

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 66

24th November 1927

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

C O N T E N T S

J. Stalin: Questions and Answers.
Politics.

G. Peri: The Treaty between France and Yugoslavia.
For Leninism against Trotzkyism.

For the Leninist Unity of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern.

Decision of the C. P. of France against the Opposition.

The Organisations of the C. P. S. U. Approve of the Expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev.

The Communist Members of the Foreign Delegations Demand Severest Measures against the Opposition.

In the International.

The Agenda of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

The Labour Movement.

Paul Reimann: The Fight in the North Bohemian Textile Industry.

A. Ketzlik: The Economic Offensive against the Workers in Austria.

José Bullejos: The Results of the Miners' Strike in Austria.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

George Hardy: Australian Workers Decide to Affiliate to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat.

Resolution of the Australasian Council of Trade Unions to Affiliate to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat.

Against Colonial Oppression.

N. K.: The Rule of French Imperialism in Indo-China.

Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.

The World Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union.

Obituary.

Th. Rothstein: A. A. Joffe.

Ten Years Ago.

Vl. Malchovsky: The Red Workers' Guard in the Year 1917.

The Discussion before the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

L. B.: The Discussion Preceding the XV. Party Congress.

Questions and Answers.

A. Discussion with Foreign Delegates.

By J. Stalin.

Moscow, 13th November 1927.

Comrade Stalin gave an interview to 80 members of the workers delegations from abroad which lasted six hours. The delegates came from Germany, France, Austria, Czechoslovakia, South America, China, Belgium, Finland, Denmark and Esthonia. The first question put to comrade Stalin was:

Why does not the Soviet Union participate in the League of Nations?

Answer: The Soviet Union is not a member of the League of Nations and does not participate in its work, because the Soviet Union is not prepared to share the responsibility for the imperialist policy of the League of Nations, for the "Mandates" which are distributed by the League for the exploitation and oppression of the colonial countries, for the war preparations and military alliances which are covered and sanctified by the League, preparations which must inevitably lead to imperialist war. The Soviet Union does not participate in the work of the League because the Soviet Union is fighting with all its energy against all preparations for imperialist war. The Soviet Union is not prepared to become a part of that camouflage for imperialist machinations represented by the

League of Nations. The League is the Rendezvous of the imperialist leaders who settle their business there behind the scenes. The subjects about which the League speaks officially, are nothing but empty phrases intended to deceive the workers.

The business carried on by the imperialist ring-leaders behind the scenes, that is the actual work of imperialism which the eloquent speakers of the League of Nations hypocritically cloak.

Question: Why is a Social Democratic Party not tolerated in the Soviet Union?

Answer: We tolerate no Social Democratic Party in the Soviet Union for the same reason that we tolerate no counter-revolutionary parties. It is certainly fairly well known that in Russia the social democrats fought in the civil war against the Soviet Union on the side of the Koltchaks and Denikins. The Social Democratic Party is at present the party of the re-establishment of capitalism and the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. I think that this development on the part of the social democracy is not merely typical for the social democracy in the Soviet Union, but also in all other countries. In Russia the social democracy was more or less

revolutionary as long as Tsarism existed. That is why it was possible for the bolsheviks to form a united party with the mensheviks at that time. When the so-called democratic bourgeoisie attains power, the social democracy becomes an oppositional or even a bourgeois party. When the revolutionary proletariat seizes power the social democracy becomes a party of the open counter-revolution.

Question: Does that mean that the social democracy is a counter-revolutionary force only in the Soviet Union, or can it be termed that in other countries also?

Answer: I have said already that there exists a difference. In the land of the proletarian dictatorship the social democracy is a counter-revolutionary force striving for the re-establishment of capitalism and the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the interests of bourgeois "democracy". In the capitalist countries where the workers have not yet won power, the social democracy is either an oppositional party or a semi-governmental party which concludes coalitions with the liberal bourgeoisie against the most reactionary forces of capitalism, or it is absolutely a governmental party which openly and unambiguously defends capitalism and bourgeois "democracy" against the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. It becomes openly counter-revolutionary and its counter-revolutionary character directs itself against the power of the proletariat only after this has become an established fact.

Question: Why is there no freedom of the press in the Soviet Union?

Answer: If by that, freedom for the bourgeois press is meant, then it is a fact that such freedom does not exist in the Soviet Union and will not exist as long as the dictatorship of the proletariat exists. If, however, freedom for the proletariat in this respect is meant, then I must say that there is no other country in the world where such an all-embracing press freedom for the proletariat exists as in the Soviet Union. Take a look at the conditions here, go through the working class quarters and you will find that the best printing works, colour manufactures for the press etc., tremendous halls for meetings and many other things which are necessary for the freedom of the proletarian press, are at the full disposal of the workers and the rest of the toiling masses. In the Soviet Union that is press freedom for the proletariat. When the bolsheviks seized power in October 1917 they declared openly that the power of the proletariat would be used to suppress the bourgeoisie in the interests of the toiling masses in town and country who form the overwhelming majority of the population of the Soviet Union. How can one after all that demand from the proletarian dictatorship that it give the bourgeoisie freedom of the press!

Question: Why are the arrested Mensheviks not released?

Answer: It is true, that active mensheviks are not released before they have served their terms. But what is there to be astonished at? Why were the bolsheviks held in prison in the months of July, August, September and October 1917? Why was Lenin compelled to remain in hiding from July to October 1917 when the mensheviks and the social revolutionaries had the power? In the Soviet Union the social democracy is a counter-revolutionary party. That of course does not mean that the proletarian revolution could not carry on without the arrest of these leaders of the counter-revolutionary party. The arrest of the mensheviks is only the logical continuation of the policy of the October revolution which overthrew the parties of the Second International. If one is permitted to overthrow them, why should one not also arrest them when they openly go over into the ranks of the bourgeois counter-revolution? Do you think that the overthrow of the mensheviks and the social revolutionaries was a less energetic measure than their arrest? One cannot hold the policy of the October revolution for correct if one does not also consider its inevitable consequences to be correct. Either the October revolution was a mistake, in which case the arrest of the mensheviks and the social revolutionaries was also a mistake, or the October revolution was no error and in that case the arrest of the mensheviks and the social revolutionaries can also not be considered an error. Events have their own logic.

Question: Why was a correspondent of the social democratic press service refused permission to enter the Soviet Union?

Answer: Because the social democratic press abroad, particularly the Berlin "Vorwaerts" has surpassed the bourgeois press in its unheard of calumnies and slanders against the Soviet Union and its representatives. Very many bourgeois newspapers, for instance, the "Vossische Zeitung", behave themselves much more "decently" and "objectively" in the struggle against the Soviet Union than the "Vorwaerts". This may seem peculiar, but it is nevertheless a fact, and a fact that must be taken into consideration. If the "Vorwaerts" behaved itself no worse than the normal bourgeois newspapers, then its representatives would certainly find a place in the Soviet Union together with the representatives of the other bourgeois newspapers. A little while ago a representative of the "Vorwaerts" asked an employee of our diplomatic representation in Berlin, under what circumstances a representative of the "Vorwaerts" would be permitted to enter the Soviet Union. He was answered: "If the 'Vorwaerts' would prove that it is really prepared to act towards the Soviet Union and its representatives as the normal 'decent' liberal newspapers like the 'Vossische Zeitung', then the Soviet government would have nothing to say against the granting of permission to enter the Soviet Union to a representative of the 'Vorwaerts'." I think that this answer is perfectly clear and understandable.

Question: Is a unification of the Second and the Third Internationals possible?

Answer: In my opinion it is not possible, because the two Internationals have a basically different attitude to fundamental questions and a totally different point of view. Whilst the Third International looks forward to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Second International looks to the recovery of capitalism and the destruction of everything necessary for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The struggle between these two Internationals is nothing but the ideological reflection of the struggle between the supporters of capitalism and the supporters of socialism. In this struggle either the Second or the Third International must win. There is no reason to doubt but that the Third International will be victorious in the working class movement. I consider therefore any unification of the two Internationals to be impossible.

Question: How is the situation in Western Europe to be estimated; can revolutionary events be expected in the next few years?

Answer: I believe that in Europe the elements making for a serious crisis of capitalism are growing and will continue to grow. Capitalism can partially stabilise itself, can rationalise its production and suppress the working class temporarily. Capitalism is temporarily still able to do this, but it will never be able to return to that "stability", to the "equipoise" characteristic of the period before the world war and the October revolution. In the countries of Europe and also in the colonial countries which represent the source of existence for European capitalism, the flames of revolution are spurting out now here and now there. To-day the flame of revolutionary outbreak is visible in Austria, to-morrow in Great Britain, the day after to-morrow in France or Germany, then in China, Indonesia, in India etc. The most obvious signs of the growing crisis of capitalism, the most clear example of the accumulated dissatisfaction and indignation of the working class, were the events connected with the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti. The murder of these two workers was sufficient to set the working class of the whole world in movement. What does that prove? It proves that the ground under the feet of capitalism is getting hotter and hotter, that the conditions for new revolutionary events are approaching. The fact that capitalism may be successful in damming the first new wave of revolution is no consolation for capitalism. The revolution against capitalism can not flow up in one single wave. It sweeps up and retires like the ebb and flow of the sea. It was like that in Russia and it will be like that in Europe. We are facing new revolutionary events.

Question: Is the Opposition in the C. P. of the Soviet Union strong, and upon what circles does it rely for support?

Answer: I think that the Opposition in the C. P. of the Soviet Union is very weak, or better, its power in the Party is practically nil. The results of the few days of discussion show that the Central Committee of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

and the theses presented by it won 130,000 Party members whilst the Opposition only received 1200 votes. That is to say, not one per cent. of the Party membership is behind the Opposition. I think that still more catastrophic results for the Opposition will result in the further voting. The discussion will last until the Party congress. In this period we will do our best to get the opinion of the whole Party. I don't know how discussions are carried on in your countries in social democratic parties. I don't know whether social democratic parties discuss at all. We take our discussions very seriously. We will ask the whole Party and you will see that the strength of the Opposition is still less than that shown in the figures already to hand. It is very well possible that the Opposition will have no single representative, no single delegate at the XV. Party congress of the C. P. of the Soviet Union. Let us take for instance, such immense factories like the Treugolnik or the Putilov works in Leningrad. The number of the workers employed in the Treugolnik works is fifteen thousand, the number of Party members is 2122. Of this number 39 voted for the Opposition. In the Putilov works there are approximately 11,000 workers employed, of these 1718 are members of the Party and 29 of them voted for the Opposition. In answer to the second part of the question, I think that the Opposition chiefly supports itself upon non-proletarian circles. Ask those non-proletarian sections of our population who are dissatisfied with the proletarian dictatorship, with whom they sympathise and they will say without hesitation, with the Opposition. Why? Because fundamentally the struggle of the Opposition is a struggle against the Party and against the proletarian dictatorship with which certain non-proletarian sections of the population are inevitably dissatisfied. The Opposition is the reflection of this dissatisfaction, it is the reflection of the pressure of certain non-proletarian elements against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Question: Is the contention spread by Ruth Fischer and Maslov in Germany correct that the present leadership of the Comintern and the Russian Party is delivering the workers to the Counter-revolution?

Answer: Does the Comintern and the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. deliver the workers to the counter-revolution! I am in a position to inform you that the Comintern and our Party have decided to invite all the landowners and capitalists driven out by us in 1917, to return and take over all their old land and factories. I see that you are laughing. Perhaps some of you will think that I am not serious enough about this question, but comrades, such questions cannot be treated seriously. I think that such questions can only be answered ironically (storms of applause).

Question: What is your attitude to the Opposition and to the Ruth Fischer-Maslov group in Germany?

