

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 9

23rd February 1928

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

CONTENTS

Georg: The Pan-American Conference.

Politics.

Walter Schultz: The Result of the Hamburg Elections.

Viktor: The Elections in Poland and the Russian White Guardists.

A. J.: Letter from Belgium.

Jur: The Overthrow of the Social Democratic Government in Norway.

Ten Years of the Red Army.

Greetings of the E. C. C. I. to the Red Army.

A. Bubnov: The Party as Leader of the Red Army.

To the Working and Peasant Youth of the Whole World (Appeal E. C. Y. C. I.)

Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

A. B.: The International Countenance of Trotzkyism.

For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.

J. B.: The Political Corps of Trotzky — the Signboard of the Yellow International.

The Labour Movement.

August Enderle: The Lock out of 800,000 German Metal Workers.

Victor Stern: The Fight in the North Bohemian Lignite Area.

K. Kilboom: The Fight of the Swedish Workers.

H. Rathbone: The Anti-Imperialist Struggle in South Africa and the I. C. U.

Jercovi: Spanish Workers in the Fight against the Wages Tax.

Economics.

Edmondo Peluso: The Economic Situation in Italy. In the International.

N. N.: A Conference of the C. P. of Italy.

The White Terror.

Our Comrades Before the Belgrade Tribunal.

The Proceedings at the Trial of Boris Stefanov.

The Fight in Defence of the Hromada.

Documents.

The XV. Party Congress and the Rural Work of the C. P. S. U. Proletarian Culture.

N. Bukharin: Leninism and the Problem of Cultural Revolution (Conclusion).

Ten Years Ago.

Paul Frölich: The Brest Peace and Germany's War Policy. II.

The Pan-American Conference.

By Georg.

The Conference of the Pan-American Union, which was opened in Havana by Coolidge in the name of the United States on the 15th of January, is drawing to a close. The last days of the Conference are hardly likely to bring any surprise. The Conference will conclude as it began: with a demonstration of the power of Dollar imperialism on the Latin American Continent.

Coolidge, who came to the Conference on board of a warship in company with American capitalist magnates, opened it with the words: "Here the sovereignty of small nations is respected, for our most sacred belief is democracy. The smallest and the weakest speak here with the same authority as the greatest and most powerful nations." That is a piece of hypocrisy which could hardly be surpassed. For these words of Coolidge were spoken at a time when United States bombing planes were bombarding the towns of the fighters for freedom in Nicaragua. Among the 20 "sovereign" governments of Latin America to whose delegates Coolidge spoke, there are those of Cuba, Haiti, San Domingo, Panama, Porto Rico, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, which are occupied by troops of the United States. His words were listened to by the representatives of the go-

vernments of Honduras, Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and other States which are being converted more and more into dependent colonies by the financial control of the United States.

Dollar imperialism prepared the Conference in such a way that not a word was spoken regarding the violation of small States, although the movement against the United States imperialism is increasing in Central and South American Republics. For the Congress did not represent the Latin American peoples, but their governments which were mostly set up by Washington by means of "revolutions", coup d'états, bribery and war.

The Pan-American Union, which convened the Congress, is itself a creation of the Washington Government of the United States, which conceals its imperialism aspirations behind the mask of "Pan Americanism", of the "solidarity of all nations of America". When the President of the United States, Monroe, in the year 1823, proclaimed the principle known as the "Monroe doctrine", according to which any interference by the European powers in the affairs of the American Continent is impermissible, this action was an anti-imperialist, progressive slogan, a defensive action of the

young Latin American countries against British imperialism, a defence of the young Latin American Republics against attacks on the part of the Spanish "mother country" and of the European Holy Alliance. Today, however, the colonising policy of the United States and its attacks upon the economic and political position of Great Britain are cloaked with the same ideology.

Thus the first task of the Pan American Union, whose permanent seat is at Washington and whose permanent President is the Foreign Minister of the United States, is the fight against Great Britain and against the anti-imperialist movement. This fact was illustrated by a significant episode during the preparations of the Congress. Great Britain brought forward the idea that a representative of the League of Nations should be invited to the Congress. The United States, however, brusquely rejected this idea. The Congress is a "purely American affair". It is an instrument of power of the United States: a sort of American "Counter-League of Nations". "Legally" regarded there is a flaw in this argument; for all these Latin American States are represented in the League of Nations and for the greater part dance there according to Washington's music. Whilst, therefore, Washington has at all times the possibility of controlling and influencing the decisions of the League of Nations, Great Britain must not interfere in Pan-American affairs.

This state of affairs corresponds to and is indeed the reflection of the actual relations of power. Since the world war the United States has become the leading imperialist power, and is gradually but surely forcing British influence back. Before the war Great Britain, with its capital investments and its trade in Central and South American States, was the dominating power. British capital investments in 1913 amounted in, round figures, to 5 milliard dollars, whilst those of the United States in the same period did not amount to 1.3 milliard dollars. The capital investments of Great Britain and the United States are at present both estimated at 5.2 milliard dollars; that is to say, United States investments have increased fourfold while British investments have remained almost stationary. In many of these countries United States capital investments have increased 20 and 30-fold. Great Britain still has a trifling lead only in Argentina and Brazil, although even these States are becoming more and more dependent, through financial and commercial relations, upon the United States.

The foreign trade of the United States with the Latin American world has increased sevenfold since 1900; exports from the United States to these areas have increased since 1913 by 158.5 per cent., whilst exports from Great Britain have made scarcely any perceptible advance. United States capital investments in Columbia have grown since 1912 by 6150 per cent.; in Argentina by 1025%; in Chile 2900 per cent.; in Venezuela by 5300 per cent.; and in Mexico by 536%.

The Congress was the reflection of this power. The representatives of the governments of the Latin American Republics grovelled before the dollar. Even Mexico, of whom the Latin American peoples hoped that it would lead their fight against dollar imperialism, made peace with Washington, complied with the wishes of Washington after the house of Morgan had offered a loan. The only opposition which disturbed the harmony of the Congress came from Argentina; that is from the country which is relatively most independent of dollar capital. The action of Argentina roused a certain response on the part of the representatives of Chile, Salvadore and Mexico. The desires of Argentina, however, expressed less the fighting mood of its population than the counter-play of English capital.

It would be a mistake, however, to accept the proceedings of the Pan-American Congress as representing a picture of the actual forces. On the one hand, Great Britain has not given up the fight by a long way. The settlement of the struggle for power between Great Britain and the United States — not with notes and Congress speeches but with warships and aeroplanes — still remains outstanding. Secondly, in the whole of Latin America anti-imperialist forces are stirring which are directed against United States as well as against every imperialism. These forces, which do not find expression in the governments and their Congress delegations, are determined by the social structure of the Latin American countries.

This social structure is somewhat similar in the various States, which for the most part are still at a low stage of capitalist industrialisation: a dominating feudal landowning

class which is allied with the most reactionary forces of dollar imperialism for the purpose of exploiting the Indian and immigrant peasants; a young industrial bourgeoisie dependent upon foreign capital, which feels this dependence to be a burdensome obstacle to its development and vacillates between aspirations for independence and inclination to a compromise with imperialism; a national intelligentsia which, together with a portion of the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie, is developing a strong national bourgeois ideology of independence. And finally, the fundamental mass of the population. These last bled for the independence of Mexico; they fought desperately against the subjugation of Nicaragua; and they developed the ideology of international fighting solidarity against dollar imperialism.

The majority of the Latin American countries, in spite of their "Republican" form of State are still feudal or semi-feudal monarchies. On the agenda of history there stands first the annihilation of the feudal remnants, the emancipation of the peasants, the agrarian revolution. In the distance there are to be seen the contours of a bloc of independent workers' and peasants' Republics which will conduct the fight against the dollar.

POLITICS

The Result of the Hamburg Elections.

By Walter Schulz (Berlin).

By a decision of the State Court of the Republic the Hamburg provincial parliament elected on the 9th October 1927, was compelled to dissolve, and new elections were announced which took place on Sunday the 19th February. The result of these new elections was awaited with great eagerness, because in the course of the last few months fierce political fights have been fought regarding which the electors were to pronounce their opinion at the ballot box.

Immediately after the election of 9th October which resulted in a combined social democratic-Communist majority: i. e. 63 social democrats and 27 Communists, the Communist Party of Germany submitted to the Socialist Party of Germany the question of the formation of the government and called upon the latter to form a social democratic government which, under certain definite and sharply defined conditions, would receive the support of the C. P. G. For the social democratic party, which since November 1918 had been closely connected with the bourgeois parties in the government, it was not easy to justify in the eyes of the working masses its refusal to form a government alone. It raised in a demagogic manner the question of the participation of the C. P. G. in the government and conducted an unexampled incitement against the Communists. At the same time, however, it carried on serious negotiations with the Democrats and the People's Party regarding the formation of the Hamburg government. These negotiations had come to a conclusion when, owing to the judgement of the Court, the newly elected Parliament was dissolved.

The S. P. G. immediately commenced a furious and unprecedented campaign against the Communists and during the election sank to ever lower depths. Apart from a few blows at the Germna Nationalists, the entire forces of the S. P. G. were directed against the Communists, who were described as "hordes of criminals", "Moscow fascists" and "bandits". On posters and in leaflets the slogan was given out: "Beat the reaction (!) from the Right and Left!" — Hundred of thousands of copies of "Minutes" of negotiations between the S. P. G. and C. P. G. which took place after 9th of October, were distributed as a pamphlet entitled: "The Swindle of the united front".

The trade union leaders came forward on a still larger scale and more openly than before October on the side of the S. P. G. in the election campaign and helped the latter in every way against the C. P. G. Any preparations for economic struggles was of course out of the question for the reformists. To make up for this, however, they carried out wholesale expulsions from the trade unions and cancelled elections in the unions which were favourable to the Opposition. In order to conceal this anti-working class policy from their own members,

recourse was had to "Left phrases" and demagogic memorial articles on the Communist Manifesto, on August Bebel etc. This pseudo-revolutionary attitude in connection with the election campaign, which was conducted only against the Communists, led to an unexampled degeneration of the political fighting methods of the S. P. G.

On the other hand the C. P. G. possessed neither the financial nor the organisatory means in order to counteract the S. P. G. campaign by numerous meetings, millions of leaflets and thousands of placards. But the C. P. G. was able to rely upon far more valuable forces, upon the zeal and enthusiasm of its Party members, and the indefatigable Youth and the members of the Red Front Fighters' League. A tremendously intensive agitation in the factories and from house to house completely nullified the effect of the campaign of incitement of the S. P. G. Numerous and well-prepared meetings in the squares of workers' dwellings, numerous factory meetings and ten thousands of copies of factory newspapers did not fail to have their effect, and on the morning of the election day the Communist workers of Hamburg, encouraged by a number of splendid demonstrations, were roused to a very confident mood. The results of the election have not disappointed them.

The Communist vote increased by 4108, i. e. to 114,223; the vote of the S. P. G. fell by 839, i. e. to 246,630. As a result of the 5% increased participation in the election the key figure for the distribution of the seats rose, so that the C. P. G. kept its 27 seats, whilst the S. P. G. lost three seats and therefore now has 60 seats. The S. P. G. have together 87 out of the 160 seats in the Provincial Parliament. What is also remarkable is the success of the Democrats, who gained 20,000 votes and won 5 seats. They had placed at the head of their list of candidates the former chairman of the Democratic Party and member of the Reichstag, Dr. Petersen, who on account of his personality secured the votes of many electors who had voted social democratic on the 9th of October but had since been repulsed by the sham radical attitude (which they had taken seriously) of the S. P. G. The increased vote of the C. P. G. is derived partly from the 5% new electors and for the rest from the ranks of the S. P. G., in which there was a strong fermentation, particularly in the last days before the election, over the despicable fighting methods of the S. P. G. leaders. A letter from oppositional S. P. workers addressed to the Social Democratic and Communist Parties gave sufficiently clear expression to this desire to break with the social democratic demagogic methods of fighting. In addition, there found expression the discontent at the inactivity of the reformists in preparing for the economic struggles — thus the increased vote of the C. P. G. is an expression of the constantly increasing fighting will of the working class.

Mention must be made of the losses of the German Nationalists, which were reaped by the National Socialists. The vote of the latter increased from 9,737 to 14,739. In the four months since October the German People's Party won about 16,000 votes while the Party of the Middle Class lost 7,000 votes.

A disastrous bankruptcy was suffered by the dozen split-off parties on account of which the new elections had to take place. Mention need only be made of the "International Communists" list, supported by all renegades, from Maslow to Korsch, from the unionists to the syndicalists, which polled only 741 votes. A miserable fiasco.

The S. P. G., already on the day after the election, issued the slogan of "great coalition"; for there can be no other meaning to the furious article against the Communists and the call for energetic and responsible collaboration in the State".

The C. P. G. is confronted by the task of making clear to the masses the anti working class policy of the S. P. G. The fight has not ended with the election — it has only just begun!

After the splendid behaviour of the revolutionary workers of Hamburg, there exists no reason to doubt that the next months will be marked by a great advance. The Reichstag elections will show that this advance is proceeding without interruption to the Left, until victory!

The Elections in Poland and the Russian White Guardists.

By Viktor.

Every day there is taking place in Poland, in connection with the election campaign, wholesale arrests, domiciliary searches, breaking up of meetings, confiscation of newspapers, mishandling of leaders of the opposition parties by "unknown persons" and often "mysterious" murders of Left workers' and peasants' leaders. In addition to the acts of repression, which are mainly directed against the Left parties, the Government is working, and not without success, at disintegrating the opposition parties from within.

Highly significant details of these repressive measures and the election machinations of the Pilsudski government are to be gathered from letters which a leading Russian Monarchist in Poland and representative of Nikolai Nikolayevitch, W. M. Gorlov, has written to the notorious former Tsarist Ambassador, M. N. Giers, and in which the chief of the department for nationalities in the Polish Ministry for the Interior, Suchenek, plays an important role.

Of particular interest is the long letter which the above-named Gorlov wrote on the 30th November, 1927, and which, among other things, describes the negotiations of the former (Russian) Member of the Polish Parliament, Serebrennikov, and the representative of the Russian National League, "Ljeljavsky" with the above-mentioned Suchenek, who, by the way, was formerly active in the secret police of Warsaw and "conducts" the nationality policy of the Polish Ministry for the Interior. In these negotiations Suchenek acted openly and cynically and revealed the "secrets" of the election methods of the government. Thus he says, among other things, that only the lists of candidates shall be submitted; they will be examined and sent to the authorities; it shall be rendered impossible for the oppositional elements to conduct an election campaign, and pretexts will be found to dissolve their meetings etc.

Gorlov's letters contain very interesting communications regarding the relations between the Polish authorities and the Russian white emigrants. What appears most striking is that the representative of the Russian monarchists has the possibility not only to live freely in Poland, but also to play a prominent political role as leader of the reactionary elements of the Russian minority.

Thus, in connection with the house searches that were carried out in June, 1927, after the murder of Comrade Voikov, the Ambassador of the Soviet Union in Poland, Gorlov, as he informs Giers in his letter of 19th of June, was received by the director of the political department of the Polish Ministry for the Interior, Svitalski, who gave him the "most reassuring promises". The house-searches and the arrests were, as he said, only an "incident of 24 hours, created by exceptional circumstances. These circumstances are now past. The incident will not have any result". It should be mentioned that on the day following the murder of Comrade Voikov a search was carried out in the house of Gorlov himself (as he states in another letter to Giers dated 13th July 1927) or as he says "something in the nature of a house-search".

No less interesting are the relations of the Polish authorities with the group of former Russian dignitaries who publish in Warsaw the paper, "For Freedom". This paper has on certain occasions called for acts of terror against the Soviet representatives. At present it is conducting an intensified campaign for the pardon of Koverda, the murderer of Comrade Voikov. The paper "For Freedom" has been repeatedly branded even in the emigration press as an organ of the Polish secret police. We now learn from such an authoritative person as Suchenek, "that among the Russian emigrants there exists a group which enjoys the full confidence of the Polish government, i. e. the group connected with the paper "For Freedom", before all D. W. Filossofov". As Gorlov further reports to Giers, "Suchenek advised him to come to an understanding with him and work out a common list of candidates".

Thus the lists of candidates for the Polish Parliament are revised by Filossofov, who, as Gorlov himself admits, thereby makes use of the opportunity to settle accounts with personal opponents.

This is the picture of the **tragi-comedy of the elections** to the Polish Parliament revealed by the stage managers and actors themselves. It must be admitted that it is a picture which is somewhat unusual even for bourgeois practices and customs. It can be safely said that Poland is writing a new page in the history of the morals and customs of West-European democracy — a page which is entitled: **An era of moral reformation**".

Letter from Belgium.

Theory and Practice of the Belgian Reformists.

By A. J. (Brussels).

Since the resignation or, rather, throwing out of, the Belgian reformists from His Majesty's Government, the leaders of the **Belgian Labour Party** have been trying to appear to the masses as rather revolutionarily inclined. The dissatisfaction of the worker and peasant masses is growing from day to day, the general election is approaching and it is therefore comprehensible that the Labour Party is preparing to fight. It would, however, be a waste of time to search the latest "fighting movement" of the reformists for anything in the nature of an election programme. Of a systematic co-ordination of the political, economic or social demands of the working class there is not a trace. But in its place there are the usual trite phrases concerning the improvement of the position of the working class.

In the reformist press and in the conferences and public meetings a "sharp criticism" of the government measures and the methods of the capitalists is duly provided. People like **Wauters, Huysmanns, Anseele, Debattre and Mertens**, who not only supported and magnified the policy of national unity and the stabilisation of the franc but have also carried it through by means of active co-operation, now have the effrontery to complain about the catastrophic consequences of this policy. After the hypocritical jeremiad of the "Peuple" about the misery of the working class and the ruin of the middle class, we now find in the "**Mouvement Syndical Belge**" (Belgian Trade-Union Movement), the official organ of the Belgian trade-union federation, the following bitter complaints:

"...It is a welcome sign that at the beginning of the year 1928 a campaign for an increase of wages has commenced. It was only right that the men waited so long before making it clear to the employers that the working class does not desire to be the duped subject of the manoeuvres of financial forces, for the sacrifices they have made finally served only the interests of those who have everything to win by maintaining the present social order."

And people, who through the throttling of the wage movements and strikes, through their policy of class harmony, have subjugated the workers to the arbitrary will of the Government and of the bourgeoisie, now have the nerve to speak and write in this fashion!

The parliamentary and trade-union leaders think that the time has come to fight for the demands of the workers. The following was said, for instance, by the reformist member of parliament, **Van Walleghem**, at a public meeting at which he gave to his constituency an account of his parliamentary activity.

