

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 53

15<sup>h</sup> September 1927

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

## C O N T E N T S

Gerhart: The Geneva Assembly of the League of Nations.  
**For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.**

Correspondence between the A. U. C. T. U. and the British General Council on the Convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The A. U. C. T. U. to the Trades Union Congress at Edinburgh.  
The "Pravda" on the Edinburgh Trades Union Congress.

**China.**

M. N. Roy: On the Eve of Chiang Kai-Shek's Return.

**Hands off the Soviet Union.**

L. Nikolayev: Chamberlain's Spies in the Soviet Union.

**Politics.**

J. B.: The Death of Zaghlul Pasha and its Importance for Egypt.

**The White Terror.**

Willi Schlamm: Vindictive Justice Rages in Vienna.  
The Life of a Pioneer of the Roumanian Proletariat in Danger.

**In the International.**

Anton Eriksson: The Party Conference of the C.P. of Denmark.

**The Co-operative Movement.**

Karl Bittel: The Political Result of the International Co-operative Congress.

**Ten Years Ago.**

Kornilov before the Gates of Petrograd.

Appeal of the C.C. of the Bolshevik Party against the Kornilov Putsch.

N. Lenin: One of the Fundamental Questions of Revolution.

N. Bukharin: The Kornilov Putsch and the Resistance of the Working Class.

G. Zinoviev: Two Paths.

Chronicle of Events.

## The Geneva Assembly of the League of Nations.

By Gerhart (Berlin).

After the conclusion of the Dawes Agreement the League of Nations attempted to solve the problem of security raised by France. The Anglo-French compromise arrived at at the time was laid down in the so-called **Geneva Protocol**, which represents a system of complicated and tangled formulae as to a general obligation concerning war and arbitration on the part of all the Powers which are members of the League of Nations. The initiative for this Protocol was taken by MacDonald as Foreign Minister in the Labour Government. After his overthrow the Conservative Government refused to ratify this Protocol, while France, on the other hand, was prepared to ratify it.

In place of the Geneva Protocol, of the system of guarantees for the League of Nations, there took place on the initiative of the English Conservative Government the Conference at Locarno. Direct treaties were concluded between England and France and Italy and Germany — which treaties were afterwards brought into the League of Nations system, — in which the Great Powers guarantee their respective Western and Eastern frontiers. Germany refused to conclude such a guarantee pact with Poland, and was supported in this respect by England.

The new Polish initiative at the present Assembly of the League of Nations aimed at carrying through by means of the League of Nations a guarantee pact for the German-Polish frontier; that is, to supplement the Western Locarno by an Eastern Locarno. In its decision Poland in fact again raised the Geneva Protocol by submitting for discussion the question of settlement by arbitration of all disputes by all members of the League of Nations and a general prohibition of war. The acceptance of the Polish proposal would have meant in fact for Poland the guarantee of its German frontiers by the League of Nations, while at present paragraph 19 of the League of Nations permits in theory a revision, and in the event of a war between Germany and Poland the League of Nations Council has to determine by unanimous vote who is the aggressor. This is an uncertain situation for Poland, which views with ill-will the growing power of Germany in all spheres and is by no means certain whether, in the event of a German-Polish war, Germany would not find a friend in the League of Nations, in which case it would be quite out of the question that Germany would be judged the aggressor and Poland receive the help of the League of Nations.

Besides this Polish action, behind which there undoubtedly

stood France, there was a Dutch proposal which is likewise an attempt to take up again the Geneva Protocol with the general prohibition of a war. It is not yet clear whether a great Power, and if so which, is behind the Dutch proposal, or whether it only represents, what is not unlikely, a rebellion on the part of the small Powers against the policy of the big Powers.

The Polish and the Dutch proposal aroused the fierce resistance of Chamberlain, so that Stresemann, who is backed up in the question of the rejection of an Eastern Locarno by the entire German "public", from the German Nationalists to the social democrats, is following at the heels of England. Chamberlain succeeded with the help of his German and Italian satellites in inducing the French Foreign Minister, Briand, to united action. The result of this compromise among the great Powers was that the Polish formula was altered and amended until it lost all content and was converted into a general non-committal formula of the great Powers.

The Geneva Assembly is taking place in an atmosphere of concentration policy and war preparations on the part of English imperialism against the Soviet Union, of Anglo-American tension as a result of the failure of the Naval Disarmament Conference, and the growing strength of the new German imperialism.

At Locarno England succeeded in pushing back France and coming forward as the mediator between Germany and France. British imperialism thereby again set up its traditional policy as arbitrator on the Continent, which policy had become extremely weakened by the Treaty of Versailles with its enormous strengthening of France and the dismemberment of Germany. English policy on the Continent aimed at playing off one against the other the interests of the various European States, to hold one State in check by means of another and thus to organise by a delicate balance a Continental bloc under its leadership against the Soviet Union.

The meaning of the Polish action was the attempt of France to take advantage of the situation which has altered in its favour and to take revenge for Locarno. Poincaré succeeded in bringing about the relative stabilisation of France. England's designs against Russia render it more dependent upon the wishes of France, particularly in view of the complicated Anglo-American relations following on the failure of the Naval Disarmament Conference.

The greater dependence of England upon France, the greater yielding on the part of England to the policy of Poincaré was shown already in a number of cases in the months prior to the meeting of the League. Poincaré, who is the real leader of French foreign policy, obstinately refused to evacuate the Rhineland as promised at Locarno and Thoiry. The French press of the Right leaves no doubt that it is in the occupation of the Rhineland and not in the Locarno treaties there exists a guarantee against the secret armaments of Germany and against the German intentions to revise the German-Polish frontiers.

The stronger economic, financial and world-political situation of France has led it to fight for the regaining of its lost positions in Europe under more favourable conditions. France is working in the first place at building barricades against the growing power of Germany, one of the most important of which barricades is the security of Poland.

The Polish attempt to bring about an Eastern pact just in this situation was due also to another reason, which should make it more palatable for England. Such a pact which submits the German-Polish frontiers to the guarantee of the League of Nations, is intended to give Poland a freer hand in the Baltic Border States, increase the pressure on Lithuania and facilitate the organisation of a bloc against Soviet Russia. Thus the Polish proposal was directed against Soviet Russia. But France, much inclined as it is to take part in the fight against the Soviet Union, as the declarations of Foch, the campaign against the Soviet Ambassador Rakovsky and other cases show, is not inclined to make concessions to Germany in return for the latter's participation in and organisation of such a fight. France is quite aware that it must pay every English concession to Germany.

Chamberlain and the English delegation opposed very sharply the Polish and Dutch plan. The English delegation had to repel the Franco-Polish advance. A number of England's

Dominions (Canada, Australia) had already after Locarno viewed with mixed feelings England's guarantee of the Western frontiers. A further guarantee for the "Alsace Lorraine" of the East would arouse fierce opposition on the part of and increase the tendencies to independence in the English Dominions. That is what Chamberlain meant when he declared, he could not sacrifice the British Empire even to the League of Nations. In addition, there is the fact that Chamberlain, much as he is prepared to make concessions to France, could not risk giving such a blow to Germany. That would have meant that the English policy of balance of power on the Continent had made a perceptible turn in favour of France.

In the comments of the English Conservative press on the attitude of Chamberlain against the Eastern Pact it is suggested to Poland that it seek the way of a direct understanding with Germany. English imperialism wishes to exclude France and the League of Nations from German-Polish relations.

Stresemann and the German delegation were dragged helplessly in the wake of England. There is not the least doubt that Stresemann is making concessions for the friendship of England at the expense of Soviet Russia.

The Geneva Assembly of the League reveals the profound differences among the imperialists. But it shows at the same time that these profound differences can be bridged over and recede into the background before the more deeply-rooted interest of building a bloc against the Soviet Union.

## FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

### **Correspondence Between the A. U. C. T. U. and the British General Council on the Convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee.**

At the Extraordinary Plenum of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, Comrade Dogadov, after the acceptance of the declaration to the British Trades Union Congress, read out the correspondence that had passed between the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union and the General Council on the convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

#### LETTER FROM THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE A. U. C. T. U.\*)

The General Council of the Trades Union Congress.

27th July, 1927.

To Mr. A. Dogadov,

Secretary of the A. U. C. T. U.,  
Workers' Palace,

Solyanka 12.

Moscow.

Dear Mr. Dogadov,

Re the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The General Council at its meeting to-day discussed the proposal of the A. U. C. T. U. regarding the convocation of an extraordinary meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

As we informed you in our letter of 22nd June last, the question was postponed at the last meeting in order to give the International Committee (of the General Council) the opportunity of delivering a report on the incidents that have occurred between the General Council and the A. U. C. T. U. following on the recent correspondence between these two organisations and the declarations and explanations of Mr. Tomsky and the A. U. C. T. U.

After the International Committee had made known its standpoint it was decided to send the enclosed statement to your Council.

\*) Retranslated from the German.

I would request the A. U. C. T. U. to consider carefully the questions contained in this statement and wish to inform you that the General Council will discuss afresh the question of the future of the Anglo-Russian Committee and also the proposal of your Central Council regarding the convocation of this Committee in the light of the answer received from the A. U. C. T. U.

Yours faithfully  
Walter Citrine, General Secretary.

#### TRADES UNION CONGRESS GENERAL COUNCIL.

#### DRAFT STATEMENT OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE TRADES UNION CONGRESS AND THE ALL-RUSSIAN COUNCIL OF TRADE UNIONS.

(As approved by the International Committee at their meeting held 12th July, 1927.)

1. The General Council have given serious consideration to the request of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions for the convening of an early meeting of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council. The General Council deem it necessary to state the principal considerations which have influenced them in reviewing this question.

2. The Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council was established as the result of a joint meeting between representatives of the General Council and the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, held in April, 1925, which was convened to discuss the difficulties arising in connection with the negotiations between the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions and the International Federation of Trade Unions. The General Council was actuated by the desire to promote International Trade Union unity by using its mediatory influence as between the Russian Trade Union Movement and the International Federation of Trade Unions.

3. It was felt that closer contact should be established between the Trade Union Movements of Great Britain and of the U. S. S. R. and the following proposals were adopted:

a) It will be our aim to promote co-operation between the British Trades Union Congress General Council and the All-Russian Trades Union Council in every way that may be considered from time to time advisable; for the purpose of promoting international unity.

b) For this purpose we agree that facilities should be provided: for a free exchange of documents between the Trade Union Movements of Russia and Great Britain, including the collection of copies of Trade Union business documents showing the rules and regulations of British Unions, the system of State insurance and unemployment insurance, contributions and benefits, the keeping of Trade Union accounts, systems of local and district organisations, methods of appointing Trade Union officials, and other general information or special documents dealing with the structure of Trade Union machinery and the general policy of Trade Union organisation and control.

c) To arrange for an exchange of memoranda on special subjects of mutual interest, with a view to joint discussions regarding important principles such as may be from time to time considered necessary.

d) As opportunities are provided, a further extension of joint contacts may be devised for the purpose of developing the closest possible mutual aid between the two countries.

e) For the purpose of dealing with any questions which may arise in connection with the objects outlined in previous paragraphs and of dealing with special emergencies, a Joint Advisory Council representing the Russian and the British Trade Union Movements should be established consisting of the Chairmen and Secretaries of both bodies together with three members each of the All-Russian Trade Union Council and the British Trades Union Congress General Council.

f) For the purpose of operating the joint machinery, the representatives of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions agree to create an International Committee of their Council corresponding to the International Committee of the British Trades Union Congress General Council.

4. The above proposals were ratified by the Scarborough 1925 Congress, and at the first meeting of the A. R. J. A. C. on the 28th September, 1925, it was expressly stipulated

"That the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress and the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions shall be recognised as the sole medium of expression on International Trade Union Unity in Great Britain and the U. S. S. R. respectively,"

5. In June, 1926, following the National Strike, the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions publicly issued a most unjustifiable and bitter attack upon the General Council, criticising violently the conduct of that Strike by the General Council.

Subsequent meetings of the A. R. J. A. C. were held on the 30th July, 1926, at Paris, and on the 25th August, 1926, at Berlin, at which strong protests were made on behalf of the General Council by the British representatives, at this unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of the British Trade Union Movement.

6. Mr. Tomsy was appointed Fraternal Delegate to the Bournemouth Congress in September, 1926, and, despite our efforts, was prohibited by the action of the Home Secretary from attending. The All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, however, utilised the opportunity to issue, under the guise of conveying a message from their Fraternal Delegate, a further unprovoked attack upon the General Council. The Bournemouth Congress recorded its emphatic condemnation at this degradation of the position of Fraternal Delegate by the Russians; whose action is unparalleled in the history of the British Trades Union Congress.

7. The General Council, therefore would have been justified in recommending the termination of the A. R. J. A. C. They, however, were influenced against such action, lest it should give encouragement to interests hostile to Russia which were agitating for a severance of diplomatic and trading relations between Great Britain and Russia.

8. The General Council, however, felt it imperative that the British Trade Union Movement should be safeguarded from a repetition of the interference which had taken place, and accordingly drafted proposals to prevent a misunderstanding of the Constitution.

9. These proposals were submitted to a meeting of the A. R. J. A. C. held on the 30th March, 1927, at Berlin. At that meeting the Russian representatives expressed their sincere desire to avoid any further friction and misunderstanding, and it was agreed that the constitution should be amended and codified.

10. The following Resolution, adopted at the Berlin meeting was unanimously agreed by the Russian and British representatives and subsequently confirmed by the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions and the British Trades Union Congress General Council:

I. "The Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council unanimously reaffirm the sincere desire and readiness of the Trade Union movements of both countries to do everything in their power to create, by their joint effort, the unity of the International Trade Union movement.

II. The A. R. J. A. C. further declares that the essential condition for success in the struggle for the International Unity of Labour against Capitalism is a firm fraternal union between the Trade Union movements of Great Britain and the U. S. S. R. It testifies its readiness to develop systematically and strengthen the existing friendly relations between those movements.

III. This development should be in the direction of more active mutual aid and support, based on the unconditional recognition of the principle that the sole representative and medium of expression of the Trade Union Movement of Great Britain is the British Trades Union Congress and its General Council, while in the U. S. S. R. the corresponding bodies are the Trades Union Congress and the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions.

IV. The A. R. J. A. C. considers as valuable and necessary the mutual co-ordination of activity in the sphere of international policy as between the General Council and the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions, together with the exchange of materials and experiences in respect of internal work. At the same time it considers that the fraternal alliance between the Trade Union movements of both countries, embodied in the A. R. J. A. C. cannot, and must not in any degree whatsoever impair the internal authority of the British

Trades Union Congress General Council or the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions, or infringe or limit their rights and autonomy, as the directing bodies of the Trade Union movement of their respective countries or allow any intervention in their internal affairs.

V. The A. R. J. A. C. considers it necessary in the interests of greater co-ordination and simplification of the work of the Council that a detailed agenda for every meeting of the A. R. J. A. C., with any addition and alteration, together with the order of business should be preliminarily discussed and agreed upon at a business meeting of the Chairmen and Secretaries of both bodies.

