the working class.

POLITICS

Proletariat and Peasantry.

(Continued from last week.)

IV.

The New Phase in the Reciprocal Relations Between Working Class and Peasantry.

What is new in this phase is that we have approached quite close to the economic questions. The stability of the workers' and peasants' block will now be determined in the first place, if not exclusively, by the economic success and the actual economic achievements.

There was a time when the stability of the alliance between our working class and the peasantry was determined by the course of the civil war. It was necessary to smash the common enemy, the White Guard bourgeoisie and the large land owners. During the last few years, immediately after the end of the civil war, the stability of this alliance was determined to a considerable degree by our international policy. In this sphere we have stood the test quite satisfactorily. The peasant feels

and knows that our government carries out a good policy and one that is advantageous to the peasantry. Firstly it has freed him from the slavery into which he would have fallen if he had had to pay the Czarist debts. Secondly it has started no wars. Thirdly it does not intend to keep too large an army. Fourthly it has won an important ally in the form of the international working class. Fifthly it is steadily increasing the influence of the Soviet Union in the international arena.

Now however we have to stand another test.

The Workers' and peasants' block has passed the test of the civil war well; it has passed and is passing the examination of international policy equally satisfactorily.

But is our peasant also convinced of it when it comes to economic questions? Is this peasant of the opinion that we Communists manage economics as well as we managed the civil war and international policy?

No, this is not yet the case.

And herein lies the centre of gravity of the question.

At the moment the workers' and peasants' block is undergoing examinations at the economic and cultural front.

The time is near when our economics will at last have reached the pre-war level. Within two or three years we shall begin in a series of domains to rise above this level. Then the question will face us "in what direction are we growing", i. e. in what direction are our economics growing. Towards socialism? If the balance of our Soviet economics reaches the pre-war level numerically (that of agriculture and the cooperative movement also), that is, when economic "saturation" is reached for instance in the degree of the years 1913 and 1914, the question will arise: shall we finally gain the victory over the new bourgeoisie or will the new bourgeoisie have fortified itself in the first line in order to continue its advance against us?

This question already faces us in its full significance. For the present we can only with full conviction say: If we pursue a correct Leninist policy, i. e. if our political approach to the peasantry is as it should be, if we consolidate the important higher positions (industry, banks etc.), as we have done up to the present, there is every prospect that the victory will finally be ours, and that the peasantry itself, from a certain moment in our development, will be convinced in the end, that the proletarian power is the most desirable and advantageous in the economic sphere as well as in others.

From this result there arise the following fundamental practical tasks of our policy in the village:

1. **Prices policy.** Always, again and again a policy of low prices, reduction of prices for the products of town industry, with all the means in our power.

2. **Questions of cultivation of land and produce from the land.** Energetic, intensive cultivation of land while considering local conditions. Every step in this direction must be made in as close cooperation as possible with the peasant masses. It is essential to do all that is necessary so that the forms of the produce of the land may ensure to the peasant a greater stability in his farming, thus enabling him to work his land without worries using all his efforts and accessories in order that his own budget may be more reliable.

3. **To improve the political situation in the village,** that is, actually to revive the village and district Soviets, to ensure to the peasants the possibility of introducing a considerable number of non-party members into the Soviets. To inaugurate a systematic campaign against arbitrary and for Soviet constitutional proceedings.

4. To do the same in still greater measure with regard to cooperative societies. At present cooperation in our country seems to be largely a second State trading, which develops the tendency to lead the whole population into the cooperative movement, which however so far has not realized it. Real voluntariness and real eligibility in the cooperative societies are on the next agenda.

5. **A serious reform in the domain of the system of taxation** and as far as possible a reduction in the number of taxes for the village.

6. **Seriously to put and to solve the question of the reduction of the working expenses of State foreign trade** so as to make the monopoly of foreign trade more advantageous to the peasant.

7. **Good village schools.**

8. **Newspapers for the peasant masses.** The first success has been achieved. On Nov. 1st 1924, we had in the Soviet Union altogether 583 newspapers of which 135 were peasant newspapers. Of the total issue of 6¼ millions, the issue of the peasant editions amounted to 1,3 millions. That however is only a begin-

ning. Newspapers are now becoming with us a collective organiser, a really leading central. The newspaper is now beginning to play that part which Comrade Lenin preached for the Bolshevik organs at the beginning of Bolshevism, in his small book "What is to be done?", but on a far greater scale than anyone has so far dreamed. To drive this matter forward with a good swing, is one of the chief tasks of the Party.

9. Rural Young Communist League. The impetuous growth of the organisations of the Young Communist League in the villages is inevitable. There are already, as well as 6000 workers' nuclei, 24,000 rural nuclei. This growth is a very pleasing sign. It is of course only necessary to take measures in good time to prevent the movement growing beyond the control of our Youth League and that the proletarian influence is preserved at any price.

10. The same applies to the sphere of political work among our peasant women.

The questions which are now on the agenda are, agricultural credit, agricultural cooperation, the village school, the village nucleus, the village correspondent, the Young Communist League, agriculturalism, melioration work, the Party nucleus in the village, the attraction of the non-Party peasants to the village Soviet.

It is in the light of these problems that we must prepare and carry through the impending third Congress of the Soviets of the Soviet Union. It is in the light of these tasks alone that it is possible to give the right value to the Congress of the teachers of the Soviet Union.

Only a policy of this kind will lead to a true consolidation of State industry and will secure its further development and growth. Only in the light of these tasks can we attain real growth, concentration and enlargement of the social power of the industrial proletariat. Only thus can we strengthen the dictatorship of the industrial proletariat under the conditions of the new economic policy.

The socialist character of the proletarian power must remain as before. The alliance of the working class with the peasantry must be consolidated in the new stage of development. New methods of work, old Leninist foundations of policy.

V.

In the years 1920 and 1921 we saw also a growth of the political "activity" of the village of that time. It found expression in the sufficiently known events in Siberia, then in Cronstadt, then in the government of Tambow etc. This was a growth of "activity" on the basis of the diminishing economy, on the basis of the increase of acute dissatisfaction with the Soviet power. This was the first (and let us hope the last) great internal crisis of the Soviet power, as Lenin called the situation at that time.

Now we have a growth of political activity of the village on the basis of the augmenting economy, on the basis of the economically convalescent village. This growth of the political activity of the village can now proceed entirely on the lines of strengthening the proletarian dictatorship, and this it will do, if we make no great mistakes.

The new village is becoming economically stronger. The area under cultivation is growing. Individual districts (for instance the Ukraine) have raised themselves almost entirely to the level of 1916. Indeed, taken as a whole, the area under cultivation in the whole Soviet Union has reached 87% of the pre-war time.

The rapid increase of technically used and marketable agricultural products is beyond doubt. Cattle-breeding has almost reached the level of 1916. Even the failure of the harvest in 1924 did not stop the pace of the increase of agriculture, but only retarded it. The village is beginning to be more and more satisfactorily provided with food. The village has used per day and per adult the following amount of calories: in 1919—1920 3594, 1920—1921 3387, 1921—1922 3053, 1922—1923 3819, 1923—1924 4040. The number of farms without horses is decreasing, the number with one or two horses is slowly but steadily increasing.

To put it briefly, the new village is improving economically. If the rate of development continues as it has been up to the present — and possibly it will even accelerate — the prospects of the development of agriculture are truly magnificent.

The number of farms without land sown with seed and without economic strength is diminishing, and the medium sized farms are on the increase. Numerically the middle group has grown. This is demonstrated by all statistics for 1924.

"The face to the village!" does not mean only the face to the owners of medium sized property, but in any case and at any price the face to them also. The October revolution proceeded under

the slogan: the power to the workers and to the poorest peasants. But this does not mean that the "poorest" peasants must always remain the poorest. And, needless to say, our task is by no means to leave them for ever among the poorest. The two opposite poles of the village are without doubt growing. At present, here and there, the large farmers are increasing and joining forces. In due time we shall have to organise the fight against them, especially in the economic sphere, more systematically than has hitherto been the case. This fight against the large farmers under circumstances unfavourable to us, may even form the main feature of the political fight in the village for a number of years. But just so as to be able to carry on the fight against the large farmer successfully, we must at any cost, combat the existing tendency to give the name of "large farmer" to any moderately wealthy peasant who is improving his farm and endeavours to lay by stores on his farm. We must not forget that the owners of middle-sized property form the large majority in the village and that even this majority of owners of medium-sized property is, as a matter of fact, economically very weak.

"Theoretically we are agreed that the owner of middle-sized property is not our enemy, that he needs special treatment, that a change in this matter will depend on numerous accidental factors in the revolution," said Comrade Lenin at our 8th Party Congress (vol. XVI, p. 99).

"On principle this attitude was clear to us even before the revolution began. We were set the task of neutralising the peasantry. In a meeting at Moscow, at which the question of the attitude of the petty bourgeoisie had to be raised, I quoted Engels' words exactly, who not only points out that the owners of medium sized property are our allies, but even gave expression to the opinion that it might be possible to avoid reprisals and measures of force even as regards the large farmers. We were, we are, and we shall be in a state of direct civil war against the large farmers. This is inevitable. We see it in practice. But, as result of the inexperience of the Soviet functionaries and the difficulty of the question, it happened that the blows intended for the large farmers, fell on the owners of medium-sized property.... We have no goods of the kind that we can give to the owner of middle-sized property; he however is a materialist, a practical man and demands concrete, material goods, without which the country may have to undergo months of difficult fighting which now promise us complete victory. But we can do a great deal in the practice of our administration, we can improve our apparatus, we can remove the greater part of existing abuses. We can and must straighten and adjust the line of our Party, which in the beginning was insufficiently based on the alliance and agreement with the owners of medium-sized property." (Ibid. p. 107—108).

Thus spake Comrade Lenin in 1919. Now we need more than ever alliance and agreement with the owners of medium-sized property. We can adjust their attitude. In the course of a few years we can bring it about that the owners of medium property will be just as contented and, in a certain sense, an equally firm support of the Soviet power, as is at present the average non-party worker. This we can and must do. The position with regard to our putting material goods at the disposal of the village is of course at present anything but brilliant. How many Arschin (1 Arschin = 71 cm) of cotton can the peasant exchange for one pood (= 16 kg) of rye-flour? That is the chief question in farming. And in this respect the following table which applies to the Soviet Union, gives at present a not very cheerful answer.

In 1919	6.3 Arschin
in 1921	7.2 "
in 1922	11.7 " *)
in 1923	1.6 "
in 1924	2.9 "

We are constantly coming up against the question of prices. As far however, as "material goods" are concerned, the question is in a far better position in 1925 than in 1919. The chief thing however is that there is most definite evidence of a tendency to a better and more successful move forwards.

*) This does not mean, that the peasant lived better in 1922 than in 1925. At that time this price was a sign of decrease. The present day price is a sign of an improvement in farming, both in town and village.

As far as administrative practice is concerned, as far as the line of our Party in regard to an understanding with the owners of medium property is concerned, the preliminary conditions are already existent. The chief task of the working class is now as ever to help the agricultural labourer to organise, to help the poorest in the village on to their feet. But the slogan: "The face to the village!" does not, in the 8th year of the existence of the proletarian dictatorship by any means exclude the course being directed also towards the medium farmer.

It is the task of the workers' State to isolate the large farmer in the village, in other words, to unite all in the village, including the medium farmer, against the large landowners. In the growth of the political activity of the village which has already begun, the large farmer will not stay behind. On the contrary, he will constantly become a more active political figure in the village. It is our task to help the agricultural labourer, the small and medium farmer, the members of the Young Communist League who are near us, to beat the large farmer in this arena also.

VI.

The Method of Persuasion and the Method of Compulsion.