"...Comrades, we do not feel that we are defeated.

The hour has come for a fight which must be carried on with clarity, boldness and method. I request the workers to believe in the urgency of pressing forward!"

In this and similar ways the reformist leaders are trying again to win the duped working masses for their policy. What these gentlemen really think about "fighting", "boldness" and "method" is best illustrated by the attitude of the reformists in the military question. As is well known, the slogan "**six months military service**" was and is the only "tangible" point in the programme of the Belgian Labour Party. For the sake of these popular election slogans they allowed themselves to be put out of the Government. In the whole of the country they developed a feverish activity in order to get the support of the masses of workers for this their "programme".

Just let us hear what the unity and social patriot **De Brouckère** thinks about this question. This time it is not a

question of an address at a public meeting but of a "concrete" discussion before the military commission of the Chamber of Deputies. **Mr. de Brouckère**, invited by the military commission as former Minister of War, expressed himself regarding the reorganisation of the army and the six months' service in the manner which we here briefly summarise:

The training of soldiers could be effected in a period of less than ten months, provided that less time were lost than is at present the case, 10-day there is a shortage of training ground, skeleton corps, armaments and equipment. To make this shortage good would cost less than keeping the soldiers' idle in barracks. It is necessary to rationalise in every department. Too much energy is now being wasted unnecessarily. To-day 44,000 men are being called up, whereas 55,000 might be called up if the length of service were shorter. Our problem is so to organise the nation that an attack may be quickly repulsed.

After a thorough lecture upon the organising of technics, the mechanics of the army, aviation, the engineers, artillery, etc. etc., **Mr. de Brouckère** proceeds to speak about the training of school children. Physical culture and sports must be promoted. It is necessary to build up a good corps of reserve officers. The officers who are called up for training must keep in contact with the men. Military allowances must be created in order to get more men and officers, etc.

From this it will be seen what kind of "fight" **Mr. de Brouckère** is putting up against the bourgeoisie. Even the slogan "six months service" will in reality help him to strengthen the army. Like his glorious accomplice, the French reformist, **Mr. Paul Boncour**, he wants to prepare the nation for war and increase armaments. He wants to rationalise the army, so that the ruling class may have a better weapon to use against the proletariat of its own country or of another country.

The demagogy of the Belgian reformists is adequately characterised by their ambiguous tactics. They desire by the use of imposing radical and revolutionary phrases to attract to their party the masses of the workers and petty bourgeois, whom the reactionary parties cannot win over, so that they may deliver them to the bourgeoisie as objects of exploitation and as cannon fodder.

The Overthrow of the Social Democratic Government in Norway.

By Jur.

The social-democratic government of Norway, which has just been overthrown, only existed on the sufferance of the capitalist parties. The bourgeoisie permitted the formation of a government of the Labour Party solely because there did not prevail in its own ranks sufficient unity regarding the degree of the pressure that should be exerted upon the working class on the occasion of the approaching revision of the collective agreements between the employers' and workers' organisations.

The main role in this connection was played by the banks, which form a link between foreign capital and Norwegian industry. These feared that the reduction of the dividends of the banking concerns might lead to foreign capital being withdrawn from Norway and to fresh bank failures. The main demand of the banks was that the profitability of the undertakings must be increased at all costs by means of rationalisation and wage-cuts. Foreign capital, through the mediation of the Norwegian banks, further insisted upon a reduction in the State expenditure, in the first place upon a curtailment of the social services and particularly of unemployment benefit. The differences between the various bourgeois parties were of a purely technical nature and related to the question as to the methods for best realising the demands of bank capital.

Pending the time they arrived at an agreement among themselves, the bourgeois parties allowed the social democrats the pleasure of occupying the ministerial seats for a few days.

It sufficed, however, for the Labour Party to adopt in their government programme the far from extreme demands for a "reasonable" unemployment benefit, for reduction of the taxes in arrear by the poor population and by the municipalities, for investment of funds in agriculture in order to extend the area of land cultivated by the peasants, and the abolition of the law of freedom for strike breakers and the differences within the

bourgeoisie retired into the background. The vote of censure against the government was unanimously supported by all the bourgeois parties.

The Norwegian Labour Party took over the reins of government in the hope that it would succeed in obtaining the support of the Liberals by granting concessions to the petty bourgeoisie and by the promise that in the revision of the collective agreements the class collaboration would be maintained. These hopes, however, have not been realised.

By compromising the social democrats the Norwegian bourgeoisie has unintentionally rendered the working class an invaluable service. It has thereby demonstrated not only the complete futility but also the great harm of a policy of class collaboration. The proletariat of all the capitalist countries has acquired further proof that the resistance of the bourgeoisie cannot be broken by means of Parliament but only by the proletarian dictatorship.

TEN YEARS OF THE RED ARMY

Greetings of the E. C. C. I. to the Red Army.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International on behalf of the Communists of all countries, on behalf of the revolutionary proletariat and oppressed peoples sends its fervent fraternal greetings to the heroic Red Army on the occasion of its X. Anniversary.

Ten years ago, the workers of Russia having overthrown the power of the bourgeoisie and its social opportunist lackeys proceeded with the building of a regular army of the proletarian revolution for the defence of the young Soviet Government against the domestic and international counter-revolution. With lightning speed the workers of Russia learned the art of war and how to fight and conquer.

The workers' and peasants' Red Army organised under the direct collective leadership of Lenin's Communist Party splendidly resisted all blows of the numerous enemies of the first victorious proletarian revolution and guaranteed an opportunity for the republic of labour to proceed with the construction of Socialism.

The Red Army is an army of proletarian revolution. The Red Army is a child of October, the defender of its conquests. The Red Army of the Soviet Union is the steel sword of the oppressed and the exploited of the whole world because it guards the Soviet Union, the stronghold of world revolution, because the final aim of the Red Army is the abolition of oppression and exploitation throughout the world.

The imperialist robbers are sharpening their teeth against the first Socialist State. But the oppressed and the disinherited of the world regard this Socialist State as their country and are ready at any moment to defend it against all enemies together with the Red Army.

On their behalf, on behalf of the millions of workers and peasants of the whole world, the Plenum of the Comintern fervently greets the Red Army and its organiser the C. P. S. U. on the occasion of the celebrations of its Tenth Anniversary.

Long live the Red Army of the Soviet Union, the army of the oppressed and exploited of the whole world!

Long live world revolution!

Executive Committee of the Communist International.

The Party as Leader of the Red Army.

By A. Bubnov.

The Red Army is the armed force of the Soviet State which realises the dictatorship of the working class. It came into being during the civil war in the years 1918 to 1921. During the civil war we had in the Red Army millions of "village people", millions of peasants and a "thin layer" of the proletariat. With such a class composition it had to be converted into an army which should be a powerful instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

At the end of 1918 Lenin wrote that "a new social class cannot consolidate its State otherwise than by the gradual formation of a new army in a heavy civil war, by the creation of a new discipline, a new military organisation of the new class". And thus our Party had to solve, in the process of creating this "new organisation of the new class", a number of important organisational problems, and before all the most important one, of securing the leading rôle of our Party in the Red Army consisting of workers and peasants.

At the commencement of the civil war we had to build up the Red Army without our own military experience, by using the war science and the military experience of those military specialists who had arisen from the school of the old army. The solution of this task encountered the problem of securing the leading rôle of the Communist Party in the army.

Lenin said that the war is not only "the continuation of politics", but also "the concentration of politics".

In the process of civil war there took place the political training of the cadre troops of the peasantry, and in this fight for the peasant masses, in the fight for the middle peasant, the Red Army played a big rôle, for the Red Army became, as Lenin said, an "instrument for enlightening the peasantry". And this we achieved by a "new work", i. e. by the organisation of the political work and by organising the Party political Bolshevik apparatus within the Army. The Red Army, as is known, was the instrument to exploit the "bourgeois specialists". But this again could only be achieved by the "new organisation", i. e. by the creation of such a system of the "organising forces" within the Army which got hold of the bourgeois military specialists and compelled them to work along our lines. Lenin emphasised that "by force alone" nothing could be achieved, "the organisation, discipline and the moral weight of the victorious proletariat" was here needed.

This became only possible because the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been, and still, is the leader and organiser of the Red Army.

In this way there arose during the civil war a whole number of organisational-political tasks the solution of which could only be brought about by creating those organisational preconditions within the Army which fully secured the concentration of the political leadership of the Army in the hands of the working class and its Party.

The embodiment of this great rôle of our Party in the construction of the armed forces in the epoch of the great civil war was the War Commissar. In the snow-covered fields of Siberia, in the steppes of Turkestan, in the mountains of Caucasia, in the great plains from the Volga to the Baltic Sea, near Leningrad near Tsaritzin, near Tula and near Ufa, near Vladivostok, in the fight against Machno, against Antonov, in the fight against banditism, the Commissar carried through, firmly and without contradiction, the iron will of our Party to victory over the capitalists, the landowners, white-guardists and kulaks.

This rôle of leader of the Army has been maintained by our Party during the whole ten years of the existence of the Red Army. The Red Army was, is and will be the instrument of the Soviet State, the instrument of the dictatorship of the working class. And this rôle regarding such an important part of our Soviet State as is the Red Army of the workers and peasants, our Party could only fulfil because it was the real Party of the working class, because it defended the interests of the broad masses of the proletariat during the long years of its fight and its existence in all circumstances and under all difficulties, in victory and defeat. Our Party could fulfil and is fulfilling this rôle only because it never lost contact with the masses.

Lenin taught during his whole life that the Party of the working class must be in closest alliance with the working and peasant masses. And our Party could only fulfil this leading rôle because before the October fights, before the intensified collisions of the epoch of civil war it had collected great military experiences.

In the period of the first Russian Revolution, the revolution of 1905 to 1907, our Party, in the question of the leadership of the insurrection of the masses of the people, placed in the foreground the systematic preparation of the insurrection, both organisationally and technically. At that time our Party organised dozens and hundreds of fighting units. This was the first military experience acquired by our Party. But this ex-

perience was further enriched in the period, extremely rich in experiences, between the February and October Revolution. At this time the Party led a struggle for power. And in the process of this struggle it worked at organising the Red Guard. The fighting units were the first kernel, the germ of the organisation of the armed forces of the victorious proletariat. The Red Guard was the second step, it was a great achievement of our Party and of the working class in the creation of its army.

The success in the organisation of the Red Army is explained by the fact that our Party, before October, before the period of civil war, had collected great military experiences which helped it in the construction of the Red Army in the great and glorious epoch of civil war from 1918 to 1921.

Our Party, standing at the head of the working class and at the head of the million masses of the peasantry, created and consolidated the Soviet State. In the period of civil war it created with a firm hand the Red Army of the workers and peasants. The Red Army is the instrument of the dictatorship of the working class. Its leader is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

To the Working and Peasant Youth of the Whole World.

Ten years have passed since, in the midst of civil war in Russia, the Red Army, the first army of the proletarian world revolution, was created. In 1918 the Russian proletariat set up in a few months a mass army which, in years of fighting full of privations, defeated all the enemies of the first workers' State, the Russian generals and landowners as well as the hangmen's troops of European and American imperialism. In spite of its being badly armed, and in spite of hunger and misery, the Red Army vanquished the more powerful enemy which was armed to the teeth, because it knew that it was fighting for the cause of the world proletariat.

Today the international revolutionary proletariat looks upon the Red Army with pride and confidence. For the Red Army is the powerful weapon for the defence of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics — the fatherland of the toilers of all countries. In the deeds of the Red Army there is embodied the boundless heroism and self-sacrifice of which only the oppressed are capable in their fight against the oppressors. The revolution gave birth to the Red Army and the Red Army is serving World Revolution.

Young Workers, Peasants and Soldiers!

The imperialist States, before all England, are again preparing for a new crusade against the Soviet Union. The international industrial and financial magnates perceive with rage the consolidation and strengthening of the Soviet Power, which is showing to the whole world how the working class, allied with all the toilers, can build up its own socialist economy without the capitalists and can live freely and happily. They fear the revolutionising effect of this heroic example upon the mass of millions of workers, peasants and suppressed colonial peoples who are still pining under the yoke of capitalism. Therefore they wish to annihilate the hated Soviet State, the stronghold of world revolution, and to bring the territory of the Soviet Union again under the domination of the capitalists.

The imperialists are finding eager helpmates in the camp of the Second International, who eagerly join in the war incitement against the Soviet Union by calumniating the proletarian State and its Red Army. Paul Buncour in France, Scheidemann and Noske in Germany, MacDonald in England and Vandervelde in Belgium are fuming over the "Red imperialism" of the Soviet Union, while at the same time they grant the credits for armaments to their own capitalists and even reorganise the capitalist armies.

Do not allow yourselves to be confused by this clamour! The Soviet Union wants peace in order to build up the socialist economy in peaceful work. It has on innumerable occasions demonstrated its firm will for peace and frustrated the war provocations of its enemies. But the Russian proletariat is prepared at any moment for its defence; for it knows that world capitalism will never reconcile itself with the existence of the workers' State and will never abandon its fight against it. Only with weapons in hand can the proletariat defend the fruits of the revolution from the imperialist robbers!

Young Workers, Peasants, Soldiers!

On the tenth anniversary of the Red Army we pledge ourselves to strengthen the fight for the defence of the Soviet Union. The more eagerly the imperialists prepare for war against the Soviet Union, the louder shall resound our cry:

"Hands off the Soviet Union! — Down with imperialism!"
"Civil war against imperialist war!"

Defend the Soviet Union, the bulwark of the international proletariat!

Fight against the war preparations of world capital!

Disintegrate by means of revolutionary propaganda the armies of the imperialist Powers!"

And should the imperialists venture to unchain the dogs of war against the Soviet Union, then prevent the transport of troops, arms and munitions; do not fire at the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union; fight at the side of the Red Army against your own capitalist governments!

Long live the Union of Soviet Republics, the fatherland of the exploited and oppressed of all countries!

Down with militarism!

Long live the Red Army, the army of the world revolution!
Moscow, February 1928.

The Executive Committee of the Young Communist International.

PLENUM OF THE E. C. C. I.

The International Countenance of Trotzkyism.

By A. B.

The speeches by representatives of the Comintern sections which followed the report of Comrade Bukharin ("On the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. and on the International Opposition") at the IX. Enlarged Plenary Session, unrolled a picture of the counter-revolutionary activity carried on by the adherents of Trotzky and his Opposition throughout the capitalist world. The facts referred to by the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat had previously been mentioned in the press, but in their entirety these facts constituted such a fatal impeachment of the Opposition as not all who heard them were perhaps immediately able to grasp.

The general conclusions repeated in the speeches of representatives of all sections, were that the Trotzky Opposition had armed not only the Social Democrats but also the world bourgeoisie in the fight against the Comintern and the Soviet Union. The harder the position of the Communist Party is in one country or the other, the more violent is the assault made by the Social Democrats; the more sanguinary the terror and the more active the rôle played in the country in question against the Communists, the more destructive is the influence of the Trotzky Opposition in the respective quarter. At the same time it must be pointed out that in the sections of the Comintern the Opposition is diminutive if at all existent. Its strength by no means corresponds to its specific weight within the Party, being based exclusively on the ideological, and in many places also the organisational, connection with the Social Democrats and on the weapons it places at the disposal of the bourgeoisie.

The Opposition has attempted to organise "coalescence evenings". The coalescence in question, however, did not come about between the Opposition leaders and the workers, as the former had imagined would be the case, but between the Opposition on the one hand and the Second International and the bourgeoisie on the other. Facts are obstinate matters. History has already passed judgment upon the Trotzky Opposition in all parts of the world.

"I can now assert," said Comrade Thälmann in regard to the appeal of Trotzky to the VI. Congress of the Comintern, "that it is not the Third International but the Second International that is his ally."

In a number of countries, the coalescence of the Trotzkyists and the Menshevists is already to be seen on an international scale.

As regards the material cited in the speeches of the plenary session with reference to the oppositional activity, we may limit ourselves to that part which refers to (1) the social composition of the Trotzkyist Opposition, (2) their ideological stock-in-trade,

(3) the actual collaboration between the Opposition and the Second International, and (4) the further immersion of the Opposition in the counter-revolutionary bog.

The Social Composition of the Trotskyist Opposition.

In France the Opposition displays the most variegated of peacock's tails. Here it controls five small periodicals. As to the composition of the Opposition in that country, we may cite the utterances of the representative of the Communist Party of France. "In France," he says, "the Opposition consists mainly of petty-bourgeois intellectuals and syndicalist leaders who have degenerated during the last few years. Souvarine with his "Communist Bulletin", the representative of the most aggressive group of the Opposition, is well-known to all as a typical philistine. The official Trotsky group in France, that of Paz, Marx, and Lorient, also consists of intellectuals, for Paz is a lawyer, Madeleine Marx a writer, and Lorient a teacher. The "Clarté" was at all times an organ of the French intellectuals and petty-bourgeois decadents, who denied all and everything, including the earth itself. The "Proletarian Revolution" group consists of played-out individuals, degenerated syndicalist leaders, such as Rosmer and Monatte, who have lost touch with the trade union movement without gaining any connection with the working class.

"It is fully comprehensible," continues the representative of the Communist Party of France, "that in view of such a composition the Opposition has not only lost all its adherents from the ranks of the workers but is also arousing a feeling of great bitterness in those ranks. During the discussion in the Paris district, this hatred went to such lengths, that in one of the nuclei of Aubervilliers a worker, angered at the reasoning of Suzanne Girault, declared, "If Suzanne continues to speak, I shall throw her out of the window."

In the United States the Opposition has a pronouncedly adventurous character and is in immediate touch with the bourgeois press. In this connection the utterances contained in the speech of Comrade Engdahl are highly characteristic.

All these present defenders of Trotsky in the United States, Eastman, Lore, and Salutzki, are renegades who have been excluded from the Party. Eastman himself at one time advocated the exclusion of Salutzki: subsequently Lore supported the expulsion of Eastman, and Trotsky himself that of Lore. Eastman declares that he is fighting for liberty and equality, in the name of which ideals he recently sold the "New York Times" a forged copy of the "testament" of Lenin for \$2,000. Eastman declared that he had passed on this money to Souvarine in Paris for the purpose of financing the work of the Opposition.

Alongside of these clever journalists, the adherents of Trotsky include artful mystics such as Roland-Holst, who in her last poems full of "heavenly longing" openly admits that she was "always a stranger within the Party".