VI. The A. R. J. A. C. considers it desirable to codify in a single document the "Proposals for mutual aid", providing for the organisational relations between the Trade Union Movements of Great Britain and the U. S. S. R. which were adopted by the A. R. J. A. C.; the provisions and principles laid down in the present declaration, and resolutions previously adopted and minuted which bear upon this question.

VII. The preparatory work in this direction shall be carried out by the Secretaries of the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress and the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions and reported upon to the next meeting of the A. R. J. A. C.

VIII. The A. R. J. A. C. expresses its complete conviction that the fraternal ties between the Trade Union movements of both countries will develop and grow stronger and that the A. R. J. A. C. which embodies this Alliance will unwaveringly and persistently struggle for the unity of the International Trade Union movement."

11. Clauses 3 and 4 of this resolution dealing with the constitution as quoted above were designed to secure both Movements against interference in their internal affairs based upon the unconditional recognition of the full authority of the General Council and the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions respectively.

12. The sincere desire was expressed by both sides at the Berlin meeting that the revised constitution should be observed in the spirit as well as the letter by all concerned.

13. Despite this the Constitution was violated by Mr. Tomsky, who in an interview published in the British Communist paper, "The Workers' Life" on May 13th, attacked the General Council, the Conference of Trade Union Executives, which was held on the 29th April, 1927, and prominent individual members of the British Labour Movement in connection with their attitude towards the Trade Union Bill.

14. Mr. Tomsky, in reply to a studiously moderated request for an explanation, indulged in flippancy and put forward the claim that he could not be bound by the Berlin declarations. A moment's consideration will show the worthlessness of declarations which while officially binding the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions and the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress, allowed the individual members to interfere, criticise or abuse without restraint. The freedom which Mr. Tomsky claimed for himself as an individual could not be denied to every other member of both bodies, and if his contention was sound a perfectly impossible situation would result.

15. On May 14th a telegram was received from the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions urgently requesting a meeting of the A. R. J. A. C. to consider the situation developing between the Governments of Great Britain and the U. S. S. R.

16. Correspondence ensued and on June 8th a letter was received, dated June 3rd, signed by Messrs. Tomsky and Dogadov, recapitulating the correspondence which has passed and urging a meeting of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council.

17. The correspondence was considered by the International Committee of the General Council on June 9th; who, having regard to all the circumstances, suggested a meeting of the Chairmen and Secretaries of both bodies in Berlin for a preliminary discussion of the matters proposed to be referred to the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council. A telegram to that effect was despatched to the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions on the following day.

18. On June 11th a peremptory telegram "categorically insisting" upon a meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee was received from the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions. On June 13th a letter was received from the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions stating that if no definite answer was given

by the 14th June to the request for a meeting, they would publish the correspondence. The language used in certain of the correspondence demanding this meeting was of a decidedly dictatorial and provocative kind.

19. The meeting took place on the 18th and 19th June when the Russian representatives urged a meeting of the A. R. J. A. C. on the grounds of the imminence of a military attack upon Russia. At the same time it was stated that it had been decided by the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions to publish the correspondence which had taken place. Subsequently it transpired that the correspondence was printed in the "Sunday Worker" of that same date, which meant that it must have been forwarded to this paper by the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions some time before for publication.

20. The publication of the correspondence was done without the consent of the General Council and contrary to the Resolution agreed to in Berlin, and was evidently intended as a threat to compel the Council to acquiesce in the calling of a meeting. Neither in the correspondence nor in the discussions between the Chairmen and Secretaries was any substantial evidence given to support the view that a meeting of the Anglo-Russian Council could usefully have taken place, other than a general reference to the International situation and the danger of war against Russia.

21. The Russian representatives declared that they would be able to put before the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council evidence which would demonstrate the imminent danger of war. It was stated by the British representatives that such a matter was more properly the business of an international body like the International Federation of Trade Unions rather than the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council because border States belonging to the I. F. T. U. would be involved and they would not be represented at the meetings of the Council.

22. It was pointed out that the General Council had already publicly protested, both in a letter on the 13th of May to the Prime Minister at the time of the Arcos Raid and subsequently in a considered declaration against the severance of diplomatic and trading relations on the grounds that this might endanger the preservation of peace and have serious economic consequences.

23. A report of the conference at Berlin between the Chairmen and Secretaries was considered by the General Council at their meeting on 22nd June, and it was decided that a statement be drafted, setting forth the Council's views.

24. On the 8th July, 1927, the British Press contained a declaration of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, protesting against the failure of the General Council to summon the A. R. J. A. C., and making accusations against the General Council of "sabotage, opposition, procrastination and evasion". It was stated that the General Council had done nothing to protest against the raid on Arcos, or the breaking off of diplomatic relations between the respective Governments, and was accused of treason.

25. The General Council have shown the utmost patience and restraint throughout in their dealings with the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions. They have repeatedly endured abuse and the bitterest criticism in circumstances which rendered their attitude liable to be misconstrued into weakness. They have found it difficult to understand the attitude of mind which calls for co-operation between the representatives of two organisations, one of which publicly stigmatises the other as "traitors, renegades and capitalist lackeys".

26. The Council have endeavoured to preserve the contact they established with the Russian Trade Union Movement, not because they agreed with all the actions of that Movement, but because they felt that the problems of the Russian Movement could best be solved by the Russian workers themselves, unhindered by the sense of isolations that might result from a break up of the A. R. J. A. C.

27. It was with that purpose that the General Council, while at the same time desiring to safeguard the autonomy of both the Russian and British Trade Union Movements in their respective spheres, put forward the proposals for an amplified constitution. No constitution governing the relations of both these movements, however worded, can be efficacious unless honourably and loyally accepted, and honoured both in the letter and spirit, by all concerned.

**THE REPLY OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL OF THE TRADE UNIONS OF THE SOVIET UNION TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE BRITISH TRADES UNION CONGRESS.**

The Presidium of the Central Council of Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R. has considered the declaration of the International Committee of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress appended to your letter of July 27. The Presidium regards this declaration, which appears to be an indictment of the Central Council of Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R., as an attempt, by levelling petty accusations, to evade important questions that now confront the labour movement in Britain and in the U.S.S.R. The fact that this indictment appeared at a moment when the Conservative Government, having broken off relations with the U.S.S.R., is preparing for an imperialist war against the Soviet Republics is, in our opinion, evidence that the authors of this declaration are preparing to break up the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee in order to assist the Conservative Government to continue its military preparations unhampered. In fact, your chronological survey, when supplemented by facts and backed by convincing documents, is a crushing indictment, not of the Central Council of Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R., but of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress.

Your chronological survey lays stress upon certain declarations made by the Central Council of Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R.; particularly upon our declaration of June 9, 1926, concerning the betrayal of the General Strike (Point 5) and upon the interview given by our chairman, Comrade Tomsky on the coercive Trade Union Bill (points 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14). Our declaration of June 9 last asserted that labour's self-sacrificing struggle was cruelly betrayed, and that the capitalists secured the opportunity, under the guidance of the Conservative Government, to continue their cruel offensive against the workers. Our declaration has been fully confirmed by all subsequent events. At the Conference in January 1927, the miners' leaders unreservedly stated that the cause of their severe defeat was the black betrayal of the 12th of May 1926. In the light of all the events that followed the 12th of May, the Central Council of Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R. feels justified in declaring that its estimation of the events of the 12th of May was opportune, proletarian in spirit and correctly branded those who were guilty of creating the situation, namely, — the Right wing and "Left" wing members of the General Council who assisted the mineowners and the government to isolate the miners and thus doomed them to defeat.

The ideas which were expressed by our chairman in his interview concerning the Trade Union Bill, which has been quite rightly described by the British workers as the "strike-breakers' Charter", have also been fully confirmed. This draconic measure, which robs the British proletariat of the gains of a century of struggle, passed into law, not only because the General Council as a whole abstained from leading the working class in the struggle against the Bill, but also because it hampered the mass labour movement which was carried on to prevent the measure being passed.

As for our right to criticise crimes committed against the working class irrespective of who commits them, we consider it necessary once and for all categorically to declare, that we have never abandoned and never will abandon this sacred right. The workers of the U.S.S.R. have been trained in the struggle against secret diplomacy in all its forms and manifestations. We have not the slightest doubt that our hatred towards secret diplomacy is shared by the British workers.

The Central Council of the Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R. regards itself as a body elected by the masses of the workers to whom it is responsible for all its actions. It regards it as a crime to cloak its work in secrecy and particularly to conceal the treachery of leaders towards the working class. We consider the fact that the workers who elected us would never tolerate a policy of silence and concealment in connection with hostile actions of certain leaders towards the interests of the working class, as an enormous gain.

We categorically repudiate all your accusations concerning our alleged "interference" in your internal affairs. All our so-called interference consisted in that from the very first hour of the declaration of the General Strike in England we mo-

bilised all our forces to secure victory for the British proletariat. Your General Council's first response to the great demonstration of proletarian solidarity on the part of the workers of the U.S.S.R. was a rejection of this fraternal aid. Subsequently, it, behind the backs of the British workers, betrayed the strike; it did everything in its power to prevent us by joint efforts from helping to secure victory for the miners. At the same time we considered it to be not only our proletarian right, but also our proletarian duty to speak the truth concerning the betrayal to the enemy of the heroic proletarian army of the miners, and the fact that this betrayal released the hands of the Conservative Government to continue the attacks on the standards of living of the British workers, to intensify the criminal war against China and to make preparations for a new, horrible war against the first Socialist State.

It goes without saying that we most emphatically and categorically repudiate your attempt to interpret the decisions of the Berlin Conference of March last to mean that we have abandoned the right to criticise and expose, and that we have assumed the function of screening the activities of the General Council. Here we add that throughout the whole period of the existence of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee "prominent" leaders of the British labour movement have indulged in slander of the first Republic of Labour, its leaders and the leaders of our trade union movement. We have never been of the opinion and are not of the opinion now that the establishment of the Anglo-Russian Advisory Committee deprived either side of the right to give expression to and defend its opinions.

The British workers will agree with us when we say that your attempts in a number of points (15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20) to indict us for having insisted upon the calling of a special conference for the purpose of combating the menace of war and for having published the correspondence on this matter, do not stand criticism. It was the duty of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee to raise the voice of emphatic protest against the menace of war and, in insisting upon the calling of a special conference of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee we merely fulfilled our duty. It was also our duty towards the interests, not only of the workers of Great Britain and the U.S.S.R., but of the workers of the whole world to publish our correspondence, in order that everyone, without exception, may know the truth concerning those who are fighting against war and those who on various pretexts are sabotaging the struggle against the menace of war, and by that means are helping to organise this war.

In our opinion your declaration pursues also another aim. By means of your chronological survey, drawn up after the event (see Points 1, 2, 3 etc.), you try to make it appear that the Anglo-Russian Conference in April, was convened for the purpose of discussing the difficulties arising in connection with the negotiations between the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R. and the Amsterdam International, and that the principal function of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee was to secure that the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R. and the General Council should secure certain facilities in regard to exchange of documents concerning the trade union movement. We categorically protest against the attempt, after the event, to minimise the significance of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee, which was established to combat by joint effort the capitalist offensive, war and the menace of war, to fight for trade union unity and for a united class conscious trade union International.

Your attempt to represent the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee as a committee for the interchange of documents runs like a thread throughout the whole of your chronological survey, but you ignore the principal fact, namely, that in the declaration adopted at the conference of April 1925 (p. 2) you cite only those parts of the resolution of the Scarborough Congress and of the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee of 1925 which are of secondary importance. We regard this peculiar restriction of the functions of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee, after the event, as an attempt on the part of the General Council to seek justification for its policy of sabotage, which aims at paralysing the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee and thus to clear the way for its ultimate liquidation.

We most emphatically reject such a method of interpreting the history of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee.



We are convinced that the activities of the A. R. J. A. C. and also the responsibilities of the both sections of the Committee can and should be tested only in the light of the obligations which the Committee undertook at the time of its formation before the proletariat of the whole world.

The declaration jointly adopted at the April Conference contains the following:

"1. The Joint Conference affirms that national and international unity must be recognised as the first essential condition to enable the Trade Union movement to defend effectively the present position of the workers against attack, and to achieve the social and political aims of organised labour, as set forth in the declaration made by the workers of many countries.

7. Already it would appear that a new war, more terrible, more monstrous than anything known hitherto is being prepared. New weapons of destruction are being devised; the chemists and scientific thinkers of European countries are devoting their knowledge and skill to the task of inventing new weapons of torture and destruction for use, not only against the soldier, but also against the civilian. In the meantime, the so-called disarmament Conferences are merely encouraging dangerous illusions. They are being used to deceive the workers and lull them into a false sense of security. But the capitalist politicians and the employing interests are no longer able to hide the fact that new armaments are being built up, greater than before and more deadly.

8. There is but one power that can save mankind from being plunged into another universal catastrophe. There is but one power which can defend the workers of all countries against political and economic oppression and tyranny. There is but one power which can bring freedom, welfare, happiness and peace to the working class and to humanity. That power is the working class if well-organised, properly disciplined, self-devoted and determined to fight all who would oppose and prevent its complete emancipation. The working classes, if united nationally and internationally, would constitute an insuperable barrier to capitalist oppression and an unbreakable bond of peace and economic security. The workers are able to defeat all those who by their reactionary tendencies keep the workers divided. So long as the capitalist system continues there is danger of war. The merciless struggle for supremacy between the conflicting vested interests of competing groups of exploiters will, as in the past, eventually provoke a new crisis plunging the workers of the world into another disastrous war.

For the above reasons the British and Russian Trade Union representatives re-affirm the agreement made in Moscow between the representatives of British and Russian organised labour to promote international good will amongst the workers as a means of more adequately safeguarding the interests of international peace.

As a result of the discussions at this London Conference and of the agreement reached there, joint efforts as provided in the procedure laid down in the British declarations, will be made to induce the Amsterdam International, in all good will to agree to a free, unconditional and immediate Conference with representatives of the Russian Trade Union Movement."

(Declaration of 6th—8th April, 1925.)

It is in the light of these our joint decisions that the activities of the A. R. J. A. C. should be tested.

We assert that the General Council has grossly violated and continues to violate these decisions contrary to the interests of the working class of Great Britain and of the U. S. S. R.

Formally, the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee was in existence at the time when the capitalist offensive assumed exceptional dimensions in a number of countries and particularly in England itself. The A. R. J. A. C. did not react to this offensive, through the fault of the British Section. We speak of the A. R. J. A. C. and not of the workers of Great Britain or the U. S. S. R. The British workers retaliated to the lockout declared by mineowners against the British miners, by a mighty demonstration of solidarity, manifested in the nine days' Ge-

neral Strike. This fight was betrayed by Thomas, Pugh and their henchmen on the 12th of May 1926. The British workers and the workers of the U. S. S. R. exerted every effort to secure victory for the miners. Through the fault of the British Section, the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee remained silent.

As for the General Council, at first it rejected the fraternal aid offered by the Soviet Trade Unions (during the General Strike) and subsequently did its utmost to prevent joint efforts from being made to assist the miners.

