

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 7. No. 33

PRESS2nd June 1927**CORRESPONDENCE**

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

CONTENTS

R. Palme Dutt: Smash the War on the Soviet Union!

Politics.

The Note of the Soviet Government to the Government of Great Britain.

Comrade Litvinov on the Breaking off of Diplomatic Relations.

A. Mikoyan: The Raid on the Trade Delegation of the Soviet Union in London.

Karl Kreibich: The Presidential Elections in Czechoslovakia.

K. Leski: The Communist Election Victory in Warsaw.

J. B.: The Situation in Syria.

China.

A. Platonov: The Fight for Honan.

Earl Browder: Textile Workers of Wuhan Cities.

The Balkans.

Declaration of the C. P. of Bulgaria on the Parliamentary Elections in Bulgaria.

League of Nations.

E. Varga: The Significance of the World Economic Conference.

The Labour Movement.

The Opening of the Trade Union Conference of the Countries of the Pacific.

Our Problems.

E. Eichenwald: The Tactical Line of Action of the Comintern in China. I.

Union of Soviet Republics.

J. Jaglom: Jouhaux Exposed.

On Agitation for Rationalisation and on Recruiting the Broad Masses for the Realisation of the Campaign.

Against Imperialist War.

D. Marezky: The Future War and the Working Class III.

In the Camp of Social Democracy.

Ernst Meyer: The Kiel Party Conference of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

Ten Years Ago.

The Kronstadt Soviet Seizes Power.

The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

From Comrade Lenin's Speech at the All-Russian Congress of the Peasant Soviets.

J. Stalin: The Municipal Election Campaign.

What Do the Bolshevik Demand of the Municipality?

Chronicle of Events.

Smash the War on the Soviet Union!

By R. Palme Dutt.

The British Conservative Government has taken the plunge to let loose world war in order to smash the Revolution. The suddenness and precipitancy with which the final steps have been taken, as a result of the Die-hards' own mistakes in seeking to force the situation before the Foreign Office plans were ripe, and the consequent divisions and hesitations in the Cabinet, should not blind the view for a moment to the **permanent and long-prepared policy** which is now reaching its realisation.

The policy of the British Government is a policy of war without limitation: of this there should be no doubt. The renewal of the Franco-British Alliance, which is a purely military alliance with no other common basis; the final rupture with Nationalist China and withdrawal of diplomatic representatives from Hankow on May 17; and the meetings of the Committee of Imperial Defence (reported in the Westminster Gazette) all point in the same direction. The rupture of diplomatic relations is only the first step. The delay in the immediate sequel to the rupture is the reflection of the complications of the international situation. The immediate next step will be the organisation of the **international economic and financial blockade** as completely as it can be made. The final culminating step, if the policy reaches its success, will be the organisation of **direct military action**.

In this way the British Government seeks to revive in 1927 the situation of 1919. For eight years British policy, having failed in its original military attempt to crush the Revolution by force, has sought through more devious means to undermine or overpower the Soviet regime, first through the Trade Agreement, hoping to swamp the Soviet order by capitalist trading relations and economic penetration, and later, as that policy failed against the unbreakable wall of the State Trade Monopoly, by the passive financial blockade and discouragement of economic relations of other countries with the Soviet Union. Both these policies have failed. The Trade Agreement of 1921 was originally adopted, according to a recent statement of its negotiator Sir Robert Horne, because "he felt that no Communistic organisation could ultimately prevail against the necessities of trading with individualistic nations". But by 1927 he had to confess himself "disappointed", and therefore reversing his policy and demanding the ending of the agreement: the Communist organisation had prevailed; the capitalist sappers were unable to undermine the Foreign Trade Monopoly and the unshakable economic foundations of the Workers' and Peasants' State. The policy of the passive financial blockade and refusal of credits, by which it was hoped to starve all possibility of industrial development and so

produce dislocation of industrial and agricultural production, consequent internal economic and political crisis and capitulation to foreign capital, also failed because of the unshakable determination of the Soviet Government to continue the path of socialistic construction and industrialisation even on the necessarily slower rate of limited home resources and to allow no capitulation to the pressure of foreign capital.

The return to the open policy of brutal force is the declaration of failure of the attempts of Capitalism to undermine and force to capitulation the Soviet Union by trading pressure, blockade or refusal of credits, and of the triumph of the Soviet economy in the face of all obstacles. The eight years are to be wiped out as a net loss, and the Counter-Revolutionary War begun anew. The direct sabre-rattling attitude of British policy in answer to the unreservedly pacific policy of the Soviet Union is revealed to the whole world.

But the eight years are not to be so easily wiped out. 1927 is not 1919. The consolidation of the Soviet Union, its unshakable basing in the conscious understanding and co-operation of all its members, now reinforced by nine years deepening experience, the development of even limited economic relations all over the world, the changes in the international alignment and complicating factors, the economic and political weakening of Britain, the development of the international labour movement and Communist Parties in all countries — all these are factors differing from 1919, and to raise hopes, if every force is rapidly mobilised of speedy successful resistance to cut short or even check the deadly menace of the new Counter-Revolutionary Offensive of 1927.

The international situation has not yet been fully prepared for the British offensive — hence the hesitations and objections of the Foreign Office at having its hand forced prematurely by the bungling conduct of the Arcos raid, which lands Britain into a state of war on a starting-point of flagrant violation of international law and treaties, and which it is consequently now attempted to bury in the background behind an elaborately drawn up casus belli. Although the securing of France and Italy, and the successes in China, afford the basis of the attack, that basis is not complete. It is not even clear yet how far France has been secured. The expectation of the submergence of independent Nationalism in China is bound to be short-lived. And in Europe the keypoint of Germany has not yet been secured, although every attempt is in progress. The British Governmental press is engaged in a campaign of sharp criticism in relation to the Nationalist Party in Germany, and combined threats and offers according as the latter show themselves prepared to abandon the "Asiatic mirage" and fall in with British policy (so the Daily Telegraph diplomatic correspondent, and Garvin in the Observer). The offers are the prospect of evacuation of the Rhineland and assignment of Colonial mandates. But, according to the Paris Chigago Tribune, one of the terms of the Anglo-French bargain reached is British acceptance of French policy with regard to the Rhineland in return for French acceptance of British policy with regard to the Soviet Union and China. Here, therefore, the position is not yet cleared up for the combined international offensive desired: and the same applies to the unsolved contradictions in Eastern Europe. This situation makes for delay between the rupture and the beginning of active operations.

At home, also, the position of the Government is not strong; and this culminating outbreak bears every sign of nervous precipitation. Already elected on a minority vote, it is now harassed by open divisions; and the present Die-Hard domination is forcing policy along lines contrary to some of the strongest elements and traditions of British bourgeois policy (the combination of direct attack on all three fronts, the Soviet Union, China and at home by the Trade Union Bill, raising a maximum of hostility). Industrial and commercial opposition to the break is strong, especially in the engineering and textile industries. The Liberal Party will undoubtedly voice this opposition, and gain strength in doing so. The Labour Party will press for a General Election on the issue of the Soviet rupture and the Trade Union Bill. The working class agitation, already gathering strength on the issue of the Trade Union Bill, will be powerfully intensified by the new offensive; and the drive to action against the Government should become strong.

The present moment is, therefore, one in which the ultimatum of International Counter-Revolution has in fact already been delivered; but there is possibility of a short intervening period during which the mobilisation of the working class forces all

over the world can still by rapid action drive back the attack and even check the threatened war. It is the most urgent and critical moment in international working class history since 1920. On the action of the next few weeks the heaviest issues of war and peace, of the working class revolution and of the continued unbroken development and advance of the Soviet Union, depend. Social democratic workers and communist workers will need to fight together against the common danger. It is for the social democratic workers to demand of their chiefs, the chiefs of the Second International and I.F.T.U., to make good their repeated pledges and promises of action against war or the threat of war, or against any attack on the Soviet Union, in the prospect of which they professed to disbelieve, and which is now becoming living reality for all to see. Determined resistance now can yet check incalculable disasters: if the German Government can be forced to hesitate over committing the German workers to any adventure against the Soviet Union; if the French Government can be made to prefer the safer path of continuing its advantageous Soviet negotiations; above all, if the general strike agitation in Britain gathers strength against both the Trade Union Bill and the anti-Soviet offensive; then the advance of the offensive can still be checked, and the tottering Baldwin Government brought down.

POLITICS

The Note of the Soviet Government to the Government of Great Britain.

Moscow, 29th May 1927.

The following Note of the Soviet government signed by Litvinov has been handed to the British Chargé d'Affaires Peters in Moscow:

"The Soviet government has taken note of the contents of the Note handed yesterday to Rosengoltz, in which the British government announces its intention to annul the Trade Agreement of 1921 and to break off all diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

This decision was no surprise for the Soviet Government. The Soviet Government has long ago known that a rupture of relations with Russia was being prepared by all the policy of the present British Conservative Government, which declined all proposals of the Soviet Government for the readjustment of mutual relations by means of negotiations.

The Soviet Government once more emphatically rejects all charges of on any occasion violating the Trade Agreement of 1921, as these charges are absolutely without proof and entirely unfounded. The only source of these charges, as has again and again been undeniably established, is false information drawn from most suspect White Russian refugee sources and forged documents with which the British Government freely operated throughout the period of relation between it and the Soviet Government.

The fact that the search of the office of the Trade Delegation, which was most carefully made during several days, yielded no results is most convincing proof of the loyalty and correctness of the official Soviet agents. The Soviet Government scornfully passes over the insinuations of British Ministers regarding espionage by the Trade Delegation, and deems it unworthy of it to reply.

The Soviet Government declares that the British Government had no legal ground either for the first violation of the Trade Agreement of 1921—namely, the police raid on extra-territorial premises of the Soviet official agents; or the second violation—namely, the terminating of this agreement without six months notice as provided by the agreement.

It is evident to the whole world that the fundamental cause of the rupture is the defeat of the Conservative Government's policy in China and an attempt to mask this defeat by a diversion directed against the Soviet Union, while the direct reason is the British Government's desire to divert public opinion from the failure of the absurd police raid on the Arcos and Trade Delegation premises and to save the British Home Secretary from the scandalous position in which he found himself owing to this raid.

The peoples of the Soviet Union and their Government foster no hostile feelings towards the peoples of the British

Empire, with whom they wish to maintain normal friendly relations. Such undoubtedly is also the desire of the peoples of the British Empire. But these normal relations are not those which are wished by the present British Government, which from the very first day of its existence strove to keep relations with Russia constantly in tension and further to strain them.

The British Government prefers a system of oppression and enmity to a system of normal relations. It has decided upon a rupture of diplomatic relations, for which it must assume all responsibility, fully realising that this rupture will inevitably upset existing political and economic international relations. It could not but recognise that the rupture would increase economic chaos from which Europe still suffers after the World War, and that it would deal a hard blow at the cause of peace.

However, it decided to take this step of sacrificing the interests of the broad masses of the British Empire, and even of British industry. The Soviet Government notes this act, being fully convinced that the act will be condemned, not only by the toiling masses but also by all progressive elements of the world.

At the same time, it firmly believes that the time is near when the British people will find ways and means for the unhampered realisation of their aspirations for peace.

Comrade Litvinov on the Breaking off of Diplomatic Relations.

The Breaking off of Diplomatic Relations cannot be Regarded as anything but Forced Preparations for War.

"For its part the Soviet Government will still more vigilantly follow all the intrigues and machinations of the militarist diplomacy of the British Government in order, with all means at its disposal, to repel the blows being prepared against it, and by all measures defend the cause of peace."

Statement by Comrade Litvinov.

Moscow, May 26th.

In reply to numerous questions about the decision of the Cabinet of Great Britain with regard to breaking off relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, Comrade Litvinov, the acting People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs, made the following statement to representatives of the Soviet Press.

"The decision of the British government to break off diplomatic and economic relations with the U. S. S. R. is no casual unexpected event connected with the raid on Arcos or the alleged disloyalty of the Soviet trade organisation. The decision must be considered a logical and final issue of the anti-Soviet policy which the present conservative government has pursued from the very day when, having deceived its electorate through a forged document, it came into power.

While basing its policy on ruthless struggle against the working class in England and the enslavement of China, India, Egypt, and other countries, the conservative government could not be reconciled with the existence of a Workers' and Peasants' government which made no secret of its sympathy with the class struggle of the proletariat and the national movement of oppressed peoples.

Accordingly the desire at all costs to bring about the downfall of the Soviet government was the core of the activity of the British conservative government. All through its existence this government has carried on anti-Soviet intrigues with the object of isolating and weakening the Soviet Union so as to destroy it the more successfully.

The only reason why the British government delayed until now the rupture, was that it expected to find allies in a joint attack on our Union.

When this hope failed to materialise the British government made up its mind by itself and openly attacked the U. S. S. R., hoping again that this would be the signal for similar actions on the part of other states.

The rupture of diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R. and the threat of war are in perfect harmony also with the general policy of the British government, which consists of instigating and arming one country against another, preventing the stabilisation of peace and calm in Europe as well as in other parts of the world. This government's rule in Egypt, China, and, lastly, in the matter of the wrecking of Anglo-

Soviet political and economic relations is so evident to all that I need not dwell on it.

Sir Austen Chamberlain himself repeatedly declared that the rupture of Anglo-Soviet relations was pregnant with the danger of breaking world peace. Actually realising this rupture, the Nobel peace laureate must admit that the danger of war not only did not trouble him, but was desirable to him and formed part of the political plans of his government.

The rupture of diplomatic relations cannot be estimated otherwise than an energetic preparation for war, as a rupture can pursue no other object and would be absurd from the point of view of England's own interests.

Indeed, the rupture could hardly aim only at depriving English industry of Soviet orders consisting of many millions sterling, the English consumer of cheap raw material, or at increasing unemployment, and releasing the Soviet government from all obligations regarding Britain.

Beyond any doubt all that occurred renders impossible the maintenance of trade relations with Britain. The Soviet government has no guarantees against raids and the seizure of commercial correspondence nor against other acts of violence up to the confiscation of goods belonging to our state organisations. Neither can Arcos continue its operations inasmuch as it developed its commercial activity on account of the sale of Soviet state commodities and the purchase of English goods.

This, for long since, is what the British government aimed to prevent. It has achieved its object, having rendered practically impossible the maintenance of commercial relations and assumed the entire responsibility for their rupture. The most characteristic fact of the raid on Arcos and the Trade Delegation was that it was made the day after the conclusion of the agreement with the Midland Bank regarding the financing to the extent of £ 10,000,000 Soviet orders to English works, an agreement which opened up further prospects of the development of economic relations between both countries.

In the light of these facts Baldwin's attempts to justify the rupture by uncurling a kind of moving picture film with all the elements of firstclass American world-attractions are ludicrous and unconvincing. Who, after Baldwin's speech, will doubt that the rupture is not the result of the raid, but that the raid itself was undertaken with the object of preparing a rupture?

Indeed, Baldwin failed to justify the raid even from the purely police point of view. He was compelled to admit that the mythical 'document', in search of which the London police undertook their blustering and formidable expedition, was not found on the premises of the Trade Delegation.

Consequently Baldwin himself recognised that Joynson-Hicks had systematically deceived British public opinion when he gave out this 'document' as the reason for the raid. Having dismally failed on this central point entailing catastrophic consequences to the cause of peace, Baldwin piteously and unworthily clings to other 'documents' allegedly discovered. But neither could he, in this case, produce any documents compromising the Trade Delegation's activities. Indeed, we cannot take seriously the private letters allegedly taken from the pockets of members of the staff, even granting that the police report conforms to the truth, which, naturally, remembering the 'Zinovieff letter', may well be doubted.

Even if it were proved that this or that member of the staff of Arcos or the Trade Delegation engaged in 'criminal' correspondence with Trade Unions or other Labour organisations, can the institution wherein such collaborators were employed be held responsible?

Indeed, except for the chief of the Trade Delegation no member of the staff of the Delegation, still less Arcos, enjoys immunity. All bear full personal responsibility for personal actions. The police could have searched their pockets also outside the premises of the Delegation, could, if they had discovered 'criminal' documents, have acted towards them according to the law.

The foreign office is well aware that our plenipotentiary representation and Trade Delegation in London engage all members of their staffs by a written document and under fear of dismissal and legal prosecution they are forced strictly to observe the laws of the country in which they reside, are forbidden to interfere with internal affairs, and may not engage in any propaganda.

If any employee breaks the obligation entered upon the Trade Delegation evidently cannot be made responsible.

As regards the charge of espionage preferred against the Trade Delegation, that we must reject as a wicked inuendo. The raid did not substantiate this accusation.

If, as Baldwin asserts, the English police knew those members of the Trade Delegation staff who engaged in espionage, then the question arises why the police did not prosecute and bring them up in court.

The police do not prosecute for the mere reason that they lack any proofs whatsoever, and the charge preferred is absolutely groundless.

However, one must be extraordinarily impudent to impute espionage to a Soviet organ and at the same time fail to recognise the fact that the British government itself organises espionage, being engaged, as it is, in obtaining secret 'documents' of the Soviet government.

"Baldwin apparently mixes up the activities of the English company Arcos with operations of a well-known English commercial firm in Paris recently convicted for espionage against France. Feeling the weakness of his position, and the impossibility of justifying the raid on the Trade Delegation and the consequent violation of the trade agreement of 1921, Baldwin drags to light new 'documents' of unknown origin which by no means have reference to the raid on Arcos.

"Inasmuch as he again touched upon Borodin's activities. I must once more declare that, contrary to Baldwin's statement in parliament, Borodin is not in the Soviet Government's service, has no official relations with it, and I entirely support Rosengolz' statement: 'Under these petty "facts" and "documents," invented ad hoc, Baldwin is doing his best to conceal the fundamental political fact of the attack on the U. S. S. R. institutions, the rupture of relations, and direct threat to peace. With such facts Baldwin will not succeed in screening such an important event as the rupture of diplomatic relations and preparation for a new war.'

"Our country will draw therefrom the logical conclusions, and will undertake by all measures, not to be taken unawares. Other countries which Britain will attempt to draw in its trail along the same path of the violation of peace and the creating of chaos must know what criminal adventure they are being drawn into.

"For its part the Soviet Government will still more vigilantly follow all the intrigues and machinations of the militarist diplomacy of the British government in order, with all means at its disposal, to repel the blows being prepared against it, and by all measures defend the cause of peace."

The Raid on the Trade Delegation of the Soviet Union in London.

(From a speech by Comrade Mikojan, People's Commissary for Trade in the Soviet Union, held at the National Conference of the Commercial and Office Employees of the Soviet Union.)

The raid on our trade delegation in London, and the searching of the Arcos premises, an economic institution of the Soviet Union, working in Great Britain in keeping with British laws, effecting our entire foreign trade monopoly in Great Britain, and transacting business to a value of several hundred millions of roubles yearly, is an overt act of provocation.

In the five years of our commercial relations there has not been a single case in which the Arcos did not fulfil its obligations or in which a single British firm lodged a single complaint against the Arcos or hinted in the least at any illoyal action on its part.

Our imports from Great Britain and the export of goods to that country developed as follows:

Year	Imports from Great Britain	Export from the Soviet
	to the Soviet Union	Union to Great Britain
	In Thousands of Roubles	
1923/24	49,177	80,726
1924/25	110,698	185,639
1925/26	129,167	197,719
1926/27	176,125	251,010

And now, in defiance of all the rules existing in British law, 200 policemen break in, rummage for secret codes, burst open safes and cupboards, and damage the most important apparatus of the Arcos. And only an hour later a warrant for the search is forthcoming, instead of being presented on the spot.

If the police had demanded documents, the Arcos would have presented them, just as, in its character as a company constituted under British law, it would have delivered up the keys needed for the investigation. But our trade delegation refused to surrender to the police the keys to the safes and to the code cupboard, seeing that our trade delegation, which is conducted by Comrade Chintchouk, is in the enjoyment of the exterritorial rights confirmed according to British law in the commercial treaty of 1921. It was stipulated that Comrade Chintchouk should be entitled to communicate with Moscow in cipher, that he should have the right to keep a cipher key, and that he should be authorised to send couriers with mail which neither the police nor any one else should have the right to open. All this is set forth in the commercial treaty.

Meanwhile, however, the police forced their way into the trade delegation premises. Upon the refusal of our employees of the cipher department to surrender the cipher keys to the British police, the British police, who appear to have learnt of the Chinese police and even to excel them, maltreated our honest collaborators of the cipher department, who were prevented by their duty from betraying the secrets of the cipher code. With threats and violence our comrades were thrust aside and the police seized the cipher key by force.

In the course of the last few months we have been negotiating with Great Britain. Our commercial representative negotiated with the leading British bank, an institute of world-wide importance.

These negotiations also embraced discussions with the representative of the engineering industry of Great Britain, who knows that there is no market in Great Britain itself for the products of British engineering, which is consequently suffering from a lack of orders.

As you will know, the German Government last year granted us a credit of 150 million gold roubles, a fact which aroused a tremendous discussion in the Conservative press of Great Britain. Nevertheless, the British business circles are inclined to come to an understanding with us, and on May 11th a treaty was signed placing a credit of 100 million roubles at our disposal, this being somewhat less than the German credit. It was granted us in form of a guarantee of our bills for purchases in Great Britain.

Besides this, we have been negotiating with the leading firms of textile machinery manufacturers in Manchester, who offered us textile machinery on credit to a total value of 25 million roubles, this credit to be redeemed within a lapse of 48 months. The average length of time the credit was to run was 23 months.

We also had credit offers from other firms for equipment for petroleum boring to a value of 20 million roubles, repayable after a longer period.

Within the last two or three months, therefore, British business circles have approached us in regard to a credit to our benefit of almost 150 million roubles, that is to say very nearly as much as was granted us last year by the German Government to the great indignation of the British Conservative press.

This did not happen out of any special love of the Soviet Union on the part of the British business circles; indeed, I believe I am not mistaken if I wager that no such feelings are cherished for us there. It happened merely for the reason that they require markets for the products of their industry; it is to their advantage to sell the goods and to our advantage to buy them. This is a business transaction which is advantageous for both parties, quite independent of the political sympathies and convictions of either.

It is probably well known to all of you that the German credit reduced unemployment in Germany and that thousands of workers are now working there to Russian orders.

The same thing was now to happen in Great Britain. And to this end, on May 11th, the contract regarding the 100-million rouble credit was signed, while at the same time the negotiations took place in regard to the textile machinery. Exactly one day later occurred the raid on our trade delegation and the Arcos. How can this be made to rhyme? Obviously the Conservatives

have already become so confused as politicians that their right hand does not know what their left hand is doing. Nay, there is reason to believe that the object of the raid was that of bringing matters to a head for fear that an increase of our trade with Great Britain would strengthen the opposition not only of the working masses but also of the British industrialists and merchants against the reactionary and pernicious policy of the Diehards.

Under such circumstances I believe that in the full consciousness of our strength (and I may remark that on the world market, too, we are constantly growing in strength), in the full consciousness, I say, of our dignity and strength, we shall take all steps to safeguard our interests fully and wholly, but we shall not allow ourselves to be caught in the snare of the British bourgeoisie, who intend to inveigle the Soviet Union in a massacre.

The very fact of a grant of credits is a proof that the business circles of the European bourgeoisie cannot help recognising our unmistakable progress. They are obliged to accept the cancellation of debts and to accord us credits. Austria is willing to lend us 50 millions, besides which we have recently got into touch with a group of Austrian banks, headed by Rothschild in regard to further credits to a like amount. The Norwegian Government has resolved to grant us credits. Denmark is likewise according us export credits. With British banks and bankers we have negotiated credits to a total of 150 million roubles. Our home and foreign trade is on the increase. And at sight of our progress, at sight of our consolidation, the Diehards are seized with yet greater anger, and they are resolved to frustrate our growth. I do not think that they will succeed.

There can be no doubt but that the raid on our trade representation and on the Arcos will harm those commercial operations which were envisaged between ourselves and Great Britain. At the moment our trade delegation in London and our economic authorities hold licences to the value of 25 million roubles, intended for Great Britain. The metal industry and the chemical industry in particular afford licences aggregating about 6,130,000 roubles, while the Gostorg (State Trade) holds licences valued at two millions. For the equipment of our textile industry, we have given our consent to an order of machinery representing a value of 11 million roubles. There is, moreover, an order, not as yet placed, for apparatus for petroleum boring and another for the equipment of transportation. Besides his, there are orders for electro-technical equipment and for electrical construction.

I have received a great number of inquiries on the part of our economic authorities, showing that under the abnormal conditions at present governing our trade representation in London they have no confidence in the fact that the great investment of capital for the purpose of erecting buildings and providing raw materials for those factories for which equipment was to have been ordered in Great Britain, will ever be fully exploited. The managers of the factories and workshops point out that if the equipment does not arrive in due time, which is not excluded if raids are made on our trade representation and the work is held up, they can undertake no responsibility for the unproductive expenditure of dozens of millions. They demand the transfer of the orders to other countries.

To this must be added that already on the third day after the raid we received tenders from certain textile and electro-technical firms of the United States, inviting orders and suggesting conditions which are hardly worse than those stipulated by Great Britain. At the same time our textile industry demands the transfer of wool purchases from Great Britain to other countries. Such suggestions, which refer to the purchase of a number of goods such as rubber, coffee, cocoa, and wool, have likewise been received from Dutch, Australian, and other firms. In this connection suitable terms of credit have reached us from a number of quarters interested in the transfer of our orders from Great Britain to the countries of production.

Our export organisations submit demands that they be permitted to transfer the sale of a series of goods, such as timber or furs, to other countries, in which connection American firms have also offered to grant us favourable credit terms as regards the furs at present re-exported thither by Great Britain. Leading German firms (of Leipsic) also express their readiness to

accord us credits for the preparation or collection of furs for export to Germany.

The raid on our trade delegation will thus cause enormous loss to a number of industrial and commercial firms, which are innocent of the short-sighted policy of the Conservatives. We ourselves who appreciate the conscientiousness of many British industrial and commercial firms and recognise the value of those normal trade relations which were established between us, are of opinion that such circles in Great Britain ought to call a Government to order which causes them such substantial losses and restricts their turnover from business with Russia. But our friendly attitude towards these correspondents of ours in Great Britain can only continue if the British Government actually is called to order for this unprecedented act of violence and for their violation of the very basis of international relations.

The Presidential Elections in Czechoslovakia.

By Karl Kreibich.

The following article, which gives a survey of the political situation in Czechoslovakia, was written before the Presidential Election. As was predicted by the writer of the article, the election has resulted in the re-election, by 274 votes, of Masaryk, whilst the Communist candidate, Senator Sturc received 54 votes. The following parties voted against Masaryk by handing in unmarked voting papers: The National Party, the German National Socialists, a part of the Slovakian People's Party, the Czechish National Democrats and the Hungarian Christian Socialists. Ed.

On the 27th of May there will take place the election of the President of the Czechoslovakian Republic, as the second (seven years) period of office of Masaryk has come to an end. This election is held according to the Czechoslovakian Constitution, after the French pattern, at a joint session of both houses (House of Deputies and the Senate) of the Czechoslovakian National Assembly which comprises together 450 members (300 and 150 respectively). As the Czechish and German agrarians, the tradesmen and social patriots have already decided for the re-election of Masaryk and the decision of the Czechish and German Christian socialists in favour of him is practically certain, there exists no doubt that Masaryk will be elected.

The Presidency of Masaryk is becoming more and more inconvenient and burdensome to the Czechish bourgeoisie. This is not because Masaryk himself, in his activity as President of the Republic, is an encumbrance to the bourgeoisie; he has succeeded in the last few years in adapting his policy to its most important interests. During the world war he was one of the leaders of the national revolution who was capable of winning broad masses for himself and his policy and at the same time of diverting the national revolution, under the supreme lead of the Entente, on to the path of bourgeois-capitalist State development.

Also in the first years of the Republic, when neither the bourgeoisie nor the proletariat was able to rule alone, Masaryk was the right man to steer the coalition of the bourgeoisie with the social patriotic leaders of the proletariat past all dangers and to reconcile the masses with it. All the so-called "State-upholding elements" in Masaryk's personality brought it about that the Czechish bourgeoisie, in the year 1920, unanimously elected Masaryk as President.

In these seven years Masaryk has faithfully served the bourgeoisie and excellently adapted himself to its policy in the period of struggle for stabilisation. Masaryk proved himself most excellent in the interests of the bourgeoisie after the overthrow of the bourgeois-social-patriotic "all-national" coalition government and the formation of the international bourgeois coalition government. On the last anniversary of the Republic, on the 28th October 1926, Masaryk delivered a speech in which he welcomed the formation of the international capitalist-agra-

rian-clerical government and at the same time made an attempt to create an historical legend adapted to the new, purely capitalist, imperialist policy of the government.

Masaryk paid heed also to the catholic-clerical policy of the bourgeois stabilisation government. Already in his book "World Revolution" he emphasised his deep religious feeling, and at an interview recently he turned his back on the already very tame bourgeois Free Thinkers who always claimed him as one of themselves, and pronounced himself against forsaking the church, whilst his henchman, Benes, is negotiating diligently behind the scenes with Rome for the conclusion of a treaty, regarding which he asserts with all too obvious eagerness that it would not be a concordate. And in the last few days Masaryk administered his adherents a gentle box on the ears by signing the law for the abolition of the soldier's right to vote, which the social patriots represent as a violation of the Constitution, although it is one of Masaryk's duties as President of the Republic to be the guardian of the Constitution.

The bourgeoisie of Czechoslovakia cannot forgive Masaryk for the fact that at one time they had to look to him as their saviour, and his Presidency means for them a permanent reminder of an evil time. For these reasons the bourgeoisie would like best to abandon Masaryk on the 27th May and put one of their outspoken representatives in his place. The extreme Right Wing of the bourgeoisie, the national democrats and the Slovak clericals, state this quite openly. But the greater part of the Czechish and of the Slovak bourgeoisie as well as the German and Magyar bourgeoisie perceive that the time is not quite ripe for the fulfilment of their desires. Thus Masaryk is for the bourgeoisie the second iron which they wish in any case to keep in the fire, for Masaryk as President means at the same time that the social patriots are bound to the government. Moreover, the alliance of the German and of the Czechish bourgeoisie is still too young and not so firmly established that the German bourgeoisie could already now vote for Kramár as President. The leader of the Czechish agrarians, Svehla, who of all the bourgeois politicians has the most prospects, does not consider his time to have fully arrived and is cleverly calculating that seven years must finally come to an end and that in any event he is younger than the 77 years old Masaryk.

The bourgeois stabilisation regime, in order to realise its plans, is compelled to carry out one provocation of the masses after the other regarding such real things as customs duties, taxes, prices, social insurance and political rights. The masses standing under the influence of the social patriots and of the Masaryk petty bourgeoisie have up to now borne these provocations with patience. Therefore the bourgeoisie will leave these strata their Masaryk in order to be able the more easily to deprive them of the franchise, of municipal administration, a good slice of the social insurance as well as the eight hour day.

For the social patriots and the petty bourgeois followers of Masaryk the Presidential elections means a welcome opportunity to achieve something like a success. It is true that they do not at in any way oppose the press and meeting campaign of the Right Wing of the bourgeoisie against Masaryk with an equally strong campaign for Masaryk. They demand that Masaryk shall be elected as an "All-National", that is, as President of the whole nation, of all parties and all classes. They are therefore quite charmed with the idea that the German bourgeois parties and the German social patriots have decided to elect Masaryk. Herein is expressed the whole policy of the social patriots. Their sole political endeavour is to enter the coalition government again.

The Party conference of the German and of the Czechish social patriots, which took place in April and May, decided to enter into negotiations for a common political line for the two parties, and it is to be seen quite clearly from the comments of their party press that the goal of this common line is to be the coalition policy.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia considers its task to counteract the manoeuvres of the social patriotic leaders. It has therefore decided in the first place to put forward its own candidate. It thereby clearly and unmistakably separates itself from the social patriotic campaign for Masaryk. We have put to the social patriotic leaders the question whether they wish to conduct a real fight for Masaryk, whether they wish to set up his candidature as a fighting candidature against the

capitalist-agrarian-clerical reaction, against the present government and to link it with definite economic, political and cultural demands, of which Masaryk, as the candidate, must pronounce himself in favour. As a minimum of these demands we put forward the declaration signed by Masaryk and Benes, in October 1918 in Washington, and which they announced at that time as being the basis of a revolutionary-democratic Constitution of the Czechoslovakian Republic. This declaration contains, among other things, the promise of absolute freedom of meetings, the press, and of combination, separation of the church from the State and school, equal rights for women, national equality, militia instead of standing army, expropriation of the big landowners, cancellation of war debts etc. Of course we also demanded that this campaign shall be conducted as a fight of the masses. Needless to say, the social patriots have left all our questions unanswered, because they are bound to avoid a plain and open discussion of the question of the Presidential elections as submitted by us.

Nevertheless the Communist Party decided, in the very improbable event of it coming to a second ballot and the danger arising of the election of the candidate of the bourgeois coalition parties, to vote for Masaryk. The chief reason for this is in order, in such an event, to prepare a defeat of the bourgeoisie and its coalition government and thereby to contribute to a sharpening of the struggle. Our vote for Masaryk would in this case only be a part of our fight against Masaryk.

The third Presidency of Masaryk introduces the last stage of his political career. He must in this his third period of office become an out and out representative of the bourgeoisie and of imperialism, and will be clearly recognised as such even by those masses who still regard him as a symbol of their political and social democratic illusions. Masaryk, as the embodiment of these illusions, is bound to fail in this last stage of his political life. It is our task to help hasten this process.

The Communist Election Victory in Warsaw.

By K. Leski (Warsaw).

On the 22nd of May the working class of Warsaw expressed its confidence in the Communists. They followed the appeal of the Communist Party and voted in their majority for the list of the "Labour Left" which had been declared to be invalid. For this list, which had been persecuted by all parties beginning with the National Democrats and ending with the P. P. S., according to results up to the present, received the votes of 74,000 men and women.

No other party was able to poll such a great number of votes.

The Polish Social Democrats received altogether 72,000 votes, the Jewish reformist Bund 20,000. The "Independent Labour Party" once again proved its insignificance by polling only 2122 votes. This result is all the more significant in view of the fact that the Communist list was declared to be invalid and a large number of less class-conscious workers did not like to have their votes "wasted".

Of the bourgeois parties, the fascist "labour" party of Vice-President Bartel received 40,000 votes. The bourgeois-Jewish bloc polled the same number.

Only the anti-Pilsudski bloc "Kops" — the union of all parties of the Right — polled more votes than the Communists: 119,000. But if the national democrats, the strongest party of the Right, is reckoned by itself, then its influence in Warsaw is less than that of the Communists.

The Communist victory becomes even more significant when one considers the figures from the various districts of the town. A few examples: In five working class districts 8200 votes were cast, of which the Communists received 4892, that is more than 50%. In these districts the P. P. S. received in all 1085 votes. In another five districts 1892 votes were cast, of which the Communists received 712.

Quite another proportion is shown in the bourgeois quarters of the town. In five districts the Polish Social Democrats received 2243 votes whilst the Communist polled only 508.

We see, therefore, how many petty bourgeois votes are represented in the social democrats vote, whilst the 74,000 votes of the Communists are almost exclusively class votes.

Yet another circumstance illustrates the magnificent Communist victory. At the elections to the Sejm in 1922 the Communist candidate, Krotikovsky, polled 26,000 votes. This vote has now trebled.

The elections in the capital of the country which have been held a year after Pilsudski's coup d'état in May 1926, have resulted in a great defeat of Pilsudski and his regime.

It is true the influence of the national democrats in the bourgeois camp has been weakened, but they remain in spite of this the strongest party in the new town council, as they have more seats than the Pilsudski party and the social democrats. All their furious agitation, the pressure upon the officials, officers and non-commissioned officers and the concealed support of the P. P. S. has not availed the Pilsudski people anything.

The greatest and most unexpected blow to Pilsudski and his people as well to the rest of the bourgeois and the Social Democratic Party is undoubtedly the victory of the Communist Party, which is not disputed by anybody.

This Party, which is persecuted daily and fought with every means of illegality, has once again shown its power and its influence among the working masses. It should also be added that owing to lack of means we were able to issue only election leaflet. The police terror prevented the holding of any public meeting. It was only on Friday, immediately before the election, that the Party was able to organise two street demonstrations as a protest against its list being declared invalid. On election day hundreds of our agitators were arrested. In spite of this, tens of thousands voted for the Communists, a proof of the class-consciousness of the revolutionary working masses.

With this vote the masses have delivered the Pilsudski dictatorship a well-deserved blow. They thereby protested against the white terror of the fascists, against the offensive of the capitalists, against the misery of the workers and peasants, against the whole political and economic reaction and against the persecution of the national minorities. The working masses showed that their fighting force is unbroken, that they are marching under the leadership of the Communists.

The elections are a magnificent proclamation of the continued unrelenting fight of the working masses of Poland against the fascist dictatorship.

The significance of the elections extends beyond the frontiers of Poland. Pilsudski, under the command of English imperialism, is preparing to attack the Soviet Union. One of the slogans raised by us on election day was: **Hands off the Soviet Union!** The masses who voted for the Communist list, thereby voted against the policy of Pilsudski. The working masses of Warsaw showed on election day that they will defend the Soviet Union with all revolutionary means.

The Situation in Syria.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The French "Spring Offensive" which was to have driven the insurgents from their last positions did not meet with any success. On the contrary, in the attacks on the **Ledcha** plateau and on the encampments of the insurgents in East **Jebel Druz** the French forces suffered considerable losses, so that they were compelled to cease from any further attacks and to wait for reinforcements from France. The insurgents are now continuing their guerilla war against the French with even greater success, and thereby demonstrate the continuation of the revolt.

The fact of the continuation of the revolt is making itself felt very plainly in the other districts of Syria. The State of Emergency still remains in existence. The various governments and administrative bodies established by the French bear an undeniably provisional character; and even the French themselves cannot regard a government such as that of **Ahmed Bey Nami** in **Damascus**, which simply carries out the orders of the French, as in any way a permanent solution of the Syrian question.

The French High Commissioner, **Ponsot**, who went to France in March last, is still continuing his consultations and

discussions without any prospect of their coming to an end. Even in parliamentary circles in France there is a growing aversion to the continuation of the Syrian adventure, and there is a desire to find a solution which, while not injuring French prestige, would appear satisfactory to the Syrian nationalists. On the other hand, the French militarist and clerical circles, which have considerably increased in influence since the formation of the **Poincaré** ministry, are becoming active. The result is that the negotiations for a solution of the Syrian question have for some months been at a deadlock. It is the population of Syria which is most affected by this circumstance, and therefore the French administration has to struggle with ever fresh difficulties.

One such difficulty was the "government crisis" in **Lebanon** which occurred in the last few weeks. In this province, **De Jouvenel**, in May 1926, in order to suppress the revolt more effectively, set up a miniature republic, which is in no respect — neither politically nor economically — capable of maintaining its existence. A widespread and expensive apparatus drains the impoverished population, with the result that the "Republic" is becoming more and more unpopular. As it is difficult to attack the French mandate, the discontent expresses itself in the first place in attacks on the government, which in fact was overthrown and soon afterwards re-formed. But the new Cabinet, which includes representatives of the many Christian and Mohammedan sects in Lebanon, no longer creates any illusions. The population of that part of Syria, which the French mandate has hitherto treated most considerately, i. e. Lebanon, is realising that the fundamental evil is to be attributed to foreign rule.

Very characteristic of the manner in which, in spite of the strict French censorship and the prohibition of meetings, the emancipatory tendencies of broad strata of the people still find expression, was a patriotic festival arranged by the French in **Beirut**. On the occasion of the memorial day for the Lebanon "martyrs" who were executed during the war in the struggle against the Turks, there was to have taken place an Arab-French fraternisation festival (as the French had claimed

to be the friends of Arab independence in the war against Turkey). Under the influence of the nationalist youth who took part in it, the festival was converted into a demonstration against the French mandate. Speeches were delivered in which it was declared:

"The work of the martyrs is not yet completed, so long as the Arabian people has not yet freed itself from the yoke of the oppressors under which it is groaning today."

The audience applauded those speakers who spoke of an independent and united Arabia. There was nothing left for the French to do but afterwards to wreak vengeance on the speakers by expelling some of them from the country and bringing others to trial. But the demonstration had a very wide response precisely because it took place in **Beirut** on a patriotic occasion.

The nationalists have not abandoned their demands. A declaration of the leader of the insurgents, **Sultan El Atrach**, who denied all the reports of an approaching submission of the insurgents and emphasised that the revolt may continue for years if the rightful demands of the Syrians are not granted, has now been supplemented by a similar declaration of the leader of the "People's Party" of **Damascus**, **Dr. Schahbandar**, who is generally regarded as being moderate, who likewise advises the French to come to an agreement with the insurgents as the latter are prepared to fight until the last drop of blood.

This is the only way out if the French do not wish to sacrifice their soldiers to no purpose and to devastate Syria still further. It is doubtful however whether the military-imperialist clique, which in Syria itself is still maintaining the system of repression (only in the last few weeks two further insurgents have been condemned to death in **Beirut** and another two condemned to life-long imprisonment with hard labour, while arrests, internments are still going on and the demand for an amnesty for those arrested has not met with any response) will agree to a peaceable solution.

CHINA

The Fight for Honan.

(Military Survey).

By A. Platonov.

The domination of Honan is one of the tasks confronting the Wuhan government. This operation is of tremendous political and strategical importance. Honan, with its population of 30 millions, which is already conducting a guerilla war against the Mukden troops, will strengthen the impetus of the revolutionary movement and provide fresh reliable cadres for the continuation of the fight against the militarists.

The occupation of Honan is important also because the troops of the Wuhan government will thereby establish immediate contact with the province of Shansi, which is ruled by General Yan Si Schan, who, for the present, is neutral. It is quite possible that a defeat of Chang Tso-Lin in Honan will exercise an influence on Yan Si Schan and will facilitate the possibility of his going over to the side of the Wuhan government. From the standpoint of the further operations in the direction of Peking, the army in Shansi, numbering 80,000 men, and the geographical situation of this province will be essential factors for the further development of successes of the Northern expedition.

Finally, it must be remarked that the province of Honan is the natural territory for the preparation of the attack of the revolutionary army on Peking and the securing of this operation against Chiang Kai-Shek, who may at any moment change his policy of military neutrality towards the Wuhan government.

The joint attack which was commenced at the beginning of May by the people's army and the national army has rendered considerably easier the solution of the most important tasks of the Supreme Command: the occupation of Honan and the smashing of the Mukden troops which are operating in this province along with the remnants of Wu Pei Fu's forces. The result of the numerous obstinate struggles which have taken place in the two main fields of the Honan operations, from Tchumadjan against the North and from Tungkwan against Tchengchow is, that the troops of Chang Tso-Lin have suffered a number of serious defeats. At present Feng Yu Hsiang is conducting an attack in the district of Janchigun in which he is already before Tchengchow. At the same time the army of Tan Shen Tchi, after having defeated the enemy in the fights near Changtsai-Sipin, have reached Jantchen and after having taken possession of the fords over the river Liche, compelled the Mukden troops to withdraw in disorder along the Süchau-Fugau line.

The essence of the operations which are now proceeding consists, therefore, in the question whether Feng Yu-Hsiang will succeed in the next few days in capturing Chengchow and in reaching the railway line connecting the Süchow group of the enemy with Peking. If this manoeuvre is carried out successfully, the Honan army of Chang Tso-Lin will be cut in two. The Mukden troops defending Chengchow will be compelled, while clinging to the railway line to retire towards the North, the Süchow group, however, will be flung back in a North Eastern direction to the territory of Kaifung-Kautchong on the Lunghai railway.

The occupation of Chengchow by Feng Yu-Hsiang will play a decisive role in opening up to the revolutionary command the possibility of crushing the divided forces of the enemy and securing a basis in liberated Honan in order to prepare the attack in the direction of Peking.

Simultaneously with the successes of the Wuhan government in Honan, there is to be recorded an increase in the activity of Chiang Kai-Shek against the Shantung troops of Chang Tsun Chang in the province of Kiangsu and in the Eastern part of the province of Anhwei. Chiang Kai-Shek has succeeded in the course of the last few weeks in occupying Pengpu, throwing the enemy back and occupying positions 50 kilometres south of Tsuchow. The fight on this front is extending to the territory of Tsuchow, where the forces of Chang Tsun Chang have been forced to retreat.

Chiang Kai-Shek has obviously made it his next aim to take possession of the province of Kiangsu north of the Yangtse. Thus the attack of the Nanking troops who are pressing the forces of Chang Tsun-Chang and rendering difficult their being

employed to strengthen the Mukden troops in Honan, will in the course of a definite time give no occasion for a collision between Chiang Kai-Shek and the revolutionary armies in connection with the solution of the next strategical tasks.

For the rest it must be pointed out that the operations in Honan are, to a certain extent, connected with the liquidation of the attack of General Jan Sen who has commenced military operations in the valley of the river Chan. Advancing before Ichang and Schashi the Szechuan troops of Jan Sen have reached the Tientsin-Tjanmin line. In the Siantauchen district the enemy encountered the forces of the revolutionary army sent against him, suffered a defeat and was thrown back to the West.

From the point of view of the military situation in China as a whole the operations in the valley of the river Chan can only play a secondary role. The final shattering of the Mukden troops on the main front of the struggle and the firm occupation of the province of Honan will automatically solve all the political complications and the trifling military difficulties in the rear which are unavoidable under conditions of civil war.

Textile Workers of Wuhan Cities.

By Earl Browder (Member of International Workers Delegation).

Hankow, April 12, 1927.

Yesterday we visited the Textile Workers Union, held a meeting with their delegates' council, and visited two of the largest cotton mills in Wuhan. It was one of the most interesting days we have had in China. Crossing the river from Hankow in a steam launch, we were met on the Wuchang wharf by about 200 delegates of the Textile Workers Union, their Picket Corps (uniformed and armed), the childrens' organization (also uniformed and drilled), and the band of musicians belonging to the Union. Together with them we marched through the streets, with an accompaniment of music and fireworks, to the meeting hall.

This hall proved to be an American church, which was the only building close-by large enough for the gathering. The altar had been transformed with red flags, and large pictures of Lenin, Sun Yat-sen, and Karl Marx. The meeting was opened by singing "The Internationale", which was joined in lustily by men, women, and children; all knew the words, and in China the tune is still a matter of secondary importance; it is the spirit which is important in singing "The Internationale", and never have I heard it sung, even in Russia, with greater fervour.

The Chinese workers are great believers in the committee-system. They do not leave their affairs to single individuals. Even a meeting such as this was managed by a "presiding body" of five, of whom two were women. No union meeting is opened without the approval of the presiding body by the members.

After a few hours of speech-making, the meeting closed in high spirits, heightened by the merriment produced when we foreign delegates cried the slogans of the meeting in Chinese language.

After the meeting we went to the Trade Union Headquarters. This occupies a modern building, near the largest factory, set in a neat courtyard. It is thoroughly modern throughout, the offices are models of neatness, efficiency, and organisation, and would be a credit to any labour union in the world. We were deeply impressed by the thoroughness with which every detail was taken care of, especially when we remembered that this Union has existed only since the occupation by the Revolutionary Army, or less than six months.

From the Union offices, we went to the largest mill, the Hankow Dee Yee Cotton Spinning and Weaving Co. This is a strictly modern plant, erected in 1919, with more than 90,000 spindles, 1,200 looms, and employing 9,700 workers, of whom more than half are women in this mill, and about one quarter are children from eight to fourteen years. The machinery is all British, except the engine room and electrical equipment, which seemed to be American. Many of the machines date from 1923, the rest 1920, when the first installation was made. The plant is owned and manned throughout by Chinese. There are no foreigners employed in any capacity.

After visiting this mill and another, the Yu Wah mill with 41,000 spindles and 4,400 workers, we talked with the representatives of the Textile Workers Union about their organisation, and about the living and working conditions. The following

information was given us by Han Yu-win and Fun Chin-vin, members of the Executive Bureau of the Wuhan Union. The last-named is a young Woman, head of the secretarial department and of the women's committee.

The Wuhan Textile Workers Union has 37,096 members. These are organised in 11 branch unions. Six branches are based upon the six large cotton mills in Wuhan, one branch to one mill; two branches are silk workers, one of weavers, one of dye workers, and one of hosiery workers. The last two named are branches of artisans, employed in a myriad small shops.

In the big mills, the inner organisation of the branch proceeds, first, with the organisation of a row of spinners (for example), each row or group of machines being the basis of the first unit of organisation of the workers. This group of workers elects a delegate to a section committee. The sections of each main department join together to form a department committee. From the department committees the branch is formed.

The Dee Yee Mill, which we visited, has 9,700 workers. Here one delegate is elected by each 50 members to a branch Assembly, which is the supreme body of the branch, electing the standing executives, delegates to higher bodies, etc.

The General Executive Committee for the Wuhan General Textile Workers Union, is elected by a meeting of branch delegates, with each branch represented in proportion to its membership. This delegates meeting is held once a year; but a smaller number of permanent delegates meet every month. The Executive Committee has 25 members, who elect a Standing Committee (or Executive Bureau) of seven, for conduct of the business. Each one of the Standing Committee is in charge of a Department (Secretarial, Finance, Propaganda, Womens Department, etc.).

In the Executive Committee of each Branch, there must be at least one woman and one youth; this is to guarantee that proper attention shall be given to the special problems of women and children. The voting power was stated to be: men 45%, women 32%, children 23%, in the union as a whole; but here, as elsewhere in the world, the men predominate in the leadership more than in the general numbers.

The Union has a Picket Corps of 500 workers, trained under control of the General Union. All but 60 of these work regularly in the mills, and are only called for special service. The other 60 are on permanent duty, the personnel being changed every three months, and the workers being paid by the factory to which they belong. Support of this picket body is one of the obligations of the employers contained in the contract with the Union. Ten of the pickets are armed with rifles.

Another interesting provision of the Union contract with the employers, is the provision of an Educational Fund, to which the employers pay \$ 4000 per month, for the benefit of the textile workers. This money goes into the general educational scheme of the Hupeh Provincial General Trade Union.

The general condition of the industry is slack, and there is much unemployment. This is due to civil war conditions, interruption of transport, etc. Conditions of labour are bad, but rather above the average of even industrial workers in China, and considerably better than artisans. Hours of labour are 12 per day. In most of the mills there is no lunch time off. Pay is mostly by piece-work. Wages run from 30 to 50 cents per day, depending upon the volume of work available, being now about 30 cents. The working week is six days. The six-day week prevails in Shanghai also, but in Hankow the workers get paid for seven days, the extra day being paid for at the average rate of earnings for the week. Conditions and wages of women are somewhat below that of men. The trade union is giving special attention to the problem of women and children, but in the six months of its existence has yet made few improvements in this respect.

A set of demands has been formulated by the Union, which indicate their immediate desires regarding improvement of conditions: These include: 1. eight-hour day; 2. one-hour lunch period; 3. Minimum daily wage; 4. Punitive overtime for night work; 5. Enlargement of lodgings; 6. Improvement of toilets and health conditions; 7. Dining rooms and rest rooms in mills; 8. Abolition of child labour under 12 years, etc. etc.

The few improvements that have so far been achieved in the conditions of women and children are, briefly; women get six weeks vacation with full pay at childbirth; special schools for the children have been established by the Trade Union; factories provide special rooms for feeding children; special

departments of the Union have the duty to attend to the needs, demands, and grievances of women and children from day to day.

In the administration of the Union, the women are taking a constantly increasing part. Although women in China are only now emerging from the terrible fetters of feudalism, bound-feet, and double-oppression, they are displaying a remarkable talent which already has given them a position in the trade union movement of China at least equal to that of women in the United States.

This union above described is, of course one of the best organised unions in the newly-acquired territory of the Nationalist Government. Some unions, which existed before for many years during the illegal period, are stronger and more solid. Other of the new organisations in the trade union movement may not yet make such a good showing. But on the whole, the Textile Workers Union of Wuhan may serve as a good sample of the Chinese Labour Movement.

THE BALKANS

Declaration of the C. P. of Bulgaria on the Parliamentary Elections in Bulgaria.

The following declaration was issued by the C. P. of Bulgaria before the Parliamentary Elections. In spite of the monstrous government terror, the elections, which took place on the 29th May, have resulted, in a defeat for the government, the Communists obtaining five seats and the Left wing peasant league 58 seats, which shows a great strengthening of the radical opposition compared with the previous parliament. Ed.

The fact alone that the Communist Party of Bulgaria, which before the coup d'état of June 9th 1923 rallied round it about 225,000 working class and other working electors, is today outside the law and exposed to the most fearful persecutions on the part of the fascist government of bankers and generals, and deprived of every possibility of taking part openly and directly in the election campaign, sufficiently illustrates the violent and fascist character of the elections for the National Council called for the 29th of May and the results which are to be expected from the elections. It is thereby proved beyond all doubt that these elections are not called in order to give "free expression to the will of the people", but in order, by the reactionary election system, by unexampled election terror, and by machinations of every sort, to get a "Parliamentary sanction" (in one form or other) in order to justify the ruling system, a system which for four years has been plundering and throttling the mass of the people and torturing and crushing their advance-guard in the most bestial manner.

But precisely for this reason it is the task of the proletariat, of the working peasants and small business people, and all workers of any description in the country, to exert themselves all the more, to weld their forces together in order that this election fight shall result in a fearful blow to their worst enemy, the coalition government, the "Democratic Union", to its regime of cruel terror and fascism, of robbery and destruction, of handing over the country to foreign imperialism and delivering the Bulgarian people to the new militarist, counter-revolutionary and anti-Soviet Balkan combination.

The Malinov-Kjortchev-Tomev coalition is a bourgeois opposition, which, at bottom, is not against the fascist policy of the government, but merely aims at an extension to the whole bourgeoisie of the advantages and privileges enjoyed by bank and speculating capital. This coalition is the reserve of the bourgeoisie in view of the circumstance that the ruling regime is politically bankrupt. The Malinov coalition is preparing, together with the Ljapcheff wing of the "Democratic Union", a new third edition of the government of 9th July 1923, a government combination of extra-Parliamentary fascist methods.

The opposition of the working masses to the bourgeois opposition coalition and their refusal to support it in the election, is, therefore, quite comprehensible and justified.

The Malinov coalition and the government coalition are also opposed by the coalition of the leadings staffs of the Peasant League, of the Social Democratic Party and the Party of the small traders. The leaders of this coalition are striving in vain to represent this coalition in the eyes of the mass of the people as a "block of iron". According to its composition and its programme this coalition is very far remote from the workers. Without the participation of the proletariat, without the masses of the poor peasants and small traders, a block of the workers and an earnest and consistent fight against the emergency regime and fascism are unthinkable, just as is the fight against the methods of the 3rd of June which have brought untold injury to the people and the country.

This coalition represents an election platform which puts forward the demands of the masses of the people in a vague and elastic form, which does not expressly raise the demand for the abolition of the defence of the realm act, the dissolution of the fascist organisations, and the rescinding of the decision regarding the dissolution of the proletarian organisations.

This election platform does not put forward the economic demands of the workers (eight-hour day, labour protection, land and agricultural credits and against the burden of taxation). It does not come forward on behalf of the hundreds and thousands of refugees from Macedonia, from Dobrudsha and Thrace; it does not speak definitely for the national independence of the Macedonians, the Dobrudshianians and Thracians, nor for their separation from the States which have annexed their territories with force. It merely demands the "cultural autonomy" of the national minorities, that is to say, the perpetuation of the present dismemberment of Macedonia, Dobrudsha and Thrace and of the foreign regime of force prevailing in these provinces.

This platform does not oppose foreign imperialism in the Balkans and does not stand for the free union of the Balkan peoples in a Balkan Federation, which is the only means of preventing Bulgaria being involved in a coming war. The combinations for the preparation of such a war are directed before all against the Soviet Union, instead of restoring political and economic relations with the Soviet Union. In short, this platform of the leading staff of the Peasant League, of the Social Democratic Party and of the party of the small traders is anything but a fighting platform of the working masses; it is not a platform of the block of the workers in the election struggle. On the contrary, it is nothing else but a breach in the front of the workers, a stab in the back of the fighting masses in view of its furious enemy.

The masses have perceived this, they showed a clearer political insight than the mandate-hunting leaders of the peasants League, of the social democracy and of the small traders. As a result the masses are energetically striving on a local basis to transform that coalition into a real block of the workers.

The Communist Party of Bulgaria declares most emphatically that only by means of the block of the workers can an improvement in the present unbearable situation of the broad masses be achieved. Only by such a block can these masses be preserved from fresh misfortune, from fresh dangers of war and severe trials for which the fascist bourgeois government is heading.

In spite of the furious election terror, all workers, all right-thinking and unbribable elements in the country must rally decidedly to the fight under the slogans:

Down with the "Democratic Union!" Down with the fascist emergency regime! Down with the defence of the realm act! Full political amnesty for the victims of the white terror!

Dissolution of the fascist organisations! Restoration of the organisation of the workers!

Freedom, bread and peace for the working people!

Against the imperialist subjugation of Bulgaria and the Balkans!

Against war adventures!

For the union of the Balkan peoples in a Balkan Federation of Workers and Peasants Republics!

Resumption of relations with the Soviet Union!

Forwards to the setting up of the power of the workers, of the workers' and peasants' government!

Long live the Comintern and its Bulgarian section!

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The Significance of the World Economic Conference.

By E. Varga (Geneva).

The significance of the World Economic Conference lies in the fact that for the first time since five years a delegation from the Soviet Union had the opportunity of putting forward its standpoint at a great international Conference. Had the delegation from the Soviet Union not been present there would have been very little interest displayed in the Conference, the decisions of which are not binding for any government, but represent mere recommendations to the League of Nations. Everybody knew in fact that no Conference of any kind is capable of abolishing the antagonisms between the capitalist powers, and that therefore it could arrive at practical agreements only in regard to subordinate practical questions, such as uniform customs tariffs, statistics and such like things, but that otherwise the sole purpose of the whole Conference was to give the reformists an opportunity of imparting to the workers an object lesson in class harmony and sham pacifism.

The appearance of the delegation from the Soviet Union gave a severe blow to this co-operation between the reformists and the capitalists and placed the reformists in an extremely awkward position.

In its theoretical analysis the delegation from the Soviet Union put forward a purely Marxist standpoint, pointed out the insoluble contradictions of capitalism and at the same time showed that all attempts at a solution on the part of the capitalists lead to an increased exploitation of the working class. They showed this concretely in the discussion of the rationalisation and the question of cartels.

They drew the consequence that the working class must do everything possible in order to ward off the harmful consequences: They therefore demanded:

Strict observation of the eight hour day; six hour day for miners and workers in trades injurious to health.

All-round increase of wages.

Adequate unemployment benefit etc.

The reformists found themselves in a very difficult situation. They tried to launch a counter-attack: Jouhaux called upon the delegation from the Soviet Union to make a statement regarding the working hours and other social conditions in the Soviet Union. After he had received the desired information he found nothing better to do than, together with the capitalists, to cast doubt on the correctness of the data given by the delegation from the Soviet Union. But this did not help them to overcome the greatest difficulty: Should they expose their alliance with the capitalists by voting with them against the demands brought forward by the delegation from the Soviet Union for the improvement of the position of the working class, which would discredit them in the eyes of the workers, or should they vote with the delegation of the Soviet Union against the capitalists, which would deprive them of their good reputation with the capitalists as reliable supports of "order and civilisation"?

The reformists were at first divided on this question: Jouhaux, Mertens and some others voted in the Industrial Commission together with the delegation from the Soviet Union against the rationalisation resolution, whilst Pugh and Eggert avoided taking up an attitude. In the Agrarian Commission, in which the delegation of the Soviet Union submitted the concrete proposal that the wages of the agricultural workers be raised to the level of those of the industrial workers and that in social politics the agricultural workers be placed on an equal footing with the industrial workers, Weber, the representative of the Swiss agricultural workers, voted for the proposals of the delegation of the Soviet Union.

But these vacillations did not last long. The capitalists soon firmly realigned the reformists in their front. At the voting in the Plenum on the resolutions of the Commission the capitalist-reformist front was again firmly established; the delegation of the Soviet Union stood quite isolated in face of the common front of the capitalists and reformists.

Only Jouhau allowed himself the luxury of withholding his vote on the vote on the industrial resolution. He could afford to do this: he is such a recognised tried and trusted supporter of capitalism that he is above all suspicion. In addition the industrial resolution meant a defeat of the French bourgeoisie by the British bourgeoisie; Jouhau's abstention from voting is, therefore, at the same time the expression of the dissatisfaction of the French bourgeoisie with the industrial resolution (The French bourgeoisie wished the creation of international cartels to be recognised as the chief means for solving the crisis of capitalist world economy; it has thereby suffered a complete defeat: The resolution which was adopted speaks in favours of international cartels but with a threefold reservation: in essence, therefore, it is against them).

Thus the world Economic Conference has shown once again that the reformists, confronted by a decision, proceed together with the capitalists and against the Communists, who defend the most vital daily interests of the proletariat.

The World Economic Conference showed at the same time the profound antagonisms between the capitalist Powers. When in one commission a British-French-German motion was introduced demanding a resettlement of the war debts, the delegation of the United States threatened to leave the Conference at once. A sharp struggle took place between the French and the British delegations; in the customs question the French delegation had to agree to a resolution which was tantamount to a condemnation of the present customs policy of France.

More interesting than these squabbles between the various delegations was the struggle of the delegation from the Soviet Union for the recognition of the Foreign Trade Monopoly and the special position of the Soviet Union, to which most of the decisions are therefore not applicable. The representatives of the European capitalist States, under the leadership of Great Britain, offered strong resistance to this demand, so that the delegation had to threaten to leave the Conference. It is above all thanks to the support of the United States delegation that the standpoint of the delegation from the Soviet Union was carried, while the German delegation did not have the courage to come forward openly on behalf of our standpoint*).

It would lead too far to set forth the reasons which led to a sort of loose united front between the United States delegation and the delegation from the Soviet Union at the World Economic Conference. We will only indicate it in a few words: neither of these States is a member of the League of Nations; antagonism to Great Britain, parallelism in the Chinese policy until the question, capitalist or non-capitalist development becomes acute.

It is true, one must not overestimate the whole World Economic Conference. Although on Monday May 23rd the British delegation voted for a peaceful extension of economic intercourse with the Soviet Union, on Tuesday May 24th, Baldwin did not shrink from announcing the breaking off of relations with the Soviet Union. No Conference is capable of peacefully solving any of the essential questions: the decisive factor is power and not paper recommendations!

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Opening of the Trade Union Conference of the Countries of the Pacific.

In spite of the organised resistance of the governments of all countries of the Pacific Ocean, from Japan to Australia, even in spite of the counter-revolutionary coup of Chiang Kai Shek, who delivered such centres as Canton and Shanghai to the power of the puppets of the bourgeoisie, the Trade Union Conference of the Countries of the Pacific has been opened. The transference of the seat of the Conference from Canton to Wuhan and its postponement for 20 days have not only not diminished the importance of the Conference, but on the contrary

*) The "Frankfurter Zeitung" of May 22nd writes:

"During the negotiations in the last few days on the Russian Recognition proposal, it was noticed in certain delegation circles that the German delegation displayed an exaggerated reserve."

have emphasised the revolutionary character of the tasks confronting the Conference. The coalition of the imperialists and the Chinese bourgeoisie has only rendered more evident the necessity of the union of the workers of all countries of the Pacific Ocean in order to support the Chinese revolution.

And this union is being realised. Representatives not only from China and the Soviet Union, but also delegates from the United States, Great Britain, France and Japan, that is from those States the bourgeoisie of which consider China as an object of their colonial aspirations, were able to come to Wuhan in spite of all the obstacles and hindrances placed in the way by Chiang Kai Shek, Chang Tso Lin and the troops of the imperialists. The countries of Corea and Java, which are under the rule of the imperialists, have likewise sent their delegates; and there is not the least doubt that the Australian and Indian trade unions, whose representatives did not succeed in making their way to the capital of the National Government of China, will fully and entirely endorse the decisions of this Conference.

Those difficult circumstances in which the Conference has met, will without doubt strengthen the enthusiasm of all Chinese workers who are now conducting a hard fight and who have to parry the blows of the traitors from the ranks of the militarists. The presence of representatives of the revolutionary proletariat in Wuhan is not an eloquent exchange of mutual compliments such as constitutes an indispensable feature of reformist Congresses. The appeals of the Conference will be heard not only by the proletarians of the provinces of Hupeh and Hunan, but also by the workers of Shanghai and Canton, who are suffering under the yoke of the white-guardist terror, and by the peasant masses who, under the leadership of their unions, are reorganising the administrative organs in the areas which are under the rule of the National government and in other provinces are conducting a desperate fight against the militarists.

The Conference itself has met in a real revolutionary working-class centre. According to the reports for April there are now in Wuhan about 220,000 organised workers, of whom 28,000 are in the textile workers union, 12,000 in the metal workers' union, 11,000 in the building workers' union, 14,000 in the food workers' union, about 10,000 in the union of municipal workers. etc. The whole organised mass, which has already set up in the revolutionary capital of China its own detachments of a red Labour Guard, will not remain passive listeners to the Conference. No, from out of its midst new detachments will arise which will suppress all attempts of the militarists against the Wuhan government and will carry the decisions of the Conference to Peking, Canton, Shanghai, everywhere where the workers are oppressed by the yoke of the imperialists and the Chinese militarists. It is not for nothing that even the British press in China is compelled to admit that the position of the Wuhan government and the successes of this government in the province of Honan are to a considerable extent due to that wave of revolutionary enthusiasm at present prevailing in Wuhan.

The Conference has met at a moment in which the working masses of North China are fighting victoriously against Wu Pei Fu and Chang Tso-lin, and the working masses in South and West China are suppressing the mutiny of Sjan Du In, and in East China are conducting a guerilla war against the traitor Chiang Kai-Shek. The revolutionary experiences of the participators in the Conference will play their role in the further development of the fight of the proletariat of Wuhan and of the whole of China.

OUR PROBLEMS

The Tactical Line of the Comintern in China.

By E. Eichenwald, Moscow.

I.

How the "internal" Class Struggle is interwoven with the Fight against Imperialism.

The Communist International has always associated together the anti-imperialist revolutionary war and the internal class war. Just for this reason the Communist International has

never for a moment separated the fight for the solution of the national revolutionary tasks from the fight of the masses of workers and peasants for their class demands. Through all documents of the Comintern, the connection between the development of the class war and the anti-imperialist struggle runs like a red thread. The Comintern has expressed it particularly clearly and distinctly in the agrarian question, the immense importance and central significance of which cannot be doubted.

The Communist International has more than once drawn attention to the circumstance that the stratification of forces in China will certainly not last for ever, as the revolution advances, and that there is no reason to think that the block with imperialism will be restricted to the feudal militarist cliques for all eternity. The Comintern was of the opinion that the natural consequence of the tendency of evolution would be that, in a certain stage of the development of the revolution, the anti-imperialist (and anti-feudal) fight would inevitably turn into an anti-bourgeois fight, a fight against the counter-revolutionary block of the imperialists, the feudal lords and the large bourgeoisie.

Does Lenin's Teaching admit of temporary Blocks with the National Bourgeoisie?

What, in these circumstances, was the tactical line which the Comintern observed in the process of development of the Chinese revolution, in the process of its advance from stage to stage? Was the orientation towards a temporary block, towards an alliance with the national bourgeoisie admissible? Or was it perhaps necessary to break with it from the very beginning, to fight against it with the methods used against imperialism and against the Chinese imperialists? Let us see whether Lenin gives us hints as to the question of the tactics of the proletariat with regard to the national bourgeoisie.

At the 2nd Congress of the Communist International, Lenin, in dealing with the theses on the national and the colonial questions, said that

"very frequently — perhaps even in the majority of cases — the bourgeoisie of the subjugated countries, even though it supports the national movement, fights against all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes in agreement with the imperialist bourgeoisie, that is in common with it."

Nevertheless, Lenin's clear understanding of this question does not prevent him setting up and advocating the following thesis*):

"The Communist International must enter into temporary agreements, even into alliances with the bourgeois democracy of the colonies and the backward countries; it must not, however, amalgamate with it, but must absolutely maintain the independence of the proletarian movement, even in its most primitive incipient form."

This is also the nucleus of the whole question. Given the condition that the proletarian class organisations develop their revolutionary work among the broad masses of workers, given the condition that they clearly see how inevitable it is that the bourgeoisie should go over to the camp of imperialism in a more or less near future, given the condition that the proletariat preserves the independence of its own revolutionary class line and organisation, it is necessary and absolutely imperative that the Communists should, in certain stages of the revolution, enter into an alliance with bourgeois democracy, form a block with the same bourgeoisie which, in the next stage, will inevitably be in the same counter-revolutionary camp as imperialism.

On the Independence of the revolutionary Movement in China.

For this purpose however, it is necessary that the proletarian movement should be independent; but the Communist Party of China did not possess this independence, for, as we are told by the strategists of the Opposition, in correspondence with the line taken by the Comintern, it would not secede from the Kuomintang, it would not break the direct organisatory

*) The point of the theses quoted was passed by the 1st Congress almost without any alteration, in the wording proposed by Lenin. (My italics. A. E.)

alliance. These strategists cannot in the least understand in what the true independence of the proletarian movement consists. For them, the independence of the proletariat is equivalent to its isolation.

In these erroneous considerations we can see the chief mistake which forms the point of issue for opportunism of every kind, beginning with trade union cliquism and ending with the ultra-Left way of raising a clamour. This mistake consists in not understanding that the actual revolutionary "tendency" of the proletariat is "to stand at the head of the whole working class in order completely to overthrow the rule of capital by revolutionary means." (Lenin, my italics. A. E.) That the independence of the class-conscious vanguard is by no means contradictory to the endeavour "to combine, to approach, if you wish it, to a certain degree to amalgamate with the broad masses of the workers, above all with the proletarian, but also with the non-proletarian working masses". (Italics by Lenin!).

The line taken by the Comintern and the Communist Party of China was thus: to ensure to the proletarian movement in China just such independence in its politics and organisation. The Chinese proletariat possessed its own class organisations which were growing and becoming firmly established, which were by no means vague and did not amalgamate with the organisations of the petty bourgeoisie.

Within the Kuomintang, the Communist Party appeared as a compact and uniform organisation, so that the 7th Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I., in working out a number of measures with regard to the task of organising the Communist Party of China, particularly pointed out the necessity of

"consolidating the fractions, especially in the trade unions, in the leading bodies of the peasant leagues and in the organisation of the Kuomintang."

The C. C. of the Communist Party of China has itself entirely grasped the necessity of consolidating the independence of the Communist organisations. As early as in October 1925 it passed resolutions to this effect. In July 1926, the Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. of China, in a resolution regarding its reciprocal relations with the Kuomintang said:

"The point of the resolution of the Plenum of the C. C. of our Party, passed in October last year, is that we, while remaining in the Kuomintang... must strive for more and more political independence for our own organisations... Our Party must bring into still greater relief its independence in the political respect and in doing so, must firmly support itself on the forces of the working class and the majority of the peasants."

In contrast to the Opposition however, the C. I. realised that the secession of the C. P. of China from the Kuomintang would make the transformation of this independence into the isolation of the proletariat from the petty bourgeois working masses, an imminent danger. For it would have meant an unprecedented and tremendous concession to the bourgeoisie, had the C. P. of China seceded from the Kuomintang whilst the Right group of the Kuomintang remained in it. The petty bourgeois masses among the members of the Kuomintang would, like all masses of the petty bourgeoisie, who are deprived of the leadership of the proletariat, inevitably have come under the influence of the bourgeois section of the Kuomintang.

From all this we see that, from the point of view of organisation, it is essential for the Communist Party of China to join the Kuomintang — whilst at the same time working indefatigably at the consolidation and expansion of the organisations of the Communist Party of China and their influence over the masses — if the independent political line of the Chinese proletariat is to be put into effect. For this line of action consisted above all in combating the efforts of the bourgeoisie to play the part of the sole rulers in the national movement, in fighting for the hegemony of the proletariat in the Chinese revolution. The independent political line taken by the Communist Party of China was that of fighting in order that the proletariat should lead all the revolutionary forces of China, that the proletariat should develop a mighty mass movement of the workers and should endeavour, with all means in its power, indefatigably and resolutely to take the lead in the movement and to work at the expansion of the revolutionary movement among the peasantry and of the fights in the towns. It consisted in a fight in order that the Chinese revolution

should, at this stage, actually be a bourgeois democratic revolution and should gradually be transformed into a socialist revolution.

The chief tactical Task of the Chinese Proletariat.

What was the chief tactical task of the proletariat which had to take upon itself the fight for the hegemony in the revolution? Its task was, to see that in any given stage of the revolution, the maximum of the available revolutionary forces were turned to the best account, and to fight for the actual leadership of all these forces; it was for this that the Comintern fought, this was the fundamental principle it proclaimed as its tactics.

It is perfectly clear that the two parts of this task cannot be separated; it would be impossible to fight for the hegemony without at the same time striving to make the best use of all revolutionary forces, even though only temporarily.

From this point of view, the task of the proletariat with regard to those strata of the bourgeoisie who had fought against imperialism until the overthrow of Chiang Kai-Shek, was, resolutely and unflinchingly to fight in order to wrest the hegemony in the national revolutionary movement from them, thus fighting to make the best use of it, fighting for the cause of the national revolution. This was the true nature of the class war of the Chinese proletariat against the Chinese bourgeoisie. The idle talk which maintains that in that period the same methods should have been used in the fight against the bourgeoisie as against imperialism and the militarists, is tactil nonsense.

The Union of the proletarian Vanguard with the broad Masses of Workers.

The facts that the Communist Party of China has joined the Kuomintang, that in it they have worked in common with the Left wing, that — in the consciousness of the masses — a connection has been established between their conception of communism and that of carrying out the slogans of the Kuomintang in the most consistent, most resolute and most faithful way — it is these facts chiefly that have helped the Chinese proletariat and the Communist Party of China to fight and to obtain the hegemony in the whole national revolutionary movement.

A glance at the social composition of the Kuomintang is enough to explain the whole significance of the Communists having joined it. There are no comprehensive data as to the social composition of the Kuomintang in the whole of China. In order to throw some light on the matter, we will therefore quote the figures for the province of Kwantung. The 158,085 members of the provincial organisation of the Kuomintang in Kwantung at the end of 1926, were distributed among the various social groups as follows:

Social Composition of the provincial Organisation of the Kuomintang in Kwantung in November and December 1926.

(According to the "Canton Gazette" of Dec. 31st 1926.)

Social Groups	Percentage.
Military persons and police	2.9
Lawyers, doctors, journalists and technicians	3.5
State officials	1.1
Peasants (including landowners and gentry)	40.7
Workers	20.6
Merchants (including commercial employees)	9.6
Students and schoolboys	21.4
Various	0.2
Total	100

This shows that the overwhelming majority of the members of the Kuomintang, about 80%, are peasants, workers and students. The other 20% consists of merchants (probably the overwhelming majority is small traders), employees, military persons etc. By joining this powerful organisation which consists chiefly of the petty bourgeois working masses of town and country, the Communists gain the possibility of acquiring influence over the broadest strata belonging to the forces of the national revolutionary movement. This being the social composition of the Kuomintang, we can and must speak of

the possibility that the proletariat might gain the leadership over just the chief mass of the Kuomintang. This being its social composition, secession from the Kuomintang would, as we have already said, mean a tremendous step backwards from the hegemony of the proletariat to the transference of the lead in the movement into the hands of the Chinese capitalists.

It is a characteristic fact that the coup d'état of the Right group of the Kuomintang is equivalent to the destruction of the Kuomintang organisations; the Right group cannot win over the majority of the masses of the Kuomintang, the blow against the Communists inevitably proves to be a blow against the Kuomintang. This is evident from the fact alone that, in the Kuomintang organisation of the town of Canton, only 13,000 of the 52,000 members remained after the overthrow of Li Tsi Sin in December, that is to say, the Canton organisation was actually reduced by three quarters.

This is just the reason why the Comintern has not steered its course towards a breach between the Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang, but towards the "secession or exclusion of the Right members of the Kuomintang from the Kuomintang", that is "the isolation of the Right wing of the Kuomintang".

The Fight for the Development of the Mass Movement.

The course which the Comintern has unflinchingly taken, the course towards the development of the peasant and workers movement, was the second important lever in the fight for the hegemony of the proletariat.

More than a year ago, on April 1st 1926, the leading organs of the Comintern recognised that

"we must aim above all at the development of these internal forces, i. e. chiefly at enlisting the peasants in the revolution and at ensuring the leadership to the proletarian organisations . . .

With every step forward of the revolution, the class line of the Chinese proletariat becomes clearer and firmer. At the end of 1926, whilst developing the fight in the villages, the Chinese Communists fought at the same time for the purpose of

"making use of the most favourable moment for improving the material and legal position of the workers. Special endeavours should be made to see that the fight in the towns be directed against the upper strata of the bourgeoisie, and above all against the imperialists, whilst the petty and middle bourgeoisie should be kept as fellow-combatants in the united front against the common enemy."

The Chinese Communists have fought "to achieve a general improvement in the material and legal position of the workers by means of strikes, to make use of the strike movement in order to consolidate the trade union and Party organisations and their leadership of the masses."

In March 1927, rather more than a month before the overthrow of Chiang Kai-Shek, the leading organs of the Comintern once more sharply and definitely defined the task of

"carrying through at any price the policy of developing the worker and peasant movement, of enlisting the masses of workers in the Communist Party, of enlisting the masses of workers and peasants in the Kuomintang".

The Comintern considers it necessary

"at any price and with all energy to create a foundation consisting of peasant, petty bourgeois and labour elements for the Left wing of the Kuomintang".

This was the line taken by the Comintern, these were the tactics of the Communist Party of China. This line and these tactics consisted in steering a course towards the development of the class movement among the worker and peasant masses, a course towards the organisation of this movement and towards gaining the leadership within it.

The strategists of the "ultra-Left" Opposition were quite incapable of understanding that this course directed towards the development of the class movement of the worker and peasant masses could not be in opposition and, as a matter of fact, was not in opposition to the support of the expedition to the North, although the campaign was under the command of Chiang Kai-Shek. Furthermore, the support of the expedition to the North was closely connected with the fight to stir up a movement among the masses. As a matter of fact, the revolu-

tionary significance of the expedition to the North was not confined to aiming blow after blow at the imperialist rule in China and its agents within the country.

In connection with this circumstance, tremendous significance must be ascribed to the fact that the advance of the Canton troops towards the North was equivalent to extending that part of China in which the worker and peasant movement can develop, grow, be strengthened and organised without meetings with any considerable and systematic restrictions on the part of those in power. The Canton Government could not but meet with criticism because of the very feeble way in which it carried out agrarian reform and reform of taxation, because of its inactivity (or at least its insufficient activity) in the domain of labour legislation, because of its attempts to assume the pose of a power "above the classes", because of action which had taken place against the workers and peasants etc.; it would, however, be nonsense to deny that the worker and peasant movement in the "Canton" provinces had the possibility of achieving an unprecedented boom and power, whereas in the districts ruled by Chang Tsun Chang, Sun Chuan Fang, Chang Tso Lin etc., it was suppressed with all energy and could not develop. The advance of the Canton troops towards the North meant the possibility of an extension of the Labour and peasant foundation of the Chinese national movement.

The task of the Communist Party of China was that of supporting the expedition to the North against the imperialists and their lackeys and at the same time turning this possibility to account in order to develop the mass movement; in this way, the blow against imperialism proved at the same time to be a step forward for the mass movement. The support of the expedition to the North however proved to be a necessary preliminary for maintaining the course towards the mass movement.

Whereas our Opposition did not grasp the inseparable connection between the support of the anti-imperialist expedition to the North and the fight for the highest boom of the workers and peasant movement, and regarded the support of the expedition to the North as detaching ourselves from the course directed towards developing the mass fight, we find that, in a diametrically opposed form, the organs of the Communist Party of China failed to understand this same connection. The Communist Party of China, one of the youngest Communist Parties in the world, has had to work in conditions of unprecedented complication and difficulty. It is therefore not surprising that the Chinese comrades did not always clearly understand that the development of the mass movement must not be a factor which weakens the anti-imperialist fight, but that, on the contrary, this development is the only true foundation for the fight. In some of the resolutions of leading organs of the Communist Party of China (all these resolutions belong to the period before the 7th Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.) shows that the fear prevailed that the irresistible "trend towards the Left" of the working masses might weaken the "united fighting front of the national revolution".

We have already spoken above of the fact that only in the "trend towards the Left" of the working masses, only the instigation of their movement, only the leadership of this movement by the proletariat, was the right way to conquer the hegemony of the proletariat in the block of the revolutionary classes, and at the same time the means of rendering innocuous the inevitable secession of the bourgeoisie from the "united fighting front". For this reason any vacillation in the question of letting loose the mass movement, was a mistake. The Comintern, having, through a number of the resolutions mentioned above, pointed out with extreme clearness the necessity of developing an energetic and resolute mass movement, the Communist Party of China was able to overcome the vacillations referred to and to undertake a number of extremely important steps along the path of raising and organising the workers and peasants.

A few days ago, data were published according to which the Communist Party of China increased its membership from 1000 in January 1925 to 58,000 in April 1927. In the same period there was a tremendous growth in the trade unions and an unprecedented expansion of the peasant movement. The peasant leagues increased their membership in the same space of time from 200,000 to 9,829,000. The Young Communist League of China grew from 2365 members to a membership of 35,000 etc. etc. Finally, during the fight between Wuhan and Nanchang about the question of the seat of the Government and

of the staff, the Communist Party of China succeeded in organising under its lead a powerful movement of mass protest against the "personal dictatorship", i. e. against the dictatorship of Chiang Kai-Shek. All this proves that the young Communist Party of China has in recent times kept aloof from any vacillations and hesitations and has grasped the fact that the tactics of stimulating the mass movement are the only right tactics for the vanguard of the Chinese proletariat.

The Course steered towards consolidating the Influence of the Proletariat by Means of Organisation.

A no less clear and determined line has been maintained in a question of enormous importance, in the question of the organised consolidation of the actual "key positions" in the national revolutionary movement, of the actual "instruments of power", of the actual apparatus of power in favour of the proletariat.

We are here referring to the Government organs in the centre and in the provinces, to the army, the police etc. The Chinese proletariat could not restrict itself to having the revolutionary initiative, to being the chief driving force in the revolutionary development; the Chinese proletariat had also, if we may so express it, to have the "organisatory hegemony" in the national movement.

The following table gives a fairly good picture, not indeed of the social, but of the political composition of the leading organs of the Kuomintang, which were elected on March 11th of this year.

	Communists	Left	Near the Left	More Right than Left	Vacillators	Inclining towards Chang Kai Shek	Right
Secretariat of the C. C.	1	3	2	1	—	—	1
Bureau of the head of the Department of the C. C.	2	3	2	1	—	—	1
Politbureau	2	5	6	1	—	—	1
Presidium of the Politbureau	1	3	2	1	—	—	—
Government Commissaries	1	6	11	1	3	1	5
War Council: Generals	—	1	3	1	1	1	3
Other Members	—	4	2	1	—	—	—
In Presidential Bureau of War Council	—	4	2	—	—	—	1
In the Revision Committee	1	—	2	1	1	—	—
Altogether among 42 persons	4	9	18	1	3	1	6

Of course these figures are not exact and may even be disputed. But, both the wealth of figures and the indefiniteness of the categories, as well even as the fact that the data are disputable show that the organisatory consolidation of the influence of the proletariat and of the working masses which proceed hand in hand with it, was only in an early stage. A more exact consideration of the figures completely confirms this conclusion. Of 42 persons who form the organs of the Kuomintang, 4 are Communists, 9 belong to the Left, 7 to the Right and the groups closely allied to it, and 23 to numerous intermediate groups. At the same time, the influence of the Communists and of the Left is comparatively stronger in the party organs of the Kuomintang than in the military organs. Among the 9 generals who are members of the War Council, i. e. among those members of the Kuomintang in whose hands was the leadership of the army, there is no single Communist and only one who is definitely Left, beside 3 definitely on the Right and 5 who are vacillating towards one side or the other. Anybody can understand the whole significance of such a situation and all the dangers it involves.

The very circumstance that the process of the organisatory consolidation of the proletarian influence was in an early stage, forced the Comintern to devote special attention to this side of the question.

The 7th Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. stated that "since the Canton Government came into being, the real power within it has been in the hands of the Right wing of the Kuomintang" it pointed out emphatically and in definite form that

"the Communists must join the Canton Government in order to support the revolutionary Left wing in its fight against the weak and vacillating policy of the Right" and that it

"must penetrate into the apparatus of the new Government in order to give expression to the agrarian programme of the national revolution".

Supporting itself on the mass movement, the proletariat took the first steps towards conquering the "organisatory hegemony", until the overthrow of Chiang Kai Shek, which indeed partly consisted of mutiny against these steps and in their being suppressed. To these steps belong the entry of the Communists into the Government as Ministers for agriculture and for Labour, the reorganisation of the War Council, the formation of the Government of Shanghai, in which the Left and the Communists predominated etc.

(To be continued.)

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS

Jouhaux Exposed.

By J. Jaglom (Moscow).

The "Daily Herlad", the organ of the Labour Party and of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress of Great Britain, published on 11th of May 1927 a report on the World Economic Conference under the sensational title: Soviet Delegates Attacks Capitalism. M. Jouhaux makes strong criticism of Russian conditions."

Wherein consists this "strong criticism" by Jouhaux?

As is known Comrade Lapse delivered a speech at Geneva on the labour question, in which he asserted such indisputable facts as that the position of the working class in Western Europe is becoming continually worse, that capitalist rationalisation results in unemployment and reduced wages for the international proletariat, and that in practice the eight hour day has been abolished in the big capitalist countries. These facts, one would have thought, are universally known and recognised and are no longer disputed even by certain bourgeois national economists and students of capitalist economy. These bitter truths did not please the originators of the Conference. It was necessary therefore to refute this bolshevist "demagogy" as quickly as possible, and this refutation had to be given through the mouth of a "labour leader".

With that flunkey-like eagerness which he has acquired in the lobbies of the French Ministries and the League of Nations, M. Jouhaux hastened to the aid of his masters.

He declares in the columns of the "Daily Herald" that "liberty does not exist in Russia. There is no such thing as the eight hour day in Russia — a fact, however, which does not prevent the Russian delegates demanding an eight-hour day and complete freedom for the trade unions in every other country."

Under other conditions it would not be worth while to refute the inventions of M. Jouhaux. But the fact that the inventions of M. Jouhaux are given space in the organ of the Labour Party and of the General Council and are dished up to the working class as the "truth" regarding the Soviet Union, compels us to suppress the feeling of repugnance and, in face of these calumnies and lies, to state the truth regarding the working-day in the Soviet Union.

As regards the length of the working day in the Soviet Union, there lie before us the returns for the economic year 1925/26. The data are furnished by the factory undertakings to the authorities of the State statistical departments and contain information regarding the days and hours actually worked. In the economic year 1925/26 data were given regarding the working time of 6600 industrial undertakings in which 2,100,000 workers are engaged, so that we receive by means of these figures a comprehensive picture of the question which interests us.

The average length of the working-day was reckoned, keeping in mind workers enjoying shorter hours, to which in the Soviet Union the following groups belong: 1. workers under 21, 2. workers engaged in trades injurious to health. The first category forms 5½% of the total number of workers,

the second category about 7%. In addition to this one must bear in mind that in the Soviet Union there exists the 46 hours working week.

In summarized form we obtain the following figures regarding the length of the working day and the amount of overtime worked by the factory workers of the Soviet Union in the economic year 1925/26, giving the average for the whole of industry and according to its various branches:

Branch of Production:	Average duration of working Day in hours	
	Total	of which overtime
In the whole of industry	7.5	0.18
The production and working up of minerals	7.4	0.10
Naptha industry	7.9	0.81
Metallurgy, iron	7.4	0.50
Machine building	7.5	0.11
Chemical industry	7.5	0.14
Working up of cotton	7.4	0.02
Tanning and Fur industry	7.6	0.08
Working up of wool	7.4	0.03
Textile industry	7.7	0.07
Typographical industry	7.7	0.07

As can be seen from the above table, the picture is quite other than M. Jouhaux would like to see in the Soviet Union.

M. Jouhaux has for some reason or other, shamefully kept silent regarding the working day in France, the labour movement of which he represented at the World Economic Conference. We gladly fill this gap which, apparently, is to be attributed to the forgetfulness or distraction of the "labour leader" who is engaged in high politics in Geneva.

According to the official returns of the Ministry for Labour, the average working-day in France in the course of 1923/24 was 8 hours 45 minutes. The ideal of international reformism, the Washington Agreement regarding the eight-hour day is not carried out in the democratic native country of M. Jouhaux. On July 8, 1925 the French Parliament conditionally ratified the Washington Agreement and made this ratification dependent upon its ratification by Germany. Parliament has therefore endeavoured to obtain a reinsurance in the Germany of Hindenburg. But even this proved to be inadequate, and the French Senate which had ratified the Washington Agreement, introduced on the 10th of February an amendment according to which

"the obligations which are laid upon France by the ratification will only come into effect when the draft of the Agreement has been ratified by Germany and England also".

Thus the Senate decided to seek a further reinsurance in the Great Britain of Stanley Baldwin, which only recently prolonged the working day of the miners and has now introduced the anti-trade union bill.

Jouhaux, according to his own estimation, belonged in the days of his youth to the anarcho-syndicalists. The latter, as is known, are against the participation of the workers in Parliament. Would not M. Jouhaux like to tell us what he and the "Confederation General du Travail" have done against the decisions adopted by Parliament mentioned by us? Will not M. Jouhaux take the trouble to tell us what he and the reformist unions of France have done in order to bring about the eight hour day in France, or at least to reduce the number of the many factories which are pilloried in the columns of "Humanité" day after day and in which nine, ten and eleven hours a day are being worked?

That is the true state of affairs regarding the working day in the Soviet Union and in democratic France.

We do not believe that the editor of the "Daily Herald" was ignorant of the true state of affairs in regard to the working day in the Soviet Union. The delegation of the British trade unions which visited the Soviet Union in 1924 and published a special report on their journey, paid special attention to this question. The editor of the paper could have obtained information regarding the working-day in the Soviet Union from other and no less authoritative sources. In spite of this the editor of the "Daily Herald" has given space in his paper to the amazing lies of M. Jouhaux, and took no steps whatever in order to ascertain the truth, Hundreds of thou-

sands of working class readers of the paper are thus misinformed through the medium of their own labour paper regarding the state of affairs in the Soviet Union.

Does this attitude of the paper mean that a certain soul affinity exists between the editor and M. Jouhaux? In this case we do not venture to congratulate the editor.

On Agitation for Rationalisation and on Recruiting the Broad Masses for the Realisation of the Campaign.

(Resolution of Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. on
May 9th, 1927.)

In regard to the work done for the purpose of recruiting the broad working masses in the interest of enhanced production, attention must be drawn, not only to the animation of the production conferences and the increased interest of the workers in the promotion of production, but also to a number of serious deficiencies.

a) The majority of the Party nuclei pays altogether insufficient attention to questions of enhanced production and of the co-operation of the broad masses in attaining it. In particular, Party members are far too little drawn into the work of the production conferences and commissions.

b) The agitators, propagandists, trade union functionaries, and cultural workers in the enterprises are not sufficiently trained and are often not in a position to form a practical connection between general tasks in the realm of rationalisation and the concrete conditions of their realisation in the enterprises.

c) There is, furthermore, not the necessary interest either on the part of the trade union organs or on that of the management and the technical personnel in the recruiting of engineers, technicians, and foremen for the mass work of rationalisation of production.

d) In the enterprises and at the production conferences, there is as yet no permanently and technically trained staff of functionaries to enlighten the workers as to the practical tasks of rationalisation and to take an active part in their realisation.

e) The activity of the trade union organisations in the enterprises, and particularly that of the production committees and production conferences, the clubs, "red corners", and wall newspapers is too little connected with the measures of rationalisation to be carried out.

f) Certain mistakes on the part of the economic organs and the absence of the necessary and timely information and enlightenment of the workers in regard to the measures to be adopted make it more difficult to recruit the workers for the purpose of effecting the rationalisation in the enterprises.

g) In pointing out that the main condition for a successful solution of the tasks embodied in the resolution of the Central Committee of March 24th, 1927, regarding the rationalisation of production, is a conscious attitude, an active participation, and an extensive initiative on the part of the working masses, the Central Committee makes the following suggestions:

I. Regarding the Management of Agitation and Propaganda.

1. It is essential that the fundamental difference between the capitalistic rationalisation and the Socialistic rationalisation effected by our proletarian State be thoroughly explained, seeing that the aim of the latter is the acceleration of Socialistic development and in connection therewith the betterment of the material position of the workers.

Furthermore, the enlightenment of the broad masses with respect to the significance of an improvement in technics and of an organisation of production, must be directed towards these general tasks of rationalisation and its individual forms (better exploitation of the existing technical apparatus, transfer to mechanical operation, endless-chain systems, specialisation of the enterprises, standardisation, and the like) being taken up by the working population. In this connection, attention must also be paid to the questions of making use of working forces and the proper establishment of the standards of productive capacity in co-operation with improved technical resources.

Special importance attaches to the exploitation of the results attained in the rationalisation of production, especially as regards the improvement of the workers' condition, such results being enhanced safety technics, measures for workers' protection, wage increases, the extension of production, the growth in the total number of employed workers, and the like.

Agitation and propaganda for the rationalisation of production must not everywhere be given the same character, uniform for all enterprises. On the contrary, our activity in this direction must be built up in keeping with the volume and character of the measures of rationalisation provided for a given district, branch of production, or concern.

2. In the interest of a better manipulation of oral agitation and propaganda on behalf of the rationalisation of production, the following points should be borne in mind.

a) For the sake of the necessary work of enlightenment among the broad masses in regard to the fundamental importance of the Socialistic rationalisation of production, and with a view to the effectuation of appropriate measures in the enterprises, it is in the first line necessary that a staff of subordinate Party functionaries be trained, and this by means of the discussion of questions concerning the improvement of technics and the organisation of production, which discussion should take place at meetings of functionaries, in circles of agitation, at the meetings of the group organisers and agitators, and at propaganda seminars, where the questions of the rationalisation of production are introduced into the programme of Party debates. Corresponding measures must also be effected in regard to the activity of the Young Communist organisations in the works.

b) Within the limits of the activity of cultural committees, clubs, circles, and "red corners", the enlightenment of the broad working masses as to questions connected with the rationalisation of production must receive greater attention, the said activity of such organisations being directed towards the promotion of education in the technique of production particularly by means of evening discussions, productive competitions, and the like.

c) In connection with the constantly growing aspiration of the workers towards improving their qualifications, the Supreme Economic Council and its organs, the central administration of the political schools, and the trade union organs must increase their activity in the direction of the technical instruction and technical self-training of workers of both sexes by the publication of popular scientific and technical reading material for the masses, the establishment of small libraries, by tables, posters, the publication of manuals and books of reference, etc.

d) Among the women workers, too, there must be conducted in the clubs as well as in the communal houses, a work of enlightenment regarding the carrying out of rationalisation, while at the same time those labour questions of the working women connected with rationalisation (increasing of their qualification etc.) must be elucidated among the broad masses.

3. It is likewise essential that the necessity of making use of the wireless and the cinematograph in the interest of rationalisation propaganda be fully recognised. This could be effected by the preparation of a series of productional films and a relative organisation of the wireless and cinematograph records.

II. The Tasks of the Press.

The main task of the press in the direction of rationalisation activity is a conscientious and carefully sifted intelligence and an attentive study of failures and success in the realisation of rationalisation measures. At the same time the press must evince a maximum initiative, and that both in recording the new problems arising in the process of rationalisation, and in elucidating practical measures. To this end, the following points must be observed:

a) The enlightenment of the public in regard to rationalisation measures must be handled by the press in a manner calculated to lend special prominence to the initiative of the working masses in the improvement of technics and the organisation of production. Similarly, all remarkable inventions and improvements in the individual enterprises, workshop, and work departments, especially such as have been effected at the

suggestion of the workers or the production conferences, must be discussed by the press.

b) The wall newspapers must lend extensive space to the activity of the production conferences and institute a special column under the heading of "Our Suggestions", or the like, containing contributions from the management and the technical staff.

c) Furthermore, it is essential that the workers correspondents be recruited for the purpose of dealing with the work done in the interest of rationalisation and the merits and demerits of the activity of the production conferences, such as lack of interest in valuable suggestions on the part of the workers, delays in execution, or the result of action taken on the strength of suggestions. To this end, there should be periodical conferences between the economic organs and the worker correspondents dealing with the discussion in the press of measures of rationalisation.

d) The press of the juvenile workers must take an active part in the elucidation of questions of the rationalisation of production, by paying prime attention to the struggle for a promotion of productive discipline and the improvement of the level of technical knowledge among the juvenile workers. The press must explain these problems, with special reference to the control of juvenile protection with a view to the proper use of working forces and the guarantee of normal conditions for the development of output.

4. It is essential that the economic organs, in particular the managers, engineers, and foremen, be induced to take greater part in the activity of the press for the purpose of elucidating all important measures and improvements in connection with production. In this direction, too, the press must pay more attention to the activity of the clubs of red managers, the production circles, and the like.

The columns on "Science and Technics" in the newspapers must in the main be devoted to the technics of production and dwell on the peculiarities of economy and output, discussing the tangible results and the prospects in the realm of the rationalisation of production.

(To be continued.)

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

The Future War and the Working Class.

III.

By D. Maretsky (Moscow).

The reconstruction and development of imperialistic economy bear within them the premises and factors of a new war. During the post-war period, the competitive struggle among the powers has not slackened but become more intense. The problem of procuring raw material has become critical for a number of States, while the desperate fight for markets has grown extremely sharp. The coming to a climax of the main problem for capitalism, namely, the procuring of markets, is distinguished by the following features: the disproportion between the possibilities of extending the machinery of production and of the small basis of effective demand on the part of the masses; the dropping out of the Soviet Union as a free market from the sphere of capitalist world economy; the Versailles "peace" conditions, which laid a political ban upon the possibility of extending the economic territory of the vanquished countries; the progress made in the industrialisation of the colonies and protectorates, their political awakening, etc.

The necessity for a redistribution of the world is peremptorily demanded by the inequality of capitalist development, which under imperialism becomes not, as some believe, modified but aggravated, a fact which has been demonstrated in a particularly striking manner during the post-war period*). Inequality

*) Reference should be made to a special but, from the viewpoint of danger of war, thoroughly characteristic case of the aggravation of the inequality, namely, the specific inequality in the development of the whole of industry and of war industry. While economy in general was in course of reconstruction, war industry showed a further development. After Versailles the imperialist countries again reached the level of pre-war

of capitalist development under imperialism disturbs the economic balance of the whole globe, a balance which can only be restored by a violent redistribution of the world. The imperialist States with their highly developed powers of production are thirsting for "supplementary" extension, for the supplanting of their "fellows", and striving a "just" division of the places in the sun. On the other hand, those countries, in which no means can be found of carrying out "stabilisation" successfully and which threaten continually to sink into chronic stagnation, show an inclination to save themselves by winning new spheres of influence and exploiting them thoroughly. Finally, the vanquished countries, as their convalescence progresses, begin to feel the revival of their dormant instincts, of their imperialistic appetite; colonial ideology and thoughts of just "revenge" are cropping up.

In this manner the stimuli towards redistribution become more numerous and a new imperialist war becomes more likely. Imperialism without war is unthinkable; it is only through war that it can be restored. To do away with militarism without having destroyed imperialism would be as bad a beginning as to do away with the Pope while retaining Catholicism. Imperialism cannot exist for any length of time without war. On the other hand every war that is waged by imperialist powers must of necessity be an imperialistic war, a predatory war.

It is also to be seen from the general sociological theses which Lenin took from Marx and developed. Politics are the "concentrated expression of economy" as Lenin said on several occasions. Imperialistic policy is consequently nothing but the "concentrated expression" of the economy of finance-capital. "War is merely the continuing of politics by other (violent) methods." This celebrated assertion of Clausevits was taken up fully and completely by Lenin after Marx and Engels. From these two sentences which link "economy", "politics" and "war", it will be seen that the present-day war is the "continuation" of the policy of imperialism, in other words, it is thoroughly and completely the work of robbers and exploiters**).

The disproportion between the hugely inflated military budget and the general level of economy is very pronounced in countries adjoining Russia, for instance, Poland and Roumania. The secret of their excessive arming is that they play the role of Fascist Mamelukes for the great imperialistic sharks, such as England. While they parade their military power, they behave themselves like lackeys dressed in their masters' clothes. Naturally, the masses of the people in these countries must bear the heavy burden of their governments' military zeal.

Lenin did not only take a naked formula from Clausevitz, Lenin backed it up with the richest concrete contents of the epoch. Lenin welded it with the theory of imperialism into a complete whole. In Lenin's hands it took on that satisfying, militant, revolutionary character and at the same time illuminated the

economy. In regard to military affairs, however, in the matter of armaments the development of war technics and the creation of new branches in war industry, they have far surpassed the pre-war level.

It is of interest to observe the changing relation and the inequality of war industry and industry in general in the various groups of countries. In such countries as the United States of America the growth of military power corresponds more or less to the growth of economic power. On the other hand, in England, for instance, economic decline did not prevent military progress. The English imperialists would have done anything rather than be stragglers in regard to armaments. Military power can serve them as a lever by which to get back to lost economic positions. Here lies one of the most important reasons for the adventurous and nervous nature of English policy during the last few years.

**) We would draw attention to A. Svetshint's "Strategy", 2nd edition, a book which is accessible to a wide circle of the reading public. "Military Messenger", Moscow, 1927. See his definitions: "War is a part of the political fight" and "War is only a part of policy" (page 27). A. Svetshint is one of those very important military theorists who have grasped in what measure Marxism and Leninism can enrich the theory of the art of war.

See in "Strategy" the interesting observation of the author concerning the relation of policy to strategy, of policy to economy and concerning the principles of "attrition" and "destruction" in the works of Lenin.

way of the fighting proletariat with a beam of the brightest rays.

It is one of Lenin's immortal achievements that he indicated of which policy the war of the modern "powers" is the "continuation". Lenin showed that only the regime of imperialist exploitation and nothing else can be "continued" with the bloody slaughter of war. This gave Lenin the possibility of attacking with the strength of a Prometheus the Social-Chauvinists, the Centrists and the Opportunists of all shades, to expose and scourge all the underhand accomplices of capital, from whose brains emanated the "just aims" of the war, which never had any existence, and who gave the workers the idea that shells from Krupp's and Schneider-Creuzot would promote the growth of democracy, who spread the vulgar legend "of the defence of Belgium's neutrality", who circulated the lie that the imperialist slaughter had not a class origin.

Lenin's merit was that he proved why imperialism must inevitably lead to huge wars of destruction. He thereby exposed the nauseating talk of the preachers of pacifism who diverted the proletariat from the right path and who, like the "Paneuropa" gasbag Calergi, gave the assurance that imperialism could "get along" without war. That it must not of necessity have its logical "continuation". Lenin proved masterfully and irrefutably that it is possible to fight against war only if one fights for the revolution and under the banner of the proletariat, and in no other way.

The whole of Lenin's doctrine concerning war was not exhausted in exposing the nature of imperialistic warfare and its showing its predatory character. Sundry remarks, indications and articles of the creator of scientific Socialism were transformed by Lenin into a harmonious whole, into a doctrine of the social-historic types of wars.

Wars, "the use of armed forces", occupations, "attacks", "defence", "irredentism" (the violent changing of State frontiers) — all these were experienced by humanity in the distant past, all these are ranged on the scroll of history, they are to-day being enacted and will be again in the future. From the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism, it would, however, be absolutely inadmissible and quite fruitless if we forgot the special historic characteristics of every war, if we allowed their distinguishing and special features to be lost in the colourless "lore" of war "in general", which takes its place outside of history and of class. The war which was waged by Tshingis Chan is not the same as that carried on by Napoleon; the historical significance of Garibaldi's campaign is very different from the war operations of Marshal Foch; the Red Army fought a war which was altogether different from that fought by the armies of imperialism.

(To be continued.)

IN THE CAMP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The Kiel Party Conference of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

By Ernst Meyer (Berlin).

The social democratic press considers the Kiel Party Conference of the Social Democratic Party of Germany as a great success for their party, and the social democratic party executive in particular is breathing freely again. This feeling of relief on the part of the Party Executive is only to be understood if one clearly realises in what situation the Kiel Conference took place and what debates have preceded it.

Since the social democracy was flung out of the national government, it has been forced into opposition to the government. The social democracy is compelled to criticise as the result of the bourgeois block government many political and economic facts regarding, which they hitherto, as a government party, kept silent or whitewashed. As a result and against the will of the party executive, the proletarian class-consciousness and the opposition sentiment has increased among the proletarian membership. In addition to this there is the fact that in the last few years, in spite of the stabilisation of economy which was proclaimed by the SPG, in the year 1924 as a sort of paradise for the workers, the economic position of the working masses has worsened tremendously. The enormous un-

employment, the inadequate wages, the increased speeding up owing to the rationalisation, the attacks of the employers on the trade unions, have convinced the membership that the former participation of the Social Democratic Party of Germany in the national government in no way bettered the social position of the working class nor even secured it against serious reverses. As a result there is growing within the membership of the SPG, the will to an effective opposition, instead of the sham opposition of the party executive which only desires to enter the coalition government again.

This, as yet, not very clear, moody discontent with the policy of the SPG, expressed itself at the Kiel party conference in a whole number of motions submitted by local organisations.

The social democratic Executive has now taken advantage of the Kiel party conference in order to meet the mood of its membership in certain points, and on the other hand to remain all the more obstinate in all decisive questions. Hilferding and Severing promised, from next Autumn onwards, to adopt a sharper tone in the Reichstag towards the bourgeois block government. But at the same time they, along with the Party Executive, opposed making any concession to a real class fighting policy. The Party Executive prevented by the most arbitrary ruling, which was received with indignation by the delegates of the "Left wing", the discussion and adoption of all or any proposals dangerous to the policy of the Party Executive. The discussion on imperialism and the danger of war demanded by the opposition did not take place at all at the Kiel party conference. Attempts to adopt a sharper attitude towards the policy of the Party Executive were regarded as personal attacks and, in artificially provoked scenes of moral indignation, were stilled as attacks on the spirit of comradeship in a proletarian party. The arrangement of the demonstrations, especially that of the youth, was in addition intended to disguise the fact that the SPG., according to its own figures, has not even reached the membership of the pre-war period and is not being recruited from the ranks of the youth. The causes for the splitting tendencies in the socialist working youth were disguised. The political reasons for the expulsion of social democratic supporters of the united front and of delegates to Russia were concealed behind juridical formulae in the rejection of the applications for readmittance.

The Party Executive did not permit a detailed discussion of its past policy; important questions were omitted from the official reports. In their place the Party Executive, by means of the report of Hilferding on "the Tasks of the social democracy in the Republic", provided a picture, based on alleged scientific investigation of the economic and political situation which was intended to deceive the working class regarding their actual sufferings.

Hilferding, it is true, in his speech, spoke a good deal about socialism and of the necessity of its realisation. But what socialism is namely, transformation of private property in the means of production into social property by the expropriation of the exploiters, — this Hilferding did not venture to tell his audience. He presented matters as if, by round about means and under the influence of the State on economy, socialism could be realised within the framework of bourgeois democracy, and actually declared: "There is no more serious hindrance to the realisation of socialism than civil war". With this repudiation of the class struggle, which he confined to the parliamentary struggle within the framework of the capitalist State, Hilferding places himself on the basis of all bourgeois reformers. Whilst the bourgeois social politicians admit and criticise the wretched position of the proletariat, Hilferding actually tried to paint in glowing colours the present state of affairs. He rejoiced over the "real improvement in the whole of economy", without saying a word regarding unemployment. He praised the going over to "organised capitalism", but said not a word regarding the social effects of national and international trustification. He went into ecstasies over the progress of capitalist technique, without giving a thought to its victims. As far as he dealt at all with the position of the working class he consoled himself by asserting that the workers have succeeded in maintaining their level of wages in the last few years, as if these miserable wages are in any way sufficient!

The less Hilferding spoke of the social and economic position of the proletariat, the more he sought to rouse the enthusiasm of his audience regarding the alleged advance on the political field. According to him, all the privileges of property have already been abolished and the economic privileges of

property could be abolished also if the workers would "take in their hands the lever of State power". Hilferding sees an advance of bourgeois democracy already in the fact that the rulers have to address themselves to the citizens of the State, and ever again have to have their rule confirmed by a majority in the intellectual struggle with the social democracy, as if elections did not take place under the monarchy and even under the fascist dictatorship! In defiance of the demand that the SPG. in Prussia should abandon the coalition with the bourgeois parties, Hilferding praised the Brauns and Severings as breakwaters against bolshevism and fascism, and proclaimed the coalition policy, which culminated in the payment of millions of marks as compensation to the Hohenzollerns, as a "world historical victory of the German and international proletariat".

He expressed himself cynical over his own past by saying:

"Formerly, when we had no political responsibility and no influence, we did not need to be very particular regarding the wording of party resolutions. Today we must conduct politics".

The party resolution stated therefore as the real aim of the SPG., not socialism and its realisation by the class struggle, but the winning and maintaining of the largest possible number of positions of power (this means official jobs) in the State, the provinces and the municipal bodies.

The "left" leaders of the SPG. who came forward at the conference, did not oppose to this programme of bourgeois reformism any clear and united counter-programme. They made opposition in various questions and brought forward a resolution demanding the resumption of the class struggle as against the policy of coalition. But not one of them ventured to contradict the assertion of the Party Executive that there is not a fundamental opponent of the policy of coalition within the SPG., and various "left" leaders even hastened to emphasise that they are not against coalitions in all circumstances. After a very weak offensive against the party committee they allowed themselves to be driven completely to the defensive. It is true that they are under the pressure of the discontent and mistrust of the social democratic membership, but their political outlook, which is dictated with an eye on the Party executive, remains far behind various open letters which were addressed by purely proletarian members of the SPG. to the delegates to the Kiel party conference. This proletarian opposition within the SPG. demanded a complete break with the policy of coalition and class cooperation, the prosecution of the class struggle with all means against imperialism, against the bourgeois block, fascism and danger of war, proletarian support of Soviet Russia and proletarian united front with the Communists.

The proletarian opposition within the SPG. will continue to grow, and this the more quickly the more the Communist Party of Germany learns how to take advantage of the differentiation within the SPG., to pillory the reformism of Hilferding and to influence the social democratic workers by the consistent application of the united front tactics. Hilferding, who already in 1919 prophesied the bankruptcy of the Communist Party of Germany as well as that of the Soviet Union, in Kiel again gave the assurance that Communism is decaying and is doomed to perish in a short time. His assertions only prove that the ideas of Communism are finding greater acceptance in the ranks of the SPG. workers.

TEN YEARS AGO

The Kronstadt Soviet Seizes Power.

Petrograd, May 26th. The Executive Committee of the Kronstadt Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies issued an order in which the Kronstadt Soviet is declared to be the only power in the town. The Soviet only gets into contact with the Provisional Government in general questions which concern the State.

The Reconstruction of the Kronstadt Soviet.

(Published in the "Pravda" of May 27th, 1917.)

The Kronstadt Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was organised in great haste in the first days of the

revolution, and it has long been evident that it must be reconstructed in order to suit actual conditions.

The re-election finally took place last week. At its meeting on May 16th, the old Soviet laid down the following rules for the election: groups with 30 to 100 members have one representative, groups with 100 to 500 members two, groups with more than 300 members have one extra representative for every 200 members. The Socialist parties which have committees shall have one decisive vote for three local committees.

The election was held on the basis of these regulations, with the following result: Bolshevik fraction 93, Social Revolutionary fraction 91, non-party 70, Menshevist fraction 46.

Thus we see that the Bolsheviks and the Social Revolutionaries have greatly increased their numbers in the Soviet. This increase of the two parties was at the expense of the non-party "swamp". This was the character of the former Soviet, which hardly reflected the struggle of the stormy life around us.

We can only welcome the fact that fresh political life has penetrated the Soviet and that in the Kronstadt Soviet the same political fights are now being fought out which are flaring up everywhere.

The majority of the Social Revolutionaries in the newly elected Soviet belongs to the minority of the Social Revolutionaries, i. e. to the Internationalists.

The Bolshevik fraction is relatively the strongest; nevertheless it will not be able to put its resolutions into effect, if the Social Revolutionaries act in opposition.

As the election has already shown, the Mensheviks and some of the non-party members are inclined to vote for the Social Revolutionaries and against the Bolsheviks.

The Executive Committee was elected according to fractions, each fraction having a number of representatives corresponding to its numerical strength. Thus 9 Bolsheviks, 9 Social Revolutionaries, 7 non-party members and 5 Mensheviks were elected to the Executive Committee.

The Kronstadt Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies concentrates gigantic power in its hands, which extends to all affairs of the town.

The Commissary of the Provisional Government is absolutely unknown and no attention is paid to him.

Reporter Midshipman Ilijik (R. Raskolnikov).

Demonstration of Young Workers in Petrograd.

Petrograd, May 24th, 1927.

A demonstration of the young workers of Petrograd took place yesterday on the Field of Mars at the initiative of the Wyborg Young Workers' Organisation. All marched in serried ranks to the Field of Mars, each urban district on its own, preceded by red flags and music.

Flags with the inscriptions: "Protection of Child Labour!" and "Education for All!" predominated. Flags were also seen with the inscriptions: "Long Live Socialism!", "Long live the 3rd International!" "The Young Workers are the Hope of Socialism!" "The Young Guard will establish eternal Peace!" etc.

Among the speakers on the Field of Mars there were a few juvenile workers, 13 to 14 years old. They said that the present situation is bringing us and the countries of Europe nearer to the socialist revolution, and pointed out that our capitalists are trying to grab for themselves the results of the fights our fathers fought. They want to thrust us back into the old serfdom. The Russian workers however have learnt from the experiences of the workers in other countries, they have their organisations, they know their duty and they will not cede what their fathers conquered, to the bourgeoisie, as has been done in other countries. One of the young speakers closed with the words: "We, young workers know of the experiences of our fathers, the pioneers, we shall complete their work and shall gain a victory for socialism.

(From "Pravda" of May 26th, 1917.)

The 3rd National Conference of the War Industry Committees.

Petrograd, May 29th. The 3rd National Conference of the War Industry Committees was opened. About 500 delegates were present. The Conference was opened by A. I. Gutchkov; among other things he said:

Dark mass instincts, roused by the agitation of irresponsible persons, are gaining ground among the workers. The

workers are giving expression to demands which cannot be fulfilled.

"During the old regime we believed that the forces of production would grow in a free Russia; but at the present moment, we must strain all our forces to save at least that industrial life which existed under the old regime."

Konovalov then depicted the present economic situation and said that if people did not come to their senses and realise that they were undermining the very soil on which they stand, economic ruin would be inevitable. The Provisional Government will take all possible measures to restore order in the country, to consolidate liberty and to promote national defence. The Provisional Government looks for help and support from all those who have the progress of the revolution at heart. It points out to the whole people the enormous difficulties and dangers surrounding us.

A number of speakers spoke in the same tenor.

The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

Threatened Revolution in England.

London, May 29th. As we have learnt after the event, the President of the British Miners' League, Smillie, in a speech held at Newcastle said that, whilst they were facing the possibility of famine within a few months, the authorities were playing Nero's fiddle while Rome burnt. Dozens of cases were known in which distress had arisen merely through lack of organisation and through deficient co-operation between the authorities. The latter should be compelled to take the measures indicated by the situation, and this could be done if the people showed a united front. If this did not bear fruit, the example of the Russian people should be followed who had resorted to revolution because of the want of food for which the authorities were to blame. As long as food was in the country, it was not likely that the English people would calmly look on while their children starved.

The Strike in Liverpool.

Berne, May 29th. A mass meeting of the insurgent machinists in Liverpool, held on May 24th, decided by a narrow majority to resume work. They expressly announced that they would immediately lay it down again unless the paragraph of the new Munition Bill regarding the employment of skilled workers from private factories was brought before the House. A minority proposed continuing the strike until the Government had given guarantees for the withdrawal of those terms in the Bill to which they objected.

Unrest in England.

Amsterdam, May 30th. The "Allgemeen Handelsblad" reports from London that W. Thorne M. P., the representative of the Dock Workers' Union, in the East of London, who was received by the King, stated that he had told the latter a few home truths. He had discussed with him various things which had led to the unrest in the industrial centres and had told him what the workers thought of the high prices of food and the war profits of the employers. He had told him that further disturbances were to be expected as long as the prices of food were only controlled when it was in the interest of the traders and not when it was in the interest of the workers.

Strikes of Women Workers in Paris.

Geneva, May 29th. The strike movement among the women workers in Paris has almost become general. While one group declares itself ready to resume work when its demands have been fulfilled, new groups are constantly joining the strike. The Government has issued a manifesto thanking the syndicates of employers and workers for their efforts to restrict the strike movement and appealing to the patriotism of all. At the same time the Paris Press publishes a statement to the effect that several foreigners have been arrested for carrying on agitation among the strikers.

"Figaro" demands that the Government should act quickly in order to remove the danger of the strike turning into a

tendency to international pacifism. "Action Francaise" declares that national interests are at stake. The strikers are, consciously or unconsciously, serving German interests. "Journal" calls upon the strikers to refrain from demonstrating in the streets lest it should give the impression that France had lost her courage. The paper also hints that the strikes might turn into a movement for peace.

From Comrade Lenin's Speech at the All-Russian Congress of the Peasant Soviets.

Comrade Lenin made a long speech at the Congress of the Peasant Soviets on June 4th 1917. After his usual manner, he gave a clear answer to all the questions which had been raised, and suggested measures which, while meeting the immediate interests of the peasants to the widest extent, were also completely in harmony with the general interests of the whole working population. The centre-point of the demands of the Bolsheviki was the immediate transference of the land to the peasants without any compensation to the landed proprietors. The landed proprietors and capitalists, and consequently their lackeys the Mensheviki and S. R. also stormed against these demands. For this reason, Comrade Lenin had mainly to deal with the "arguments", by the help of which it was intended to rob the peasants of the fruits of the revolution. Comrade Lenin dexterously wiped the floor with these "arguments" and said:

"I repeat: There must be no private landed property in the future."

The following are some characteristic passages from his speech:

Do the Bolsheviki Want Anarchy?

Anarchists is the name for those who deny the necessity of the power of the State; we however say, that it is absolutely necessary, not only for Russia at the present moment, but for every State, even if it is about to go over to socialism. A strong government is urgently needed. All we ask is that this power should be entirely and exclusively in the hands of the majority of the workers', soldiers' and peasants' delegates. This is what distinguishes us from the other parties. We by no means deny the necessity for a strong power of the State; we merely maintain that the land of the landed proprietors must be ceded to the peasants without compensation, according to decisions of the local peasant committees, with the stipulation that the property shall not be damaged.

No, our opinion is that, if the landed proprietors refuse to hand over the land or demand high ransom for it, it is an arbitrary action; but if the majority of the peasants says that the land shall not remain in the hands of the landowners, because they, the peasants, have received nothing but humiliation and exploitation at the hands of the landed proprietors within the memory of man, it is no arbitrary action, but only establishing conditions of justice, and this action should not be postponed.

Law and Order.

The peasant ought to know that he is taking possession of land which indeed does not belong to him, though it belongs as little to the landed proprietor, but that the land is the property of the people and that the National Assembly will finally decide how to dispose of it. For this reason, the landed proprietors ought really to make no claim for pecuniary compensation since the beginning of the revolution, since the constitution of the first agrarian committee. This is the fundamental distinction in judging what to understand by law and order. Up to the present, it has always been said in Russia that only that was law and order which was for the benefit of the landed proprietors and officials; we, on the other hand, maintain that law and order is that which is to the advantage of the majority of the peasantry. And, as long as there is no All-Russian Supreme Soviet and no National Assembly, until that time, every local authority, such as the District Committees and the Provincial Committees should be regarded as the su-

preme authority. We call it an arbitrary procedure when a landed proprietor, insisting upon all hereditary rights, demands "voluntary" agreement on the part of three hundred peasant families, each of which owns an area of 7½ desjatines. What we desire is that, without losing a month, a week or a day, the resolutions should satisfy the will of the majority to get possession of the property of the landowners.

Must the Cultivation of the Land get worse?

• I must refute one more objection which is often raised against our proposals. They maintain that, if the peasants were to take immediate possession of the estates, it is to be feared that such rapid action, taken without previous preparations, might lead to a deterioration in the cultivation of the soil, might result in the fields being less well tilled. Here I must remark as an aside, that the power of the majority, the central power of the State, is not yet established, that the peasants have not yet gained sufficient self-confidence and have not yet sufficiently lost their confidence in the landed proprietors and capitalists. In my opinion, however, the peasants will very soon lose all confidence in the old power of the State and will realise that Russia ought to have no other government than a government of workers', soldiers' and peasants' delegates. I believe that every day brings the peasants nearer to this recognition, not because any party recommends it — millions of persons will never follow the advice of a party unless that advice is in harmony with their own experience — but because things are irrevocably developing in such a way that before long it will be impossible for any other power to prevail in Russia than that of the workers' and peasants' deputies.

If I am told that the sudden seizure of the land may possibly lead to a deterioration in the cultivation of the land, I can only reply that agriculture has always been on a very low level among our peasants, owing to their having been oppressed by the landed proprietors for centuries. Russia is, at the present moment, certainly passing through a terrible crisis, as are all the other belligerent countries, and the only salvation for Russia is to adopt a special cultivation of the soil, to effect the greatest possible economy of human labour. But could anything be done now for the Spring sowing, could anything be altered by a voluntary agreement? What could be altered? Would the peasants cultivate the land any the worse because they know that they are working on land which is not private property but belongs to the whole people and that, if they pay rent, it flows not into the pockets of the landed proprietors, but into their own peasant funds? It is such nonsense that I am astonished whenever I hear anything of the kind; it is absolutely incredible and is only the result of the cunning art of persuasion of the Junkers.

The Knout and "Revolutionary Democracy" in the Service of the Junkers.

The Junkers have grasped the fact that it is no longer possible to rule through the knout. They have finally grasped this fact and now they have adopted a kind of rule which is a novelty for Russia but has long existed in Western Europe. That the exercise of power through the knout must be abandoned, has been proved by two revolutions in our own country and by dozens in the countries of Western Europe. These revolutions have taught the capitalists and Junkers how to govern the people by fraud and hypocrisy, how to adapt themselves to the new requirements, how necessary it is to be able to declaim, with a red ribbon in your buttonhole: "We are for revolutionary democracy. Only wait a little — we will do everything for you!" (Cries of: "Bravo!"). Thus, the objection that the peasants would cultivate the land less well because it was the property of the people and not of the landed proprietors, is only mocking the peasants, is only trying to maintain the rule over them, even if it be by fraud.

I repeat: There must be no private landed property in the future.

The Path of Salvation.

I and the party in whose name I have the honour to speak — we recognise only two ways of protecting the interests of the rural wage earners and of the poorest peasants, and we recommend these two ways to the consideration of the Peasants' Soviet.

The first way is that of the **organisation of the rural wage-earners and of the poorest peasants**. We desire and recommend that in every peasant committee, in every district, in every province, in every governmental district, a special fraction or special group of wage-earners and poorest peasants should be formed, which should ask itself: If the land becomes the property of the people to-morrow — and this will happen, because it is the will of the people — how are we to behave?

Where are we, who have no cattle and no tools, to get them? How shall we manage the farming? How shall we protect our interests? How are we to behave so that the land, which is really the property of the people, does not get into the hands of the landed proprietors alone? If the land gets into the hands of those who have enough cattle and implements, shall we benefit much?

Is it for this purpose that we have completed the revolution?

Was that what we wanted? There is, on principle, only one way of getting rid of the yoke of capital, of ensuring that the land which belongs to the people, gets into the hands of the workers; this is the way of the organisation of the rural wage-earners, who will be guided by their own experience, their own observations and their own mistrust in the promises of the rulers, even though they wear a red bow in their button-hole and describe themselves as "revolutionary democrats".

The poorest peasants will only have their wits sharpened by independent organisation on the spot and their own experience.

The second measure recommended by our party is that **model farms** should be established in all the large estates, in every large manorial farm of which there are about 30,000 in Russia, in such a way that a transition is made as quickly as possible to cultivation of the land by agricultural labourers and trained agriculturalists working in common and using the herds of cattle, implements etc. of the landed proprietors. Unless the land is thus worked in common under the supervision of the Soviets of the agricultural workers, the land cannot pass into the hands of the workers. This common cultivation of the land is undoubtedly a very difficult matter; it would of course be madness to imagine that anything of this kind could be decreed and commanded from above. For the custom of individual farming which has existed for centuries cannot disappear suddenly, and further we must adapt ourselves to the new forms of life, must have large sums of money at our disposal etc. If all this advice, these opinions about working the land in common, about sharing the equipment, sharing the herds of cattle, about collaboration with professional agriculturalists, if all this were, so to speak, only recommended by individual parties, things would be in a bad way; for the advice of any one party is not enough to produce changes in the life of the people. If many millions of people enter on a revolutionary struggle — and such a transformation as I have mentioned, would mean a far greater revolution than the overthrow of the feeble-minded Nicholas Romanov — if then, I repeat, many millions of people revolt, it happens not by order, but when the distress has become absolutely unbearable, when the general tension and the resolve of millions has torn down all the old barriers, and the people is actually able to begin constructing a new life.

This is a difficult task, but it is absolutely necessary to resort to work in common in large model farms; otherwise no escape can be found from ruin, from the desperate position in which Russia finds itself. It would however be a great mistake to imagine that this inconceivably great transformation could be effected by the stroke of a pen. It demands the maximum of work, demands the greatest possible tension of energy and power of resolve on the part of every single peasant and worker in the work which has been familiar to him for decades. Such things cannot be done to order, but they must be done because the war of conquest has brought the whole of mankind to the verge of ruin, because millions of human life have already been destroyed and still more will be devoured by this terrible war, unless we strain all our forces, unless all organisations of the Soviets of the Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates take decisive steps in common to cultivate the land without capitalists and landowners. This is the only way which will make it possible for the land to pass into the hands of the workers.

The Municipal Election Campaign.

By J. Stalin.

Of all the bourgeois groups which have issued election lists of their own, the independent groups hold the most indefinite position. There are not merely a few of such independent groups, there is a whole pile of them, about thirty. What lots of different names! "The United House Committee", "The Group of Educational Employees", "The Non-Party Labour Group", "Group of Extra-Party Electors", "House Administrators' Group", "Union of Houseowners", "Super-Party Republican Group", "The League for the Equal Rights of Woman", "Group of the Engineers' Union", "Commercial and Industrial Union", "Group for Honesty, Responsibility and Justice", "Group of Democratic Construction", "Group for Liberty and Order" and other groups, — a variegated picture of non-party medly.

Who are they, where do they come from and whither are they bent?

All these groups are bourgeois groups, largely merchants, industrialists, houseowners, "professional" people, intellectuals.

Their programme is based on no principles, so that the electors do not know for what they are fighting when they are called upon to vote for them.

They have no platform of municipal policy, so that the electors do not know what improvements they demand in the domain of municipal administration nor for what reason they should vote for these people.

They have no past, for they did not exist in the past.

They have no future, for after the election they will disappear like last year's snow.

They have only come into being during the election days, they live only in the present moment, for the period of the elections; they try to worm their way into the urban district councils somehow or other, afterwards the grass grows over them.

These programmeless bourgeois groups which shun the light would like to get their candidates into the local councils surreptitiously.

Dark are their aims. Dark is their path.

How are we to define the nature of these groups?

It is easy to understand why independent groups existed in the past. In Tsarist times, membership of a party, membership of the Left, of a Left group, was relentlessly persecuted "by law", and many had to take refuge in apparent independence of party in order to escape imprisonment and persecution. At that time, independence of party was a protection against Tsarist laws. But nowadays, when freedom is unrestricted, when every party can take its stand freely and openly without risking anything, when definite membership of a party and open political fighting have become our duty and a means for the political education of the masses, how shall we now define the nature of independent groups? What do they fear, whom do they fear, from whom are they hiding their face?

There are doubtless many electors among the masses who have not yet studied the programme of the political parties, and their political indolence and backwardness, a heritage from Tsarist times, is an obstacle to their being awakened, to their being quickly enlightened. But is it not clear that this lack of party and lack of programme strengthen and legalize their backwardness and indolence? Who can deny that an open, honest, political fight between the parties is the best means of rousing the masses and stimulating their political activity?

Once more! What do the independent groups fear, why do they shun the light and from whom do they hide? What can be the secret?

The fact is that, in view of the present circumstances in Russia, when revolution is developing rapidly, when there is the greatest freedom, when the masses are developing politically, not from day to day, but from hour to hour, it would be extremely dangerous for the bourgeoisie to take its stand openly. In these circumstances, it would discredit these groups in the eyes of the masses, were they openly to flaunt a bourgeois programme. The only way "to save the situation" is to assume a mask of independence, is to pretend to be a harmless group, a group "for honesty, responsibility and justice". By acting this part, it is possible for them to fish in troubled waters.

No doubt, the Cadets and the strata allied to them, who do not dare to come out into the open and who are trying to get into the municipal administration by stealth, are hiding under the banner of the non-party lists.

It is characteristic that there is no single proletarian group among them, that all these independent groups have arisen from the ranks of the bourgeoisie and from them alone.

They are no doubt capable of catching a large number of confiding, naive electors in their net if they do not meet with resistance on the part of the revolutionary elements.

This is the whole secret!

For this reason, the "independent" danger is one of the most concrete dangers in the present campaign for the municipal elections.

This is why we must tear the mask of independence from their face and show the masses their real features, to enable them to form a correct estimate of these groups. That is one of the chief tasks of our campaign.

Down with the mask of independence! Hurrah for a clear and definite political line! This is our slogan.

What Do the Bolsheviki Demand of the Municipality?

(Published in the "Pravda" of May 22nd and 25th 1917).

General Theses.

1. The urban public administrative bodies are autonomous in their administrative, cultural and economic activities just as are the urban district administrative bodies.

The reciprocal relations between the chief urban administrative body and the district administrative bodies are determined by practice. The principle to be adopted is that of the highest measure of autonomy for the urban districts. Only that which by its nature demands centralisation, i. e. a more extensive concentration of activities, passes over to the highest and central institutions.

3. At the demand of a twentieth of the municipal electors, the municipal council is obliged to submit any question of communal policy which interests the citizens in question to discussion and to subject it to general voting. The same applies to the electors of the district councils.

The Franchise.

1. Every person, not under eighteen years of age, without distinction of sex, religion or nationality, living in the district in question, is entitled to vote for the district council; any person not under eighteen years of age etc. can be elected as a district councillor or as an official of the district council, independently of where he resides.

2. The election of the members of the town councils will be held on holidays.

3. The town councillors as well as the district councillors will receive compensation for every time they attend a meeting as well as for carrying out the duties imposed on them by their office.

Remark: The amount of the compensation will be determined by the town council.

4. The town councillors, the members of the municipal authority and the officials in responsible posts will be freshly elected every year. In these elections, some categories of officials (for instance judges, teachers, officers of the militia, tax inspectors) will be elected by original voting in the districts.

Remark: The circle of officials who are to be elected directly by the people will be determined by the town council.

5. The employees of the urban administrative bodies, as indeed all public officials, receive compensation.

Financial Policy.

1. The local administrations, including the district councils have an unrestricted right of autonomy to satisfy the requirements of the local population.

2. If the money procured through direct taxation is insufficient, the local administration will receive support from the higher central authorities.

3. Plan and principles of taxation:

a) Abolition of all forms of indirect taxation, both open and secret.

b) Exclusively direct taxation of the people in the form of taxes determined by the local administration itself and in the form of additional taxes imposed by the higher administrative authorities (for instance the Town Duma in Petrograd).

c) Forms of taxes: income tax, tax on capital, inheritance tax, tax on sales, tax on increased values etc.

4. The tax collecting offices for collecting both national and communal taxes must be organised on a strictly democratic basis and under the control of the local administration.

The system of financial policy developed here is closely bound up with general national and even international policy, and for its realisation, it is necessary that the working class and those strata of the population which side with it, should carry on a decisive fight against the ruling classes: 1. for the next special economic reforms such as the nationalisation of the land, of railways, mines, banks, syndicates etc. — 2. in order to bring to an end the imperialist war which is devouring many milliards, destroying the forces of production and devastating whole countries.

The Housing Question.

The autonomous local administrations must:

1. register all dwellings and other premises.

2. fix rents.

3. requisition those premises whose owners refuse to let them at the prices fixed and

4. hand over to those without a roof over their heads empty or partly empty (not densely inhabited) houses and premises (warehouses, castles etc.) in accordance with the actual lack of housing, also premises used for purposes of no social value such as luxurious restaurants, businesses which sell articles of luxury and palaces etc.

As a provisional measure, until the whole of the land in the country is nationalised, our party demands that all waste plots of land in the environment of towns be handed over to the local administrations for the erection of houses, laying out of parks etc.

The Party cannot hide from the population the fact that the lack of building materials, the ruin of transport, the lack of workers and other general phenomena connected with the war and with the rule of the bourgeoisie have almost completely arrested practical building activities.

Undertakings of Public Utility.

The urban administration and, if it is technically and economically possible, the district administrations also, must take under their control a number of undertakings of public utility which are still in the hands of private persons or syndicates.

1. Mills, means of river transport, soap-boiling works and other undertakings connected with the production and distribution of articles of general necessity must be in the hands of the people itself.

2. The following must also be communalised: baths, hospitals, chemical, hygienic and bacteriological laboratories and all other institutions of a hygienic and medical character.

3. Crematoria must be built.

B. It is also necessary that a water supply with good drinking water should be provided everywhere, as well as that sewage should be laid everywhere and that the waste matter be rendered harmless in sewage beds by way of biological cleansing.

C. Electricity and gas should be communalised.

* * *

In carrying all this out, neither existing nor new institutions of the urban or district administrations shall be the cause of indirect taxation of the people. The majority of the undertakings must therefore cost the population absolutely nothing, and only in individual cases must the cost price be paid.

The Labour Question and the Protection of Workers.

1. In all urban undertakings, the conditions of labours of the workers and employees must be model ones and must be determined by collective treaties to which the trade union representatives are a party.

2. In all urban undertakings, a minimum wage will be fixed.

a) Equal pay for equal work.

b) Equal pay for the work of men and women.

3. In all urban undertakings a maximum of eight hours' work will be fixed.

4. In all urban undertakings the following will be abolished:

a) Overtime.

b) Night-work. (With the exception of cases where it is technically necessary, to which the trade union organisations give their consent.)

A weekly time of recreation of 42 hours will be fixed.

5. The urban administration recognises April 18th (May 1st new style) as a legal Labour Day as well as a number of other proletarian holidays and days of mourning.

6. Urban employees and workers will be granted an annual holiday of one month with full pay.

Remark: All the regulations enumerated in §§ 1 to 6 are also binding for urban tradesmen.

7. The urban administration shall take part in the national insurance against sickness, old age, accidents, disablement, maternity, widowhood, orphanhood of its workers and employees as well as in unemployment insurance at the cost of the urban administration, while granting complete autonomy to the insured persons.

8. Women employees of the urban administration shall be freed from work eight weeks before and eight weeks after their confinement on full pay.

9. The urban administrations shall organise urban inspection, elected by the local labour organisations, for the protection of wage earners and especially of child labour, as well as for supervising that labour legislation in general be exactly carried out.

10. With the object of supporting the unemployed, the urban administrations shall, with the participation of the trade unions, organise public works and workshops and shall financially support the trade unions in their fight against unemployment.

11. Free legal help for workers.

12. With the object of regulating the supply and demand of work, the urban administrations shall organise a department of labour, one task of which shall be the collection of statistical data about questions of the life of the workers, about the supply and demand of work; in connection with these there shall be organised labour exchange offices free of charge.

Schools and Education.

1. General, obligatory, free, secular education at the cost of the State, which is brought into harmony with the manifold forms of productive work.

2. Establishment of as large a number as possible of creches and schools for mothers for children under school age.

3. Homes for destitute children, and schools for the abnormal, for the deaf and blind.

4. The organisation of special technical courses in factories and works under the management of special technicians and under the control of representatives of the labour organisations.

5. Free distribution of warm breakfasts, school requisites, clothing and shoes to all pupils.

6. School colonies, children's playgrounds, libraries, museums and people's clubs.

7. Obligatory medical supervision of the school premises.

8. The teachers to be elected by the whole population, and autonomy in the schools.

Chronicle of Events.

May 25.

Note of Wilson in reply to the Note of the Provisional Government regarding the war aims.

The Executive of the Petrograd workers and soldiers' Soviets issues an appeal giving the reasons which induced the members of the Soviet to enter the government.

Strike in the Petrograd chemical works.

Intensification of labour conflicts in Moscow.

Great strikes in Finland.

May 26.

French Note in reply to the Note of the Provisional Government regarding the war aims.

The Executive of the Kronstadt Workers' Soviet declares itself to be the only power in the town.

Appeal of the Moscow organisation of the Bolsheviks calling for protest demonstrations against the condemnation of Friedrich Adler to death.

In many factories of Moscow meetings of protest against the Vienna death sentence are taking place.

May 27.

Mass protest demonstration in Moscow under the lead of the Bolsheviks against the death sentence of Friedrich Adler. Many thousands of workers and soldiers as well as Austrian prisoners of war take part in this demonstration. Similar demonstrations take place in various other towns of Russia.

May 28.

The first number of "Pravda of the trenches" appears at the front.

The Provisional Government decides to issue an appeal calling on the workers to show moderation in their demands.

May 29.

Amnesty for Finnish prisoners.

Reinstatement of students who have been expelled from the universities for political reasons during Tsarism.

The Commissar of the government of Kronstadt resigns, giving as a reason the decision of the Kronstadt Soviet to take over the whole power in the town.

May 30.

The Plenum of the Kronstadt Workers' and soldiers' Soviet approves by 210 votes against 40, with 48 abstaining from voting, the decision of the Executive to take over the whole power in the town.

The Kronstadt Workers' Soviet declares every intoxicated person to be an enemy of the revolution. The property of those persons who are guilty of having sold alcoholic liquors is confiscated; any intoxicated man found in the street is sent to prison.

May 31.

Henderson arrives in Petrograd.

Punishment by knout and punishment by straight jacket in the military prisons is abolished by a government decree.

Minister for Trade, Konovalov, resigns because he does not agree with State control of production.

The deputy for the Minister of Trade, in a report to the Soviet, states that not a single railway line is in a good condition.

At the National Congress of the Peasants' Council the representative of the Bolsheviks submits a resolution drawn up by Lenin calling upon the peasants' councils to seize the land in an organised manner.

In Moscow the commercial employees go on strike on account of wage demands.

June 1.

Henderson declares in a session of the Provisional Government that the English and the Allies in general are waiting impatiently for the Russian people to join in the common offensive of the allied armies, as this is the only way to a peace in accordance with the ideals of free democracy.

June 2.

The Soviet Executive resolves to convene an International Socialist Conference in Stockholm for the 8th of July.

June 3.

National Food Congress in Petrograd.

June 4.

At the session of the Peasants' Council Comrade Lenin delivers a big speech on the agrarian question.

The workers Soviet discusses the events in Kronstadt.

The government sends Zeretelli and Skobelev to Kronstadt to settle the relations between the Kronstadt Soviet and the government.

June 5.

According to the newspaper "Rjetch" of June 7th, the Petrograd workers and soldiers' Soviet received a telegram from the Commander in Chief on the German East front according to which Germany is prepared to state her peace conditions — under the condition that Russia shall not insist on their publication and will conduct negotiations in secret.

Discussions between the representatives of the South Russian mineowners and the representatives of the South Russian Workers and Peasants Soviets. All demands of the workers are rejected.

June 6.

Demonstration of Moscow house porters, whose demands are not even listened to by the house owners.

The labour department of the Soviet discusses the further fate of the Tsar's family and the strike of the laundresses.

The social revolutionary Minister for Agriculture, Chernov, pronounces himself against the immediate confiscation of the land.

The Congress of the post and telegraph employees resolves to dismiss all those who have been in the service of the Tsarist secret police.

Report of Zeretelli and Skobelev on their mission to Kronstadt. The government accepts this report with thanks.

The Public Prosecutor submits a report to the Minister for Justice regarding the corruption case of the Tsarist Minister Suchomlinov.

June 7.

Protest demonstration in Kronstadt against the indulgence of the Kronstadt Soviet towards the Provisional Government.

The Moscow Soviet discusses the Stockholm Conference. Comrade Bukharin explains the standpoint of the Bolsheviks.

June 8.

The Kronstadt Soviet declares that it has not given in to the government, but that it adheres to its decision of June 3rd.

The Petrograd Soviet discusses events in Kronstadt. A sharp resolution against the action of the Kronstadt Soviet is adopted by 580 against 162 votes, 74 abstaining from voting.

The 52nd regiment refuses to go to the front and arrests its officers.

June 9.

The Chief Commander, Gurko, is dismissed from his post, as he repudiates responsibility for the declaration concerning the rights of military persons.

General Scherbachev reports that the disturbances among the soldiers on the Roumanian front have been liquidated.

In Petrograd the elections to the municipality are beginning. Three groups are entering the fight: 1. the Bolsheviks, the reconciliators (Trotzky), the international Mensheviks and the Polish, Lithuanian and other social democrats of the nationalities, 2. the social patriots, the followers of Plechanov, the Bund and the S.R. 3. the Cadets round which the greater part of the bourgeoisie is rallying.

In the Soviet Henderson delivers an inciting speech calling for the continuation of the war.

The Kronstadt Soviet appeals in a declaration to the whole of revolutionary and democratic Russia.

June 10.

The first machine gun-regiment arranges a street demonstration in Petrograd in honour of the Kronstadt sailors and soldiers and forcibly releases Comrade Semaschko from prison.

The Congress of the peasants' Councils condemns by a majority the action of the Kronstadt Soviet.