Among the poems of this so-called Communist poetess there is the following religious masterpiece: "Cleanse your house of all vanity. May pride quit your chamber, and may a new song begin." What about? As it turns out, about the amalgamation of the Second and Third Internationals. In the "Klassenkampf", the paper that champions Trotsky, we find the following wise dictum: "If we demand unity in the realm of the trade unions, why should we not also demand unity in politics too?" In demanding this political unity, Roland-Holst does not disassociate herself from the arguments of de Man, the Belgian Social-Fascist.

A worthy colleague of the Christian poetess Roland-Holst is Professor Manoury, who "protests" against the banishment of Trotsky. But Manoury is altogether a very soft-hearted fellow, for there was a time when he protested just as vehemently against the execution of the counter-revolutionaries.

"In Czechoslovakia," says Comrade Jilek, "the oppositional bloc is an outcome of the amalgamation of the Ultra-Left (Michalec, Dr. Pollack) with liquidationists of the purest water (Hula, Görlich). The connection is severed between this group and the workers. In the nucleus of his district Michalec appeared and demanded the right to speak, so that he might develop the programme of the Opposition. He was granted one hour's freedom of speech, after the lapse of which time one of the workers moved that the term of speech be prolonged, so that Michalec might have occasion to say his full say. When the oppositional leader had concluded, a worker rose and demanded

his immediate expulsion from the Party. This motion was carried without the least debate.

"The Opposition," continued Comrade Jilek, "comprises elements that are not only thoroughly infected with bourgeois ideas but are quite pronouncedly shady characters. Thus, in the Bratislava district, an individual who had been convicted of being in connection with the police and who knew quite well that he was in imminent danger of being excluded from the Party, declared his adherence to the Opposition and his determination to fight in Czechoslovakia for the programme of Trotsky."

"In Greece," says Comrade Kolarov, "the oppositional group consists exclusively of intellectuals and reflects the nationalist ideology of the bourgeois Pan-Greeks. In Yugoslavia the leader of the Opposition has for the last two years assumed the standpoint of the Second International in all important questions, as, e. g., in the peasant problem, in the estimation of the international situation, and the like."

The Ideological Stock-in-Trade of the Opposition.

One of the main champions of the traditions of Trotsky and his Opposition is Souvarine, whom, in his last "directives", Trotsky declared to be an "eminent historian". This quality is reflected in the fact that for Souvarine the Russian revolution is "an event belonging to the realm of history". "At the present time", says Comrade Doriot, "the proletarian State simply does not exist any longer. The construction of Socialism in the Soviet Union is, in his opinion, "a fairy-tale invented for the sake of amusing the peasants". The demand raised by Souvarine in connection with the Chinese revolution, was just as ingenious. In his opinion, the Comintern has, since the beginning of 1927, pursued a "putschist" policy in China. Why did the Comintern set up the principle of a development of the agrarian revolution? In Souvarine's opinion, it thereby prevented the triumph of the national-revolutionary movement in China. If no workers' and peasants' demands had been raised, the Chinese revolution would have been victorious. But yet more sagacious is the philosophy of Souvarine in the question of a war danger. It appears that such a danger exists only "in the imagination of the Political Bureau of the C. P. S. U., which obviously needed it for the liquidation of the Opposition". But Souvarine is not to be duped. He does not believe in this danger. "Great Britain", he says, "is a pacifist country with a greatly developed trade union movement. It therefore cannot be coerced into a war".

Treint is also famous. He, too, does not consider the war danger a result of the accentuation of differences between the proletarian State and the imperialist world. What is, in his opinion, most liable to bring about a war is the opportunist policy of the Communist International. He evinces particular "firmness" in the question of the construction of Socialism in the Soviet Union. In keeping with the spirit of the "platform", he was originally categorical in denying the possibility of such a construction, declaring that "the theory of a construction of Socialism in a single country is a theory for kulacks and their children." But at the last Party Congress he suddenly interpreted his own attitude in another way. When cornered by the arguments of speakers who referred to the growth of the Socialist elements in the economy of the Soviet Union, he admitted that it was possible to establish Socialism in Russia, but under the sole condition that the present leadership of the C. P. S. U. was removed. It therefore appears that it will not be possible to establish Socialism in the Soviet Union until the leadership of the C. P. S. U. is in the hands of those who do not believe in the possibility of doing so.

Eastman, the pillar of Trotskyism in America, has published a booklet under the title "Marxism and Leninism". His main idea is that Leninism cannot become "a real revolutionary teaching" until it has got rid of the last remnants of Marxism. Eastman declares that he accepts the "practice of Leninism" but decidedly turns down Lenin's theory, as being under the influence of Marxism. On this basis the Socialists declare Eastman to be a Communist, while he calls himself a "revolutionary Communist".

The Collaboration of the Opposition with the Second International.

The connection of the Opposition with the Second International is already apparent on an international scale. "The Second International", says Kilboom (Sweden), "keeps a special

office for the distribution among the sections of printed matter directed against the Comintern and the Soviet Union". The actual supplier of this office is the Opposition. The Swedish Social Democrats, disquieted by the growing radicalisation of the workers, are clinging to the Oppositional platform, which they have published in all their newspapers. They say to the workers: "It is not only we who speak of a degeneration of power in the Soviet Union; Trotzky, the old revolutionary, says the same." There follows the practical conclusion that "if the Bolsheviki turn to the Right, if they make concessions to the capitalists, and if they carry on a policy of compromise, the Swedish workers will understand that in Sweden too such a policy is essential. The Russian workers live like slaves, etc."

Comrade Thälmann points out that the general estimation of the international position by the Maslov group is approaching more and more to the theory of the Second International and the opinion of Hillferding as expressed at the Kiel Party Congress. In looking through the latest issues of Maslov's publications, "Volkswille" and "Fahne des Kommunismus", it is fully apparent that there is hardly any difference between the Left Social Democrats and Maslov's group as regards their libellous attacks on the Soviet Union and the C. P. S. U.

As regards political fighting methods, we can already observe a complete ideological unanimity between the Left Social Democrats and the Maslovists. Comrade Thälmann cites a number of instances in confirmation of this assertion. Inter alia, he points out that the assemblies organised by the Maslov group for the purpose of celebrating the tenth anniversary of the foundation of the Soviet Union, were as a matter of fact not directed towards the support of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union but rather against the Soviet Union. In the matter of the banishment of the Opposition leaders we may observe the same policy and the same argumentation in the case of the Left Social Democrats and in that of the Maslovists. It is highly characteristic that the "Volkswille" and the "Fahne des Kommunismus" relegate the fight against the Social Democrats more and more to the background while their attacks on the Communist movement get more and more violent. The Trotzkyist Opposition is one of the chief obstacles preventing Social Democratic workers from joining the Communist Party.

"The reason," says Comrade Fiala from Austria, "why Austro-Marxism so enthusiastically champions the Opposition is not far to seek. After the July rising the Social Democratic leaders turned sharply to the Right, the result naturally being a movement towards the Left on the part of the masses and an increased activity by the elements of the Left, encouraged by the example of the workers of the Soviet Union, who are engaged in building up Socialism. Now the leaders of the Austrian Social Democrats seek to counteract this increased activity with the weapons of Trotzky and his Opposition. They make reference to utterances of Trotzky's, they found their agitation on the assertion that the Soviet Union is no longer a proletarian State, that the Thermidorian deterioration of the Party has advanced so far as to cause the exclusion of the best Communists. Why, they ask, should delegations of workers be sent to the Soviet Union and take an interest in the experiences of the October revolution? How can one sympathise with a regime under which not only Menshevists, but even men like Trotzky, whom Bauer loses no time in calling a "revolutionary Communist", are imprisoned?"

"In the United States," says Comrade Engdahl, "Opposition enjoys the support of such organs of the Liberal bourgeoisie as 'Nation' and 'New Republic', which vie with the reactionary press in publishing the last letter of Joffe. This letter is reproduced just as zealously by the capitalist press as it is by the Social Democrats and by the reactionary trade union organs. Their aim is always the same, viz., that of supporting the Opposition and attacking the Soviet Union. The Social Democratic paper "Daily Forward", an embittered enemy of the Soviet Union, expresses its sympathies for Trotzky and his adherents. The same may be said in regard to Hillquit's Socialist organ, the "New Leader". In this collusion between the Social Democratic and the reactionary trade-union bureaucrats with the Trotzkyist Opposition, Comrade Engdahl sees a certain danger. "The Opposition", he says, "will presumably make use of the support of the Socialists in order to form a sort of party to fight against the Communists; in this way the Social Democrats will obtain support from the ranks of the trade unions in their fight against the Communists."

"In Great Britain," says Comrade Rust, "the Opposition of Trotzky has no supporters in the Communist Party, but on the other hand it enjoys the support of certain adherents in non-Communist parties in its attacks on the Comintern and the Soviet Union.

This support is mainly afforded by leaders of the Independent Labour Party, especially by certain noxious renegades among them. During the last few weeks these turncoats, like Postgate and Price, shed tears at the fate of Trotzky. They would be glad to erect a democracy on Baldwin lines in the Soviet Union, with one party in office and the other in opposition. Nevertheless, the official organ of the I. L. P. was forced to write an answer to articles defending Trotzky. This is the result of the growth of sympathy for the Soviet Union among the working masses.

"At the latest Party Congress of the Socialist Party of France," says the representative of the C. P. of France, "Renau-del's secretary especially distributed the Souvarine Bulletin containing Joffe's letter. This letter served as evidence against the Soviet Union at the Congress. Souvarine thus took pains that the arguments for this campaign should be in good time in the possession of the Social Democrats. When the "Populaire" copied the well-known directives of Trotzky from the "Pravda", Souvarine professed to be indignant that a Social Democratic paper could believe documents that had passed through the G. P. U. He has every reason to consider himself a monopolist for the supply of oppositional documents to the Social Democratic press."

The Further Immersion of the Opposition in the Counter-Revolutionary Slough.

With remarkable rapidity the Trotzky Opposition is sinking down into the counter-revolutionary slough. Above, there was recorded the utterance of Comrade Thälmann to the effect that the Maslov press is occupied less and less in criticising the Social Democrats and is coming more and more to speak with the same tongue as that of the Left Social Democratic press. But that is not all. "The line of development of the Maslov group," says Comrade Thälmann, "is openly directed towards an organisational union with Korsch. After the capitulation of Zinoviev and Kamenev, Maslov dictated his instructions to the Russian Opposition, insisting on the union between the Trotzkyists and the adherents of Saprnov. Maslov himself started effecting this coalescence. There will be new elections at Hamburg on February 19th. The Maslov group eschewed the preparation of lists of its own for these elections and drew up a joint list with the Korsch group, the flag-bearers of Saprnov in Germany. This common list was styled "Workers' Opposition in the C. P. G."

In France the group of Suzanne Girault is degenerating very fast. Things have gone so far, that Suzanne Girault was heard to say in reference to the character of the Soviet State: "What is it you would have us believe of your proletarian State? What there is in Russia is in reality nothing but Fascism." At the Party Conference she declared that there was no difference between present-day Russia and that of Tsarist times.

As regards the "Left" Treint, he adheres fully to the tactics of the Left Bloc in regard to the tactics at the coming Parliamentary elections. "It is necessary to have a new bloc", he says, "and to support not only the Socialists but all Radicals without exception."

The "Ultra-Left" Michalec in Czechoslovakia has developed so quickly, that he not only approved of the collaboration of Oppositionist Taussik with the Fascist and National-Socialist organ "Cesko Slovo", but also, as Comrade Jilek tells us, applied to him in a search for employment.

In the countries of Fascist terrorism, the Trotzkyist Opposition has assumed a very dangerous form. In this connection the report of Comrade Purmann of the Polish section is highly instructive. "In Poland", he says, "where the Social Democrats form part of Pilsudski's Fascist camp, the Trotzkyist Opposition plays the part of a dangerous weapon in the hands of our enemies. With the aid of oppositional arguments the P. P. S. often succeeds in exercising an influence on vacillating elements."

Comrade Purmann cites instances in which the P. P. S. succeeded in achieving a certain success at the elections and in its attempts to induce individual Communists to desert their party, by using arguments initiated by the Trotzkyists as to the degeneration of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, the deterioration of the workers' situation there, etc.

The P.P.S. Fascists are thus provided with the best weapon for the preparation of a war against the Soviet Union. The Fascist Government, meanwhile, endeavours to profit by anything that tends to weaken the devotion and love of the workers to the Soviet Union.

Such is the international aspect of the Trotsky Opposition. Just now that the Social Democrats are turning more pronouncedly to the Right, and that a mad campaign is being developed against the Soviet Union and the Communists, the Trotsky Opposition has become one of the chief tools of the Social Democrats in their fight against the Communist International and the Soviet Union. The state of affairs, as depicted by the foreign delegates, confirms once more that adherence to the Trotsky Opposition, which has become an altogether anti-Soviet group, is completely incompatible with membership of the Communist International.

FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

The Political Corpse of Trotsky — the Signboard of the Yellow International.

By J. B.

At the Second International there exists a commission to investigate the position of political prisoners. Crispian and De Brouckère, who are at the head of this commission, have addressed a fresh letter to the chairman of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union, Comrade Kalinin, and this has been published by the "Vorwärts" under the heavy headline: "As it was under Tsarism!" The "Vorwärts" publishes a communication on the new move of the Yellow International "with regard to the political persecutions in Soviet Russia". This time it is not a question of shooting monarchists and White Guardists nor of arresting Mensheviks and social revolutionaries. No, this time these yellow "Socialists" are shedding crocodile tears for a different reason. They consider it their "democratic duty" to stand up for the protection of Trotsky and for the protection of the exiled members of the Opposition.

The representatives of the Second International have resolved to exploit the political corpse of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. as a sign board and slogan in the new campaign of incitement against the Soviet Union, in the campaign which essentially is nothing but the ideologic preparation of the imperialist war against the first proletarian State.

"The persecution of your Party Opposition and especially the case of Trotsky", write Crispian and De Brouckère, "will serve as a crass example of your system, which tolerates no freedom of opinion, which subordinates everything to the will of your absolutist government."

Crispian and De Brouckère demand freedom of action for Trotsky. In whose interests do they demand it? What is the significance of the fact that in this question the united front of Maslov-Korsch-Crispian against the Comintern, against the revolutionary proletariat of the Soviet Union, has quite obviously become an accomplished fact? What is the meaning of the clamour which has been set up by the whole of the bourgeois press together with all their Social-Democratic and "ultra-left" imitators on the occasion of the last banishments? Every conscious worker will grasp that the banishment of Trotsky has given rise to the formation of a bourgeois-Social-Democratic bloc means that just this bloc, just the opportunists and traitors, are hit hardest by this banishment.

Crispian and De Brouckère declare that the measures taken against Trotsky cannot be justified by the assertion that he is a counter-revolutionary. But neither Crispian nor De Brouckère, nor the murderers of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, nor the betrayers of the German revolution of 1918, which they have for a further ten years continued to betray, nor the friends of Karl Renner, who has openly taken the part of the hangmen of the Vienna workers, nor the supporters of MacDonald, who in the year 1926 delivered the miners of Great Britain into the hands of the coal magnates and whose effigy was burnt by the Indian nationalists along with those of Baldwin and

Birkenhead as symbols of colonial exploitation and subjugation, are called upon to judge who is a counter-revolutionary and who not. The only ones who can form a judgement on this matter are those who are fighting against the counter-revolutionaries, who overcome them, only those against whom they content, only those who are threatened by them. The best judges of the point are the revolutionary proletariat and its communist vanguard, against whom are now marshalled all the forces of world reaction from the British Conservatives to German Social-Democracy and to Maslov's "ultra-lefts"; from Chamberlain to Crispian and Urbahn; from the British fleet; from the battalions of Marshal Pilsudski; from the hangmen of Chiang Kai Shek to the calumnies of the "Vorwärts" and of the "Fahne des Kommunismus" (Flag of Communism) and to the illegal pamphlets of the Trotsky Opposition, which are set in secret printing-works by the hands of White Guardists.

Is Trotsky a counter-revolutionary or is he not? The Communist International as a whole, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in particular, on whom falls the greatest historical responsibility for the history of the world revolution, for the destiny of Socialism in the whole world, would commit an unpardonable error, nay more, a direct crime against the working class, if in the liquidation of this question they allowed themselves to be guided by any sentimental considerations and memories of the past instead of by judgement in the objective sense of the present activity of Trotsky as leader of the Opposition. The interests of the revolution, the interests of the working class, the interests of hundreds of millions of the oppressed and exploited — these are the only criteria for the revolutionary, whether he is a real revolutionary and not a traitor hiding his treachery under "Democratic" twaddle.

The services which Trotsky rendered in the past are better known to us than they are to all the Crispians and the De Brouckères. But when a person is trying by every method, possible and impossible, to poison the mind of the working class by statements to the effect that the Soviet Union is not a proletarian State, that the worker and peasant government is a government of Thermidorians, when a person in the most decisive question, the defence of the Soviet Union against imperialism, sinks to an attitude of conditional defence, when he attempts on this ideological platform to undermine the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat itself by trying to create a second party with its own illegal apparatus and with its own illegal press, which party is, furthermore, helped by obviously anti-Soviet elements, when in consequence he becomes a star of hope to all the anti-proletarian and counter-revolutionary elements in the country, then the Party of the revolutionary proletariat must not, in view of its responsibility to millions of people, hesitate to treat such folk as Trotsky, Radek and Rakovsky as it would deal with counter-revolutionaries.

And the facts that the "Berliner Tageblatt" writes highly emotional and, in parts, jubilant articles, that his advocate in Germany is Ruth Fischer, that Crispian and De Brouckère appear in his defence in the name of the yellow Second International, go to show the more clearly the depth of the abyss into which the political corpse of Trotskyism has fallen.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Lockout of 800,000 German Metal Workers.

By August Enderle (Berlin).

Since the following article was written the Court of Arbitration has pronounced a binding Award according to which the metal workers are granted a wage increase of five pennings an hour. As a result of the pronouncement of the Award the employers have postponed the lockout for a week. Up to the time of going to press the reply of the workers' representatives has not been received. Ed.

For the second time within two months, German trust capital is threatening to stop work in the most important branches of metal industry and thus to paralyse the whole of German economy. The first time, the producers of steel industry of the Ruhr district announced that they had resolved to close down

all the works should the eight-hour day be carried through in accordance with the regulation of the Labour Minister and should the "unbearable" demands of the trade unions be fulfilled. The present threatened stoppage involves the lockout of 800,000 metal workers throughout Germany, with the exception of the whole Ruhr district, of Upper Silesia and of the Saar district and of a few smaller metal-producing areas. Whilst the cause of the threatened closing down of works in the metal industry had chiefly been the question of the hours of work, the abolition of the twelve-hour shift and the introduction of the three shift system, the cause of the threat at the present moment is the strike of the workers in Central Germany and the demand for an increase of wages by 15 pfennigs per hour, the threat of such a gigantic lockout having been resorted to because a partial lockout in Central Germany did not lead to the results desired by the employers.