Formally, the A. R. J. C. A. existed at the time when the British Government, in concert with other capitalist governments, commenced a savage war against China, a war which is being conducted to this day. Under cover of the armed forces of Britain and of other capitalist States, the various militarists are savagely slaughtering the militant leaders of the Chinese people. Through the fault of the British Section, the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee has not reacted to this executionist war. The workers of the U. S. S. R. regard the struggle of the Chinese workers as their own and have tried and still try in every way to help to bring about the victory of the workers and peasants of China. In England a number of committees were set up to combat intervention in China. But the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee remained silent.

Our attempts to rouse the A. R. J. A. C. to action and to come out in defence of the Chinese people against the British and other imperialists have proved fruitless.

The Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee was in existence when the British Government perpetrated the raid on Arcos, broke off relations with the U. S. S. R. and began openly to prepare for war against the First Socialist State. Even the A. R. J. A. C. refrained from taking any measures to avert the danger of a most frightful, cruel and frankly counter-revolutionary war. Your proposal to submit the question of fighting against war to the so-called International Federation of Trade Unions meant to give the matter a first-class funeral. The workers of Britain and of the U. S. S. R. have known and know now that the imposing sign-board of the "International Federation of Trade Unions" screens a small clique of reactionary reformists who, formally, are led by the brazen flunkey of capitalism, Oudegeest, behind whose back the wires are pulled by the Sassenbachs and Leiparts. None other than Mr. Brown, the British Secretary of this Federation, at its IV. Congress proved by facts and documents that Oudegeest and his colleagues were mainly engaged in intriguing against the unity of the trade unions and particularly in intriguing against the British and Soviet labour organisations.

Therefore, to transfer the task of combating war to the Amsterdam International would have the same political sense as submitting the fate of the miners to the hands of that capitalist agent, Sir Herbert Samuel.

We have stated that on the 12th of May the General Council betrayed the miners' strike. It is our duty now to add that the General Council is now equally betraying the cause of peace, releasing the hands of the Baldwin Government to continue the attack on the conditions of labour of the British workers, to continue the executionist war in China and to prepare for a fresh imperialist war against the U. S. S. R.

We most emphatically reject the General Council's opinion that its letter to the Prime Minister of May 3rd, concerning the raid on Arcos and its declaration against the breach of diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R. can be regarded as effective opposition to the preparations for war against the First Socialist State. There was another occasion in the history of England when the British Government tried to pass from partial intervention to open war against the U. S. S. R., but then it encountered the determined and organised resistance of the British workers. We refer to August 1920. The British workers on that occasion retaliated by establishing Councils of Action, which proved effective in staying the hand of Lloyd George. The protests and declarations to which you refer can merely have the effect of weakening the vigilance of the masses of the workers and providing the Conservative Government, — the very Government which condemned the British miners to an increase in working hours and to an existence of semi-starvation, the very Government which has deprived the British workers of the trade union rights for which they have fought

for decades — with the opportunity to continue the war against China and to prepare for war against the U. S. S. R.

Summing up what has been said above we come to the conclusion that the representatives of the General Council on the A. R. J. A. C. have hampered the Committee in the fulfilment of its duty to fight against the capitalist offensive against military intervention in China and against the new dangers of an imperialist war. To this we will add that the General Council has failed even to carry out the very elementary decision of the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee of January 1926, to convene a conference of representatives of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the U. S. S. R. and of the Amsterdam International to discuss the question of trade union unity.

On the other hand, the whole history of the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee is eloquent and convincing proof of the fact that the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the U. S. S. R. has throughout made strenuous efforts to induce the A. R. J. A. C. to fulfil its obligations towards the working class of Great Britain and of the U. S. S. R. However, all the proposals made by our representatives on the A. R. J. A. C. concerning the fight against the capitalist offensive, against the war and the menace of war, in favour of trade union unity and for aid to the British miners were either rejected or, if some of them were adopted, they were deliberately sabotaged.

True to our traditions and in complete accord with the interests of the working class we honestly, openly and justly bring to the knowledge of the masses of the workers of the U. S. S. R. and of Great Britain the policy of sabotage which the General Council has been carrying on in regard to the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee and the treacherous policy which the General Council has conducted towards the miners and other British workers (the Trade Union Act), on the question of war (the imperialist war against China), and the menace of war (the preparations being made by the Conservative Government for war against the U. S. S. R.).

In acting in this way, we are merely fulfilling the duty of proletarians and revolutionaries to the working class. We have criticised and exposed those actions of the General Council which we regard as being criminal and harmful to the interests of the working class. We have always been prepared and are still prepared to listen to criticism of the activities of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the U. S. S. R. that may be levelled by the working class of Great Britain and its representatives; for we believe that representatives of the working class cannot and must not fear the light of publicity; they cannot and must not conceal the truth from the workers. We believe that the masses of the workers of Great Britain and of the U. S. S. R. alone can serve as the judges in this case and that the so-called leaders cannot escape their judgement, no matter what tricks they may resort to and in spite of all their efforts to break up the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee.

Moscow, 30th August, 1927.

Central Council of Trade Unions  
of the Soviet Union.

## **The A. U. C. T. U. to the Trades Union Congress at Edinburgh.**

We publish below the full text of the telegram sent by the A. U. C. T. U. to the Trades Union Congress at Edinburgh, Ed.

To the Trades Union Congress.

The Soviet C. C. T. U., on behalf ten million U. S. S. R. organised workers greets in person your congress. British workers labouring under heavy blows of reaction. U. S. S. R. workers follow struggle British workers during past year with keenest attention. Blows dealt at British workers felt with equal weight by us. Together with miners we experienced horrors of defeat consequent upon betrayal General Strike and caused both by treachery twelfth May and continued sabotage mineworkers heroic struggle. We also thoroughly understood that enslaving Bill coming into force entirely as result on one hand of miners defeat and on other hand of deliberate sabotage

of struggle against Bill by Labour Party Liberal leaders and General Council Reformist leaders, deprives British workers hard-won privileges of century. This Blackleg Charter represents victory governmental conservatives not only over British workers but over workers of world. Miners defeat and Blackleg Charter enabled bankers and mineowners Government to embark murderous war against China and prepare bloody adventure against U. S. S. R.

Despite numerous blows falling on British and world workers we continue to believe creative power British workers, their capacity to recover after defeat and drive from their midst capitalist and imperialist lackeys and once more embark on revolutionary struggle.

Strength and discipline British working class showed themselves in famous nine days' General Strike. These days showed also source of weakness British working class and causes strength its enemies. First nine days of General Strike gave example whole world of class solidarity and iron working class discipline. Ninth day showed tragic situation army led by traitors Thomas and followers such as Hicks and Purcell who now together with Labour Party leaders are nourishing workers on illusions as to parliamentary government ability solve all working class problems. They ignore bourgeois machinations disarming workers in daily struggle promising easy victory of vote in near future thus misleading workers to defeat. We are profoundly convinced present Congress will draw proper conclusions from last years lessons.

We consider first immediate task check attack of capital in England itself daily encroaching with increasing insolence on British workers' labour conditions. Second task struggle against predatory British imperialism which not content with scourging own workers carrying on murderous war in China strangling peoples all over Empire. Third task struggle against new imperialistic war directed in all its intensity against first Socialist State and being prepared in face of world.

Solution these problems demands first of all substitution of old bankrupt leadership by fresh bold honest working class leaders conducting workers struggle against their enemies with complete personal disinterestedness. But mere efforts by British working class even under leadership courageous honest working class leaders insufficient. Combined working class forces in all countries including oppressed peoples imperative. Last Congress Amsterdam International proved that this international Federation under thumb group corrupt career mongers lackeys of capitalism and schemers placing personal interests above interests working masses. Fighting International uniting Trade Union whole world in struggle against capitalism and Imperialism. essential. We consider, as before, that Anglo-Russian committee set up by efforts British and Soviet working class might be instrument to unite not only British and U. S. S. R. workers but workers whole world. But this instrument class struggle sabotaged General Council leaders just as they sabotaged all other instruments of class struggle. They have chosen way of Baldwin Government instead of workers way. Baldwin before rupture diplomatic relations produced groundless accusations. General Council also produces groundless accusations against Soviet Trade Unions as pretext for breaking off relations. This is not working class solidarity but united front between General Council and Conservative Government.

Sending British workers fraternal greetings we consider our duty on behalf U. S. S. R. workers preparing celebration tenth anniversary working class power to state that we are always and everywhere prepared to struggle together with British workers shoulder to shoulder against common foes especially against menacing war now being worked up by your Government which in scope and severity will exceed even so-called "great" imperialistic war.

Forward struggle and victory British working class.  
Down with imperialist war and its incendiaries.  
Long live Chinese revolution.  
Long live struggle against attack of capital.  
Long live workers international unity.

Fraternal greetings

Soviet Central Council Trade Unions  
Dogadov, Secretary.

## The "Pravda" on the Edinburgh Trades Union Congress.

Moscow, 7th September, 1927.

The "Pravda" points out that even before its opening, the congress of the British Trade Unions in Edinburgh justified the expectations of Baldwin. The first day of the Congress showed that despite the disagreement of the working masses, the Congress did not intend to go beyond the bounds laid down by Baldwin. The speech of Hicks was that of a strike-breaker from beginning to end.

The "Pravda" points out two factors, first that compared with the time of the congress at Bournemouth, the membership of the unions has sunk by 20,000. This is the first result of the new Trades Union Bill and the strike-breaking activities of the General Council, and secondly, that this blackleg spirit of the Congress leaders does not represent the spirit of the masses. The blacklegs have settled down in the leading circles of the British trades union movement for good, as was shown by the first day of the congress. Whilst the masses are becoming more and more discontent and angry and are seeking a way out of the cul de sac of trades unionism, the trades union leaders have already found this way out to the Right. The circle is closed. The General Council is Americanising itself, and in these circumstances it would not be at all surprising if the Congress decides to break with the labour unions of the U.S.S.R. in order to please the British bourgeoisie.

Hicks who made a terrible left-wing speech in Moscow has now shown the working class of Great Britain and of the whole world his real scab face. One must give the reformist leaders of the German trade union movement their due; they were right when they supposed Hicks would make a worthy chairman for the Amsterdam International. There is ground for the assumption that he will show himself to be just such another good for nothing as the former chairman of the Amsterdam International, Thomas. Hicks has not yet said the last word, but the British working class has also not yet said its last word.

## CHINA

### On the Eve of Chiang Kai-Shek's Return.

By M. N. Roy.

Moscow, 3rd September, 1927.

To save one's face is a very important consideration in the political life of China. Chiang Kai-Shek's dramatic resignation just at the moment, when the Wuhan "left" capitulated before Nanking puzzled the world. There was doubt as regards who won. Chiang Kai-Shek's resignation was interpreted by many as indicating the victory of Wuhan over Nanking — not vice versa, as was really the case. As a matter of fact, Chiang Kai-Shek's resignation was a carefully calculated act to make it easier for Wuhan to capitulate — to make it possible for Wang Chin-Wei to betray the revolution without losing face before his followers.

The reconciliation between the two fractions of the Kuomintang signifies more than the formation of a feudal-bourgeois bloc against the workers and peasants. It also signifies the bankruptcy of the petty bourgeois democratic radicalism represented by the "left" Kuomintang led by Wang Chin-Wei. The essentially reactionary nature of petty bourgeois radicalism was exposed by the tidal wave of revolution. As soon as the class struggle became fierce, the "left" leaders hastened to join hands with the feudal-bourgeois right in the struggle against the revolutionary masses. The right reactionaries would welcome the left leaders, particularly Wang Chin-Wei, not in order to swell their ranks by so many individuals, but to win over the entire upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie to the side of counter-revolution. Wang Chin-wei would be a valuable asset to counter-revolution only if he could bring with him a considerable section of his petty bourgeois following. Should it be necessary for him to go to Nanking as the

vanquished, then Wang Chin-Wei could not be expected to do that. In that case the petty bourgeois masses would desert him as the traitor that he is.

For the petty bourgeois "left" politicians the vital class-issues involved in the Nanchang split were not of much importance. The political significance of this split was not explained to the petty bourgeois masses. To them it was more a question of party democracy and personality. Therefore, Wang Chin-Wei could not lead his bloc out of the bankruptcy of Wuhan "leftism" to be the camp followers of the feudal-bourgeois bloc, should this insist on having the hated Chiang Kai-Shek at its head. Chiang Kai-Shek had rendered his services to the counter-revolution, for the further strengthening of which the services of Wang Chin-Wei is now necessary. The doors of the temple of counter-revolution should be so thrown open to him that he could enter without losing face. As an act of staunch loyalty to counter-revolution Chiang Kai-Shek resigned.

The comic character of this resignation was evident from the very beginning. Immediately after his resignation there began the obviously inspired movement demanding his return. When Wang Chin-Wei went abroad to make room for Chiang Kai-Shek, the petty bourgeois left clamoured for his return to the leadership of the Kuomintang. Now Chiang Kai-Shek's return to the head of the nationalist army is demanded by the bourgeois right. The services of both are needed for the counter-revolutionary bloc from the feudal militarists to the petty bourgeois democrats. Chiang resigned only to return as a saviour, as an idealist who could sacrifice personal considerations for the unity of the party.

According to the latest news, Tan Yen-Kai and Sun Fo, two outstanding leaders of the ex-left Wuhan group, have gone to Nimpo, where Chiang Kai-Shek is resting from his counter-revolutionary activities, to persuade him to resume the command of the united nationalist armies. It is very significant that Tan Yen-Kai and Sun-Fo are chosen to carry the olive branch. In spite of their compromising association with the Wuhan "left", these two are the typical representatives of the classes that supported Chiang Kai-Shek and in whose interests he split the Kuomintang. Tan Yen-Kai is a feudal militarist of the classical type. He had been a Tupan\*) for 15 years. He consciously represents the landlords and gentry. While, in June last, the agrarian question was sitting on the troubled breast of the Wuhan "left" as a dreadful nightmare, Tan Yen-Kai declared in a meeting of the Kuomintang Political Council: "I am prepared to give away my lands, but I cannot betray my own class". Sun-Fo represents the comprador bourgeoisie. As mayor of Canton he bought up a number of large cinema theatres and several thousand mos of homestead land in the suburbs. Previously he belonged to the extreme right of the Kuomintang. He politically fought his father Sun Yat-Sen when the latter was alive.

These two and more were inside the Wuhan group as agents of the feudal-bourgeois right wing after it had split the nationalist front and turned against revolution. The existence of such elements prevented the development of the Wuhan government in the direction of democratic dictatorship. The petty bourgeois left did not carry on a struggle to drive these elements away, thus completing the split of the Kuomintang along the ever-sharpening line of class differentiation. Finally, the petty bourgeois democrats headed by Wang Chin-Wei capitulated before the agents of the feudal-bourgeois right wing, and the way to reconciliation between Wuhan and Nanking was clear.

Now Tan Yen-Kai and Sun-Fo go to Chiang Kai-Shek to say: look, comrade, how successfully we have accomplished our job; we have destroyed the Wuhan left from within, though you could not do that from without; we have prevented the petty bourgeoisie from travelling on the road to revolution with the proletariat; and we have won Wang Chin-Wei for the counter-revolution. When invited by two such illustrious representatives of the feudal-bourgeoisie, who have so successfully combated the growth of a revolutionary left Kuomintang, Chiang Kai-Shek will certainly return to his post and grasp the hand of his ex-enemy Wang Chin-Wei, nearly as soiled as his own with the blood of the working class.