The 7th point of our Party programme is as follows:

"The leading rôle which the town industrial proletariat took in the whole revolution, as the most concentrated, united enlightened part of the mass of workers, and most steed in battle, has shown itself both in the rise of the Soviets and in the whole course of their development to an organ of power. Our Soviet Constitution has given expression to this by granting the industrial proletariat, as compared with the more scattered petty bourgeois masses in the village, certain privileges.

In order to link up the most backward and divided masses of the rural proletariat and semi-proletariat, as well as the medium peasantry more closely with the advanced workers, so as to counterbalance the guild interests which capitalism has cultivated among the workers, the CP. of Russia must, by declaring the transient character of these privileges which have arisen historically from the difficulties of socialist organisation in the village, strive persistently and systematically to make the best of this situation of the industrial proletariat".

When Comrade Lenin stood up for this programme before the 8th Party Congress, he said:

"We do not at all apologize for our behaviour, but enumerate the facts, exactly as they are. Our constitution was obliged, as we have pointed out, to introduce this inequality because the standard of culture is low and our organisation weak. We do not in the least regard this as an ideal, on the contrary, the Party programme makes it our duty to work systematically for the removal of this inequality between the organised proletariat and the peasantry. (N. B. between the proletariat and the peasantry and not any other. — G. Z.) We shall remove this inequality as soon as we succeed in raising the standard of culture. Then we shall manage without such limitations. Even now, after about 17 months of the workers' and peasants' revolution, these limitations play in practice a very insignificant part." (Vol. XVI. p. 129/130.)

We are now beginning to come more or less close to the question which Comrade Lenin raised with such far-sightedness as much as 6 years ago. If Comrade Lenin even in 1922 showed us, that we must understand how to act not only by methods of compulsion but also by methods of persuasion, it is now perfectly clear that the proletarian dictatorship must, in the measure of its consolidation, transfer the centre of its gravity more and more into methods of persuasion rather than of compulsion. At one time we were compelled, in order to save the revolution, to resort to sending requisitioning divisions into the villages. Since then we have compensated for the goods requisitioned, and later we have united all kinds of taxes into a uniform tax. Later still we replaced the uniform tax in kind by a money tax. We are now coming to still newer reforms and alleviations in the sphere of taxation.

The Soviet power is entering more and more into the flesh and blood of the country, into its very existence. The proletarian vanguard must, with the same ruthlessness as hitherto, break with all those elements which deliberately work at

the severance of the alliance between working class and peasantry. But this same proletarian dictatorship must guarantee to the peasantry itself real revolutionary legitimacy, a Soviet power within the grasp of the peasantry, must more and more include the peasant himself in the Soviets.

Our State now consists of two main classes, taking into consideration a certain defection. The remains of the old bourgeoisie and the beginnings of the new bourgeoisie form this "defection". We must follow this "defection" closely in order to prevent it developing too luxuriously. We must never forget that the actual fate of our State is determined chiefly by the reciprocal relations between two classes — the working class and the peasantry.

The work of raising the culture of the broad masses of the peasantry which numbers many millions, that work of which Comrade Lenin spoke at the 8th Party Congress as a preliminary condition for some corrections of our Soviet constitution, is just beginning. But, unless all signs are deceptive, this work will now proceed quickly and successfully. We must always bear in mind what Comrade Lenin has said as to the relations between peasantry and proletariat after the seizure of political power by the latter. If our policy is a right one, unless we are disturbed in the immediate future by a frontal attack of the international Imperialists, we shall be in a position to bring along more and more serried ranks of the peasantry behind the working class.

Only in the light of these prospects can the course taken by our Party in order to impart real life to the Soviets, to exterminate arbitrary action in the province and to incorporate true revolutionary Soviet legality into our life, be understood. **Less compulsion, more persuasion! Less commanding, more objective help for the peasantry!**

VII.

Undervaluing or "Overvaluing" of the Peasantry.

If we undervalue the peasantry, then you overvalue them, we are sometimes told by representatives of the opposition in our own Party. Some of them go so far as to reproach us with directly "deviating from our course for the sake of the peasants", with a re-birth of the "Narodnikism" and more such nonsense. In this connection he it said that in 1916, as an echo to the brochure by Lenin and Zinovjev "Socialism and War", Comrade Trotzky called the writers of this brochure "Narodniki from Tscheljabinsk" (*). (Tscheljabinsk is a small place beyond the Urals on the borders of Asia. Ed.)

This novelty has a familiar sound. Since the first steps of Bolshevism, when Comrade Lenin had to cross swords for the first time with the literary representatives of Menshevism, he was immediately accused of "Narodnikism". We however know now, from the history of three revolutions, that the only one who has fought consistently to the end against the reactionary petty bourgeoisie of the Narodniki is — Comrade Lenin. We know that the Menshevist leaders who accused Comrade Lenin of "Narodnikism", as a matter of fact, in 1917 joined the counter-revolutionary part of the Narodniki.

Is there actually any sense in accusing us of "overvaluing" the peasantry? In view of the whole present situation of the proletarian dictatorship there is indeed a danger of undervaluing the peasantry. Our Party is a workers' Party. Our Party came into existence in the workers' districts. Our Party has not, in the course of two decades, gone outside the borders of the town in its practical work. The working class in our country is now organising itself in every direction. A network of workers' organisations is spreading more and more closely over the land.

But the village? The condition of his life alone prevent the peasant organising as the workers organise. The needs and demands of the village reach us naturally by much more roundabout ways and with more difficulty than the needs and demands of the workers. "The face to the village!" means also the necessary improvement of all these conditions.

The working class is now proclaiming through the mouth of its Party and in its own name the slogan "The face to the village!" For it understands that only thus can the power of the Soviets be politically strengthened and only thus the conditions for the re-birth of the village to Socialism be created.

* See G. Safarov's beautiful preface to the very interesting book "Trotzky on Lenin and Leninism".

There is no doubt that the material position of the workers is beginning seriously to improve. In some of our large industrial districts we have already almost reached the pre-war level of wages. The workers' cooperative societies are growing. The question of the building of workers' dwellings has actually been placed on the agenda. Culture is spreading among the workers. Of course, even in this sphere, we are still quite at the beginning. But just the undervaluing of the economic needs of the peasantry, the growth of their political activity, might lead to a rupture between the working class and the peasantry. Such a rupture or even only a serious dissension would, in a disastrous way, arrest the growth of the material well-being of the workers, which has begun, would undermine even the preliminary conditions for the increase of the social power of the working class, and of its foundation, the industry of the towns.

VII.

The Leading Part Played by the Party.

"The theory of Marxism which has been enriched by the bright light of the new rich experience of the revolutionary workers, rich when measured by the world standard, has helped us to understand the lawfulness of what has happened. It will help the proletariat of the whole world which is fighting to abolish capitalist wage slavery, to realise more clearly the object of their fight, to pursue the appointed path with more energy, and to carry off the victory and to consolidate it with more justice and assurance".

(Lenin, vol. XVI. p. 55.)

We can now say that the theory of Marxism, enriched by Leninism, helps us to realise more clearly the object of our fight, and to follow with more firmness the path which Comrade Lenin has so brilliantly illuminated.

The discussion which has just ended has helped our Party once more to understand the foundations of Bolshevism.

What is socially behind the present discussion? What political disputes of the day are hidden behind the discussion on the "permanent revolution"?

The following:

The Party shows an unflinching determination to yield not a foot to the "European" pseudo-Marxism, which is hiding in the cloak of "left" Trotzkyism, either in the question of the policy of the working class towards the peasantry or in the question as to the actually leading part played by the Party in the State.

This is the essence of the whole philosophy...

The time is now not far distant when it will become clear to the whole Party that behind the external literary disputes, which were said by the nature of their object to be merely historical, those problems were really hidden, which we have powerfully illuminated in this article. In other words, the most important problem which determined the whole course and issue of our revolution was hidden: the problem of the mutual relations between proletariat and peasantry.

"The face to the village!" For the success of this slogan it is above all necessary that the face which is looking must not itself be contorted, i. e. that the Party itself which is at the head of the working class must be a Leninist Party and moulded in one piece.

Lenin spoke in the following words of the "leading" part played by the Party:

"... The recognition of the leading part played by the Party must be before our eyes ... We must know and remind ourselves, that the whole juridical and actual constitution of the Soviet republic is based on the fact that the Party can bring everything into order, determine and construct according to one single principle, that the Communist element which is allied with the proletariat, can fill the proletariat with its spirit, subordinate it to itself and free it from the bourgeois deception ... There can on principle be no doubt for us that the leadership of the Communist Party must be maintained ... everyone (of us) belongs to the Party which has the administration, which leads the whole State and the international fight of Soviet Russia against the bourgeois order of society. Each of us is a representative of the fighting class and of the Party which rules and must rule over a powerful apparatus of State." (Speech from the Conference of the political departments for enlightenment on Nov. 3rd 1920. I quote the bulletin of the All-Russian Conference of the political departments for enlightenment, Moscow 1920, State publishers, copied in the collected work of V. I. Lenin

"The socialist revolution and the tasks of enlightenment", journal "Krasnaja Novi" 1923, p. 40/41)

How far are these words of Lenin's firm as steel, from the twistings of the Trotzkyists and semi-Trotzkyists who have not the courage to speak their thoughts to the end, but who, as a matter of fact, take entirely a line of weakening the "leading" part of the Party, or even of directly "liberating" the "enormous apparatus of State" from the Party!

Just in order to make it possible to carry out this whole policy of the working class towards the peasantry, without which final victory is impossible, the first preliminary condition is: **the true unity of the Party on the basis of Leninism and the unconditional maintenance of the leading part of the Party in the organs of State and economics.** Only if the working class through its Party keeps its hand firmly on the rudder of the whole ship of State, is a successful carrying out of all the above enumerated tasks possible. But for this it is first of all necessary that Leninism should hold the rudder of the Party itself. It would mean the destruction of the whole mutual relation between working class and peasantry, if the Party were in the least diverted to the part of a merely agitating propagandising organisation. The slightest admission of the "theory" of the emancipation of the Soviets from the Party is striking a blow at the hegemony of the proletariat itself.

To manoeuvre successfully in the international arena in a situation in which the first proletarian State is surrounded by enemies on all sides; to solve successfully the most important question of the revolution, the question of the mutual relations between working class and peasantry; to remain true to the principles of Leninism — all this is only possible if we yield not a foot in the question of the leading part played by our Party in the economic and State organs.

The petty bourgeoisie instinctively supports "Trotzkyism" which it understands in its own way, particularly because it feels that the victory of Trotzkyism means in reality weakening the leading part of the Party in State and economics. But this is the breach through the widening of which the petty bourgeois element would penetrate into the fortress of the proletarian dictatorship.

Just because our Party is the leading Party it must, more than the Communist Party in any other country care for its uniformity and homogeneity. Just for this reason we resorted, under the leadership of Comrade Lenin to such unusual means as the purging of the Party. The mechanism of the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship is manifold. Not only the trade unions as schools of Communism and the Soviets as the organs and schools of administration, and a series of most important organisations which play their part in the "leverage-system" of the proletarian dictatorship are parts of this mechanism. So that the system of levers however may be properly set in action, it is necessary that the most important lever in the system of levers the C. P. of Russia, should remain on the unshakeable basis of Leninism. This however means among other things: firstly that the Party must on no account split up into various "currents" and tendencies, and secondly this applies in still greater measure to the general staff of the Party.

"To carry off the victory", this task was fulfilled by the Party under the immediate leadership of Comrade Lenin. "To consolidate the victory", this work the Party must carry to its end without the immediate leadership of Comrade Lenin. This problem is not easy, but it is perfectly soluble. We shall without doubt solve it, if we remain completely irreconcilable to the end where the principles of Leninism are concerned.

The League of Nations and the Opium Trade.

By A. Katz.