What is the underlying reason why German capital is proceeding in such an aggressive way? At the moment it is only a question of an increase by a few pfennigs of the wages of the metal workers on strike in Central Germany, an additional expense which the employers could undoubtedly pay quite easily in view of the extraordinarily great increase of productivity and of the total production in the past few years. Apart from this, the employers know very well that — under the pressure exercised by the workers — the Reformist trade union leaders have indeed refused to consent to the three-pfennig award at the commencement of the strike, but that they are prepared to content themselves with 6 or 5 pfennigs and to renounce the total demand of 15 pfennigs. The reason why German industrial capital is nevertheless resorting to the said violent measures is that it wants to pocket the whole of the profit resulting from rationalisation and from the favourable turn of the home market without any deduction and to use it for the construction of its own apparatus of production in order to extend its market on a world-wide standard. The fierceness of all the wages' movements and economic struggles in Germany is due to the determination of German capital to recover its former position of world-power as quickly as possible and to beat any competitor in a sharp fight on the world market.

The present action of the employers is further influenced by the fact that the collection agreements as to wages and hours of work involving in all four million workers will come to an end in March and April. The workers have everywhere put in claims for an increase of wages and for a reduction of the hours of work. With the present lockout, a blow is dealt at all those movements; it means at the same time a warning to the trade unions that they must reckon with a total lockout should they persist in their demands, and that the employers are determined not to yield in any circumstances.

The employers are frank enough to speak of their plans with every clearness. The "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung", one of the leading organs of capital, for instance, wrote on February 9th as follows:

"It is indeed a question of principle which is now being solved, i. e. the question as to whether it is possible to bring about a gradual ebbing in the movement of the market by a wise and far-sighted policy regarding wages and overhead charges, or whether a rapid and fatal collapse of the market will be occasioned by imprudent interferences in the conditions of production. Unless the first eventuality comes true, we cannot expect that, when business in the home market slackens down, we shall find the connection with the world market which is an urgent necessity in order to protect the German apparatus of production from serious dangers."

This flourish of trumpets of Neo-German imperialism is supplemented by articles in the whole capitalist Press, in which it is "proved" that the German employers, and especially those in the metal industry, have worked at a loss for the past few years; that they are paying trifling dividends only in exceptional cases and that they are therefore, in no circumstances, in a position to grant a further increase of wages.

In reality, the figures of the increase of production and even the balances of the big joint-stock companies, which are certainly veiled, show that the employers, especially in metal industry, have reaped enormous profits in the last two years. The daily output per head of the workers in iron industry for instance, increased by 33.8 per cent. in 1926. This increase continued in 1927, although there are until now no figures available.

In crude-steel production, the daily output per head of the worker has increased to 120.8 per cent. in 1926 as compared with pre-war times, and in 1927 to a monthly average of 134.3 per cent. The big concerns, such as Klöckner, Hoesch, Siemens, AEG, etc., have, without exception, made gigantic net profits in spite of writing off large sums. Industry producing ready-made goods and machines also was and is doing an unusually good business, and has undoubtedly made no less satisfactory profits than did the big concerns, although in many cases it cannot be recognised from the dividends.

In view of this state of affairs, it is obvious that the German proletariat cannot retreat unless it wants to renounce the improvement, nay even the maintenance of its present condition. The German working class must engage in the fight which capital is forcing on it. It must make a breach in the enemy's front, if it does not want to be doomed to chronic pauperisation. The German trade unions, however, are headed by the Reformists, by the social democratic leaders. The latter are trying, as they always did, to avoid the fight; they think they can evade the situation which is unpleasant for them by foul compromises. In order to divert the masses of workers from the main point of the question, from the inevitable combat, and in order, even now, to prepare for the betrayal, the Reformists are raising cries of "attacks of the metal industrialists on the State", of the "strangle-hold of the captains of industry", just as they did when the steel magnates threatened to close down their works. To put it briefly, the Reformists are repeating their old demagogical tactics as though the present State were on the side of the workers and as though the rebels against the State from the Right were the industrialists in the metal industry pretending that the interest of the workers against trust capital is protected by the awards of the State arbitration apparatus. This is how the workers are being prepared for the award and even for the agreement of the trade union leaders to an absolutely inadequate award which may be anticipated with certainty.

In their threat of a lockout, the metal industrialists have already calculated on the cowardly tactics and on the strategy of defeat on the part of the Reformists, when they fixed no date at all in the first resolution with regard to the general lockout passed at the beginning of February, and when, on the occasion of the second resolution, passed on February 13th, they announced that the lockout would only come into force on February 22nd. The capitalists united in trusts know very well that the trade union leaders will do everything in their power in those ten days in order to adjust matters, i. e. to accept the award made by the German Labour Minister by order of the capitalists.

This also explains why the leaders of the metal workers' union, numbering about 800,000 members, do not react to the lockout by any counter-measures, but proclaim in the Press that they are calmly awaiting events. The advisory body of the metal workers' union, which met on February 15th, did not say a word about the means of defence which the leaders of the union intended to use in order to protect the workers against the employers' attack; they contented themselves with uttering a few phrases about the militant and self-sacrificing spirit of the workers. It is quite obvious that the leaders of the union are reckoning on the usual arbitration and on a settlement of the conflict by the arbitration negotiations before the Labour Ministry, fixed for February 17th. The leaders of the union are even ruthlessly stifling all other wages' movements "in order to avoid irritating the employers still more".

The Berlin tool-makers, on a ballot vote, had pronounced by an overwhelming majority for a strike, because their demands had been refused in the bulk by the employers. The leaders of the union, however, prevented them from engaging in the fight with the argument: we must not offer the employers any pretext for a lockout. In another group of metal workers, that of the iron constructors, who had been called together by the leaders of the union on the basis of a former resolution, in order to draw up the demands for wages for the anticipated tariff movement, the leaders of the movement declared: "In view of the threatened lockout we should not make any demands at the present moment." A cowardly retreat along the whole line.

The A. D. G. B., the leading body of the German trade unions, does not even think it necessary, in face of the threatened lockout of 800,000 metal workers, to take a definite attitude towards that question. It finds it much more to the purpose to

arrange a great banquet for the representatives of the Labour Office in Geneva and to congratulate the German Labour Minister of the bourgeois bloc on the occasion of his 60th birthday, expressing the wish that "he may be spared to carry on his beneficial activity for many years to come".

The Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unionists are straining every nerve in order to mobilise the whole mass of the workers and to prepare them for an unrelenting defensive fight.

The mood of the masses is in favour of the fight. The reformist sabotage must be overcome in order that the employers' attack shall meet with an equally energetic and determined resistance.

The Fight in the North Bohemian Lignite Area.

By Victor Stern (Prague).

Since the 13th of February the 3000 miners in the Brůx-Teplitz-Komotau lignite coalfields have been engaged in an open struggle. The workers have joined in the fight to the last man and the fighting spirit is increasing every day. The fight was provoked and forced upon the workers by the brutal attitude of the owners, who not only rejected the modest demands of the workers, but ventured to impose upon them, under the title of an "improvement of the position of the miners", a considerably intensified exploitation.

In order to understand the importance of the fight and of the whole situation created by the struggle, it must be remembered that the fight was preceded by a serious wage movement of the whole working class of Czechoslovakia. All the endeavours of the Red Miners' organisation to set up a united front of the miners were frustrated by the resistance of the united German and Czechish reformist miners' unions. It was only in the second half of last year that the pressure of the impoverished miners became so strong that the reformist leaders were no longer able to evade the fight and the miners succeeded in having the demand put forward on 18th November 1927 of a special allowance of 400 Czechish crowns for married workers and 300 crowns for unmarried workers. Even this ridiculously small sum was rejected by the owners in the most brutal manner, although they could not deny that prices have risen considerably since the year 1923, that the output of the miners has increased tremendously and that only wages have remained the same.

After rejection of the common offer of all the miners' organisations, the red organisations redoubled their efforts to set up a united fighting front for serious wage demands. The reformist leaders thereupon resorted to a manoeuvre in order to come out of the situation as peaceably as possible and to shift the responsibility from themselves. To the demand of the red trade unions that ultimative far-reaching demands should be submitted and, in the event of their rejection, a miners' strike along the whole line — that is, a general strike of the miners — should be proclaimed, they declared that they were prepared to take up the fight only as a fight in the Brůx-Komotau-Teplitz lignite area. They confronted the red organisations with the choice, either to take part in a common fight in this coal area or be compelled to abandon any common conduct of the fight.

The reformist leaders confidently reckoned in this manoeuvre on the possibility of being easily able to prevent the fight in the North-West Bohemian lignite area when the workers were faced with an isolated and partial struggle. As a matter of fact, many of the workers were of the opinion that a fight was indeed necessary, but that it would be useless unless it was conducted along the whole line. This manoeuvre was thwarted by the red organisations, as well as by the miners themselves. The red organisations, of course, did not abandon their fundamental standpoint that a general strike of the miners is necessary, but they declared themselves prepared for the time being to take part in the partial struggle in the lignite area.

On the 9th of January there was submitted the demand for a 20% increase in wages, and at the same time notice was given of the termination of the collective agreement on the 5th of February. The owners, in their reply of 20th January,

declared themselves ready to enter into negotiations; and the negotiations actually began on the 30th January.

At these negotiations the employers declared the demand of a 20% wage increase to be unacceptable. But not content with that, they brought forward counter-proposals of such a character that every worker was bound to consider them as an insolent and monstrous provocation. They wished to bring about "an increase of wages" by declaring themselves ready to pay a premium on increased output. The present output of 20.5 cwt. per shift was to be taken as a basis and an increased output of 10% should be accompanied by a wage increase of 7%. When it is borne in mind that the output per shift has already increased since the year 1919 from 16 to 20.5 cwt. one can realise what a murderous intensification of exploitation the owners have ventured to offer as a "wage increase".

But that was not all. This "concession" was accompanied by the counter-demand that the working time should be increased on Saturday from six to eight hours, and on all other days (not reckoning the journey to and from the coal face) to 8½ hours. The reformist leaders replied to this provocation not by breaking off negotiations, but with counter-proposals which meant the acceptance in principle of the abominable bonus system. They abated their demands to 10% and declared themselves ready to accept this wage increase in the form of payment for increased output, but that there should be adopted as a basis not the present output, but one by which the present output would lead to a 10% wage increase.

The rejection of these proposals by the owners led to the breaking off of negotiations on the 4th of February. According to a previous decision of all organisations the strike ought to have been begun on the 6th of February. But against the will of the workers, who were demanding that the struggle be taken up immediately, the reformist leaders postponed the commencement of the strike to the 13th of February. They wished thereby to gain time in order to be able to avoid the struggle at the last moment by surrendering the interests of the workers and making further concessions to the employers.

At the continued negotiations the reformist leaders displayed great yieldingness to the employers and declared themselves to be satisfied with a premium increase of 7½%. In fact they even went so far to declare that the strike would be abandoned if the employers would offer 5%, because the trifling difference between 5 and 7½% could then be settled by peaceable means; perhaps by halving the difference. Such an attitude, of course, encouraged the owners and they rejected even this offer, so that the strike was unavoidable. On the 13th of February, therefore, the strike commenced with unexampled determination and fighting enthusiasm.

The following facts will serve to give an idea of the provocation of the owners and the absolute necessity for the fight. The standard of living index has increased since 1923 from 889 to 940. In the year 1922 the output of 51,500 workers in the whole lignite area amounted to 19.2 million tons; for the year 1927 the output of 37,600 workers is estimated at 20 million tons. The present collective treaty has not been altered since 1923, nevertheless, according to government figures, the average wage has considerably decreased since 1923, to i. e. for underground workers from 66.33 crowns in 1923 to 44.03 crowns and 38.68 crowns, for surface workers from 50.91 crowns to 33.65 crowns and 28.63 crowns. On the other hand the lignite mining shares have increased in value by 50%. The dividends of the North Bohemian collieries in Brůx amounted on an average before the war to 14% and after the war to 20 to 25%.

A success on the part of the miners would strengthen the fight of the entire working class for an increase of wages, which have greatly fallen in value owing to high prices. The capitalists naturally want to prevent this at all cost. This fact and the attack by the employers on the working time prove to what a great extent the fight of the lignite miners is a fight of the entire working class of Czechoslovakia.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has emphasised the importance of the miners' struggle. With the outbreak of the strike it redoubled its efforts to extend the strike to all mining areas and to obtain the support of the entire working class for the struggle. The reformist trade union and party leaders are working in the opposite direction. The chief aims of their tactics are: first to isolate the struggle, secondly to moderate instead of intensify the struggle, and thirdly the

speediest termination of the struggle by adopting a yielding attitude towards the owners. Every proposal of the representatives of the Red trade unions for intensification of the fight is replied to with the ultimative threat to put an end to common action.

At the same time the reformists are proceeding further in their concessions to the employers. In spite of all the decisions of the workers, who reject on principle the premium system, the reformists are negotiating on the basis of this system and bargaining with the employers and the government representatives regarding a few per cent. The question of the lengthening of the working day they have left to stand over.

The workers, however, are frustrating these intentions of the reformist leaders. At all the pits decisions are being adopted calling for the withdrawal of the safety-men and cessation of supply of coal to electricity works. The miners also declare themselves against the premium system, and of course against any lengthening of the working time in any circumstances.

Also in other mining areas the demand to join in the struggle is becoming more insistent. This applies especially to the adjacent Falkenau mining area. Also in the Kladno district, which is under the influence of the Communists, preparations are already being made to join in the strike as soon as possible.

The government of course stands unequivocally on the side of the employers. Bodies of heavily armed gendarmes are being imported into the strike area every day. The gendarmes visit various workers and call upon them, it is true without avail, to resume work. The mood of the lignite miners as a result is becoming more excited and has already found expression in various demonstrations. The women and young workers are taking particularly active part in the fight. The Communist Party and the Communist Youth are rendering the fighting workers every possible help and have mobilised all the forces at their disposal for work in the strike area.

In such circumstances it is by no means easy for the reformist leaders to realise their intentions to bring about a speedy termination of the fight by means of a foul compromise. They are however, working at high pressure in this direction. For the time being the task of negotiating with the employers is in the hands of a committee of three members. The Red trade unions are not participating in this smaller committee, as they reject on principle the premium system, on the basis of which the negotiations are being conducted. It is quite likely that the reformists will very soon conclude a compromise, but the mood of the workers is such that a compromise would be indignantly rejected by them.

The Fight of the Swedish Workers.

By K. Kilboom.

Since the year 1925 capitalism has consolidated itself in Sweden. The banks, the industrial and commercial undertakings increased their profits year by year. Dividends are wen on the way towards reaching pre-war level. Speculation is developing at accelerating speed and shares are going up rapidly. Even on the international exchanges: New York, Paris, London and Berlin, many Swedish securities are traded. Huge sums were invested in Swedish shares by the United States, Great Britain, Holland and even by Switzerland and Germany.

This is the economic background against which the conflict between labour and capital is being fought out in Sweden. When, at the beginning of the new year, the collective agreements of various trade unions lapsed, the reformists brought all their efforts to bear in order to prolong them. In spite of the miserable wages paid in the iron works, it was resolved for these above all to prolong the agreement for another year. The bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats were jubilant.

But to the great distress of the reformists the workers in the ore mines and in the cellulose factories preferred to annul the agreement which expired one month later, on February 1st of this year. The workers in the mines demanded an increase of wages, while the employers insisted upon a reduction from 10% to 25%.

The same thing happened in the cellulose industry. The negotiations, which began long before the termination of the agreement, led to no result. The plan of the employers and of

the reformists was intended chiefly to liquidate the conflict, which involved eighteen thousand workers, in order to be able then to deal more easily with the four or five thousand workers engaged in the mining conflict. In this way the reformist leaders assisted the employers to cause a split on the side of labour, instead of uniting it.

As the negotiations of the intermediaries led to no result, a government commission was set up to try, as usual, to rescue the profits of the employers. It is characteristic of the representatives of the trade-union council, the chairman Torberg and the secretary Johansson that they did everything they could to induce the representatives of the workers in the paper industry to make the greatest possible concessions. Among the delegates of the workers, however, there were at these negotiations two Communists who would not accept the proposals of the mediating commission. The employers declared that if consent was not forthcoming by January 30th, the workers in the saw mills would also be dismissed, i. e. 70,000 to 80,000 workers would be thrown onto the streets. These measures were obviously devised for the purpose of depleting the trade-union funds as soon as possible.

But the reformists and the employers made a mistake. Our Party called upon the workers to vote against the arbitration award and, in spite of the usual rabid agitation on the part of the Social-Democratic press, which openly took the part of the employers, the proposals of the commission were rejected by a majority of more than two thirds of all votes. The feeling in favour of the resolution was transformed into a fighting spirit. The conflict now involves about 50,000 workers.

In mining the workers defended their demands steadfastly from the beginning. All attempts at mediation were wrecked by their resistance. Furthermore, the workers in the ore mines at Norrbotten have declared a sympathy strike, in spite of the fact that their wages are without doubt the highest in the whole country. In that district, too, there prevails a sturdy fighting spirit, which is largely attributable to the strong influence of the local communists.

As far as the platform of the Communist Party is concerned, it contains the following points which the Party formulated in a manifesto distributed widely among the masses:

Support of the fighting workers by the whole of the proletariat. The central trade-union organisations have no right to conclude agreements which contain no concessions to the workers. The trade-union council must exert all its power for a victory of the workers. In all workers' premises free meals must be given to the families of workers on strike and relief funds for the payment of rent must be organised. United and determined fight of all Labour organisations against the attempts to gag the trade-union organisations by coercive laws.

The Communist Party calls upon its members to carry on from the towns a broad campaign for the material support of the strikers, to organise meetings and demonstrations, so that the attention of all workers, no matter what camp they may belong to, may be drawn to the fight; to declare that this is a common affair of the whole of the working class and that the fight of the Swedish workers is a part of the international fight against capital.

The latter activity will help to clear up the question of the support which the comrades in the Soviet Union are rendering to the Swedish miners federation. This support has been treated with disapprobation not only by the bourgeoisie but also by the reformists. The workers, on the other hand, have naturally appreciated this brotherly help. In general the understanding with the miners of the Soviet Union served to enhance the fighting spirit and to promote international trade-union solidarity.

It is quite clear that the reformists are doing their best to destroy this understanding. We are convinced that this attempt at sabotage will not succeed. The fight whereby the capitalists desire to defeat the industrial workers in order to weaken their resistance and to force through the execution of measures of coercion against the trade-union movement, is still in progress. This fight will only tend to enhance the militant enthusiasm of the workers and the influence of the Communists and considerably increase the comprehension of the significance of national and international trade-union unity.

The Anti-Imperialist Struggle in South Africa and the I. C. U.

By H. Rathbone.

In spite of the reactionary policy of Kadalie, the leader of the South African native workers union the I. C. U. (Industrial and Commercial Union), in expelling all members from the I. C. U. who are Communists and in spite of his policy of identifying himself completely with the reformist leaders both in England and in Europe generally while on his recent visit from South Africa, events in South Africa are forcing the I. C. U. into a position in which, if its leadership does not come out clearly on the side of the anti-imperialist struggle with all the implications that that step would involve, its influence amongst the native workers will rapidly decline.

A temporary compromise on the struggle between the British and the Dutch capitalists as to which should be the predominant exploiters of the South African native peoples, expressed as it was in the Flag controversy, has now been reached. This leaves the way clear for an agreement to be come to between the two white capitalist groups to intensify this exploitation of the native peoples. This will be done by the four **Anti-Native Bills** which will shortly come up before the South African Parliament again for decision. These bills will, on the one hand, intensify the exploitation of the native peasant and, on the other hand, are designed to force him from off his land in order to make him seek employment from the capitalist industries and mines in the towns.

Therefore the I. C. U. in the first place, owing to its recent efforts to get membership in the agricultural areas will be forced into taking a very militant attitude against these bills if it is to retain any of the membership it may have gained in these areas.

Secondly the leaders of the white labour movement have still more clearly shown their essential antagonism towards the native movement in full agreement with the imperialists. The **South African Labour Party** at its last Annual Congress in the first days of January had before it a proposal to alter its constitution in order to shove off the day still further when it expected to be able to introduce Socialism. An immediate advance to Socialism, so the report to the conference ran, is "in no country more incongruous than in South Africa... garrisoned by a handful of white people, living a civilised life superimposed upon a proletariat of black men gradually evolving from barbarism". (Cape Argus, 3. 1. 28.) Accordingly due regard must be taken, so continued the report, "of the differences in the fundamental conditions imposed by the presence of an overwhelming native population still for the most part in the most primitive stage of development, side by side with a small European population — whose standards of life must be maintained and improved". (Our emphasis, H. R.)

So only the white workers standards must be "maintained and improved". The natives — well they are still hardly beyond the stage of "barbarism". Further, the advocacy of Socialism raises inconvenient questions as to how Socialism for the white workers only would benefit the native population; for naturally Socialism is impossible for the latter because they are still "in the most primitive stage of development".

So the Labour Party cynically abandons the last pretence of serving the workers' cause and thus openly agrees to share with the exploiters in the most fearful and dastardly exploitation of the native peoples.

Though these proposed alterations from which we have quoted were not apparently discussed at the Conference, yet it is clear from other facts that these alterations really express the policy of the Labour Party. For not only is the Labour Party in favour of the Anti-Native bills now being put forward by the Hertzog Government of which they are a part, but they have even proclaimed their intention of moving an amendment to a Women's Enfranchisement Bill now before the South African Parliament, in order to restrict the franchise to European women. As a certain number of the natives in the Cape Province still have the right to vote, the extension of the franchise to women under this bill would have meant the enfranchisement of many of the native women in this province. (Times, 4. 2. 28.)

The so-called "Left Wing" of this Labour Party is no better. For one of their E. C. members, **Kentridge**, prominent in this so-called "Left Wing", in an interview with the Cape Argus, 30. 12. 27., said that the Pact Government should concern itself "with an agreed programme for raising the standard of life in this country and creating conditions which will assist the white people and make this a white man's country in fact and not merely in name". Not a word about "assisting" the native peoples or about assisting them to raise their standard of life, but merely a purely imperialist ideology of keeping the native exploited by the capitalists.

Now the **British Labour Party** through one of its so-called Left Wingers, **Beckett** after his visit to South Africa, has approved of the attitude of the South African Labour Party. Can then the I. C. U. expect anything from the British Labour Party?

Thirdly the South African white Trades Union Congress have rejected the application of the I. C. U. for affiliation. In rejecting this application they clearly revealed the same standpoint as the Labour Party. For to the original application of the I. C. U. for affiliation the reply was made by the T. U. C. that the 100,000 native members of the I. C. U. would swamp the 50,000 white membership at present affiliated to the T. U. C. The I. C. U. in spite of this smack in the face turned the other cheek by stating that they were quite willing to agree to any arrangement to preclude such an eventuality". (For the sake of unity this was of course the only tactic to adopt.) Yet in spite of this they got their second smack by the final rejection of their application. It was pointed out that this rejection was not based really on the white T. U. C.'s fear that they would be outnumbered, but "on reasons mainly economic". Exactly. They were afraid for their own wages and no thought of assisting the native workers to raise theirs.

The I. C. U. in view of this situation issued a manifesto. In this manifesto it first rejects the counter-proposal of the T. U. C. for "periodical meetings" as "patronising". Though such a rejection is but natural, it is of course incorrect. For by such meetings the native workers would have had an excellent opportunity of still further exposing the anti-native policy of the white trade union leaders not only to the native workers but also to the white workers. The manifesto then, however, goes on correctly to point out that "We are the real working class in South Africa, the most oppressed section of the working population, and as trade unionists we have the right to dominate all trade union councils in which we happen to be in the majority". (It should be stated that the adjective "real" in the above quotation is only correct if by "real" is meant the most oppressed and exploited.)

But this process of forcing the I. C. U. onto the revolutionary path in spite of the reformist turn that its leadership has taken has just received new impetus. For the newly formed "self-governing" state of Southern Rhodesia has recently issued a ban against the I. C. U. from organising branches in its state and has summarily deported the I. C. U. organiser from Southern Rhodesia. This has forced Kadalie to come out with some very militant statements. He says: "In spite of your ban we shall find means as we have done in the past to get our message to our fellow workers, and we shall find men and women in your colony to raise and uphold the banner of freedom from all forces of oppression". With regard to the deportation he says "it is consistent with the best traditions of capitalist 'democratic' governments the world over... free speech is as non-existent in Southern Rhodesia as it is in other parts of the British Empire". (Times, 2. 1. 28.)

While we join in protest against this deportation and call upon all workers to do the same, we would like to point out to Kadalie that such fine sentiments about the non-existence of free speech etc. would come better from one who had not suppressed free speech in his own organisation, the I. C. U., by expelling Communist Party members.

Further, we could ask Kadalie whether all these events do not show that the **Communist Party of South Africa**, which has consistently fought for the rights of the natives and is proved by the events we have described to be the only body containing European elements to have undertaken this struggle, is correct when it stated that the I. C. U. and the native workers could find no hope in the British Labour Party or in the Amsterdam International. We have heard no protest from either of these two bodies on these events. The **Daily Herald** has not

thought it even worth while to mention, let alone to protest against the deportation. We have had to learn the news from the capitalist Times.

Finally we would warn Kadalie that if he does not break completely with the policy of the Second International expressed by him when he said, after expelling the members of the Communist Party at the end of 1926, that "the strike weapon was obsolete", if he does not realise that only a revolutionary struggle is possible against the forces of imperialism, if he refuses to co-operate with those who are prepared to assist in such a struggle, if he persists in denying free speech within his organisation while protesting against its denial by the imperialists, he will find himself swept away in the revolutionary struggle which undoubtedly is coming every day nearer in South Africa, and which he himself is assisting by being forced to protest against these acts of imperialist suppression which we have described. The I. C. U. can only exist as an organ to help the native workers if it is prepared to carry on a revolutionary struggle against imperialism. The events we have described clearly prove this.

Let Kadalie and the present leadership of the I. C. U., if they wish to show that their protestations against imperialism are not mere hypocrisy in order to retain their present positions in the I. C. U. — let them come out and withdraw the ban against members of the Communist Party being members of the I. C. U. Secondly let them link up with the only other body in South Africa whose leaders are prepared to carry on this struggle against imperialism — the African National Congress. For only by consolidating the forces of those who are prepared to struggle against the world forces of imperialism can the native masses of Africa hope to achieve freedom from imperialist exploitation.

Spanish Workers in the Fight against the Wages Tax.

By Yercovi (Barcelona).

As was expected, the fascist government of Primo de Rivera has intensified its anti-working class policy.

Since its attempt in Summer of last year forcibly to introduce the nine-hour day in the textile factories of Barcelona — an attempt which, thanks to the determined attitude of the workers, was frustrated — it has endeavoured more and more to worsen the standard of living and working conditions of the working class. As a matter of fact it has succeeded, with the help of the reformists and in spite of the courageous defensive fight put up by the miners, in introducing the nine-hour day in the mines of Asturia.

This lengthening of the working day in the mines of Asturia has naturally led to an increase in the number of unemployed in this area. As a result the discontent of the workers found more and more clear expression, and the government of Primo de Rivera resorted to a very simple means in order to stifle the unrest — it arrested the champions of the unemployed. No less than 200 active workers, among them being 20 women, were thrown into prison.

The government however will not content itself with prolonging the working day. In order to make up the budget it has now introduced a decree according to which a further direct tax will be placed upon the workers: the wages tax. Wages amounting to 2250 Pesetas and over will be subject to a deduction of 3.5 per cent. Practically all the workers are affected by this tax.

This tax was to have come into force on the 1st of January last. But the Spanish working class, in spite of the state of emergency under which they live and in spite of the treachery of the reformist leaders, would not and will not tolerate such a tax, which is to be deducted from the already terribly low wages.

The first measure of resistance was adopted by the printers in Madrid. In the "Prensa Grafika" printing works, where there is a Communist nucleus, the whole staff went on strike against the wages tax. This strike was concluded after two days by the employers' themselves undertaking to pay the tax which was to be imposed on the workers.

A few days later a strike broke out in the printing office of the daily new papers "El Sol" and "La Voz" and also in the big publishing house "Calpe" which belongs to the same firm. The reformist leaders of the printers' trade union, much against their will, had to intervene in this strike. Of course they shrank back from the consequences of this conflict and concluded a shameful compromise; they agreed that Comrade Isidoro Ascevedo, one of the 200 strikers, and an old Communist champion, should be dismissed.

Numerous workers' delegations from Barcelona, Valladolid and other towns interviewed the Prime Minister and demanded an alteration of the law regarding the wages tax. Primo de Rivera replied to them in a provocative manner, declaring that they must first pay and keep their mouths shut, for the principle of authority must not be challenged: the government would see later on whether they would modify the tax.

The revolutionary trade unions of Barcelona have replied to this challenge with a strongly worded manifesto calling upon the workers not to pay the tax, and if necessary to go on strike. This appeal met with a response among the workers of Barcelona.

In the metal industry of Barcelona the workers have downed tools. The strike is general. The government is attempting to crush it with every means. More than one hundred arrests have already been carried out. The press with the aid of the censor, has been rendered completely silent in order to foster the belief, both in Spain and abroad that everything is in the best order. The governor of Barcelona has even resorted to releasing all prisoners sentenced on account of petty larceny in order that they may be employed as strike-breakers.

Nevertheless the government has not yet succeeded in breaking the movement. The discontent of the working class against the dictatorship is constantly growing. Primo de Rivera's regime is approaching evil days.

ECONOMICS

The Economic Situation in Italy.

By Edmondo Peluso.

Once more the Fascist Government of Italy is being helped out of a critical situation by the financial capital of the United States. On the basis of an agreement concluded last autumn with English and American banks, the Bank of Italy received a credit of 125 million dollars; of this total, 75 millions were guaranteed with a gold cover by the central banks of the United States and 50 millions by the Morgan Bank, representing banks of the United States and Great Britain.

Upon receiving this credit, the Fascist Government proceeded, on December 22nd, 1927, to publish a decree in regard to the stabilisation of the lira. The new gold parity was established at 7919 grammes of fine gold per 100 Italian lire, corresponding to 19 lire to the dollar or 92.46 lire to the pound sterling. By means of this manipulation of bookkeeping, debts of the Italian Government to the Bank of Italy to the value of 4300 million lire were simply annulled.

Yet the Fascist Government failed to achieve a complete victory in its fight for the lira. The financial programme of the Government provides for a complete restoration of the lira rate in the course of a few years. But long before the lapse of this time, the Fascists had to take recourse to measures to prevent a further fall of the lira and thus to obviate an economic catastrophe which threatened to destroy the entire Fascist regime.

The legal rate thus established by decree at a level of 92.46, is already in excess of the "90 rate" which the Fascist Government had vociferously proclaimed to be the highest that could possibly be permitted. The rate of 92.46 is a concession to the Italian industry and was established with a view to enabling industry to reconquer those markets which it had lost by reason of the temporary stabilisation of the lira.

It will not be out of place here to call to mind that the economic consequences of the deflation programme published by Mussolini in his speech at Pesaro, have been unpleasant both

for the industry and for the agriculture of the country. The Italian industry lost its markets at home and was forced to work mainly to stocks, to decrease its output, and to dismiss part of its workers; at the same time agriculture has run over head and ears into debt, seeing that grain and other agricultural produce have been selling at a loss.

The Fascist economists declared that the stabilisation of the rate of the lira would bring about a sinking of wholesale and retail prices. This has not happened; prices have changed very little, if at all. This is to be explained by the distrust of commercial circles in regard to the further development of the lira. The Fascist Government, however, continues to hope that the legal stabilisation of the rate, which affords trade a full measure of security, will ultimately lead to a lower level of prices.

In this way the Fascist Government has again received the help of Anglo-Saxon capital at a moment when the country appeared to have got into an economic blind alley. For a certain time, the Fascist Government regained the stability which it would otherwise have lost as a result of the closing of foreign markets to Italian goods and of the extraordinarily serious internal crisis long prevailing in the country.

This aid on the part, mainly, of the capital of the United States, at the same time shows that the bourgeoisie regards Fascism as a form of State administration which deserves a full measure of confidence and support. Otherwise it could not be explained that a country suffering under so pronounced an economic crisis should suddenly be accorded so great an amount of the wherewithal to continue "paying its way". True, the United States, the chief creditor of Italy's industry, are particularly interested in seeing a prosperous continuation of Fascism.

Will the success of the stabilisation be a matter of any duration? We very much doubt it. In spite of its imperialist guidance, Fascist Italy cannot possibly become a real "Great Power" or compete with other powers, such as the United States, Great Britain, or Germany; and that, firstly, because Italy is very poor in mineral wealth, and, secondly, because the output of the Italian industry only covers four-fifths of the requirements of the home market.

Italy's only wealth lies in its labour. As a market for the excess of labour, Italy until quite recently exported labour to other countries, the United States in particular. These exports were the main factor in the country's balance of payments. The concentrated sweat of Italian labour came home in the form of gold dollars or full-value sterling. This source has now dried up, and the surplus labour increases the considerable economic difficulties of the country. Italy, which was over head and ears in debt even prior to the Fascist coup, is now mortgaged to the hilt; the mere interest on the 86,000 millions of foreign debts swallows up one quarter of the total annual income of the State.

The economic instability of present-day Italy is fully apparent. The home market suffers under the complete impoverishment of the working masses. Exports also decrease. Business contracts constantly sink in volume. The decline in goods traffic is quite remarkable. Last year, the Italian railways forwarded 300,000 tons less of certain goods than the year before. The number of protested bills and direct insolvencies has increased alarmingly. Official statistics report an average of 920 insolvencies monthly between May and September 1927, whereas the average for the corresponding period of 1926 was only 671 and in the years 1912—1914 no more than 596.

The pawnbrokers' shops, those barometers of the poverty of a nation, show that the number of pawned articles, which stood in July 1926 at 599,000, had risen by July 1927 to 725,000, while the sums advanced had risen from 32 to 47 million lire.

Never before was the poverty of the masses so obvious and so terrible. In the streets of the larger Italian towns workers may often be seen in rags and with shoes that will barely stick to their feet. Nor can conditions be different, if, as the official Fascist statistics show, out of a total of three millions and a half of industrial workers, half a million are unemployed and another half million work only a few days in the week.

The mechanical industry of the country is likewise a victim of the crisis and of the inordinate taxes. In many cases the works are equipped on highly up-to-date lines, as for instance

the Fiat automobile factory at Turin, but by reason of the impoverishment of the home market and the lack of foreign purchasers they cannot dispose of their goods. As to the crisis in the Italian textile industry, enough has already been said.

In Italy, rationalisation is not based, as in other countries, on scientific principles, but merely consists in a reduction of wages.

The only great technical progress achieved by Italy of late years is the development of the hydro-electric generation of energy, which really represents a great national asset. Thanks to the American capital, lent at the exorbitant rate of interest of 7 — or, including commission, 8 or 9 — per cent., production in this branch of industry has greatly increased and is adequately centralised, but it lacks markets, for no new factories are being built and those in existence show no intensification of output. And how else is the hydro-electric industry of Italy to fulfill the obligations entered into towards the American users, without increasing the expense of the produced energy, which would in turn increase the costs of production of the industrial product?

It follows from the above that if Italian industry is to regain its lost markets or restore some degree of economic equilibrium, there is no other way open to it than that of reducing the workers' wages.

And this is what the Fascist Government is engaged in doing. With the aid of the Fascist corporations, it has reduced wages by 30 per cent. all along the line. The Fascist papers have no word to say on the subject, but the result has been a strike wave throughout Italy, from Sicily to Turin. It embraced the miners of Sicily, the tobacco workers of Venetia, the workers in the canned-food factories in and around Trieste, the textile workers of Pisa and other provinces, 10,000 metal workers in Milan, etc. Added to this, there was the strike of 60,000 peasants on the rice fields in the provinces of Vercelli and Novara and the demonstration of peasants and unemployed in the neighbourhood of Venice and Piacenza and in Tuscany. The last great strike at Gallarate ended in a collision with the police, in which two strikers were killed and a number of others wounded.

All these movements were of a spontaneous character and could not be united or centralised. The resistance of the working class to the Fascist regime is growing stronger and stronger; the lengthy period of passivity on the part of the workers appears to be drawing to a close. On the other hand, the Fascist rule becomes day by day more violent. Quite apart from the fact that the Fascists have reduced the wages, they desire to introduce the payment of wages in the form of orders, as was done in Russia during the Tsarist regime.

Parallel with this exploitation of the working masses, the Fascist State is endeavouring to subject the entire economy of Italy to its influence.

The Fascists control the imports and exports by means of the banks and other credit organisations. They likewise determine what forms of industry are to be accorded State aid and what branches are to be repressed.