\*) Tupan — military governor of a province.



The bourgeoisie, however, is playing the game too cleverly. All these stage-managings will only defeat their own end. Wang Chin-Wei is not only the idol of the nationalist petty bourgeoisie. He had a big influence upon the masses. The debacle of the most faithful follower of Sun Yat-Sen frees the masses from the lingering influence of petty bourgeois radicalism. It frees the Chinese revolution from the fetters of the "three peoples' principles". Counter-revolution, led jointly by Wang Chin-Wei and Chiang Kai-Shek, will only quicken the development of the revolution.

## HANDS OFF THE SOVIET UNION

### Chamberlain's Spies in the Soviet Union.

By L. Nikolayev (Moscow).

On the 3rd September there commenced before the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of Justice of the Soviet Union the trial of a band of English spies and their Russian confederates. We publish below a brief summary of the activity of these emissaries of Sir Austen Chamberlain, which throws a vivid light on the preparations for war being made by the English conservatives. Ed.

While Chamberlain and Baldwin are assuring "public opinion" that they do not think of provoking a war against the Soviet Union and that "the danger of war exists only in the imagination of the Bolsheviks", a large body of spies is engaged in the Soviet Union in collecting information as to the condition of the Red Army and Air Fleet, the armament factories etc.

One of the organisers of British espionage in the Soviet Union was Captain Boyce, a prominent representative of the British Intelligence Service in London. Captain Boyce has a long period of service behind him. In view of his past services he was entrusted by the British Intelligence Service in the year 1919 with the important commission of reorganising the English spy service in the Scandinavian and Baltic countries. The idea of this "reorganising" consisted of course in extending and systematising the activity of British spies on the territory of the Soviet Union. The best indication of the principle underlying the commission given to Captain Boyce is to be found in the choice of the leading persons in the various spy centres. As the representative of English espionage in Helsingfors, Captain Boyce appointed the former Russian Hussar officer, Colonel Sumsy. As head of the group of English spies in Terioko (Finland), there was likewise appointed a Russian white officer named P. P. Sokolov, who had fled to Finland after having taken part in a counter-revolutionary conspiracy at the end of 1918.

Finally, it was not a mere chance that Boyce selected for the purpose of carrying out special commissions the former Tsarist spy, Ivanovitch Goyer, who in 1916 was a secret collaborator with the Russian naval attaché in Copenhagen. During the English intervention in the north of Soviet Russia Goyer also worked in the English spy service in Murmansk and Archangel; and when the English were compelled to leave Bolshevik north Russia Goyer rendered valuable services as a spy of the English in Norway, Sweden and Finland. After a few years interruption in his connection with the English espionage service, Goyer met his old friend Captain Boyce at the beginning of 1924 in Reval and accepted the latter's proposal to take up espionage work in the Soviet Union. Boyce brought Goyer into contact with the representative of the British Military mission at Reval, from whom Goyer received immediate direct instructions as to espionage work.

The information that Goyer had to obtain in the Soviet Union was of a very definite nature: **What results were yielded by the experiments with gas clouds in our manoeuvres? In what condition is the hydroplane service and the air service generally in the Soviet Union?** These are the chief instructions that the agent of the English Secret Service received from the English Military Mission. Goyer was given these instructions in the house of Captain Boyce in Reval. It was here that

the cipher to be employed in the correspondence was agreed upon, as well as the technic regarding the sending of letters, the use of pass-words etc.

This technic is of special interest to us as showing the role played by Finland in the English spy service in the Soviet Union. Captain Boyce came to an arrangement with his chief agent according to which the letters should be sent from Leningrad to other towns through the mediation of the Finnish Consul in Leningrad, these letters to have two envelopes. On the outer envelope of this "diplomatic post" there should appear a perfectly harmless and unsuspecting address: "Finnish Foreign Ministry. To the Finnish Ambassador, Dr. Holsti, Reval." On the inside envelope there was written another address: "To Ernest T. Boyce."

It was the task of the Finnish Consul not only to act as mediator in the "diplomatic correspondence" between the English spy Goyer and the English Secret Service official Boyce, but also to use his influence to obtain the release of the spy if he should be arrested in the Soviet Union.

Provided with all the necessary documents, Albert Goyer went on 11th March, 1925 to Moscow, from whence he moved to Leningrad and there obtained a position in the merchant fleet. Goyer, as arranged, immediately informed Boyce as to his success through the Finnish General Consul in Leningrad.

In September, 1925 there called at the Goyer's residence an envoy from Captain Boyce. The envoy gave the pass-word agreed upon and handed over to Goyer a packet of chemical ink with the necessary accessories. From this time there develops between Goyer and Captain Boyce an intensive correspondence. Goyer reports in his letters chiefly on the state of the Red Fleet and the naval harbours of the Soviet Union.

Already in February 1926 Goyer's activity appeared suspicious to the organs of the G. P. U. He was arrested on suspicion of having sold the model of a sub-marine to the English Consul in Leningrad, Preston, but was released owing to lack of evidence. This little "unpleasantness" induced Goyer to move from Leningrad to Odessa. On the way he enlisted in Moscow the services of a certain Vladimir Valitzky, through whom from now onwards he receives the letters from Captain Boyce etc.

Goyer and his assistant Valitzky are not the only agents of Captain Boyce in the Soviet Union. The representative of the English spy service in Terioki, Sokolov, since 1920, crosses the Soviet frontiers with the active assistance of the Finnish espionage service and eagerly collects the material and information of interest to him.

A particularly active role among the spies of the Sokolov group was played by Anton Chlopuchin, who fled from Leningrad to Finland in 1921. This Chlopuchin, thanks to his extensive circle of acquaintances among the commanders of the army and the fleet, as well as among the employees in various undertakings and also by means of his relatives in Leningrad, succeeded in creating a highly developed system of espionage. He had a whole number of houses at his disposal for the purpose of maintaining connections.

At the beginning of July last the activity of the whole band of spies was completely discovered by the organs of the G. P. U. On the arrest of Valitzky and Goyer letters were found written with a special chemical ink. Anything written with this ink remains invisible until the paper is soaked in a tincture consisting of a special chemical composition. These letters show beyond all doubt what Captain Boyce and the other English spies were specially interested in and what kind of work their agents have carried out in the Soviet Union. In these letters continual reference is made to our sub-marines, our cruisers, the repair of our ships; they contain instructions to ascertain the names of the existing light cruisers and those in course of construction etc. etc. At the same time the letters from the English agents continually insist that information must be "thoroughly reliable" and obtained from "documentary sources". The representatives of the English secret service imperatively demand that their functionaries in the territory of the Soviet Union shall establish connection as soon as possible with the "airship factories", with "bodies of troops", with units of the active fleet". The representatives of the English spy service are not modest in their demands. One of the letters states: "so long as you have not collected

sufficient material we consider it unnecessary to send courriers to you..." And there is immediately added in sharp tones: "You will please note that your first letters were very badly written; the secret ink was visible with the naked eye..."

The Leningrad spy trial is of enormous importance. It proves once again how tenaciously and persistently the English government is preparing the English spy service for decisive battle with the Soviet Union, and what part the States bordering on the Soviet Union, especially Finland, are playing in this preparation as obedient servants of predatory English imperialism. The trial will throw fresh light on England's protested "love of peace". It will show that England is not only constantly provoking the Soviet Union to war, but is working uninterruptedly at practical preparations for war.

## POLITICS

### The Death of Zaghlul Pasha and its Importance for Egypt.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The Egyptian nationalist movement has sustained an irreplaceable loss by the death of **Zaghlul Pasha**. Saad Pasha Zaghlul (1860—1927. Chief dates of his life: 1882 participated in the revolution of Arabi Pasha, then entered the State service, became Minister of Education 1907, 1919 leader of the Egyptian delegation which demanded complete independence, 1921—1923 persecuted and exiled, 1924 Egyptian Prime Minister, 1925 leader of the coalition of all the Egyptian parties, 1926 President of the Egyptian Parliament), idolised by the Egyptian masses as the "Father of the Nation", the founder and head of the largest Egyptian nationalist party, became especially in the last years the embodiment of the will to freedom of the country of the Nile oppressed by imperialism. All personalities of Egyptian political life had to submit to his authority, his leadership held together with firm hand a following consisting of all possible classes and strata of the Egyptian people and whose interests — landowners, and land-holding peasants, employers and workers, — were diametrically opposed. Zaghlul Pasha knew how to concentrate the attention of the suppressed masses of Egypt on their deadly enemy, British imperialism, and placed himself at the head of this fight against this imperialism. The demand of "complete independence of Egypt" as a programme, combined with a number of outstanding personal qualities with the help of which Zaghlul knew how again and again to bewitch the masses, were the secret of his almost unbounded influence on the fate of Egypt.

Against the personality of Zaghlul all the means and tricks of British imperialism failed to achieve anything. The more he was persecuted and the more British propaganda attempted to slander and discredit him, the more his reputation grew in the eyes of the population and the more the entire national movement rendered him unconditional allegiance.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that Saad Pasha Zaghlul really represented entirely the interests of the broad mass of the people who placed such great confidence in him. He was rather the representative of that class the beginning of the development of which occurred in Egypt at the time of the commencement of his career, and which to the extent to which it increased in strength and importance came more and more into fierce opposition to British imperialism. This class was the **Egyptian bourgeoisie**. This fact was to be recognised not only in the typical bourgeois nationalist demands which Zaghlul had inscribed on his flag, but it found expression before all during the short time when Zaghlul himself was at the helm: he suppressed with draconic means every expression of the labour movement, dissolved the trade unions and introduced laws for the protection of property and the bourgeois State apparatus. At the same time there was revealed precisely at that period — in the year 1924 — and with great clearness the limits of the revolutionary sincerity of the Egyptian bourgeoisie. Zaghlul Pasha concluded a Pact with the British bourgeoisie (represented at that time by Mac-

Donald), and if the imperialists had not been so obstinate there would undoubtedly have come about an alliance between the British and Egyptian bourgeoisie at the expense of the masses of the Egyptian people.

When with the coming into power of the Baldwin government the policy of England became one of brutally suppressing the national movement even in its bourgeois form (the British imperialists wanted the entire monopoly of the exploitation of the Sudan), Zaghlul was again forced into opposition and was able to bring rapidly again under his power the masses who had become disappointed during his period of government. Since that time he aimed on the one hand at obtaining certain concessions from the English by "constitutional" means, without giving up the programme demands, and on the other hand at maintaining his influence over the masses.

For this purpose Zaghlul Pasha created the coalition of the three great parties: the **Liberal-Constitutional Party**, which is openly in favour of "peaceable collaboration" with the British; the **Nationalist Party**, which recognises only revolutionary methods of struggle; and his own powerful **Wafd Party**, which has no clear programme except that which Zaghlul Pasha embodied in himself. He succeeded by means of enormous efforts, and after he had overthrown the Zivar government which was directly in the service of the British, in manoeuvring between the contradictions which were becoming more and more acute. He would not permit anything which could lead to an open conflict with England, as an open conflict could have brought Parliament, in which the Zaghlulists possess the great majority, and the Cabinet, which was actually ruled by Zaghlul, in danger. But Zaghlul Pasha regarded the "constitutional institutions" as a basis for a later fight for complete independence, or of a compromise with England.

He endeavoured to bridge over the antagonism between the various political parties. He did everything in order to set up as broad a platform as possible for the maintenance of the coalition and to cover the growing antagonistic interests within his own "Wafd" between the Left radical and the Right compromising wings. In order at the same time to blunt the class struggles which were becoming more and more acute (between the peasants and the landowners, and the workers and the capitalists), he attempted to carry out social economic reforms and to form nationalist peasants unions in the villages and labour unions in the towns.

In all these efforts he achieved only partial success. It came to a conflict with England (the question of army reform and the naval demonstration before Alexandria in May last), to growing antagonisms between the parties (temporary going over of the Watanists to the opposition, threats of a breach on the part of the Liberal-Constitutional Party), to strikes in industrial undertakings and the protest movements of the peasants. Everywhere the personality of Zaghlul Pasha had to intervene in order to smooth over and to settle differences.

Now, after the death of Zaghlul, the Egyptian national movement has no personality at its disposal which could take over this role. And the question of a successor to Zaghlul is giving rise to a fierce conflict. Although the memory of Zaghlul will undoubtedly continue for a long time to have effect, the fact that the numerous contradictions in Zaghlul's work, which were determined by his connection with the bourgeois class, cause the conception of a Zaghlulism to be unclear and confused, offers for various persons and groups the possibility of attaching Zaghlul's label to their special interests.

These are the interests which will determine the further development of the nationalist movement in a much clearer form than was possible in Zaghlul's time. Fight against imperialism, or compromise; united revolutionary mass party, or political cliques thrown together by personal connections; leading role to be played by the organised working masses, paying regard to the interests of the peasants, or hegemony of the bourgeoisie and domination of the landowners. These are the problems to which the national-revolutionary movement in Egypt must now give a clear answer.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### Vindictive Justice Rages in Vienna.

By Willi Schlammm (Vienna).

The great work of revenge against the Vienna workers, who on the 15th of July ventured to rise against class justice and the fascist offensive, has begun. A vindictive justice, which could not be more shameful and open even in the notorious countries of white terror, is raging against the workers of Vienna.

The series of these vindictive trials commenced on the 3rd of September. The government and the courts are cleverly stage-managing these trials. On the one hand the government, in accordance with its strong policy and the furious provincial fascism, is bound to make an example of the Vienna workers; on the other hand it is compelled, even after the 15th of July and precisely because of the 15th of July, to regard the Vienna workers as a force which in spite of the social democratic leadership can break out. And for this reason class justice, which has to revenge the 15th of July in the spirit of the bourgeoisie, is following a very cunning course. Of the more than 300 prosecutions, those cases are being tried first which when resulting in sentences of one to two months imprisonment mean a shameless class justice, but which are intended to give the impression of intentional mildness. The Vienna working class is to be got slowly "used" to heavy sentences; class justice will slowly proceed from these less serious cases to the big trials in which it can take full and unbounded revenge.

The trials which have been instituted fall into **three groups**. The first group, the proceedings of which have already commenced, involve workers who are accused of having held up motor cars on the 15th and 16th July, insulted the police, offered resistance to the orders of the police and "incited" against the police. The second group consists of workers accused of setting fire to buildings, of incitement, robbery, plunder, murder. These cases are expected to be tried in **October**. The third group are the purely political trials, in particular against responsible functionaries of the **Communist Party**, on account of manifestoes, leaflets and speeches, incitement summoning the workers to revolt and similar very serious charges. This is the case with Comrade **Koplenig**, who has already been in prison for six weeks awaiting trial without the formal indictment against him having been completed. This is also the case with some other comrades who have accepted responsibility for the appeals of the Party issued during the days of the struggle. All these cases are to be tried by jury.

Up to now there have been 292 arrests in Vienna. Of the arrested 84 are still in prison on remand. Up to the present, ten cases have been tried.