Answer: My attitude to the Opposition and to its agency in Germany is the same as the attitude of the well-known French novelist Alphonse Daudet to his "hero" Tartarion de Tarascon (laughter amongst the delegates). You know to what embarrassment and scandal the fantastic boastings of Tartarin led for his followers. I think that the self important noise the leaders of the Opposition have raised in Berlin will end in the same embarrassment and scandal for them.

Question: In what way does the Soviet government intend to fight against the foreign oil companies?

Answer: I think that question is wrongly formulated. With that formulation of the question one might imagine that the Soviet government intended to open up an attack upon the oil companies in other countries with the aim to smash them. In actual fact, however, certain of the oil companies in the capitalist countries are striving to throttle the Soviet oil industry on the world market. The Soviet oil industry is weaker than that in the capitalist countries both as far as the quantities of oil produced and the market connections are concerned. The Soviet oil industry defends itself against these attempts to throttle it both by increasing the quality of its oil production and decreasing its prices. The Soviet oil industry is not a capitalist industry and therefore does not need the insane super-profits. Everywhere the products of the Soviet Union, and in particular its oil, tend to lower prices and thus improve the situation of the consumers. That is the secret of the

wild hatred of the oil industrialists of all countries, in particular Mr. Deterding. At the same time these oil industrialists seek to cloak their exploitation of the consumers and their policy of high oil prices with hypocritical phrases about "communist propaganda".

Question: How do you intend to bring about collectivism in the Peasant question?

Answer: We intend to bring about collectivism in the peasant question gradually by measures of an economic, financial, cultural and political nature. I think that the most interesting question is that of the economic measures. In this matter our measures aim in three main directions, first of all to the organisation of individual peasant farms into co-operative unions. Secondly, towards the organisation of peasant farms, chiefly the farms of the poor peasants, into productive co-operatives, and thirdly and lastly towards the inclusion of peasant agriculture in the systematic economic system of the controlling and regulating State organs, both with regard to the placing of agricultural products and to the supply of the peasantry with the necessary industrial products. In the commodity exchange between town and country, the role of the co-operatives and the State trading organisations can be regarded not only as the strongest, but even as the dominant factor, if not exactly a monopolist one. With regard to the supply of the village with manufactured articles, the share of the co-operatives and the State trading organisations is over 70%. With regard to the supply of agricultural machinery, the co-operatives and the State trading organisations have almost 100%. With regard to the purchase of cereals, the share of the co-operatives and the State organisations is 80%, in the purchase of raw materials for industry such as cotton, sugar beet etc. it is almost 100%. That means that favourable conditions are being created in the village for the abolition of the capitalist elements and for the further limitation and final abolition of the Kulaks, for the organisation of the working peasants into productive co-operatives and for the financing of these co-operatives by the State. Let us take for instance the production of sugar beet for the sugar industry and the production of cotton for the textile industry. The extent of the production of this raw material, the determination of its quality and price is not arrived at spontaneously by the slash of forces upon an unsystematic market, through speculators, intermediaries etc., but through systematic agreements between the sugar and textile syndicates on the one hand and tens of thousands of peasant farms which are organised in co-operatives for the production of sugar beet and cotton on the other hand. It cannot be said that other branches of our economic system have already reached this advanced stage of development, but it can be said and with conviction that all branches of agriculture, including the production of cereals will gradually go through this same development. This development is the direct line to the collectivisation of agriculture. The complete collectivisation will only then come about when peasant agriculture has received a new technical basis by mechanisation and electrification and when the majority of the working peasants are included in the trade union organisations, when the majority of the villages are covered with a net of agricultural co-operatives of a collectivist character. This is the direction which the development is taking. However, this aim has not yet been reached and it will be some time before it is reached. Karl Marx said that no single new social order in history consolidated itself without being intensively financed by hundreds of millions. I believe that we have already entered that stage of development in agriculture where the State can sufficiently finance a new social order. It is a fact that the socialist industry has already become the leading factor in the national economic system and that it is leading agriculture. This fact is the most certain guarantee that peasant agriculture will continue to advance along the road to collectivism.

Question: What were the chief difficulties during the period of War-communism when an attempt was made to abolish money?

Answer: The industry of the Soviet Union with the exception of the war industry was crippled and wasted. Agriculture limped along. An orderly intermediary trade apparatus between town and country practically did not exist. Nevertheless, following upon the conclusion of the civil war and the introduction

of the New Economic Policy, the economic situation of the country radically improved. Industry developed, strengthened and took a dominating position in the whole economic system. In the last two years we succeeded in investing two milliard Roubles in industry absolutely from our own resources and without any loans from outside. The co-operatives and the State trading organisations have so developed that they have taken a leading role in the commodity exchange of the country. The results which have been achieved are sufficient to enable further progress to take place towards the successful building up of socialism. Now we must re-equip our industry and build new factories upon a new technical basis. We must raise the level of agricultural production and create an intermediary distributive apparatus between town and country which is capable of taking the needs of both town and country into consideration and satisfying them both. When we have done all this, presumably the time will have arrived where money will be no longer necessary. However, up to that point is still a long way.

Question: What is the situation of the "scissors"?

Answer: Our industrial commodities are still being sold at a somewhat higher price than would be possible under other circumstances. The reason for this is to be found in the youth of our industry and in the necessity to protect it from outside attack and to create the conditions for its speedy growth. Its speedy development is necessary both for town and country. In order to abolish this minus for the peasantry, the Soviet government and the Party have set themselves the aim of steadily reducing the prices of industrial goods. In the last few years we have been successful in reducing retail trade prices for industrial goods by from 8 to 10%. The industrial organisations are systematically reducing the costs of production and the prices of industrial goods. The policy of steadily reducing the prices for industrial goods is the main plank of our economic policy and without this no improvements possible and no rationalisation in industry, and the alliance of the workers and peasants cannot be consolidated.

Question: What are the proposals of the Soviet government to the French small investors with regard to the debts? What steps are being taken to inform these latter of the proposals?

Answer: Our proposals with regard to the pre-war debts have been made known in the well-known interview of Rakovsky. They are made dependent upon the granting of credits to the Soviet Union. In this matter we adhere to the famous principle, you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours. Although the famous decree concerning the abolition of the Tsarist debts remains valid, we are prepared to pay a part of the war debts within the bounds of a practical agreement if in return we are granted the credits which are necessary for us and at the same time useful for French industry. The payments with regard to the debts we regard as simply extra-interest for the credits which we wish to receive for the development of our industry. People speak of the war debts of Tsarist Russia and of certain alleged claims on the Soviet Union in connection with the events which accompanied the October revolution. But they forget that our revolution is a fundamental negation of imperialist war and the Tsarist debts connected with it. The Soviet Union cannot and will not pay the war debts. Further, it is forgotten that for several years the Soviet Union was exposed to the violence and predatory acts of a number of foreign States during the intervention and that in this connection the Soviet Union has formulated certain counter-claims which cannot be struck out of the reckoning. The imperialist ringleaders would like to expunge these things from our memory, but you must remember that people do not forget such things so easily.

Question: How can the alcohol monopoly be brought into harmony with the struggle against alcoholism?

Answer: In this respect there is undoubtedly a contradiction at present. The Party is aware of this and has consciously permitted it because in the present state of affairs a minor contradiction is the lesser evil. When we introduced the alcohol monopoly we were faced with the dilemma: Either become slaves of capitalism, hand them over a number of important factories and works and demand in return certain necessary sums, or introduce the alcohol monopoly and thus

obtain the sums necessary for the development of industry from our own resources. The members of the Central Committee, including myself, had a discussion upon the subject with Lenin and he recognised that should we fail to obtain the necessary loans from abroad, then we would have to go over openly to an introduction of the alcohol monopoly as a temporary measure of an unusual nature. We therefore chose the lesser evil. To-day this monopoly produces a yearly sum of over 500,000 Roubles. If we abandoned the monopoly, then we should have to abandon this source of income also, and at the same time there would be very little reason to suppose that the consumption of alcohol would decrease, for the peasant would begin to make his own alcohol and poison himself with wood spirit. Obviously, a certain role is played here by the insufficient cultural development of the village. If the production of alcohol was handed over to private persons, that would first of all strengthen private capitalism, secondly it would take away from the government the possibility of controlling sufficiently the production and consumption of alcohol and thirdly, it would make the abolition of the production and the consumption of alcohol in the future still more difficult. At the present moment our policy culminates in a gradual reduction of the production of alcohol. I think that in the future we shall be successful in abolishing the State monopoly and reducing the production of alcohol down to that minimum required for technical purposes and then completely stopping the sale of alcohol. I think that neither the question of alcohol nor a number of other unpleasant things would ever have troubled us very much if the Western European proletariat had seized power into its own hands and given us the necessary support. For the moment our Western European brothers do not want to seize power and we are therefore compelled to help ourselves with our own means. That is not our fault, it is fate. (Laughter and applause amongst the delegates.)

Question: What are the rights of the Political State Administration (G. P. U.), do proceedings take place without witnesses and without a defence, do secret arrests take place, and if so is it intended to abandon or alter these methods?

Answer: The State Political Administration is a punitive organ. It is more or less analogous to the Committee of Public Safety that was formed during the Great French Revolution. It punishes chiefly spies, conspirators, terrorists, bandits, speculators and forgers. It is a sort of political court martial formed for the purpose of protecting the interests of the revolution against the attacks of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and its agents. It was created in the days following the October revolution when various conspiracies, terrorism and espionage organisations which were financed by Russian and foreign capitalists made their presence felt. This State organ developed and strengthened after a number of counter-revolutionary terrorist attempts against leaders of the Soviet power, the murder of comrade Uritzky, a member of the revolutionary committee in Leningrad, by a social revolutionary, the murder of comrade Volodarsky also a member of the revolutionary committee in Leningrad by a social revolutionary and the attempt upon Lenin who was wounded by a member of the social revolutionaries. One must recognise that the State Political Administration hit the enemies of the revolution with severe and certain blows. This character it has retained, by the way, down to this very day. Since then the State Political Administration is the terror of the bourgeoisie, the protector of the revolution and the bare sword of the proletariat. For this reason it is no wonder that the bourgeoisie of all countries have an animal hatred for the State Political Administration. All thinkable fairy tales and slanders about the State Political Administration are fabricated. The workers, however, respect the State Political Administration. People preach mildness and propose to abolish the State Political Administration. But can any one give us the guarantee that when we abolish the State Political Administration the capitalists of all countries will cease to organise and finance the conspirators, terrorists, incendiaries and bomb throwers? To disarm the revolution without the guarantee that the enemies of the revolution are also disarmed, would that not be madness?, would that not be a crime against the working class? No, comrades, we do not want to fall into the same error as the Parisian communards fell into. They were all too mild towards the Versailles, and Karl Marx has accused them of this since.

Do you, comrades, think that the Russian bourgeoisie and landowners are less bloodthirsty than the Versailles bourgeoisie of France? In any case, we know how they treated the workers when thanks to the intervention of France, Great Britain, Japan and the United States, they occupied Siberia, the Ukraine and the North Caucasus. From the internal standpoint the situation of the revolution is so absolutely firm and unshakeable that we could easily do without the State Political Administration, but what internal enemies do exist are not isolated individuals, they are connected with the capitalists abroad by a thousand threads, and the latter support them with all means. We are a State surrounded by capitalist States. The internal enemies of our revolution are the agents of the capitalists in all countries. The capitalist States form the basis and the rear guard for the internal enemy we are also warring against the counter-revolutionary elements in all countries. We do not want to repeat the mistakes of the Parisian Communards. The State Political Administration is necessary for the revolution and will continue to exist to the terror of the enemies of the proletariat (Storms of applause).

A delegate then thanked comrade Stalin in the name of those present for his explanations and for refuting the lies which are spread about the Soviet Union abroad.