"Social and humanitarian questions" form a permanent chapter in the reports issued by the League of Nations on its activities. These questions are however confined exclusively to three problems. The questions of the Russian fugitives, of the white slave traffic, and of the opium trade, form the three dimensions of the social humanitarian field of activity covered by the League of Nations. Up to now there has been but little success to record on the first two points, but the opium question, or, in the terminology of the reports "the fight against the use of opium", has

been brought into the front line of public interest by two international events. In the first place the League of Nations devoted two international conferences to this question, at the end of 1924 and at the beginning of 1925. In the second place the matter is greatly complicated by the civil war in China. China is the largest consumer of this drug, and almost the sole country importing enormous quantities of opium. The Chinese empire has always been, and continues to be, the bone of contention influencing the inter-state regulation of the opium traffic. The policy pursued by the great powers with regard to China, and their hankerings after intervention, are invariably connected with the opium question to an extent which should not be underestimated.

The cultivation of opium was introduced into Bengal by the English East India Company, and the branch of the company in Canton promoted the use of the poison in China as well. By the beginning of the 19th century opium had already become a Chinese mass article of consumption, the demand being met for the most part by imports from India. The annual import increased from 4628 cases in 1821 to 26,670 cases in 1830. The disastrous effects of this mass poisoning presently became apparent however, and in so catastrophic a manner as to bring about the first attempt at an inter-state regulation of the opium traffic. The ensuing conflict took the form of the opium war of the year 1839. The barbarian central government of China prohibited its subjects to drug themselves with this poison, and interdicted the import of opium. Upon this the English pioneers of civilisation defended the freedom of the opium trade with the aid of warships and cannon, and their victory enabled them to release the opium import, besides squeezing out a war indemnity of 21 million dollars, of which 6 million dollars represented the value of the opium which had been destroyed.

In 1857 England again incited a combat for the freedom of the opium trade, this time with the connivance of France, and thus obtained the complete legalising of the opium trade, the opening of some trading ports, and the admittance of Christian missionaries into China. By 1873, 6.4 million kilogrammes of opium were produced in India, 6.1 million kgs of which were imported into China.

But at the end of the 19th century a change took place in the opium policy. China had meanwhile commenced to cultivate the poppy on its own account, and many other competitors had put in an appearance, destroying India's monopoly of opium. Persia and Turkey, for instance, imported considerable quantities of raw opium, and Germany chemical preparations of opium, whilst an international opium trade central was formed in Switzerland. The United States of America took another line of competition, and obtained many concessions in 1880 on undertaking not to participate in the opium import.

After this time the anti-opium propaganda in England, based on religious reasons, became much more pronounced, and in 1893 the House of Commons appointed a commission to inquire into the evils of opium. 13 years later an agreement was come to between England and China on the limitations to be imposed upon the consumption of opium. According to this agreement, China agreed to diminish its inland poppy crop by 10% yearly, whilst England undertook to suppress the Indian export to a corresponding degree. China took demonstrable measures for the suppression of the cultivation of the poppy, but in 1911 the opium imported into China from India was still 4.1 million kgs, representing a value of 10 Million pounds sterling. In the following year an international opium conference was held at the Hague, and here the famous International Opium Convention of 1912 was accepted.

This convention, which has not yet been put into practice, is a typical half measure of capitalist self-limitation. It contains no thought of a radical abolition of opium. Importance is attached chiefly to a mutual agreement for the suppression of fraudulent competition, for the more efficient combatting of opium smuggling into China, for the import and export of opium via certain ports only, and through the hands of persons appointed by the authorities, and for the mutual exchange of statistic material. The sole limitation put on the use of opium by the convention is the fundamental declaration that the manufacture and consumption of prepared opium is to be gradually suppressed, and the traffic confined to raw opium only. This differentiation is stated to be made from a medical point of view, but in reality it signifies a preference given to those countries possessing opium growing colonies in Asia. It is thus easily comprehen-

sible that the otherwise empty and practically meaningless International Opium Convention has been rejected by very many countries. According to statistics published by the League of Nations, it had only been put into force by 36 States by April 1922, although 52 states are members of the League of Nations.

These figures are fairly characteristic for the efficiency of the League of Nations, article 23 of whose statutes places in its hands the responsibility of leading the fight against the use of opium. The League of Nations is fulfilling this sacred mission by keeping up a permanently acting opium commission, containing representatives on the one hand of England, France, Holland, Portugal, and India, and on the other hand of China, Siam, and Japan, that is, representatives of the countries producing and the countries consuming opium. The first group has been playing first violin, as may plainly be seen from the results of the work of the commission. The greatest practical result has been nothing more nor less than the working out of a complicated system of import and export licences for the opium trade, intended to completely crush all illegal traffic. This system is excellently adapted to promote the taxation and higher prices of opium, so that the victim of the use of the drug is given the opportunity of adding material ruin to physical, and a welcome pretext is supplied for the confiscation of the opium consignments of competitors. Despite this, or perhaps for this reason, the system has only been accepted by 20 states.

Since the beginning of 1923 the activity of the commission has however become visibly more radical, a change caused by the participation of representatives of the United States. America does not produce opium, feels its interests to be prejudiced by the opium trade carried on by other states, and is, in principle, an energetic opponent of opium poisoning. As a result of American intervention the commission has now ventured to raise that critical question which is to form the first step forward in the fight against opium poisoning. This is the definition of what is "illegal opium consumption". It is an established fact that every country requires a certain amount of opium for scientific purposes and other objects of public benefit, and the fight against opium must not endanger this necessary amount. A conference held in collaboration with the Health Commission finally arrived at the not very surprising conclusion that opium is only to be employed in medical practice, and to a much less degree even here. As a stimulant opium is not permissible, not even in the tropics. The report given by this mixed commission formed the basis of a proposal that only the medical and scientific employment of opium should be considered as legal, and the cultivation of the poppy so reduced as to supply no surplus beyond these legal requirements.

This narrow-minded medical interpretation of the report caused however much consternation in the commission, and the English and Japanese representatives emphasised the right to define what is legal and what is illegal in the consumption of opium as one of the essential integral parts of the sovereignty of the different states. The Indian representative declared that India, "in consideration of the special needs of the Hindu people, holds unconditionally to the legality of the use of opium in a degree in accordance with the customs of the people." But England is not prepared to recognise this sacred right to self poison in the case of China. At least not in a form permitting the Chinese to produce at home what they require for poisoning themselves.

The commission devoted much attention to the contentions between England and China. England made a violent attack upon the Chinese government, accusing it of not having reduced the cultivation of the poppy. In 1922 China issued a comprehensive statistic report on the reduction of poppy cultivation, to which England replied by a fat blue book throwing doubts upon the data supplied by the Chinese control commission. The English demanded that the foreign consuls should make energetic application to the governors of the various districts, and insist upon taking part in the work of control. Upon this the Chinese made the counter proposal that an international control commission should visit the whole of the countries producing opium. This proposal however encountered energetic protest on the part of the Indian representative, and the League of Nations contented itself with requesting the Chinese government to exercise a sharper control.

At the present juncture the opium commission has passed fairly far-reaching resolutions, and proclaims that means are

going to be simultaneously adopted for the suppression of other drugs: cocaine, morphium, heroin, etc. In reality the struggle is against the smuggling in of opium from Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan, countries supplying China with cheaper opium. On the other hand America is going to try to set a limit to the business being done in opium by its competitors in China. Thus all these social humanitarian phrases serve solely as a cloak for the actual imperialist warfare over the profits to be won from poisoning human beings. World capitalism cannot even forego the freedom to administer poison to the peoples.

The Attempt to Throttle the Communist Party of Germany.

By Arthur Rosenberg (Berlin).

The attempt of General von Seeckt to destroy German Communism by his prohibition of the C.P. of Germany was completely wrecked a year ago. When the C.P. of Germany was forbidden, the Communists participated in all the municipal and diet elections, and everywhere achieved astonishing successes. The German bourgeoisie perceived that it could not accomplish anything by this means. Herr Ebert had therefore to abolish the state of martial law and to render the C.P. of Germany legal again. Only in Bavaria is the Party still prohibited.

The open and brutal suppression of the Party having failed, the wire-pullers of the German bourgeoisie have adopted a new course. They are now seeking to achieve the same end by definite legal means, which would not attract too much attention. German Justice has arranged the trials for high treason in connection with the events of 1923 in such a way, that practically all communist Party work will be rendered impossible. At the head of this attempt there stands, of course, the **High Court for the Defence of the Republic**.

This Court is not an institution for the administration of justice in the sense of any objective laws, but is a purely political fighting instrument for keeping down the proletariat. It is extremely interesting to note, that in the first place black-red-gold men are taking the lead in the war of annihilation against the C.P. of Germany. The President of the High Court, Herr **Niedner**, who wants to place the Communists "against the wall", is a staunch democrat and republican. The Chief Public Prosecutor, **Ebermayer**, is a constant contributor to the "**Berliner Tageblatt**" (a democratic paper). In addition to this, one of the politically most influential members of this Court is the social democrat **Wolfgang Heine**. Another important member of this Court is the social democrat and former Minister of Trade, **Wissel**, who is also involved in the Barmat corruption scandal. As usual, Herr **Severing**, the Prussian Minister of the Interior, is promoting the action of the High State Court in every way with the help of the police and other means, and a happy chance has placed in our hands the documentary proof that the Berlin Examining Judge **Vogt**, in the a big action against the C.P. of Germany, in the raid upon the Communist offices of the Reichstag and Prussian diet, had received instructions beforehand from Herr Ebert.

The President of the Republic is at the head of this cunning manoeuvre to throttle the C.P. of Germany by legal means. The great personal influence which the **English ambassador in Berlin** exercises upon Herr Ebert is well known. In his action against the Communists, Herr Ebert is following the instructions of Anglo-American capital. It is not a mere chance that the legal campaign against the C.P. of Germany began in the same weeks in which the Dawes Plan appeared in German politics. The destruction of the Party of the proletarian opposition is as equally necessary for the carrying out of the Dawes Policy as is, for instance, the formation of the new Reich railway company.

From the last pronouncements of the High Court against communists it is possible to draw the following conclusions:

The C.P. of Germany advocates the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, the C.P. of Germany is constantly hatching high treason. This pronouncement constitutes an unheard-of violation of the law. No political Party can be forbidden to carry on propaganda for another form of state. The German nationalists are carrying on propaganda for the monarchy every

day, and it is just as impossible by legal means to convert the Weimar Republic into a monarchy as into a Soviet dictatorship. How seriously the bourgeois parties regard the present form of State is shown by the fact that our present "Republican" Reich government, on the first day of its existence, took a formal vote as to whether they were for the Republic or for the Monarchy.

It is a special business of the High State Court, not only to proceed against the communists with the help of the general laws as to high treason which are contained in the criminal code, but to catch the communists in the meshes of the most terrible exceptional law which has ever been issued in Western Europe. We refer to the monstrous law for the defence of the Republic. In order to be able to strike at the communists with the law for the defence of the Republic, one must prove that Communism constitutes a secret organisation, hostile to the state.

The Communist Organisation is just as open and legal as the organisation of the other parties. But the High State Court makes the following assertion: apart from the open legal organisation, the Communists have their parallel secret organisation. This secret organisation is represented by the communist sub-district. To be a member of the C.P. of Germany is not punishable in itself, but whoever, for example, joins the Wedding (a suburb of Berlin) district organisation, becomes, according to the opinion of the Leipzig jurists, at the same time a member of the communist "sub-district". The "sub-district" is, in their opinion, the expression of the legal secret organisation.

These alleged facts were put forward by the High State Court as being notorious, and regarding which no further proof is necessary. According to this reasoning therefore, every communist comes under the ban of the law for defence of the Republic in virtue of his membership of his sub-district organisation.

A damned clever invention. Herr Ebert could confer the highest Orders of the German Republic upon Messers. **Niedner** and **Ebermayer** for this great service. But this tricky manoeuvre will be shattered by the opposition of the German working class. In the approaching "Tcheka" trial the C.P. of Germany will be able effectively to mobilise the masses. The indignation of the proletariat regarding these machinations will be stronger than all the "Tcheka" lies and all the legal subtleties of the High State Court.