Fascist intervention goes so far as to aspire to influencing the number of births. In this connection a discussion has arisen between Coleta, the well-known Italian statistician, and the "Popolo d'Italia". Mussolini's paper is of opinion that Coletta, who bases his arguments on the undeniable recession in the number of births, is in the wrong, demanding that the Italians should "have as many children as possible", though without pointing out how this is to be managed.

"The great nation", says Mussolini, "must endeavour to attain a population of 60 millions, for only thus can Italy make its power really felt."

But the material situation of the working masses is growing worse and worse. The sufferings of the working class are increasing, while the financial oligarchy of Italy continues, with the help of Anglo-American capital, to enrich itself quite shamelessly.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

A Conference of the C. P. of Italy.

By N. N. (Rome).

Some days ago there took place an information and organisation Conference of the C. P. of Italy. It was the first time since the third Party Congress, which took place in January, 1926, that the Party was able to bring together representation of its organisations. This Conference was also participated in by representatives of the Italian Communist groups in the West-European parties.

The Conference stated that the Communist Party of Italy possesses an indestructible life force and that it is winning influence among the working masses.

The analysis of the situation in Italy and the political directives which were elaborated by the Central Committee, have proved to be correct. The political activity, which aimed and still aims at capturing the masses and their organisations, at being in permanent contact with them and at advancing their movement, was approved by the delegates and its decisive importance for the Party work confirmed.

The Conference warned the Party of deviations which the present situation can call forth: the tendency that the Party withdraws into itself and confines its activity to defending itself only physically, and that it even takes into consideration such methods as terrorist action — be it individual action or, be it organised by small groups. Although these tendencies do not find clear expression in the Party, it was nevertheless necessary to mention them in order to be able to extirpate them the more quickly. These tendencies would constitute nothing else but a reflection of the passivity of the masses and a symptom of their discouragement.

The Conference declared the criticism by the Communist Party of the parties of the "democratic-anti-fascist concentration" to be correct. The Communists must continue their work of destroying the social basis of this "concentration". It would be a shallow and wrong view to think that the "concentration" does not exist in Italy because the parties which are forming it are developing their activity in the emigration.

The chief aim of the Party must remain that of winning and organising the masses. Before all, therefore, the Trade Union Federation (C. G. L.) must be strengthened and the factory nuclei, the industrial federations and the trade union cartels built up.

The Conference approved the line pursued by the Communist fraction of the Executive Committee of the C. G. L. both with regard to trade union activity in Italy and international trade union relations.

The directives issued in 1927 for creating the leading organs of the mass movements (workers' commissions, agitation committees etc.) remain effective for the activity of the Party in 1928.

With regard to the so-called "socialist unity" which is at present being propagated by two socialist parties in the emigration, the Conference declared that this "unity" would only mean the union of the leaders of the two socialist parties, but that proletarian unity can only be realised in Italy, in the action of the masses grouped round the C. G. L. The revolutionary unity of the proletariat can find expression only in the Communist Party.

The Conference adopted two reports: one on the international situation and the other on the situation in the C. P. S. U.

The delegates emphasised the danger which the action of the Opposition means for the consolidation of the workers' State and for the development of the international revolution.

The Communist Party of Italy has been at its post for seven years. It was at the head of all the fights of the proletariat. This explains why the Communist Party of Italy had to suffer more than other parties. Three formations of the active elements were one after another annihilated in the struggle.

Although the present leading cadres arose in the struggle, they are still lacking the necessary political education.

The Conference therefore emphasised the importance and the urgency of the political educational work for all comrades, especially for the functionaries in the leading organs. The Conference also dealt with the problem of the "reserve forces" of the

Party, the courageous youth organisations and the Italian Communist groups living abroad.

The emigrated Italian Communists have the duty to prepare ideologically for their future tasks and to develop their political activity (if possible with the help of the Italian Party and the brother organisations to which they at present belong). The comrades who live in emigration must not forget that the Party will need them.

The Conference has examined the measures for consolidating the Party, especially in the factories, and for securing its permanent and immediate connection with the masses. The Party work must be so organised that the Party and its organisation remains as intact as possible in spite of the blows of the enemy.

The Conference has drawn the balance of the activity of the C. P. of Italy and discussed its tasks in a very difficult moment for the Italian movement. Both the Communist International and the many thousand comrades who are languishing in the dungeons and in places of banishment can look to the future with confidence: The C. P. of Italy will continue to remain at its post and lead the proletariat to victory.

THE WHITE TERROR

Our Comrades Before the Belgrade Tribunal.

The great trial of 25 Communists who were accused under the Yugoslavian Defence of the Realm Act on account of membership of the illegal Communist Party and the Young Communist League, took place from the 13th to 15th February in Belgrade. It has brought to light the terrible tortures which were employed in order to extract confessions, and has ended with a severe moral defeat of the reactionary regime, as even the court, which is naturally prejudiced against the accused, was not able to impose the highest penalty provided by the above-mentioned Act.

The accused bore themselves bravely before the court and openly acknowledged their membership of the persecuted organisations. They gave terrible details regarding the customary inhuman tortures practised in the prison of Belgrade and completely exposed the inquisitors of the white government.

A number of the accused admitted that by means of these tortures, "confessions" had been extorted from them, by which they not only severely incriminated themselves but also other comrades. Of course they withdrew the statements made in these "confessions" when placed before the court. Others of the accused were likewise tortured, but the authorities did not succeed in forcing them to incriminate others. Only a very few of the accused escaped the tortures, some of which were so diabolical that even the torturers could not proceed further.

The Defenders in their speeches stigmatised the reactionary police regime and called special attention to the high moral qualities of the accused. The accused youth comrades dealt in their concluding speeches with the economic exploitation of the working youth in Yugoslavia and proudly and confidently declared themselves to be members of the illegal Young Communist League and to be only still more confirmed in their conviction as a result of their sufferings while in prison. The accused Kersovani and Kovatchevitch spoke of the national oppression in Yugoslavia and the class struggles of the international proletariat. When applause was heard among the public in the court room, several persons were removed from the court by gendarmes. The accused Dr. Sima Markovitch refuted the attacks of the Public Prosecutor on the Soviet Union. The secretary of the Independent Trade Unions, Lazar Stefanovitch pointed out that the police attempted to compromise the Independent Trade Unions by means of the persecution directed against him.

Five of the accused, i. e. Ivan Brijatchek, Jossip Cazi, Nikola Kotur, Pavel Kovatchevitch and Josip Redebolja were each sentenced to five years hard labour; nine of the accused, among them being Ottocar Kersovani, were each condemned to six months hard labour; four of the accused, on account of their youth, were condemned to 3 months hard labour. The remaining seven accused, among them Sima Markovitch and Lazar Stefanovitch had to be acquitted. In all 31 years and 4 months imprisonment were imposed.

The condemned heard the pronouncement of the sentences proudly and calmly. The court officials could not prevent enthusiastic cries being addressed to them from among the public. "We will not forget you, brothers", was heard from their class comrades who were present in the court.

In the three trials which formed part of the great proceedings, the editor Schlesinger and the jurist Dr. Kussovatz had to be acquitted, Comrade Rada Vuyovitch, who still maintained his statements regarding the tortures to which he was subjected in the prisons of Belgrade, was condemned to nine months imprisonment.

The Proceedings at the Trial of Boris Stefanov.

We publish below a report of the proceedings of the trial which we take from the Vienna "Rote Fahne" of 16th February. Ed.

The trial of Boris Stefanov and Comrades was accompanied by an intensification of the terror against the workers' organisations; the arrest of the young workers Arnoldi and Comrades; the expulsion from the country of the French lawyers Junker and Delbert who had arrived in order to defend the accused; fresh attacks on the unitarian trade unions, imposition of military preventative censorship in Kishinev and in fact a new control of the Bucharest press.

By the condemnation of Stefanov and Comrades the bourgeoisie not only attempted to justify the suppression of the Communist Party of Roumania and the persecution of the Unitarian trade unions; it attempted to make use of the trial for the purposes of anti-Soviet incitement. The charge brought against Stefanov was that of "high treason, committed by having connection with the enemy (the Soviet Union) for the purpose of bringing about the military invasion of a foreign power for the occupation of Bessarabia and for the overthrow of the existing order; crimes against the security of the State within the meaning of the Defence of the Realm Act". The other accused, Comrade Zacharescu, student, and the workers Comrades Ladislaus Luka, Josef Illes and Johann Gruja were accused of committing crimes against the security of the State and the existing social order by having carried on Communist propaganda activity.

The prosecution was placed in the hands of the royal commissioner and a professional hangman, Major Hofineau.

Already at the cross-examination of the accused the complete collapse of the indictment became apparent. The attitude of the accused constituted an example how revolutionary workers have to behave before the class court.

Thus Comrade Stefanov declared in his speech, which occupied three days of the proceedings:

"The suppression of the Communist Party of Roumania was carried out by decree and by making use of the State of Emergency, which however, since the end of the war, is void of any legal basis. The bourgeoisie had also crushed and deprived of their legality, not only the trade union organisations, but even the sport and cultural organisations of the working class. No suppression and no persecution can intimidate the Communist Party of Roumania or stifle its activity for organising and preparing the masses for obtaining power by overthrowing the existing regime and setting up the workers' and peasants' government, in spite of the conditions of illegality. The Communist Party is working underground for the time being, nevertheless it never abandons its right to legality.

I entirely associate myself with the programme of the Communist Party of Roumania, and therefore also acknowledge the right to self-determination of suppressed peoples, even up to the complete separation from the State. It is a matter of course that my standpoint in the Bessarabian question is in accordance with this fundamental principle of my Party".

He declared in conclusion:

"Instead of us there should be in the dock those who bring the charges against us in the interest of a corrupt

and rotten regime, a profit-mongering, blood-thirsty ruthless bourgeoisie."

No less firm was the attitude of the other comrades. They devoted their speeches mainly to dealing with the rôle of the reformists, who are protected by the bourgeoisie. Along with Stefanov they proclaimed their solidarity with the Communist Party of Roumania and the Communist International. Comrade Luka declared:

"The hands of this brutal justice is stained with the blood of innumerable workers. Our Comrade Pavel Tkatchenko (here all the accused rose from their seats) was most foully murdered by the scoundrels of the Siguranza.

During the Hungarian Commune I was a soldier of the Hungarian Red Army and fought with all my strength for the victory of the Hungarian proletariat, and shall undeterred devote all my powers to the victory of the Roumanian proletariat."

Comrade Illes dealt mainly with the position of the Hungarian workers in Transylvania, and described the double oppression under which they have to suffer: exploitation by capital, and national oppression by the ruling regime. As the example of Russia shows, only the victory of the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party will bring about a just solution of the national question.

Comrade Zacharescu described the rôle of the anti-semitic fascist students, who are a tool in the hands of the Liberal government which is interested in organising pogroms.

At the hearing of the evidence of witnesses, a number of trade union organised workers, to the great embarrassment of the court, described the medieval cruelties of the Siguranza.

In face of the evidence of these witnesses the court was compelled to acknowledge the fact of the torturing on the accused and thus to withdraw the basis from the indictment and to pronounce a judgment against the Siguranza and itself.

Nothing proves better the superiority of the accused and the complete annihilation of the indictment than the fact that the Public Prosecutor finally withdrew the charge relating to the slogan of the right of self-determination of the nationalities. This collapse which the Roumanian class justice, and with it the ruling bourgeoisie, suffered did not prevent it from condemning the leaders of the Roumanian working class to long terms of imprisonment.

Comrade Stefanov was condemned to eight years penal servitude and Comrade Zacharescu to seven years penal servitude.

The other accused who were present had to be acquitted. Comrade Lisa Dijour was sentenced in her absence to ten years imprisonment.

The trial proves that the Communist Party of Roumania, in spite of all blows and in spite of the severe losses, continues to live, is succeeding even in illegality in maintaining its influence over the proletariat of Roumania and continuing the fight for the winning of its legality.

The Fight in Defence of the Hromada.

The greatest trial of Polish justice will begin in Vilna in February this year. Five hundred White Russian workers, peasants and intellectuals, will appear before the court under the accusation of having been members of the Hromada, the White Russian Peasant and Workers' party. What was the Hromada? It was the organisation of the working masses of White Russia. The Hromada had set itself the task of conducting the fight against the oppression exercised by the landowners and the bourgeoisie; it proclaimed the slogan of the workers' and peasants government. The Hromada demanded that the extensive estates, which owed their existence to the distress and exploitation of the serfdom of the White Russian and Lithuanian peoples, be divided among the peasants without indemnification. The Hromada carried on a fight for the unification of White Russian territory under a Workers' and Peasants' government. The Hromada was energetically opposed to the Polish policy of colonisation, it demanded schools with White Russian methods of education for the White Russian children.

Whilst advocating the national liberation of the White Russians and struggling, not only for the social freedom of the latter, but also for their national rights, for their own language, for schools of their own, the Hromada kept aloof from any national chauvinism, rooting, on the contrary, the conviction in the White Russian masses that the Polish peasants and workers are by no means their enemies, that their enemies are no other but the Polish bourgeoisie, the landowners and the authorities devoted to those classes. The Hromada proclaimed indefatigably and throughout the country, its solidarity with the masses of Polish workers who are in the same way struggling against capitalist oppression throughout Poland.

With that slogan and thanks to its incessant struggle for it, the Hromada gained an extraordinary popularity among the White Russian people in the two years of its legal activity (from April 1925 to March 1927). In March 1927, the number of its village groups (the so-called *Hurtkan*) exceeded 2000, the total number of its members reached 160,000. That gigantic development of the truly revolutionary organisation for the freedom of the people inspired the Polish bourgeoisie and the landowners with panic fear. Hundreds of articles appeared in the Polish reactionary newspapers, directed against the legal existence of the Hromada. The leaders of the latter, especially the deputies of the Hromada, were denounced by those scribblers, who demanded day by day that the Hromada be deprived of its legality. They pointed out the social and political danger and even the danger of war by which the Polish bourgeoisie was threatened in consequence of the activities of the Hromada.

The whole action was carried on under the lead of the Government camp. As a matter of fact, the government of Marshal Pilsudski ordered an action in 1927, the object of which was to annihilate the legal activity of the Hromada by means of wholesale arrests and by prohibiting membership of the Hromada. The Government did not shrink from arresting the parliamentary representatives of the Hromada, although the Constitution prescribes the inviolability of the deputies. Rak-Michailovskii, Taraszkievich, Volosyn and Miotla, deputies of the Hromada, and Holovacz, a White Russian deputy of the Independent Peasant party were arrested on January 14th 1927. At the same time, 800 active members of the Hromada were arrested, amongst them the pre-eminent leaders of the organisation of the peasants and White Russian intellectuals, the White Russian teachers and the cultural leaders. Neither was the White Russian Co-operative Bank and the Society of the White Russian School spared house searches and arrests.

The fact that 692 searches were made in five White Russian factories in the course of three days, i. e. until January 17th, as has been reported by the official Telegraph Agency, is evidence of the scale on which those counter-measures were carried out. Although that action as a whole did not at all lead to the result the defensive had expected from it, as no material was found on the grounds of which an accusation could be brought against the Hromada, be it even in accordance with the articles of Tsarist law — or just because of that negative result, the rumour was spread that the Hromada had been found guilty of espionage and that its was an organisation of "paid agents from Moscow". The police and provocative agents, who will appear as witnesses for the prosecution, will repeat these accusations at the trial.

Endeavours are being made, by systematically repeating that empty talk, to defame the Hromada in the eyes of the working masses of Poland, which have been in solidarity with the movement of the White Russian masses for their national and social freedom. The imperialist Governments are now stirring up one nation against the other in order to destroy the class solidarity of the working masses, just as the Tsarist Government had done.

That manoeuvre was not able to deceive the vigilance of the masses. The working masses of Poland are realising that they cannot win social freedom unless they fight in common with the working masses of the oppressed peoples. They are realising that the legal proceedings against the five deputies of the peasant and working class, which are taking place on the eve of the election to the new Seim, are a continuation of the attack on the franchise of the working masses.

Now, on the eve of the trial of 500 leaders of the Hromada, who will have to defend themselves before the Polish court on the basis of the Tsarist legislation which has been abolished in Russia by the revolution but is still in force in Poland, we

the representatives of the revolutionary organisations of Poland, raise a protest against that infamous trial in the face of the whole world. Together with the masses of workers of White Russia, we maintain that, by bringing before the court the 500 representatives and leaders of the most numerous organisations of the White Russian people, persons from all the different districts of the furthest West of White Russia, the Polish Government is at the same time bringing a charge against the White Russian people of striving to put into effect the right of all peoples, the right of national self-determination, a charge of demanding that the landless peasants should receive land without indemnification.

The point of the legal proceedings instituted against the Hromada is directed against the working class of Poland. In the name of the Polish parties organised in the Inter-Party Secretariat for the fight for the amnesty of political prisoners, we call upon the working masses of all the nations residing on Polish territory to join in a mass protest.

We demand that the trial of the Hromada be abandoned.

We demand that the deputies and all the accused in that trial be released.

We demand the release of all political prisoners.

Long live the international solidarity of the proletariat!

The fraction of Communist deputies.

The Club of the deputies of the Independent Peasant party.

The Ukrainian Socialist Union of Peasants and Workers "Sel-Rob".

The Left wing of the Polish Socialist Party.

The Independent Socialist Labour Party.

The Left wing of the Jewish S. D. Labour Party "Poale Zion".

The Polish Freethinkers' Union.

DOCUMENTS

The XV. Party Congress and the Rural Work of the C. P. S. U.

Theses of the Agitprop of the E. C. C. I.

The Opportunist View of the Peasant Question.

1. Throughout the history of the struggle between revolutionary Marxism and opportunism in Russia, the question of the relations between the working class and the peasantry was one of the main objects of discussion. The revolutionary Marxist theory deemed it both essential and possible that the proletariat should place itself at the head of the broad working masses for the purpose of leading them against the Tsarist regime, which was allied with the Russian bourgeoisie by a thousand ties. On the other hand the opportunists, taking refuge behind references to the petty-bourgeois character of the peasantry and ignoring the inability of the bourgeoisie (as an ally of Tsarism and the landowners) to support the cause of the peasants at all effectively, thought it inevitable that the peasants would follow this bourgeoisie. In reality the opportunists thus renounced the task of a proletarian guidance of the peasants in their struggle and preferred to leave such guidance to the bourgeoisie.