All these ten are "very light cases". In spite of this the ten workers in question were kept for many weeks in prison awaiting trial, although there was not the least legal justification for such treatment. Of these ten, four were accused of having on the 15th of July held up private motor cars and taxi-cabs in order to use them for the transport of workers who had been wounded by the police. This first aid work is designated by a shameless class justice as "extortion", and the following sentences have been imposed: **Steinbichler**, a worker, received **three months hard labour**; **Brixel** a worker, received **two months hard labour**; **Hochberger**, another worker, **three months hard labour**; the young worker, **Mörsel**, **one month's strict arrest**.

For the fascist murderers in Schattendorf, acquittal; for First Aid work on the 15th of July, months of imprisonment with days of bread and water diet and a plank bed.

Three of the accused who had been kept in prison on remand for weeks on the charge of insulting the police had to be acquitted.

Of the case of the ten accused workers that of the office employee **Lemberger** is the most important at present. Lemberger's whole crime is that at midday on the 15th of July he called upon his work mates to strike. Because he expressed this demand in very excited words, he was, after having been for several weeks in prison on remand, sentenced to **two months hard labour**. In the democratic model country of Europe, which is only 7% short of a social democratic majority, summoning

workmates to strike is now answered with imprisonment! That is the harvest of the first two days proceedings.

Of course the trials presented the outer picture of hostile punitive action against the working class. Reinforced police patrols in all the streets leading to the court; a tremendous number of guards on the stairways and entrances to the court buildings; no worker admitted into the court-rooms.

The bourgeois public is, of course, highly satisfied with the course of the trials up to the present. The **social democratic party**, as is known, since the 15th of July has not undertaken any action for the release of the arrested and the abandonment of the trials. It left no doubt remain that it considers the "mob", the "rabble of the big town" (that is what Seitz the social democratic burgomaster called the persecuted fighters of the 15th July) is not worth any serious dispute with the future coalition partner. Immediately before the first proceedings the "**Arbeiterzeitung**" came out with a piteous appeal to the judges, in which, with sickening servility, it begged for mildness and mercy. After the first sentences in which the undisturbed determination of class justice became plainly visible; the "**Arbeiterzeitung**" argued in long articles that the accused ought to have been punished not on account of extortion, but for violating the law against disorderly conduct! In their fundamental attitude the social democratic leaders are at one with the unchained guardians of bourgeois law and order: both parties regard the revolt of the Vienna workers as a total of punishable acts. The only difference of opinion is regarding the extent of the penalty.

The **Communist Party** of Austria is the only force which stands for the release of the arrested and the abandonment of the trials. Up to now the Party has held **forty big meetings** in Vienna and more than **thirty** in the provinces against the unchained class justice. Thousands of social democratic workers have attended these meetings and there expressed their indignation at the capitulation of the social democratic leaders. The "**Rote Fahne**", the organ of the C.P., has published up to now, in addition to the many resolutions adopted at meetings, about twenty resolution of factories and trade union groups in which, as against the social democratic Parliamentary demand for an amnesty — an amnesty which presupposes in this case the passing of the sentences — there is demanded, in the sense of the Communist slogans, the release of the arrested and the abandonment of the trials.

The present central question of the class struggle in Austria is the rallying of the forces of resistance against class justice. The campaign of persecution is a **trial balloon** of the bourgeoisie in order to ascertain how great is the depression of the Austrian working class and to what extent its power of resistance is broken. If the bourgeoisie can break through this sector of the front, without the working masses being rallied to determined defence, then the bourgeois attack will proceed in a sharper form on other sectors. The rallying of the revolutionary defence, however, is being organised exclusively by the Communist Party, while Austro-Marxism is shamefully continuing its capitulation also in the face of class justice.

### The Life of a Pioneer of the Rumanian Proletariat in Danger.

Prague, 7th September 1927.

Comrade **Elek Koebloes**, one of the pioneers of the revolutionary working class movement in Roumania, was arrested by the Czechish authorities a few days ago in the Carpathians after he had successfully crossed the Roumanian-Czechish frontier illegally. Recently the Roumanian government has done everything in its power to get Comrade Koebloes into its hands in order to mete out to him the fate which so many other pioneers of the revolutionary movement have suffered, i. e. **Tkatchenko**, **Stefanoff** etc. In Roumania, Koebloes has always been successful in eluding the Siguranza. Finally the government set a price of 100,000 Lei upon his head. There is no doubt about it that if comrade Koebloes is handed over to the Roumanian authorities he will be murdered.

This fate is certain to be his if the Czechish authorities hand him over to the Roumanian authorities. The Roumanian government is exercising strong pressure upon the Czechish

authorities in order to secure the extradition of Koebloes. Koebloes is in immediate and extreme danger all the more because he is being held in the neighbourhood of the frontier and therefore within reach of the Roumanian hangmen.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is making all possible efforts to secure the right of asylum for comrade Koebloes. It has issued an appeal to the Czechish proletariat to save Koebloes from falling into the hands of the Roumanian authorities by creating a storm of protest. The intervention of the Communist parliamentary fraction with the Czechish government has not, up to the moment, met with any success.

In order to prevent the murder of a heroic fighter for the proletariat by the Roumanian authorities, the workers of other countries must join the workers of Czechoslovakia and demand with all possible energy the release and the right of asylum for comrade Koebloes.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### The Party Conference of the C. P. of Denmark.

By Anton Eriksson (Copenhagen).

The Danish section of the Communist International held its Conference from the 27th to 29th August in Copenhagen.

For many years the development of the Party had been retarded by a bitter struggle, so that it bore the character rather of a sect than that of the advance-guard of the fighting proletariat. The National Conference held in June last cleared out the fractional remnants and set up a Party leadership which in the nine weeks of its existence endeavoured with great eagerness and obvious success to give the organisations a political content which was really in accordance with the policy of the Comintern.

The last Conference of the Party took place in January 1926 in Nyborg. The decisions there adopted, which were correct in themselves, were only to a very small extent carried out. The chief responsibility for this and for the increase in the fractional struggle rests in the first place with the former leader of the Party, Comrade Sigvald Hellberg, who at the June Plenum abandoned the leadership and who also refused, in spite of repeated invitations, to defend his policy before the forum of the Conference.

Thus it came about that in spite of the best objective pre-conditions — tremendous unemployment, shameful anti-proletarian policy of the social democratic government, strong Left tendency of the trade union organised workers, reactionary "economy" measures of the present government — the Party had almost no influence among the working class and great apathy prevailed in the Party organisations.

The June Conference brought with it a change. The provisional Central Committee commenced a recruiting campaign which resulted in four new local groups, about 150 new members, 500 new readers of the Party organ, "Arbejderbladet", and about 1000 crowns being collected for the Party funds. This campaign is still being continued. The Danish section took the judicial murder of Sacco and Vanzetti. In Denmark it was only the Communist Party that carried out this mass campaign. The Party also began to be very active among the unemployed. This activity was so effective that the leaders of the Trade Union Federation considered it expedient to give way to the growing pressure and to convene an all-trade union Conference to discuss measures against the law which comes into force on the 1st of October. This initial success is at the same time a result of the opposition policy conducted by our comrades in the trade unions against reformism and for the unity of the trade union movement, which is very much divided.

It was in this considerably improved situation that the Conference met. 37 local branches were represented by 74 delegates. The E. C. C. I. was represented by three comrades; the C. P. of Germany sent Comrade Geschke, the C. P. of Norway Comrade Furubotn and the C. P. of Sweden Comrade Johanssen. In addition Comrade Olgeirsson attended the Conference as representative of the Communist Labour Party of Iceland. Our Finnish, Austrian and English brother Parties and the Tula-Gouvernement section of the C. P. S. U. sent letters of greeting. Almost 90% of the delegates came direct from the

workshops and factories. The Young Communist League also took active part in the work of the Conference.

The Conference was a workers' Conference in the true sense of the word. For the first time since a long time there was given to the Party a comprehensive analysis of the social driving forces and the forms in which they express themselves in political life. This analysis was supplemented by a detailed survey of the international situation. During the discussion not a single voice was raised in defence of the Hellberg group, and this group could only muster 1/9th of the votes and was quite unable to bring forward a single positive proposal as an alternative to the programme of action which it rejected.

Exactly 80% of all the delegates approved unreservedly the report of the provisional Central Committee and demanded the continuation of the work of the Party along the lines confirmed by the E. C. C. I. Some oppositional voices, which are tending to ultra-leftism, were heard from the territory which was separated from Germany after the war (Soenderjylland). These voices were not heard in the Plenary discussions as they were already convinced in the Commissions, and a guarantee has been created that this most South lying district shall receive the greatest attention in future. The conditions in former North Schleswig are in fact much nearer to revolution than those in the rest of the country: great unemployment, no market for industry, crippled commerce, social misery among the peasantry, which renders its easy for the separatist-fascist Cornelius Peterson to unite the discontent of the peasantry against the working class and the government.

The most important result of the Conference was the welding together of the whole Party on the basis of the programme of action. The detailed character of the programme finds its justification in the lack there has been up to now of Communist expositions in programmatic form in the Danish language.

The acceptance of the new Party Statute, which is based upon the model statutes of the Comintern and is adapted to Scandinavian experiences, means a great step forward.

Special directions were decided upon for work among the rural population and among the women which has been completely neglected hitherto.

The Manifesto of the Conference lays the chief emphasis upon combating the approaching imperialist war, and last but not least the relations between the Party and the Young Communist League were laid down in a special resolution in accordance with the international decisions.

In regard to the reorganisation of the Party, the new, unanimously elected Central Committee was given detailed directions.

The Conference was certainly the most valuable in the history of our Party. We hope soon to be able to inform the comrades in our brother Parties of the first welcome effects of this Conference in our "little country" which, although it is so small, is daily receiving increasing attention from Great Britain.

## THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

### The Political Result of the International Co-operative Congress.

By Karl Bittel.

The Twelfth International Co-operative-Congress which was held at Stockholm from August 15th to 18th is of political significance for the whole labour movement. For upon the congress platform of this solitary undivided big International the left and right wings were directly opposed. The attitudes of the various political groups are so characteristic and enlightening for the worker public that it is necessary to draw therefrom several general lessons.

The majority of the Congress was, thanks to the passivity of the masses of members in the co-operative movement, formed by reformist and social democratic business managers, who used their power in ruthlessly tyrannising and violating the opposition minority. Of the 500 delegates from 34 countries there was a proletarian opposition of 65 co-operative society delegates from the Soviet Union, 10 Communist comrades from Czechoslovakia, 2 American, 2 Finnish and 1 Norwegian Com-

munist. The Communist opposition in Germany and France, although they have several big co-operative societies in their hands, were refused delegations by the central associations, and, in England too, the famous "co-operative democracy" rendered impossible Communist participation in the Congress.

During the whole of the Congress the Communists held the lead in putting questions, in proposing practical solutions and indicating a clear line of proletarian co-operative policy.

The majority, composed largely of registered Social Democrats, defended themselves, rejected proposals, influenced feeling by provocation and incitement — especially the German delegation — and then carried their point with their majority. The presiding committee took care to evade every earnest question and disturbed or throttled discussion. In spite of all this, the Congress has provided material enough to show the different roles the two wings of the labour movement are playing: we saw the Communists defending with the utmost energy the most elementary demands of the proletarian members against the scandalous treason to the workers, which the collaborating Social-Democratic majority, so thoroughly bourgeois in its attitude, perpetrated at the Congress.

At a time of an international offensive on the part of capital against the standard of living of the workers it is to be expected that analysis of the situation and the formulation of a suitable plan of action would be in the foreground of the International Co-operative Congress. The former was not even undertaken. Neither the presidential address nor any of the speeches dealt with it. A plan of campaign against increase of prices, the price dictatorship of the trusts and rings, against rates and taxes and against the danger of imperialistic war and Fascism was presented by the Soviet delegation. The proposal laid stress upon the necessity for a co-operative programme, which should "express a proletarian policy". This International has been in existence for more than 30 years and is still without a programme. It does not want one, because it is sailing in the wake of the League of Nations. It is hardly credible how the Social Democrats defended themselves against the Russian proposal. The old pioneer of the Socialist co-operative movement, Serwy (Belgium), proposed in writing in the name of his delegation that they were in agreement, provided the words "proletarian", "imperialistic" and "Fascism" were removed. The situation of the Social-Democratic faction of the congress was rendered so ridiculous thereby that the spiritus rector Albert Thomas (International Labour Office) tried in person, by means of a proposal to intermediate, to mitigate the disaster. Comrade Kreutz (Reichenberg) uttered to the Congress a few home-truths concerning Serwy & Co's "Socialism", to which was found no other answer than "Communist impudence".

A world congress of the organisation which boasts of pursuing a traditional policy of world peace and calls itself a guaranty of peace, must take up a clear attitude towards the acute danger of an imperialistic war. An anti-war resolution was presented by the English co-operative congress. After hazy pacifistic phrases the resolution demanded in its concluding paragraph that the co-operative societies of all countries "should be prepared at all times to meet with determined resistance the declaring and carrying on of war". The English bureaucratic delegation must have carried this radical resolution to Stockholm with trembling hands; for such a resolution was not their opinion but the mass feeling at an English congress which they did not dare oppose. Then an incredible thing happened: at the meeting of the executive committee held on the day before the Congress, it was resolved to put before the Congress this resolution with the decisive sentences mentioned above left out. There was nobody in the English delegation to defend energetically the purport and the next of the English congress. The efforts of Grinling and Mrs. Barton were resigned and without fighting spirit. The Communist speeches of Comrades Meschterjakow (Soviet Union), Kaninska (Czechoslovakia) and Ronn (America) were passionate, they drove home the danger of war, depicted the war already begun and pointed out the positive remedy to be used by the working class. Never again should the co-operative movement render moral, economic and financial support for the preparation and carrying on of war, the whole power of its 50-million-strong organisation with its peculiar organisatory and technical apparatus must be employed in the mobilising of the working class against the imperialistic war.

What a contrast between this fighting spirit and the address of the Social-Democratic speaker Lorenz (Hamburg)! He had nothing better to say than that such concrete resolutions belonged neither to the tasks nor to the duties of an international congress. The call for direct action, which was contained in the original English proposal would bring co-operative society members into conflict with the law. "Think of the consequences!" The vague phrases of the executive committee were carried by 244 votes.

Still a third question exposed the Congress majority. Throughout the world there arose at this time an outburst of indignation, for it had just been made known that the attempt to rescue Sacco and Vanzetti from American class justice had failed and that the cruel martyrdom was to be protracted a further ten days. The Soviet delegation proposed first of all to the executive committee that the Congress should raise its voice in protest. "That is no task of ours" was the cynical reply of the bureaucracy. When, on the first day of the plenary session of the Congress, Comrade Kissin communicated this, only one person responded and that was Kaufmann (Hamburg), who shouted: "The juridical murders in Russia are also an affair which concern the whole world." As, right to the end, the presiding committee undertook no steps in the matter, even though the rescue action was growing throughout the world, the Russian delegation repeated its proposal at the last moment. President Whitehead refused to permit the proposal and allowed the demonstration of protest against the justice murder of Sacco and Vanzetti to drown in the music from the organ. Truly, a practical illustration of the stupidity and evil of the "political neutrality", with which every business with the bourgeoisie is cloaked and every action in working-class interests is rejected.

These three general questions serve as proof that the attitude of the Social-Democratic fraction at the Stockholm Congress was politically reactionary and absolutely hostile to the working class. Even in minor questions no concession was made to the feelings of the masses as was always the case at previous world congresses. The bureaucracy is so assured of its power over the working masses, its alliance and collaboration with the bourgeoisie is so strong, its subordination to governments and to the League of Nations is so marked, that it continues its reactionary course openly and consciously.

From now on, the fight waged against the Communist co-operative members in the individual national associations will be just as ruthless and violent as that against the Communists at the Congress. As soon as the first discussion under the heading "Communist Propaganda" in the business report was opened at Stockholm and our comrades formed up in an international front and showed the absolute necessity of sharp opposition, Herr Lorenz very self-consciously recommended to his colleagues the "Hamburger methods", namely, to throw the Communists out or silence them.

Stockholm has proved to us in a concrete and alarming manner that we, as vanguard of the proletarian opposition, shall have to carry on our fight within the co-operative movement with increased vigour and more systematically in every co-operative society, including even the smallest. It is no longer a question of individual derailments and of opposing and correcting the policy of individual bureaucrats; the whole of the international line taken by co-operative policy marks a course so characterised by reaction and animosity to the working class that the loss of working-class influence in the entire co-operative movement is at stake. It would be a disaster for the class war if the co-operative movement, built up laboriously by the proletariat in the course of decades, were to be completely lost through the treachery of the leaders of the working class.

If we regard the course and the resolutions of the Stockholm Co-operative Society Congress as authoritative for the whole of the international co-operative movement of 100,000 district and local organisations, then the point is practically reached when the co-operative societies will side with the bourgeoisie, the imperialist governments and the League of Nations in the fight against the class-conscious proletariat in all countries.



## TEN YEARS AGO

### Kornilov before the Gates of Petrograd.

**Petrograd, 4th September.** Kornilov issued an appeal to the Cossacks, containing the following: "I accuse the Provisional Government of irresolute action and incapacity to govern. I accuse it of allowing the Germans complete freedom of intervention in our international affairs... I accuse various members of the Government of actually betraying the Fatherland, and I have proofs of this... Cossacks! you have promised to help me if I should find it necessary... The hour has come... I will not submit to the Provisional Government and I fight against it... Therefore listen, and fulfil my commands."

#### Kornilov Tries to Lure the Government into a Trap.

**Petrograd, 10th September.** Kornilov appeals to the people in a proclamation in which he says: "I appeal before the whole people to the Provisional Government, and say to it: Come to me in the army headquarters, where your liberty and safety are assured by my word of honour, and co-operate with me to form a government of National Defence, ensuring the victory and glorious future of the Russian people."

#### The Government Pulls itself together, under the Pressure of the Revolutionary Masses, and Resists...

**Petrograd, 13th September.** At the session of the Petrograd Soviet Bogdanov declared: "When the Provisional Government wavered, and applied to such intermediaries as Milyukov and General Alexeyev, the fighting committee against the counter-revolution made every effort to prevent a compromise. The pressure was such that the Government broke off the negotiations and rejected all Kornilov's proposals..."

#### ...but its main Anxiety Remains the Suppression of the Peasantry.

**Petrograd, 9th September.** The "Rabotschi" reports that agrarian risings have broken out in the Usmansk district, in which several thousand peasants participated. The insurgents seized upon Prince Byasemsky's estate and murdered the prince. The insurrection spread to the Velyaminov estate. The Government has sent troops to suppress the starving peasants.

#### THE BOLSHEVIKI LEAD THE DEFENCE OF THE REVOLUTION.

##### The Demands of the Bolsheviks.

**Petrograd, 10th September.** The leading article of the "Rabotschi" writes as follows: "It is a fact that the whole bourgeois press, from the 'Russkaya Volya', to the 'Novoye Vremya' and the 'Ryetsch', have helped General Kornilov during the last few days by spreading rumours on 'Bolshevist conspiracies'; it is a fact that the Cadet Party is still in the camp of the traitors and counter-revolutionaries, as it was in July... In the present struggle between coalition government and Kornilov party it is not revolutionists and counter-revolutionists which combat one another, but two different methods of counter-revolutionary policy... The workers and soldiers are taking all measures for a determined fight against the counter-revolutionaries and Kornilov's bands, should these come to revolutionary Petrograd. They will stop the counter-revolutionaries, and go forward themselves on the road to the final victory of the Russian revolution... We demand:

1. The immediate removal of the counter-revolutionary generals from the trenches and from the front; they are to be replaced by leaders chosen by the soldiers, and by a thoroughly democratic organisation of the army.
2. The formation of revolutionary soldiers' organisations, these alone being capable of creating democratic discipline in the army.
3. The abolition of all methods of repression, especially the death penalty.

4. Immediate transference of landed estates to the peasants' committees.

5. Legal establishment of the eight hour day, organisation of the democratic control of the factories, workshops, and banks, by the working class.

6. The complete democratisation of economics; ruthless taxation of capital.

7. The organisation of a proper exchange of commodities between town and country.

8. The safeguarding of the right of self determination for the national minorities of Russia.

9. Convocation of the Constituent Assembly.

10. Dissolution of the secret treaties with the allies, and immediate proposals for a general democratic peace.

The Party declares that the sole way to fulfil these demands is to break with the capitalists, completely liquidate the bourgeois counter-revolution, and to place the power in the hands of the revolutionary workers, peasants, and soldiers.

This alone can save the country and the revolution from ruin.

#### THE BOLSHEVIKI GATHER THE MASSES.

**Petrograd, 10th September.** The "Rabotschi" writes: "Counter-revolution is coming on to the attack. The counter-revolutionary conspiracy has been revealed. Comrades, the closest organisation is now necessary. Do not let yourselves be provoked by any proclamation or rumour; maintain perfect reservation and calm."

**Petrograd, 10th September.** The Bolshevik fraction of the Petrograd Soviet has discussed the situation created by Kornilov's offensive, and decided on the measures required for the defence of Petrograd. It was resolved at the same time to liberate the Party leaders under arrest since July.

**Petrograd, 10th September.** The war organisation of the Bolsheviks organised a number of meetings today, in which the soldiers were called upon to defend the revolution against Kornilov. At these meetings the soldiers declared themselves ready to take up arms for the revolution at the first call.

**Moscow, 10th September.** The "Social Democrat" reports on 12 meetings in factories, troop divisions, etc., at which determined resolutions were passed against Kornilov, and in favour of the taking over of the power by the Soviets.

#### KRONSTADT IN THE FIGHTING FRONT AGAINST KORNILOV.

**Petrograd, 11th September.** The "Rabotschi" writes: "In Kronstadt everything is ready for the alarm. The Soviet has undertaken the organisation of the fight against counter-revolution."

#### The Greater the Danger for the Revolution, the Greater the Influence of the Bolsheviks.

**Petrograd, 13th September.** After a lengthy discussion, the Petrograd Soviet passed the fighting resolution against the counter-revolution, proposed by the Bolsheviks, by 279 votes against 115 and 51 abstentions.

\* \* \*

#### Strikes and Wage Struggles in Moscow.

**Moscow, 9th September.** 150,000 leather workers have been on strike for a week. The minister of labour, Skobelyev, has come to Moscow to settle the conflict. He proposed arbitration. After several days of consideration, the employers declared that they are not agreed to a settlement of the dispute by means of arbitration. The strike continues.

\* \* \*

In Moscow the telephone workers are on strike.

## THE KORNILOV PUTSCH STIMULATES THE KERENSKY GOVERNMENT TO PROCLAIM THE REPUBLIC AT LAST.

Petrograd, 16th September. (Report of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The Provisional Government has issued the following official proclamation: "The rebellion of General Kornilov has been suppressed, but the confusion which it has caused in the army and in the country is great. The Fatherland and its freedom are again threatened by deadly danger. In consideration of the necessity of establishing the political form of the government, and of the unanimous and enthusiastic sympathy shown for the republican idea, expressed so clearly at the Moscow State Conference, the Provisional Government declares the political form of government of Russia to be republican, and proclaims Russia a Republican State. The urgent necessity of taking immediate decisive measures for the restoration of the shaken order of the state has induced the Provisional Government to entrust the whole power to five ministers, headed by a president of the ministerial council. The Provisional Government sees its main task in the restoration of order in the state, and the renewal of the fighting capacity of the army. The Government, being convinced that only the united living forces of the country can rescue the Fatherland from its present critical position, will endeavour to complement its forces by admitting to its ranks representatives of all elements placing the lasting and general interests of the Fatherland above accidental private, party, or class interests. The Provisional Government is fully confident of accomplishing this task successfully within a very short time."

### THE EFFECT OF THE KORNILOV PUTSCH IN THE PROVINCES.

Odessa, 13th September. The Provisional Revolution Committee has introduced the censorship of newspapers. The municipal council condemns the Kornilov putch and calls upon the population to defend the revolution. The railway union is controlling all trains.

Poltava, 13th September. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The municipal council has resolved to add its signature to the telegram of the Committee for the defence of the revolution, and to call upon the population to submit to all the directions given by the Committee.

Petrograd, 13th September. (Petrograd telegraph agency.) Reports are received from Vyatka, Sum, Lugansk, and other towns with regard to the organisation of Committees in defence of the revolution.

Krasnoyarsk, 13th September. (Petrograd telegraph agency.) The Executive Committee of the Soviets has concentrated the whole power in its hands.

### KORNILOV'S TROOPS REFUSE TO JOIN THE PUTSCH.

Petrograd, 14th September. The "Izvestiya" writes: "The newspapers have mentioned the first cavalry regiment among the troops taking sides with Kornilov. At a meeting of the soldiers and officers, this regiment passed a unanimous resolution showing its actual attitude to Kornilov and his adventure.

The resolution is as follows: We have cognisance of the report of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on General Kornilov's treason, and have discussed the events and the present situation. The meeting declares:

1. We demand that the Provisional Government brings the traitor Kornilov, and all persons taking part in the conspiracy, before a revolutionary tribunal.

2. We protest against the insulting insinuation that we take sides with Kornilov, and demand that those persons who are spreading such reports behind the back of soldiers and officers should be punished.

3. The meeting declares that the first cavalry regiment is ready to defend the revolution at any moment, at the call of the Provisional Government co-operating with the Soviet.

### KORNILOV'S ARREST.

Petrograd, 14th September. At 2 o'clock in the afternoon Kerensky ordered General Alexeyev to arrest Kornilov and Lukomsky within two hours, otherwise he would declare Alexeyev to be the prisoner of the army staff.

Late in the evening Alexeyev reported that Kornilov, Lukomsky, Romanovsky, and Pryushevsky had been arrested at 10 in the evening.

Kornilov was heard at once, but as the chairman of the investigation commission declared it was "difficult for him to question Kornilov", the general was requested to make his statements in writing.

### THE FIRST BOLSHEVIST VICTORY IN THE PETROGRAD SOVIET.

Petrograd, 19th September. (Petrograd telegraph agency.) The plenary session of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet having passed a resolution proposed by the Bolsheviks, demanding that the power be taken over by the Soviets, the whole bureau of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet has resigned, including the chairman Chaidse, the vice chairman Anissimov, and Gotz-dad (?), Skobelev, Zeretelli, and Chernov. The bureau will be re-elected at the next sitting.

### The Central Executive is still Menshevist.

Petrograd, 14th September. The Central Executive Committee of the Soviets held a stormy meeting, the dispute being on the question: Seizure of power by the Soviets or coalition government? The Mensheviks and S.R. spoke in favour of the latter. Skobelev for instance declared: "To give the power to the Soviets at the present moment would be a crime against the revolution." The Bolsheviks were alone in favour of the immediate seizure of power by the Soviets, and based themselves on the Bolshevik resolution accepted by the Petrograd Soviet. The vote ended in the defeat of the Bolsheviks, the resolution of the Mensheviks and S.R., in support of the coalition government, being accepted.

## Appeal of the C. C. of the Bolshevik Party against the Kornilov Putsch.

To all the toilers, to all the working men and soldiers of Petrograd!

Counter-revolution is advancing on Petrograd. The betrayer of revolution, the enemy of the people, is leading the troops whom he has deceived against Petrograd. The whole bourgeoisie, headed by the Cadet Party, spreading its ceaseless slanders against the workers and soldiers, now welcomes the traitor, and is ready to applaud whole-heartedly the man who will stain the streets of Petrograd with the blood of the workers and revolutionary soldiers, and crush the revolution of the proletarians, soldiers, and peasants, with the aid of his ignorant and misled followers. In order to make it easier for Kornilov to shoot down the proletariat, the bourgeoisie invented a rumour: a workers' revolt had been successful in Petrograd. But now you see that the revolt is not on the side of the workers, but on the side of the bourgeoisie and the generals, and that Kornilov is the first to revolt. Kornilov's victory means death to freedom, loss of the land to the peasants; it means that the landowner is victorious over the peasant, the capitalist over the worker, the general over the soldier.

The Provisional Government was scattered by the first movement of the Kornilov counter-revolution. This government, in which a part of the democrats (though not unanimously) expressed their confidence and to which they gave full power, — this government has proved incapable of fulfilling its first and most important duty, that of nipping the counter-revolution of the generals and bourgeoisie in the bud. The attempts at compromise with the bourgeoisie weakened the democrats, whetted the appetite of the bourgeoisie, and gave it the courage to rise openly against the revolution, against the people.

The salvation of the people, the salvation of the revolution, is a matter of the revolutionary energy of the proletarians and

soldiers themselves. It is only on their forces, their discipline, and their organisation, that we can rely. We entrust the leadership of the determined battle for the salvation of the revolution, its achievements, and its future, to that power which fulfils decisively and certainly the demands of the masses of the workers, peasants, and soldiers. Only this power saves the revolution, saves it in spite of the vacillations, the indecision, and lack of character of many of the democrats.

People of Petrograd! We call upon you for a determined fight against counter-revolution! Petrograd is backed up by the whole of revolutionary Russia.

Soldiers! In the name of the revolution, forward against general Kornilov!

Workers! Close your ranks in the defence of the city of revolution against the attack of counter-revolution!

Soldiers and workers! The blood shed in the February days has welded you together in a fraternal alliance. Show Kornilov that it is not in Kornilov's power to crush the revolution, but that the revolution will overthrow and exterminate the counter-revolutionary advance of the bourgeoisie.

In the name of the interests of revolution, in the name of the power of the proletariat and the peasantry in emancipated Russia and all over the world, meet the enemy of the people, the betrayer of the revolution, the murderer of liberty, in closed ranks, hand in hand, as one man!

You have shown yourselves capable of overthrowing Tsarism, — show that you will not tolerate the rule of the accomplice of the landowners and the bourgeoisie — Kornilov.

The C. C. of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party.

The Executive Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party.

The War Committee of the C. C. of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party.

The Central Council of the Factory Committees.

The Bolshevik Fraction of the Petrograd Soviet and of the Central Council of the Workers', Soldiers, and Peasants' deputies.

## One of the Fundamental Questions of Revolution.

By N. Lenin.

Published in "Rabotschi Puty", 27th September, 1917.

Without doubt the main question of every revolution is the question of state power. The decisive thing is, which class has the power in its hands. And when the newspaper of the greatest government party in Russia, the "Dyelo Naroda" complained recently (No. 147) that the question of the Constituent Assembly and the question of bread supplies were being forgotten in the dispute for power, then the only reply to be given the Social Revolutionaries is: You accuse yourselves. For it is the indecision and irresolution of your party which are more to blame than anything else for the "antics of the ministers", for the eternal postponement of the Constituent Assembly, and for the frustration by the capitalists of the measures projected and accepted for the bread monopoly and the safeguarding of the bread supplies of the country.

The question of power can be neither evaded nor postponed, for it is the one fundamental question determining everything in the development of the revolution, both in home and foreign politics. It is an indubitable fact that our revolution wasted half a year "fruitlessly" through irresolution in the question of power, and that this irresolution was due to the policy of the S. R.'s and the Mensheviks. And at bottom the policy of these parties was determined by the class position of the petty bourgeoisie, by its economic inconstancy in the struggle between capital and labour.

The whole question now is: Has petty bourgeois democracy learnt anything from the pregnant events of this half year, or has it not. If not, then the revolution is in danger, and only the victorious rising of the proletariat can save it.

If it has learnt something, then the next step is the formation of a firmly established power. For nothing short of such a power can be steadfast in a period of people's revolution, that is only such a power can arouse the masses of workers and peasants to life. It must be a power based consciously and unconditionally on the majority of the population.

Up to now state power in Russia has remained in actual fact with the bourgeoisie, and this is only obliged to make occasional partial concessions (which are withdrawn again next day), to give promises (which are not kept), to seek every kind of cloak for its rule (in order to persuade the people of the existence of an "honourable coalition") and so forth. In words: a democratic and revolutionary people's government; in deeds: a government hostile to the people, anti-democratic, counter-revolutionary, and bourgeois. The contradiction here existing is the source of the complete indecision and vacillation in the exercise of power, and of all the "ministerial antics", promoted by the S. R.'s and the Mensheviks with such regrettable (for the people) zeal.

Either let the Soviets be dispersed, and die a disgraceful death, or let all power be given to the Soviets — this was my demand before the All-Russian Soviet Congress at the beginning of July 1917; and the history of July and August confirms convincingly the rightness of my words. The only Soviet power which can stand firmly is one consciously supported by the majority of the people, and this fact cannot be altered by any lies on the part of the lackeys of the bourgeoisie, Potressov, Plechanov, etc., who call it an "extension of the basis" when they place power in the hands of an insignificant minority of the people, the bourgeoisie, the exploiters.

Only a Soviet power can be steadfast. It alone cannot be overthrown by the most tempestuous moments of a tempestuous revolution, and it alone can secure a permanent and broad development of the revolution, a peaceful struggle of the parties within the Soviets. Until there is such a power, we shall inevitably have indecision, irresolution, waverings, unending "power crises", the senseless comedy of ministerial antics, and explosions from Right and Left.

But the slogan: "Power to the Soviets" is very often, if not mostly, quite falsely understood in the sense of a "ministry of the parties of the Soviet majority". We must discuss somewhat in detail this fundamentally wrong idea.

"A ministry of the parties of the Soviet majority" — that means a change in the persons forming the ministry, but the retention of the sacredness of the whole apparatus of governmental power, a thoroughly bureaucratic and entirely undemocratic apparatus, incapable of real reforms, even those contained in the programme of the S. R.'s and the Mensheviks.

"Power to the Soviets" — that means a radical alteration of the whole old state apparatus, this bureaucratic apparatus, hindering all advances towards democracy. It means the removal of this apparatus and its substitution by a new, a people's apparatus, that is by the organised and armed majority of the people, the workers, soldiers, and peasants, and securing the people's majority not only in the choice of delegates, but in the government of the state, the realisation of reforms and in reorganisation, initiative, and independence.

In order to make this difference clearer and more graphic, let us call to mind an admission recently made by the newspaper of the government party, the party of the S. R.'s, the "Dyelo Naroda". Even in the ministries — wrote this newspaper — left to the socialist ministers (this was written at the time of the famous coalition with the Cadets, when the Mensheviks and S. R.'s were ministers), even in these ministries the whole administrative apparatus remained as before, and hampered all work.

This is easily comprehensible. The whole history of the bourgeois parliamentary countries, and to a great extent also of the bourgeois constitutional countries, shows that a change of ministers means very little, since the actual work of administration lies in the hands of the gigantic army of officials. This army is completely saturated with the spirit of anti-democracy; it is bound by thousands of ties to the landowners and the bourgeoisie, and dependent from these in every respect. This army is surrounded by an atmosphere of bourgeois relations; it breathes this atmosphere, it is petrified, dried up, rigid, totally incapable of tearing itself away from this atmosphere; it is unable to think, feel, or act differently from its old rut. This army is bound up with the titles, with

the well known privileges of the "civil servant", its upper strata is enslaved to financial capital by banks and shares, and represents in a certain sense in itself the agents safeguarding the interests and influence of financial capital.

It is a great illusion to suppose that this state apparatus will aid in such reorganisations as, the expropriation without compensation of the landowners, the bread monopoly, etc. A self-delusion and a deception of the people. This is an apparatus which can only serve the republican bourgeoisie, by creating a republic in the form of a "monarchy without monarchs", like the third republic in France; but it is entirely incapable of carrying out reforms curtailing, not to speak of abolishing, the rights of capital, the sacred "rights of private property". Hence it comes about that all possible "coalition ministries" with the participation of the socialists, that these socialists, despite the sincere efforts of many of them, have never been anything but a mere ornament or screen for the bourgeois government, a lightning conductor diverting the wrath of the people from the government, a tool of this government for the deception of the masses. This was the case with Louis Blanc in 1848, it has been the case with dozens of socialists in England and France since then, Chernov and Zeretelli found themselves in the same position in 1917. It has always been so, and always will be, so long as the bourgeois order exists and is kept intact by the old bourgeois state apparatus.

The Soviets of the workers', soldiers', and peasants' deputies are of enormous value as representing an immeasurably higher and incomparably more democratic type of state apparatus. The S. R.s and the Mensheviks have tried every possible and impossible means to convert the Soviets (especially the Petrograd and the All Russian Soviet, that is, the Central Executive Committee) into mere debating societies, affording a semblance of "control" by the expression of powerless resolutions and wishes, dropped politely into the waste paper basket by the government. It only needed the "fresh breeze" of the Kornilov rebellion, however, with its promise of good storm, and the musty atmosphere of the Soviets vanished, and the initiative of the revolutionary masses appeared as something great, mighty, indomitable.

May all the faint hearted may learn from this historical example. They should be ashamed to say: "We have no apparatus which could replace the old one, with its inclination to defend the bourgeoisie." We have this apparatus in the Soviets. Do not fear the initiative and independence of the masses, trust the revolutionary organisations of the masses — and you will see in every sphere of state life such a force, a greatness, and indomitableness of the workers and peasants, as was displayed in their combination and advance against Kornilov.

The lack of faith in the masses, the fear of their advance, the fear of their independence, the trembling before their revolutionary energy, instead of general support for the masses — these are the greatest sins of the leaders of the S. R.s and the Mensheviks. Here lie the deepest roots of their indecision, their shilly-shallying, their unending and fruitless attempts to pour new wine into the old bottles of the bureaucratic state apparatus.

Let us take the history of the democratisation of the army in the Russian revolution in 1917, the history of the ministry of Tchernov, the history of "the rule" of Paltschinsky, the history of Peschechonov's resignation — and everywhere you will find striking confirmation of this. The lack of perfect faith in the organisations elected by the soldiers, the failure to carry out unreservedly the principle of electing the officers by the soldiers' votes, resulted in an army led by Kornilovs, Kaledins, counter-revolutionary officers. This is a fact, and unless we deliberately close our eyes we are bound to see that after the Kornilov rebellion the Kerensky government will leave everything as it was, will actually establish a Kornilov order. The appointment of Alexeyev, the "peace" with Klembovsky, Gagarin, Bagration, and other followers of Kornilov, the mild treatment of Kornilov and Kaledin themselves — all this shows clearly enough that Kerensky is actually establishing a Kornilov order.

There is no middle course. Experience has shown us that there is no middle course. Either all power to the Soviets and complete democratisation of the army, or a Korniloviad.

And the Chernov ministry? Have we not always seen that any really serious step towards actually satisfying the requi-

rements of the peasantry, any sign of faith in the peasants, their mass organisations or actions, arouses the greatest enthusiasm among the peasantry? But Chernov found it necessary to "negotiate" and "bargain" for four months with the Cadets and bureaucrats, until these, after endless delays and disappointments, forced him to resign without having accomplished anything. During these four months, and thanks to these four months, the landowners and capitalists won the game. Landed estate was left untouched, the Constituent Assembly was postponed, and even reprisals against the land committees were commenced.

There is no middle course. Experience has shown us that there is no middle course. Either all power to the Soviets in the metropolis and in the provinces, and all land to the peasants at once, before the Constituent Assembly meets, or the landowners and capitalists hinder everything, restore the power of the landowners, drive the peasants to despair, and drive the matter to a furious peasant insurrection.

We saw the same thing when the capitalists (with the help of Paltschinsky) thwarted any serious attempt at the control of production, and the dealers utilised Peschechonov to sabotage the grain monopoly and the commencement of a regulation of the democratic distribution of bread and other products.

We are not concerned in Russia at the present time with finding "new forms" or projecting comprehensive "plans". Nothing of the sort. That is how the capitalists, with Potressov, Plechanov, etc., who raise such outcries against "the introduction of socialism", against the "dictatorship of the proletariat", regard the matter, and in so doing are deliberately dishonest. In reality the situation in Russia is such that the unheard of burdens and miseries of the war, the threatening shadow of economic ruin and starvation, point out in themselves the only path to be taken. They demand, and not only demand, but already insist imperatively on the following immediate reforms and changes: grain monopoly, control of production and distribution, restriction on the issue of paper money, proper exchange of grain for industrial goods, etc.

Such measures as these are universally recognised as necessary, and in many places steps are being taken for their execution. Steps are being taken, but everywhere obstacles are thrown in the way by the landowners and capitalists, by the resistance of the Kerensky government (a government thoroughly bourgeois-Bonapartist at heart), and by the old bourgeois state apparatus, acting under the direct and indirect pressure of Russian and "allied" financial capital.

Not long ago I. Pileschayev lamented in "Dyelo Naroda" (No. 147) over the resignation of Peschechonov, over the collapse of fixed prices, over the breakdown of the grain monopoly:

"Courage and determination are qualities lacking in all our governments no matter of what composition. . . Revolutionary democracy should not wait; it must seize the initiative itself, and intervene systematically in the economic chaos. . . We need more than ever a fixed course and a determined power."

What is true is true. Golden words. But the writer of them forgot that the question of a steady course, of courage and determination, is not a personal question, but a question of the class possessing this courage and determination. The proletariat is the only such class. Courageous and determined power, a steady course — this is nothing else but the dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasantry. I. Pileschayev unconsciously desires this dictatorship.

What would such a dictatorship mean in actual fact? It would mean the breaking down of the resistance of Kornilov and his adherents, the complete realisation of the democratisation of the army. Within two days of its establishment 99 per cent of the army would be enthusiastic followers of the dictatorship. It would give the land to the peasants, and give the peasants' committees full powers in the provinces. Can any reasonable person suppose that the peasantry would not support such a dictatorship? What Peschechonov only promised ("the resistance of the capitalists is broken" — Peschechonov's own words in his famous speech at the Soviet Congress), would be realised by this dictatorship, converted into deeds, and the democratic organisations already springing into being

food supplies, for control, etc., would not be destroyed, but on the contrary aided, developed, and all hindrances to their work removed.

Only the dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasantry is capable of breaking down the resistance of the capitalists, of showing true courage and determination, and of securing the enthusiastic, unconditional, really heroic support of the masses, the army, and the peasantry.

All power to the Soviets — this alone can ensure a gradual, peaceful, and steady development, carried forward on the level of the will and consciousness of the masses of the people, on the level of their own experience. All power to the Soviets — this means the complete transference of the administration of the country and of the control of economics to the workers and peasants, to whom no one will dare offer resistance, and who will very soon learn from their own experience how best to divide the land, the products, and the bread.

## The Kornilov Putsch and the Resistance of the Working Class.

By N. Bukharin.

Kerensky, realising that the bourgeoisie needed him no longer, but Kornilov, adapted himself more and more to the course of counter-revolution. But he had to keep up at least an appearance of connection with the masses. His position was similar to that of an agent provocateur entangled in the nets of the police: — unless he betrays, he will be dismissed, but he will be dismissed just the same if the revolutionists whom he betrays expose him. Kerensky had lost almost all his credit with the masses. But to fulfil his worthy task he had to make a threatening gesture against the Right, in order to be able to plan assassination against the Left.

To come forward openly against Kornilov meant a rupture with the financial clique and the generals, whilst an open alliance with these meant the destruction of the last remnants of confidence in his own person, a confidence already almost completely undermined. Under such circumstances there was only one thing left for him: to carry on the comedy of the struggle, whilst carrying on transactions behind the scenes tantamount to a conspiracy against the revolution. This was all the easier as all the assistants of Kerensky were declared adherents of Kornilov; Savinkov, Filonenko, Burzev, not to mention the members of the Cadet party, were enthusiastic for a state upheaval in favour of landed estate and banking account. Therefore the first preparations for the struggle (a struggle now no longer against the "Bolsheviks" alone, but against the Menshevik-Social Revolutionary Soviets) were made on the directions of the Bonapartist comedians; and Savinkov, with Kerensky's agreement, lead the 3rd cavalry corps to Petrograd to destroy that same revolutionary democracy whose adherent he pretended to be.

On 26th August Kornilov sent his ultimatum through Prince Lvov, one of the ministers of the first "revolutionary" government. Kerensky "arrested" Lvov. Kornilov, in whose headquarters the "pillars of society" had taken refuge, published a solemn manifesto "to the Russian people", declaring the government to be in the hands of the Germans and Bolsheviks. The "war operations" begin....

Whilst Gutschkov, Rodsyanko, Nabokov, and other leaders of the Cadet ultra-reactionary bourgeoisie, organise a piratical raid from the staff headquarters, the Cadet ministers break up the cabinet from within, in order to weaken their simple minded "socialist" colleagues. The cabinet goes to pieces amidst uproar and tumult. Incredible confusion reigns in all governmental departments. After consultations, negotiations, threats, and request, the Kerensky-Kischkin government emerges from a network of despicable intrigues.

The exchange replies to Kornilov's putsch by a general raising of values. International capital applauds in its press, with rare harmony, the "redeemer of Russia". The new hero is welcomed loudly not only by the organs of allied bankocracy, the "Times", the "Temps", and the paid press of the American trusts, but even by the German imperialist press. The English government places armoured cars at Kornilov's disposal, in

order to assist in the destruction of Red Petrograd. Weapons and finance alike are directed against the workers and peasants.

At the moment of the advance of Kornilov's troops against Petrograd the ultimatum of counter-revolution is reinforced by the threat of opening the front to the Germans. General Lukomsky, Kornilov's right hand, declares that the front will be opened and a separate armistice concluded, in order to free the troops for a blood bath in the capital. Hall-marked patriots, patented protectors of "national pride", Saints George with black hearts and red lining, these generals were prepared to bow down devotedly before the Prussian bayonet, merely for the sake of being able to march a part of the troops against the proletariat!

A violent storm raged through the country. The proletariat, on its guard the whole time, calling in vain upon petty bourgeois democracy, and warning against the deadly danger, now rose. The workers in the cities and in the provinces seized their weapons. Wherever it was possible to obtain steel guardians of liberty, the proletariat armed. In Petrograd the Red Guard sprang into being. The workers in the ordnance factories doubled their production at once, and began to produce machine guns, cannons, and projectiles for the defence against the class enemy. The proletarian Party, the Bolsheviks, issued the slogan of the fight to the last drop of blood; not the fight for Kerensky, but for the revolution. And everywhere, in this critical moment, the working class and its Party were brought by the nature of the struggle into the most dangerous positions.

The Councils and petty bourgeois democrats fled in mortal terror to the proletariat..... The Party of the proletariat, hitherto slighted as a band of criminals, agents provocateurs, and spies, was rehabilitated within 24 hours and converted into a desirable ally. The leaders of the petty bourgeoisie in the Councils took sides hastily with the working class; they realised that counter-revolution has its logic; they knew that Kornilov's victorious bands would sweep away not only the Bolsheviks, but also all the followers of compromise; they realised that reaction was ready according to Milyukov's and Ryabuschinsky's demands to destroy "all Councils and Committees". Trembling in every limb, they began to whimper miserably about the "unity of the revolutionary front".

The attack of the masses was tremendous. Every workers' organisation was on its feet. New life, ready for the fight, pulsed in the Councils, in spite of the majority of compromisers. Revolutionary organs of power were formed everywhere, from the large cities to the remote provincial towns. In Petrograd and Moscow the armed people reappeared on the scene. And everywhere where forces were to be mobilised, influence exercised upon garrisons, or responsible fighting organisations formed, the Party of the proletariat proved the most adaptable, the boldest, the most determined, and the most competent fighting organisation.

## II.

Kornilov's rebellion withered before it blossomed. Kornilov's forces, tricked by their generals into advancing on Petrograd, scattered at the first contact with the troops sent out against them, giving way not so much before Kerensky and his comedy of a fight, as before the organisations of the Soviets, into whose hands the actual leadership of military operations had passed. And in the large towns, where the knights of St. George, the officers and generals, the male and female death battalions, were discoursing so loudly on the coming "dawn", expressing their sovereign contempt of the "unbridled mob", and demonstrating their "courage" by wearing Kornilov's badge — here these heroes did not venture to show their faces at all. They knew only too well the value of their allies — the philistine crowd which is only bold when out of danger. The aid sent by Kaledin, who was to approach from the South and to cut off the corn supplies from the North, was observable only in the fact that after a few days wagons with water melons and sunflower seeds were sent to Moscow instead of corn. The piratical raid on the people broke down miserably. The conspirators had over-estimated their powers — but they had also under-estimated the forces of the revolution. The "lowest strata in the towns" showed no inclination whatever



to obey the riding whip, as the bandits of capital had hoped. These lowest strata replied to the general by unanimous: "Death or victory!", and hastened to the outposts of civil war with an enthusiasm of which only a working class, young and heroic, radiant with enthusiasm, and profoundly conscious of its great historical tasks is capable.

Fraternalisation was the chief medium used for disintegrating Kornilov's troops. Even the semi-savage Tekins, chosen by the bold general to form a select company for the salvation of bourgeois civilisation; even these "savages", pressed into the service of the extermination of the Huns of "Socialism, Communism, and Anarchy", lost their slavish servility to Kornilov. The advance of the troops at the inner front, though so carefully prepared in the selectest drawing rooms of the friends of Russian culture, and announced by much triumphant bell ringing, suddenly shrivelled to nothing, like a bladder pricked by a pin. The mighty hero of the bourgeoisie turned out to be an obstinate noodle, without the slightest resemblance to a victorious military genius.

The effect of the Kornilov putsch was diametrically opposite to that desired by the bourgeois conspirators. It opened the eyes not only of the workers where these were still unenlightened, but also of the peasants both in their homes and at the front; it caused extensive regroupings of forces, and greatly strengthened the position of the Party of the revolutionary proletariat.

The compromise government, which had thrown open its gates for the solemn entry of counter-revolution, could now continue to exist only on the basis of the unconscious faith of the masses in capital and of its conscientious defence policy. And only to the same extent could the masses acknowledge the S.Rs. and Mensheviks as leaders. The sentimentally simple-minded and joyful excitement of the March revolution — that "All-Russian" revolution, at which even the thoroughbred rascals of the finance oligarchy feigned sympathy, — and the faith of the deluded masses in such would-be mighty "leaders of revolution", in frockcoats, as Rodsyanko and Lvov — vanished like smoke. The progressing class struggle destroyed all illusions, tore aside every veil, ruthlessly unmasked the heroes of deception, and showed the masses the brutal countenance of this "protector of the people". The bourgeois imperialists and the press of the social-traitors, which at one time possessed the confidence of the people so thoroughly that the bourgeoisie was able, in the July days, to carry on such a campaign of agitation against the proletarian Party that martial law was proclaimed, now lost the faith of the masses once for all.

The working class, whose majority had already followed revolutionary social democracy at the time of the Moscow Conference, now threw aside the last remnants of the petty bourgeois illusions to which the more backward still clung.

The peasantry saw in Kornilov's rebellion an attack by the landowners, a threat against their dreams of land. Hitherto the peasants had delighted the landlords by "being patient" and postponing the question "till the Constituent assembly", as they were so eagerly advised to do by the Social Revolutionaries; But now even their patience was at an end. The Kornilov movement among the landowners was followed by an exceedingly strong movement among the peasants, developing into an actual peasants insurrection in many places. The capitalist press noted this with alarm, and published the agrarian "disorders" under the headings, "anarchy" and "pillage". In reality the agrarian movement was a sign of the growing class-consciousness of the peasantry, no longer willing to be palmed off with everlasting promises. "Arbitrary seizure", the bugbear of the bourgeoisie, became a customary procedure. The land began to disappear from the hands of the landowners, and was taken possession of by the peasants.

The army, which had trusted Kerensky blindly at one time, and was misled into the shameful June offensive, was now aroused by the whip of the hangman into burning hate against the commanders, down to the officers at the front. The higher command, consisting without exception of adherents of Kornilov, which reintroduced the death penalty, despised and slandered the soldiers, betrayed them at every step, treated them like a contemptible rabble — this higher command felt the hate-filled glance of the millions of the army following their every movement. The class struggle shaking all society went on at the

front in an intensified form. The army threw off the pressure of the imperialists once for all.

And finally, Kornilov's action made the national questions acuter than ever. The Korniloviad was a desperate attempt on the part of the imperialism of Russia as a great power. Under the false slogan of "united and indivisible Russia", proclaimed by the patriotic generals and their disciples among the "merchant class", the customary strangulation policy of imperialist destruction was concealed, unaltered since the days of Tsarism. And when the generals, with or without Nagaika, issued the slogan of "unity and indivisibility", this signified that all so-called "foreign peoples" had to cry for help. Hence Kornilov's "adventure" and its defeat brought about a growth of national separatist endeavours, a further disintegration of Russian imperialism.

The political development of the class-consciousness of the broad masses of the people was shown in the complete collapse of the compromise parties.

The Mensheviks, leaning to a great extent upon backward strata of the working class, infected by petty bourgeois prejudices, hopes, and expectations, disappeared almost completely as a party from the field of politics; for all these delusions were dispelled with amazing rapidity under the protectorate. These illusions were overcome with an almost catastrophic rapidity.

The Social Revolutionaries entered a period of inner dissolution, one section adopting more and more the ideology of the determined peasant exploiter, the other the ideology of the poorest peasantry. This process culminated in the schism of a Left wing of Social Revolutionaries, which gained an increasing number of followers. Finally, the Party of the proletariat began to grow like an avalanche. The country divided more and more into two hostile camps; one of these — headed by the revolutionary proletariat and its Party — became the camp of the workers, the "people's" camp, whilst the other, combining all the fractions of the ruling classes, from the former lady-in-waiting down to the flour dealer and village usurer, was headed by financial capital and the party of the traitors to the people.

The course of events forced the hand of the bourgeois camarilla, and civil war became inevitable. The vanished confidence of the masses in capital, the complete breakdown of the compromise parties, the feverishly rapid growth of the Party of the proletariat, all this forced the bourgeoisie to resort to civil war. It had become impossible to rule by means of fraud, flattery, and compromise, by the mediation of the "socialist" traitors, to pose as democrats, and to hold the dagger of the death penalty at the same time. Only one thing remained: new attempts at armed counter-revolution.

But before it came to a decisive struggle, history permitted the country to experience one more All-Russian farce. The name of this farce was the "Democratic Conference".

(From the Pamphlet: "From the fall of Tsarism to the fall of the bourgeoisie.")

## Two Paths.

By G. Zinoviev.

(Published in "Rabotschi", 13th September, 1917.)

Two prospects open before us, and at the moment of writing they are both equally possible.

The first prospect. The Kornilov conspiracy has been crushed. Kerensky, who saved Russia from a Bolshevik "insurrection" in July, now comes forward in the rôle of "saviour" from the Kornilov adventure. The bourgeoisie, especially the most experienced, the most energetic, and the cleverest of them — the Cadets — enter for the time being into a fresh alliance with the popular Kerensky. For the Cadets have contrived to hedge and to remain "neutral". A "new" government is formed, without Chernov, but with a certain Kischkin. Kornilov has been removed, but his place is taken by a new Kornilov named Alexeyev. About ten generals have been removed, but the 790 Romanoff generals remaining of the original 800 still retain their posts. The "misunderstandings" with the hot headed

monarchist young bloods are settled, the soldiers left to the kindness of the higher command. Agrarian policy in Russia is in the hands of the liberal landowners. The fate of industry remains in the hands of the counter-revolutionary capitalists who sabotage industry. High prices, famine, economic decay, prevail everywhere. The policy of war "to a victorious end" conquers. Everything which has happened up to now is regarded as a regrettable "episode", from which only one lesson is to be learned, that the Provisional Government must become even more "reasonable", must admit the big industrialists to its ranks, etc. This is the path along which Kerensky is being drawn by Plechanov, Milyukov, and Nekrassov.

The second prospect. The "Kornilov days" have opened the eyes of the majority of the "revolutionary democracy". At last they are convinced that without an alliance with the working class there is no salvation for the revolution, no land or liberty, no end to famine and ruin, no end to the bloody war. Bitter experience has taught them that an alliance with the bourgeoisie throws them into the jaws of Kornilov, ruins them and the country. Democracy arrives at the conviction that it must fight against the bourgeoisie, not in alliance with it. It realises that the only honourable alliance is that of coalition with the workers, soldiers, and poor peasantry, against the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Out of the three main forces in the revolution: 1. proletariat, 2. petty bourgeoisie, 3. bourgeoisie and landowners — the first two join together against the third. The proletariat becomes the vanguard of the movement. Radical changes take place in the army. A thorough-purging of the ranks of the officers is carried out. All army affairs are in the hands of the soldiers' committees. The land is given to the peasants. Reprisals cease. The workers' organisations organise at once the control of production and of the banks. A Workers' militia is formed everywhere for the preservation of public order. The bourgeois newspapers are prohibited, and we print millions of copies of our newspapers for the peasants and soldiers. The Constituent Assembly is convened at once. The central power passes into the hands of the workers, soldiers, and poor peasants. Capital is partially confiscated. The general obligation to work is introduced, enforced by the worker's militia. The Tsar's secret treaties are made public at once, and Russia comes forward with proposals for a general peace, on just and democratic conditions.

These are the two possible alternatives. That we are wholeheartedly for the second need not be emphasised.

But which path will be chosen by Russia in the near future?

This depends chiefly upon whether the peasants, soldiers, and Soviets have learnt the lesson of events, and how much they have learnt.

Up to the present the Soviets have appeared to be unreliable organisations. The rule of narrow-minded Menshevism and Social Revolutionism appeared to be assured in the Soviets for a long time to come. But Kornilov has proved an excellent teacher. Events have had their effect.

At the present moment the petty bourgeoisie continues its negotiations with the big bourgeoisie. Kerensky conducts negotiations with the Cadets, and with Alexeyev and his like. Paltchinsky receives a high post. The ideological disciples of Kornilov are at full liberty. Milyukov is immune. The bourgeois press continues its counter-revolutionary agitation everywhere. The generals are the sole candidates brought forward for the high posts in the army. The political prisoners have not been reinstated in their positions. The "Rabotschaya Gazeta" even proves that "the propaganda of the Soviets for the seizure of power, for workers' control, etc., are to blame" for the Korniloviad. This newspaper holds the view that if the mountain will not come to Mohammed, then Mohammed must go to the mountain, that is, if the bourgeoisie will not come to democracy, then democracy must go to the bourgeoisie.

All these are threatening signs. And we shall not be surprised if the same old comedy of compromises begins again tomorrow, if the crisis of power is repeated again with fresh

combinations of ministers, and if the workers and soldiers, after having "saved" revolution to-day from a bourgeois conspiracy, find themselves in the net of a "new" ministerial combine tomorrow. Everything is possible in this (for the bourgeoisie) best of all worlds. We must be prepared...

We Bolsheviki will fight to the utmost for the victory of the second prospect. And even should the first prospect be realised, it will only be a postponement of the victory of our standpoint — only a postponement.

We remember that three or four months ago we were still in the minority in the working class. The July events won the workers for us. The September events will bring us great masses of new followers among the peasants and soldiers.

If Kerensky, if the S.Rs. and the Mensheviki, after putting an end to the Kornilov adventure, continue in the "old spirit", the soldiers and peasants will turn away from them, and this time for a long time. After the Kornilov adventure, you must not expect that the soldiers will tolerate the death penalty and the unrestricted rule of the generals. After the Kornilov adventure you must not expect that the peasants will "wait" for land until you have come to an "understanding" with the Cadets.

You can make another attempt. But it will cost you dear, and is bound to end in your defeat.

We, the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat during the last historical events, at this great turning point in the history of Russia, propose to you once again the fraternal alliance of all the revolutionary forces of the country, for the establishment and maintenance of power in the hands of the workers, soldiers, and poor peasantry.

## Chronicle of Events.

### September 9.

Kronstadt elects a Bolshevik as chairman of the Soviet Executive.

Kerensky orders the troops marching on Petrograd to retreat, — Kornilov orders them to advance.

### September 10.

Kornilov calls on the Cossacks to support him.

The Bolsheviki enlighten the people by proclamations in their press.

Bolshevist meetings everywhere pass fighting resolutions. The South West front takes sides with the revolution.

### September 11.

The first conference of the Petrograd young workers, representing 13,000 organised young workers, declares its solidarity with the Bolsheviki.

### September 12.

The "Rabotschi" publishes an appeal of the Bolsheviki on the Kornilov putsch (text see above).

The Provisional Government appoints Kerensky commander in chief of the whole army.

The "Social democrat" calls upon the workers to arm.

### September 13.

The Petrograd Soviet accepts the Bolshevik resolution by 279 votes to 115 and 51 abstentions.

### September 14.

The government is reconstituted; Avksentyev, Sarudni, and Skobolev resign.

"Novaya Shishn" and "Rabotschi" are prohibited. Kornilov's arrest.