Comrade Stalin answered: "We Soviet workers are of the opinion that it is our duty to our class brothers to account to them in all questions. Our State is a child of the world proletariat. The leaders of our State are simply fulfilling their duty towards the world proletariat when they account for their stewardship in all these questions to the representatives of the international working class. (Applause.)"

POLITICS

The Treaty between France and Yugoslavia.

By G. Peri (Paris).

On November 11th 1927 **Briand**, the Foreign Minister of France and **Marinkovitch**, the Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia, signed the Treaty of Arbitration between France and Yugoslavia.

This diplomatic action will not fail to open up an era of serious complications in Central and South East Europe and to contribute to the process of consolidation of the two imperialist blocs which are hostile to one another.

The Treaty of Arbitration contains the arrangements usually made in agreements of this kind: the parties to the treaty pledge themselves not to resort to war for the purpose of settling differences which may arise between them; they testify to their readiness to discuss matters in a friendly way every time the territorial condition which has been fixed by the treaties seems to be endangered.

Not the wording of such an agreement however is of decisive significance. The spirit, the origin and the significance of the agreement at a given moment are much more important. This demands a few explanations.

The negotiations resulting in the conclusion of the treaty between France and Yugoslavia date back to 1922. They therefore took place before the negotiations which led to the conclusion of the treaties between France and Czechoslovakia and between France and Roumania. The negotiations which, on Yugoslavia's behalf, were carried on by **Vernitch** and afterwards by his successor **Spalaikovitch**, were completed with the edition of the treaty which was paraphed in 1926.

Only the exchange of signatures was still wanting in order to make the treaty valid. At this point however, difficulties cropped up. This was in 1926. It was the epoch when Italian Fascism loudly proclaimed its imperialist aims, protested noisily against the crystallisation of Europe, looked with envious greediness on the Mediterranean and the Adriatic, prepared the nasty trick of the Pact of Tirana with Albania and ensured for itself the collaboration with the London Cabinet, which is intent upon putting an end to France's predominance on the Continent.

The Government of France was obliged to give way under the pressure of Great Britain and to postpone the setting of the signatures which **Nintchitch**, the Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia, urged repeatedly but in vain.

Now however, the treaties are signed, the preliminary agreements have become definite and the paraphs have been replaced by signatures. What factors prompted the Paris Cabinet to put an end to its hesitations?

In the first place undoubtedly the intensification of the dissensions in the Balkans. The Balkans offer to-day the same deplorable aspect as they did before 1914. Political assassinations are following one another in more and more rapid succession, incidents on the frontiers and attacks made by the bands which are in the pay of the oligarchic governments involve a permanent condition of war. Italy, certain of Great Britain's support, is entering into a constantly closer alliance with the omnipotent military league in Bulgaria, is receiving with great pomp the ill-famed **Protogerov**, the leader of the Macedonian bandits, is entering in alliance with **Horthy** in Hungary, who hurried to nominate a military attaché in Rome.

Imperialist France is responding to these dirty intrigues with intrigues of the same kind. She is using Yugoslavia as her chess-man in the game. In view of the approaching conflicts, Italy has made sure of Bulgaria's and Hungary's help whilst Yugoslavia is ensuring for itself the support of France, her powerful mistress.

On both sides the positions at the front are being taken up.

To these causes of a general nature, which in themselves suffice to explain the haste with which the Foreign Ministries of France and Yugoslavia exchanged signatures, special causes which should not be neglected, come in as an addition. The Government of Yugoslavia is in urgent need of financial support. It can only find the means it requires in foreign countries, that is Great Britain and the United States. For several months negotiations have been going on between the financiers of London and the Cabinet of Yugoslavia. The first demanded from the beginning that Yugoslavia should immediately settle her war debts to Great Britain. It was not until this was done that actual negotiations were entered upon.

The representative of the London Stock Exchange demanded in return for granting a loan to Yugoslavia that she should make important concessions in the field of industry. In the course of his last negotiations with the Minister of Finance and the King of Yugoslavia, **Clark**, General Director of the Bank of England, developed at full length a programme which is, in reality, equivalent to taking possession of Yugoslavia by Great Britain's capital.

This condition of affairs naturally caused alarm in the leading circles of France which had already for a long time been at work with a view to accelerating the exchange of the signatures.

This is a counter-move of the group France and Yugoslavia against the manoeuvres of British and Italian imperialism, a counter-attack of Paris and Belgrade, i. e. an instrument of war. The Treaty is consequently interpreted in a suitable manner by the Press of Italy and of Great Britain.

"Whatever may occur in the Balkans in the next few years", writes the "Times", "Italy will hold France responsible for having interfered in matters which are no concern of hers".

The Treaty is also a proof of the obstinacy with which French imperialism is continuing its policy of close alliances in Central and Eastern Europe. This is what is going on two years after the Locarno Conference and at a time when all the bourgeois parties of France elected **Paul Boncour**, the Socialist, President of the Parliamentary Commission for Foreign Affairs.

It is evident that, although the Treaty was given the unpretentious name of "Arbitration and Cordial Treaty", we have before us a regular military alliance according to which France and Yugoslavia pledge themselves to come to one another's assistance in case of an attack being made by a third Power on one of the parties to the treaty. This "peaceful" agreement is a fresh threat against peace, as the approach between France and Yugoslavia will prompt Italy to enter into a military alliance with Bulgaria and Hungary on the one hand and with Spain on the other hand. The conflict of interests between Great Britain which is at the back of these alliances and France is thus being further intensified.

FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

For the Leninist Unity of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern.

Decision of the Polbureau of the Communist Party of Germany on the Expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev.

The Polbureau of the C. C. of the Communist Party of Germany in its meeting of November 18th, adopted the following decision on the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev from the C. P. S. U.:

The Polbureau of the C. C. of the C. P. G. declares its complete solidarity with the Leninist leadership of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern in its action against the Trotzky-Zinoviev group in the fight for securing the unity and fighting capacity of the Communist World Party.

The expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev was inevitable, as these leaders of the Opposition, in order to carry through their anti-Party and anti-Soviet policy, have openly allied themselves with elements outside of the Party for the fight against the Party, and have gone so far as to organise the fight against the Soviet State itself by publishing secret documents in counter-revolutionary organs abroad; by organising illegal printing offices with the assistance of non-Party and bourgeois intellectuals; by attempting to arrange counter-demonstrations and meetings against the Soviet government and the C. P. S. U. on the 7th November; by occupying institutions of the Soviet Power; and by starting the organisation of their own "defence guard". The C. C. of the C. P. S. U., which has to defend the unity of the Party and the existence of the proletarian dictatorship, of the Soviet Power against all anti-Party and counter-revolutionary attacks, could not reply otherwise to this open attack against the Party and against the Workers' State — the more so as Trotzky and Zinoviev refused to abandon the counter-revolutionary methods — than by expelling them from the Party.

The Communist Party of Germany, in the former conflicts with Trotzkyism, has always in its overwhelming majority taken the side of the Leninist C. C. of the C. P. S. U. The hopes of the Trotzky group to split off, with the assistance of the renegades Maslov-Ruth Fischer, a portion of the C. P. G. and to use it as auxiliary troops against the C. P. S. U. and against the Comintern, have been miserably shattered. The Party and the Communist-minded workers realise: Trotzky, Zinoviev and their group, whom the Social Democratic Party of Germany uses as crown witnesses for their anti-Communist and anti-Labour policy, have become the auxiliary troops of international menshevism and of the international bourgeoisie in their intensified fight against Communism, the Comintern and the Soviet Union.

The Comintern, the C. P. S. U. and all its sections will, after the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev, more energetically than ever organise and carry through the unity and the principles of the Comintern against all disrupters and enemies of the Soviet Union and for the annihilation of imperialism. The masses are realising to a greater degree that only the Comintern, the world Party of Lenin, can lead the proletariat and all exploited and oppressed to revolutionary victory over the bourgeoisie, to the overthrow of imperialism, to the building up of Socialism. The Comintern will undeviatingly proceed forwards on this way.

Long live the unity, firmness and fighting capacity of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern, long live the Leninist leadership of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern, long live the international, united, revolutionary fight in defence of the Soviet Union, for the annihilation of Menshevism and for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie!

Decision of the C. P. of France against the Opposition.

The C. C. of the C. P. of France adopted the following resolution at its meeting held on November 9th:

"The C. C. stigmatises the fractional activity which the Russian Opposition is continuing in spite of repeated warnings.

In its hostility to the fundamental line of the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern the Opposition is proceeding to the worst violations of the most elementary discipline, and is even going so far as to lay the basis for a second Party, which in words is to be Left but in fact will be Menshevist.

The C. P. S. U. and the Comintern, which are conducting a correct and Leninist policy, have the duty not to tolerate any further the actions of the Opposition, as the latter have broken the pledges they have undertaken to respect Party discipline, and have replied to the attempts to lead them back to the right path by renewed attacks. This duty of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern arises from the necessity to secure the defence and the victory of the revolution.

The C. C. of the C. P. F. fully and entirely approves of the measures adopted by the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern against the leaders of the Opposition—especially also the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev from the C. C.

The C. C. openly declares that the Russian Opposition is attempting to extend its fractional and anti-Party activity on an international scale. For this purpose it is allying itself with the worst elements expelled from the Comintern such as Ruth Fischer and Maslov in Germany, the liquidatory elements in Austria, Souvarine and Monatte in France. It attempts in this way to set up a fraction in every Party, which is to work in the same disruptive manner as itself.

In France Treint has not ceased since his return to display a fractional activity.

He has, for instance, before the session of the Central Committee in August, handed over to Comrade Lebourriers the copy of a letter addressed to the Executive Committee of the Comintern, without having informed the Central Committee of the Party of this letter. He has, in agreement with the Ruth Fischer-Maslov group, entered into negotiations with the Bordiga group in France. He attempted, with the assistance of Comrade Barré, to obtain the addresses of the responsible trade union comrades of the 20th district of the Unitarian trade unions. He has published, under the name of Gaston Faussecave, documents of the Opposition in a brochure entitled: "The Left Opposition and the Comintern", and spread it in France. He finally attempted to make use of the organ of the A. R. A. C. (French Red Front Fighters League) in support of the policy of Trotzky.

These facts constitute undoubtedly an outspokenly fractional activity.

Treint, in the session of the C. C. of September 11th, undertook to bring forward his views in an objective, less slandering and less insulting manner than he did at the session of the C. C. in August. But he has not carried out this undertaking.

His declarations at the session of the September C. C. are, it is true, more moderate in form but they amount to solidarity with the worst attacks of the Opposition on the Comintern and the C. P. S. U. The spirit and the political line of his declarations are in the sharpest contradiction to the fundamental line of the Comintern and of our Party, to the extent that they have been published and spread by the renegades of the type of Maslov and the liquidators in Germany and Austria.

It is therefore beyond doubt that the motion submitted by the Pol Bureau in September to expel Treint from the Central Committee, is completely justified by his new fractional activity, the extremely dangerous character of which is fully realised by the C. C.

The C. C. therefore decides to exclude Treint from the C. C. and declares that this measure must be considered as the greatest warning. The C. C. at the same time demands of the Comintern the expulsion of Treint from the Executive Committee.

In addition the Central Committee appeals to comrades Treint, Barré, Gaston Faussecave, George Birard, Delfosse, Paz, Hosfeld, Madelaine Marx, who publicly and in a fractional manner have associated themselves with the Russian Opposition, to cease at once all fractional activity, failing which the proposal to expel them from the Party will be submitted to the Central Control Commission.

The Organisations of the C. P. S. U. Approve of the Expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev.

Moscow, 17th November 1927.

Yesterday the congresses of the Communist Parties of Usbekistan, Georgia, Armenia and of the Moldavian Autonomous Republic took place. All these congresses approved unanimously of the policy of the Central Committee of the C. P. of the S. U. and of the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev, and demanded energetic measures against the opposition.