The "Pravda" on the German Tcheka Trial.

An article in the "Pravda" entitled "The German Tcheka Trial" states:

Thousands of workers are languishing in the prisons of the German Republic because they fought against exploitation, against oppression, against the abolition of the few remaining gains of the November Revolution, whilst the participators in fascist conspiracies remain at liberty.

Communist workers are brought before the Hamburg Court on account of the Hamburg insurrection, although the insurrection was only a reply on the part of the workers to the attempts at seizure of power by the open and disguised fascists.

The bourgeoisie, after a year's careful preparation, wishes to exhibit the "crimes" of the communists by organising the Tcheka trial before the Leipzig Court.

The raid upon the Berlin Trade Mission of the Soviet Union was a link in this chain of measures adopted in the preparation of this trial. The absurd rumours regarding "Cholera germs", which according to the declaration of the Chief Public Prosecutor could not even harm a rabbit, also served the same purpose.

The meaning of the trial is that the accused must defend themselves against police spies who were sent into the Communist Party by the social democratic coalition government.

The prosecution states that the workers obtained illegal weapons from the Reichswehr in order to defend their own lives and the interests of the working class. The victor invariably pronounces judgment upon the vanquished. The Cologne communist trial in the year 1849 constituted an act of revenge on the

part of the Prussian junker leagues upon the vanquished masses. The difference between the Cologne trial and the Leipzig trial consists in the fact that the proletariat, although it was compelled to retreat in October 1923, is not beaten, as is to be seen from the results of the elections. Nearly three million workers stand under the banner of the C. P. of Germany. The bourgeoisie was too premature in believing itself to be the victor.

The Cologne trial was conducted against a handful of communists. The Leipzig trial, however, will be followed by millions, who will reply to the baseness of the bourgeoisie with growing hate and determination.

The trial will reveal how the prisoners are tortured in the prisons; how the accused and the witnesses are bullied and intimidated. It will provide a picture of the base means by which the German bourgeoisie is endeavouring to maintain its power.

We are not afraid of the German press attacking us for our condemnation of German justice. The Magdeburg Court, in order to please the fascists, stated that Ebert had committed an act of treason against the Fatherland, although, as a matter of fact, the bourgeoisie ought to be exceedingly grateful to Ebert. How then will the Court proceed when it is a question of a fight against the Communist Party! The ruling classes wish to destroy even the November Republic, how furiously then will they rage against the supporters of the Soviet system!

The Leipzig judges, with all their falsifications, will not lessen the influence of Communism upon the working masses. The German workers will say: "We did not make proper preparations for victory, we must so prepare for victory that we shall place our class enemies in the dock."

Ebert-Barmat-Erhard Auer — a Corruption Trial of the German Republic.

By S. (München).

It is only jurists who are able to distinguish the Ebert, Barmat and Auer trials according to their respective contents. For the working class they all form part of a whole; they constitute a feature of the face of the bourgeois republic; they constitute a trial for corruption of this republic. It is not the question of Ebert, Barmat and Auer which has to be answered in this trial, the question is: bourgeois democracy at the expense of the working class, or rule of the working class.

It is not a mere chance that social democracy occupies the central position in this trial. For the one-time workers' party has become the party of this bourgeois republic, the party, which has made it its first task to uphold this corrupt republic.

We will not deal here in detail with the case of Parvus-Helphand, for whom it was possible, as a result of the influence of his party, to amass a huge fortune as a war profiteer. His was only an isolated case within Social Democracy. But the Barmat affair shows that the bourgeoisie — and in this case the shady dealing section of the bourgeoisie — succeeded with the help of Social Democracy in systematically buying state officials. The brothers Barmat were able to obtain all sorts of advantages as a result of their friendship with a governmental Party. Although it can never, or only with great difficulty, be brought to light what moneys have flowed into the coffers of the Social Democratic Party, a number of social democratic leaders have already been proved to have received money personally from Barmat and have made pleasure tours at his expense. In the Auer trial in München, Auer personally admitted having received from director Neubauer, a big manufacturer well known in democratic Party circles, 10,000 gold marks for the Party funds.

What we are seeing today is a perfectly logical consequence of the policy which the Social Democratic Party followed during the war. At the same moment as it joined itself to the bourgeoisie it was swallowed by the latter wholesale. And if today Social Democracy stands together with the bourgeoisie before the bar of public opinion in these corruption trials, it has only itself and its own policy to blame.

The Ebert trial in Magdeburg, which dealt in the main with the attitude of Social Democracy in the war and in the January strike of 1918, clearly demonstrated the rôle which Social Democracy adopted in the interest of the bourgeoisie during the war. The Auer trial in München goes much farther. It is nothing else than a continuation of Magdeburg, for it not only deals with

the January strike, in which Erhard Auer played the same rôle as did Ebert in Berlin and Noske in Chemnitz, with the sole difference that he declares today that he always has been against strikes, because he considered them as treason to the State, but it goes farther and shows the attitude of Social Democracy during the revolution and during the whole of the political events almost up to the present day.

Where in the whole world is there to be found a man, calling himself a labour leader and declaring in the same breath: "I consider the revolution to be a disaster. If I could have prevented it I would have done so!" In which country is it possible for labour leaders to conspire with the bourgeoisie against the working class with impunity? It is, of course, ridiculous for Herr Auer to call Count Arco, the murderer of Eisner, as a witness that he did not discuss this murder beforehand with him. Such proofs do not get rid of the fact that the whole German Social Democracy during the revolution deliberately collaborated with the bourgeoisie, deliberately organised counter-revolutionary troops, that its whole press poured out hatred and venom against the "Spartakist gang" and daily conducted a campaign of incitement to murder which has never anywhere been equalled.

The Auer trial is still going on. One thing, however, is already clear: these trials have proved that the German bourgeoisie believes itself to be again so firmly in the saddle, that it no longer requires the help of German Social Democracy, of which it has availed itself for the past ten years. Whilst the Ebert trial constituted a conscious attempt to accuse Social Democracy of betrayal of the fatherland — Social Democracy which did everything for the "fatherland" and nothing for the working class —, in the Auer case, the murderer of Eisner, Count Arco, (who while serving the very mild sentence he received on account of this crime received a bouquet from Auer), acting according to his caste, administered a direct kick on the pants to the formerly courted social democratic Minister by declaring that he could not imagine any member of his class presenting a bouquet to Auer.

The trials have shown that the bourgeoisie feels itself to be very strong and is prepared for a direct attack. In the new class struggles which are approaching, the workers must not tolerate a party which seeks to act as intermediary between the two camps. Those who really desire the victory of the working class must not only leave the Social Democratic Party, but must fight against this party, as being the deadly enemy of the working class, even more bitterly than against the bourgeoisie.

Mr. Abramovitch Comes to Town.

By I. A m t e r.

Mr. Abramovitch, of Second International ill-fame, has come to town. He was given a reception a few days ago — a worthy reception. The socialists engaged one of the large halls of New York city to greet their "comrade". On the stage were all the socialist worthies — Hillquit, of La Follette fame, Panken, the "socialist" municipal judge, and the socialist heads of the Workmen's Circle, a petty bourgeois sick benefit organisation. All the socialist counter-revolution was assembled to greet and cheer the "representative of the social democratic workers of Russia".

What these American "leaders" said and did is immaterial. They are small fry in the ocean of counter-revolution. We are interested in Mr. Abramovitch. When Mr. Abramovitch appeared on the platform, he was met with a storm of hisses and boos so that he could not begin to speak. Finally, after the first outbursts, he began. It was a mild beginning, for Mr. Abramovitch sensed that the audience was not very sympathetic. He spoke of Soviet Russia — and was about to say something derogatory, but the mere mention of Soviet Russia threw the audience of 2,500 people into a spasm and the cheers for the Socialist Republic would not end. The spite and hate that he wished to couple with the name of Soviet Russia were lost in the cheers.

Mr. Abramovitch then spoke about the Third International. What he said, however, will never be recorded, for the mere mention of the name provoked an ovation. Cheers were called for Soviet Russia, for the Communist International. The "Internationale" was sung. Bedlam broke loose: this was a Communist audience — an audience sympathetic to Communism and Soviet Russia.

This did not at all please the counter-revolutionary socialists. They knew that something of this sort would arise. Hence they took good care to have their "strong-arm" men at the meeting. The gangsters employed by the reactionary bureaucrats of the trade unions were on hand to "keep order". They marched up and down the aisles, looking for "disturbers, that is to say Communists and Communist sympathisers. In the midst of the meeting, when enthusiasm for Soviet Russia reached one of its heights, when the socialists no longer could tolerate these expressions of solidarity with the Soviet Republic, they showed their indignation by assaulting the Communists. The gangsters also played a part, using their fists and other weapons on the Communists.

There came a time, however, when these methods did not suffice. Mr. Panken, who knows the capitalist method of "preserving order", sent out word, and 200 policemen entered the hall and took charge of the meeting, ordering the gangsters' to step aside. Mr. Panken, the other socialists and the police protected Mr. Abramovitch from the Soviet sympathisers.

Mr. Abramovitch did not finish his speech. The hurrahs for the Soviet Government and the Communist International drowned him. He had challenged the audience to produce facts about Soviet Russia, and his challenge was accepted from all parts of the hall. The meeting ended by the Communists and Communist sympathisers marching out of the hall, between the rows of the police, singing the "Internationale". But it did not end there. The victory of the Communists was too much for the socialists and the gangsters. They fell upon the Communists, beat them up, tore their clothes and seriously injured one comrade, who had to be taken to the hospital.

Mr. Abramovitch did not finish his speech. The hurrahs for York. The reactionary chairman of the Workmen's Circle extended to him the freedom of the socialist ranks. This so-called socialist organisation is turning more and more counter-revolutionary. Although the socialist party definitely took a stand against Soviet Russia some years ago, this enmity was confined to a great degree to the yellow leadership. But slowly the poison of anti-sovietism is entering the blood of the rank and file. The fight is becoming bitter. Mr. Abramovitch's coming to America is a symptom of what these counter-revolutionists intend — his coming, just at this time, makes it all the more significant.

The Communists are answering this invasion of all the counter-revolutionary forces that the bourgeoisie and the yellow socialists — the appendages of the bourgeoisie — command, by starting a broad campaign for recognition of Soviet Russia and in favour of the Communist International.

The counter-revolutionary campaign is all the more significant since senator Borah has now become the outstanding figure in the pro-Soviet movement — in spite of Coolidge's statement that the policy of the United States government toward recognition will remain the same. The battle is to be fought out — the "interests" will decide whether recognition is necessary or not. Japan has now recognised Soviet Russia — only America remains. Can America, with a big surplus of production and no markets to absorb it, allow Soviet Russia to become a market for all the other industrial countries? It is impossible. The battle will be fought out — for recognition of Soviet Russia is the issue of the day. The imperialist powers believe that Soviet Russia is weak, and that the Trotzky controversy may lead to bad consequences for the Russian Communist Party. That Trotzky has been removed from his position only proves that Soviet Russia is perfectly united. Hence the hopes that Soviet Russia can be destroyed from within come to naught.

So Mr. Abramovitch, emissary of the monarchists and social-traitors of Europe, self-styled "representative of the social democratic workers of Russia" — although such exist only in Paris and Berlin — comes on a vain mission. Soviet Russia remains and is strengthened by the unity following the controversy. The workers of America are not to be trapped by Abramovitch's glib tongue. The report of the British Trade Union delegation, which recently visited Soviet Russia, has more meaning to them than all the Abramovitches, Vanderveldes, Brantings and Kautskys. Mr. Abramovitch will knock at the doors of empty houses. He will speak to audiences of Communists and Communist sympathisers. He will get the same greeting and welcome as in New York, and he will have the American police beat up the American workers who are friends of Soviet Russia.

We welcome you, Mr. Abramovitch. Your visit will merely accelerate the recognition of Soviet Russia.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The National Conference of the English Minority Movement.

By Minnie Birch (London).

A definite stage in the growth of militant trade unionism in Great Britain was marked by the success of the National Minority Conference held at Battersea on January 25th. for the purpose of giving an impetus to the already increasing desire for international trade union unity.

In all, 750,000 workers were represented by 635 delegates from trade union branches, trades councils, unemployed committees, co-operative guilds, and minority groups in various industries. From all parts of Britain they came together — the most virile champions of organised labour, bringing with them the atmosphere of the mine, factory and workshop, and imbued with the determination that the workers' movement should become united nationally and internationally.

Owing to the opposition of union executives, many of the delegations from large cities had to rely upon collections taken in the workshop to cover their expenses, and delegates from branches of the National Union of General and Municipal Workers, for example had to rely upon voluntary contributions for their expenses owing to their union rules prohibiting the handling of finances by the branches. The N. U. C. & M. W. representation of 58 delegates, second only to the A. E. U. (Amalgamated Engineering Union) with 63 delegates, was proof positive of the interest taken by the rank and file of that union, in the Minority Movement.

Notwithstanding the widely representative nature of the gathering it did not fully indicate the extensive and growing influence of the National Minority Movement. Many letters were received from trade union branches, trades councils, and other working class bodies, expressing regret at their inability to be represented.

The vigour and enthusiasm displayed was a fitting warning to the opponents of unity, that the rank and file is beginning to move, and at the same time a tribute to the growing communist influence among left wing trade unionists.

In the absence of A. J. Cook (Miners' Federation), Tom Mann, presiding, dramatically opened the proceedings after the singing of the "International", by calling attention to the large portrait of Lenin, draped in black and red, and occupying the forefront of the platform, and calling upon the assembly to pay tribute on the first anniversary of the passing of the greatest working class leader.

A statement from A. J. Cook was read to the conference by the chairman. He said: "We may expect in the near future the widest attack of all the forces of capitalism. The press, pulpit and Secret Service will, without scruple, be ranged against us. Either we must accept defeat or we must organise internationally. We must organise by industry. Every industry must be linked up nationally and internationally. Every struggle, whether offensive or defensive, must be fought nationally and internationally".

After extending a warm welcome to all present, Tom Mann declared that the Minority Movement was part and parcel of the Trade Union Movement. "It was born out of the absence of what its adherents conceive to be the correct attitude and outlook on the part of those holding responsible positions in the trade Union Movement. It refuses to leave the unions, but seeks to make them militant and constructive, first on the industrial field, second in class struggle generally. We know full well that the evils afflicting society to-day are directly traceable to the capitalist system. We are not willing to remain victims of this cursed capitalist system."

Before proceeding with his report on the 6th. Congress of the Russian Trade Unions, Comrade Pollit read messages of solidarity from the the Left Wing Movement of Canada, the Seamen's Union of Hamburg, Miners' Union of France, George Hicks, S. Saklatvala, and other well known political figures in Great Britain.

In giving his report, Comrade Pollitt contrasted the industrial movement in Russia with that in Great Britain. Russia has 22 industrial unions for 6,500,000 organised workers; here we have

1,111 unions covering four and a half million trade unionists. The Russian unions are led by a real General Council which acts as a General Staff, with power to take decisions between congresses, and under obligation to carry out Congress resolutions.

At the Hull Trade Union Congress, held while the Labour Government was in existence in this country, not one responsible cabinet minister was present, for fear of associating the Parliamentary Labour Party with the industrial movement of the workers. Comrade Pollitt contrasted this with the Russian Trade Union Congress where reports were given by the Prime Minister, Comrade Rykov — Lenin's successor, Comrade Losovsky and others. In Russia there are 24 daily newspapers for the Trade Unions and none for the capitalists. In England we have one for the Trade Union and Labour Movement and all the rest for capitalism.

Comrade Pollitt then dwelt on the fact that Russian Congresses are not annual re-unions, but places where hard knocks are given and taken, where stocktaking is indulged in, and where there is a remarkable degree of self-criticism and self-condemnation. He declared that the report of the British Delegation to Moscow was the exact opposite of what the master class and the social democratic leaders desired it to be. Their desire for a condemnation of the workers' dictatorship in Russia was not fulfilled. The interest taken in the delegation's report proved that the British working class movement was solidly behind the Russian working class in its struggle against capitalism. The master class at home was compelled to attach great importance to the report in view of it coming from the chosen representatives of British Labour.

The principal resolution of the Congress, that on Trade Union Unity, was moved by Comrade Horner, who stated that subterfuges were being used in this country to make the reactionary nationalist, Mr. Frank Hodges, secretary of the International Miners' Federation. "He is not likely to return to the mines for a living as he has stated is his intention." (Indeed, the "Daily Herald" on the morning following the Minority Conference, announced Mr. Hodges' nomination for this position). Comrade Horner, stated that it was significant that the British Trade Union movement, the strongest force inside the Amsterdam International, and the Russian Trade Union movement, the strongest force inside the R. I. L. U., have been drawn together by the establishment of the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee.

In seconding, Comrade Alex. Gossip (General Secretary of the Furnishing Trades Association) said that if national unity among ourselves was a good thing, then international unity also was a good thing. He had always depreciated empty criticism of trade union leaders, but when you get leaders of the German social democratic party stating that they became associated with a certain strike, not to help the workers to win, but in order to break and destroy the strike, then criticism and a revolutionary movement was sorely needed.

The resolution, which was discussed in detail and passed with no dissentients, welcomed the news that the General Council of the Trade Union Congress has endorsed the proposals of its recent delegation to the Russian Trade Union Congress, and also declared that

"international unity, to fight capitalism, not to defend it, can only be achieved if the Labour Movement of all countries, and particularly our own, succeeds in forcing the Amsterdam International to agree to the convening, together with the R. I. L. U., of a world Trade Union Congress. At this congress, representatives of all the trade union organisations affiliated both to Amsterdam and the R. I. L. U., as well as those trade unions outside any international organisation shall be present."

A resolution on solidarity with the trade union movements of the British Empire was moved by Comrade Hannington and seconded by Comrade MacAnnulty, and carried amidst enthusiasm.

The resolution on Trade Unions and Co-operatives, was moved by Mrs. Walker, who made a rousing appeal to the delegates to get down to the job of transforming the Co-operatives into genuine working class organisations, and called for a closer contact between the Co-operative and Trade Union Movements.

Comrade W. C. Loeber of the National Union of Railwaymen moved a strong resolution in condemnation of the attempt to militarise the railway men. This resolution, which was

was carried with acclamation, repudiated the attempts now being made to militarise the Railway Workers. It further repudiated the action of Stephan Walsh, the late Labour War Minister, for sanctioning the Army Reserve Scheme, and called upon the General Council to immediately convene a special Congress to fight this new attempt of the capitalists to militarise Labour.

Fraternal greetings were conveyed to the Congress by

J. Heis (R. I. L. U. of Czech-Slovakia),

J. Dudilieux (R. I. L. U., and Secretary of French General Confederation of Labour),

Jim Larkin (representing the revolutionary workers of Ireland),

Ubudhay (representing the revolutionary workers of India),

J. Cannon (Trade Union Educational League of America),

Müller (representing the revolutionary Trade Unionists of Germany).

The note sounded by these comrades was a warning against the splitting of the unions into reformists versus revolutionaries, and consequent capitulation before the boss tactics of "divide and conquer". The conference signified that the British workers were beginning to move and would lead the fight against world dominant British imperialism. Graphic descriptions were given of the conditions of the toiling masses in the various countries represented.

The chairman brought the proceedings to a close by again referring to the magnificence of the conference. "The Organisers of it" he said, "are more than satisfied". Despite the mud-slinging and treachery of the reactionaries, progress is very apparent. The Minority Movement will not leave the Trade Union Movement, but as this Conference indicates, is well on the way to making it worthy of modern civilisation.

A thrilling moment came when Tom Mann, with his usual vim, announced that the Conference would close with the singing of the Red Army March. He called upon all to stand, including press reporters, to the singing of the workers' battle song.

The whole gathering was splendid. Not one discordant note was struck. The presence of the fraternal delegates made the proceedings more impressive. As they were introduced the assembled delegates insensibly rose to their feet and many times attempted to sing the "International", and only the reference by the chairman to the heavy agenda, prevented the continual repetition of songs and cheers. But all delegates gave vent to their feelings at the conclusion of the Conference, with cheers as hearty as any ever heard in this country. All present agreed on the tremendous significance and great success of the gathering.

It is true to say that at this conference the movement for International Trade Union Unity was effectively launched in Great Britain, and further progress is measured by the large number of applications for affiliation to the National Minority Movement from Trade Union Branches and other working class organisations.

The Right Amsterdamers against Trade Union Unity.

By Andres Nin (Moscow).

In the course of the last month or so several events have occurred which will have important counter-effects upon the further development of the campaign for international trade union unity. These are: 1) the return from Moscow of the English trade union delegation; 2) the Conference of the trade union organisations of the Scandinavian countries; 3) the offensive of the Right Amsterdamers against the Left, and 4) the joint session of the Amsterdam and the Second International which took place in the first days of January in Brussels.

The social democratic press of all countries has directed a fierce attack against the English delegation to Moscow. It heaped abuse upon Purcell and his co-delegates for having, as it considered, played a dirty trick on the I. F. T. U. of Amsterdam. The campaign was introduced and has been further carried on with special eagerness by the German reformists. The "Vorwärts" has played a leading role in this connection. The organ of the Dutch social democrats, "Het Volk", has weighed in with an

article by trade union bureaucrat Stenhuis. The object of the campaign is to discredit Purcell and to estrange the delegation of the English trade unions from the English labour movement.

The French reformists and Oudegeest have adopted a more diplomatic attitude. The French object to our proposals for unity, but protect the English delegation. Oudegeest, in an article published in the Press Bulletin of the I. F. T. U., and which is full of reservations, seeks to create the impression that he believes that the declarations of Purcell and of his fellow-delegates which have been published abroad are not authentic and that Purcell will not stray from the path indicated by Amsterdam. This old fox knows very well that the chairman of the English delegation declared at the Congress of the trade unions of the Soviet Union, that should the Amsterdam International resist the action for unity, the English trade unions would act on their own account.

Many indications lead us to believe that the I. F. T. U. is organising its attack. The January number of the Hungarian social democratic organ "Socialismus" has published a letter addressed by the A. D. G. B. (German General Federation of Trade Unions) to the Hungarian General Federation, proposing joint action against the English delegation. The Central Committee of the Polish trade unions has decided to support the protest of the A. D. G. B. against the English delegation. Almost at the same time the Swiss Trade Union Central addressed a circular to the Amsterdam International and to the Trade Unions affiliated to it. This document reveals the profound uneasiness which has been called forth among the reformists by the attitude of the English delegation and the formation of the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee. The Swiss Trade Union Central pronounces itself to be definitely opposed to the convening of an international unity congress. According to its opinion, unity can only be realised within the Amsterdam International and in accordance with the statutes of the latter. This is open sabotage.

The leader of the Norwegian trade unions, Ole Lian, is one of the most trusted agents of the Right Amsterdamers. He remembers that the attitude of the Norwegian workers compelled him for a certain time to pose as a communist. His manoeuvres had the effect that the Norwegian trade union Central, after having disaffiliated from Amsterdam, did not affiliate to the R. I. L. U. This cunning bureaucrat, in the meantime, did everything possible in order to bring back his organisation to the reformist International, although at the vote taken in the spring of 1924 two thirds of the members were in favour of fraternal relations with the R. I. L. U. Upon his initiative, and in agreement with the reformist leaders of Sweden and Denmark, the trade union organisations of the Scandinavian countries held a Conference in Copenhagen on the 2nd December 1924. They there, against the votes of two communist delegates from Norway and the abstention from voting of the delegation from Finland, adopted a resolution advocating the affiliation of all Scandinavian Centres to one International (in this case to Amsterdam).