When, contrary to the predictions of the opportunists, the proletariat had achieved the revolution at the head and with the help of the working peasantry — especially at the time of the economic rise on the basis of the New Economic Policy — the Russian and international opportunists did not tire of maintaining with obstinate persistence that the proletariat of the Soviet Union was incapable of preserving and consolidating the bloc with the peasantry, that it would not succeed in guiding the development of the peasant economy, and that the peasants would inevitably follow the bourgeois elements and pursue the way of capitalist economy.

The Russian Mensheviks maintained and still maintain that the peasantry of the Soviet Union is developing economically

by the formation of small-capitalist farms known as kulak farms, and that this was the only possible way for it to develop; also that this capitalist development of the great mass of the peasantry must inevitably lead the Soviet Union back to capitalism and thus bring about the overthrow of the Soviet Government.

Bauer and Levi have repeatedly attempted to prove in detail that, in spite of all the efforts of the Russian Communists, the small-farm economy of Russia would finally gain the upper hand, that the proletariat would be forced to comply with the wishes of the capitalistically inclined peasantry, so that the "interesting experiment" would end in failure. Every bourgeois newspaper regards it as axiomatic that the peasantry of the Soviet Union must necessarily develop along capitalist lines and looks upon this as an irrefutable proof of the necessity of a "Thermidor". In a word, the fundamental conviction of the bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats in regard to the question of development in the Soviet Union, begins and ends with the idea that a movement of the peasantry in the direction of Socialism is impossible, while their development in a capitalist direction, such as has always been characteristic of the small-farm economy, is inevitable.

Lenin's Perspective.

2. On the other hand, Lenin and the C. P. S. U. visualised the development of the great bulk of small peasant farms in the sense of their union in the form of large-scale co-operative undertakings. In the first place such a union was to serve the purpose of comprehending and organising the collective preparation and marketing of farm produce, the distribution of means of production, etc. Secondly, the co-operative societies of the peasants were to serve the purpose of the common purchase and employment of the most up-to-date agricultural machinery, the joint tillage of the soil, and the gradual substitution of great collective enterprises for the small separate peasant farms.

In this way there is created the possibility of a Socialist formation of peasant economy in the place of a capitalist development. Such a path of development has of course only been rendered possible by the fact that the proletarian revolution has replaced the bourgeois-capitalist industry with its commerce, etc., by a socialised industry with banks and commerce nationalised by the proletariat, and the bourgeois-capitalist administration of agriculture, with its enslavement of the bulk of the peasantry and its encouragement of the growth of the small kulak capitalist, by a Socialist administration with a repression of the kulak, a support of the village poor, and a systematic and all-round promotion of the collective development of agriculture.

The Menshevist Standpoint of the Trotzkyists in the Light of Actual Development.

3. Prior to the Party Congress, one of the most pronounced signs of the complete desertion of the Trotzky Opposition to the camp of the Mensheviks was the fact that in regard to the prospects of development among the peasants the Opposition was at one with Bauer, Levi, the Russian Social Democrats, the "Vorwärts", etc. Trotzky recognised "the nature of the present period of our policy" to lie in the fact that "with the present means of our industry we are not in a position to collective agriculture", and must therefore "allow of the development of the productive forces by the aid of capitalist methods". Smilga, a former oppositional member of the Central Committee, was altogether Menshevistic in his ridicule of the idea that the development of peasant economy in the Soviet Union could possibly ensue on any other than capitalist lines. He designated the opinion that in our State everything was altogether different from what it was in other countries as "an erroneous assumption". He considered it a mistake to believe that matters could be one way in a capitalist State and quite another way in a Socialist one.

The theses of the Opposition in regard to the work of the C. P. S. U. in the village attempted, in agreement with the entire bourgeois and Menshevist literature, to prove that in its bulk the Soviet peasantry was progressing along capitalist lines and that the entire countryside was being turned into a number of enriched kulak farms on the one hand and a mass of impoverished semi-proletarians (dependent upon the said

kulaks) on the other. The Opposition maintained that the middle peasants were losing their predominant importance and that the ground, the cattle, the agricultural implements, and the influence in the peasant organisations were all passing into the hands of the kulaks.

4. Reality easily confutes this Menshevist opinion as to the development of the village in the Soviet Union. The XV Party Congress declared in a resolution that a fight is in progress in the rural districts between the capitalist and the Socialist tendencies. On the one hand the wealthy peasants are profiting by the freedom of trade and their superior resources for the purpose of enriching themselves yet further by exploiting the poor, weak farms (in employing the poorer peasants as labourers, lending them money, seedcorn, etc., at a high rate of interest, and hiring their cattle and agricultural implements). The consequence is a partial growth of the kulak farms and the proletarianisation of some part of the poorer peasants, or in other words what is known as a differentiation of the peasantry. Thus the number of what, according to the conditions of Russian villages, would be designated as "big" farms (with an arable area of more than 10 desyatines) rose from 2.8 per cent. of the total number of farms in 1925 to 3.9 per cent. in 1926. At the same time a certain proportion of the smaller peasant undertakings became "proletarian", the number of farms without arable ground rising from 4.7 per cent. in 1925 to 5 per cent. in 1926.

On the other hand, thanks to the Socialist administration by means of the urban State industries, to the credit system, and to the commercial apparatus, the development of the rural districts cannot move in a direction of a growth of kulak farming, a proletarianisation of the village poor, and an absorption of the most numerous middle class of peasants. Contrary to the capitalist line of development in the rural districts we actually see another direction of progress, for, alongside a partial increase of the capitalist kulak elements and a consequent differentiation of the peasantry, we see a process of amelioration as regards the bulk of poor farms, a process of growth as regards the co-operatives of the middle and poorer peasantry. The proletarian towns, which through their State and co-operative organisations have the purchase and sale of the bulk of the rural produce in their own hands, which furnish the peasants with industrial products and grant them credits, which distribute according to class principles, restricting the kulaks in every possible way and promoting the rural poor by special means, exercise an appreciable and decisive influence on the development of the village.

The following table furnishes some idea of the general results of the fight between the various tendencies of development in the village.

Percentage Proportion of the Farms and the Arable Area (in the R. S. F. S. R.).

	Farms w. 2 desyat. of land and under	Farms w. 2—10 desyat. of land	Farms w. upw. of 10 desyat. of land	Together
1925	38.7	58.5	2.8	100
1926	35.1	61	3.9	100

As will be seen, the group of peasants owning a middle-sized area is not only not on the decline through turning into kulaks or poor peasants, but is rather increasing its relative importance. If we take into consideration that the group of poor peasants has slightly decreased, it will be obvious that we have here a growth of some of the poor farms into farms of the middle category. Though some of the poor peasants have been "proletarianised", a larger proportion has on the other hand experienced a change for the better. The same result of a rise on the part of the bulk of the poor farms and a consolidation on the part of the middle ones appears to be confirmed by the fact that the quota of farms without cattle receded between the economic year 1923/24 to 1925/26 from 17 to 15 per cent. of the total number of farms, while that of farms with not more than two head of cattle moved from 63 to 60 per cent. and that of farms with from two to four head of cattle from 18 to 22 per cent. This all shows that the outcome of the struggle in progress between various tendencies in the

village amounts in general to a step forward for Socialist construction.

The socialist leadership of the development of the village is proving itself capable of preventing the proletarianisation of the main mass of the small undertakings and the absorption of the middle groups. This is also confirmed by the success in the development of the agricultural co-operatives, which organise the marketing of the products of the peasants and the provision of the peasants with agricultural machinery. Already at the commencement of the year 1925 five million peasant farms, i. e. about 30 per cent. of their total number, were organised in the agricultural co-operatives. At the present time this percentage has increased still further.

On the Way to Collective Big Undertakings.

5. In view of the economic strengthening of the bulk of the poor and middle groups and the growth of the co-operative movement, the XV Party Congress was in a position concretely and comprehensively to attack the problem of a transition of agricultural activity by the peasantry from small separate farms to large collective enterprises. The most important presumption for the inception of this matter was the increase in the guiding and regulating role exercised by the proletariat in regard to agriculture.

This increased influence was expressed firstly in the fact that the State and co-operative organisations had gained control of the great majority (more than two thirds) of agricultural products by ousting private capital and getting into their hands the price regulation for such commodities. Secondly it found expression in the fact that the rural districts are now directly supplied with articles of urban production to more than 50 per cent. by the State and co-operative trading organisations. Finally, the industrial organisations of the State are now adopting the system of direct orders, by way of the co-operative organisations, to the peasants for the delivery of definite quantities of pronouncedly agricultural products such as cotton, beet-root, or flax, making special agreements as to the quality of the goods and assisting the peasants to execute the orders in question by a loan of money, agricultural machinery, and the like. In this connection the State organisations make arrangements in their contracts for improved methods of production, and thus at the same time promote the development of the peasant farms.

This new method of a guiding influence of Socialist industry on peasant farming is of special importance in that it renders possible the direct regulation of the economic development of the rural districts. To what extent this regulating process of peasant production has already progressed, is to be seen from the fact that the State sugar trust alone has, via the co-operative organisations concluded agreements with 900,000; peasants; the State textile industry with 750,000; the State linen industry with 150,000; and so forth. The contracts in question are on a collective basis, the order being given to peasants united in a particular co-operative organisation, which latter are entrusted with the distribution of the requisite machinery, the control of execution, the despatch and delivery of the agricultural commodities, and thus also with the organisation and co-ordination of the peasant production.

6. Under the guidance and with the assistance of the proletarian State, millions of peasant farms are preparing for the collectivisation of agriculture. The poor and middle peasants are beginning to realise the impossibility of a development of their little farms without the introduction of collective large-scale farming.

The introduction of tractors and other complicated agricultural machines, the achievements of the great Soviet farms, the development of the co-operative system, are all factors entailing and promoting a mass movement towards collectivism. If formerly the collective farm was no more than an isolated phenomenon in rural economy, the simplest forms of collective economy, at any rate, are now to be seen everywhere. The first indications of a mass movement towards collectivism are to be recognised in the fact that one million persons are already organised on collective farms, in communities, and in smaller societies for the purpose of a co-operative cultivation of the soil, as also in production-cartels and the like. Besides this,

the smaller machinery, land improvement, horse-breeding societies and the like, comprise no less than one million peasant farms. The growth of these organisations is progressing rapidly on all hands; the number of members increasing sevenfold in two years.

All this points to the fact that the possibility of an introduction of collective-estate farming on the basis of a technical reconstruction of a constantly increasing number of peasant farms is a practical and immediate question. The promotion of this process has been set up by the XV Party Congress as a main item on the programme of the Party in the direction of agricultural production.

7. If the increase in the Socialist management of the village by the town and the exploitation of this management for the purpose of converting the collectivisation of the peasant farms into a general process is the main task of Soviet constructional work in the village, it is undoubtedly a task which is closely connected with the further extensive and radical attack on the capitalist and kulak elements in rural economy. Thanks to the policy of the Party in the village, the village poor have greatly increased their activity, combining to form groups in connection with the rural Soviets, extending their influence in the official organs, consolidating their relations with the middle peasants, and thus helping to isolate the kulak elements. Having established the existence of such a political and social framework in the villages, the XV Party Congress resolved to effect a series of new measures for the purpose of restricting the development of capitalism in the village and of guiding the peasant farms in the direction of Socialism.

Among these measures, the following deserve special mention: 1. The exemption, already decreed, of 50 per cent. of the peasant farms (i. e. practically all the poor peasants) from the payment of the agricultural tax, combined with steps towards the greater taxation of the well-to-do strata; 2. the establishment, with the co-operatives, of an extensive system of loaning stations with a view to supplying the peasants with agricultural machinery on easy terms; 3. the increased accordance of credits to the village poor; 4. the restriction of land tenancies to not more than ten years; 5. the necessity of depriving the kulaks of their vote in the "rural association", i. e. the assemblies of peasants for the purpose of deciding the question of a distribution and utilisation of land in the respective village areas.

The Cultural Improvement of the Soviet Village.

8. Besides the questions of an economic, social, and political improvement of the rural districts, the XV Party Congress also dealt with the problem of a liquidation of the cultural backwardness of the peasantry. To gain some idea as to the extent of this backwardness it suffices to point out that 43 per cent. of the male and 66 per cent. of the female population of the rural districts are illiterate. This illiteracy and lack of culture are grave obstacles in the way of Socialist construction, so that an augmentation of cultural and political enlightenment is essential.

The XV Party Congress therefore emphasised the necessity of a number of measures for the cultural improvement of the rural districts, including "steps towards the energetic realisation of general compulsory elementary education", to which end the initiative of the population and of the local Soviets must be encouraged as far as possible; furthermore, a certain school fund is to be created with a view to assisting the children of the village poor, and special attention is to be paid to the development of wireless stations, the cinema, the enlargement of public libraries, etc.

9. The resolutions of the XV Party Congress in regard to the problems of introducing collective methods of farming, are of the greatest importance for the entire international proletariat, in so far as the latter still gives credence to the Social Democratic estimate of the part played by the peasantry in the revolution. These social democratic prejudices, fostered for decades by the international Social Democracy, have now been adopted by the Neo-Menshevism of Trotzky and Maslov with a view to undermining the confidence of the proletariat in Socialism and the possibilities of its development despite the existence of millions of individual peasant farms. This is a point where the paths of the old Social Democrats and the Neo-

Mensheviks most obviously meet. The problem of including the rural districts in the plan of Socialist construction is looked upon by the international Social Democracy and the Neo-Mensheviks as the Achilles heel of the C. P. S. U.

The concrete experiences gained by the members of the C. P. S. U. in the interest of a solution of this very important task, will furnish an example not only for the Communist parties of the agrarian countries but for all sections of the Communist International immediately after they have seized power.

To study these experiences and to popularise them not only among the Communist but also among the Social-Democratic and non-party workers, would mean imbuing them with confidence in the powers of the proletariat, overcoming pessimism, and showing millions of peasants all the world over the means of saving themselves from poverty, slavery, and death. For the Communists in countries in the eastern part of Central Europe (e. g. the Balkans, Poland, Hungary) and for the Communist parties of trans-oceanic countries where there are so many small impoverished farmers, the resolutions of the XV Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. are of quite particular importance. They teach us how the Communist parties can remain revolutionary adherents of Marx and Lenin and yet lead the widest classes of the working population in the struggle for Socialism. The experiences of the Soviet Union in collectivising of agriculture must be made the common property of the entire international proletariat.

PROLETARIAN CULTURE

Leninism and the Problem of Cultural Revolution.

By N. Bukharin.

Speech Delivered at the Celebration of the Anniversary of Lenin's Death.

(Conclusion.)

If we ask ourselves what we must do and what are the main tasks confronting us at present on this cultural sector of the battle-front, it seems to me that our answer must be as follows: In our cultural efforts we must even more speedily than in other respects overcome the period in which the "old" has already been destroyed without the "new" yet having been constructed. In our entire great revolution there is a certain amount of method, not only in an economic, but also in a political and cultural direction. At one time we overturned the old economic apparatus and destroyed it, when the old discipline of work went to pieces. We destroyed that old working discipline without immediately achieving a new one. We destroyed the old economic and administrative system, but did not immediately create a new system to take its place. The same was the case in a military connection in the army. We disintegrated the old army, which was a necessary step. After all, you cannot make an omelette without first breaking the eggs. And we did not immediately achieve the organisation of the Red Army.

The same may be said of the State apparatus. And this process is still in progress in a cultural respect. Thus we have destroyed the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois moral code and broken it to pieces; indeed, it crumbled under our very hands. But we cannot yet say that have set up any regulations of our own such as we require. There are many who look with contempt on the old morals (and they are right in doing so), but they have not yet any new standards and now hover in space without any points of gravitation. That is a very bad state of affairs which can do us great harm.

In regard to our manner of living and the standards regulating the relations of individuals to one another, in art, and in a number of other matters which impart what we may call "mental culture", we have not yet got our bearings. In many of these connections there are not even the rudiments of any new standards. This often results in very regrettable consequences.

Relative instances from the different spheres of social life are known to all of you. The old family and sex morals are destroyed, and that thoroughly, but the influence of newly evolving standards of conduct in this regard is very weak, and the

consequent "interim" entails many deplorable and very disadvantageous features of our manner of living. The old bureaucratic ideology has been destroyed, but there is still much to be desired in regard to the development of a new ideology of work for the workers, an attentive consideration for all "applicants", especially if they are workers, the economical use of State funds, etc. We have shattered the old "ideal" of a subordinate devoted to his superior, but we cannot yet say that we have trained in any general sense such a type of the conscious public worker and fighter on all fronts of our activity, as may be counted on to persecute all nepotism and toadyism. We are working in that direction, without as yet having more than the first few steps behind us.

The entire problem of rationalisation, and that not only of production but also of the manner of living, still faces us as a task to be fulfilled, or rather yet to be begun. We must pull ourselves together, whether it is a question of the masses, of the formation of cadres, or of the "highest" leaders. Not only have we not yet reached any result in this connection; in many respects we have not even laid our first foundations. To mention a few general tasks which confront us in this connection, we may formulate them somewhat as follows: We must make greater haste in getting over the intermediate stage between the eradication of the old and the introduction of the new. Starting from this standpoint, we must set ourselves a series of tasks, firstly as regards the masses, secondly in respect of the cadres, which represent the most progressive section of the masses, and finally with reference to the most highly qualified leading groups. In speaking of the masses, it is obvious that we are in the first place faced with the task of as rapid as possible an advance in the matter of elementary knowledge. It is an altogether mistaken policy to "scrap" certain reading-rooms, libraries, and even schools, as is sometimes done in the rural districts. To "stint" in these things is altogether impermissible at the present time, for how can "civilised" members of co-operatives be trained without an increase in the system of educational establishments?

The care of the public health must also be extended as far as possible, the first step in this direction being a development of the fight against alcoholism and syphilis. It is only illiterate and really uncultured people that can ignore the importance of this task. I recently perused the work of Bumke, a German professor, which has also appeared in Russian. The writer cites a whole number of circumstances in proof of the fact that since the war it is particularly alcohol and syphilis which have diminished the capacity of the masses, a state of affairs particularly noticeable in this country. The fight against alcoholism and the organisation of really rational forms of amusement, the proper development of the cinema and wireless and the active encouragement of sport, are all matters we must take in hand without delay.

Furthermore, we must strive to make the broad masses conversant with a rationalisation of economy and with the art of reckoning accurately. These are assets required by the peasantry just as much as by the working class. Thus Comrade Shatzky visited a great number of farms and arrived at the undeniable conclusion that, in spite of the small budgets, nay, even within the limits of the present budgets, it should be possible to attain a greater agricultural output. A whole series of accurate investigations of peasant budgets led to calculations, which were distributed among the peasants by school-children and which caused great surprise among them. These calculations show very clearly that even within the limits of the ordinary budget of a peasant farm, there is the possibility of very considerable progress. Moreover, it would be advisable to consider a whole number of measures by which the peasant would be assisted not only in looking after his own farm but also in looking after the welfare of the entire district, or, in other words, of "public economy". Finally, we must aim quite particularly at turning these districts into integral parts of what Lenin called the "Community State".

The questions of the worker's budget, of his family budget, of his participation in production, and of his increased interest in the course of production, and of a conscious and socialist-cultural attitude to this production are all matters of importance in our economy. We must also initiate the rationalisation of the manner of living. We must say that we are still most uncultivated, especially in view of the tasks which confront us. Sometimes we cannot stir a finger to put to right trifling matters on which much depends.

The question of amusements, of clubs, wireless, picture-theatres, the question of public baths, laundries, bakeries, schools, and libraries, and a number of other "every-day" questions, are not infrequently solved in such a way, that we set forth all sorts of fine plans, standpoints, and tasks, and yet permit a tremendous time to elapse before the work in question is executed. But Lenin said that our work of propaganda must consist in examples, in action, in energetic effectuation and not in a "political drumming", which was once necessary but is now fairly out of date. There are very many facts to hand indicating that our efforts would profit greatly, if we were to substitute a good form of instruction for the present system of revisions and written reports. Real practical help would disappoint neither the peasant nor the worker, who would experience something really alive in the place of bureaucratic formalities. These are, more or less, the main tasks with which we are faced, so far as the masses are concerned.

These tasks, however, cannot be executed if our cadres are not improved to the utmost. A peasant summed up our shortcomings pretty tersely in saying, "You Communists are most of you very progressive people, but there are few of you that are willing really to put your shoulders to the wheel." (Laughter.) That is very near the truth. Our "progress" consists in a great readiness to "project" all sorts of things. But there is as yet no control of execution, though Lenin repeatedly emphasised this side of the programme. And it is just the practical execution of the good resolutions passed which forms the best means of propaganda. Greater attention to the practical details of an economic and cultural nature in the rural districts and practical help even in quite small matters are better and more convincing means than whole cartloads of "political arguments". This sort of propaganda and this sort of work must be given prime consideration.

But there are also a number of quite elementary "virtues" which are practically little known to our cadres and have to a very small extent become a part of our being. It can but be useful to call to mind the simple principles which Lenin set up as milestones of the work of construction, such principles as "Learn to reckon properly", "Be thrifty", and so on. In that respect we are still greatly behind-hand. If our cadres had really already acquired these indispensable qualities, it would surely not be possible for such miscalculations to occur as are frequently made. By no means, "Be accurate". That is also quite an elementary rule. But can our cadres be said to have adopted this rule? Are they absolutely accurate in all things? Unfortunately not. To this very day we show traces of typically Russian negligence.

We must learn to adapt ourselves more quickly to circumstances, to go more into details, and to be altogether more thorough. We must cultivate in ourselves always and everywhere a feeling for the masses, a feeling of identity with the masses, a feeling of constant and unintermittent care for the masses, whether we are serving on the board of a trust, a syndicate, a trade union, a municipal Soviet, a goubierina committee, or a war committee. The feeling of responsibility must be constantly more developed. It not infrequently happens to us that, by reason of our lack of organisatory experience, it is not even known who is really responsible. The acquisition of such a feeling of responsibility, responsibility towards our class, our State, and ourselves, is also one of the cultural tasks incumbent upon us.

In certain sections of our Party there are tendencies towards resting in self-contentment on our laurels. We have, thank goodness, got the better of starvation. This bureaucratic self-contentment is a thing we must strike "hip and thigh", for it savours of a psychology which is altogether incompatible with Bolshevism and Communism. It will not carry us very far. This proposition must be put most energetically to every worker and every soldier who is really devoted to the Party. As long as we live, there can be no "resting on oars" and no spiritual "laying on of fat".

Besides this, we need an increase of special knowledge within our cadres. In this respect there are a number of weak points. Thus we have very few technicians with a medium degree of qualification, while many of our technical engineers are also insufficiently qualified. Technical and agricultural workers with a medium amount of qualification is what we mainly need. Very often such members of our Party as are unacquainted with a number of practical matters requiring spe-

cial knowledge, are unable to fulfill their political functions in the Party. Now neither the peasants nor the workers can content themselves with such a political leadership as can talk about Chamberlain but have no idea of farming or technics. Our Party members not only give instructions but also see to the execution; they not only prescribe the "line" but also follow it up practically. They are not only "politicians" in general but also administrators.

If this is the case, the workers in these positions must necessarily extend their knowledge from year to year. In this connection, too, it is of importance that, outside the task of increasing our knowledge and training our feeling of responsibility towards the masses, special attention be paid to the small details. Let us make the following test. Let us take the "Life of the Worker" column and the respective correspondence columns of any of our bigger newspapers ("Ekonomicheskaya Shisn", "Trud", "Gudok", "Pravda", "Rabotchaya Gazeta", etc.), and read out all such remarks as refer to any shortcomings or misuses. Let us then try to analyse these various complaints. We shall soon see that nine tenths of all these different abuses do not result from "objective" circumstances, but could be avoided if dealt with energetically and in detail. If among the working masses there are still very considerable remnants of an indifferent attitude towards the interests of the State, there is on the other hand still an undeniable lack of culture in our administering cadres and even among members of the Party.

If we encounter instances of a negligent psychology among workers engaged immediately in production, we may also meet in the cadres with such as wish somehow or other "to get out of" performing their duties. ("We have been even worse off; somehow we shall manage to get away with it", is what we hear, or, again, "Things are not so very bad after all".) This is a rotten psychology. Every leader, and in particular every Communist, must be an exemplary cultural pioneer, using all his energies to find out shortcomings and to correct them with energy. Even the smallest detail must not be regarded as a "trifle" lying outside our sphere of influence. There must be no such "trifles", for it is of such details that life consists. They can even become political factors of importance. A sleepy "oblomov" attitude towards these small shortcomings is a nuisance we must combat with all our strength.

We must bring pressure to bear on all our functionaries immediately in touch with the masses, whether they are in the trade unions, or in the Soviet organs, or in the Party. He who attacks this question without "rolling up his shirt sleeves" is not a Communist. This indifference, this lack of attention to the immediate requirements of the masses, may easily grow into a disgusting form of bureaucracy and self-satisfaction on the part of the officials. That is a barbaric characteristic which we must attack with all the weapons at our command. We must tell all our workers that the mass cannot be educated or made to attain ever higher grades of active culture, if those in authority give an example of bureaucratic self-contentment and self-love. We must listen to every criticism on the part of the masses, instead of designating all censure as anti-Soviet, as malicious blockheads or bureaucratic idiots are inclined to do.

As regards the yet "higher" leading cadres, the following questions might well be raised. Greater intimacy with Western and American experiences, more thorough attention to our great economic and other plans and manoeuvres, elaboration of a number of scientific questions from special points of view, and periodical journeys through the length and breadth of the Soviet Union. We have frequently asserted that the revolutionary spirit in connection with efficiency, or again the revolutionary spirit in connection with Americanism are tasks confronting the Communists. What was meant by a revolutionary spirit? A revolutionary spirit means subordination and co-ordination of every single step in relation to the fundamental idea of revolution, i. e. to the idea of the world-revolution on the one hand and that of the construction of Socialism on the other. A revolutionary spirit, however, does not only presume such a mental and intellectual attitude; it also presumes a definite state of mind, a revolutionary enthusiasm and revolutionary optimism. A revolutionary spirit presumes a definite belief in a cause and in the denial of defeatism, pessimism, failure, and any kind of corruption, which is altogether incompatible with a revolutionary attitude.

A rising class can in no wise be in connection or sympathy with a rotten, pessimistic psychology. Naturally our optimism must not be confounded with a stupid optimism which declares everything in the world to be perfect. Voltaire created a hero of this stamp, a man who, in the face of an earthquake or a disagreeable illness, constantly declared that everything was very well arranged in the world. Nor can we assume the standpoint of St. Augustine who affirmed that God had only created evil things so as to make good things appear to better advantage. We must be steadfast in combating all signs of decline, decay, and dissolution, whether they appear in literature (as, e. g., in the writings of Yessenin), in politics, or in life. It is obvious that the rising class can only solve the tasks set it and complete its great work, if it is full of belief in its own powers and in the cause it has undertaken.

There have been very hard times in the history of our revolution, but our Party has managed to overcome them merely because it has been inexorable and has never under any circumstances lost its belief in its great cause. In this respect our leader Lenin was the model of the new type of men and fighters. Lenin revealed the new forms of our social existence. That fact is expressed in the slogan of world revolution, "All Power to the Soviets". Lenin raised the veil concealing the future and showed us the example of a man who, in defiance of all obstacles and of even the most formidable of adverse circumstances, upheld the flag of revolution and marched forward on his way with a will of iron.

We can clearly see what tremendous historical perspectives are opened out before us. The world is already trembling with the distant rumble of the great revolution, which will surpass all that has ever been experienced or imagined. Gigantic masses will be put into motion and in our country the way will be opened up for further stupendous creative efforts. If we read the stupid references to "savage Huns" and if the "civilised hangmen" of the international bourgeoisie accuse us, the creators of a new life, of "barbarity", we can answer with quiet consciences, "We are creating and shall continue to create a new civilisation, in comparison with which the civilisation of capitalism will appear like "caterwauling" compared with the heroic symphonies of Beethoven."

TEN YEARS AGO

The Brest Peace and Germany's War Policy.

By Paul Frölich.

II.

2. Brest-Litovsk and the Social Democracy.

The political importance of social democracy was anyhow important enough. Revolutionary propaganda had not yet penetrated into the small towns, and broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie still supported the social democratic party. The Government rather overestimated than undervalued its influence. Its attitude towards the Brest peace treaty was therefore very important with regard to the further development of affairs in the East and to the policy of war and conquest altogether. This is clearly evident from a letter addressed by v. Radowitz, under secretary of the State, to Count Limburg-Stürm, the representative of the Imperial Chancellor at the Supreme Command. The Supreme Command wished to turn its victory over the political administration thoroughly to account. It had won over both William II. and the Crown Prince for the demand that the Imperial Chancellor should publicly and in a positive way disclaim any connection with the peace resolution passed by the Reichstag. In reference to that, v. Radowitz wrote on January 17th that the Imperial Chancellor quite agreed with them on principle, but that the execution of the plan offered difficulties:

"A declaration of that kind would make it impossible for Social Democracy to preserve its face in the eyes of its own partisans. That declaration would immediately split the present majority and drive Social Democracy as a whole, the greater section of the Liberals and possibly a certain number of the Centre party into an attitude of

opposition to the Government, which would make it impossible to carry on the government. The Imperial Chancellor is therefore endeavouring to persuade the Reichstag to realise for itself that the preliminary conditions of the resolution have ceased to exist and that Germany ought to shake off that chain with which it has bound itself. If this procedure succeeds, it will be possible for Social Democracy to maintain its contact and to keep up its co-operation with the government. We need that co-operation as long as war continues for, if Social Democracy, treated badly by the government withdraws from co-operation, it loses at that very moment, any desire to advocate the intentions of the government before its electors and especially before the trade unions, and even has no possibility to do so. The latter will then altogether drift into the hands of the Independents, and the danger of strikes etc. will become imminent...

We must therefore keep them to the point and should not forget that, in spite of everything, the Russian example is acting on our country also and may lead to evil consequences unless the bad elements are kept in check by their own leaders...

The transformation of the Right wing of Social Democracy into a national Labour party will be frustrated for all time to come if the government occasions a breach at the present moment."

That testimony not only shows how the social democratic leaders used to fool the workers in common with the government, but also the position of power it held in its relation to the government. If they really meant the peace resolution so earnestly as they boasted to the whole people, they also were in a position to drive the government into a fateful crisis on account of the Brest peace and to compel it to yield. They did nothing of the sort. The "Vorwärts" stated on February 18th 1918 that the action for peace had altogether failed. Peace with the Ukraine had given offence to Poland and made it Germany's enemy. Instead of peace, three fresh wars came into being, one in Finland, another in Courland, the third in the Ukraine. The newspaper then raises the following question: Why should further war-credits be granted? The following answer reveals the whole moral depravity of social democracy:

"An opposition without activity is an absurdity and sheer idleness, an oppositional action however, can only be of an extra-parliamentary nature. Is there any possibility of changing the course of foreign policy into a different direction which corresponds more with the interest of the German people than that steered hitherto, by means of an extra-parliamentary action? None but he who answers this question in the affirmative and denies that the Reichstag has the right to exercise a decisive influence on politics, may stand up for a tactical measure which will then be more than a cowardly way of escape."

Those contemptible idle words naturally mean nothing more nor less than: We are quite willing to be overpowered. But they meant even more. It is easy to understand that the government started an agitation against the Bolsheviki at the time when the violation of Russian roused the indignation of the masses of German workers. The "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung", the organ of the government, published articles about "Russian anarchy". The social democratic Press which had up to that time courted the favour of the Bolsheviki, immediately joined in the tune. Under the catch-word of "Bolshevism", Friedrich Stamper published, in the "Vorwärts" of February 24th 1918, an article of revolting baseness. He did not find words against the peace of conquest of the German Government, but he poured forth the following repulsive effusion against the Soviet Power:

"It was an awful thing to witness with what light-heartedness they yielded up Russian territory, how they pushed away one country after the other with a negligent movement of the hand, how they repeated with unchanged equanimity: even to its separation from Russia. Never would German Social Democracy have acted in that way had it been in a similar position! Those socialists who think themselves very up-to-date, do not show the slightest understanding for the necessity of keeping together

vast economic domains. Those German Social Democrats who feared that the Balkanisation of the East would be a danger to all the peoples concerned, including the German people which is nearest to their hearts, were actually driven to despair by the behaviour of the Bolsheviki. There was every reason to say: Well, if the Bolsheviki and the German annexationists are united in their views — what are we, the German social democrats to do against it?

This is how the Bolsheviki have wrested one weapon after the other from the hands of German social democracy. We maintained: "Russia is still a Power." We received the answer: "But there is not a single man at the front!" We said: "You are conjuring up a fresh war of revenge." We received the answer: "The Russians are not French, their national feeling is not developed." We argued: "Russia could not bear the loss of the Baltic provinces." We received the answer: "The Russians themselves relinquish those provinces!" We said: "We will not admit that the achievements of the Russian revolution are destroyed." We received the answer: "Look close at those achievements, one socialist group in that country is firing at the other socialist group."

The Bolsheviki still fail to realise that they have promoted imperialism, that they have put difficulties in the way of any real fight against it. They are constantly starting at their one illusionary and useless measure: the revolutionary mass strike.

German social democracy never regarded the mass strike as a means of carrying out revolution at one blow, still less as a means of terminating the war. It has been repeated over and over again at the international socialist congresses that, as the revolutionary mass strike cannot break out in all the countries at the same time and with equal force, it will threaten, above all, those countries in which it is put into effect first and with the greatest vigour. In Russia, the correctness of this assertion has been confirmed.

The German people does not care to be the next on that path."

On February 27th, the "Vorwärts" stated with a perceptible sigh of relief:

"The overthrow of the Bolshevik Government can be foreseen as the result of that peace treaty."

All that however had already been surpassed by an article written by Otto Braun, a member of the party executive, to-day Prime Minister of Prussia, published in the "Vorwärts" of February 15th. In that article, the methods which social democracy later knew to apply in such a masterly manner, in its alliance with the anti-Bolshevist league, were used for the first time. It ran as follows:

"They are killing democracy and replacing it by energy and brute force. They are gagging the public opinion in a way which must rouse the envy even of the most brutal servants of the Tsar and are throwing large numbers of their own comrades into prison even though they only tactically deviate in their views.

They are forcing everything that offers resistance to the ground by force of arms with the help of the soldiers who are still devoted to them. The rule of that unbridled Bolshevik military rabble should however be condemned in the same way as is the rule of violence of the Tsarist soldiers. In any case, it cannot last.

The chaos in the economical and political field must necessarily become gradually worse and must finally lead to a collapse of that unnatural socialist rule by the sword.

The ways and doings of the Bolsheviki in Russia have nothing in common with socialism nor with democracy, they are, on the contrary, a case of the most brutal put-ty-smism and anarchy.

This is why we must draw a thick, visible line of separation between Bolshevism and ourselves."

These things were even too much for the Vienna "Arbeiter-Zeitung", the sister of the "Vorwärts". The first maintained that the opinion expressed by Braun, a social democrat, was hardly different from that of any narrow-minded bourgeois and reactionary person.

"His thick line is therefore probably at the same time a document of the moral and mental condition of many a comrade in the German Empire at the present moment."

The social democratic Press continued its agitation. It broke off, however, on the very same day on which the Soviet Government signed the peace treaty. Thereupon the tussle with the Independents about the question as to who was next to the Bolsheviki, began once more. That anti-Bolshevist interlude had therefore been an offensive carried on by the German Government with the object of unburdening itself at the moment when it intended to resume the fight against Soviet Russia.

There were, it is true, still a few last Mohicans left who wanted to take the "peace policy" of social democracy seriously, but they were drawn into a violent dispute about words with the majority of the social democratic leaders. The discussion began when Stamper, in a correspondence article in March 1917, stood up for the consent to the predatory peace of Brest by the Reichstag fraction, on the grounds that the Russians should not draw the conclusion that they were at liberty to begin war afresh. This was said by the same man who, a few weeks later, stated in the "Vorwärts" that, at three decisive moments, German policy had taken a different route from that chosen by social democracy, and who had continued as follows:

"Those three moments were Austria's ultimatum to Serbia, the declaration of the unrestricted submarine war and the conclusion of peace at Brest-Litovsk. That policy which we combated, resulted in the situation in which we are at the present time. There is indeed no other issue from it than one by force. We have been promised that we should be taken along that path to a victorious end, and have been told that the end was near... We are joining in the march, we are contributing to the costs, we are sharing the hopes, but we state that those bear the responsibility for the result who have taken upon themselves the leadership of the State."

We could give further quotations. It suffices to exhibit these "labour leaders", these serfs who, while drunk, boast and swagger over the misdeeds of their masters! A vote was taken on the peace treaty in the social democratic Reichstag fraction. 25 votes were given in favour of accepting the treaty, 29 for abstention from voting, and only 12 for its rejection. Finally, the social-democratic Reichstag fraction decided to abstain from voting. They agreed to the peace with the Ukraine.

(To be continued.)

TO OUR READERS!

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

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 schillings
Norway	1.50 crowns
Sweden	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.

The Business Manager.