The Communist organisations of numerous towns also approved of the decisions of the central bodies and sharply condemned the anti-Party activities of the Opposition.

The Council of Peoples Commissaries of the R. S. F. S. R. has decided to remove Zinoviev and Muralov from their posts as members of the Presidium of the State Economic Commission of the R. S. F. S. R.

At the same time was published the decision of the Council of Peoples Commissaries of the Soviet Union to remove Vladimir Smirnov from this post as a member of the collegium of the State Central Office of the Soviet Union.

The Communist Members of the Foreign Delegations Demand Severest Measures against the Opposition.

Moscow, 15th November 1927.

The "Pravda" writes:

Amongst the delegates to the conference of the Friends of the Soviet Union are at least 300 communists from all countries. Many of them were eye-witnesses of the provocative actions of the Trotzky Opposition on the 7th November 1927. At their request comrade Bukharin delivered a speech before these foreign communists upon the activity of the Opposition. Before comrade Bukharin could answer a number of questions which were put to him, the British delegation brought in a short resolution and insisted that a vote be taken immediately as the resolution represented the opinion of all foreign communists. Later a vote was taken upon the resolution of the British comrades, and it was accepted with all votes and one vote withheld. The comrade who withheld his vote, a member of the French delegation, declared that he personally did not doubt that the Trotzkyist Opposition was acting like an enemy of the October revolution, but he did not find it possible to vote for the resolution because the latest acts of the Opposition had not once been discussed by his organisation.

The resolution of the meeting of foreign communists is particularly noteworthy. Representatives of the most various countries took part in this meeting. The majority of the delegates are workers who were elected by the working masses. They all, like one man, regard the acts of the Opposition as the open organisation of a second Party in the Soviet Union, as an attempt to disintegrate the ranks of the Comintern and to undermine the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, and just for this reason they considered it necessary to demand stern measures against the enemies of the October revolution.

The resolution which was adopted by the communist members of the conference of the Friends of the Soviet Union reads:

"The meeting of the communist members of the various delegations to the conference of the Friends of the Soviet Union supports entirely the C. C. of our brother Party, the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. in its struggle against the Trotzky Opposition and it approves completely of the measures taken against the organisers of a second party in the Soviet Union.

The meeting condemns the attempts of the Trotzky Opposition to found an anti-communist international with the assistance of renegades and anti-soviet elements in all countries. The meeting is convinced that the Communist Parties affiliated to the Comintern will not tolerate the activities of the Trotzky Opposition against the Proletarian Dictatorship in the Soviet Union and against the Comintern. The meeting demands more severe measures against the enemies of the October revolution.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Agenda of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 17th November 1927.

The XV. Party Congress of the C. P. of the Soviet Union has been convened for the 1st December in Moscow. The agenda contains the following points:

1. Political and organisational report of the C. C.
2. Report of the central revision committee.
3. Report of the central control commission.
4. Report of the delegation of the C. P. of the S. U. to the Comintern.
5. Directives for the economic plan for the next five years.
6. The work in the village and
7. The election of the central party bodies.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Fight in the North Bohemian Textile Industry.

By Paul Reimann (Reichenberg).

On Friday, November 11th, 7000 textile workers of the Friedland agreement territory of the North Bohemian textile industry spontaneously left their work and went on strike. The commencing of the fight in this district, which is only a portion of the big North Bohemian industrial area, means the beginning of the fight in the whole of the North Bohemian textile industry, which employs 52,000 workers. In addition to the textile workers of North Bohemia, the textile workers in the Asch textile area have started a movement for an increase of wages. Notice to terminate the wage agreement for the Czech East Bohemian textile area, in which 45,000 workers are employed is to be expected on December 1st, so that one third of the Czechoslovakian textile workers are participating in the development of this wage movement.

The workers have decided upon a demand for a 15% increase for all districts, and in view of the terrible wage conditions this must be regarded as very modest. The wages which are paid by the North Bohemian textile industry are unspeakable. If we calculate the average for the Reichenberg agreement territory, we arrive at a wage level of 140 crowns, i. e. 17.50 gold marks or 17/6 sh. for a working week of 48 hours. But a large portion of the workers do not reach this level, for in the textile industry in particular, where many juveniles, and women are engaged, the differences between the individual categories of workers are unusually great.

The wages in the Friedland district, where the fight began, fall on an average 16% below the wages paid in the Reichenberg agreement district. But especially in the lower categories in the Friedland district the differences are still greater and partially exceed 30%. That the North Bohemian textile workers are condemned on such wages to living conditions positively beneath the dignity of human beings is comprehensible. This state of affairs is aggravated by the terrible pressure brought to bear on the workers in the mills, by the accelerated pace of rationalisation, whereby the employers aim at reducing piece rates in such a manner that the workers are not even able to make the agreement rates. In the train of rationalisation spying is developing in the factories and cases of dismissal of responsible functionaries of the workers under various pretexts are becoming more and more frequent.

Although the state of business in the Czechoslovakian textile industry is regarded as unusually good even by the employers themselves and efforts are being made in all the factories to force the workers to put in innumerable hours of overtime, the employers are not willing to consider any concessions at all. The employers are only gracious enough to offer the workers a single inflation bounty, amounting in general to 300 crowns for an adult male worker and in the Friedland district to 260 crowns, while the amount for the

other categories of workers is still lower. Nevertheless, they make the payment of this inflation bounty dependent on a number of unheard-of conditions. It should be paid in three instalments, of which the last is due in November of next year. Under the condition that only those workers will enjoy the bounty who have been four months in a factory without interruption, a certain portion of the workers are to be deprived of the benefit. Furthermore, workers on short time are to receive only a part of the bounty, and, finally, the trade unions must agree to do nothing until the end of next year.

In the whole of the Friedland textile area the workers resolved to answer this offer by **stopping work immediately**. This has been executed almost **unanimously**.

The fight in North Bohemia is of decisive importance. In the whole of Czechoslovakia the workers are suffering under the pressure of rigorous exploitation. In consequence of the introduction of customs duties the level of wages has sunk considerably; inflation has robbed the workers of a large part of the value of their wages; through social insurance a portion of the burden of health insurance was shifted on to the workers; and, finally, the reform of taxation has introduced the principle of deducting taxes direct from wages. Owing to these heavy burdens, both in Czechoslovakia and in Germany the workers are becoming more and more disposed to make a fight of it. The wage movement in the Prague building trade, the wage movement of the railwaymen, which has in the meanwhile been throttled by the reformists, and a number of other fights show that the Czechoslovakian workers are now coming forward energetically with their demands.

The preliminary conditions of the fight in North Bohemia are especially favourable. This is not exclusively due to the good state of trade. An important factor is the circumstance that of the 52,000 workers 42,000 are organised in trade unions and that the majority of these trade-unionists are in the ranks of the Red trade unions. The Czech and German reformists have about 14,000 members, the strength of the Christian trade-unions is estimated at 4000 members.

The workers everywhere are thoroughly resolved to fight. The prevailing mood is best shown by the fact that the workers resolved on the first day in their strike meetings to renounce for the first 14 days any support from the unions in order that they might successfully hold out for any length of time. A further sign of the fighting spirit of the workers is the fact that the reformist leaders, who attached themselves during the wage negotiations to the reactionary Christian and German-yellow organisations against the Red trade unions, were obliged to declare their solidarity with the strike in Friedland.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has issued a proclamation to all the North Bohemian workers pointing out that the fight of the Friedland workers is the only way of countering the more and more impudent attacks of the employers and the only expedient from the insufferable position of the North Bohemian textile workers and calling upon the whole working population to give their active, material and moral support to the fighters.

The Economic Offensive against the Workers in Austria.

By A. Ketzlik (Vienna).

The vehement offensive begun by the Austrian bourgeoisie on July 15th against the working class is now being carried on chiefly in the economic sphere.

The new customs tariff, which must involve a reduction in the standard of living of the proletariat, has been accepted by Parliament, without meeting with serious opposition from the Social Democrats. The Social-Democratic chairman of the Vienna metal workers, Deputy Janicek, in the course of the customs debate in Parliament informed the representative of the employers, Deputy Dr. Weidenhoffer, who held out a prospect of an advance in wages to compensate the effect of the new customs tariff, that "Austrian industry was not in a position to assume such a burden".

This offensive is to be followed by a serious modification of the Tenants' Protection Act. First of all, however, the civil servants are to be deprived of the right to strike and the rest of the workers are to be shorn of the so-called "social-political achievements of the revolution".

Moreover, the Federal Chancellor, Dr. Seipel, is a great tactician, who is capable, in view of the policy of capitulation adopted by the Social Democrats, of achieving his objective.

The civil servants asked for a 17½% advance. Seipel said that this question might be discussed, provided that the civil servants renounced their right to strike and agreed to submit future demands for advances to a court of arbitration. On the other hand, the Social Democrats, whether they would or not, had to take up a definite attitude, a circumstance which Seipel well knew and counted upon. He said, he would first of all negotiate in regard to the demands for higher salaries, but these were, however, much too high. They would constitute for the State a supplementary expenditure of 200 millions. They would have to be reduced from 17½% to 5½%, because the budget could not stand them — although a short while ago the budget was quite capable of standing many millions for the purpose of putting the Christian-Socialist banks on their feet again. When, however, he continued, the question of salary is settled, Parliament will naturally decide, "in the interests of national economy as a whole" upon the question of the civil servants' right to strike.

By means of this manoeuvre Seipel succeeded in getting a considerable reduction in the demands of the civil servants. The Social Democrats can imagine that they have won a "success", not because they were successful in getting salaries increased in the measure which the civil servants desire and expect, but because, for the time being, they have "repulsed" Seipel's counter-demand. If, however, the question of robbing the civil servants of their right to strike is brought up in Parliament, these leaders will declare that they must not allow themselves to be provoked into a fight outside Parliament and thus give the Fascist organisations the opportunity of carrying out their contemplated march to Vienna, but that they must stage the fight at a time convenient to the Social Democrats and not to the reactionaries. In this way Seipel may not only succeed in considerably reducing the demands for increased salaries but also in abolishing the right to strike.

The bread-factory owners have succeeded in executing a similar manoeuvre. The Vienna Bakery Workers resolved at 21 district meetings that a demand for a 15% to 25% rise should be put forward. The Social-Democratic leaders of the Foodstuff Workers' Association however, found it advisable "in view of the general situation" to ask for 10% only. During the negotiations the employers declared that they could not discuss the wage demand before some alteration was made in their favour in the collective agreement. Naturally, the Social Democratic leaders could not agree to this. Two big meetings of the Vienna Bakery Workers protested against this proposal. Thereupon the employers declared: We are ready to consider the wage demand first but we reserve the right to bring up our counter-demand on some other occasion, i. e., to have Parliament modify the legal prohibition of night-baking. The representatives of the employers then offered 3% and finally 5%, which latter was accepted as a "success" by the Social-Democratic leaders and subsequently, by a conference of factory councils, without asking the bakery workers themselves. "For the time being the employers have not succeeded in putting through their counter-demands!"

In this fashion, the employers have thrown to the bakery workers a sop of 5% and are now proceeding, through Parliament to get the collective agreement altered as they require by law.

Owing to the fear the Social-Democratic leaders have of a fight, the workers are being pressed back step by step by the reactionaries. The Grünbach miners, who demanded a 15% to 20% increase of wages and are so badly off that a piece of cat flesh, or dog flesh is a delicacy to them, had to be contented with a rise of 5%, in spite of the fact that against the constant increase of prices which has taken place since 1924 they have had no advance in wages. A serious, united wage-fight is being avoided at any cost by the Social-Democratic leaders, for they are afraid that such a thing would afford the Fascist organisations the opportunity they desire to intervene with violence. For this reason strikes lasting for weeks — often started over the heads of the Social-Democratic leaders — are carried on in order to get an average wage-increase of about 5%.