Scarcely was this resolution published, however, when several trade union organisations raised energetic protest against it. The Central Committee of the Norwegian Labour Party, which was soon followed by a great number of local organisations, disavowed the Norwegian delegation, and pronounced itself in favour of the Norwegian Central remaining outside of the two Internationals so long a trade union unity has not been realised, and this in the sense proposed by the R. I. L. U. The Norwegian delegation from Copenhagen was compelled to submit a very ambiguous declaration and to beat a retreat.

The intrigue of Ole Lian can be considered as frustrated. A final blow has been given him by the Central Committee of the Finnish Trade Union Federation, which after the return of its delegates declared itself to be against the resolution of Copenhagen, announced its affiliation to the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee and declared itself for an International Unity Congress. It is exceedingly probable that Amsterdam will not be able to constitute the block in the Scandinavian countries of which it dreamed. On the contrary: the trade unions of Finland and Norway, on the strength of their international autonomy, will be able to intervene in favour of international trade union unity.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Foundations of the Policy of the C. P. of Russia.

Speech by Comrade Stalin at the 13th Moscow District Conference of the C.P. of Russia.

Comrades, I wish to say a few words on the foundations of the political line which the Party is taking at present as regards the peasantry. There can be no doubt as to the specially great significance of the peasant question at the moment. Many people are so carried away that they say that a new era, the era of the peasantry has begun. Others are inclined to take the slogan: "The face to the village!" to mean: "The back to the town!" Others again even think of a political "Nep". This is of course all nonsense, it is pure exaggeration. Apart however from this exaggeration, one thing remains, that is that the peasant question at the moment, just at this moment, is gaining great significance.

The first reason why the peasant question has such special significance for us at the peasant moment is, that among all the allies of the Soviet power, among all the chief confederates of the proletariat — and in my opinion there are four of them — the peasantry is the only ally which can be of immediate help to our revolution. It is a case of immediate help, exactly under the present conditions. All the other allies, who have a great future before them, and who represent a splendid reserve for our revolution, are nevertheless at the present moment not in a position to be of immediate help to our power, our State.

Our first, our chief ally is the proletariat of the advanced countries. The advanced proletariat, the proletariat of the West, is a gigantic force, and it is the most faithful, most important ally of our revolution and our power. Unfortunately the revolutionary movement in the highly developed capitalistic countries, is in such a condition that the proletariat of the West is not able to give us direct and decisive help. We have its indirect moral support, the value of which to us is immeasurable. That however is not the immediate help which we now need.

The second ally is — the colonies, the oppressed peoples in the less developed countries, which are oppressed by the highly developed countries. That, Comrades, is the greatest reserve of our revolution. It is however developing far too slowly. It is therefore not capable at present of giving us immediate help for our socialist construction, for the consolidation of our power, for our socialist economic construction.

We have also a third ally, intangible, impersonal, but of the highest degree of importance. This is those conflicts and contradictions between the capitalist countries, which indeed have no personal form, but without doubt signify a great support for our power and our revolution. This may seem strange but it is a fact. If the two chief coalitions of the imperialistic countries had not had to fight one another to the death, if they had not seized one another, by the throat, if they had not been occupied with one another, but had time to concern themselves with the fight against our power, our power would not not have been able to maintain itself.

The fight, the conflicts and the war between our enemies is, I repeat, our strongest ally. What is there to say about this new ally? World capital began to recover in the post-war time, after a few crises. This we must recognise. The most important of the victorious States, England and America, have now acquired such power, that they are materially in the position not only to make capitalism more or less enduring in their own countries, but also to infuse new blood into France, Germany and other capitalist countries. This is the one side, and this side of the question brings about that the contradictions between the capitalist countries do not, for the time being, develop as quickly as they did immediately after the war. This is an advantage to capital and a disadvantage to us. This process has however another aspect. Its reverse side consists in the fact that, in spite of all the comparative stability which capital has for the time being been able to accomplish, the contradictions between the advanced exploiting countries and the backward exploited colonies and semi-colonial countries is becoming more and more acute and intense, and

threatens to frustrate the "work" of capital from a new "unexpected" direction.

First of all the crisis in Egypt and in the Soudan — then a whole series of complications in China which may kindle a dispute between the "allies" of to-day and undermine the power of capital, another series of complications in North Africa where Spain is losing Morocco and where France is now stretching out its hand for the latter but cannot occupy it as England will allow France no control over Gibraltar — all these are facts which in many ways remind one of the pre-war period and which must signify a danger to the constructive work of international capital. This is in general terms, the plus and minus of the development of the contradictions. Since however the plus side of capital in this respect exceeds the minus side, and since armed conflicts between the capitalists cannot be expected from one day to the next, it is clear that things are not yet as we would wish them with regard to this third ally.

There remains the fourth ally, the peasantry. It lives side by side with us, we are building up with it — for better or worse, but always with it — a new life. This ally is not very strong, the peasantry is not as reliable an ally as the proletariat of the capitalist advanced countries. It is nevertheless an ally, and among all allies the only one which can to-day give us immediate support and receive our support in return.

For this reason the peasant question is of such special significance, just to-day, when the development of the revolutionary and all other crises has slightly slackened. This is the first reason for the special significance of the peasant question.

The second reason why we place the peasant question in the centre of our policy is that our industry, which constitutes the basis of socialism and of our power, is dependent on the home agricultural market. I do not know how things will be when our industry is in full bloom, when we shall meet the requirements of the home market and shall face the question of conquering foreign markets. And we shall have to face this question — of that there is no doubt. It will hardly be possible for us to count on taking foreign markets away from capital which has so much more experience. We shall however be in a decidedly better position as regards markets in the East, with which we have fairly good relations, which relations we shall improve. The chief products with which we shall supply the East and in regard to which we shall have to fight out a competitive war with the capitalists, will doubtless be textile products, means of defence, machines etc. This however concerns the future of our industry. As regards the present when we have not yet exhausted even a third of the possibilities of our agricultural market, our chief problem is the question of the home and particularly of the agricultural market. Just because at present the home market is the chief basis of our industry, we, as the holders of power and the proletariat, are interested in improving agriculture in every respect, raising the material position and the purchasing power of the peasantry, bettering the relations between proletariat and peasantry and realising at last that coalition of which Lenin spoke and which we have not yet realised in the way we should. This is the second reason why we, as a Party, now place the peasant question in the foreground and why we must give particular care and attention to the peasantry.

These are the preliminary conditions of the policy of our party in the peasant question.

The greatest danger is, that many comrades do not at present understand this peculiarity of the situation.

* * *

Is this question then — the peasant question — in any way connected with the questions of Trotzkyism?

Trotzkism implies a lack of confidence in the power of our revolution, a lack of confidence in the alliance of the workers and peasants, a lack of confidence in the coalition. What is our chief task at present? It is, to use Lenin's words, to turn the Russia of the "Nep" into a socialist Russia. Is it then possible to carry out this task without an alliance of the workers and peasantry? No, it is impossible. Can we then realise this coalition, this alliance between workers and peasants, without destroying the theory of lack of confidence in this alliance, i. e. the theory of Trotzkyism? No, this is impossible. The conclusion is plain: if we wish to rise victorious

out of the "Nep", we must abandon Trotzkyism as an ideological tendency.

Before the October revolution, Lenin frequently said that among all our ideological opponents the Mensheviks are the most dangerous, as it is their aim to sow distrust in the victory of the proletariat. He said that it is therefore impossible to achieve the victory of the proletariat without destroying Menshevism.

I believe that there is a certain analogy between the Menshevism of that time, the October period, and the Trotzkyism of to-day, the period of the "Nep". I believe that among all ideological currents, at present, since the victory of October and under the present conditions of the "Nep", Trotzkyism must be regarded as the most dangerous, as its aim is to sow mistrust in the forces of our revolution, in the alliance between workers and peasants, in the transformation of the Russia of the "Nep" into a socialist Russia. Therefore, unless we destroy Trotzkyism, we cannot achieve victory under the present conditions of the "Nep", we cannot transform the Russia of to-day into a socialist Russia.

This is the connection between the policy of the Party as regards the peasantry and Trotzkyism.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The II. International and the Hungarian Party Dispute.

By Eugen Landler.

** The Executive Committee of the II. International decided at its last session in Brussels, to set up a commission which should offer its good services to the Social democratic Party of Hungary in order to clear up those difficulties which have arisen by the publication of the Bethlen Pact. In its resolution relating to this decision, the Executive Committee expressed the hope that it would succeed in preventing a split in the Hungarian Labour movement.

The commission consisted of Tom Shaw, de Brouckère, Otto Bauer and Karl Kautsky. The last named had the honour of representing the Horthy Social democrats. Edo Fimmen, who had been appointed by the Hungarian Opposition as its representative, was unable to attend the negotiations, so in his place there appeared on his own account as the neutral guardian angel of Marxism, Friedrich Adler. The discussion was held in secret; the Vienna "Arbeiter-Zeitung" only published a bare report.

This report did not bring with it any surprise. Anyone knowing the nature of the II. International could have guessed the result. With the present "difficulties" of capitalism one can always be certain that when the II. International speaks of its "good services", it is always meant in the interests of the bourgeoisie. The commission has really done its very best in this respect. Its report has rendered the best service to the bourgeoisie.

What are the actual contents of this report? The Hungarian social democratic opposition accused the party leadership of the Socialist Party of Hungary of having committed a shameful act of betrayal. The commission of the II. International acted as judge. The judgment is contained in the report. Whom does the report condemn? It is seen on the first glance at this document that it is not the Party but History which is accused. There suddenly appears as the chief culprit that "fatal bolshevik adventure" into which Hungary plunged in the year 1919, while a share of the guilt is placed on "the Hungarian labour movement which experienced a deep decline in 1921"; while, in order to do something really "revolutionary", Bethlen is also dragged before the revolutionary tribunal of the II. International in order that the latter could declare with a furious gesture, that Bethlen had no right to conclude such a "humiliating pact", as he knew himself, that they (the obligations undertaken by the Socialist Party of Hungary) contradict all the principles of the international labour movement, while some of them even contradict the principles of socialist morality.

In order to show that this is no exaggeration we will quote the first three paragraphs of the report. They speak for themselves:

„The fatal bolshevik adventure into which Hungary plunged in the year 1919, brought the Hungarian working class into an exceedingly tragic situation. For five years the Hungarian proletariat has lived under the dictatorship of counter-revolutionary terror.

In 1921 the Hungarian labour movement was in a very weak condition. Its best elements had emigrated abroad. In Hungary itself thousands were languishing in the prisons and internment camps. The unrestrained police terror rendered it impossible for the remainder to take up any function in the labour movement. The trade unions were completely paralysed. The working class was given over defenceless to exploitation.

Count Bethlen, the Chief of the Hungarian government, took advantage of this situation in order to attempt a shameful act of extortion against the leadership of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party. Count Bethlen offered the Hungarian social democracy to set free a portion of the imprisoned and interned workers, to restore some rights to the trade unions of the industrial workers; but he attached to this concession the condition that the Party leadership should undertake obligations which Count Bethlen knew contradicted all the principles of the international labour movement, some of them even contradicted the principles of socialist morality”.

These words mean:

1. An unsuccessful revolution, even if it arises as a result of the world war, even if most of the social democratic leaders take part in it, but then betray it, must always be regarded as the original cause of the misfortune of the workers;

2. if the labour movement is in a weak condition it has nothing to expect from the leaders of social democracy, if

3. the Chief of the Horthy government does not take care that his treaties do not contradict the principles of socialist morality.