As is well known, the Austrian workers are among the worst paid according to international standards. In view of the systematic, well-prepared attacks of the reactionaries, which constantly succeed owing to Social-Democratic capitulation, mass-fights, which may lead to a revolt similar to that of July 15th in spite of the precautionary measures taken by the Social Democratic Party leaders, are inevitable. It is the most important function of the Communist Party of Austria to prepare these mass fights. Under their leadership alone will the Austrian proletariat be in a position to put an end to the policy of July 15th, as carried out by the reactionaries and the Social-Democrats in collaboration.

The Results of the Miners' Strike in Asturia.

By José Bullejos (Madrid).

In the Spanish province of Asturia, the block formed by the mineowners, the Government and the Socialist leaders of the miners' trade union succeeded, in spite of the forty days' strike, in breaking the resistance of the miners and forcing them to resume work under conditions of a longer working day. In order to achieve this triumph, the bourgeoisie set in motion all means of force at its disposal: wholesale arrests, deportations, fines and brutal corporal punishment which the "Guardia Civil" (Civil Guard) carried out itself in the streets, as far as their courage allowed, in view of the miners' resistance. Even women and children were not spared such barbarous tortures. If the police did not succeed in arresting one of the miners on strike, they resorted to punishing the father's resistance by flogging his sons in the most cruel way. The Civil Guard even went so far as to attack the strikers with sticks; when this also proved to be an insufficient measure, the strikers who lived in houses belonging to the mining companies were given notice to quit. Distress finally compelled the workers to capitulate and resume work.

The first result of this strike movement was a decrease, or rather the annihilation of the influence of the Reformist leaders among the proletarian miners of Asturia. Hitherto it had been impossible to mobilise the miners of Asturia for the fight without interference on the part of the Reformist trade union. The province of Asturia, and above all the mining district of that province had been one of the most solid pillars of the trade union federation and its most important stronghold. It can be said that, since the split in the Socialist Party, the province of Asturia was the only important industrial centre over which the Socialist party exercised real influence. The Communist Party of Spain has now for the first time succeeded in mobilising the masses of workers, of Asturia and carrying on a struggle for forty days against the will of the Socialist leaders.

The miners of Asturia have become convinced that the Communist Party alone defends their interests, as the Reformist leaders made common cause with the mineowners. This fact will undoubtedly have a big effect on the life of our Party, as the latter now has two important industrial centres on which to rely in its activity: Biscaya and Asturia.

There can be no doubt as to the fact that the defeat of the miners of Asturia places the problem of the offensive against the hours of work on the order of the day. Now that the workers have been defeated, the bourgeoisie is organising its offensive throughout the whole of Spain. Even in Biscaya the miners' question has been raised quite openly. Quite recently the economic organisations of the bourgeoisie presented a memorandum to the Government calling upon it to issue a decree prolonging the working day by one hour in the same way as in Asturia. Now, after the result of the strike in Asturia, the attack on the miners of Biscaya can be expected at any moment. In anticipation of this offensive, the Communist Party has begun organising the resistance and is convinced that the miners of Biscaya will respond with a general strike to proposals aiming at a prolongation of the hours of work.

In the same way a revival of the strike movement is imminent in Catalonia. For the time being this conflict has been settled by a discussion in the Parity Committee. For more than a month, however, a fight has been waging within the Committee between the representatives of the workers and the

representatives of the employers regarding the solution of this problem. The majority of the bourgeois representatives hold firmly to the proposal of prolonging the hours of work, as the votes of the representatives of the Government decide matters in the said Committee. The representatives of the workers do not dare to accept such a solution, as they are convinced that a strike would break out were they to consent to the proposal of the mineowners. The defeat of the miners in Asturia will inspire with fresh courage both the employers and the Government, which hitherto was hesitant, from fear of causing a strike to break out in Catalonia simultaneously with the miners' strike in Asturia. It will therefore issue a decree prolonging the working day.

The capitalist offensive has called forth a strong reaction on the part of the workers and driven them into a fight which will undoubtedly be the most important factor in the struggle against the dictatorship. The fact of the working day being prolonged directly by the Government in the form of a royal decree will impart a particularly deep political character to the action of the working class against the capitalist offensive, and this action will also be directed against the dictatorship.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

Australian Workers Decide to Affiliate to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat.

By George Hardy.

It is a consequential and far-reaching decision the Australian Trade Unions have made in deciding to affiliate to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Movement. It is also natural that the Australian movement should be enthusiastic regarding the future development of the P. P. T. U. It was in December 1922 that the Australian delegates raised the question of organising a Pan-Pacific movement at the 2nd Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions. They gave as a reason for their timely suggestion the urgent need for combating future capitalist war in the Pacific. The organised Australian workers, probably more than the workers of any other country, were conscious during the great war that many of their leaders, with the aid of traitors led by Hughes, were being drawn into the Temple of Janus, and that the workers were being sent to slaughter, solely in the interests of the British capitalist class. The overwhelming vote against conscription during the war proved this.

There have been subsequent events during the post-war period, in spite of the Australian trade unions being hampered by the Arbitration laws, which indicate a growing consciousness among the rank and file led by the more militant leaders: The defeat of Premier Bruce in the National "Security" Referendum vote, which would have given the willing tools of the City of London powers to crush any action intended to seriously enhance the power of the working class; the active support given to the unofficial strike of British seamen during 1925 when Havelock Wilson gave the shipowners £ 1 a month off the seamen's wages; the intermittent strikes of Australian seamen, and the many sympathetic actions which have a great influence on the employers, such as the recent railway strike on behalf of the sugar workers in Queensland — all precluded affiliation leading to unity on a larger scale in the sphere of the Pacific Ocean.

The Pan-Pacific Trade Union Conference drew attention to the dangers of war between the various capitalist countries. But not sufficient attention has been given to this question by the workers around the Pacific. The momentous nature of this decision to affiliate is lost if we do not, at the same time, consider the antagonistic capitalist forces. The rivalry between the great imperialist powers is constantly increasing around the Pacific, and Austin Chamberlain is forever pressing Tokyo for assistance against the Soviet Union in the East.

The aggressive policy of Japan in Manchuria if allowed to run its course freely will not be confined to north China, for

although Japan relinquished Shangtung upon instructions of the Washington Conference, it has not abandoned this Chinese Province as a Japanese sphere of influence, to say the least. A few more uninterrupted years of Japanese imperialist development will inevitably lead to clashes both with Britain and America in the East. The anti-Japanese policy of Washington is always a danger when one remembers that the Philippine and Hawaiian Islands are natural homes for the surplus population of Japan, which is increasing at the rapid rate of one million a year. Nothing more is needed to prove that all is not peaceful between Britain and America in the west than the news items on the recent "Naval Disarmament Conference" which appeared in the capitalist press. To quote only one statement, which is an eloquent expression from a special Japanese correspondent for the "Osaka Mainichi" who attended the Geneva Conference:

"Everything would have gone smoothly, if the participants had discussed the naval limitation question from a defensive point of view rather than an aggressive one."

It is only a united working class that can effect a condition for ultimate disarmament by struggling against capitalist war, and by successful action destroy capitalist armaments in a struggle for working class power. This is the real significance of Pan-Pacific labour unity, as well as a means to enable the workers to fight for immediate demands by mutual assistance.

Our Australian comrades have given another lead to all trade union movements in the Pacific countries which are still outside the P. P. T. U. If the items in their resolution, which appears below, are emulated by our affiliated organisations in the East, and the Canadian, American and Mexican trade union movement in the West, it is certain that the trade union organisations around the Pacific ocean will be a challenge to international imperialism in what must be a more devastating and destructive war than the great war of 1914-1918.

It is the Pan-Pacific trade union movement that the western imperialists fear in the East. This is why in Java and the Malayan Federated States, in India and China, in fact in every Eastern country north of the equator, legitimate trade unions are suppressed. The agents of western imperialism, as well as Japanese minions, use the bloodiest methods to crush the rising revolutionary spirit which gives rise to the building of real trade unions in the above mentioned countries. The important decision to create a Pan Pacific Affairs Committee will make the affiliation a real living contact with every trade union in the Pacific zone, and will bring unity where none exists today. This is what the employers dread. It is a prelude to the end of capitalism. The urgent and immediate tasks of aiding and strengthening our weaker units in the various countries will be greatly assisted by the additional weight the Australian trade unions have thrown into the scales against the imperialist bandits of Holland, England, America, etc.

As against the recent decisions of the British Trades Union Congress to break up the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee and to co-operate with the murderous masters who are slaughtering the Eastern workers, our Australian Trade Union comrades have expressed themselves for unity around the Pacific, and for freedom of organisation, assembly and press. The vote to affiliate to the P. P. T. U. movement by our A. C. T. U. means another blow dealt to the war-mongers and crushers of the inhumanly exploited working class of the East.

Resolution of the Australasian Council of Trade Unions to Affiliate to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat.

In view of the previous action of the All-Australian Trade Union Congress initiating the calling of a Pan-Pacific Trade Union Congress in China during May 1927, and the urgency of the problems confronting the working class of all Pacific countries, as stated also by the All-Australian Trade Union Congress in May 1927, and looking towards a Pan-Pacific Trade

Union Congress to be held in Australia in 1928, the Australasian Council of Trade Unions decides:

1. That we express our gratification that, in spite of the tyrannical refusal of the Bruce Government to permit Australian labour to confer with delegates from other countries at the Conference it called to be held in Canton, the Conference met and was successfully carried on at Hankow.

2. That the Australasian Council of Trade Union notes with satisfaction many of the resolutions and decisions of the Hankow Pan-Pacific Trade Union Conference and hereby affiliates to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat as established by that Conference.

3. That this Council elect from its members a subordinate Committee on Pan-Pacific Affairs, whose duties shall be: a) To maintain the closest contact possible with the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat; b) to assist specifically in uniting all trade unions in Australia and New Zealand into the Australasian Council of Trade Unions on the basis of the constitution of the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Conference held at Hankow; c) to gather statistical and other material relating to the trade union movement of Australasia in reference to all Pacific problems of labour, to furnish such material to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat and to give publicity under authority of this Council to similar material from other countries we may receive in exchange.

4. That the Council's Secretary be instructed, together with the Pan-Pacific Affairs Committee, to communicate with the Pan-Pacific Secretariat with a view to carrying out the Congress resolution of May 1927 looking towards the calling of the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Congress in Australasia in 1928, if feasible, and to make the necessary preparations.

5. That one representative and two alternates be elected to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat.

6. That the Secretary be instructed to send a message of encouragement and solidarity to our comrades of the All-China Labour Federation, who are fighting bravely in a crucial struggle to free themselves from exploitation and who are thereby advancing the interests of the whole world's working class.

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

The Rule of French Imperialism in Indo-China.

By N. K.

The "Conflict" between the Chinese and the Annamites.

In August of this year bloody collisions took place between the Annamites and Chinese in Haiphong, the seaport of Tonking. Eight Chinese were killed and 125 wounded. Eight Chinese factories and 32 Chinese houses were set on fire. The French Press in Indo-China and in France maintain that the conflict concerns only the Annamites and the Chinese, that it arose out of the "hate" of these two peoples for one another and that the French have had no hand in the matter.

This statement is not true. The Chinese did not arrive in Indo-China yesterday. They have been there for hundreds of years. And they have always played a very important part in the economic life of Indo-China. But previously there were no conflicts between the Annamites and the Chinese.

The present conflict, as also the boycott of Chinese goods in the year 1919, was fanned by the French colonists for the following reasons:

For some time now there has been great unrest among the Annamite population: nationalist demonstrations, strikes of university students and of workers, peasant revolts, activity of the secret revolutionary organisations, election to the native "parliament" of people previously sentenced for political offences, etc. These things have frightened the French colonists, who are trying by every possible means to subdue such political activity.

In the course of the last few years the Annamites have displayed great sympathy for the Chinese revolution. When the French warship "Michelet" anchored in Saigon for repairs, the arsenal workers of the port refused to do the job and went on strike. When, in the same year, five Chinese were deported from Saigon by the French authorities on account of revolutionary propaganda, several thousand Annamites gathered together spontaneously to accompany them on their departure. These rapprochements between the Chinese and the Annamites were the cause of no little alarm to the French.

The Chinese living in Indo-China are oppressed and exploited by the French. Taxation is ruinous. Both the Annamites and the Chinese must have passports if they want to move from one place to another, a circumstance which causes them serious loss of time and money and hampers them considerably in business. The Chinese workers are not permitted to organise freely. The above and similar restrictions have given rise to an anti-French tendency among the Chinese, which, if it were combined with the revolutionary feelings of the Annamites, would be an earnest threat to Imperialism.

For all these reasons the French imperialists try to sow dissension between the Chinese and the Annamites and to set them at one another's throat. This, however, cannot be done easily, in spite of all attempts, in spite of the constant censorship, in spite of the employment of spies by all officials, including even head masters and school teachers, in spite of the fact that every schoolboy who undertakes espionage gets 30 piastres, in spite of the prohibition of all meetings.

The Annamite "Duma".

Under the pressure of the native masses French imperialism is compelled to make concessions or, rather, sham concessions. The "Socialist" Varenne was sent out as General Governor. He issued the slogan "Co-operation between the French and the Annamites". He organised a "people's representation".

The Annamite "Duma", which is not elected by general suffrage, but only by the notables, the landed proprietors and the merchants, has done nothing towards pacifying the Annamites.

At the last election candidates were elected who were well known for their nationalistic activity and their criticism of the French administration, as also others who had returned after being convicted for political offences. Not a single candidate proposed by the Government was able to get a seat.

All these "representatives" have merely a consultative right. The "representatives" of Annam are convoked only once a year at a time appointed by the Chief Resident. They have neither an assembly room of their own nor yet offices. At every meeting a French official takes the chair. But this does not prevent the poor annamite delegates from speaking their minds and making highly interesting disclosures.

In the session of August, 1927, the "Speaker" of the Annamite Chamber stated, inter alia:

"The representatives have not even the right to speak; how can they possibly help others? The people, however, who believe that we have the right to intervene in all the questions which are of interest to the country, expect much of us..."

Can peace and order prevail in view of the means of oppression which the Government has at its disposal and uses on every occasion? It certainly does not. One disturbance follows the other... Many Annamites are persecuted, arrested and imprisoned, because they read papers passed by the censor. Punishment is meted out to the whole family of a man who has committed no other offence than speaking at a meeting. Children who stay away from school on a single occasion are expelled and left in ignorance for the rest of their lives..."

The Chief Resident thereupon answered that, in order to achieve civilisation and progress, discipline and respect for the ruling power were essential.

Famine, cholera, taxes, etc.

Indo-China is being rapidly depopulated by starvation, cholera and — French imperialism.

The number of deaths greatly exceeds the number of births. Child mortality is terrible. In the town of Haiphong, for instance, there were in July, 1927, 147 births, 204 deaths, including 84 children. Among the Europeans there were 8 births against 3 deaths, including 1 child; among the Chinese 22 births against 23 deaths, including 6 children.

In five provinces of Central Annam cholera is raging. In a single province there were more than 7000 victims in August alone.

The insufferable heat destroyed the rice crop, thus causing famine. In Tonking famine has been caused by inundations. In order to protect the French of Honai against damp, when the district of Tonking was flooded the colonial administration destroyed the dyke of Salem, which lies opposite Honai, and allowed the water to flow in that direction. This was done without advising the natives, and in consequence 20,000 Annamites were drowned by the French administration.

After the inundations the Annamites of the central and southern districts organised collections for relief service. The French authorities allowed the greater part of the money to flow into the account for the bolstering of the franc. Although there were many contributions in kind, the authorities allotted only 2.5 kilogrammes of rice (about 5 lbs.) per head per month to the victims.

In spite of all these natural disasters, the French continue to heap on taxation. The budget of Tonking has again been increased.

Such are the methods of French imperialism in Indo-China.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

The World Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union.

Moscow, 13th November 1927.

Comrades Jagger (Gt. Britain), Barbusse and Tomski spoke to the second point on the agenda of the conference of the Friends of the Soviet Union: The war-preparations of the imperialists.

Referring to the optimists who doubted the possibility of war in the near future Jagger declared that the danger of war really exists and is becoming greater with every passing day. He described the war preparations of the imperialist powers and quoted facts to show the steadily increasing armaments. The strength of the standing armies of Gt. Britain, France and the United States respectively totalled in 1913 1,413,000 men, in 1926 it was 1,881,000. The increase in the strength of the navies since 1913 was: Gt. Britain, 32%, the United States, 21% Japan, 100%. Specially important was the increased strength of military aviation by 2000%. The imperialist powers were preparing themselves, declared the speaker, for a terrible chemical warfare, a proof of this was the refusal of the capitalist governments to ratify the Washington Convention forbidding the use of poison gas.

The speaker described the friction between the imperialist powers who were nevertheless united in hatred and fear of the Soviet Union which had wrested from them the right to exploit one-sixth of the earth's surface. The growth of the revolutionary movement in China, the sympathy of the oppressed peoples for the Soviet Union all tend to increase the hostility and the aggressiveness of the imperialist powers towards the Soviet Union.

The speaker pointed to the many aggressive actions of the British government against the Soviet Union and congratulated the Soviet government upon its peaceful attitude towards these provocations. He appealed to the delegates to do everything possible to make an anti-soviet war impossible and to persuade the workers to prevent all transport of munitions etc. against those countries fighting for their freedom.

The second speaker, comrade **Barbusse** declared that delegates from all parts of the world were present at the October festivities. Despite the different political opinions represented by them (only 15% of the delegates are communists) all the delegates had come to the unanimous conclusion that a constructive work was being carried on in the Soviet Union unexampled in history. This would mean the final victory not only of a people, but of the socialist system.

The threatening danger of war, declared Barbusse, must be considered as imminent. The existence of the Soviet Union alone disturbs the imperialist policy of conquest, although the Soviet government could say with truth that it had never interfered in the politics of other countries.

Barbusse opposed the opinion that the war was already at an end. On the contrary, war is still going on in Africa and in Asia and it is being prepared against the Soviet Union under the leadership of Great Britain which commenced a number of acts of war against the Soviet Union in the very first years of the revolution.

Barbusse decried briefly and clearly the policy of Gt. Britain directed to the encirclement and destruction of the Soviet Union, a policy that France was also pursuing with some hesitation. The British imperialists hoped to restore the shaken world power of Great Britain by a provocative new armed conflict. In this the hope of obtaining the natural resources of the Soviet Union for capitalist exploitation, played a great role.

In face of the imperialist preparations for war, preparations which could be judged by the intensity of the campaign of slander carried on against the Soviet Union by the capitalist press, Barbusse appealed to the delegates to express their solidarity actively with the socialist State and to defend it against its calumniators and aggressors.

Comrade **Tomski** who was received with enthusiastic applause, began his report by declaring that the danger of war was ever more threatening and imminent. The economic and political conflicts between the capitalist States still exist and are even intensifying.

The speaker described the post-war development of the capitalist States which was characterised by two main factors: 1. rationalisation of production and 2. the growth of capitalism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The next war would be far more terrible than the last world war, for the military activities would not merely be directed against the hostile armies; but also against the whole population of the belligerent countries. Two chief factors were working against imperialist war, 1. the resistance of the working class, and 2. the existence of the Soviet Union. Therefore world imperialism was striving to break the resistance of the working class and to destroy the Soviet State, the hope of the oppressed and the exploited in all countries. For these reasons alone, the imperialist attack upon the Soviet Union was inevitable. It would take the form of a coalition of all capitalist powers against the socialist State. Tomski pointed to the efforts of Gt. Britain to form this coalition and to force the Soviet Union by provocations and humiliations to steps which would lead to the outbreak of war. He pointed to the necessity of the daily struggle against the danger of war, so that the working class which was being fed with social democratic and pacifist illusions, would not be so unprepared as it was in 1914. Therefore the workers would have to take up the struggle against the shameful and opportunist slogans like the "Defence of the Fatherland" and destroy the pacifist ideology.

The social democratic accusation of "red imperialism" is a deliberate lie, the absurdity of which is shown by the fact that the gravediggers of imperialism were confused with the imperialism itself. The Soviet Union would take part in the Disarmament Conference and propose radical measures which would convince the working masses who were being deceived by the pacifist phrases of the ruling classes, of the peaceful nature of the policy of the Soviet Union.

The anti-war propaganda must permanently bear in mind that as long as capitalism exists war is inevitable. The anti-war propaganda must at the same time be directed against capitalism itself and must prepare the workers to transform any imperialist war into a civil war.

Moscow, 13th November 1927.

The discussion upon the speeches of **Jagers**, **Barbusse** and **Tomski** commenced this morning. **Hermann** (Austria) declared that the task of the working class of all countries was to beat off the attack upon the only workers State in the world and to prevent a repetition of the world war.

Caro Taro brought the greetings of the proletariat of Spain suffering under the rule of fascism and expressed the full sympathy of the Spanish proletariat for the Soviet Union.

Rivera (Mexico) pointed to the importance of the countries of Central and South America in the world war as the supply sources of raw material. Having regard to this situation of their countries the toilers of Central and South America would do their duty to the international working class in the imperialist war.

A delegate from Ireland pointed out that the driving force in the preparations for war against the Soviet Union was British imperialism and declared that the revolutionary workers of Ireland promised to fight against the preparations for war and in case of war they would openly go over to the side of the Soviet Union.

A deeply impressive ceremony then took place. A delegation of the Supreme Revolutionary War Council headed by **Voroshilov** and including Generals **Budionny**, **Kamenev** and **Bubnov** appeared in the hall. All the delegates present rose in their seats and cheered the leaders of the Red Council which began with the statement that the October revolution was the first victory of the international working class. The teachings of **Marx**, **Engels** and **Lenin** controlled one sixth of the earth's surface. From the very beginning the international proletariat and the oppressed masses of the East had expressed the most active sympathy with the fighting Russian workers and peasants. In a great number of countries the workers caused a series of defeats for the ruling class in severe struggles and thus shook the fundament of capitalism, improved the situation of the Soviet State and assisted in the victory of the Red Army.

In memory of the international solidarity of the working class in the years of the civil war and as a sign of the fraternal alliance of the workers of the world, the Revolutionary War Council has decided to decorate the following comrades with the Order of the Red Flag: **Clara Zetkin**, **André Marty**, **Max Hoelz**, **Sadoul**, **Bela Kun**, **Chang Go-tas** and **Lanzusky**. The decree praises warmly the revolutionary services of these comrades.

Amidst storms of applause and the singing of the "International" the investiture then took place. **Max Hoelz**, **Marty** and **Lanzusky** were represented by other comrades.

Sievert (Germany) expressed thanks in the name of the comrades who had received the order of the Red Flag and declared that upon their return to their native countries the delegates would see to it that the workers recognised their sacred duty to stand side by side with the Soviet Union, prevent all attacks upon the Soviet State and see to it that every attack upon the Soviet Union becomes the signal for a revolt of the exploited in a struggle against the capitalists of the whole world.

Liau (China) declared that the Chinese proletariat was prepared to fight and defend the Soviet Union. The struggle must be continued until imperialism was completely destroyed. As a sign of the coming victory of the world proletariat the speaker presented the Russian labour unions with a red flag in the name of the Chinese workers and peasants. Amidst great enthusiasm on the part of the assembled delegates, comrade **Tomski** accepted the gift on behalf of the Russian labour unions.