According to Otto Bauer and Karl Kautsky's socialist conceptions therefore, it is a principle of socialist morality to hold up the proletarian revolution as a warning bogey, and a bourgeois government chief as an ideal, who, in place of the leaders of the labour movement, acts as the guardian of the principles of the labour movement and always keeps before him the principles of socialist morality.

The heroes of the II. International have been proving every day of late that this international is really based upon this socialist morality; this shameful document — simply described as a report, —only proves that, try as they will, they are unable to conceal this fact.

What, under these circumstances, is going to be done to the Central Committee of the Socialist Party of Hungary, which at least is formally accused? The „socialist morality” of the II. International sees to it that the Horthy socialdemocrats shall have nothing to complain about regarding their International.

The fourth paragraph of the report states:

“The Hungarian party leadership under the pressure of this attempt at extortion, was placed in a fearful dilemma.”

The fifth paragraph reads:

“Faced with this fearful dilemma, the Hungarian Central Committee decided to accept the pact which was forced upon them”.

And now let us see what a terrible sentence the judges of the II. International pronounce upon the traitors:

“It was not the task of the commission to judge whether the Party Central acted rightly or not, when it decided to place the interest of the working class in regaining certain liberties before political and moral considerations, which would have urged the non-acceptance of the pact. Neither can the commission decide whether, perchance, in the political situation in which Hungary was at that time (after the second putschist attempt of Karl Habsburg, in the course of which the legitimist and fascist wings of the Hungarian counter-revolution were opposing each other with arms), the liberation of a part of the imprisoned and interned workers, and the moderation of the police pressure could have been obtained without such great political and moral sacrifices. What is certain is, that the Party Executive acted in the belief that it had no other course by which it could liberate the Hungarian working class from unbearable oppression”.

Even the II. International has never treated a question of the labour movement more shamelessly, more cynically and more basely than it has done in the present case. Each day it

surpasses itself. It lies in the nature of things that it cannot stop half way in its shameless course.

This report means the complete identification of the II. International with the social democratic Horthy bandits, Payer and Co., who were parties to the shameful Bethlen document. This report, signed by Otto Bauer, Kautsky, de Brouckere, Tom Shaw and thereby by the whole II. International, is a carte blanche for every social democratic traitor and criminal who acts against the labour movement in the “belief that he has no other course”. Neither the reservations nor the fine phrases addressed to the Opposition are of any avail: the report means open recognition of Counter-Revolution and of the counter-revolutionary Horthy social democrats. The shameful document of Payer and Miakits is equalled by the shameful document of Otto Bauer and Kautsky. The pact of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party has been sanctioned by the report of the II. International; and from being a Hungarian social democratic crime has become an international crime against the whole of the working class.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Congress of the Trade Union of the Soviet and Commercial Employees of the Soviet Union.

By D. Antoschkin (Moscow).

The Trade Union Congress of the Soviet and Commercial Employees which ended on December 27th 1924 was, as far as the representation of the local organisations is concerned, of greater significance than all previous congresses of this trade union. All local branches of the trade union with the exception of those of the Jakut district and of Kamtschatka, were represented (for those two the return journey to Moscow would have taken nearly 3 months). All local branches in the frontier districts, in the national republics and territories used their right of representation to the full. The presence of the national minorities at the congress showed on the one hand once more the unity of the trade union movement of the Soviet Union, and on the other hand was indicative of the fact that the conditions of living together in the Soviet republics attracts the workers of all the nations populating the USSR. into the trade union movement. The large number of representative from district and local branches and of communal Soviets should also be emphasised.

As chief topic, the congress discussed with attention and in detail the report of the Central Committee of the trade union. This discussion was facilitated owing to the circumstance that during the 3 months before the congress, conferences of the local trade union branches had taken place at which, besides other questions, the report of the Central Committee of the trade union had been brought up for consideration.

How may we sum up the results? First of all it must be stated that during the last two years the trade union has gained considerably in strength, the number of members has greatly increased. At the end of 1922 it was 450,000, at the end of 1924, 793,000. This increase goes even further, chiefly as a result of the strengthening of the groups of the employees in trade, cooperative societies and banks, which is connected with the enlargement and expansion of trade and bank undertakings. The general increase of membership of the trade union gives expression to the circumstance that during the period of the new economic policy the percentage of organised employees grew steadily; at present only isolated individuals are not members of the union, apart from those who are excluded by the statutes (these are about 5% of the total number of employees).

The trade union activity in the sphere of the settlement of disputes is determined by the general situation of the workers in the Soviet Union. All disputes arising on the basis of contracts and altogether of conditions of work in State and trade union institutions and works are settled by mutual agreement, either at the place of work itself or in the organs in the People's Commissaries for Work. Any breaches of collective treaties or of the Labour law code are quickly settled. The trade union hardly needs to resort to a strike. By far the greater part of the disputes in private commercial undertakings are settled in the same way. It sometimes happens however that in individual cases and in private undertakings the trade union has to resort to a strike.

In 1922 the trade union carried through two strikes: one in the city market of Moscow, the other in the institution "Ara" in Minsk; both strikes resulted in the victory of the strikers. In 1923/24 there were 32 strikes in 232 private shops in various towns of the Soviet Union, with 744 employees; 16 of these strikes were caused by the refusal to make a collective contract, four arose out of disputes as to questions of wages, 3 because of irregular payment of wages, 2 because trade union members were dismissed, 2 from solidarity with workers in private undertakings, and 5 strikes had other causes. All these strikes had an organised character from beginning to end, and the trade union came off with a complete victory. For strikes of this kind, the trade union has a central strike fund at its disposal.

As to wages, the following can be said: in the course of the last 2 years, the average wage of the employees in the whole Soviet Union has risen by more than 50% (up to June 1st 1924); they continue to increase. In the group of commercial, trade union and bank employees, the average wage has nearly reached that of prewar time. Wages and all conditions of work of 70% of all employees are regulated by general and local collective contracts.

The trade union has achieved remarkable results in the domain of "repairing" the workers, in that trade union members have the opportunity of spending their summer holiday outside the towns, in holiday homes, at bathing resorts and in sanatoria. According to incomplete reports, this opportunity was made use of by almost 10,000 members in the summer of 1924 alone. We will not speak of all the other sides of the protection of Labour (social insurance, medical help etc.), as they are entirely regulated by Soviet legislation.

In discussing the wages question, the Congress decided that measures must be taken to combat the lack of uniformity which prevails in this respect. As regards the increase of wages, this must keep pace with the growth of national economy. In order however to increase and accelerate the latter, the Congress has worked out an elaborate programme for the participation of the State, trade union and commercial apparatus.

For this reason, the questions of the organisation of State and cooperative trade, the questions of the simplification and perfection of the Soviet apparatus as well as the question of the productivity of Labour formed the centre-point of the discussions at the Congress of the trade union of Soviet and commercial employees.

Apart from a special report of the Trade Union Central Committee on all these questions, and apart from the elaborate programme for practical work in these directions, accepted by the Congress, papers were also read and thoroughly discussed on trade (People's Commissaries for Home Trade), on cooperation (by the Central Organisation of Cooperative Stores), and on the question of the improvement of the Soviet apparatus (by the People's Commissioners of workers' and peasants' inspection). After these papers had been read, resolutions were passed, in which the important achievements of these organs in their sphere of activity were pointed out, and a series of practical measures were proposed which aim at improving the general organisation of work and at removing certain abuses.

The resolutions of the Congress will help further to consolidate and intensify the work of the trade union, and to attract the mass of employees still more to an active participation in the life of their trade union.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Conference for the Work amongst the Peasant Women.

The transition to the New Economic Policy had as its result a great increase in the peasant economy of the Soviet Union. With this economic revival there also began the differentiation and the political awakening of the village.

Just as the economic differentiation, the political awakening is developing in two directions; one of these directions, representing the poor peasantry, is friendly to the soviets whilst the other, representing the rich peasants with powerful capital, is hostile to the Soviet State.

In these circumstances it is of decisive importance to win the most powerful section of the Russian peasantry — the middle section — to an attitude friendly to the Soviets and to withdraw them from the influence of the rich peasants. The decisive

importance lies therefore in the ultimate victory of the tendency which is friendly towards the Soviets.

This great and important task demands from the Party a tremendous exertion of all its forces. As, however, the Party organisations on the land are still very weak, the Party must utilise all its auxiliary forces to the full. These auxiliary forces which are in a position to assist the Party and to make it capable of defeating the anti-soviet forces, are the Young Communist League, the demobilised Red soldiers, the societies for the mutual support of the poor etc. One of the most important forces is the peasant women. For many reasons their attitude is of immense importance.

The importance of the work amongst the peasant women was laid down in the Theses of the XIII. Party Conference of the R. C. P., and since then, much has been done in this direction. The All-Russian Conference of Peasant Women recently held in Moscow furnishes an account of the results of this work.

The material in our possession regarding this Conference is of considerable interest. From the reports of the women representatives from the various districts of this vast country one learns to understand the immensity and complexity of this work. In a country like the Soviet Union, comprising such varied economies, it is impossible to work according to hard and fast rule. This is especially true of the work amongst the peasant women. When we consider the backwardness of the country inherited from Czarism, the illiteracy; when we bear in mind the fact that in the Musulman districts the woman lives, even to-day, as though surrounded by a Chinese wall, and when we also remember that the woman of the Eastern peoples is still the object of sale and barter, only then can we learn to understand the immense difficulties which have to be overcome by the cultural work of the Communist Party.

The Conference provided us with the proof not merely that this work has been begun, but that it is making progress along the correct lines. The number of peasant women delegates in comparison with the previous year showed an increase of 35 to 50%, and their participation in political life has become greater. The percentage of women members of the soviets, in the co-operative apparatus, and in the societies for mutual help likewise shows a considerable increase. In the cultural work on the land, the lion's share falls to the work of the peasant women, and practice has shown that the mother and infant protection amongst the peasant women is in the best hands. This quickening and improvement of the work was obtained by the alteration of the composition of the women's commissions and is also partly due to the fact that class-consciousness shows itself much more strongly amongst the peasant women than amongst the peasants. The peasant women will no longer tolerate the wives of the rich peasants amongst them, and in the elections they are continually active against the rich peasants.

The class differentiation amongst the masses of the peasant women not only shows itself in the Russian village, where the poor peasant women very often oppose the wife of the "village usurer", but also on a national scale.

It is reported, for instance, from the Bashkirian Republic (Tschischilinsk District) that a well-dressed woman spoke at a conference of Bashkirian women in the following manner:

"What rights do I need? If I am good myself, then my husband will be good to me also. What do I need freedom for?" This speech showed an astounding similarity to the speeches of the peasant women from the possessing sections of our own (Russian) villages.

Suddenly, the figure of a peasant woman clothed in a torn black Kaftan and with a handkerchief bound round the head in the Russian style, stood up from the back benches and called out loudly over the whole hall: "Naturally, you don't need any rights, what is the use of right to you, what is the good of the Soviet Government to you, you who are the wife of a Rey! But we widows and poor peasant women, we need the Soviet Government. I had no land, who gave it me? The Soviet Government! Naturally, this Government does not please you, nevertheless, we need it. Long live the Soviet Government!"

The peasant women who are elected to official posts distinguish themselves by strong class-consciousness and by an indefatigable energy. Everywhere where they are elected they assist considerably in the improvement of the work. A great hindrance to this participation in public life is the fact that the peasants have not yet got into the way of electing women to official posts. The peasants often oppose the women candidates

by saying that the "peasant woman wont permit herself to be bribed". This is the best proof of the necessity of drawing the peasant women into public life.

Very characteristic of the situation is the fact that whilst the peasant woman is often more progressive and more active politically than the peasant, she is also very often at the same time very conservative in economic affairs. Very often the peasant woman stands in the way to the transition to a better utilisation of the soil or to a social cultivation of it. She is even sometimes the prime mover in the withdrawals from the collective undertakings, the communes and the collective co-operatives. This fact can be explained by the difficulty experienced by women in surrendering their individual household. And in the communes, these individual households create numberless causes of friction.

A very remarkable fact is that the women teachers take an active part in the social work of the peasant women and in this way the effect of their own activity, particularly in the liquidation of illiteracy, is considerably raised. In the past, the women teachers and indeed, the intelligencia of the country in general, withdrew from public life and sympathised with the elements hostile to the Soviets, the Kulaks, the rich peasants. In this respect there has been a fundamental change recently. The reason for this is partly in their conviction of the stability of the Soviet Power, and partly in the increase and betterment in their material situation. Teachers, doctors and agronomists, with the exception of a small section incapable of any progress, are to-day friendly to the Soviet. We must, however, not forget that in the last seven years of the Revolution a great number of teachers — working and peasant girls — members of the RCP, have graduated in the soviet schools and entered upon their work for the soviets with great enthusiasm and knowledge.

Similarly, the entrance of the peasant women into the Party has increased, and in this way the bonds between the peasant millions and the comparatively small Party and the industrial working class have been considerably strengthened.

The Conference of the Peasant Women shows us only a small part of this immense, systematic, creative work of the Soviet Union. But this work, both as a whole and in its details, proves to us its vast scope and it is impossible not to feel from it the great achievements and the incalculable possibilities of progress which the Russian Revolution has opened up for us.

Progress in Culture among the Railwaymen.

(How the Central Club of the Moscow-Kaluga Railway was Created.)

By Vladimir Gavrilov (Moscow).

Close to the station Moscow I. there were two buildings of the Army Munition Works which had been damaged by fire in 1919. They stood there, destroyed and deserted, without windows and doors, with half burnt roofs, an eyesore of the passing railwaymen. For some time the railwaymen's organisation had had its eye on the deserted buildings, and imagination pictured in their place a large, well equipped club, which could satisfy the requirements of an organisation with 8000 members, for at that time nothing but small premises, which had been miserably equipped in the first years of revolution, were at their disposal, in which the development of cultural work, vehemently demanded by the masses of workers, was out of the question.

Then came the year 1923 and what had hitherto appeared impossible or only a beautiful dream, became a reality. The beginning was made by visiting all the larger financial departments of the railway administration which promised material help; the workers also promised support from their own resources. Estimates were given for the restoration of the buildings, calculations and re-calculations were made, gentle pressure was exercised once more on the economic departments and the conclusion was come to, that a start could be made. In spite of the good will of the masses of workers to work with their own hands at the creation of their club, the building had to be handed over to a building society; they themselves could only work in their free time and that would have taken too long; time pressed, the demand for new, spacious premises grew from day to day. The members of the railwaymen's union however undertook the interior decorations and the supply of the equipment; furniture was brought from every direction, the individual pieces were

repaired, educational material and accessories, requirements for the social side of the work were provided etc.

At last the longed-for, joyful day arrived: on Feb. 22nd 1923 the club was opened and was given the name of Comrade Kuchmisterov, an ex-locksmith in the railway workshop, the first who worked for culture on the Moscow-Kaluga railway. The first festive meeting of the club members took place within the still damp walls, and surrounded by portraits of the leaders of the revolution. Thus another vigorous organisation came into being, created from the remains of former times, hammered and chiselled by the will and work of those who had been of no significance and have become all important.

As soon as the Red Star began to shine over the entrance door of the club, many workers began to go out of their way to drop in to the club to read a newspaper or magazine. The young people flocked to join the study-circles for Marxism, classes for physical culture, the choir, the dramatic class and others. They were followed by the fathers who were attracted by some classes in which questions of production were discussed, and in which they could get information about the theoretical side of their work, the economic situation and methods of perfecting technique. Gradually those women who were not too much taken up with the demands of children and household were also included in the club work. Classes were opened in cutting and sewing, lectures were held on questions of hygiene, household management, care of children and other subjects. The members of the club were so enthusiastic about the educational classes, the attendance was so large, that the club committee had to apply to the railway administration for permission to use the second building.

Besides the already mentioned groups, the Kuchmisterov Club has several smaller NOT. (scientific organisations for work), the fine arts, wireless and others, a legal information bureau for members etc.

The club has now three buildings. Two of them are two-storied and are joined by a covered gallery. In one of them is a hall for theatrical performances with accommodation for 750 persons, amply provided with chairs and benches, the stage also is supplied with every necessary requisite. The first floor is devoted to the classes; each class has its own room, equipped with the necessary educational material and appliances. Here also there is a nursery under medical supervision; every working woman and every worker's wife who comes to the club can leave her child there and be undisturbed in her occupation. One floor of the second building contains recreation rooms, which are furnished with upholstered furniture; here are found a chess room, a reading room, the Lenin corner, the corner of the "godless" (anti-religious association) etc. Exhibitions of various kinds are also held here. The club does not forget the children: it has a pioneer division with 250 members, to which also a special room is allotted.

In order to meet as far as possible the needs of the masses of workers, the club committee entered into negotiations with the "Narpit" (Society for National Feeding) and now we have on the first floor of the second building a dining hall in which 2500 good dinners can be served daily at minimum prices. Near by there is a hairdressing and shaving saloon; the prices are 65% less than in the town. The club possesses a library of more than 8000 volumes from all branches of knowledge. In the neighbouring building which had also been destroyed, there is a gymnasium with all the necessary apparatus. Behind the platform there is room for a lantern, and lectures are often illustrated with lantern slides.

For warm weather the club has a summer stage with a garden, a special open air stage and reading hall, also a cinema in the open air. In summer the garden is always overcrowded, healthy life abounds everywhere. A brass-band composed of workers plays on the open-air stage.

Thus our club has developed from close small premises to an extent of 500 square archin, and now, as regards sizes, equipment and work, it holds the first place among all the clubs of the Moscow railway centre. It bears the name of "model club", and we hope that its work will serve as an example to our western comrades, when they finally shake off the yoke of slavery and march in step with their brothers, the Russian workers, on the road to Communism.

(Literary group "Smelting Furnace" of the Rogoschko-Simonow district, Moscow.)

THE PEASANT INTERNATIONAL.

The Mexican Farmers Join the Peasant International.

The agrarian question is at the centre of the political life of Mexico as, among others, Callies, the recently elected President of Mexico has asserted.

Although the Constitution accepted in 1917, provides for an extensive agrarian reform, it has not yet been possible to carry it through completely, owing to the resistance of the United States and England. The Land Law declared the whole of the land to be national property, and admitted of a distribution of the property, of the large estate owners among the needy farmers. This involved a considerable disadvantage to the interests of the Standard Oil Company, the English plantation owners and the producers of naphtha who, by this law lost not only the land but also its treasures.

The U. S. A. do not approve of this situation and are inciting a whole series of insurrections in Mexico in order to bring about the overthrow of the Obregon government and to get the Land Law, which is so disagreeable to the Standard Oil Company, rescinded.

Callies' predecessor, general Alvarez Obregon, was finally compelled to cancel the application of the agrarian law to the Americans, and thus gained America's recognition of revolutionary Mexico.

England, which up to then had not recognised Mexico, followed in America's footsteps. England would like to guarantee to its industrial producers and plantation owners the inviolability of their possessions. In the Summer of 1924 the Mexican Government expelled from the country the English charge d'affaires, Kamens who had tried to make use of extra-territorial rights to interfere in the international affairs of Mexico.

The resistance of foreign capital to agrarian reform has produced a corresponding reaction not only in the government but also in the peasantry. Thus in July 1924, Sally Evans, the English property owner, was murdered on the way to Texmeljuken whither she was going to pay the workers' wages. Her murder was an act of revenge on the part of the Spanish and Indian peasants, because Mrs. Evans did not obey the law, barricaded herself in her house and refused the Mexican officials entrance to it, when it, together with her landed property, was to be taken away from her.

The spontaneous discontent of the masses of farmers with the policy of foreign predatory capital which opposed agrarian reform in every way has recently led to the farmers beginning to unite in political and agrarian organisations.

The Congress of the League of Agricultural Communities of the State of Vera Cruz, which was held in December 1924, resolved to join the Peasant International. The Congress passed the following resolution:

1. Both national and international organisation are recognised as absolutely necessary for the successful protection of general interests. All forces must be used to create a national agrarian organisation in order to carry on the fight against international capital.

2. Membership of the Peasant International in Moscow which is working for the overthrow of capitalism.

3. The Peasant International in Moscow is the only organisation which satisfies the hopes and demands of the workers; our Congress will take action to join the Peasant International as soon as possible.

Long live the fight for land and freedom!

Galapa, Vera Cruz, December 1924.

This resolution was proposed by Manuel Diaz-Ramirez, Karillio and Ursullio Garvan, who were elected members of the presidium of the Peasant International at the 1st International Peasant Conference. At present Ursullio Galvan is a lieutenant and leader of a regiment; at the time of the recent civil war against de la Huerta (Fascist movement) Galvan was at the head of a battalion which consisted exclusively of peasants.

WORKERS' CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from a Russian Textile Worker.

Dear foreign Comrades,

Being aware that your bourgeois press misrepresents the life of our Russian workers, I will tell you the truth and nothing but the truth about the life and doings of the Russian proletariat.

I will describe how we work.

I work in a textile factory which employs 11,000 workers. (The former owner of the factory has escaped abroad.) This very big concern is under the management of a worker. All our workers are doing their utmost to revive and increase production, for they know that they do not work for their master but for themselves. They work eight hours out of the 24. All questions connected with the factory are decided at the workers' general meetings. Every worker has the right to point out by word of mouth or through the press any shortcomings, and may suggest improvements in the conditions under which the workers live and work, etc. We have factory and workshop committees to which our best comrades from the bench are elected. There are also organs for the protection of labour and motherhood and childhood, and above all, there is the trade union. All these organisations are composed of working class comrades whose chief aim is to work in the interests of the working class. This, dear comrades, does not exist in your country, and will not be as long as the bourgeoisie is in power. Our workers carry out on their own initiative all sorts of campaigns. For instance, they come to the assistance of the unemployed, they help to liquidate illiteracy, they care for homeless children, open children's homes and shelters, most of them are members of the International Red Aid, etc.

Thousands of children of our workers and peasants have the benefit of higher education in the universities and other institutions, a thing unknown under the czars. And dear comrades, I hardly think that your bourgeoisie will admit the children of the poor into the universities and other institutions for higher education.

At present our workers are doing their utmost to raise the productivity of labour and to reduce the cost of production. Results have already been achieved in this field because of the workers' very reasonable attitude in this matter. Our workers are fighting for the complete reconstruction of our industries and agriculture. One year of this work has shown our workers that as far as wages and output are concerned, they are approaching pre-war level. All necessities of life are quite accessible to the workers.

All factories and works have clubs for the workers which carry on cultural-educational work. There are free libraries and reading-rooms, and the club has also various circles and sections; such as: art, dramatic, choral circles, musical and other circles, in which workers and children get instruction. This, comrades, you also lack. This can only be done by a workers' and peasants' government. The workers of our factory have made great progress during these years of revolution as far as culture and education are concerned. They are, therefore, interested not only in the life of their fellow-workers, but are also following very carefully the life of the oppressed workers of all countries. Their hearts beat in unison with those of the workers abroad, and they are ready to come at any moment to the assistance of their foreign comrades.

Our workers demonstrate openly with red flags and posters against the bourgeois oppression of the working class.

A few more years of such steady and strenuous work and our country will be so strong economically, that it will no longer need the help of the Western capitalist countries. I should like to close my letter with the slogans: Workers of the world, unite! Long live the proletariat and the working class of the world!

With comradely greetings,

Malyshev.

Workers correspondent of the Wall Newspaper
"The Rudnikov Worker".