Speaking in the name of the American trades union delegation, **Jensen** declared that they promised to do everything possible for the defence of the Soviet Union and to work amongst the American working class in this spirit.

Following upon similar declarations by **Colomers** (France) and by the delegates of **Portugal**, **Java** and other countries the conference was closed with a short speech of **Lawther**.

The delegates left the hall cheering the Soviet Union and singing revolutionary songs.

OBITUARY

A. A. Joffe

By Th. Rothstein (Moscow).

Comrade Joffe was the first chairman of our Peace Delegation at Brest-Litovsk, and in this capacity he signed the armistice with the Central Powers. He remained with the delegation when Trotzky was appointed its chairman, and along with the latter he refused to sign the Brest-Litovsk "Peace". After the conclusion of peace, however, he was prepared to go as Ambassador to Berlin, and was thus our first representative abroad.

His position was very difficult, and it became still more complicated after the murder of Mirbach when he, on the occasion of this incident, had to express his condolence in the name of the government. He established a firm connection with the Left wing of the Social Democracy at that time, but three days before the November Revolution he, with the entire Embassy staff, was expelled from Germany on the accusation of revolutionary agitation. This accusation was based upon "inciting" proclamations "found" in a travelling case of a courier proceeding to Joffe. As a matter of fact these proclamations had been smuggled into the travelling case.

But the German revolution was victorious and Comrade Joffe conducted negotiations at Minsk with the "Council of People's Deputies" regarding the re-establishment of relations. The "brave" social democrats, however, did not venture to take this step. Comrade Joffe made a second attempt to return to Germany in the capacity of Chairman of a special delegation which was appointed by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee for the Congress of the Workers' and Soldiers' Council in Germany. But this time also he was not permitted to enter the country.

As member of the Council for Defence and of the People's Commissariat for Inspection he was sent to the Ukraine, and was obliged to flee from there after this country had been captured by Denikin and Petljura. He came to Leningrad and worked there again in the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. He took part in the defence of Leningrad against Yudenitch, then, however, was again appointed to a diplomatic post, and as Chairman of our Peace delegation he conducted successful negotiations and concluded an armistice, first with Esthonia, then with Lithuania and Latvia. In the year 1921 he was the leader of our Peace Delegation at the negotiations with the Poles, which he concluded successfully in March of the same year. In all these negotiations he displayed great skill and courage and defended our position with extraordinary steadfastness.

Later in Turkestan he became chairman of the Turkestan Bureau of our Party and of the Special Turkestan Commission of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. From Turkestan he was sent to Genoa as a member of our delegation. He did not take part in the second Hague Conference as he was sent to the Far East as Extraordinary Plenipotentiary for the negotiations with China and Japan. He had to conduct negotiations in Peking and then in Tokio, but he became seriously ill and in 1923 was obliged, to return to Moscow, from whence he was sent to Vienna in order to recover his health. On his recovery he was sent to London as a member of our delegation for the negotiations with the MacDonald government. On the conclusion of these negotiations he was appointed Ambassador in Vienna.

This was his last diplomatic post. He became ill again and returned to Moscow where he was appointed deputy chairman of the chief Concessions' Committee. But his sickness prevented him from working. Only in the last month was there an improvement in his condition. But this improvement was only an outward one.

He was scarcely 44 years old. At such an age a politician of such a calibre could, in bourgeois countries, still work and "make a career" for another good two decades. But for our politicians, who are obliged to wear themselves out in revolutionary

work as well as in political work, there is reserved another fate. A man of great spirit, of many-sided culture, Comrade Joffe combined with these capacities a great character, an active temperament which always sought activity for its powers, a warm heart which beat for the working class and for socialism. To those who knew him personally he was a beloved comrade whose memory will never fade.

TEN YEARS AGO

The Red Workers' Guard in the Year 1917.

By Wl. Malchowski.

When we remember October of 1917, we cannot help recalling the armed force of the October Revolution. This armed force, the origin of our Red Army, was the Red Workers' Guard.

The Red Workers' Guard was the most important armed force in the October Revolution and the grand example for the self-activity and creative energy of the lower strata. It is necessary to review, though only briefly, the history of the Red Guard.

* * *

As is well known, the theorists of the Second International placed in their programme the demand for the substitution of the standing army by a general people's militia. Very soon, simultaneously with the adaptation of the whole ideology of the Second International to the bourgeois order, the demand for a people's militia received an opportunistic interpretation. The international reformists spread among the workers a Utopian faith in the possibility of organising a people's militia within the confines of the bourgeois social system.

The view of Marx and Engels on this matter was, however, different. The organising of "divisions of armed people" is closely connected with the class character of society; the army in a capitalistic society is always the weapon of the bourgeoisie; so said the founders of Marxism.

The book "State and Revolution" is a brilliant proof of the fact that Lenin consistently followed his great masters in this question.

Lenin was decidedly against a bourgeois militia and fought, therefore, for a purely proletarian militia. He rejected the example of Switzerland and pointed out that even in the freest republican countries "the character of the militia always develops towards that of Prussia and prostitutes itself; troops are mobilised against strikers".

Immediately after the February Revolution, Lenin devoted a whole third of his "Letters from Abroad" to the theme: "Concerning the Proletarian Militia". In these letters he clearly delineated the present political moment and the tasks of the revolution, consisting chiefly of taking care that the army of the revolution was organised to help the existing Soviets to found the proletarian State, for the bourgeois provisional government was doomed to collapse. The realisation of this task was unthinkable without a general organisation of the proletariat. For this reason, the slogan of the moment was "Organise". But one could not stop at the usual organisations (Party, trade unions, etc.); the Soviets had to be strengthened, for they were the organs of the insurrection and of the future power. One had to fight against the attempt to restore the old machinery of State, which in February began to break up the working class. These attempts found expression in the fact that the Gutshkoff-Miljukoff Government gradually and secretly created for itself military support in the form of the new general militia, detached from the people.

In Lenin's opinion the proletariat requires a militia combining the functions of a people's army with those of a police force and with the functions of chief and fundamental organs of the State system and of the State administration." "This militia must be the executive organ of the Soviet and during this period of transition from the first to the second stage of the revolution it must prepare for collision with the Gutshkoff-Miljukoff people, with the landed proprietors and capitalist imperialists."

Lenin did not confine himself to words but proceeded determinedly with the practical realisation of these important tasks. When, on April 14th, a correspondence from Kanavino was published in the "Pravda", mentioning that "in nearly all the factories a workers' militia had been created by the administration", Lenin immediately welcomed the introduction of a workers' militia, to be paid by the capitalists, which would have "a most decisive practical and profound significance". This fact was presented by Lenin as an example for all other workers.

* * *

The Red Guard was a child of the Bolsheviks. They played the leading role in it from the very beginning, they took measures to bring about its unification.

It is true, that for a time there existed in Petrograd a provisional commission of the Red Guard, consisting of two Bolsheviks and three Mensheviks. These Mensheviks were, however, stay and naive people, who were soon disavowed by their party and withdrawn from the work.

What was the attitude of the Menshevik Party to the Red Guard?

At a big meeting of delegates of the Red Guard of Petrograd, held on April 28th, the representative of the executive committee of the Soviet, the Menshevik Judin, spoke resolutely against the Red Guard, declared it to be injurious and unnecessary and demanded its disbandment.

This attitude of the responsible Mensheviks corresponded exactly with their general views and tactics; it was just the continuation of the line of action taken by this party right from the beginning.

* * *

The turning point in the development of the Red Guard was the Korniloff coup d'Etat. The workers fully recognised the necessity of organising and developing their armed forces. On September 2nd the Bolshevik paper "Social Democrat" reported that delegates from the factories and works had approached the Soviet of the Workers Deputies and demanded the distribution of arms.

In this period also falls the elaboration of the new statutes for the Red Guard, determining its aims and tasks as also its internal organisation and structure. The Red Guard steadily grew to be the military weapon of the maturing proletarian State.

The education of the Red Guardists was carried on intensively, and, according to those who participated therein, the members showed more success and zeal than did the soldiers of the Tsarist Army. At the same time, the military training projected by Lenin was not neglected. Arms were gathered together by every possible means; preparations for the inevitable fight proceeded apace.

When the insurrection began, the workers swarmed to the Red Guard. In the Wyborg district alone there were 1000 Red Guardists. In those days the masses displayed extraordinary self-activity.

One point deserves particular attention. While the Bolsheviks in Leningrad acted with resolution and conviction, forming the revolutionary military committee exclusively of Bolsheviks without bothering about the parties favouring compromise, nominating their commissaries for the divisions of troops, etc., affairs in Moscow showed a very different aspect. During the months immediately preceding the October revolution, an opportunist attitude in the matter of organising the armed rebellion and the leadership of the Red Guards was shown by a number of prominent comrades. These comrades, among whom Comrade Muralov played an important rôle, were doubtlessly influenced by the conception held by the more or less left-wing Mensheviks concerning the Russian revolution, which at that time was resolutely and vehemently defended only by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev.

For this reason it happened that after the Kornilov coup d'Etat the Moscow Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies organised the general staff of the Red Guard, to which, in addition to Bolsheviks, S. R.'s and Mensheviks were elected. These parties were also allotted seats on the Military Revolutionary Committee. However, from the beginning of the February Revolution there existed a central staff of the Red Guard led by the Bolsheviks and having the closest communication with all the divisions of the Red Guard.

This staff, which had not been dissolved, got into the most awkward position. Furthermore, the vacillating portion of the Moscow committee took measures to make the chief staff (with the Mensheviks and S. R.) the command of the Red Guard. Indeed, three days before the revolution, a proposal was made on November 4th in the Moscow committee to liquidate the central staff, and a second to liquidate the War Commission and the commission for the work of the Red Guard on the Moscow Committee. This proposal meant neither more nor less than self-disarmament. It is a fact that the majority of the Moscow Committee were not in favour of the motion, but through the compromise many persons left the group of waverers and joined the Central Staff.

The October events in Moscow are well known. Owing to the numerous mistakes, unnecessary sacrifices were made, and the success of the revolution was jeopardised. As Comrade Bukharin once rightly remarked, this course of events was due to many objective facts. But to us must be clear the conclusion that under such circumstances, if we have various unfavourable objective premises, the comrades who did not grasp the true character of the prospective revolution and submitted to the influence of Kamenev and Zinoviev and failed to comprehend the counter-revolutionary character of the parties disposed to compromise, were for that reason all the poorer as leaders.

The Discussion before the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

The Discussion Preceding the XV. Party Congress.

By L. B.

The discussions which precede the 15th Party Congress were started in the Press of the C. P. S. U. on October 30th. Three extensive discussion sheets have hitherto been published in the "Pravda", the central organ of the C. P. S. U. The first two sheets chiefly contain speeches delivered by various comrades on former occasions (from the minutes of the October Plenary Meeting of the C. C. and the C.C.C.). Comrade Stalin's speech has already been published verbatim in the "Inprecor." With regard to the other contents of the "two discussion papers" mentioned above, we should like to point out an article by Comrade Kollontai, Comrade Kollontai, who was formerly, in Lenin's time, one of the woman leaders of the "Labour Opposition" and a passionate opponent of the policy of the Party, is now vehemently combating the Opposition. (Published in "Inprecor" No. 64.)

The actual discussion was opened in the discussion paper No. 3 of November 5th with the publication of the theses of the Opposition on activity in the village. From now onwards we shall publish exact — although short — reports of the contents of all contributions to the discussion numbers, the more important ones we shall publish in full.

Discussion Sheet No 3.

In the theses on the activity in the village signed by Comrades Bakajev, Kamenev, Rakovsky, Jevdokimov, Muralov, Smilga, Zinoviev, Peterson, Trotzky, the Opposition developed

its attacks on the policy of the Party in nine chapters containing 38 points. The content of these 38 points can be summarized briefly as follows:

1. The assertion of the C. C. that the dictatorship of the proletariat was changing fundamentally the conditions and the course of agricultural development, was creating a new type of shifting of the masses etc. is — in this form — incorrect. Lenin's characterisation of the period of transition of the proletarian dictatorship is replaced in the theses of the C. C. by a vulgar opportunist declaration which confounds the Nep with socialism. The C. C. is said to gloss over the naked reality, to weaken the attention the proletariat is devoting to the young shoots of capitalism and thus to foster the growth of capitalist relations in the village.

2. The Opposition is "realising and considering" (!) the tremendous achievements of the October revolution but is opposed to reality being glossed over. The C. C. maintains that the "well-being" (inverted commas by the Opposition. L. B.) of the village poor, the middle peasants and the Kulaks is growing. These idyllic conditions however do not exist, on the contrary, class war is spreading in the village on the basis of the development of agriculture.

3 and 4. The correct assertions in the theses of the C. C. according to which the economic commanding positions, above all large industry, are the fundamental leading element of the whole development of national economy, have been borrowed from the Opposition.

The theses of the C. C. fail to throw light on the growth of the capitalist elements in the national economy of the Soviet Union.

5 and 6. The danger with which the country is threatened by the Kulaks is underrated. Two years ago, Bucharin believed in "the Kulaks' growing into socialism".

7. Now, however, Bucharin is of the opinion that a reinforced attack should be made on the capitalist elements, above all on the Kulaks. This is a proof that "the Opposition did not carry on its fight in vain."

8. The "kowtowing to the Kulaks" could not but lead to a neglect of the agricultural workers and the village poor as the social basis of the proletarian dictatorship.

9. Stalin is said to deviate more and more from Marxism and to tend towards the theories of the S. R. with regard to the question of the petty bourgeois character of the property owned by the peasants and of peasant farming.

10. Both Bucharin's dealing with Lenin's co-operative plan and the theses of the C. C. are said to be of a revisionist character and to involve a turning away from the Marxist fundamental thesis which maintains that nothing but a powerful socialist industry is able to promote the collective transformation of agriculture.

11. The representatives of the new bourgeoisie are trying to turn this revisionism to account in order to strengthen their position under the cover of the development of the productive forces and of the commodity character of agriculture.

12. The C. C. denies the existence of a capitalist differentiation in the village and further denies the fact that the middle peasant is being ground between the two extreme economic groups.

13. The bulk of the most important means of production (machinery, cattle for working the soil, area under cultivation etc.) is said to be in the hands of the wealthy strata of the rural population which use it for exploiting the village poor.

14. The accusation is raised that in 1925 the direct taxes were not fixed progressively. The burden of taxation laid on the shoulders of the wealthy groups has, it is true, been somewhat increased since then, but at the same time differentiation has proceeded further. Indirect taxation is very heavy and adds to the relative burdening of the poor strata.

15. Differentiation is proceeding along the path of the development of the extreme groups of the rural population at the cost of the middle peasants.

16. More and more land is being leased. The concentration of leasehold estates in the hands of the most prosperous strata of the peasantry is increasing.

17. The same applies to the employment of wage workers.

18. The provisions of cereals which are unequally distributed are, in the hands of the wealthy strata, a means with which to enslave the poor peasants and frustrate the economic plans of the Soviet Power.

19. Machines and credits are everywhere getting into the hands of the Kulaks and wealthy peasants and promote exploitation.

20. In spite of the deep-reaching process of differentiation the middle peasant remains the most numerous group of the village, and it is one of the most important tasks to win him over to a socialist policy. The trend of the C. C. towards the "strong peasant" however is a trend towards the disintegration of the middle peasant and towards undermining the nationalisation of the land.

21. to 23. In order to ensure and consolidate nationalisation, the Opposition demands that the land should be retained in the hands of the poor strata and that liberal material support be granted to these strata, especially on the lines of collective farming: raising of the technical level, development of the co-operative forms of agriculture in the interest of a rapid transition to collective farming etc.

24. to 26. The wealthy strata are said to be included in the co-operatives to a larger extent than the poor strata.

27. Assignments to the fund of the village poor are quite inadequate; the sums allotted to the development of Soviet farming should also be raised considerably.

28. The change of the election instruction of 1925, which represented a breach of the Constitution and promoted the invasion of the Kulaks and petty bourgeois elements into the Soviets, is the result of the criticism exercised by the Opposition. Even without the franchise however, the growing economic significance of the new bourgeoisie makes it possible for it to exercise its influence on politics.

29. The "official fight against bureaucracy", which is not supported by the class activity of the workers but only by the endeavours of the apparatus, was not able to produce any results of importance. The formulation of the C. C. theses on the active peasant cadres is "entirely borrowed from the Opposition."

30. The exemption from taxes of a further 10 per cent of the peasants (in addition to the 25 per cent up to the present) resolved upon in the "manifesto", is said to be a belated acceptance of the oppositional demands.

31. A certain part of the stores of corn should be taken from the Kulaks in the form of a loan.

32. and 33. With regard to the mistakes and deficiencies of individual State and other authorities, the C. C. is wrong in putting all the blame on them in view of the fact that the general political line taken by the C. C. is a mistake.

34. Only a very small number of agricultural labourers is included in the trade unions (20 per cent), their wages are too low etc. In point 35. the organisation of a "League of the Village Poor" is demanded, in point 36. support to the middle peasants, in point 37 restriction of the tendency of the Kulaks to exploit the peasants by severe progressive taxation, the protection of labour etc. The last point (38) states that the theses of the C. C. contain some "just demands borrowed from the Opposition", but that they are only a method of cloaking Right actions with Left phrases.

The Answer to the Theses of the Opposition.

Comrade Bucharin opened up the refutation of the theses of the Opposition by his article "The Economic Prospects in the Village".

We are faced by two different assertions of the Opposition. On the one hand it is "realising and considering" the results of the October revolution (which even the Social Democrats

cannot deny), on the other hand it is talking about the Thermidor, i. e. about a victory of the counter-revolution, about a shifting of the classes as regards power; their leaders maintain that the Communists are better off in Hindenburg's Germany than in our country (Zinoviev). And when we declare that all that talk about the Thermidor is simply a calumination, we are accused of "glossing over actual facts". The Opposition is sinking more and more deeply into the slough of Menshevism, which considers our achievements to be the results of a peculiar kind of capitalism under the rule of a Kulak and Nepmen power, whereas it provides the big trusts with a socialist label (Hilferding).

Nobody has denied the well-worn truism that a class struggle is going on in the village. The Opposition however denies that the proletarian dictatorship and the socialist commanding positions result in a different type of development in the village. This is the **worst negation of Leninism**.

The Opposition is deliberately **misrepresenting** the idea of the C. C. with regard to differentiation. The C. C. has never spoken of an "idyllic" equal growth of the well-being of all the rural strata, in point 7 the theses of the C. C. deal with a "process of strengthening the group of middle peasants at the cost of the wealthy strata of the middle peasants, involving a certain temporary growth of the Kulak group whilst at the same time there is a numerical decrease of the village poor, one section of which is becoming proletarianised whilst another is gradually advancing into the group of middle peasants." The assertion of the Opposition is therefore a monstrous lie!

When the Opposition assumes that with us **everything** in the village is **exactly** the same as it is under the rule of capitalism, it fails to understand the leading rôle of the proletarian town. It is all the more ridiculous and presumptuous when the Opposition has the "courage" to maintain that the thesis about the leading rôle of the socialist commanding positions is borrowed from it.

It would be absurd seriously to enlarge on a number of lies of the Opposition. The leaders of the Opposition themselves know very well what monstrous lies they are spreading. Some interest, however, should be devoted to the "objection" why we have spoken differently at the 14th Conference from what we are doing now when we demand a reinforced attack on the Kulaks. Well, we are now entering on the **successful completion of the manoeuvre** which was decided upon at the 14th Conference. At that time the leaders of the Opposition voted for the resolutions of the Conference, whilst at the same time just the leaders of the Opposition (Kamenev) were — quite wrongly — maintaining that the resolutions of the 14th Conference (among other things the permission to rent land and to employ hands in the village. — Editor) of which they approved, were a concession made to the Kulaks. The carrying out of the resolutions of the 14th Party Conference consolidated the alliance with the middle peasants which had already been shaken. The Opposition fails to understand that it was only possible after solving this task to proceed against the Kulaks with every security, hand in hand with the middle peasants and more firmly supported by the village poor.

Even at the 11th Party Congress Lenin said that the economic forces which are in the hands of the proletarian State were sufficient to ensure the transition to Communism. To-day we have far more "economic forces" at our disposal than at that time. If anyone is revising Leninism, it is the Opposition and the Opposition alone.

Comrade Jakovlev discusses that section of the Opposition theses dealing with the differentiation of the village and with the co-operative system.

In the question of the "substantiation" of its assertion with regard to the differentiation of the village, the Opposition

resorts to the following manoeuvre; it is drawing conclusions applying to 25 millions of farms from statistics which are based on the investigation of 1208 farms **altogether**, and that in districts with the crassest differentiation! In reality 69.1 per cent of the agricultural machines and 91 per cent of the area under cultivation in the Ukraine are in the hands of the **middle peasants**; in the Northern Caucasus 74.8 per cent of the machines and 88.3 per cent of the area under cultivation; and in the Ural 67.4 per cent and 80.2 per cent respectively. Apart from the fact that the Opposition is, in a demagogic way, counting a number of the middle peasants to the Kulaks, the development of the Kulaks has been considerably retarded precisely **during** the last year thanks to the policy of the Soviet Power, nay, in some districts their proportional relation to the total number of peasant farms has even decreased. The significance of the middle peasants, however, has increased in all districts.

What the Opposition says with regard to the rôle of the wealthy strata in the question of leasing and renting the land is equally untrue. 67 percent of the land on lease is in the hands of the middle peasants. It is an **absolute fraud** when the Opposition maintains that the co-operatives mainly include the upper strata of the village and that they promote differentiation. Comrade Jakovlev is proving on the basis of figures that exactly the contrary is true.

The "practical" proposals of the Opposition are general hollow phrases, whereas, the theses of the C. C. are endeavouring to solve **practically** the tasks of restricting the growth of the Kulaks and of consolidating the nationalisation of the land.

An article by Comrade W. K. on "Collective Farms and Soviet Farms" and an article by Comrade Saizev "They want to **correct** the Line taken by the Party" refute the other assertions made by the Opposition. Comrade Saizev summarises his criticism in the following points: The Opposition fails to understand the character of the resolutions of the 14th Conference which aim at isolating the Kulaks in spite of their economic prosperity; it fails to understand that the permeation of the village with State and co-operative organs is one of the forms of our offensive against the Kulaks; that the achievements we have attained in this respect cannot even be compared with the situation two years ago; that the policy of the Party has led to the pacification of the middle peasants and to a boom in peasant farming; that the growth of the Kulaks is enormously outweighed by the greater growth of the socialist commanding positions etc.

The Opposition does **not** follow any line. The Party, however, is following the Leninist line which is: "Out for a reinforced offensive against capitalism, for a reinforced support of the elements of socialist construction in the village on the basis of the real, positive results of the resolutions of the 14th Conference!"

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Imprecorr" are as follows:

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| England | 2 sh. |
| America | 50 cents |
| Germany | 1,50 marks |
| Austria | 2 (Austrian) Schillings |
| Norway | 1,50 crowns |
| Sweden | 1,50 crowns |
| Denmark | 1,50 crowns |
| U. S. S. R. | 1 rouble. |

The subscription rate for **other** countries is **three dollars** (or equivalent in local currency) for six months.

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers.