

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 9. No. 15

PRESS

22nd March 1929

CORRESPONDENCE

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

CONTENTS

- E. Yaroslavsky: "Mister" Trotzky in the Service of the Bourgeoisie.
L. F. Boross: The Tenth Anniversary of the Proletarian Revolution in Hungary.
- Politics.
Paul Braun: A Turning Point in the Reparations Conference.
- China.
Tang Shin She: War Preparations of the Kuomintang Generals.
- Against Imperialist War.
Workers! Oppose the New War that is Threatening!
G. A. The Transport Workers in the Struggle against War.
- Hands of the Soviet Union.
Albert Norden: The Document Forger Orlov.
- Fascism.
The International Anti-Fascist Congress in Berlin.
A. H.: The Anti-Fascist Conference in Oslo.
- Trade Union Movement.
A. B. Elsbury: Disruptive Policy of Reformist Trade Unions in England.
Resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia on the Textile Workers' Struggle.
- Union of Soviet Republics.
L. F. Winov: The Initiative of the Masses in the Work of Socialist Development.
- In the International.
W. M. Molotov: Achievements and Difficulties of Socialist Construction (Conclusion).
The V. Party Congress of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia.
Arvid Hansen: The Third Party Conference of the C. P. of Norway.
Political Resolution of the Leningrad Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.
- Against the Right Danger.
The C. C. of the C. P. of Poland Unanimously Supports the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. in the Fight against the Right Danger.
- Proletarian Commemoration Days.
L. A.: The Paris Commune and the "Z" Plan.
- In the Camp of our Enemies.
D. Petrovsky: What Would a Lenin Do Today to Save the Russian Revolution?
- Obituary.
Wilhelm Koenen: Wilhelm Bartz.
Fritz Reussner.
- Proletarian Women's Movement.
Phyllis Neal: The March of British Unemployed to London.
- Tenth Anniversary of the Comintern.
Appeal of the R. I. L. U.
- The C. P. of Germany and the International.
The C. P. G., the Rights and the Conciliators. By Comrade Molotov.

"Mister" Trotzky in the Service of the Bourgeoisie.

The First Steps of L. Trotzky Abroad.

By E. Yaroslowski (Moscow).

Since the end of February 1929, the reactionary bourgeoisie has been enriched by a new collaborator in the person of D. Trotzky. In the "Daily Express", the organ of Chamberlain and of the Conservative Party in Great Britain, in the "New York Herald and Tribune", the organs of the American capitalists, in the ultra-Conservative Dutch papers "Algemeen Handelsblad" and "Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant", as also in other reactionary bourgeois papers, served by the American "Consolidated Press" agency, a series of articles by Trotzky recently appeared, which were acquired by the agency for a substantial sum in American money. This has naturally caused triumphant perorations in the bourgeois press, which

could never have expected that in 1929 they would have no less a collaborator than "Mr. Trotzky", as he is described below in his portrait in the "Daily Express" of February 27th, 1929. In their enthusiasm the "Daily Express" and other bourgeois papers publish overwhelming headings, such as "Trotzky's Own Story of his Exile", "Dramatic Revelations by Banished Revolutionary", "Bitter Attacks on Stalin, his Chief Enemy", and so on. Thereupon the "Daily Express" reminds its readers that "the second part of his (Trotzky's) revelations are to be read to-morrow exclusively in our columns".

Yes, the bourgeoisie has reason to be glad. For a time the name of "Mr. Trotzky" will serve as a bait for the love of

sensation on the part of the public which the bourgeois press manages to keep in a state of benighted stupidity. And it is well worth while paying Trotzky a few thousand or even tens of thousands of dollars for the articles in which he libels the Communist Party, the Soviet authorities, and the Communist International.

* * *

Of late years our class enemies have evinced great interest in the fate of Trotzky, the leader of the former "Opposition" and the organiser of an illegal anti-Soviet party. Both the Social Democracy and the bourgeois press have promptly seized upon every invention, every libellous declaration of Trotzky, on all his attacks on the Party, on its leaders, on the Soviet authority, and on the Comintern. His books and articles are prized by bourgeois publishers and bourgeois editors, who are glad to advertise them, seeing that the outward Left veneer of his writings is of no significance compared with their counter-revolutionary contents and in comparison with the objective, counter-revolutionary rôle which these writings have played and still play in the hands of our class-enemies. If a friend of Trotzky the reformist Souvarine, found it possible to write in his organ, "The Proletarian Revolution" that "the Political Bureau is taking the place of the Tsarist Cabinet as the supreme organ of the bureaucracy", why should such an utterance not be repeated by Lord Grey? If in October 1928 Trotzky declared the Soviet Government to be nothing but a "reversed Kerenski regime", why should all the enemies of the Soviet Union not seize upon this simile and why should the Social Democrats not make use of such remarks for the purpose of hoodwinking the petty bourgeois?

On June 13th, 1927, the "Manchester Guardian" stated that "the ideas of the Social Democrats and those of the Communist Opposition were growing more and more alike".

On October 4th, 1926, the Vienna "Arbeiter-Zeitung" remarked that, in contradistinction to the Soviet Government, Trotzky represented the right to opposition and the right to the freedom of speech. Trotzky was fighting against the absolutism of the ruling group. He appeared as the harbinger of a great coming phase which should get the better of the dictatorial monopoly of the ruling group.

In August 1927 the Social Democrat Rosenfeld wrote in the "Populaire", the organ of the French "Socialist", that the Trotzkyites were preparing the overthrow of the Bolshevik dictatorship and its democratic liquidation.

At the time of the most violent attacks of Trotzky and his followers against the Party, the Menshevist Garvy made the following remarks in the "Socialistischer Bote", the organ of Dan and Abramowitsch:

"The Chinese wisdom of Radek will soon be forgotten. But what will constantly be remembered is Trotzky's utterance that 'The most dangerous of all dangers is the Party regime'. The discontented masses will interpret this utterance in their own way and in its broadest sense, viz. 'The most dangerous of all dangers is not the regime of the ruling Party but the regime of the dictatorship.'"

In this chorus the White Guard press also joined, a fact which did not prevent it from time to time from inventing the most fantastic stories as to the fate of Trotzky.

Trotzky's latest article, of October 21st, 1928, was copied by the entire bourgeois press and accompanied by triumphant commentaries. At last Trotzky himself was inciting strikes against the Soviet authority, whereas hitherto such incitements had emanated from the Social Democrats and from democratic bourgeois circles. These papers could not then have imagined that two months later Trotzky himself would figure among their collaborators.

Trotzky's counter-revolutionary incitements and the anti-Soviet activity of the illegal organisation founded by him led to his banishment from the Soviet Union. This measure was approved not only within the Party but also in the ranks of the non-Party workers. The leading article of the "Pravda", in which the central organ of the Party adequately estimated the activity of Trotzky and of his organisation and set forth the reasons why the Soviet Government felt obliged to employ more and

more severe measures against the illegal party of Trotzky—against its organs, met with decided approval not only in the Party but also among the non-Party workers. Both the Party masses and the members of the Party knew how to judge of the latest activity of Trotzky and his followers, and there was still any one who doubted the wisdom of his banishment, such doubts referred only to the question whether Trotzky might not prove much more harmful abroad than he was still within the borders of the Soviet Union. Not a single fact, not a single group of workers, not a single Party nucleus raised an objection to Trotzky's banishment. On the contrary, the measure met with full approbation in all resolutions and declarations.

At the meeting of the "Red Putilov Workers", the Communists joined with the non-Party workers in suggesting to the Government,

"that it continue to employ the severest possible measures against all attempts on the part of the counter-revolutionary Trotzkyites to harm our cause. For Trotzkyism, which presents a pronounced counter-revolutionary group, there is no place in the Soviet Union."

In largely attended assemblies, the workers, seamen, and Red Army soldiers of Sebastopol demanded the employment of rigorous measures against the Trotzkyites.

From Ivanovo-Vosnessensk, Tula, Moscow, and other large industrial centres, numerous resolutions of Party meetings at public workers' assemblies were received, expressing approbation of the measures adopted by the Party and the Government.

The workers of the "Dombal" tramway-workshops at Kiu declared as follows:

"The further development of our economy on the lines of Socialist construction, the task of overcoming the difficulties with which we are faced, and the constant intrigues of the capitalist States surrounding us demand of us the most resolute fight against the counter-revolutionary Trotzkyites, who are undermining the foundations of the Soviet authority."

This is how the workers spoke before Trotzky had begun to write for the reactionary bourgeois press.

What will they say of Mr. Trotzky now that he is using the channels of the reactionary imperialist press of Europe and America for the purpose of attacking the Soviet Union?

* * *

Let us compare with this the attitude expressed in the bourgeois and Social Democratic press in regard to the announcement of Trotzky's banishment. Though there was no absolute uniformity of opinion among them in their estimate of the rôle played by Trotzky, most of the bourgeois and Social Democratic papers agreed in opining that the Trotzky now reappearing in the capitalist world is not the same man as the Trotzky who left in the year 1927. The Trotzky now returning from Russia is a man who will do much to weaken the Soviet Union, and such he was a welcome guest. There were but few papers which did not voice some such opinion.

A record of stupidity was achieved by the reactionary "Stockholm Tidningen", which states in its issue of February 1st that the Moscow power works had declared a strike in consequence of the banishment of Trotzky, that the whole town thus remained without light or power, so that the tram service had to be interrupted, that the troops of the Cheka occupied all the Government buildings, that theatres and other places of amusement had been closed, and that the frequenting of the restaurants had been obliged to hurry home. It had been at 11 at night that with the help of technical troops—students work in the power works could be resumed. This paper went on to say that Zinoviev had been banished to the Caucasus and that Losovsky and certain other leading functionaries of Soviet unions trade unions had resolved to make use of Trotzky for the purpose of organising strikes in the industrial countries of Europe.

We mention this classic example of political cretinism and thoughtless stupidity merely so as to show what sensation

Social Democracy than to strengthen any Communist Party or to waken the Social Democrats in any way."

Besides this, the Austrian Social Democrats arranged a collection for the so-called "Mateotti Fund" in support of the Social Democratic movement, with particular reference to the support of the banished Trotsky.

In the "Leipziger Volkszeitung" of January 30th, the well-known Menshevist Olga Domanevskaya likewise defends Trotsky. She assumes that Trotsky still has remnants of his Communist illusions, symptoms of war-Communism, and the like, but points out that it is not these differences that must be remembered but rather the various points which bring Trotsky nearer to the Social Democrats. This approach, she says, is based mainly on the fact that.

"Trotsky now derives his 'vital' slogans from the programme of the Russian Social Democrats. The Trotskyites are gradually finding the right path. And the sooner they succeed in defending their political attitude down to the smallest detail and in breaking the spell of their old illusions, the sooner will it be possible for all class-conscious political groups within the Russian working class to join together and the greater will be the chances of success for a democratic victory over the Communist Party dictatorship."

This is how the Mensheviks of all shades manage to explain their standpoint in relation to Trotsky and his direction. They welcome Trotsky, who is waging a campaign against the Communist Party, against the Comintern, who is inciting the workers of the Soviet Union to strikes, who derives his "vital slogans from the programme of the Russian Social Democrats", and who is undermining the foundations of the proletarian dictatorship.

How should such a kindred spirit not be welcomed?

This question is answered by the Social Democratic Chemnitz "Volksstimme", in a leading article under the heading of "What is Trotsky Fighting For?"

"The Trotsky Opposition may be ever so convinced that it is able to strengthen the proletarian dictatorship; in reality it too is a pioneer of democracy". The result is the retreat to democracy. That is the decisive thing about Trotsky's suggestion. The Russian people can only win its freedom on the basis of democracy."

The bourgeois press writes in a similar tone. Here the return of Trotsky to Social Democratic traditions meets with the liveliest approbation.

It is obvious that Communist workers must view the eviction of Trotsky in another light.

The "Humanité", the organ of the C. P. of France, expresses its approval of Trotsky's eviction in a leading article of February 21st., under the heading "And Now, if Ever, Unshaken Confidence in the Party of Lenin"; in this article it discusses Trotsky's counter-revolutionary rôle and rightly points out that

"at every important juncture of the revolution, Trotsky opposed the Bolshevik principles with other principles of his own, which threatened to lead the revolution to ruin. Trotsky returns to the camp of his former associates, who hasten to welcome him. Henceforth the international proletariat will know Trotsky merely as the warning example of a man, whose fallacies turned him from a former leader of the revolution into a hope of the counter-revolution."

The Central Committees of the Communist Parties of France, Germany, and certain other countries fully approved of the resolution in regard to the banishment of Trotsky. The unanimous resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. F. contains the following passage:

"The fact that the Social Democrats of all countries protect the exiled Trotsky, in itself suffices to justify the measures adopted against him. The evolution of Trotsky is not surprising. Great as his merits may have been in the service of the Russian revolution and of the Comintern, he cannot claim the least thanks since he has entered the ranks of the counter-revolutionaries. The interests of the world-revolution justify all the severe measures adopted

against its enemies. The C. P. F. welcomes the entrance of many thousands of workers into the ranks of the C. P. F. as being the best possible answer to the common conspiratorial of the international bourgeoisie and of the renegades of Communism. The C. P. F. declares that it is inspired by the determination to fight undeterred against the Trotskyite elements, which in France side openly with the bourgeoisie and calls upon all workers to consolidate the united front against all enemies of the Comintern in defence of the Soviet Union against imperialist menaces."

The "Sunday Worker" closes its article of February 3rd on the subject of Trotsky's eviction with a moral, which all workers, not only those of Great Britain, will do well to remember.

"The lesson for the workers is clear. Not 'great' and meteoric temperaments, but devoted revolutionary fighters, living, thinking, feeling, and expressing the revolt of the masses against capitalist exploitation, are needed. The workers of the Soviet Union are strong enough to do without the 'great'. With a contemptuous gesture they send them where they are appreciated — to capitalist Europe."

The Berlin "Rote Fahne" writes as follows in an article on February 7th, under the heading "Bourgeois Welcome to Trotsky — the Open Arms of the Social Democrats":

"Since the day when we announced the eviction of Trotsky from the Soviet Union, the bourgeois and Social Democratic press have been in a state of constant excitement. Day after day the capitalist papers join in a regular chorus of welcome for the 'victim' of Bolshevist terrorism. There is no greater shame for a former revolutionary, or a former commander of the Red Army, than this friendly-benevolence on the part of the same bourgeoisie which is preparing for a murderous war of intervention against the Soviet Union.

"In the columns of the capitalist press Trotsky can see how low he has sunk. From the mouths of the German employers, bankers, and stock-jobbers he can hear what his counter-revolutionary activity against the Soviet Union has primarily benefited. The Noske party, soiled with the blood of the best fighters of the German revolution, makes Trotsky its declared protégé. In a flood of leading articles it celebrates his former merits on behalf of the Russian revolution. The 'Berliner Tageblatt', the 'Vossische Zeitung', the 'Vorwärts', and the yellow 'Volkswille' join in touching harmony with a view to protecting Trotsky against the 'attacks' of the Communist press.

"Nothing can more effectively dishonour and more painfully stigmatise Trotsky in the eyes of the fighting workers of the world than this very fact. By his anti-Soviet activity he fully and wholly earned his present fate."

* * *

On February 12th, Trotsky arrived at Constantinople. His first step was the following declaration, addressed to Kemal Pacha:

"To His Excellency the President, of the Turkish Republic.

"Before the gates of Constantinople. I have the honour to inform you that it is not by my own free will that I reached the Turkish border and that I cross it merely under the force of compulsion. Deign to accept the expression of my esteem.

"February 12th, 1929.

Trotsky."

On the very same day Trotsky declared in an interview with the chief of police that the reference to compulsion in his letter referred not to the Turkish but to the Soviet authorities.

Trotsky's first step in a capitalist country was thus an accusation against the Soviet Union and an expression of deference to the Turkish President. We are not surprised at that. But what is Trotsky ashamed of quoting this letter in full when publishing it in the "Daily Express" after having previously made the reservation that his aim "is not propaganda but only the

uth"? Is he ashamed that the letter should be read by his artisans? He quotes this letter of his without any reference to the expression of deference it contained, merely thus:

"Sir, I formally declare to you that I am not voluntarily entering your territory, but merely under compulsion."

The truth is therefore a "watered" truth, the thoroughly misleading truth of a renegade.

It is obvious that the agents of the bourgeois press immediately seized upon this bait. The representative of the American "United Press" informed Trotzky that this bourgeois press organisation greatly valued his telegrams in regard to questions of interest to the public in Europe and America. And immediately the bargaining began, the only condition of which was that he was to avoid all revolutionary propaganda and to refuse articles or interviews to other papers during the period of one month. In any case he was from the very beginning offered no less than 5000 dollars for the first articles and was informed that no less an organ than the dirty-yellow "Daily Mail" was anxious to acquire the right of publishing his articles, that the copyright had been sold for a big sum to Scandinavia, and that the Banque Ottomane was ready to place the honorarium for his articles at his disposal. We do not know the details of the arrangement. According to some reports, he was to receive more than 10,000 dollars, according to others even 5,000. That is of no interest to us. When the late Joffe complained of the Party, because he was not allowed to entrust his memoirs to bourgeois publishers for a handsome consideration, that attitude made a sufficiently disgusting impression. True, Joffe wrote this immediately before his death. In the present instance, however, we have a living political corpse, a living renegade bargaining for a price for which he is willing to sell his libels of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party.

The reactionaries know what they are doing. They know why they publish the article of Trotzky. For the sake of his credulous readers he is at liberty to make the reservation: "Before I started writing this article, I demanded the right of full freedom for my utterances. I shall either say what I think or I shall say nothing at all. Every one has the right to ask since when and why the bourgeois imperialist press has become a free tribune or such as profess to be good Leninists. And if this "truth", which appears to-day in the columns of the "Daily Express", the "New York Times", the "New York Herald", the Dutch and other reactionary organs, has been paid for with the gold of the bourgeoisie, every worker will understand that this "truth" is advantageous to the bourgeoisie, as otherwise it would hardly be paid for. Let Trotzky declare that he does not aim at propaganda but solely at the truth. Any one who knows that Trotzky was subjected to the condition of avoiding all revolutionary propaganda will know how to estimate the meaning of his declaration that propaganda is not his aim.

And is it not curious that the British bourgeoisie is willing to pay tens of thousands of dollars for "propaganda" to Trotzky, whereas it organised its breach with the Soviet Union for no other reason than just on account of "propaganda"? Is it not obvious that Mr. Trotzky's sort of propaganda is absolutely different from the sort of propaganda for which Communists have been arrested and shot in all the capitalist countries of Europe and in America?

In reality Trotzky carries on propaganda in his articles against the Soviet Union, against the Communist Party, and against the Communist International. That is why he is being paid by the money-bags of Great Britain and the United States.

The "Daily Express" prefaces the article by a short remark, worded as follows: "An historic document", telling how Trotzky has dramatically broken his 'long silence'."

"He blames bitterly his arch-enemy Stalin", says this note. "He criticises the Soviet's present regime and reveals the secret history of the developments which have led to his being a penniless political outcast."

Poor Mr. Trotzky. How is it possible not to pity this man who is now penniless and obliged to make money out of his political conscience?

There is nothing to be done. He who has engaged to serve new masters must also suffer such reservations, such as Trotzky would not so long ago have attacked in the strongest terms. The "Daily Express" concludes the article with a remark in regard to the G. P. U., which it describes as "the terrorist organisation which succeeded the Cheka". Trotzky himself remarks in parentheses that the G. P. U. is the political police and remarks for the diversion of the bourgeoisie that "my two hounds were visibly agitated when they saw so many strangers in my room" (the strangers in question having been members of the G. P. U.).

Poor hounds, terrorised by the awful appearance of the members of the G. P. U. terrorist organisation. Trotzky has found the way to the hearts of the British lords and ladies who annually ask a blessing on their hounds and get the clergy to sprinkle them with water from the font. How glad they would be to treat his hounds in the same way. But how deeply he must have sunk to wish to humour the bourgeoisie in this way.

We do not wish to argue matters out with Mr. Trotzky. We merely point to the rapidity with which he has found his way back to the fleshpots of his new masters.

The "Daily Express" triumphantly quotes Trotzky to the effect that "the Soviet regime governs the rebellious people by force". How many times Kautsky and his adherents were slapped by Lenin and Trotzky for any such remark and yet how easily the author of "Terrorism and Communism" (a book especially directed against this standpoint) seizes upon this accusation of the Soviet Government before the eyes of the bourgeois public.

This is naturally not propaganda against the Soviet regime. Trotzky "eschews propaganda". His aim is not propaganda but truth. He may be suspected of encouraging the bourgeoisie to attack the Soviet Government. But why should he trouble to do such a thing?

Trotzky declares:

"Our method is that of internal reforms. I take this occasion of telling this to all the world, so that, as far as possible, I may safeguard the interests of the Soviet authority. Great as the difficulties may be which face the Soviet Republics, difficulties arising not only from objective circumstances but also from a fruitless policy of vacillation, all those who believe in a speedy overthrow of the Soviet regime are doomed to bitter disappointment."

I am afraid Mr. Trotzky is guilty of plagiarism at the expense of Mr. Boothby, Churchill's Under-Secretary of State, who recently declared in exactly the same words in the House of Commons that it was hopeless to look for a speedy overthrow of the Soviet regime. In regard to the prospects of the world revolution, which are based on the Soviet regime, Trotzky and Boothby are therefore of one mind. And if Trotzky's "Communism" does not go beyond the assertion of the Conservative Under-Secretary of State, is it not obvious that Trotzky and Boothby are also completely at one in regard to the fact that an overthrow of the Soviet regime, though not to be expected soon, may nevertheless be relied upon eventually to ensue? Is that not so, Mr. Trotzky?

To-day it is already apparent to what Mr. Trotzky's "propaganda" really amounts.

And it is equally apparent why the bourgeoisie was so willing to pay him ten thousand dollars.

The Tenth Anniversary of the Proletarian Revolution in Hungary

By Ladislaus F. Boross.

On 21st of March, 1919, the international proletariat, whose first victorious advance guard, the Soviet Power of the Russian proletariat, was engaged in severe and desperate struggles for its existence, received a new and powerful reinforcement. The proletarian revolution captured an important stronghold in the heart of Europe. Taught by the experiences of the bourgeois-social democratic coalition regime, with unshakable faith in international proletarian solidarity, the Hungarian proletariat seized power after five months of struggle conducted by the Communist Party against the bourgeoisie and the social traitors.

The Hungarian Soviet power immediately proceeded to the rapid realisation of its socialist programme. Its main slogan was: The factory for the worker, the land to the toiling people! The very first decrees provided for the uncompensated expropriation and nationalisation of the banks, of all factories and works employing more than 20 workers and also the expropriation, also without compensation, of the large landed estates. It secured to the workers the eight-hour day, to the young workers the six-hour day. The Soviet power resorted to far-reaching measures for socialising the land in the form of State farms and productive co-operatives. It later entirely exempted from taxation all peasant farms comprising less than 100 acres of land.

In place of the completely disintegrated and demoralised "people's army" of the bourgeois Republic there was set up in a few weeks a Red Army whose fights against the much better equipped and numerically superior armies of the Czech and Roumanian bourgeoisie are worthy to rank in heroism and fighting enthusiasm with the military struggles of the Russian proletariat against the counter-revolution and intervention.

The Soviet Republic abolished all the remnants of feudalism and all bourgeois privileges. It shattered the bourgeois State apparatus. It set up the power of the councils of workers, soldiers and poor peasants deputies. It confiscated the houses of the bourgeoisie and handed them over to the proletarians. In Budapest alone it housed 40,000 proletarians in the former residences of the bourgeoisie. It did away with the scandalous contrast between wealth and poverty by expropriating the bourgeoisie and by the decree that the salaries of the highest State officials should not exceed the highest pay of a skilled industrial worker and that the owners of the private banking accounts which have not been confiscated must not withdraw more than 2000 crowns a month (less than the highest wage of the worker).

In the sphere of culture the Soviet Power completely carried out the separation of the Church from the State and confiscated the Church lands. It made tremendous efforts in order that the proletariat should acquire as rapidly as possible that knowledge which had been withheld from them by the bourgeoisie. An example: For the purposes of vocational training and free instruction of the proletarian youth, two entire departments of the People's Commissary for popular education were placed at their disposal. In the palaces and parks of the nobility and of the financial aristocracy splendidly equipped convalescent homes for proletarian children were established. The Soviet Power endeavoured to spread the influence of proletarian ideology to the whole sphere of culture and art.

Bourgeois class justice was replaced by the revolutionary tribunal of the ruling proletariat. A special organisation was founded for combating the counter-revolution. All the laws of the bourgeois State were abolished; there commenced an eager theoretical and practical work in order to codify in a uniform system the class law of the victorious working class.

The foreign policy of the Hungarian Federated Socialist Soviet Republic was based upon the principle of alliance with the Russian Soviet power, of confidence in the coming support of the international proletariat and of a life and death struggle against imperialism.

The entire working class of Hungary greeted with enthusiasm and pride the socialist measures of the Soviet Power. With enthusiasm the proletariat of the big Budapest factories crushed the counter-revolutionary putsch of June 24th.

Less enthusiasm was aroused among the peasantry and the poor rural population by the agricultural policy of the Soviet government. They expected from the revolutionary power the

satisfaction of their land-hunger. The Hungarian Soviet Republic, however, was not sufficiently elastic in its policy in order according to the example of Lenin and the Russian Soviet Power, to divide the big landed estates among the poor rural population and thereby win them as allies in maintaining the Soviet Power. The Soviet Power, and above all the Red Army which consisted for the greater part of peasants, thereby lost a powerful support. Whilst Russian Bolshevism showed the international proletariat how a correct policy towards the peasants can help the proletarian revolution to surmount many dangerous difficulties, the experience of the Hungarian revolution showed that a bad peasant policy which — even if unintentionally — in many respects reminded one of the Trotskyist theory of the "hostile collision between the proletariat and the peasantry after the seizure of power", can become fatal for the proletarian revolution.

The Hungarian proletariat fought its courageous fight for the capture of power under the purposeful leadership of a united Communist Party. It proved possible to capture power without bloodshed because the daily increasing pressure of the working class and the inner and foreign political impasse in which the coalition government had arrived, simply compelled the social democratic party leadership to give way to the demands of the Communist Party. Dazzled by its easy victory over the social democracy, the C. P. of Hungary surrendered its independence and agreed to amalgamate with the social democracy on the basis of the Communist programme, and allowed some of the social democratic leaders to occupy important positions. The reformists made use of this "unity" in order at the first difficulty to stab the revolution in the back. They made use of the food difficulties of the proletarian revolution for the purpose of an agitation against the Soviet Power and for disintegrating the Red Army, and of the foreign political difficulties of the revolution for the purpose of a treacherous collaboration with the diplomats and general staffs of the Entente powers.

The error of the Hungarian Communist Party, which is also reminiscent of Trotskyism in regarding the Party as a rallying point for various groups and fractions, showed how fatal the failure to realise the role of the Communist Party as the only leader of the revolution and the role of the social democracy as the incorrigible auxiliary troops of the bourgeoisie can be for the revolution. This fault was partly due to the fact that the C. P. of Hungary was a young Party which had no traditions like those of the Russian Bolsheviks. It must, however, be stated that a part of the Communists, headed by Comrade Otto Korvin, who was later murdered by the White terror, soon perceived these failures and undertook steps for the revival of the old Communist Party. Parallel with this there was a movement on foot under the leadership of Comrade Bela Kun for creating a Communist Mass Party on a new basis, before all by winning the revolutionary elements of the trade unions.

It was, however, already too late. The most shameful act of treachery which the social democracy has ever committed gave the finishing stroke to the proletarian dictatorship already weakened by the objective difficulties and the results of its own errors mentioned above. After an attempt on the part of the social democracy, lasting five days, to restore a capitalist exploiting democracy, counter-revolution triumphed in its most blatant form. The bourgeoisie took a bloody revenge. Many hundreds of the best champions of the proletariat were cruelly murdered, tens of thousands were imprisoned for years. There is hardly a single workers family in Hungary of which at least one member has not been in the dungeons of Horthy. The social democracy sealed its treachery by actively supporting the white terror. Two social democrats were members of that government which caused Comrades Korvin, László, Kohn-Kerekes and other martyrs of the proletarian revolution to be murdered.

The international proletariat has drawn important lessons from the mistakes of the Hungarian Soviet Republic; these lessons are laid down in the theses of the II. World Congress

of the Communist International on the role of the Party and on the peasant question. The tradition of the glorious struggles and of the magnificent achievements of the Soviet Republic for the Hungarian proletariat and for the rest of the toiling population, its achievements in the interest of the international working class, and above all in the interest of the Russian Soviet Power, form a highly revolutionising factor in the present and future struggles of the working class. This tradition increases the revolutionary courage and the will of the Hungarian proletariat to fight for the second Hungarian Soviet Republic; it increases its sympathies for its revolutionary leader, for the Communist Party of Hungary which is today forced into complete illegality under the double persecution of the bourgeoisie and of the social democracy.

POLITICS

A Turning Point in the Reparations Conference.

By Paul Braun (Berlin).

To judge by the more or less pessimistic reports in the bourgeois press on either side, the Paris Reparations negotiations appear to have come to a standstill. A number of papers, including the generally well-informed Paris "Matin", speak of a "crisis" of the Conference and of the possibility of the discussions being adjourned without any result having been attained. Sauerwein, the semi-official confidant of the Paris Foreign Office and correspondent of the "Matin", is of opinion that the experts should be sent home and that a conference of responsible representatives of the interested (!) Governments should be convoked for the end of April, by which means the aim in view would be sooner attained.

The attitude of Sauerwein, even should his remarks be nothing but a feeler on the part of the French, is particularly interesting. It shows most clearly that the Reparations question is not a problem of payments but an eminently political question, which brings up all the important problems of international politics, that of the European bloc against the Soviet Union, the problem of the Anglo-American antagonism, and that of the general crisis of world-capitalism, so that it itself becomes both a result and a reason of imperialist hostilities.

The development of the Paris Conference to date has revealed the political contents of the Reparations negotiations with surprising clarity. While the first phase of the negotiations still showed a united front of the creditors towards Germany, the imperialist differences collided all the more violently in the second phase, when the discussions passed from the stage of generalities to the treatment of the actual agenda.

The dramatic sequence of the different concrete plans, which in spite of all official secrecy have come to light from out of the darkness of the secret discussions of the Commissions, not only shows up all the differences in the international situation but also the growing crisis of the whole capitalist system.

The Anglo-American duel was opened by the British. The draft submitted to the plenary session of the Conference on February 26th suggests the division of the German annual payments into two parts, one of them to continue to be protected by the transfer clause and another in regard to which this clause is no longer to obtain. This gives in the second instance the possibility of a mobilisation, i. e. the transformation from a reme into a distribution of capital. The important point, however, is that the first-named section is to be used immediately for the payment of Allied war debts to America, being transferred to the American war-debt creditors by a special organ to be newly established in the place of the General Agency and acting in the name of the Allies.

This English suggestion, the acceptance and realisation of which would not only against the will of America, link the question of indebtedness with that of Reparations but would also revive the old English plan of a bloc of European debtors, with Germany as general debtor in their midst, opposed to the United States, was answered by an altogether gigantic counter-suggestion on the part of the American delegation.

On March 6th, the American delegation in Paris put forward the idea of a Reparations Bank, to be established in some "neutral" country, with the object not only of accepting the

German payments in the character of a trustee and of distributing them to the Reparations creditors, but also of financing the deliveries in kind and taking over the mobilisation loans, at the same time having the right to pass on to third States at its own discretion any such deliveries in kind as are refused by the Reparations creditors for reasons of competition.

The tremendous significance of this gigantic project is immediately obvious. The Reparations Bank, which from the very outset would be under the control of American financial capital with its enormous resources, is to serve American imperialism as a jumping-off board for its leap into the world market for which it has already prepared, as a means of immensely increasing the competitive struggle against its British rival and gaining the unrestricted predominance on the international money market and the decisive influence on the international capital and credit movement.

It is apparent that this plan could but meet with energetic resistance in London and Paris. The French and British press is loud in its protests against the suggestion of Morgan, at the same time vehemently attacking the whole system of deliveries in kind. The "Temps" and the "Matin", obviously inspired by official quarters, are already formulating the conditions on which France and England would give their consent to the founding of a clearing-bank for Reparations. By a composition of the Board of the prospective bank "in keeping with the interests of the Powers concerned", certain "guarantees" are to be provided for the Reparations creditors, while the Reparations Bank is before all to act as an equalising factor between Reparations and war-indebtedness. This practically throws the American project overboard and revives the original British suggestion.

The Anglo-American struggle for the political and economic hegemony is in full swing and seriously endangers even a provisional and partial success of the Reparations negotiations.

Under such circumstances a tangible forecast of the immediate prospects of the Paris Conference is impossible and vain. Two things, however, have been proved beyond doubt by the development to date of the negotiations and by their echo in the press of the German trusts ("Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung", "Kölnische Zeitung"), viz. that in the Reparations bargain the German imperialists are consciously and systematically pursuing the aim of joining the Anglo-French bloc at any price and that they have completely triumphed over the original speculation of certain circles of German financial capitalism in regard to a possible support by America in the way of an action by Morgan (who by supporting the French thesis of the proved paying ability of Germany is serving not only his own financial-capitalist interests as a supporter of the stability of the franc but also the general imperialist interests of the United States).

The American attempt to loosen the Anglo-French front has hitherto had the opposite effect. The Entente is more closely allied than ever and the altogether provocative frankness with which an important part of the German trust-press has turned against America permits of the conclusion that considerable progress has already been made in regard to the inclusion of Germany in the Franco-British anti-Soviet front.

CHINA

War Preparations of the Kuomintang Generals.

By Tang Shin She.

Whenever the imperialists have wished to make use of the Chinese bourgeoisie against the workers and peasants, they have represented the stinkingly rotten Kuomintang as being an Asiatic perfume and maintained that it is a united body and that the Nanking Government is a central government. The most ridiculous assertions in this respect have been made by the representative of the "Berlin Tageblatt", who, after making a journey through China, maintains that the pen has vanquished the sword.

Now, after the conflict between the Americans on the one side and the English and the Japanese on the other has become obvious, their agencies are spreading reports that the

Kuomintang Generals are at loggerheads and that a war will break out before long between Chang Kai-shek and the Kwangsi clique. This is the Anglo-Japanese reception-music for the American finance commission which has just come to China.

The Japanese "Nippon Tempo" and the English "North China Times" are now publishing reports every day regarding the movement of Chiang Kai-shek's troops to the provinces of Anhwei and Kiangsi and of the troops of the Kwangsi group to the Peking-Hankow railway line. It is further reported that Feng Yu Hsiang and Yen Shi San wish to remain neutral; that the ruler of Mukden, Chang Hsü Liang, has sent his troops to north Chili and rejected Chang Kai-shek's request to send his fleet to Shantung to suppress the rebellion of Chang Tsang Chang. This approaching war is, therefore, no longer a local affair, as in the provinces of Szechwan, Kweichow, Shantung, Honan etc., but will be another civil war on a national scale, which will lead to the complete dissolution of the so-called central government of Nanking.

An armed struggle of a local character has been proceeding between Chang Kai-shek and the Kwangsi group since the end of last year. Thus Chang Kai-shek organised the fight of the oppositional Generals of Kweichow and Szechwan against the Kwangsi Generals who are ruling these two provinces. The Kwangsi Generals have moved their allied troops, who were in Honan, where they were opposing Feng Yu Hsiang, to Anhwei — Chang Kai-shek's territory. Without asking the Nanking Government, they have even removed the president of the Hunan Provincial Government, General Lu, and set up one of their own Generals in his place. This was the first affront to the prestige of the Nanking Government since the latter's existence. The same Generals are now threatening the province of Kiangsi. Poor Chang Kai-shek, the spokesman of the bourgeoisie, has not only suffered a defeat at the disarmament conference, but his territory is now threatened by the feudal militarists. The chief leader of the Kwangsi group, General Pen-Tsung she, by his "sickness" and his consequent withdrawal from the disarmament Conference, dealt the main blow against Chiang Kai-shek, and in addition extorted money from the latter in order to carry on war against him.

Feng Yu Hsiang was recently the ally of Chiang Kai-shek against the Kwangsi group. Although he had been in Nanking for a long time, he was unable to obtain sufficient advantages, so that after the disarmament Conference he settled matters with Chiang Kai-shek. We learn from reliable sources that Feng Yu Hsiang, after the farcical conference, made the following proposal to Chiang Kai-shek: "In order really to strengthen the government, Comrade Li Dji Chin shall take over the control department of the Government, Comrade Yen Shi San the examination department, and I shall take over the administration department". This means that Feng Yu Hsiang wished to transform the Nanking government into a military directory under his leadership and that Chiang Kai-shek should be only a puppet. The latter, however, flatly rejected this proposal. Feng Yu Hsiang therefore demonstratively left Nanking, which action naturally served to encourage the Kwangsi generals. It is highly probable that the astute Feng Yu Hsiang will be neutral in the war between the Kwangsi group and Chiang Kai-shek.

Owing to the lying reports of the Kuomintang and of the imperialists, the impression has been created in many quarters that the execution of Yeng Yü Ting was carried out for the benefit of the Nanking government and represents a disservice to the Japanese. The calm prevailing in Manchuria, which is under the domination of the Japanese, is in itself a denial of this rumour. The activity of Chang Tsung Chang in Shantung and the conference between the Anfu, Wu Pei-fu, Sun Chuan Fang and Chen Shui Min groups etc. bear witness to the positive work of the Japanese. Chang Hsü Liang's refusal to employ his fleet, which is at present stationed off the coast of Shantung, to suppress Chang Tsung Chang in Shantung is a further proof of this hostility towards the Nanking government.

The rest of the troops of Chang Tsung Chang and Chen Shui Min on both sides of the Tchechow-Tsinan railway line in East Shantung, number in all 50,000 men. By means of supplies of weapons and money by the Japanese this strong army is in a position at any moment to attack Shanghai, Nanking and the Tientsin-Pukow line. It is only a question of when Japan will consider the time for this action to have come.

The approaching civil war in China means a fight of the British and Japanese against the Americans. Chang Hsü Liang, the son of Chang Tso lin, is nothing else but a tool of the Japanese. The Kwangsi group is the common property of the British and the Japanese. In addition they have united all their old friends, such as Wu-peï-Fu, Tuan She Sui etc. against the Nanking government. China will, therefore, be again split up and the old feudal militarists will again obtain domination over the country. The power of the treacherous bourgeoisie will be at an end. The salvation of the country can be achieved only by the completion of the revolution by the workers and the poor peasants. The present urgent task of the Communist Party, therefore is, that of capturing the masses.

* * *

Moscow, 14th March, 1929.

According to a report from Shanghai, Li Tchung-she, the Chairman of the Wuhan Political Council and holder of a number of other important posts in the Kuomintang, has resigned. In his letter of resignation he points out that not one of the numerous plans for the reconstruction of China has been carried out as everyone is "much too occupied with political combinations". He also points out that before the recent discussion of the military leaders it had been very difficult to maintain peace, and that the Nanking government dissatisfied with the reorganisation in the province of Hunan where the supporters of Chiang Kai-shek were turned out of the Hunan government by the Kwangsi leaders, carried out a mobilisation and concentration of troops, whereby the sum set aside for mobilisation purposes was expended.

Chiang Kai-shek has answered this attack with a sharp letter to Li Tchung-shen. The reply declares that the situation in the province of Hunan where Li Tchung-shen's orders were not carried out, had developed to such a pass that a mobilisation by the Nanking government had been absolutely necessary. The Nanking government would not lightly declare war, however, it would not permit the local authorities to rule on their own and ignore the central power, for the dignity of the national government had to be upheld.

According to the "North China Daily News", the news of the resignation of Li Tchung-shen has made a deep impression upon Chinese circles in Shanghai, as this is considered as a sign of a coming war between the Kwangsi group and Chiang Kai-shek.

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

Workers! Oppose the New War that is Threatening!

The following appeal has been addressed to the working class by the Communist Parties of Belgium, Holland, France, Great Britain and Germany.

The revelations regarding the existence of a Franco-Belgian secret military agreement characterise in the most striking manner the secret activity carried on by the governments of the capitalist countries in preparation for the next imperialist war.

The official denial, the public declarations of the leaders of the governments and their diplomats will not alter anything; and the working masses, who only want peace, must not be deceived by them.

The joint action of the French, Belgian and British armies envisaged and laid down by the secret military agreements (Franco-British naval agreement, Franco-Belgian military agreement) and the employment of the armies and the war material of these three countries for common action against an eventual enemy, are only episodes in the regrouping which is taking place among the capitalist countries in face of the great and bloody conflicts which are being prepared.

Thus at the moment when the capitalist governments are making use of an unbounded pacifist demagoguery, when they vie with each other in their asseverations of their "desire for peace" and sign the Kellogg Pact, secret military agreements in preparation for war are concluded between the general-staffs in the name of these same governments.

Just as the secret naval agreement between France and Great Britain is directed against the Soviet Union, so also the Franco-Belgian military agreement is directed not solely against Germany, but aims, by exerting pressure upon Germany, at enrolling this State in the imperialist bloc of the world powers against the first proletarian State, against the Soviet Union, whose proposals of a general, simultaneous and immediate disarmament were rejected by the capitalist governments.

In the feverish armament competition of the capitalist countries, in the defence of the bourgeois "native countries", the social democracy of all countries prove themselves to be the most reliable and faithful allies of imperialism.

The Belgian social democracy was the first to take up the defence of "its" government in order to cloak the secret military agreement.

Caught red-handed the responsible governments are resorting to denials, just as they did on the occasion of the Franco-British naval agreement. Their denials and their pacifist protests will not serve to deceive the working class of Belgium, France and Great Britain.

But the "indignant" protests of the capitalist governments of Holland and Germany, who on their side are concluding or attempting to conclude military alliances, will succeed just as little in deceiving the working classes of Holland and Germany.

The Franco-British naval agreement and the Franco-Belgian military agreement are by no means the only treaties concluded among the capitalist powers. In the present period the immediate danger of war is expressed by the feverish armaments competition of the imperialist rivals and by the conclusion of alliances securing them a maximum of favourable prospects in the approaching conflicts.

All these agreements, all these alliances, all these so-called peace-treaties are directed against the first proletarian State, against the Soviet Union which the imperialists wish to crush.

The creation of the anti-Soviet bloc is advancing every day. The pursuing the aim of which is now being held in antagonisms among the imperialist rivals and enrolling Germany in the capitalist united front which is to conduct the war against the Soviet Union.

The Communist Parties of Belgium, Holland, France, Great Britain and Germany warn the workers of their countries.

The Communist Parties call upon the workers to take joint action against and to declare ruthless war on the imperialist robbers who, in the secrecy of the Chancelleries, are preparing the slaughter of the masses of workers for the profit of imperialism.

Against the machinations of the General Staffs who are organising war!

For the defence of the threatened Soviet Union! Gather round your class parties, around your Communist Parties, which alone are capable of leading the workers in the struggle!

Down with bourgeois militarism!

Down with the imperialists and their social democratic allies!

Long live the unity and the action of the proletariat against capitalism, for the defence of the Soviet Union! Long live the triumph of the proletarian revolution!

The Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Belgium, Holland, France, Great Britain and Germany.

The Transport Workers in the Struggle against War.

By G. A.

The imperialists of Great Britain, France and the United States, Japan and Italy did not discuss disarmament at their conferences to limit naval armament, but the tonnage and construction of the cruisers to be built in future, e. g. ships which will play a predominant role in future naval warfare.

Hiram Johnson, an influential United States senator declared at the end of January in the United States Senate that America must have a big navy for the defence of the dominant position of the United States in the sphere of trade. He

said that we are not very far off from a new world drama. That drama will be played on the Pacific Ocean. The United States is a naval power whose trade exceeds that of the whole of Europe lying West of Russia. America's foreign trade is more than 10 billion dollars a year. This necessitates a commercial fleet which in its turn needs a military navy for its protection.

Hiram Johnson's words are confirmed by the measures taken by the United States government to intensify the construction of ships, the subsidy of new shipbuilding to the extent of two-thirds of its cost if the ships belong to American citizens.

In 1928, America commenced to enforce the law of 1925 to put people on the commercial boats who have gone through a course of naval training.

Great Britain, in accordance with the law on the naval reserve, spends over £ 250,000 annually for the upkeep of officers and men in the naval reserve. Eighty-five per cent. of the officers on the Cunard Line are taken from the Royal Naval Reserve. Both in the United States and in Great Britain, as well as in the other imperialist countries, the governments are taking steps to prepare the commercial fleet for war purposes. In Great Britain and other countries new fast-passenger boats are being built with additional armour and facilities for naval artillery so that in case of war they may be easily converted into cruisers and auxiliary battleships.

The old seamen of the commercial fleets of all countries well remember the imperialist war of 1914—18 when they were driven to death in the seas by the thousands by Havelock Wilson, Rivelli, Fureseth and many other reformist leaders of seamen's unions in the interests of their bourgeoisie. The English Channel was turned into a forest of masts of sunken commercial boats. About 30,000 seamen thus lost their lives during the war. The imperialists are preparing the same fate to a much larger extent for the seamen of all countries in the coming wars.

During the imperialist intervention in China, the crushing of the uprisings in North and Central Africa, Syria, Nicaragua and other countries the reformists helped their bourgeois governments. The German revolutionary seamen and transport workers in 1926—27 declared a boycott of military shipments from German ports and thus prevented the supply of arms to the counter-revolutionary Chinese militarists from German ports. The British and French revolutionary transport workers carried on campaigns but they could not stop the shipment of troops and ammunition. That must be remembered in the future.

The capitalists pay much attention to all forms of transportation in their preparation for war. In rationalising and introducing machinery in the transportation system, the capitalists get rid of those people who are opposed to war, i. e. Communists and conscious opponents of war in general.

According to the Dawes Plan, over 350,000 railwaymen were laid off on the German railways as a result of rationalisation with the passive assistance of the reformists.

In the United States 200,000 railroad men have been laid off due to rationalisation in the course of 1924—29.

In Great Britain there is also a constant cutting of the railroad staff.

Japan has excelled the United States and Germany in rationalising the repair of engines. Whereas in the United States and Germany the time limit of the re-building of an engine has been reduced from 60 to 20 days, in Japan it has been brought down to 6.

In the commercial fleet rationalisation also leads to a great diminution of labour power and especially firemen who are the chief motive labour power on the boats. Instead of coal, coal dust is used like oil, many boats use oil and lately, boats are built with internal combustion engines, and firemen are entirely dispensed with.

Huge boats up to 9,000 tons are now being tested of a combined internal combustion and electrical type which can be run from the captains bridge by one man. The working of the helm is being rationalised and there is no man needed to control it.

All these measures greatly reduce the number of men on the boats — a cut of about 30—50%.

Automobile traffic is also of great importance in war and rationalisation is being done also in this sphere. The capacity of auto engines is raised to 15 tons instead of 4 or 6, which also reduces the need for labour power.

Apart from rationalisation the railways dismiss all Communists. In **Czecho-Slovakia**, for instance, this happens on the North Eastern and other railways of strategic importance in case of a Polish and Roumanian war against the U.S.S.R.

The loading and unloading of boats is also being greatly rationalised and the ports are gradually becoming working automats with a minimum number of men and the number of dock workers has in recent years been reduced by 50 and even 75%.

Extensive ideological work is being carried on among the transport workers by the reformists and the fascists. In **Poland** railwaymen are compelled to join the fascist "Strelak" organisation which is headed by Pilsudski. That organisation gives its members a military training even in working hours.

The imperialists are preparing the Yugoslavian and Greek ports for war against the U.S.S.R. so that troops could be shipped through them to Roumania and Poland.

Aviation is even still more being prepared for war than the other forms of transport. The end of 1928 an aviation Ministry was established in **France** which has charge also of civil aviation. In **Great Britain** the government instructed the municipalities to build special aerodromes and is negotiating with the French Government for the construction of similar aerodromes in North **France**.

The Polish Government is also busily preparing its air forces for war. The Ministry for Communications, together with the War Ministry and the League of Air Defence have worked out a common plan of construction of aerodromes.

Such aerodromes already exist in **Warsaw, Krakow, Posen, Lvov, Lodz and Katowic**. They have hangars — wharves and shops.

The capitalists well remember 1920 when the transport workers together with the other workers opposed imperialist intervention in the U.S.S.R. and when committees of action were organised in many countries. That is why they are trying to reduce the number of workers to a minimum in rationalising the transportation system. But the Social Democrats favour capitalist rationalisation and create public opinion in favour of war. In **Great Britain** their motto is "Industrial peace" and in **Germany** "Industrial democracy". Just as in 1917, they are telling the workers that they must defend their bourgeois fatherland. The Social Democrats support the fascist organisations against the Communists. They support the steel helmet in **Germany**, the Strelak in **Poland**, the National Defence organisation in **Austria**, etc.

The social-democratic and reformist leaders of the various transport workers' unions and the general council of the International Transport Workers' Federation are in an alliance with the imperialists.

In the struggle against war and against preparations for war, the transport workers hold the most decisive strategic positions. We must see the difference between work for peace in order to avoid war and the pacifist idea of struggle against the war danger and against actual war. We must be always ready to apply militant tactics to prevent the preparations for capitalist wars. We must not wait for the actual "declaration" of war as a signal of open hostilities because as a matter of fact war has never stopped since the imperialist war which ended in 1918. Transportation of war material for the imperialist attack on the workers, the colonial and semi-colonial peoples and the U. S. S. R. must be prevented at all costs. Each category of transport workers must be so organised as to have close contact with the other categories as well the workers of the war industries. We must create vigilance organisations which would actively co-operate in this direction so that war material of the capitalist states should by no means reach their points of destination.

All revolutionary minorities and revolutionary unions must carry on intensive propaganda and agitation in their organisations and inform their members on the war danger preparing them for an active struggle against the imperialist war preparations.

We must begin with the systematic organisation of control committees on all railroads, ports, boats, etc., to watch the shipments of ammunition and troops.

In order to prepare the masses of transport workers for a struggle against war, not only correct slogans are necessary, but methods of drawing them into the actual struggle against the imperialist war danger or an attack on the U.S.S.R. must be worked out. Thus, for example, every revolutionary trans-

port worker must inform the control committees and councils of action concerning the shipment of ammunition, etc.

We must remember what Lenin said to Bukharin, Zinoviev and Molotov on February 4, 1922 on the question of struggle against war at the International Metal Workers' Congress. Lenin said: "The means of struggle are not strikes against war, but the formation of revolutionary nuclei in the belligerent armies, their preparation for the accomplishment of the revolution."

HANDS OFF THE SOVIET UNION

The Document Forger Orlov.

By Albert Norden (Berlin).

On March 2nd **Vladimir Orlov**, formerly tsarist Public Prosecutor and examining judge at the Ochrana, was arrested in **Berlin**. Hundreds of false passports, stamps and other apparatus for the making up of documents were confiscated on his premises. The arrest was made at the instigation of the Government of the United States, whose agents had clearly proved that nobody else but Orlov had fabricated a number of documents, by means of which it was "proved" that the United States senators **Borah** and **Norris** had accepted bribes from the Soviet Government amounting to \$ 100,000 each.

Immediately after the arrest the reproach was made in public that Orlov and his supporters were working closely with the spies of the German authorities, although the latter knew about Orlov's crimes, and that this former Tsarist hangman was not proceeded against, because he denounced to the German Government legal and illegal foreign revolutionaries and handed them over to their enemies.

It took a whole week to get the notorious Social-Democratic Chief of Police **Zoergiebel** to open his mouth. He did not deny that Orlov had rendered well paid spying service to the German authorities, but maintained that it was only a few months since Orlov fell under suspicion.

That is an impudent lie. In reality Communist papers and brochures made it clear as early as 1920 that **Vladimir Orlov** was a prominent personality in the world of White-Guardist document forgers. He is a man of absolute steadfastness of purpose. Under the Tsarist reign of terror he brought dozens of Russian revolutionaries to the gallows, and during the war he was chief of counter-espionage in the Caucasus army of Grand Duke **Nikolai Nikolayevitch**. When the Soviets were victorious he naturally went over immediately to the Whites and played an important part in the armies of **Wrangel** and **Denikin**. When the war of intervention came to a close he continued his anti-bolshevistic activity first in **Paris** and then in **Berlin**.

In the course of the espionage trial held in **Moscow** three years ago Captain **Elvengreen** admitted that he had prepared, together with **Boris Savinkov** and Captain **Sidney Reiley**, agents of the British secret service, attempts upon the lives of the delegation from the Soviet Union to the Genoa Conference and upon important Bolshevist leaders. The discussions took place in Orlov's house. Orlov provided the revolvers, photographs of **Bukharin**, **Chicherin** and **Krassin**, as also a number of false passports.

This startling evidence went the round of the Press of the whole world at the time and was read by the Social-Democratic Ministers **Severing** and **Grzesinski**, and also by their party associate Chief of Police **Zoergiebel**. But this did not prevent them from maintaining their intimate relations with the assassin and forger, Orlov, who was rendering them such important service in the fight against the Labour movement. In fact they even refused after Orlov's arrest to bring a criminal charge against him, because they feared the disclosures that might be made at the trial, and it was necessary for the Soviet Union legation, supported by fresh disclosures made daily by the "Rote Fahne" (Red Flag), to intervene to get criminal proceedings started.

It is hardly necessary to say that the proper investigation of the case is not to be thought of so long as the matter remains in the hands of men who are Orlov's accomplices. For instance, **Zoergiebel** has not the least intention of arresting the man who gave Orlov most of his commissions, the notorious Tsarist lieutenant-colonel **Gumanski**. This young man, who

sold to the Government of Bulgaria and Poland documents which he had himself fabricated for the purpose of compromising the Communist International, undertook spying work against Germany, and is, at the same time, intimate of Oberregierungsrat Muehleisen, the German prince of spies, must have a very long score with the Berlin police. Although the most remarkable of forgeries were found on his premises although he is the organizer of active contra-revolutionary emigrant organisations, such as the Aubert League, although everybody knows that in conjunction with Orlov he concocted the ominous "Zinoviev letter", he is still at liberty. His chief protection is his acquaintanceship with the Secretary of State, Weismann, the representative of the Prussian coalition government in the Reichstag, the same Weismann who in the year 1921 made the proposal to set up espionage offices in Moscow and Leningrad.

It will be seen that the Orlov-Gumanski case is a new proof of the close alliance existing between the European governments; in this case particularly between the German Government and its Social-Democratic Chief of Police, on the one hand, and the emigrant pack who shrink at no forgery, no crime and no murder in order to overthrow the Soviet Power and to hoist the flag of some White Guardist scoundrel on the Kremlin.

FASCISM

The International Anti-Fascist Congress in Berlin.

(The following has been already sent to the Press.)

The International Anti-Fascist Congress was opened at 10 a. m. on Saturday, 9th March in the great hall of the Berlin Trade Union House. Delegations from numerous countries were present. The four delegates from the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions were unable to be present because the German consular representatives in Moscow had refused to grant them visas. The German consular representatives in Belgium also refused to grant visas to the Belgian delegation.

The composition of the congress is as follows: From Germany 70 delegates are present, from France 34, from Great Britain 12, from Czechoslovakia 20, from Austria 11, from Poland 6, from Norway 14, from Sweden 3, from Denmark 5, from Switzerland 9, from Lithuania and Latvia one each, from Spain 7, from Italy 19, from Hungary 3, from Rumania and Bulgaria four each, from Yugoslavia 3. The national minorities in the Balkans are represented by 6 delegates. The various groups are strongly represented at the congress, thus there are 30 peasants' delegates, 22 delegates of the youth, 17 delegates of the national minorities and 7 delegates of the war invalids.

A number of well-known personalities participate in the congress. Michael Karolyi, the former Prime Minister of the Hungarian republic, Fan Noli, ex-Prime Minister of Albania, Guido Miglioli, former deputy of the Catholic People's Party in the Italian Chamber, Ledebour, Paquet, Theodor Lessing, and various members of the Polish, Swiss, German, Czechoslovakian and other parliaments.

After a short opening speech by Henri Barbusse, the following presidium was unanimously elected: Barbusse, Snook (leader of the British Workers Legion), Heinrich Bittner (member of the Polish Sejm), Michael Karolyi, Guido Miglioli, Muenzenberg, Heckert, Stassova (Soviet Union), Yevreinov (Soviet Labour Unions), Landova-Stychova (member of the Czechoslovakian parliament), Alfons Paquet (author, Germany), Fan Noli, Martelli (France, Peasant Leagues), Folli (Italy, youth organisation).

The Rumanian delegation proposed the election of a number of well-known victims of Fascism, White terror and class justice in various countries as honorary members of the presidium. The idea was enthusiastically adopted and the following comrades were elected: Terracini, Gramsci (Italy), Mathias Rakosi (Hungaria), Buvor, Stefanov and Dobrogheanu-Gherea (Rumania), André Marty, Carotti (France), Rudolf Margies (Germany), Hofmaier (Switzerland) who was only some days ago sentenced to 15 years and 9 months hard labour in Italy, comrades from Poland and Yugoslavia.

The chairman of the congress Comrade Muenzenberg, announced the provisional agenda which was then unanimously adopted.

Comrade Wilhelm Pieck then made a speech of greetings in the name of the revolutionary workers of Berlin. He pointed out that there was an uninterrupted line from the policy of Noske, who murdered the best fighters of the German proletariat ten years ago, down to the policy of the social democratic police president of Berlin, Zoergiebel, who prohibited workers demonstrations and refused to permit them to honour the memory of their murdered comrades.

The chairman then read numerous telegrams and letters of greetings from various organisations and persons, including a meeting of 10,000 workers in Basle, the Red Aid organisations of Poland and Switzerland, the land-workers union of Norway, the Unitary Trade Unions of Roumania, etc. A letter was read from James Maxton, the chairman of the British Independent Labour Party, explaining with regret that he was unable to attend the congress owing to pressure of other important matters.

Henri Barbusse then made the opening speech upon the first point on the agenda, **Fascism, Imperialism and the Danger of War**: The anti-fascist congress is of tremendous importance because it aims at rallying the broad masses of the workers and the intellectuals in all countries to mass action against Fascism. The scourge of Fascism is not brandished by individual persons but by the capitalist system, which strives to hold down the working masses who have arisen for a decisive struggle against the capitalist order of society. Only in the Soviet Union have the workers been triumphant. In all other countries the bourgeoisie is still in power, partly openly fascist and partly under the mask of democracy. The capitalist governments are favouring fascism with all possible means. They are building up fascist organisations everywhere: These organisations are composed of bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements.

The historical phenomenon of fascism must be understood broadly. Not the various external forms are important, but the nucleus of fascism. Fascism is in power not only in Italy but also in Spain, Hungary, Poland and the Baltic and Balkan States. The danger of fascism is growing in Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Belgium and Great Britain. The imperialist powers are contributing largely to the maintenance of fascism in the smaller States.

The persecutions of the working masses by fascism are terrible. Massacres, tortures and prison horrors are the methods of fascism. The workers are being robbed of all their rights and their organisations are being destroyed. The main weight of the fascist terror falls upon those enemies mostly feared by the capitalists, i. e. the communists. But others also who refuse to bow down are crushed.

However, the anti-fascist congress has not met in order to mourn, but to appeal to the working masses, to the working-class organisations and to the intellectuals to rally in a joint struggle against fascism, to free its victims and to destroy its system. At the conclusion of his speech, which was answered with tremendous applause, Henri Barbusse expressed the greetings of the congress to the Soviet Union, the fatherland of all toilers and the one country which has no place for fascism.

Manfred Georg, the chief editor of the "Tempo" one of the largest Berlin dailies, declared that the fascist danger in Germany was becoming acute. The petty bourgeois leaders of the masses were the greatest hindrance in the struggle against fascism. Nothing had been left in Germany of the achievements won by the workers in the revolution.

George Middleton, one of the leaders of the Hunger-March of unemployed workers upon London, declared that Great Britain could no longer be considered as a bulwark of democracy. Strong fascist tendencies existed, a good example of this was the anti-trade union law which had been adopted after the general strike and whose aim was to clear the way for an imperialist war against the Soviet Union. Mondism was another example. The abolition of the rights of the working class was being carried on with the support of the reactionary trade union leaders. Despite their attitude, however, the fighting spirit of the workers had not been crushed. On the contrary, the enthusiastic reception which the hunger marchers had received in London was very promising for the future struggles. The British working class would resist all attempts to introduce fascism into England and would finally break the neck of British imperialism.

Count Michael Karolyi declared that the statements of the German reactionaries that he was anti-German were untrue. Or

the contrary, he was a friend of the German working class. Of course, he opposed the reaction in Germany just as he opposed it in all other countries. Fascism in Hungary copied Italian Fascism and was supported by the latter, which expected that the Hungarian workers and peasants would be used as cannon fodder in the furtherance of Italy's imperialist aims.

Two witnesses to the Fascist terror in the "democratic" republic of Czechoslovakia, then spoke. The worker Nazarevitch from Boronova in Carpathian Russia and the miners wife Kladsenska from Kladno. Both of them had been the victims of police punitive expeditions in the mining centre of Kladno and in Carpathian Russia. In Kladno the wives of the miners who had abused the strike-breakers were arrested, taken to Prague and held for weeks in prison without trial. Such terrorism occurred repeatedly in Czechoslovakia and was a proof that Fascism was developing swiftly.

Dr. Welti, a member of the Swiss National Council described the beginnings of Fascism in Switzerland. In any case, Switzerland was a centre of world reaction because it was the seat of the League of Nations whose whole activity was directed against the Soviet Union. The passivity of the Swiss bourgeoisie represented objectively the promotion of Fascism. The prohibition of the antifascist demonstration in Ticino by the government represented a further strengthening of fascism. The Swiss social democracy and the Swiss trade union federation refused to join in the struggle against fascism, so that the only organised anti-fascist force was the Communist Party.

Fritz Heckert, a member of the German Reichstag, dealt with an article in the official organ of the German social democracy, the "Vorwaerts" which declared that the congress was a communist manoeuvre and that "the only power which has the moral right to conduct a struggle against Fascism is the social democracy". The contrary, he declared, was the case, for the social democrats were the fathers of fascism.

The social democracy declared that democracy was a protection against fascism, but all the facts showed that bourgeois democracy was the breeding ground of fascism. This policy of the German social democracy contributed to the growth of fascism and to the preparation of a new imperialist war, above all against the Soviet Union.

Many well-known facts showed what "moral right" the socialists had to talk of fascism; D'Aragona and numerous social democrats had gone over to Mussolini in Italy; in Hungary Peidl and Peyer had assisted in consolidating the Horthy regime; in Poland one of Pilsudski's chief assistants was the former member of the Central Committee of the Polish Socialist Party, Moraczewski and a whole group of social democrats. In Greece and in Yugoslavia the social democrats supported the reaction. In Yugoslavia the social democrat Topalovitch was co-operating with the military dictatorship; in Spain the social democracy supported Primo de Rivera. The social democratic Secretary of the International Labour Office, Albert Thomas, could find nothing wrong in Roumania when he was there, and whilst in Italy he had declared that Mussolini was a fighter for social progress. He also shook hands, whilst in China, with Chang Kai-shek and congratulated him upon his seizure of power. The French social democrat Paul Boncour had declared, whilst in Poland, that Poland was the bridge-head of European civilisation and that it must be defended against the Bolshevik hordes. Hundreds of facts proved that most social democratic leaders were embryonic fascists.

The ten years history of the German republic was a chain of bloody actions by the social democrats Noske, Hoersing and Co. against the working masses. The bloody suppression of the Ruhr struggle of the workers after the Kapp Putsch, the murderous suppression of the insurrection in Central Germany and of numerous other great proletarian mass actions was the work of the German social democratic leaders. A document which had just been published proved conclusively that the social democrat Hoersing, the chairman of the Reichsbanner, had asked the industrialists for money for the Reichsbanner with the remark that the latter would defend the republic against the attacks of the communists.

Last but not least in the portrait gallery of social democrats who had "the moral right", to fight against fascism, must come the police president of Berlin, Zoergiebel, who had threatened the anti-fascist congress with dire penalties should it attempt to hold any demonstrations on the streets against fascism. This fine social democrat had even prohibited the May Day demonstration. From reformism to fascism was only a small step,

and the reformists were prepared to take this step at any given moment. Whoever wished to struggle against Fascism must also be prepared to struggle against reformism. (Applause.)

Second Session.

In the afternoon the second session of the congress was opened in the great hall of the Neukoelln Townhall. First of all various commissions were appointed and then the former deputy of the Catholic People's Party (Populari) to the Italian Chamber Guido Miglioli spoke on the second point of the agenda: Chamber Guido Miglioli spoke on the second point of the agenda:

Fascist Terror and the persecution of the national minorities.

There were, he said, three main stages in the development of the fascist terror in Italy. In the first stage the armed fascists exercised a bloody but illegal terror which was, however, tolerated and even encouraged by the State as it aimed at suppressing the workers. This period ended with the March on Rome and the seizure of power by the fascists. The second period represented a legalisation of the terror, whereby however, certain democratic principles were still maintained. The third period of the terror commenced after the Bologna "attempt" upon the life of Mussolini when the exceptional laws were introduced. This was the period of the fascist Special Tribunal, the deportations and the final abolition of all the democratic rights and freedoms. The fascist terror was then not only legal terror, but an integral part of the State system. Now even the Church has been forced into the service of Mussolini. Despite everything, the tens of thousands of victims have not suffered in vain. The struggle against fascism was going on tirelessly and would cease with the final overthrow and destruction of fascism. The task of the present congress was to work out ways and means for conducting this struggle.

Heinrich Bittner, a member of the Sejm (Polish parliament) described the fascist regime in Poland. The fascist government had refused the other Polish delegates their passports. A considerable amount of the fascist terror was directed against the national minorities which made up forty per cent. of the total population of Poland. The main reason for the brutal terror against the national minorities, particularly in the Western Ukraine and in West White Russia was, that the workers and peasants of this district wish to be reunited with the Soviet Ukraine and Soviet White Russia. In addition to the terror against these national minorities the Polish fascists are attempting to corrupt the possessing classes in these districts and win them away from the national revolutionary struggle.

The speaker reviewed briefly the terrorist acts of the Pilsudski government; the mass trials against the Hromada, and against all workers and peasants organisations, the imprisonment of thousands of workers and peasants and the murder of their best representatives, the pogroms against the Ukrainians and the economic terror against the national minorities, the suppression of the minority schools, the abolition of the minority rights and the complete enslavement of the workers. The national question was closely connected with the social question and the workers and peasants of the national minorities knew that they could only win their freedom in the political struggle and with revolutionary means. Poland was a danger to the peace of Europe and therefore Polish fascism had to be fought not only with words but with deeds.

Ledebour, the old German revolutionary, declared that fascism arose everywhere where the dominance of the bourgeoisie was threatened by the workers. At such times the reformists became the allies and supporters of the fascists, Noske, Ebert, Scheidemann and the others were the forerunners of Mussolini.

In Germany the fascist danger was very great. Therefore the most important lesson of the defeat of Italian socialism must be taken to heart, i. e. that fascism could be destroyed only by an armed insurrection of the workers against the fascist system.

Mgr. Fan Noli spoke concerning the persecution of the national minorities in the Balkans. Fascism in the Balkans means war, war against the external enemy and against the internal enemy, i. e. against the left-wing parties, and the national minorities. Fascism in the Balkans has the support of the imperialist powers and above all of Great Britain. He then described shortly the terror of the Liapcheff government in Bulgaria, of the Maniu government in Roumania, of Achmed Zogu in Albania, of General Zivkovitch in Yugoslavia and of Ven-

selos in Greece. Everywhere the militarists were in power and behind them stood the bourgeoisie. Everywhere preparations for new wars were being made. In the Balkans more than half of the population were national minorities and were oppressed in consequence. The workers, peasants and national minorities enjoyed none of the usual civil freedoms. Some compact masses were doomed to utter extinction, and the speaker gave a number of terrible examples. Those masses who were forced off their lands to make room for the conquerors were hopelessly lost. There was only one solution of this terrible situation, which was being maintained with the help of the League of Nations and the reformists, and that was a federation of workers and peasants republics in the Balkans (Applause).

Stoyanoff (Bulgaria) declared that the wave of blood which carried the bourgeoisie in Bulgaria to power had no precedent in the history of Europe. 20,000 workers and peasants, the opponents of capitalism, had been murdered. Tens of thousands had been imprisoned. To-day 12,000 political prisoners were still in gaol. Abroad there were 2,000 Bulgarian political fugitives. But the resistance to the terror was growing and international solidarity was making itself felt to an increasing extent. The congress must unite the struggle against fascism in the Balkans with the general struggle for the overthrow of fascism.

Jean (Lithuania) dealt with the present situation in Lithuania. The fascist coup d'Etat had been directed above all against the workers and peasants in 1926 because they were going over to the Lithuanian C. P. The social democracy had prepared the way for fascism. Before the fascist seizure of power the social democracy had been in the government, but it had done nothing to stop the preparations of the fascist organisations. Its only aim had been to keep the revolutionary opposition, the C. P. of Lithuania, in illegality, and thus when the fascists seized power the best fighters of the revolutionary movement were murdered with the assistance of the social democracy. The economic situation of the workers and peasants was terrible. The average monthly wage was about 7 to 9 dollars and strikes, whilst not being officially prohibited, were crushed with all the weight of the State apparatus and their leaders put into prison. Despite the persecutions the C. P. of Lithuania was steadily growing. It was the only power which was fighting against the military plans of the Lithuanian government.

The chairman **Fritz Heckert** then read the following telegram which had arrived from the Soviet Union:

"The delegation of the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions sends the Congress its fraternal greetings. It is convinced that the assembled friends and comrades will find ways and means of fighting against fascism. The delegation will be unable to be present at the congress because the German consular representatives refused to grant the necessary visas, Evreinon, Passtuchova, Belenetz."

Blache, the secretary of the Red Aid of France, declared that in France, unlike Roumania, the elections were "free", but nevertheless the deputies Marty, Doriot, Menetrier and Duclos had been sentenced to long terms for their parliamentary activities. The repressive laws against the workers were being intensified. In the colonies all civil freedom had been abolished. The terror of the government itself made, for the moment, all fascist organisations superfluous. There were however signs that such organisations would play a role in the future. The workers of France must fight against fascism with all the means at their disposal. The League for the Rights of Man was absolutely useless as a leader in the struggle against fascism. Only the revolutionary proletariat in France and in the rest of the world could stop the development of fascism.

Folli, a member of the Young Communist League of Italy, declared that fascism was trying to win the working youth, but that fascism was unable to offer these young workers anything. They had to work long hours for little wages and they therefore marched behind the Y. C. L. into the front against fascism. Despite the persecutions, despite the terrorist sentences, they organised mass demonstrations, carried out actions in the factories, formed united front committees etc.

Dr. Petrescanu, a member of the Roumanian delegation, declared that the oligarchy in Roumania had destroyed all working class and peasant organisations. The reformists alone had been spared. The terror was directed above all against the C. P., the Y. C. L. and the I. R. A. which were only able to operate illegally, but even the W. I. R. and the intellectuals were subjected to persecution. The national minorities suffered bloody oppression. According to official figures 2,000 peasants were

murdered in one night in Tatar Bunar in Bessarabia. The state of martial law in Roumania had existed for 11 years. The new government of Maniu had not altered the state of affairs. Despite its "democracy", it is continuing the oppression of the people. Therefore the congress should also carry on the struggle against the cloaked fascism which existed in Roumania.

Professor Gennari, then made the opening speech upon the third point on the agenda, the situation of the workers, peasants and intellectuals under fascism. The social essence of fascism was first of all a high development of capitalism (finance capital) and secondly a colossal exploitation of the working masses, and above all of the workers. The present situation of the Italian worker could only be compared with the situation of the Chinese coolie. According to the official statistics of the Italian trade unions, which only embraced 1,229,882 workers, the average hourly wage was 2.19 Lira. From June 1927 to the end of the same year wages were cut all-round from 10 to 15 per cent. Despite the increase in the cost of living a new reduction of wages has been announced. The purchasing power of wages and the wages themselves diminished the further south one went, until in some parts of the south of Italy the purchasing power of wages was about one-tenth of the purchasing power of a workers wages in Great Britain (average). The taxation of the broad masses had been greatly increased by fascism, particularly the indirect taxation. The State income from direct taxation had fallen considerably during the first 5 budget months of 1928-29, whereas in the same period the income from indirect taxation had risen from 1,849 to 2,230 million Lira.

The petty-bourgeoisie which was deceived by fascism and which supplied the latter with its shock troops, is being mercilessly exploited in the interests of the bourgeoisie. During the first 5 budget months of the present year no less than 75 per cent. of the total income went for the finance and war ministries. As the means for the fascist militia were taken from the budget of the Ministry of the Interior, no less than 80 per cent. of all the State income went for debt interest, for the preparation of war and for the holding down of the population. All this was made possible by the destruction of the class trade unions of the workers and their replacement by fascist so-called trade unions. The contributions for these unions are deducted from the wages of the workers by the employers and handed over to the State.

The class trade unions of the workers were working quite illegally. The blind hatred of the fascists against these unions is caused by the fact that fascism has been unable to extend its own social basis, on the contrary, this social basis of fascism has been diminished. The struggle for the free trade unions thus becomes a struggle against fascism as a whole. Fascism can only be overthrown by the toilers under the leadership of the industrial proletariat. (Applause.)

Closing Session.

After the Commissions had met in the forenoon of March 10, and drawn up the resolutions to be submitted to the Plenum, the Congress was reopened in the Neukölln Town Hall.

The discussion on the third point of the agenda was continued.

The first speaker was the delegate from the United States **Markov** who greeted the congress in the name of the millions of anti-fascist workers in America. The United States government supported the fascist states with loans, for instance the last dollar loan to Mussolini. However, amongst the people of the United States there was a strong anti-fascist movement. Millions of foreign-born workers, who come from fascist States are now living in the U. S. A., for instance there are five millions of Italians alone. Anti-fascist committees are being organised amongst these workers and numerous meetings and two conferences have taken place as the commencement of the anti-fascist struggle.

Hermann, a member of the Austrian social democracy described the difficulties placed by the social democratic leaders in the way of the anti-fascist struggle. The left-wing social democrats would carry on the struggle against fascism despite the threat of expulsion from their party. (Applause.) The numerically strong Austrian social democracy was permitting fascism in Austria to develop into a great danger. The fascist dictatorship in Austria and the march on Vienna were real dangers. In many large industrial districts, such as Styria, factory fascism was prevalent thanks to a pact made by the trade union bureau

crats with the fascist employers. In Austria also a struggle on two fronts was necessary, against fascism and against reformism.

Romagnoli, a delegate who had come direct from fascist Italy, was greeted with a storm of cheers by the congress. He informed the Congress that the Confederazione Generale del Lavoro had decided to affiliate to the congress. After the treachery of D'Aragnona the Italian General Confederation of Labour had been compelled to exist illegally. Despite the tremendous terror, the illegal factory and peasant Committees were doing good work, also inside the fascist unions. Hunger was a constant companion of the workers and peasants in Italy who were in revolt against the fascist system. Citrine and Sassenbach had gone to Italy behind the backs of the Italian workers in order to give the workers in other countries an entirely wrong picture of the situation of the Italian workers. Such people were the most dangerous enemies of the working class. Fascism could be overthrown only by an armed insurrection of the Italian workers and peasants.

Kaladyayev, a former deputy of the Bulgarian Workers Party, declared that the imperialist powers were the strongest support of Bulgarian fascism. Thanks to the help of imperialism, the fascist governments were able to hold themselves in power despite the terrible economic situation of the workers and peasants. Unemployment was very great and the eight-hour day and labour protection were unknown. The trade union organisations had been destroyed but the government of Bulgaria had not been able to form fascist trade unions. All the objective conditions for the setting up of a united front against Bulgarian fascism were present. The most important thing was the organisation of an international struggle against fascism and imperialism.

Nicoletti, the representative of the red peasants of Italy, pointed out the great significance of the peasants' movement in the anti-fascist struggle. He declared that it was wrong to say that fascism represented the interests of the peasants. The contrary was the case. The situation of the peasants in Italy was terrible. They were not allowed to marry or to receive visits from their relatives without first of all obtaining permission from the landowner. In this situation the peasants represented fruitful ground for anti-fascist propaganda. A united front of the workers and peasants would have to be formed to organise an armed insurrection for the overthrow of fascism. (Storms of applause.)

The chairman **Fritz Heckert** then read a letter from the former member of the Italian Chamber and chairman of the Republican Party of Italy, **Mario Bergamo**, to the congress. This letter expresses itself in favour of the aims of the congress and condemns all those who stand on one side and sabotage and slander the congress, i. e. the social democratic parties. **Mario Bergamo** regretted that he could not attend owing to sickness. "The congress was an honour to Europe", declared **Bergamo** in conclusion.

The chairman read a number of telegrams to the congress from various organisations, including the International Red Aid with 11 million members, the workers sports organisations in Czechoslovakia with over a hundred thousand members, from the World Youth League, from the Workers and Peasants Fraction of the Latvian parliament, etc. **Comrade Inard**, one of the few surviving communards, had also sent a letter in the name of his comrades welcoming the congress.

Voitinsky, a Polish peasant deputy, greeted the congress in the name of the poor peasants of Poland and described their terrible situation, which made them realise more and more the necessity of an alliance with the proletariat against fascism. Not only had the Hromada been destroyed, but all other organisations of the working peasants and national minorities. The resistance of the masses was growing. An international struggle against fascism was necessary because British and French imperialism was preparing for war, with Poland as an ally.

Gorkin, a Spanish delegate, declared that the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera was being supported by the Spanish trade union bureaucracy and the representatives of the Second International. The reformist organisations were neither prohibited or suppressed. The revolutionary organisations, on the other hand, were compelled to work illegally, and the Catalonian separatists were bitterly persecuted.

Volkov, a Dutch delegate, described the fascist methods of the Dutch government, in Indonesia. The Indonesian insurrection had been drowned in blood. Seven natives had been

hanged and a great number sentenced to terms of hard labour ranging from eight to fifteen years. In addition, hundreds of national revolutionaries were banished in the internment camps where they died like flies of malaria. The communists had to bear the main weight of the persecution. Strikes were prohibited and the freedom of the press and the right to organise had been abolished. Even in Holland itself there were signs of fascism, above all ideologically. The social democratic party of Holland was co-operating with the Dutch government.

Hornik, welcomed the congress in the name of the Red Front Fighters League of Germany. Fascist methods, he declared, were being used not only to suppress the workers and peasants, but also to prepare an imperialist war against the Soviet Union. The German social democracy had commenced to use fascist measures. The Republican Reichsbanner, which consisted to ninety per cent. of social democratic workers, was the Praetorian guard of the bourgeoisie. For this reason the struggle against fascism was also a struggle against the second International. The German Red Front Fighters League would carry out the decisions of the congress.

Professor Nejedly from Czechoslovakia declared that Fascism was not only a problem for the workers and peasants but also for the so-called intelligentsia. A considerable portion of the intelligentsia was in the camp of Fascism. We must tell these people that the workers and peasants have no respect for them and that they will fight them like the other fascists.

The congress then listened to the reports of the various commissions on point 4 of the agenda: **Ways and Means for Conducting the International Struggle against Fascism**. — **Heinrich Bittner** made the report for the political commission. **Dr. Welti** for the commission on the right of asylum, **Sandini** for the trade union commission, **Fan Noli** for the national minority commission, **Leibbrand** for the youth commission, **Trostel** for the amnesty commission and **Guido Miglioli** for the peasant commission.

Miglioli read the following telegram from the International Peasant Council:

"In the name of the oppressed and exploited peasants of all capitalist countries and in the name of the peasants of the Soviet Union the International Peasant Council sends its fraternal greetings to the International Anti-fascist Congress and is convinced that the congress represents the commencement of a victorious struggle against fascist tyranny and capitalist exploitation."

The congress decided to send the following reply:

"We greet the peasants of the Soviet Union, admire their great achievements, wish success in their work and assure them that the oppressed and exploited peasants of all countries will follow their example and gain the final victory."

The chairman **Fritz Heckert** proposed that the congress should accept the resolutions presented by the commissions as a basis and hand the same over to an editorial commission. This proposal was unanimously adopted and the presidium then presented a resolution for the formation of a permanent International Anti-fascist Bureau in Berlin. The tasks of this Bureau to be laid down by the presidium of the congress in discussions with the delegations and the anti-fascist committees. The nucleus of this Bureau to be the congress presidium. Further additions to be made from various countries in order to secure complete representation. The resolution was adopted with great enthusiasm.

Henri Barbusse, who received a great ovation, made the closing speech:

Every single delegate must return to his country and take his place as a soldier in the great army of anti-fascism. Despite great difficulties this congress has been held, and I think we may say that it has done that which it set out to do. This congress is a great weapon against the international reaction. We do not wish to say that the congress has completed its work, no, it has begun it. The resolutions of this congress must be regarded as orders to action. The call of this congress must penetrate far beyond the walls of this hall and reach the ears of the masses of the oppressed and the exploited. These masses must be mobilised. That is the most important thing. Every working class organisation and every factory must become a detachment of the great army of the anti-fascist struggle. The offensive of fascism must be answered at every step by a counter-offensive of the toiling masses. We must remember, however that fascism can finally be defeated only by

the revolution. Another word for the anti-fascist struggle is revolution. The defence of the positions of the workers is not enough, a decisive offensive must be commenced. Such an international offensive against fascism will grant us the victory. Down with Fascism! Long live the international anti-fascist front of the workers and peasants! (Tremendous applause and the singing of the "International". Further cheers and the Italian delegation commenced to sing with great enthusiasm "Bandiera Rossa".)

Max Hdez who had been arrested in the morning on the way to the anti-fascist demonstration of the Berlin workers in Circus Busch, and held the whole day in the police presidium, arrived in the hall just after the speech of Barbusse and addressed a few words to the congress. He described his arrest, which he declared was another proof of the fascist methods being used in a so-called democratic State, and the delegates expressed their indignation. The congress concluded amidst great enthusiasm and the singing of revolutionary songs.

The Anti-Fascist Conference in Oslo.

By A. H.

There are a number of facts which indicate growth of the Fascist movement in Norway.

1. The attempt of the Fascist leader Thommesen and of the Fascist — led, reactionary "Peasant Party" (the Peasant Party of landowners, wealthy farmers and financiers) to set up a demagogic platform by proposing a reduction of the military estimates and of the civil service.

2. The increase of fraternalisation between the Fascist and the reformist leaders and the intensification of propaganda for co-operation of the classes, "community of interest in industry", co-operation of the workers' factory clubs with the capitalistic factory management, etc.

3. The intensification of Fascist activity in the country through the so-called "Patriotic League". This movement has recently captured a number of important positions among the peasantry.

4. The creation of Fascist women's organisations, such as "Volunteer Military Service of Norwegian Women", women's sections of the "Patriotic League", etc.

5. The renewal of the open Press propaganda for the introduction of Fascism. For instance, on February 28th the leading Fascist newspaper "Tidens Tegn" wrote:

"It will not be long before Norway has to choose between the two ways which the other nations of Europe have had to take: the parliamentary way of concentration policy or the dictatorial way of Fascism."

6. The increased activity of the Fascist civil guard (Samfundsvernet) and its legalisation as a recognised fighting weapon of the police and of the reactionary government. The members of the civil guard are armed and must solemnly swear "to defend the existing order of society against revolution and the actions of revolutionaries".

We must keep in mind the foregoing when judging the success of the first Norwegian anti-Fascist conference which took place in Oslo on March 3rd. The conference was convoked by an initiative committee of well-known members of the Communist Party, of the trade unions and of the Social-Democratic Party. Over 20,000 workers, chiefly of the trade unions, workers' athletic associations and housewife societies in Oslo and the neighbourhood were represented at the conference by 103 delegates.

The anti-Fascist conference discussed international Fascism, the war danger and the Fascist danger in Norway and passed two important resolutions. Part of the resolution concerning international Fascism reads:

"Fascism is the offensive movement of the bourgeoisie and the preliminary condition of its success is that the working class shirk the fight and adopt an attitude of passive expectancy in the face of Fascist activity. In Italy, Poland and Yugoslavia, Social-Democracy prepared the way to Fascist victory through its cowardly exclusively parliamentary tactics. If a further advance is to be stopped, it is absolutely necessary to rally the working class in all countries for a strong counter-offensive. The conference therefore welcomes the approaching anti-Fascist Congress and hopes that the congress will be the starting point of a systematic, international anti-Fascist movement."

In the second resolution the conference adopts the idea of creating a workers' guard against the Fascist guard.

The conference itself has formed a permanent committee, in which the Social-Democratic workers are also represented. Three delegates were elected for the Berlin Congress.

The anti-Fascist initiative has met with a response in the rest of the country. Anti-Fascist demonstrations have been held in Trondhjem, Bergen and Skien. A number of delegates were chosen for the Berlin Congress, among them being representatives of the agricultural and forest workers' union and of the town council of Odda, the centre of the chemical industry. In general, a wide basis has been created for the anti-Fascist movement in Norway, which has been joined by a considerable number of well-known intellectuals, as well as by the Claré Society.

TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

Disruptive Policy of Reformist Trade Unions in England.

A. B. Elsbury (London).

On March 7th a Mass Meeting of the London membership of the Tailors and Garment Workers Trade Union decided to break away from that organisation and to set up a new militant clothing workers union.

This action was taken in consequence of a decision of the Garment Workers' Executive Board in Leeds to dismiss the London Organiser and to "discipline" the London Secretary. The resolution was passed without one dissentient amongst the 1,200 Union members who filled the hall and was as follows:

"That this London Committee having heard the report of our Executive Board member and the decision of the officials, recommends to the mass meeting to be held on Thursday at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, — That no further moneys be sent to the E. B., and that a separate organisation be immediately established, the London Committee to prepare rules, etc., to be submitted to a further meeting of the members."

Amid the tense attention of the membership Dave Cohen, the London E. B. member, and Sam Elsbury, the London Organiser, described in detail the history of the many years of conflict arising from the militant spirit of the London organisation reacting against the treacherous conservatism of the National Officials and the E. B. at the headquarters.

For years, they pointed out, every dispute waged in London with the employers had been conducted without the official sanction of the Head Office which had come to make a habit of taking credit for the London successes won in direct opposition of their own demands. In one of the last issues of the Amsterdam "International Clothing Bulletin" Mr. A. Conley, General Secretary of the Garment Workers, claimed one such unofficial victory (Of the Cutters) as an evidence of the Union's activities.

A notorious evidence of the E. B.'s attitude towards the London militants was in the "Simpson Affair". The members in the Simpson factory which was 80 per cent organised demanded Union support for an increased wage programme and 100 per cent Unionism. A national Union Official, M. Selare, was sent down to deal with the dispute over the heads of the London Committee and succeeded by his vacillations in not only disgusting the workers but in completely de-unionising the factory. For this he was blamed by even his own reactionary E. B. who, as a result of a special enquiry, declared him to be "Lacking in tact" and "unsuitable to deal with the London membership". This last should be noted as it is just this "unsuitable" individual whom the E. B. have selected to fill the post rendered vacant by their dismissal of Elsbury.

But the major complaint of the London members against the Union bureaucracy in Leeds is that of definite attempts at betrayal of the famous Rego Strike of Oct-Dec. 1928. During this long drawn out contest the E. B. venomously attacked the London organisation in the midst of its herculean struggle on behalf of hundreds of young women strikers. Refusing to pay a penny of the Union funds towards the thousands of pounds of strike pay required they went further and conducted press attacks against their London officials in the midst of the strike.

Despite them the strike was brought to a successful conclusion. Nevertheless it is actually on this absurd tactical ground that they have chosen to challenge a break with the London membership which total 6,000 out of the 33,000 total membership.

This choice of ground, however, was by no means sought by the E. B. itself. It is one openly dictated by the employers' federation of the industry as is evidenced by the following excerpt from a letter from the employers as reproduced from the Union's official Minutes:

"We are driven to the conclusion that the tactics of the London officers of your organisation are largely responsible for jeopardising the amicable relations which have for so long continued to exist between us, and, in future, while it is no part of our business to interfere with your organisation, we feel that these undermining influences will be extended from London to the country.

You will therefore not be surprised if we ask you, as the main purpose of this letter, to give some definite undertaking before we go further with the new agreement, that you will be able to exercise some control over your London officials."

It must be understood in this connection that the Union has, for many years collaborated in a national "Agreement" alleged to cover the conditions of the British clothing workers. That this "Agreement" was of little importance may be gathered from its 4th Clause:

"No increase or decrease in Rates of Wages shall become operative until and unless such increase or decrease shall have become obligatory under a determination of the Readymade and Wholesale Bespoke Tailoring Trade Board (Great Britain)."

Nevertheless, such as it was, this agreement with slight amendments is eagerly sought after by the Garment Workers' Executive Board. It was on the plea that negotiations were pending for this Agreement and were being held up by the Rego Strike that the antagonism of the E. B. to London has been expressed, vide the employers' letter above. The employers' demand for an "understanding" has been given effect by the dismissal of one London official and the "disciplining" of the other.

That the London membership should not agree the Executive's course is not to be wondered at. The Mass Meeting, in unqualified terms, expressed its detestation of the entire arrangement. Elsbury, in dealing with the subject, declared, "Whenever the London employers declare they are satisfied with me, that will be the time for the new union to dismiss me".

On the day following the formation of the new union commenced the attack of the Leeds "yellow" leadership on four of its leaders. They obtained an injunction in the High Court of Justice restraining the four from giving effect to the Resolution of the mass meeting. Believing that this would have the effect of terrorising the membership into returning to the fold has had the opposite result. A meeting of the Cutters, the most conservative section of the members, held on the same evening that the injunction was obtained re-acted to it in the reverse fashion by presenting an ultimatum to the E. B. of unqualified re-instatement of Elsbury within 3 days failing which a further meeting to be called to take action.

On Tuesday, March 12th the four leaders appeared before the High Court to face the chargers of the Injunction. They refused legal defence though the E. B. had expended £ 300—£ 500 in securing highly priced lawyers against them. Sir Henry Slessor, Solicitor-General to the ex-Labour Government had been secured against them. Faced with the jeers of the legal fraternity the four workers presented an admirable case to the judge and secured a complete victory.

The new union, which is named The United Clothing Workers' Trade Union, has already got down to work. On the morning following the break away increases in wages were effected at two large London factories and a reduction stopped at a third. The struggle is now extending nationally. London is obtaining the support of numbers of the provincial branches who have long admired its fight against the reactionary officialdom. The new militant organisation commences under the best of auspices. Its membership is enthusiastic and convinced they will be able to wage the industrial struggle to better effect now that the dead hand of the officialdom has been withdrawn. The prospects of the new union superseding the Garment Workers nationally become every day more rosy and to this end the London Committee is devoting its fullest attentions.

Resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia on the Textile Workers' Struggle.

On 12th February, 1929, the strike of 8000 North Bohemian textile workers, which has been conducted with greatest sacrifice, was broken off. With this breaking off of the strike there ended the first stage of the development of the wage movement on the part of the textile workers, in which it has been possible to rally broad masses of the textile workers round the demands and slogans issued by the C. P. Cz. and the Red trade unions and to conduct the most militant troops of the textile proletariat in the open struggle against the combined forces of the employers, the capitalist State and the reformists.

The first stage of the struggle signified one of the greatest and most important experiences of the Czechoslovakian proletariat. The development and the course of this heroic struggle betoken a great advance on the way of the development of the class struggles in Czechoslovakia. A new phase of the development of the struggles of the Czechoslovakian proletariat was initiated, the class struggle has reached a new higher stage of development.

In this struggle the C. P. Cz. has applied for the first time the new political line of the VI. World Congress of the C. I. and of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. The general political line of this struggle was correct. The struggle in Northern Bohemia was not only conducted for the economic demands of the proletariat; the fighting working class has realised the necessity of combining the economic struggles with great political offensives against the dictatorship of trust capital in Czechoslovakia. The striking textile workers have also realised the necessity of conducting the fight against reformism, which is a constituent part of the imperialist united front.

The reformist leaders have openly exposed themselves in this struggle as the agents of organised strike-breaking in the ranks of the working class. Their direct alliance with the employers for the purpose of crushing the fighting workers has never become so obvious as in this struggle. The reformists were this time in alliance with the gendarmerie at the head of the campaign against the struggle of the textile workers. The whole front of the reformists, the capitalists and the capitalist State, as well as the campaign of incitement of the bourgeois press, were combined against the striking workers. All the forthcoming struggles of the Czechoslovakian working class will be conducted on the same basis against this triple alliance of class enemies.

Joint action with the reformist organisations at present does not signify the carrying out of the united front tactics, but the betrayal of the workers' interests. It is the task of the C. P. and of the red trade unions to wrest the reformist workers from the reformist organisations by the united front from below in the factories.

In spite of the open counter-revolutionary campaign of the reformists more than 8000 textile workers took up the struggle. This fact is a striking proof that the objective conditions for the struggle were to hand. By this the whole outcry about adventurers and a hazardous game is refuted. In spite of the heroic efforts of the fighting working class, the strikers, who for the first time in this struggle united under their own elected strike leadership against their class enemies, did not yet succeed in defeating the front of the employers and of the reformists. The reason for this lies before all in the fact that the Communist Party and the red trade unions did not entirely fulfill their tasks in this struggle.

Whilst the Polbureau of the Party, in its decisions, showed a clear line for the leadership of the struggle, this struggle revealed the fact that a portion of the leading cadres of the Party and of the red trade unions clung to wrong opportunist conceptions and worked against the development of the fighting forces of the textile workers. This resistance to the development of the struggle was based on the conception that it is impossible to organise the struggle against the reformists. This resistance has also called forth certain vacillations in the ranks of the functionaries, especially among those comrades who have not yet sufficiently grasped the new tactics. All this caused the bad preparation of the struggle.

The positive results of the struggle consist in the first place, apart from the complete exposure of the reformists, in the fact that the initiative of the struggle was from the beginning in the

hands of the red trade unions and of the C. P. Cz. Further, in this struggle the attempt has been made for the first time to win the unorganised workers for common action with the revolutionary organisations and to reach them through the elected strike leadership. The rallying together of the unorganised and of a portion of the workers organised in the reformist trade unions created the pre-conditions for the establishment of the united front from below. It is a fact that before all the unorganised, the women and the youths have proved to be the most militant elements. During the strike new strata of revolutionary workers in the factories came to the fore.

Apart from these phenomena, which clearly demonstrate that the first stage of the textile workers' struggle signifies a great advance in the struggle of the Czechoslovakian proletariat and that the Party has achieved results by the application of the new political line, there are also some negative results which deserve the greatest attention. In the first place there is the fact that the course of the Party and of the red trade unions was not sufficiently directed towards getting hold of the big factories, and that neither in the preparation nor in the carrying out of the campaign was there sufficient intensive work in this direction. The question of rationalisation did not receive sufficient attention in the course of the campaign.

It was further a mistake that the strikers were not led into the streets. The slogan of the general strike did not correspond to the situation. In the generally correct political line of the press campaign mistakes have occurred which consisted particularly of the fact that the press campaign did not sufficiently take into account the individual phases of the struggle.

The breaking off of the struggle and the methods thereby applied must be designated as opportunist mistakes. Although the fact that a considerable portion of the striking workers have resumed work in an unorganised manner means a change in the development of the struggle, in such a situation it must be the first task of a revolutionary leadership to do everything in order to consolidate the ranks of the strikers. The measures in this respect were quite inadequate. When after the carrying out of these measures it proved necessary to retreat, the retreat had of course to be effected in perfect order. The fact that the working class, even after the breaking off of the strike, has not resumed work in a number of factories, but continue to strike for the reinstatement of their victimised fellow-workers, proves that the fighting forces of the proletariat were not broken at the time of the retreat.

But in spite of all the weaknesses of the struggle its development refutes also the outcry of the opportunist elements within the ranks of the C. P. Cz. and of the red trade unions who attempt to represent the strike and its carrying out as a mistake because the struggle had to be temporarily interrupted. The declarations of this kind are completely at one with the views of the reformist press which designate this struggle as a "New Red Day" and as an adventurous game of the Communist Party.

The struggle of the textile workers was a really revolutionary advance of the working masses, the first example of a new fighting tactic of the revolutionary movement on the basis of a far-reaching enlightenment campaign in the ranks of the C. P. Cz. and in the red trade unions. Whilst the revolutionary textile workers opened the struggle, it came to light that the opportunist elements in the red trade unions, in the ranks of the functionaries and in leading positions, undertook an open attack against the struggle of the textile workers, against the directives of the Party by adopting the standpoint of the reformists. The chief leader of these elements, which in this struggle marched step by step into the anti-working class fighting front, is the secretary of the textile section of the red trade unions, Sykora, who openly elaborates his reformist platform to the effect that this struggle, which was taken up by thousands of textile workers for their interests, was not based upon an objective situation and therefore constituted an irresponsible adventure.

After the conclusion of the first stage of this struggle, the Communist Party and the red trade unions are faced by great tasks. It is before all necessary to explain to the broadest masses the lessons and experiences of the first stage of the textile workers struggle, to work in the direction of capturing the decisive big factories, to clear out the rotten elements from the Communist Party and from the red trade unions and to replace them by really militant elements who have proved their devotion during the struggle.

It is the task of the Party and of the red trade unions to continue the preparation of the struggle of the textile workers. The Communists reject the bonus which is given once only. The lessons of the North Bohemian struggle must be taken into account to a large extent in this work of preparation.

One of the chief tasks in this preparation is the broadest enlightenment of the working class concerning the counter-revolutionary role of reformism, as well as the exposure of reformism in our ranks, which has become a hindrance to the leadership of the economic struggles of the proletariat.

If the Party understands how to draw the correct lessons from these experiences of the textile workers' struggle, then this struggle will be the starting point for a decisive turn in the development of the proletarian struggles in Czechoslovakia.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Achievements and Difficulties of Socialist Construction.

Full Text of the Report delivered by Comrade W. M. Molotov at the XVII. Moscow Gubernia Conference of the C. P. S. U., held on February 23rd, 1929.

(Conclusion.)

Finally, I must point to the necessity, emphasised by the resolutions of the Party (e. g. at the XI. Party Congress), for the conduct of all operative questions of an enterprise to be concentrated in one hand.

The necessity of participation by the trade-union and Party organisations in the effectuation of economic measures should in no case lead to any form of triple authority (nucleus, factory-council, and administration), since this would merely entail the disorganisation of work and output. The responsibility of the economic functionaries and of the administrative and technical staff in all work connected with the directives of decreasing working expenditure and increasing labour discipline must be firmly established, as must also the work of the trade unions and in particular the production conferences for the purpose of ensuring a participation of the workers in the realisation of the respective measures. In putting these measures into execution, the Party members and the members of our Youth Leagues must stand in the forefront and remember that therein lies the chief task of our Socialist development.

I now come to the question of agriculture.

The rate of development in agriculture has of late fallen far short of the rate of development in industry. To this fact the XV. Party Congress had already occasion to point. During the last three years the value of industrial output has been increased by more than 50 per cent., while agricultural production has advanced by no more than 7 per cent. This is sufficient to characterise the difference between the rate of development in the one case and in the other. The indications to hand in regard to the individual branches of agriculture during the last three years also show a slowing-down in the rate of development. The total area under cultivation of the individual farms grew in the course of the last three years (1926—1928) in the following proportion: 5.7 per cent., 2.5 per cent., 0.7 per cent. These figures indicate an uninterrupted growth in the area under cultivation but also a pronounced slowing-down in that growth. In the case of the year 1928, it is true, we must not omit to take the extremely adverse weather conditions into consideration, which were quite particularly felt in the consequent decrease in the growth of the cultivated area of the Socialist section (the collective and Soviet farms). It is further a matter of great importance that, whereas in 1928 the area under grain somewhat receded, the peasant areas for technical and other sorts of cultivation have greatly increased. In stock-breeding, too, an advance is recorded in all the main groups (horses, cattle, sheep, pigs). In general, the growth in the volume of stock during the respective three years was 6.6, 4.8 and 1.0 per cent. Cattle-breeding on the Soviet and collective farms shows a yet much speedier advance, figuring for 1928 alone at almost 28 per cent. Besides this, various other factors point to anything but a deterioration of agriculture but rather to a development of the progressive elements engaged therein. The remarkable results attained in the introduction of the multiple-field system, the growth in the number of acres tilled during the autumn in preparation for the spring seed-time, the increased production of sorted seed-corn, the growing

supply of agricultural machinery, and the distribution of mineral fertilisers, are all factors speaking for progressive tendencies in agriculture.

The talk of the deterioration of agriculture is fundamentally contradictory to these facts. These rumours, however, fully reflect the fact that while the area under cultivation in the case of the small and middling farmers is advancing, that of the kulaks remains within the definite limits prescribed to them. The fundamental mass of the poor and middle peasants is extending the area under cultivation. This cannot be stated of the upper strata of the village. The talk of a deterioration of agriculture reflects the attitude of the kulaks, who naturally desire a repeal of these restrictive laws imposed by the Soviet authorities on the growth of the capitalist elements.

What we have said regarding the development of agriculture shows that the present rate of development does not correspond to the interests of a speedy industrialisation of the country. The difficulties of the grain-provisioning campaign in the last two years make this problem yet more acute. In this respect we must at any price effect a considerable improvement. In this connection the Soviet authorities have been and still are carrying out a series of big-scale measures both for the enhancement of the individual farms of the poor and middle peasants and also for the purpose of developing the Socialist sector of agriculture.

The fundamental measures which have already been effected in regard to the individual farms or are still contemplated in this respect are as follows: Prior to the grain campaign of the year 1928, a resolution was passed in regard to the increase of agricultural prices. This was essential for the purpose of enhancing the interest of the peasants in increased cultivation. In this connection the seed-corn campaign of the current year has turned into a political fight for the increased productivity of the peasant farms. We set the task of a 30 to 35 per cent. increase in the productivity of the soil in the course of the next five years by means of a wholesale realisation of agricultural measures with the aid of the co-operatives. Among the most important measures for enhancing productivity are the enactments of the new agricultural taxation laws. These still maintain the principle of complete tax-freedom for 35 per cent. of the farms (including the village poor and the least pecunious among the middling farmers). The bulk of the middle peasants liable to taxation enjoy many important facilities under the new law. The total of agricultural taxes has been reduced by 50 or 60 million roubles. The enlargement of the new cultivation-areas of the poor and middle peasants is during the next two years to be connected with no additional taxation. Particular facilities also obtain in regard to the farms of such middle peasants as are engaged in agricultural improvements. Besides this, the standard of taxation is to remain unchanged for three years. This will cause a certain stabilisation in the economic calculations of the peasants. At the same time, the individual taxation of the richest section of the peasant class is maintained and the taxation-percentage on farms liable to individual taxation increased to two or three per cent.

This year, therefore, various big measures have been and are being put through for the promotion of the individual farms. Under the given circumstances, however, these measures are insufficient. The extremely slow rate at which agriculture progresses is an outcome of the splitting-up, the backwardness, and the primitive technics of the peasant undertakings. The only and fundamental means to overcome this backwardness and primitiveness lies in the introduction of big-scale production on the basis of collective economy. Therefore the solution of the tasks of industrialisation is indissolubly connected with the task of a big-scale work of the masses, a comprehension in co-operatives, and the introduction of collective forms of agriculture.

In this direction various successes have already been achieved. The number of collective undertakings rose in the course of last year alone from 17,000 to 37,000. Hand in hand therewith, it is true, there was a certain diminution of the average dimensions of the collective undertakings. In the collective farming system there are many mistakes and many abuses, but nevertheless the collective undertakings have begun to find favour not only among the village poor but also with many of the middle peasants. A process of concentration among the collective undertakings themselves is also noticeable, at times assuming very considerable proportions. Thus, according to statements of the Union of Agricultural Co-operatives in the Saler

district, 31 collective undertakings have already combined, while 22 further undertakings are about to do likewise. The Agricultural Collective Co-operative Combine of Digorsk (in the northern district of Ossetin, Caucasia) has been organised on an area of 15,000 hectares. On an area of about 13,000 hectares the community known as the "Third International" has been founded in the Slavgorod circuit. Two villages, Krivushtchi and Kamenka, in the circuit of Balashov, have formed a society for the collective cultivation of 5,500 hectares. A like area is reported in regard to a co-operative at Yevpatoria. A number of other communities on areas of from 2,000 to 4,000 hectares might be mentioned. According to statements from the same source, steps are being taken in various districts with a view to the foundation of 22 new collective undertakings on a total area of 291,000 hectares. Mention should, moreover, be made of such a fact as the contract concluded by the Ukrainian Union of Soviet Estates (in the Odessa district) with 24 villages in regard to the cultivation of 30,000 hectares with the tractors of the Soviet estates. Further agreements with 15 to 20 other villages are in preparation. Last year saw the commencement of a new action on the part of the co-operative organisations, the creation of tractor-columns, to be employed for tilling extensive areas of peasants' fields on the basis of special contracts with the land-communities. The Grain Centre and the Association of Agricultural Co-operatives last year organised 13 tractor-columns with 326 tractors, which are employed to till almost 67,000 hectares of land for 641,000 undertakings. All this shows that there is a large-scale movement on hand in the direction of collectivisation. Great importance attaches in this connection to the growing practice of furnishing contracts. In regard to grain alone, the supply contracts for 1928/29 comprise 15,500,000 hectares, besides which there are 3,375,000 hectares of technical cultivation, etc. Here, too, a gigantic work is in progress, preparing the transformation of peasant economy on the basis of a greater technical development and of a collective system. Finally, the significance of the Soviet estates is constantly increasing. Besides the development of the old Soviet estates, important measures are being effected in the interest of developing new Governmental grain-works, the rôle of which in the output of grain products promises soon to grow very important. According to preliminary calculations, the share of the Soviet estates and collective farms in the agricultural output of the current year figures at 9.3 per cent., which is more than half as much again as the corresponding proportion of last year (i. e. 5.9 per cent.).

We have thus far only taken the very first steps towards the development of Socialist positions in agriculture. The significance of these first steps of Socialist agriculture is very great. Now, that the period of reconstruction in agriculture is practically over, the question as to the channels of development of the peasant undertakings gains increased importance. The peasant undertakings have the choice between two forms of development. One of these is the capitalist form, characterised by a strengthening of the kulak elements and the ruin of the great mass of poor peasants. This is not the form for the peasants of the Soviet Republics to choose. The other way of raising agriculture lies in the direction of a transition to collective production on the basis of a higher degree of technical development. This is the way of a gradual Socialist transformation of peasant economy, and it calls for an ever increasing quantity of complicated machines, tractors, electricity, etc. There can be no third line of development for the productivity of peasant undertakings. At present, in view of the very palpable backwardness and the slow rate of development of agriculture, the working class of the Soviet Union is faced most drastically with the problem of fighting for the second, the Socialist, manner of development in agriculture. So as to advance in this direction, we must supplement the forms of co-operation hitherto in use (i. e. the co-operative system of goods circulation, etc.) by various new forms of combined activity between industry and agriculture, between the working class and the peasantry. These new forms of co-operation are the Soviet estates and the collective undertakings, the tractor-columns and the supply-contracts. Hitherto our agricultural co-operatives have paid little attention to the productive tasks; now their main activity has come to lie in that direction. This means that in peasant farming a new era, the era of reconstruction, must begin. The development of all sorts of co-operatives in the villages and of the productive co-operatives in particular will consolidate the new form of co-operation between the socialist towns and the vil-

ages with their population of poor and middle peasants. The problem of the present time lies in combining the task of improving the individual undertakings with that of constantly strengthening the new form of co-operation with a view to transforming the peasant undertakings in their entirety into a collective system with a high degree of technical development. These two tasks must be combined, both in the interest of the fundamental aims of Socialism and also immediately in the interest of a real improvement of the position of the peasant masses. The resolutions of the XV. Party Congress in regard to the village have therefore proved correct, and the maximum endeavours of the working class must now be directed to the realisation of these resolutions.

3. On the Political Situation, the Aggravation of the Class Struggle, and the State Apparatus.

So as to render possible an estimation of the political position in the country, I shall first have to touch on the political tendencies among the working class and the peasantry and on the question of class struggle.

The facts concerning the political tendencies of the working class are characteristic enough. Let us take the campaign for collective contracts. It has met with the unconditional support of the broad working masses. The attempts undertaken here and there by the Trotzkyites to undermine the campaign, suffered a signal defeat on all hands. A further instance of the relations between the working class and the Soviet authority is to be found in the execution of the Second Industrialisation Loan. It is well known that the workers responded with enthusiasm to the respective announcement of the Soviet Government and that the loan was not only fully subscribed but over-subscribed. To-day we must effect definite measures for a new organisation for supplying the workers. So as to supply the working areas with bread and so as to prevent speculative reselling and the employment of grain for feed purposes, we are now proceeding to an organised system of supply for all working districts. The relative measures of the Soviet authorities are fully supported by the workers, as has already been seen. Finally, the entire Soviet electioneering campaign bears witness to the growth of activity in the working masses, in the increased participation in the elections, and the like. All these facts prove that the Soviet authority is based on the unwavering support of the broad masses of the working class.

As regards the village, the proletarian positions have been strengthened there too. It will be remembered that last summer panic-like rumours were spread, even among the Communists, of a danger of our losing touch with the peasantry. The recent Soviet elections in the village are a fitting reply to the scare-mongers. The data to hand in regard to the Soviet elections speak of a greatly increased activity on the part of the working masses. Since the last election campaign, the participation of the peasant class increased from 48 to 59 per cent. The percentage of the poor peasants and agricultural workers and the percentage of members of the Communist Party among the newly elected members of the Soviets have likewise increased. Here and there, however, too little attention has been paid to the necessity of recruiting members of the middle peasant strata to work on the village Soviets.

In the meantime the class struggle has increased in the country. This is in connection with the increased importance of the Socialist element in economy, which again is an outcome of the increased ousting of capitalist elements from their former positions. The offensive of the Socialist State was answered by the kulaks with increased resistance and with attempts at a counter-attack. This aggravation of the class struggle is manifest, e. g., in the increase in the number of acts of terrorism on the part of the kulaks. The assaults on Soviet and Party functionaries and the increased cases of arson on collective farms and Soviet estates, sufficiently prove the accentuation of this hostility in the rural districts. During the grain-collection campaign of the present year, too, there were repeated attempts on the part of the kulaks to frustrate the plans and measures of the Soviet authorities. In the towns, too, an increase of the class struggle is observable. The Shakhty trial showed that the bourgeois counter-revolutionaries are employing new fighting methods against the dictatorship of the proletariat and are still endeavouring to undermine the foundations of Socialist development. On various sectors of the ideological front, attempts have of late been made at an attack on the proletarian dictatorship. Such tendencies were revealed, inter alia,

on the occasion of the recent elections for the Scientific Academy. In literature and the theatre there is a more and more pronounced tendency towards defending anti-Soviet, bourgeois opinions. On the other hand, however, the aggravation of the class struggle has led to a pronounced differentiation among intellectuals, among whom it is causing a distinct orientation in the direction of Socialism. In this respect characteristic utterances have been made by the two eminent professors Tchelitzev and Tchajanov, former members of the Narodniki Party, who renounce their old opinions in defence of the individual peasant undertakings and, albeit not quite unambiguously and in too small a measure, recognise the correctness of the Socialist way of agricultural development. While last year some of the "hangers-on" of literature adopted reactionary attitudes, there are symptoms indicating a certain inclination to the Left on the part of other retainers of literature. Attention should also be directed to the growth of forces in proletarian literature and the increase in the organisation of the scientific Marxist workers (e. g. the congress of Marxist historians).

Finally, we come to the Question of the State apparatus.

The growth of the political activity of the workers finds utterance in the Soviet election campaign. The question as to an improvement of the State apparatus has become particularly prominent at the present time. The slogan of self-criticism roused great masses and involved ever more circles of workers in the fight against bureaucracy in the State apparatus. In the July resolution of the C. C. in regard to the development of self-criticism, the Party drew the attention of the workers and of all toilers to the question of a control of the work of the State organs, an elimination of foreign elements from the State apparatus, and a recruitment of fresh workers for its service. The task of a big-scale fight against bureaucracy in the State apparatus must first be presented in a proper form. For this reason the C. C. placed this question as a special item on its agenda for the prospective national Party Conference. We may assume that this conference will give a new impetus to the fight for an improvement of the State apparatus, for the elimination of bureaucratic abuses in the work of the State organs, for the recruitment of new cadres of workers in the State apparatus for the extended eligibility of functionaries of the State, and the like. In this connection the task of developing cultural work among the worker and peasant masses is still more accentuated. It must be pointed out in particular that the introduction of the seven-hour day in part of our factories has as yet been far too little exploited for the purpose of cultural work and enlightenment among the workers. Meanwhile, the improvement of the State apparatus, the increased participation of the masses in the work of the State organs, and the recruitment of new proletarian cadres for this work under the conditions of increased class hostility, are tasks of great political importance.

4. The Party and the Fight for the General Bolshevik Directives.

The XV. Party Congress drew the main balance of the fight against Trotzkyism. The Party declared Trotzky's ideology to be incompatible with membership of a Bolshevik organisation. In this the Party has proved to be altogether right. The progress made since the XV. Party Congress has shown what Trotzkyism eventually led to. It was and is based on disbelief in the possibility of a victorious development in our country. In connection therewith, Trotzky's policy lay in the direction of rejecting an alliance with the middle peasants as the basis for proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union. His attitude towards the working class was reduced to a policy of opposing the craft-interests of certain groups of workers to the interests of the entire working class. The campaign for a renewal of the collective contracts again proved that Trotzkyism was tending entirely in the direction of Menshevist directives, while continuing to veil its anti-proletarian policy under the style of an "opposition of the Leninist Bolsheviks". The Trotzkyites, however, not only broke with the Party, but went to the length of attempting to organise the action of anti-Soviet elements against the Soviet authority (masking these movements under the designation of an "intervention of the masses" in matters of "Party reform"). Trotzkyism turned into an anti-Soviet organisation, a petty-bourgeois, counter-revolutionary group. The old petty-bourgeois parties, the Social-Revolutionaries and the Menshevists, have forfeited all credit in this country. Their place the Trotzky group now tried to take, thus figuring as a

sort of new petty-bourgeois party. In reality this group is an organisation of petty-bourgeois elements, irreconcilably opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore we can now only regard the Trotsky organisation as an anti-proletarian and counter-revolutionary group. (Applause.)

It must not be forgotten that even to-day there are elements within the Party who have not yet quite got overcome their conciliatory tendencies in regard to the Trotsky opposition. These are inclined to give up the present fight on two fronts, with a concentration of fire on the dangers from the Right, in favour of a one-sided fight against these Right dangers, quite forgetting the existence of so-called "Left" tendencies of a Trotsky type, which are again attempting to make themselves felt. This leads to a distortion of the Party line. In the course of the last few years, the Party has more than once pointed out that a fight for the general Party directives must necessarily mean a fight on two fronts, viz. a fight against the under-estimation of the alliance with the middle peasants on the one side and the a fight against the under-estimation of the hegemony of the working class in this alliance on the other. Now that the Party has undertaken a gigantic political work against Trotskyism and has expelled the Trotskyite elements from among its ranks, it is only natural, in keeping with the entire situation, that the main attention should centre on the fight against the Right deviations and against the conciliatory attitude in this connection. While continuing its struggle against all sorts of attempts to revive Trotskyist and semi-Trotskyist tendencies, the Party must now concentrate its fire on the Right deviation.

And what is the principal danger of these Right deviations at the present juncture? It lies in the fact that the Right deviations tend to undermine the work of the Party in its efforts to overcome the main difficulties and solve the main problems in the direction of a Socialist development of economy. In this connection I should like to emphasise some important points.

1. **On the rate of industrialisation.** The Party is effecting industrialisation at a rapid rate, and this calls for a gigantic effort on the part of all forces of the working class. This rate is in the first place forced upon us by the external situation. We must profit by the existing state of peace for as great as possible a development of industry and bear in mind that we are constantly exposed to the imminent and growing danger of an imperialist assault. This forced rate of development is likewise necessitated by the internal situation. A mitigation of the dearth of goods and the ensurance of its elimination in the future can only be attained by an increased development of capital investments in industry, by an all-round promotion of our backward heavy industries, and by a yet greater output of the lighter industries. A forced rate of industrialisation is in particular indicated in view of the necessity of consolidating our alliance with rural economy not only by an increased provision of the rural population with articles of consumption but also by an all-round increase in the provision of agriculture with machinery, tractors, chemical fertilisers, and the like. We have encountered the task of developing the Socialist elements in agriculture. This means, however, that we must furnish the rural areas with industrial products, which will ensure their transition to a new technical system, to a system of collective large-scale farming. In the matter of speed, the Right deviations occupy a standpoint which is opposed to the standpoint of the Party. The petty-bourgeois nature of the Right deviations may be seen by the fact that their directives practically constitute a renunciation of the fight for the elimination of the "limitations" in economy (dearth of building materials, undue exploitation of our foreign-currency resources, and the like). The right deviations point in the direction of an adaptation to these "limitations" instead of mobilising the forces of the working class for the purpose of surmounting the obstacles in the path of industrialisation. In the place of an increased mobilisation of the forces of the Party, the working class and the working peasants, with a view to fighting for an increase of our inadequate material resources, for a strengthening of our reserves, for an augmentation of the productivity of work, and for enhanced measures of thrift throughout the economic and State apparatus, the Right deviators are working in the direction of an abandonment of industrialisation, of a slowing-down of its operations, and thus of an undermining of Socialist development.

This is the direction, too, in which all talk of a degradation of agriculture really tends. The panicky talk of a degradation of agriculture serves the purpose of furnishing an excuse

for the slowing-down of industrialisation. In reality, the slowing-down in the rate of industrialisation not only represents no alleviation for agriculture but condemns it to diminish its output of goods and renders more difficult its transition to a higher technical level of development. The directives of the Right deviators represent the obstruction of progress in agriculture and the impossibility for the broad masses of poor and middle peasants to arrive at a new and Socialist form of development of their productive forces. In the matter of speed, therefore, the Party can admit of no vacillation. There is every indication of the fact that the rate of industrial development accepted by the Party is not only being adhered to in practice but that we have exceeded our plans and estimates. It is only by means of an energetic, persevering, and undeterred fight, however, for the rate of industrialisation accepted by the Party and for its possible enhancement, that we can attain the true presumptions for the victory of Socialist development not only in the towns but also in the country, and for the extermination of all the roots of capitalism from our economy. Any vacillation in this respect and any concession in the matter of speed represent deviations in the realisation of the general Bolshevik directives and constitute one of the most typical phenomena of petty-bourgeois political weakness of character. Therefore the Bolsheviks must evince a maximum of firmness and determination in the matter of the rate of industrialisation as accepted by the Party.

2. **On the possibilities of agricultural progress.** The rate of progress in agriculture falls far short of the rate of progress in industry. This backwardness of agriculture is one of the chief dangers threatening the realisation of industrialisation. The Party has set itself the task of bringing about a decided change in this respect. This can, however, not be effected speedily. The question as to the main means of an increased promotion of agriculture must, nevertheless, be put most emphatically. And in this respect the directives of the Party differ fundamentally from those of the Right deviators. The Party sets itself the task of promoting the improvement of the undertakings of the poor and middle peasants by all the means at its disposal. The incentive towards improving the poor and middle undertakings, the promotion of this improvement by the State organs, and the all-round development of the activity of the co-operatives are now factors of particular importance for the purpose of improving the individual peasant undertakings. The Party combines this task with that of developing the Socialist positions in agricultural production. Hence the policy of greater limitations in relation to the kulaks, of the greater restriction of the growth of capitalist elements, of an all-round promotion of the development of the collective farms and Soviet estates, of developing the activity of the tractor-columns, of extending the practice of supply-contracts, and of promoting all such measures as make for a consolidation of the Socialist positions and for a strengthening of State influence on agriculture.

This line of procedure in agricultural development calls for the surmounting of gigantic obstacles, it calls for a determined fight against all backwardness, the scattered nature and lack of culture in agriculture, as also an increased restriction of the growth of exploitative elements in the rural districts. In this matter the Right deviators occupy a standpoint irreconcilably opposed to that of the Party. The nature of this standpoint may be summed up somewhat as follows: Less expenditure for the Soviet estates and collective farms, a more cautious procedure in the development of supply-contracts and the organisation of new tractor-columns, and a slowing-down in the construction of agricultural machinery, tractors, etc. The active side of the Right deviations, on the other hand, leads to an emancipation of the kulaks, of free trading without Government restrictions, and the unchaining of the capitalist element in general. The policy of the Right deviations is diametrically opposed to the policy of the Party. Therefore there may be no vacillation in our Party in regard to this question, the question of the direction of agricultural development. A policy of promoting the development of the kulak farms, which would finally mean the victory of bourgeois relations and the re-establishment of capitalism, must be repudiated by the Party most emphatically and unscrupulously. The Party must most energetically oppose every vacillation which becomes apparent in its ranks in connection with these vital questions.

3. **On the aggravation of the class struggle.** The policy of the Socialist offensive of the proletariat represents the ousting

the capitalist elements from their positions. Socialism cannot advance without encountering strong resistance on the part of the capitalist elements. At the present stage we see the accentuation of the fight between the capitalist and the Socialist elements. Here again we require absolute clarity in our directives. He who at the present stage denies the inevitability of an increased hostility between the capitalist and Socialist elements, abandons the policy of an offensive against the kulaks in favour of an opposite policy and comes down to the theory of a peaceful adaptation of the kulaks to Socialism. It is altogether obvious that this theory is incompatible with the directives of the Party. The Party consolidates the Socialist positions in agriculture by relying on the village poor and maintains a firm alliance with the middle peasants against the capitalist elements. Between our policy of an offensive against the kulaks and the theory of a peaceful adaptation of the kulaks to Socialism there is a deep chasm. This theory it is the duty of every Communist to combat. In this respect the Party can brook no vacillation. The policy of an increased offensive against the kulaks and other capitalist elements is the policy of Socialist development. The theory of a peaceful adaptation of the kulaks to Socialism practically means the abandonment of the offensive against the kulaks; it leads to an emancipation of the capitalist elements and finally to the re-establishment of the power of the bourgeoisie. For every Communist it must be obvious, what standpoint he must choose in this connection. (Applause.)

4. On the Party and the fight against bureaucracy. More than ever before the Party is now concentrating the attention of the working class on the fight against bureaucracy. In this connection the Party relies on the growing activity of the working class and on the growing participation of the workers in the Party life and in the work of all proletarian organisations. The slogan of self-criticism has become one of the main slogans of the Party. This slogan has come more and more to represent a means of strengthening the fight against bureaucratic abuses in the State apparatus, of cleansing the State apparatus of elements alien to the working class, and of disclosing all sorts of shortcomings and all sorts of bureaucratic elements in Party life. The slogan of self-criticism calls more and more for the mobilisation of the masses in the fight for a practical realisation of the general Leninist directives of the Party. Therefore the calumny spread by the Trotzkyites in regard to a bureaucratisation of the Party under present circumstances merely represents a departure from the Party and from the working masses. Such calumnious accusations can only serve the purpose of cloaking differences of opinion in relation to the Party and of changing the slogan of self-criticism into a slogan for the alteration of the Leninist directives of the Party. Naturally the Party must emphatically repudiate every vacillation in this respect, too, and answer the calumnious accusation of bureaucracy by a strengthening of the activity of the Party members, by the recruiting of more workers for the Party, and by the elimination of the bureaucratic and other disintegrating elements within the Party.

5. Finally, on the fight for Bolshevik directives in the Comintern. The VI. World Congress pointed out that one of the main tasks of the Communist Party at the present time was the increased fight against deviations to the Right. Under the conditions of a lasting capitalist stabilisation, the attempts made within the various Communist Parties to strengthen the respective Right wings represent a serious danger. The growth of these tendencies shows the strength of the Social Democratic influence on certain portions of the Communist Parties. The overcoming of these tendencies is one of the necessary presumptions for a strengthening of the fight of Communism against reformism. The Social Democrats still possess great influence with the working masses, although they have in practice become out-and-out agents of imperialism among the workers. Particularly artful manoeuvres are practised by their "Left" wing, which has recourse to elastic and demagogic measures of reformist calumny in regard to the workers. The fight against the Social Democrats now gains special importance for the sections of the Comintern in view of the maturing conditions of a new revolutionary development. This fight is also connected with the overcoming of opportunist tendencies in the Communist Parties themselves. Therefore the fight against the Right elements and against all who advocate conciliation in regard to them, has of late become especially pronounced in the Commu-

nist Parties in general and in the C. P. G. in particular. This is an absolutely necessary development. In this connection the expulsion of the leaders of the Right wing from the ranks of the Party has become a necessity in the interest of cleansing the Communist Parties in general. The fight against the conciliators is likewise necessary as a presumption of a real Bolshevisation of the Comintern sections. Attempts are, however, being made to represent this fight and the cleansing of the Communist ranks of opportunists as a disintegration of the Comintern. In practice the object of this attitude is that of a diplomatically cloaked defence of the Right wing and the conciliators. It is obvious that any vacillation in this respect represents an abandonment of the directives of the VI. World Congress. The outcry at the disintegration of the Comintern raised on the occasion of the elimination of semi-Socialist elements like Brandler and Thalheimer, will naturally not avail the defence of those Right deviators who have broken off their connection with Communism. For any real Communist it is obvious that only a decisive fight against all vacillations in this direction can ensure the mastery of the dangers threatening from the Right and the removal from the revolutionary ranks of the Comintern of all evils of opportunism.

In all the problems mentioned above, the vacillations of certain elements in our Party have been on the increase of late. This means that the opportunist tendencies in our ranks have by no means yet been overcome. Such vacillations can but lead to a strengthening of the Right deviations in our Party and to the accelerated development of a special line of procedure, representing a deviation from Leninism in some of its most essential points. For the Party the development of such a special line represents a danger, provided the nature of the Right deviation in question is not fully unmasked in view of the broad mass of Party members. The fight against opportunism encounters particular difficulties. Lenin said that

"if we speak of a fight against opportunism, we must bear in mind the characteristics of up-to-date opportunism in all directions, its irresolution, vagueness, and impalpability. In keeping with his nature, the opportunist will always depart from a definite, unchangeable manner of putting a question, seeking a middle line and winding his way like a snake between two opposite standpoints while endeavouring to "agree" with both of them by reducing his differences to corrections, doubts, and well-meant and innocent wishes." (Lenin's Works, vol. V, p. 473, Russian edition.)

This characterisation by Lenin of opportunism is quite particularly confirmed by the Right deviation in our Party. It may be supposed, however, that this Right deviation is now passing through an intermediate stage in its ideological development. This fact embodies the danger of a fractional struggle, the harmful character of which the Party knows only too well.

The evolution of the Right tendencies in our Party is connected with the general difficulties of the present period. In so far as we can overcome these difficulties by means of a tenacious struggle and of persevering and arduous work, we must also reckon with the possibility of an increase in the political vacillations within the Party. To such vacillations on the part of individual members, the Party opposes the closed front of the broad mass of members and of the working class and their unconditional adherence to the Party directives. The greater the determination with which the broad masses of Party members and of the working class express this standpoint in regard to the policy of the Party, the easier it will be for us to overcome the vacillations in question. We must ensure a maximum of Bolshevik firmness and discipline in our ranks. Every Communist must be mindful of his responsibility for the cause entrusted to him by the Party. In our circles we must admit no attempts at shirking the responsibility for the cause of the Party. Our task must consist in an all-round strengthening and mobilisation of the forces of the working class in the interest of a fight against the difficulties obstructing Socialist development, and for the victory of the proletarian revolution. The working class, which is strengthening its alliance with the broad masses of peasants, will continue in future to march confidently forward towards the victory of that Socialist development which is more and more apparent in our country. (Prolonged applause.)

The V. Party Congress of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia.

From the 18th to 23rd of February 1929 there took place in Prague the V. Congress of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia. The Central Committee of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia has sent us a detailed report of the Party Congress, the first instalment of which we publish below. Ed.

First Day (18th February).

The Congress was opened by Comrade Gottwald in the name of the Central Committee. Thereupon the Presidium was elected **unanimously**, two Comrades abstaining from voting.

After the acceptance of the agenda and the standing orders the Congress proceeded to the **election of the commissions**. There were then read out a number of messages of greeting from brother organisations of various countries, and other organisations and individual comrades.

Comrade Guttman then read, out to the accompaniment of enthusiastic applause, a letter of greetings to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to the C. P. of Germany.

The Chairman, Comrade Haken, then announced that Comrade Jilek and Comrade Gottwald had been chosen to deliver a report and co-report respectively on the first item of the agenda:

The Situation and the Further Tasks of the Party.

Comrade Jilek stated that he had informed the Central Committee, and the Comintern, through the representative of the E. C. C. I., that he could not deliver a report at the Party Congress; that he had already communicated to the Central Committee his reasons therefor and demanded that the comrades in the C. C. should report to the Congress on the matter.

On being called upon by numerous delegates to explain why he would not deliver a report, Comrade Jilek declared:

"Just as other reporters I was entrusted with the task of drawing up a report for the Party Congress. The November-Plenum of the Central Committee approved this decision, and it was decided at the same time that the Economic Department should supply the reporters Gottwald and Jilek with material on the economic situation in Czechoslovakia.

"We were instructed that we must submit a draft of the theses not later than the 1st of January. I was unable to do this as I did not receive any material. I have since then insisted three times in the secretariat that the Economic Department be called upon to place material at my disposal. It was not until the 25th of January that an article was sent to me by Comrade Freud, which was published in the first number of the "Kommunistische Revue". It is impossible for me to deliver a report at the Party Congress when I have no material. You will admit that it is impossible for me to procure the material myself, especially when the Central has a department for the compilation of material." (Protests and cries: That is ridiculous!)"

Comrade Fried, in the name of the **Congress Presidium**, makes the following declaration in refutation of the statements of Comrade Jilek:

"The Presidium states that Comrade Jilek's failure to give a report is a complete acknowledgment of the political bankruptcy of the opportunist Party leadership (Loud applause), which was swept away by the membership at the time of the discussion. The Jilek group which has become bankrupt is seeking to shirk its duty to give an account of itself at the forum of the Party Congress, in order at the same time to organise, behind the backs of the Party leadership, a fight against the new political line. This cowardly attitude must be sharply repudiated by the Party Congress. (Applause from the whole Congress.)

Thereupon Comrade Gottwald was called upon to speak. In his report he analysed in detail the question of the stabilisation of capitalism, and showed that to deny the shaky character of stabilisation leads to liquidationism.

In the question of the danger of imperialist war there are two foci: the antagonism between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union, and the antagonism between England and America. We regard as one of the essential signs of the third post-war period the increasing radicalisation of the masses, which is marked by a counter-offensive character.

In judging the situation in Czechoslovakia we must in the first place take into account the false view prevailing hitherto on the character of the Czechoslovakian State. Czechoslovakia

is an imperialist State. The community of its interests with the interests of the big imperialist States is shown before all in the increasing activity of Czechoslovakia in the war preparations against the Soviet Union. The inner situation in Czechoslovakia is characterised by the rule of the financial bourgeoisie, the rapid concentration of capital and the formation of monopolies. Czechoslovakian economy has surpassed the pre-war level at the cost of an intensified exploitation of the working population, whose standard of living is far below the pre-war level. As a result, there is taking place a shifting of class forces. Class forces are being polarised. On the one side there is finance-capital, which unites the bourgeoisie of all categories and nations and is bringing the big peasant elements of the country, the upper strata of the small peasantry and the labour aristocracy under its influence, and on the other side there is the proletariat, which is being radicalised, the small peasantry and the middle strata which are being proletarianised. Also in Czechoslovakia reformism plays the role of an agent of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the proletariat. In all the daily struggles of the proletariat it performs strike-breaking work and is actively preparing for the fascist upheaval and imperialist war.

The fascist danger is becoming the most important problem. The bourgeoisie is preparing a fascist coup in order to secure the inner prerequisites for increased exploitation of the proletariat and for conducting war. In the fascist upheaval which is being prepared, the driving force of which is the financial bourgeoisie, the "Burg" (seat of the government) will play the leading ideological role. The fight against fascism is the most important task of the day. Without this fight it is impossible to conduct successfully a fight against the danger of imperialist war, nor is it possible to conduct successfully the economic partial struggles of the proletariat.

The Party became isolated from the masses, and found itself in a crisis because it was opportunist, in the process of the class struggle it lagged behind the toiling masses and was isolated from them. This was shown by the failure of the Red Day, which gave the impulse to the open outbreak of the Party crisis.

The roots of the crisis of the Party lie in the social democratic traditions and in opportunism. To render the Party sound it is necessary to overcome these two main causes. The Party crisis of the year 1924/25 did not completely liquidate the reformist traditions. The Party leadership, after a short period of upsurge, did not succeed in deepening and rendering concrete the political line of the V. Congress of the Comintern and of the II. Congress of the Party.

The social democratic traditions hang like heavy weights on the feet of the Party. After splitting away from the social democracy the Party took over its old ideological ballast, and the Party leadership had not sufficient forces in order to throw it overboard. The basis of the false policy of the Party in the past lay in the incorrect view regarding the origin of the Czechoslovakian Republic, regarding its character, regarding the relation to the capitalist State, in the incorrect attitude to the Czechoslovakian national question and the question of national minorities in general. The sum total of the false views in these questions, as they were theoretically formulated in the decisions of the I. Party Congress of the C. P. Cz., already form the basis of Smeralism. The II. Party Congress annulled these decisions in words but did not completely shatter the ideology from which they arose. The IV. Party Congress of the C. P. Cz. was then able to develop further the political platform of Smeralism and give it concrete form in a new situation, in the third post-war period. It gave a wrong answer to the question of the character of the Czechoslovakian Republic, a false answer in the trade union, agrarian and municipal questions. With such an ideological equipment we were bound to arrive at the defeat in connection with the Red Day.

The Party crisis and the discussion let loose in the Party an ideological struggle in which several currents began to form: on the one side the historical Rights, the unprincipled opportunist Jilek-Bohlen group and the Trotskyist opportunist Neurath group; on the other side there stood the Left opposition, the nucleus of which was formed by the old anti-Smeral and anti-Pubnik opposition from the year 1924/1925. The discussion, it is true, has not completely fulfilled its task, but has nevertheless seized hold of the most important questions and exposed the bearers of opportunism. The Opposition elaborated the results of the discussion in the theses submitted to the Congress. These theses indicate where the Opposition has landed

politically. Where the above-mentioned three opportunist groups have landed is shown by three classical documents: the discussion article by Comrade Kyrál (historical Right), the Hlohovec memorandum (Trotskyists) and the counter-memorandum of the No. 1 district (Jilek). In these documents there is reflected the rapid development of these tendencies to open liquidationism. These documents show that all opportunism, every vacillation, all reconciliation towards the Right elements and every political lack of principle, leads today, far more rapidly than formerly, into the camp of the liquidators.

The textile workers' struggle showed the extent and greatness of the liquidatory danger. In this movement the new strategy and tactic was applied for the first time on a large scale in Czechoslovakia. In spite of various faults in carrying it out, this tactic has proved to be perfectly correct. Today the question is a follows: either to fight against the united bloc of the reformists, the bourgeoisie and the capitalist State and to conduct this fight with revolutionary means, or to capitulate altogether and deliver the proletariat over to the mercy of the bourgeoisie. What has happened? The liquidators, headed by the renegade Sykora, have entered on an open fight against the Party and the red trade unions by deriving their arguments from the ideological arsenal of the bourgeoisie and of reformism. The experiences of the textile workers' movement teach us, among other things, that at every practical turn of the Party to the Left we encounter the obstinate resistance of the liquidators who threaten the unity of the trade unions and of the Party.

The most important political task for the immediate future is the fight against the danger of imperialist war, the fight against fascism and the danger of a fascist upheaval as well as the fight for the economic daily demands of the working population in town and country. At the same time we must endeavour with all our forces to revolutionise and to strengthen the red trade union organisations, to improve the social composition of the Party by means of an influx of young revolutionary workers, and to introduce young blood into the whole cadre of Party functionaries. With regard to the ideological side the most important task is to overcome the social-democratic traditions in all spheres of Party activity.

A disintegration of the Communist Party. The Party will overcome its crisis and its isolation from the masses, will place itself at their head and lead them in the fight: through fights for partial demands to the decisive fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Political Debate:

Comrade Sverma emphasised that the most important task of the Party Congress is to improve the revolutionary policy of the Party, to purge the Party and to change fundamentally the methods of Party leadership and its whole policy. He pointed out that in the discussion there was revealed agreement with the Open Letter and with the decisions of the VI. World Congress. But a single struggle, the struggle of the textile workers, had sufficed to reveal all the opportunist liquidatory and counter-revolutionary currents which are concealed in the Party in various forms. He pointed out the game the Jilek group had played in the Party, which demonstrated that they had never grasped the situation of capitalism as a whole and the consequences arising therefrom. He then proceeded to a detailed analysis of the textile workers' strike and, in connection therewith, the situation in the red trade unions and laid emphasis on the tasks confronting the Party in this direction. The danger of an imperialist war demonstrates more plainly than ever the necessity of making, immediately at this Party Congress, a decisive step towards correcting the wrong policy of the Party.

Comrade Reimann described the course of the discussion in the German districts, dealing in particular with the standpoint of the Neurath group and stated that, with this group also it is a question of the transition from opportunist views to open social democratic views. He then proceeded to deal with the question of the textile workers' struggle and emphasised that precisely in this struggle has the opportunist danger in the C. P. Cz. been most strikingly revealed.

Comrade Hruby (Prague) protested in the name of the delegates against the action of Comrade Jilek in refusing to deliver a report to the Congress. He said that this meant not only the political bankruptcy of the Jilek group, Jilek had thereby insulted the delegates who represent 100,000 Party members.

(To be continued.)

The Third Party Conference of the C. P. of Norway.

By Arvid Hansen, Oslo.

The 3rd Party Congress C. P. of Norway, which was held recently, was rightly described by the representative of the E. C. C. I. as the Party Congress of Bolshevisation. Important resolutions were passed and work was done, which constituted an important step on the path towards the Bolshevik mass party, towards the party of consistent Leninism.

The Party Congress made a survey of the five-year development since the foundation. The C. P. has to face a deeply rooted so-called "Labour party", which does not belong organisationally to the Second International, but which, since the transition to ministerial "Socialism" in February 1928, has been executing more and more openly the policy of the II. International in Norway (execution of the order of finance-capital in communal policy, acceptance of a bourgeois military budget of 25 millions a year, decoration of the capital on the occasion of the heir apparent's wedding, commencement of expulsion tactics in the trade unions, supporting of industrial peace, of measures of capitalist rationalisation, increasingly serious calumniation of the Soviet Union, etc.). At the same time a considerable radicalisation of the broad masses of the working class and of the toiling peasantry is discernible (building workers' strike of 1928, increased activity of the unemployed, mutual agreements with several Russian trade-unions in spite of the sabotage resolutions of the trade union federation, anti-Fascist conferences, spontaneous strikes against the 20 per cent. tax deduction, sanctioning of the Communist slogans in the question of the debts of small peasants and agricultural labourers, numerical growth of the Communist Party, increasing proletarian opposition to the leading bureaucracy in the trade union council, etc.).

The Party Congress drew a clear picture of the position of the party and also of its strong and weak sides. A characteristic feature of the Norwegian Party is its close connection with the trade-union movement. Every fifth member is a trade-union functionary, at the last congress of the trade-union Federation there were about 50 Communists, the Communist fraction in the Oslo Trades Council numbers 54, an important number of trade-union associations and trades councils are under Communist leadership. In spite of the markedly opportunistic inclination of the Party since its foundation, at which time a genuine Norwegian Brandlerism existed, particularly in the parliamentary fraction, the right wing has never succeeded in spite of several attempts and attacks, in diverting the Party from the path of consistent revolutionary trade-union policy. After the liquidation of the influence of the right wing (Scheilo) and their allies ("Mot Dag"), the Party succeeded in getting the entire leadership of the illegal building workers' strike against the compulsion laws into its hands and carrying the fight under the strike leadership of the workers themselves to a political triumph. The growing influence and the strong moral position of the Communists in the trade unions are now being countered by the reformists by means of the expulsion of the leading functionaries, more especially in the trade union federation. Tranmael-Halvard Olsen & Co. demanded the signing of a statement, in which the two Communists, members of the Executive Committee of the Federation, were to have condemned the attitude of the Communist Press (publication of the Communist proposals), a demand which was naturally refused by our comrades. The Communist minority in the Executive Committee is leading the campaign against the expulsions, for the banding together of all oppositional revolutionary elements, for the fight for the reinstatement of our comrades in their trade-union functions, for the dismissal of the Amsterdam bureaucrats from the Executive Committee, for a consistently class action on the basis laid down by the Red International of Labour Unions.

The parliamentary activity and the election campaign of the Party, which suffered several losses, were extremely weak and partially opportunistic. Considering the conditions in the country, the work of the Party among the peasants was also much too slack. The fight against war was not steady and systematic. Work among the unemployed was neglected for a long time. The same also applies in a large measure to the

internal ideological training of the Party itself. In regard to the resolutions of the IV. R. I. L. U. Congress insufficient explanation and enlightenment were rendered to the members. There have been no Party schools since the autumn of 1925. The Labour schools of the "sympathising" Mot-Dag group were means toward ideological disintegration and opportunist grouping and not at all training centres for the revolutionary cadres of the workers in the spirit of a Leninist Party.

The Party Congress was not afraid to submit its own mistakes to severe criticism and laid special emphasis on the necessity of continuing the fight against the danger from the Right. The tendency on the part of individual comrades to overestimate the stabilisation and underestimate the leftward development of the proletariat was energetically corrected by the Party Congress. The Party Congress also resolved to annul the "reciprocity treaty" with the Mot-Dag group.

The resolutions of the Party Congress explain a number of the most immediate questions of the new phase of the class struggle, of the so-called third period, inter alia: the slogan of "factory control" as a cloak for the slogan of industrial peace, the question of the unorganised workers, of independent strike committees, the attitude on the military question, tasks relating to the fight against Fascism (legalisation of the Fascist civil guard), local political tactics and mass mobilisation, preparation of an international Red Day against war, the work of the Party among the toiling peasants and fishermen, new organisational tasks of the Party.

The 3rd Party Congress of the C. P. of Norway devoted adequate attention to international questions: the questions of the international situation, the present phase of stabilisation, the question of war (Kellogg Pact), the international campaigns and the question of right-wing dangers in the C. I. On the basis of the VI. World Congress of the Comintern, the Party Congress adopted a firm attitude against the right wingers and conciliators in the C. P. G. and other sections and also against their opportunist views in regard to capitalist stabilisation.

After the Party Congress, the Party will endeavour in every sphere, and at the moment particularly in the question of unemployment, to undermine the attempts at stabilisation made by the bourgeoisie and their "Labour party", to consolidate the self-defence of the proletarian masses against the growing Fascism, to improve Party work in parliamentary matters, to extend the opposition in the trade union and by various means to divert the Left-Wing workers from the reformist, social-imperialist Tranmael party and to join their forces with the section of the C. I.

Political Resolution of the Leningrad Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

The resolution on the report of comrade Voroshilov adopted by the Leningrad Party Conference fully and entirely approved the political and organisational policy of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The resolution contains inter alia the following:

With special satisfaction the Conference stresses the correctness of the policy of the delegation of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the Executive Committee of the Communist International. The correct Leninist leadership of this delegation by the Central Committee contributed very much to the working out of a correct analysis of the present stage of the development of capitalism and to the working out of the basic lines of Bolshevik strategy in the complicated circumstances of a partial stabilisation of capitalism. With the active co-operation of the Central Committee the Comintern has worked out and adopted a uniform programme which is the most important document of the international communist movement. Despite the contentions of the rightwingers and the conciliators concerning an alleged decline and decomposition of individual sections of the Comintern, the Communist Parties have consolidated themselves upon the basis of a continued bolshevisation, the consolidation of their leading organs and the strengthening of their influence upon the working class.

Through its delegation in the Executive Committee of the Communist International the Central Committee called the attention of the Comintern in good time to the necessity of the intensification of the struggle against the right wing opportunist danger and against the conciliatory tendencies inside the Communist Parties in the present period. The measures which the Executive Committee of the Comintern carried out in the German Communist Party, the expulsion of Brandler and Thalheimer and the decisive struggle against the conciliatory policy of Ewert and others have resulted in a consolidation of the German Communist Party and increased the authority of its leaders, thus arming the Party for the coming decisive struggles against German imperialism and its support, Social Democracy. The right-wing deviation and the conciliatory tendencies inside our Party and other sections of the Comintern which declare that there has been a consolidation of the capitalist stabilisation and which deny the intensification and development of the capitalist contradictions, degenerate in basic questions of tactics to opportunism and approach to the social democratic estimation of the stabilisation. In order to conceal their defection to opportunism, the right-wingers and the conciliators make serious accusations against the organisational leadership of the Comintern. This is in reality a struggle against the organisational structure of the Comintern and against its iron discipline.

The resolution enumerates the achievements upon the field of industrialisation and the socialist reconstruction of agriculture and declares that the industrialisation will be carried out in the closest connection with the measures for the economic development of the individual undertakings of the poor and middle peasants. The logical fulfilment of the tasks of collectivisation and of the building up of Soviet undertakings set by the XV. Party Congress, show that the Central Committee is carrying out the main policy of the Party which is directed towards destroying the economic basis of capitalism in agriculture and towards creating definite guarantees against a possible restoration of capitalism upon the basis of small scale commodity production. The Conference approves the measures of the Central Committee directed towards consolidating and strengthening the leadership of the Party in the labour union and rejects the attempts of the conciliators to interpret this step as a method of splitting the labour union movement. The Central Committee must make an end to all attempts to bring the leadership of the Party into contradiction to the labour union movement as such attempts represent a great danger for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Conference approves the measures of the Central Committee against the remnants of the Trotzky opposition and its counter-revolutionary activity. With especial satisfaction the Conference records the Leninist firmness in the struggle against the right-wing deviation. The Central Committee mobilised the Party in good time in a struggle against the right-wing opportunist deviation and against the conciliators as the chief danger in the present period of socialist construction.

In conclusion the resolution declares:

"The Conference condemns with deep indignation individual attempts of the right-wingers and the conciliators to indulge in fractional attacks upon the Party and against the Central Committee, and decisively rejects the slanderous attacks upon the individual Party leaders which are only designed to cloak the attack upon the general policy of the XV. Party Congress and upon the organisational basis of Bolshevism. The conference demands that the Central Committee should take decisive measures to prevent all attempts at any fractional activity on the part of the right-wingers and the conciliators which violate the iron Bolshevik discipline and endanger the Leninist fighting unity of our Party. The social roots and the nature of the right-wing deviation must be exposed ideologically and the Party may under no circumstances fail to use organisational measures to prevent any fractional development of the right-wing deviation. The Conference promises complete support to the Central Committee in carrying out the basic line of the Party in developing speedily the industrialisation of the country and the collectivisation of agriculture."

PROLETARIAN COMMEMORATION DAYS

The Paris Commune and the "Z" Plan.

By L. A.

The capitalist Governments are preparing not only for an imperialist war, but also for civil war against their own masses. In connection with the war preparations against the Soviet Union and with the swing to the Left of the working class the civil war preparations of the bourgeoisie have become particularly intense lately, because the imperialists know that their criminal attack on the workers' State can let loose a storm of revolutionary indignation, that such a war means the development of civil war on an international scale. The tactic of suppressing "internal unrest" has become a burning problem in the military literature of the capitalist countries.

Plan "Z" (the plan of the French General Staff for the defence of Paris in the event of internal unrest) is a typical example of these civil war preparations of the bourgeoisie. This plan has been elaborated on the basis of the experiences connected with the suppression of the Paris Commune. Therefore, it will be opportune to study it a little more closely in connection with the anniversary of the Paris Commune, all the more so as the plan itself is not of a purely French character. According to the "Revue des Vivants", plan "Z" provides in the event of serious disorders breaking out in Paris for the removal of the troops stationed in the city from the centre, and for their withdrawal to Versailles, in order to recapture Paris from outside, together with the garrisons drawn from the provinces, and to re-establish "law and order".

As Messrs. Poincaré, Foch and Chiappe intend to adopt the same methods which were used by Thiers, Mac Mahon and Gallifet during the brutal suppression of the Paris Commune, an investigation of the experiences of the struggles of the Paris Commune will be of the utmost importance also to the workers. We wish to recall a few facts which can throw light on this tactic.

On March 18, 1871, Thiers attacked with the loyal governmental troops the Paris National Guard in order to disarm revolutionary Paris. The answer of the working population of Paris to this attack was a powerful revolutionary mass action, an armed insurrection. As the revolutionary ferment was beginning to spread to the governmental troops, and cases of refusal to obey orders and going over to the side of the rebels became more and more frequent, Thiers was compelled to leave Paris in a hurry with the troops which had remained loyal to the Government, and to retire to "peaceful" Versailles.

In Versailles, Thiers prepared a well-planned attack on Paris. He was most anxious to create a reliable army. For this purpose troops were drawn from the provinces which had not been in touch with revolutionary Paris. By agreement with Bismarck, the enemy of yesterday, 60,000 French war prisoners were released from Prussia and included into the army which was to attack Paris. When the concentration and organisation of this army of 130,000 men was complete, the Versailles Government began a regular war against Paris, using the following fighting methods: siege, bombardment, street fighting, and blood baths among the population.

The fathers of Plan "Z" want to use exactly the same methods in the event of serious unrest: if they do not succeed in nipping the revolutionary action of the masses in the bud, they want to withdraw their troops from Paris leaving the city for the time being in the hands of the rebels to concentrate their troops in Versailles and to recapture Paris from outside.

One should realise that the tactic of the plan "Z" is the most consistent civil war tactic of the bourgeoisie. Of course, the gentlemen of the French General Staff will do their utmost to nip in the bud any "internal unrest". But if they have to do with a real revolutionary mass movement, if direct contact with the excited masses might produce vacillation, disintegration, a revolutionary mood, insubordination and going over to the side of the people, they prefer to withdraw, for the time being, their armed forces from the hotbed of revolution, in order to make use subsequently of tactics which will enable them to keep the armed forces in order and at a safe distance from the rebel population, so as to ensure their immunity from the revolutionary ferment. This can be best achieved by an attack

from outside, when the troops act within the framework of big detachments, when they carry on a regular frontal attack on the hotbed of revolution, when they have a "subdued" and secure rear and can keep the necessary distance between the soldiers and the masses with the help of artillery and machine-gun fire.

This was the tactic of Thiers, MacMahon and Gallifet. It is also now one of the fundamental rules in the theory and practice of all capitalist countries when it is a question of suppressing mass movements. It does not of course offer a guarantee for the absolute suppression of any insurrection. On the contrary, it cannot be successful if the insurgents know how to set against this tactic of insurrection-suppression a correct insurrection-tactic. For instance, even the victory of Thiers and his helpers over the Paris Commune was to a great extent due to the mistakes made by the Commune. Already on April 12, 1871, Marx wrote to Kugelmann: "If they succumb it will be entirely due to their kind-heartedness." One should have marched at once to Versailles after Vinoy and after him the reactionary section of the Paris National Guard had themselves cleared the ground. The right moment was missed out of conscientious scruples.

If the Commune had taken from the beginning the initiative of action, if it had assumed from the beginning a ruthless offensive, if it had been able to carry out a definite action among the regular forces of the government in order to disintegrate and disarm them or to draw them onto the side of the insurgents, the government would probably not have succeeded in escaping to Versailles with their armed forces. If this had partially succeeded, the Commune should have immediately made an attack on Versailles in order to give the quietus to the remainder of the counter-revolutionary troops which had been withdrawn from Paris.

Through the humaneness and passivity of the Commune the counter-revolution was given the respite which it needed. Up to April 3rd, i. e. for 16 days it was allowed to rally its forces undisturbed, before the Commune attempted its first undecided attack. Naturally, the columns of the Paris Commune met now with the organised resistance of the Versailles. As time went on, the correlation of forces took an unfavourable turn for the Commune because it could not possibly compete with the bourgeoisie in regard to army organisation. The technical forces required for such work were almost entirely in the camp of the bourgeoisie. Provided it could have at its disposal more or less docile cannon fodder, it was an easy matter for it to create a well organised army, whereas the organisation of the army was inevitably very slow on the side of the Commune. The strength of the Commune as of every mass insurrection, lay of course not in military organisation, but in the revolutionary activity and the heroic self-sacrifice of the masses, and last but not least, in the strong moral effect of the "spectre of revolution" on the enemy and his armed forces. Through their timorousness and passivity the leaders of the Commune missed the moment when the activity of the masses had reached its climax and when the enemy had not yet concentrated his forces. The greatest heroism in the defence of the barricades could not replace the offensive which should have taken place at the very beginning. In an armed insurrection, it is the first moments which decide the success of the struggle.

Another contributive factor to the suppression of the Paris Commune was the passivity of the provinces, especially of the peasantry. The Commune was certainly proclaimed in several towns (Lyons, Marseilles, St. Etienne, etc.), but even there it did not come to active struggle for and against the army, no efforts were made to prevent the concentration in Versailles of the provincial garrisons and of the troops released from the Prussian war prisoners' camps.

If the future "internal unrest" feared by the originators of plan "Z" will be limited to Paris, if it is not accompanied by such "internal unrest" everywhere in the provinces and if the rebel masses do not assume from the beginning a ruthless offensive, so as to prevent the concentration of the armed forces of the counter-revolution, plan "Z" will have certainly every prospect of success.

Fortunately, not only the representatives of counter-revolution and reaction profit by the experiences of the class struggles, but also the oppressed revolutionary classes.

The revolutionary proletariat in all the countries believes in the struggle of the Paris Commune, it gathers courage and enthusiasm from the heroic example of the Paris barricade fighters and profits by their mistakes.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Initiative of the Masses in the Work of Socialist Development.

New Forms of Proletarian Democracy.

By L. F. Vinov.

On the occasion of the competition of production conferences, the workers of the "Dzershinski" and "Pravda" concerns at Dnepropetrovsk (Soviet Ukraine) submitted on their own initiative 30,147 suggestions for the improvement and rationalisation of production. In the same town the workers of the "Petrovsky" concern made 22,476, the workers of the "Lenin" concern 1685, and the workers of the "Karl Liebknecht" concern 1463 suggestions for rationalisation.

In support of the spring sowing campaign, numerous staffs of industrial enterprises send working brigades to the villages under their "patronage". To these working brigades, which generally consist of from 20 to 40 workers, agrarian experts are attached. They bring the peasants tractors, seedcorn, and fertilisers. The entire costs of the working brigades are defrayed by the respective staffs themselves, raising the money partly by collections and partly by working extra hours.

The members of the Young Communist League in the Red Putilov Works have formed groups which are entrusted with the patronage of the machines and workshops. The voluntarily incurred obligations of these groups consist in the supervision of the machinery and the energetic prevention of careless treatment or wilful damage thereof. This initiative on the part of the Young Communists has already led to substantial results. In the three weeks since the foundation of the patronage-groups the number of injuries to machinery perceptibly decreased.

The following new method has been introduced for the purpose of counter-acting the evils of bureaucracy. The works nuclei of the twelve largest industrial concerns in Moscow have appointed 1500 workers, who, on the basis of a programme worked out in community with the workers' and peasants' inspectorates, made a "raid" on 300 Moscow authorities. They visited numerous officials in the character of ordinary petitioners, begged for information or made suggestions. In this way they examined into the manner in which the public was treated by the individual authorities. They saw how often an applicant has to go from pillar to post before getting the ear of the competent quarters, how long he is made to wait in ante-rooms, and the like. Thus ample material was collected in regard to bureaucratic abuses of different kinds, which will be worked up by the Peoples' Commissary for Workers' and Peasants' Inspection and employed as a starting-point for practical measures.

The "Krassny Vyborshetz" works at Leningrad has called upon a number of metal works in various Russian cities to take part in a competition for the reduction of the initial costs of output. In the first three months of the current year, the initiative of the "Krassny Vyborshetz" workers had already effected a reduction of initial costs by 7 per cent.

These facts are at the same time a brilliant confirmation of the fact that the progressive consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship entail an extraordinary consolidation of proletarian democracy, proletarian dictatorship and proletarian democracy proving to be in no sense opposed to one another but rather the mutually supplementary components of the power of the working class. How triumphantly such facts give the lie to the miserable Menshevist accusation that the Soviet authority is no dictatorship of the proletariat but a dictatorship over the proletariat, as also to the Trotzkyist calumny to the effect that the industry of the Soviet Union is not a Socialist industry, since the relations between the workers and the works-administrations is not truly Socialist.

Would the workers show such admirable zeal in voluntarily sacrificing their free time for the purpose of working out masses of plans of rationalisation for the works and thousands of new and valuable plans of improvement, based on daily experience, if they did not feel that the works are their own works, really Socialist works? Would the workers of their own initiative incur great material sacrifices for the purpose of strengthening the bond between industry and agriculture by the delegation of working-brigades, if they were not convinced

that the industry of the country is their own Socialist industry? Would they of their own initiative adopt various organisational measures for the protection of the machinery and tools, if the machinery and tools in question were not their own?

The facts here recorded, which are symptoms of new forms of mass-initiative, mean that the proletariat in general and the industrial workers in particular, not only continue to feel themselves masters in their own Soviet State, but are also growing increasingly efficient, conscious, and sure of themselves in the exercise of such functions as they are called upon to perform as the ruling class in the country. The "Vorwärts", which on the occasion of one of its regular attacks on the Soviet Union bitterly complained that in the Soviet Union every second worker was "an agent of the G. P. U." failed to notice how greatly this fact confirmed the growth of that very proletarian democracy the existence of which it had so flatly denied. Though it is not literally true that every second worker is an agent of the G. P. U., it is a fact that the measures of the Soviet organs, including the G. P. U., against the counter-revolution are not only approved but are also actively supported and promoted by the entire working class. Naturally, the times when the combating of the counter-revolution was the only object of mass-initiative are far behind us. If we desire to stick to the manner of expression chosen by the "Vorwärts" we might well say that every second worker, or indeed the overwhelming majority of the workers, act as "agents" of the Supreme Economic Council and of the State Planning Commission, as "agents" of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, the cultural authorities, and the like.

These achievements, which stand alone in the economic history of the world, are in no small measure due to the mass-enthusiasm and mass-initiative of the ruling proletariat.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

What Would a Lenin Do Today to Save the Russian Revolution?

By D. Petrovsky (Moscow).

Under the above title there appeared in the last number of the theoretical organ of the Austro-Marxists, "Der Kampf", an article the author of which is Friedrich Adler, secretary of the II. International.

Friedrich Adler proposes to the Soviet Union in the name of the II. International, an honourable and democratic peace. He promises the Soviet Union the active help of all socialist parties. Nay more, he maintains that Lenin, were he alive, would undoubtedly joyfully accept Friedrich Adler's offer of peace and would even be grateful for his services in "saving the Russian revolution". What is the essence of this new proposal? The "article" is rather long but is written in the style in which diplomatic notes are written. This "Peace Note" differs from the usual Curzon Notes only in that the conventional lying phrases of diplomacy are replaced by Marxist phraseology in the spirit of the Austrian interpreters of Marxism.

Nevertheless this long article contains a short sentence in which there lies hid the whole content of the Adlerian philosophy. This sentence reads:

"As the expectations of October have not been fulfilled, March at least must be saved."

The meaning of this sentence is clear. One must renounce October, one must renounce the proletarian dictatorship, the idea of socialist revolution and turn back to the March revolution, that is to the revolution which placed power in the hands of the big landowners and capitalists. Such a power, i. e. the power of the big landowners and capitalists, the II. International is ready to defend.

This cannot of course cause any surprise. We are quite aware that the II. International is not only prepared to defend the capitalist power but that it is actually defending it effectively in all parts of the world. At the same time, however, Friedrich Adler's proposal constitutes the height of cynicism and shamelessness. Not even Lord Curzon ventured to make such "simple" proposals. Here he lacks has surpassed his master.

Friedrich Adler does not, however, confine himself to offers of peace; he accompanies the offer with threats. If the Soviet Union does not accept the offer, if it does not return from October to February and does not give power back into the hands of the big landowners and capitalists, then it is

threatened by the danger of becoming "a bulwark of reaction".

The reader will perhaps say that is not quite clear. True, it is only at exceptional moments that the Austro-Marxists speak very plainly. If one, however, reads attentively the whole Peace Note, then the meaning of the manoeuvre becomes perfectly clear. It is as follows: If you restore the bourgeois power, then we will defend you. (Against whom?) If, however, you do not do so, then we will not prevent international imperialism from laying hands on you.

The "article" of Adler is extremely interesting and symptomatic. At the moment at which the German social democracy, the pride of the II. International, is drawing up its military programme of armed struggle against the First Socialist State, the "Left" Friedrich Adler has to prepare the misguided workers to accept this military programme. In order to inspire the workers with confidence in his idea, Friedrich Adler attempts to bolster it up with the assertion that Lenin would think the same if he were alive.

Friedrich Adler has obviously confused Lenin with Curzon. Of course he did this deliberately. The "article", therefore, deserves to be taken note of by the workers of the Soviet Union as well as by the workers of all the capitalist countries.

AGAINST THE RIGHT DANGER

The C. C. of the C. P. of Poland Unanimously Supports the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. in the Fight against the Right Danger.

The C. C. of the C. P. of Poland holds the policy of the leadership of the C. P. S. U. and its struggle against all deviations from the political Leninist line to be entirely correct. The C. C. of the C. P. S. U. declares its solidarity with the standpoint of the Moscow Party Conference, which pointed to the necessity of calling the attention of all sections of the Comintern to the Right and conciliatory danger.

The C. C. of the C. P. of Poland points to the alliance which exists between the Right-conciliatory bloc in the Comintern and the Right elements within the C. P. S. U. Their retreat and their shrinking back in face of the difficulties of socialist construction is closely linked up with their illusions regarding the growing power of international capitalism, the failure to perceive its process of decay, its intensifying contradictions and the acute general crisis of capitalism. This alliance found expression in the interpretation of the decisions of the VI. World Congress of the C. I. regarding the question of stabilisation, in the under-estimation of the role and the tasks of the proletariat, in the struggle against the organisational policy of the E. C. C. I., in the defence of the Brandier fraction, which openly fights against the Comintern and violates all principles of Bolshevik discipline. The Right-Conciliatory tendency in the C. P. S. U. is becoming the point of crystallisation of all Right tendencies in all sections of the Comintern. Its political consolidation leads to the existence of a united Right fraction in the Comintern. The danger of the fractional, anti-Party activity of the Right and conciliatory elements, to which the Moscow Conference points, is nowadays threatening the whole Comintern and calls for determined resistance on the part of the leadership of the C. I.

The C. C. of the C. P. of Poland expresses its full conviction that the vigilance of the ranks of the C. P. S. U. against the Right danger, the determination with which the Moscow organisation comes forward against the Right and conciliatory deviations, the inexorability with which it is conducting the fight against these deviations, afford a guarantee that there will not take place, under cover of a wrong interpretation of the political legacy of Lenin, the consolidation of the Right ideology, the deviation from Leninism, or that under a sham "fight against the Rights", the Right elements find shelter in the responsible Party organs.

The Right danger, which is making its appearance in all sections of the C. I. and which is often cloaked by Left phrases, and the danger of tolerance towards these Right deviations, which consists in the repetition of sacramental formula without drawing from it the political conclusions, require from all Parties the same watchfulness in the struggle against this danger, as is displayed by the Moscow organisation.

The C. C. of the C. P. of Poland will support with all its forces the Leninist leadership of the C. P. S. U. in its further struggle against Trotskyism, which is openly sinking into the camp of counter-revolution, as well as in its fight against all Right opportunist attempts to shatter the unity of the Party and the Leninist principles.

OBITUARY

Wilhelm Bartz

Born 10th December 1881 — Died 18th of March 1929.

By W. KOENEN (Berlin).

After a painful internal sickness our Comrade Bartz died on 18th of March 1929. By the death of Comrade Bartz the Communist Party of Germany loses one of its most devoted and faithful functionaries and the "Inprecorr" one of its first editors and later business managers. He belonged to the few leading functionaries who came from the labour movement of the pre-war time and through all differences have faithfully followed the path of the revolutionary portion of the German proletariat.

Wilhelm Bartz was born a proletarian child in 1881 in Tangermünde. After attending the elementary school he was apprenticed as a printer and in 1900, after completing his apprenticeship, immediately entered the Party and his trade union. Already in 1907 he had so won the confidence of the workers of Bremerhaven that he was appointed editor of the Nord-Deutsche Volksstimme. As an intelligent and promising student, his district organisation sent him in 1911/12, to the Party School.

Up to the year 1919 Wilhelm Bartz edited his paper, the Nord-Deutsche Volksstimme, in the sense of the radical wing of the working class. He was among the first to oppose the granting of war credits, and edited his paper in accordance with the views of the Left Independent Socialist Party of Germany. When, in 1919, the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, on the strength of a legal title to the property, seized possession of the paper, Wilhelm Bartz took over the editorship of the newly founded Independent socialist Party paper the "Arbeiterzeitung für das Unterwesergebiet". In 1920, as leading political functionary of the Lower Weser District, he was elected to the Reichstag on the Independent Socialist Party ticket. But also in the great political decisions of the radical working class of the lower Weser district Wilhelm Bartz remained at the head. At the Party Congress in Halle in Autumn 1920, when the split occurred in the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, he stood firmly on the side of the revolutionary workers who went over to the Communist International. This close connection with the proletarian masses and the revolutionary development enabled our Comrade Bartz, in all the disputes of the years 1921 to 1924, to oppose energetically as genuine fighter all the renegades and liquidators.

He then belonged finally to the small group of 11 Communist deputies who in the worst inflation years of 1922 and 1923, from the tribune of Parliament, voiced the demands of the revolutionary masses.

In the year 1921, shortly after the founding of the "Inprecorr" Wilhelm Bartz was engaged first as editor of this important organ, and later took over the post of business manager, which post he held until his death. For the C. P. of Germany he was at the same time active as business manager for the Rote Fahne and later of the Central Publication Department of the C. C. In addition to his participation in the work in his own district, Wilhelm Bartz also had the function of district deputy and representative of the C. P. G. in the Prussian State Council.

Thus his life was filled with the most intensive work for the Party, for the revolutionary labour movement. He was at all times a model of conscientious fulfilment of duty. Even his ever recurring sickness did not prevent Wilhelm Bartz from performing the most self-sacrificing work entrusted to him by the Party. Thus his whole life was devoted to and filled with work for the Party. It is in this sense that the Party will revere his memory.

Fritz Reussner

On Thursday 21st of February there passed away in the Botkinsky hospital in Moscow, Comrade Fritz Reussner. Four days previously, in making a ski-jump, he sustained a serious injury to the spine (fracture of the sixth vertebra) which proved fatal in spite of the fact that he received immediate medical attention and had the services of the best surgeons.

Fritz Reussner was born in Berlin on the 5th of April 1899. His parents are proletarian. He himself was a metal-worker. From his seventeenth year he belonged to the revolutionary labour movement. In 1916 he was already active as a functionary in the League of the Free Socialist Youth of Germany, the forerunner of the Young Communist League of Germany. For a time he was the chairman of the Berlin organisation of the Y. C. L. of Germany and a close collaborator in the work of the Central Committee.

In October, 1918, he entered the Spartacus League. During the civil war at the end of 1918 and at the beginning of 1919 he was among the fighting Spartacus forces who occupied the police headquarters and newspaper offices in Berlin.

After the crushing of the revolutionary rising in Germany by the combined forces of reaction and in the time of the illegality of the Communist movement, Reussner worked uninterruptedly in the leading positions in the Y. C. L. of Germany and for eighteen months in the, at that time, illegal Berlin bureau of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International. When the Executive Committee of the Y. C. I. was transferred from Berlin to Moscow Reussner was also called to Moscow and there continued his political work.

For a long time he occupied the post of general secretary of the Executive Committee of the Red Sport International, of which he was one of the founders, and remained up to the last a member of its Presidium. Since the beginning of the present year he was active as secretary of the organisation department of the Executive Committee of the Comintern.

Fritz Reussner was cremated on the 23rd of February in the Moscow crematorium. The ceremony was attended by a large number of workers in the E. C. C. I. and in the Party and trade union organisation, by worker sportsmen and his friends and acquaintances.

Fritz Reussner was a true, eager and splendid Party comrade. He was a real internationalist. The international proletariat will preserve the memory of this indefatigable and faithful fighter.

PROLETARIAN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

The March of British Unemployed to London.

The Women's Part in it.

By Phyllis Neal.

On Sunday, February 24th, there was seen in Trafalgar Square, London, one of the greatest demonstrations ever assembled there. 25,000 workers filled the square to greet an army of 1000 unemployed men, who had marched from all parts of the country to demonstrate in the English capital the plight of those 2 million workers to whom capitalism refuses the opportunity of earning a living, and to make their demands upon the Baldwin government. The marchers were the selected representatives of the unemployed workers in all the principal industrial areas, mobilised by the National Unemployed Workers' Committee Movement under Communist leadership: from Scotland (region of coal, shipbuilding, cotton and jute, and metal industries); North-East Coast (coal, iron and steel, chemicals); Yorkshire (wool, coal and steel); South Wales (coal); Lancashire (cotton, coal and chemicals); Midlands (iron, pottery, railway works); Notts and Derby (coal, hosiery, lace manufacture); South West England (shipbuilding and docks).

Starting from their respective districts during January and February, the marchers have made their way by various

routes, covering the whole distance on foot. An exact timetable was planned, in order that all might reach London at the same time; and despite snowstorms, rains, bitter frosts and fogs, the plan was carried out with complete precision. A distance of about 20 miles a day was regularly covered; the Scottish men marching the great distance of 500 miles. This would have been an achievement even for men who had been prepared by good feeding, much more so for men, many of whom had been in the greatest want for a period not merely of months, but years. Only the hardest and most determined were deemed capable of the undertaking. From a host of volunteers a careful choice was made. Every man regarded himself as a delegate of the hundreds of thousands behind him, and in the whole journey not a man turned back.

True to their practice, the reformist labour leaders took up an attitude of total hostility to the March, even while the bourgeoisie (no doubt mainly influenced by the nearness of the coming Parliamentary elections) have in many towns professed sympathy, offering them charity and advising them to return home. The bureaucrats of the trade unions and the politicians of the Labour Party prefer that the unemployed workers should starve quietly at home, lulled with hopes of improvement when they have voted a Labour government into power. This militant action bodes no good to their endeavours to make peace with capitalism.

But among the rank and file of the workers, the marchers have found enthusiastic and practical support. Before the March could begin, it was the gifts of the workers of the whole country which made it possible to equip this army. Every man had to be provided with clothing to withstand the weather and boots which were suited to the roads which they would tread, a blanket and a knapsack of necessaries. It was necessary to ensure that at all stopping places along the routes provision would be made for shelter, hot baths, meals, and so on. This was done by scouts, travelling in advance all the way. To the honour of the British working class all this was done, and done cordially. In spite of advice from their reformist leaders, local Labour Parties, Labour women's sections, trade union branches, trades councils, co-operatives societies, etc. responded to the call of the Communist Party, the Minority Movement, and the unemployed Workers' Movement, to show their solidarity with the marchers. In many towns united reception committees were formed for the purpose.

In the magnificent receptions accorded to the men, the working class women were ever to the front, cheering them on by their encouragement as well as ministering to their material needs. Not content with working for them from the time when they arrived until they left in many cases they marched out to meet them, and when they departed, accompanied them along the way. From the town of Newcastle, the women and young girls marched 14 miles to the next town, Durham. In the villages, as the men passed through, women ran out with parcels of food.

And well may the working women throw their energies into this campaign! The brutal Blanesburgh Act, which has already partly operated for a year, and will come into full force in April, attacks the unemployed women and girls even more heavily than the men and boys. An unemployed young woman will receive no more than a quarter of what would keep her, and even that will be made almost impossible to obtain. What is there left for such young workers but starvation or prostitution, unless they organise for struggle? As wives of unemployed workers, also, the women have long gone not only famished, but worn with anxiety, to see their children being sacrificed. The death rate among babies has risen rapidly in the distressed areas.

The Communist women are now saying "Why not a march of unemployed women?" Although the process of rationalisation in England is accompanied, as in all capitalist countries, by the substitution of women for men workers, this very process forces ever more women into the labour market to compete with one another. The result is that there are about 200,000 of them unemployed, many thousands of these being in the cotton and woollen textile areas. In the spring it is hoped to organise a march of these unemployed women into the textile centre of Manchester, there to make their immediate demands, and at the same time demonstrate this determination, together with their class-brothers, to continue the struggle for the overthrow of the capitalist class.

TEN YEARS OF THE COMINTERN

Appeal of the R. I. L. U.

On the Tenth Anniversary of the Communist International.

To all Affiliated R. I. L. U. Organisations.

The beginning of March will mark the Tenth Anniversary of the existence of the Comintern. During these ten years the Comintern and its local sections have been struggling unrelentingly against predatory capital to free the proletariat from oppression and exploitation, against opportunism and reformism which have betrayed working class interests all along the line.

Its ideas and slogans of the Third Communist International have penetrated practically all corners of the globe, helping to weld together and organise workers and women workers against the capitalist offensive, against imperialism and colonial oppression. This struggle has played a stupendous role in the history of the development of the revolutionary trade union movement. Revolutionary trade unions and revolutionary oppositions are constantly working in close collaboration with the sections of the Comintern. The members of the Communist Party are, and have been, the foremost organisers of the working class and its economic organisations — the trade unions. The finest elements in the ranks of the Communist Party have laid down their lives, have given all their strength, energy and enthusiasm to the struggle against Capital. The Tenth Anniversary of the Comintern is a historic revolutionary date, which must be noted by workers everywhere and by all who are oppressed and exploited.

R. I. L. U. adherents must now take active part in the Tenth Anniversary campaign organised by the Comintern and its sections.

According to the plan elaborated, the Tenth Anniversary of the Comintern will be celebrated between March 5 and May 1. During this period the following campaigns will also be carried out: March 8 — Anniversary of Paris Commune. Furthermore on March 10 an Anti-Fascist Congress will be held which must likewise focus the attention of the workers at large. These campaigns must be conducted under the following slogans: "Class against Class", to counter the reformist slogan of class collaboration. To struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat throughout the world, and in its name to struggle for unity of the broad working masses. To fight against the new war danger and to transform a war, should it arise, into a class war, into a civil war. To mobilise the workers everywhere around the slogan: Defend the U.S.S.R., as the centre and stronghold of the world revolution. To struggle against the continual onslaught of the bourgeoisie in the economic field and against the withering influence of the reformists and their treacherous scabbing. To urge the united front between workers in town and village in all countries, and an alliance between the toiling peasantry and the oppressed peoples in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

We must take active part in organising the Tenth Anniversary Celebrations of the Comintern. The Party organisations must be assisted in every way in carrying out Agitational Evenings, Meetings, placing at their disposal available clubs, premises, choir, musical, dramatic and sport circles, doing all in our power to get the rank and file in the unions to attend the meetings and gatherings organised to commemorate the Tenth Anniversary of the Comintern. At the meetings organised for the Tenth Anniversary of the Comintern besides the report of the Party short addresses should be made on the revolutionary trade union movement, the achievements and weakness of the given R. I. L. U. section, pointing out the role of the Comintern in revolutionising the trade union movement, laying bare all the mistakes and errors of opportunism in the T. U. movement.

This campaign must be conducted so that the maximum organisational results shall be received and our organisation be strengthened and extended. A campaign must be developed to recruit new members in the revolutionary unions in those countries where the T. U. movement is divided. Our slogans must be: Not a Single Member of the Party, Not a Single Member of the Young Communist League must remain outside the revolutionary unions. Each member of the Party, each class-

conscious member of the revolutionary unions and the Y. C. L. must be charged to recruit a certain number of unorganised workers in the unions to mark the Tenth Anniversary of the Comintern. In those countries where the T. U. movement is undivided, a broad campaign must be conducted to elucidate the fundamental decisions of the R. I. L. U., urging the masses to line up in the unions in order to strengthen the revolutionary T. U. opposition.

The recruiting campaign must be accompanied by a strong agitational campaign in the press (both in the general press and in the factory papers) by arranging special demonstrations, especially in those areas where there are large numbers of unorganised (workers' settlements, near the factories) making wide use of artistic agitational activities. March 8 must be utilised to explain to the broad masses of women workers the basic policy of the Red International of Labour Unions and to popularise the decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress.

The revolutionary T. U. press must concentrate their publicity work to elucidating the role of the Comintern in revolutionising the T. U. movement, to clarify the basic decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress, our strike strategy, exposing the mistakes of all kinds of "deviationists" like the ultra-lefts (Trotzkysts), simultaneously subjecting to special criticism the rights and the conciliators. The papers should also contain reviews of the activities of the R. I. L. U. sections, making clear the significance of the united front from below and also the general slogans mentioned in the foregoing.

All organisations of the workers must be induced to take a hand in conducting the campaign. In the various cultural labour organisations — sport, radio, cinematograph, theatrical, literary and other organisations — R. I. L. U. adherents must urge the management committees to take part in the foregoing campaigns. Should there be a refusal on the part of the reformist leaders, our comrades must assume the initiative to organise and carry out this campaign against the desires or wishes of the reformist bureaucrats, getting the broadest circles of the workers to participate.

The culminating point of the campaign has been fixed for March 18, to which date the various mass sport tournaments and other entertainments as well as the organisation of artistic agitational evenings should be arranged to make our agitational work as effective as possible. The programmes of these artistic entertainments should be drawn up so as to popularise our fundamental slogans in an artistic fashion.

In order that this campaign shall become international in character, all forms of international workers connections must be utilised, for example worker-correspondents must be induced to respond to each other in all parts of the world, material and wall-papers should be exchanged on an international scale, calls be issued through the radio and through the short-wave sets of worker radio amateurs, and exhibitions illustrating the struggle and the position of the working class in the various countries should be organised.

Artistic and literary forces, sympathising with the revolutionary struggle of the workers should be induced to take a hand in all this work. Ways and means of conducting the campaigns must be taken up in the leading organs of the trade unions and other labour organisations, special comrades to be appointed to attend to these activities. The campaign itself must be linked up with the concrete questions confronting the workers in the given country and in the given enterprise. All the problems arising from the present campaigns must not be placed before the workers in an abstract, theoretical way, but must be taken up concretely and in a popular form, so that they will be understood by each and every worker. The experience of the workers in the U. S. S. R. taking the power and the successes achieved must be given wide publicity. All questions of Soviet construction, state, economic and cultural must be made clear to the workers at large. The superiority of government by Soviets as against bourgeois government must be stressed, and in this fashion the problem of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat will be placed before the workers in all its significance. Affiliated R. I. L. U. organisations must do everything in their power to give this campaign a mass character.

With comradely greetings,

General Secretary

Red International of Labour Unions: A. Losovsky

Member Executive Bureau

Manager Agit-Prop. Dept: I. Usefovich.

The C. P. of Germany and the International.

The C. P. G., the Rights and the Conciliators.

Full Text of Speech Delivered by Comrade Molotov at the Meeting of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. on December 19th, 1928.

Comrades, the German question now under consideration in the Presidium is one of the most important questions in the Comintern. It is evident that the main questions, the questions of Comintern tactics, have to be considered in connection with it. The debates have already shown that in connection with the question of the Right danger in the C. P. G., the fundamental resolutions of the VI. Congress of the Comintern are discussed. Primarily, it is a question of the basic political resolution of the VI. Congress of the Comintern.

It should be immediately observed that under cover of the defence of the line of the VI. Congress, obvious attempts are now being made not only in the ranks of the German Party, but also among some active workers of the Executive Committee to revise the line of the VI. Congress. One may swear by his faith that he stands by the decisions of the VI. Congress, but if he wishes to prove that this is so, he must enforce those decisions. However, Comrade Humbert-Droz has given us one of the most typical examples of how, under pretext of defence of the decisions of the VI. Congress, a policy is pursued towards a revision of the foundations of those decisions. Any unbiased comrade who reads the stenogram of Comrade Humbert-Droz' speech at the Polit-Secretariat must admit that Comrade Droz has deviated from the line of the VI. Congress. The cardinal question in Humbert-Droz' speech is the question of the third period in the post-war development of world capitalism. Comrade Humbert-Droz wants to prove that the German Party, as represented by its Executive bodies, revises the decisions of the VI. Congress on that question. But the fact of the matter is quite the contrary. Comrade Humbert-Droz speaks ironically of those who still describe capitalist stabilisation as decayed, vacillating, etc. If we were to agree with him we would have to admit that capitalist stabilisation has become stable, that capitalism is becoming stronger and that this is the chief characteristic feature of the contemporary phase of capitalist development. Naturally from this viewpoint we would not be satisfied with what is stated in the resolutions of the C. C. C. P. G. The trouble is that Comrade Humbert-Droz has given a glaringly one-sided, and therefore incorrect and distorted characteristic of the contemporary period in the development of capitalism.

The decisions of the VI. Congress are not one-sided. The Congress recorded the fact that capitalism has surpassed the pre-war level, that the capitalist countries have made certain progress in the sphere of technical development, rationalisation, creation of more powerful capitalist mergers, etc. But to see only this side of the matter and to emphasise only these features in the development of capitalism, means to distort all that has been said by the VI. Congress regarding the third period in post-war capitalism. That is exactly what Humbert-Droz has done. He omitted in his speech the other side of the third period spoken of by the VI. Congress. The growth of technique in capitalist production, the higher organisation of capital, are under the present conditions accompanied by evergrowing contradictions in the capitalist system. In the decisions of the VI. Congress it has been sufficiently emphasised that the present period of stabilisation is connected with growing contradictions in the capitalist system, that contemporary capitalist stabilisation is simultaneously deepening the crisis of capitalism. This idea is absent in Humbert-Droz' speech.

Humbert-Droz: It is there.

Essentially Comrade Humbert-Droz' speech is an one-sided opportunist interpretation of the decisions of the VI. Congress on this fundamental question, the question of the third period in post-war capitalism.

Interjection: Hear, hear.

Otherwise, Comrade Humbert-Droz would not have said that the VI. Congress has not described contemporary stabilisation of capitalism as decayed and vacillating stabilisation.

Comrade Humbert-Droz accuses the C. C. C. P. G. of rejecting what has been said in the decisions of the VI. Congress concerning the third period. But the fact is that not the C. C. C. P. G., but he, Comrade Humbert-Droz, distorts the decisions of the Congress on this question. Any opportunist will admit that there are contradictions in capitalism, that sooner or later these contradictions will bring about the destruction of capitalism. That is why the decisions of the VI. Congress do not merely speak of contradictions in the capitalist system. In describing the third period the decisions state that side by side with the successes (technical development, capitalist organisation) there is now in some capitalist countries to be observed an accentuation of the capitalist crisis, we witness a rapid growth of inner and outer contradictions of capitalism, explosive revolutionary matter is accumulating among the workers. Only if we give this estimate of the contemporary phase of stabilisation, can we correctly solve our immediate tactical problems. From the one-sided opportunist evaluation of the third period given by Comrade Humbert-Droz, incorrect tactical conclusions must logically follow. That is why it is necessary first of all to establish clarity on the question of the third period.

It is necessary to deal with those new facts which are of utmost importance in characterising the economic and political situation in the capitalist countries. A series of great facts from the domain of the labour movement in the last few months shows that the general evaluation of the development of capitalism and the political conclusions drawn from it by the VI. Congress are splendidly confirmed. But it is to be regretted that some active members of the Comintern, as the debates have shown, do not want to reckon with this fact. In this respect, Comrade Serra's speech was very indicative. Comrade Serra has given a very light evaluation of the draft letters proposed by the Commission to the C. P. G. (the Open and Closed Letters to the Party). Comrade Serra maintains that these drafts give no analysis of the economic and political situation, that they incorrectly deal with the question concerning the tasks of the Party in time of strikes, concerning the attitude towards the reformist unions and the unorganised workers. It is needless to show that the extremely shallow and essentially wrong draft presented by Comrade Serra concerning the Rights in the C. P. G. is unsatisfactory. In criticising the draft letters proposed by the Commission, Comrade Serra has not only failed to analyse the situation in Germany, and particularly the recent class conflicts in Germany, but he got actually lost on some of the points of the resolution of the R. I. L. U.

Comrade Serra quoted several points from the resolutions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. concerning the need to work in the reformist unions, to win over the trade union masses, etc. But what has Comrade Serra done in order to link those decisions of the R. I. L. U. with the recent class struggles in Germany? He ignored the facts in the domain of the class struggle of the German workers in the last few weeks and months. He has not noticed anything new in the German labour movement. Comrade Serra is dissatisfied over the fact that the German Party organisation undertook during the lockout to organise the unorganised, but he does not ask himself what a Communist Party should do if more than 200,000 workers are suddenly locked out, if the reformists do not want to fight in defence of the locked-out workers and if the overwhelming majority of those workers is unorganised. But that was actually the case in the Ruhr. Can a Communist Party at such a moment fail to take up the question of setting up anti-lockout organisa-

of the workers and is it not under such conditions legitimate to take up the question of finding new forms of labour organisation? Can the creation of militant anti-lockout and strike organisations of workers be regarded as an act conflicting with the line of the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern to win over the workers belonging to the reformist unions, the line to get possession of the reformist unions from below? Of course not. The line of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., sanctioned by the IV. Congress of the Comintern, is to wage a stubborn struggle for winning over the working masses belonging to the reformist unions. This is a recognition of the need for a systematic struggle for the capture of those unions from below, for pursuing a policy of removal of reformist trade union leaders from their posts, no matter what obstacles the Communists will have in their way of doing so. But does this mean that the Communists must refuse to organise locked out workers who are not defended by the reformist bureaucrats, refuse to organise strikers who have entered a struggle against capitalism? Of course not. The resolutions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. clearly state that it is necessary to create under certain conditions special organs for the leadership of strikes, without and in spite of the reformist leaders. The Party must be at the head of the masses, it must support the struggle of the workers in spite of the bureaucrats of the reformist unions, because only by doing so will the Party be able to fulfil its principal task, the task of gaining leadership in the struggle of the working masses.

But Comrade Serra occupied himself here with reading points from resolutions without in any way trying to link those resolutions up with facts of the class proletarian struggle of the recent period. By this Comrade Serra has simply shown that he sees nothing new in the recent events, that he does not see that the events in the strike and anti-lockout struggles have brought before the workers, and consequently before the Communist Party, a series of new tasks. One may of course omit in a speech the actual facts, but that does not answer the questions raised by the workers who are fighting against capital. It does not answer to our comrades who are now working among the masses.

It must be admitted, however, that a series of important facts in the labour movement: A Germany, Poland and France, have raised before us in a new light certain practical tasks of organisation of the masses, and particularly the question of our attitude towards the unorganised workers. The growing strike movement, the drawing in of hundreds of thousands of workers from various countries into strike conflicts, and the prospects of new big class battles, demand that we pay much attention to the indicated questions. One could not maintain that without a thorough study of the experience in the strikes of the Ruhr, Lodz, etc., we could give all necessary instructions on these questions. It is necessary to assemble all material, to make a careful study of the recent strikes, and only then will the Comintern be able to give new instructions on the questions connected with strike tactics, with the practical tasks of the struggle for the capture of the reformist unions, with the tasks and methods of organising the unorganised. In the present conditions, when aggressive elements, elements of a new rising tide in the labour movement, are to be observed in several countries (Germany, Poland, etc.), all these practical questions concerning strike conflicts, struggles against lockouts, etc., become especially urgent and assume enormous political significance.

But has Comrade Serra in any way shown this? No, he is guilty. He simply fails to see that the economic struggle of the workers at the present time is taking a new course, that it is assuming new forms, that side by side with the defensive struggle there is to be observed a counter-offensive of the proletariat, and a new revival in the labour movement. Can we under such circumstances ignore the question of organisation of locked-out workers, of organising strikers, of organising the unorganised? It is not enough to recall or to repeat what has been said in some points of the adopted resolutions, it is necessary to have a certain minimum of revolutionary feeling and understanding of what is going on in the actual class struggle. Not to see that we have certain new elements, elements of an offensive in the proletarian struggle of the present time as compared with the past, means not to see and to ignore what is most important for the proletarian revolution. We cannot tell our comrades in time of lockouts or big strikes to limit themselves to mass meetings and to reading of various paragraphs of the

most excellent resolutions of the R. I. L. U., as Comrade Serra does. The resolutions of the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern must be linked up with the concrete facts in the labour struggle against capital, otherwise, instead of defending and explaining those decisions, the revolutionary tasks of the proletarian struggle are ignored and contact with the masses is broken. The interests of the revolutionary proletarian struggle demand that on the basis of our main decisions we should be able properly to approach the solution of practical tasks of the proletarian struggle, to distinguish skillfully all that is new, all that is happening in the struggle, and by establishing contact with the masses to march onward so as to secure leading Party influence in the proletarian struggle.

Finally, the third question, the situation in the German Party, and the internal policy of the Party.

It seems to me that the Communist Party of Germany is now really going through a phase of growth and construction as a real mass revolutionary proletarian Party which is being forged in the heat of unfolding class conflicts. This is a very difficult period. The Party must inevitably make mistakes, it will occasionally lag behind events and at other times reveal too much haste and deviate towards the Left. In the draft closed letter the names of two comrades of the C. C. C. P. G. (Remmele and Neumann) are given who have made errors of a Left wing character although their political line in general is correct. These mistakes must be pointed out so that the Party might be able to avoid them in the future. But it is quite obvious that no one in the Comintern will succeed in constructing a line of criticism of the political course of the German Party on the basis of these mistakes of individual comrades who actively participate in the revolutionary struggle, and who conscientiously try to carry out a revolutionary class policy. As important as it is to warn the Party against mistakes of a hasty character, such as the "immediate revolutionary perspective" is, the main issue in the C. P. G. is the question of struggle against the Right danger. The need for a merciless struggle against the Right elements in the C. P. G. is made imperative by the entire present situation. The Rights have become one of the main obstacles in the struggle of the Party for leadership in the labour movement. In evaluating the latest facts of the proletarian struggle in Germany, the Rights have entirely abandoned the revolutionary proletarian line and have most clearly demonstrated their ideological kinship with the Social Democrats. The Party cannot help regarding such people as Hausen and Galm, and especially their leaders Brandler and Thalheimer, as amputated units. They have entered on an irreconcilable struggle against the Party, they have broken with its policy, they break its discipline. The Party revealed maximum patience in relation to the Rights wishing to keep back the workers who followed them. But after what the Rights have done and are still doing (issuing papers, urging an open struggle against the line of the C. P. G. and the Comintern, systematic violation of discipline) an explanatory ideological struggle against the Rights is not sufficient. Organisational measures in relation to people who have definitely broken with the Party are also necessary.

In this connection, the question of conciliatory tendencies is becoming very acute in the Party. In order to overcome conciliatory views, a decisive step forward is necessary. It is well-known that not only the Rights, but also the conciliators have of late been attacking the C. C. C. P. G. on the pretext of the Wittorf incident. In this case, the conciliators have followed in the footsteps of the Rights. By this they have shown their weakness on questions of principle. This attack on the C. C. C. P. G. by the Rights and the conciliators has been exposed, but it cost the Party dearly. Suffice it to say that speculation on the Wittorf affair had its negative influence also on the outcome of the anti-cruiser campaign. Notwithstanding the weakness of the C. C. C. P. G. in connection with the Wittorf incident, the Party as a whole has rapidly and solidly repulsed the attack. Now the attack on the C. C. C. P. G. has assumed a much wider scope. The attack is led by the Rights who have broken all bounds with the Party. In this period conciliation is particularly harmful.

Unfortunately, comrades Humbert Droz and Serra have also on this question done a bad service to the C. P. G. and the Comintern. Instead of exposing the role of the conciliators who frequently support the Right wingers, Comrades Humbert Droz and Serra have themselves adopted the opportunist position of the conciliators. Comrade Serra said here that Comrade Thälmann cannot be regarded as a representative of the Comintern policy

in the German Party and proposed an alteration in the personal composition of the Polit-Bureau of the C. C. C. P. G. This being the case, who does represent the line of the VI. Congress in the C. P. G.? If we take the decisions of the VI. Congress we find that one of the main internal tasks of the German Party is to combat the Right danger and to overcome the conciliatory attitude towards it. The question arises: whom did the VI. Congress of the Comintern have in view when it spoke of the necessity to combat not only the Rights, but also the conciliators in the C. P. G.? Everybody knows that when speaking of the conciliators in the C. P. G. the VI. Congress had in view the Ewert group. But Comrades Humbert Droz and Serra who criticised the policy of the C. C. C. P. G. had attacked Comrade Thälmann, the leader of the C. P. G., tried to ignore the erroneous position of Comrades Ewert, Gerhardt, and others and thereby to conceal the mistakes of that conciliatory group. Is this not the reason why they try to picture that group as the true representatives of the Comintern in the C. P. G.? Is it not clear that this is a most obnoxious way of garbling the truth and turning the resolutions of the VI. Congress of the Comintern upside down? That is exactly the path chosen by Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra, that is how they defend the decisions of the VI. Congress. Comrade Serra's statement that the C. C. headed by Comrade Thälmann does not carry out the line of the VI. Congress of the Comintern, is a repetition of what the conciliators say in the C. P. G. But the VI. Congress called for a determined struggle against conciliatory tendencies and how can Comrade Serra's statement be reconciled with the decisions of the VI. Congress? Comrade Serra got in the end confused also in this respect.

Comrade Serra's and Humbert-Droz' position in relation to the conciliators is particularly intolerable at the present time. We know that in practice the Ewert group revises enti-

rely the line of the VI. Congress. The VI. Congress spoke the need to fight against Left wing and especially against Right wing deviations, in which connection it approved of the line of the C. C. C. P. G. Comrade Ewert and his group are now advocating a different point of view. They also stand for struggle on two fronts, but their fronts are not those of the VI. Congress of the Comintern. On the one hand they are against the Rights, but in words, on the other hand they are against the C. C., against the present policy of the German Party, i. e. against the policy sanctioned by the Comintern. Can Comrade Ewert's policy, defended here by Humbert Droz and Serra, be considered the policy of the VI. Congress? Of course not. There is an actual struggle against the line of the VI. Congress which means that the Presidium of the Comintern must resolutely expose their attempts to depart from the decisions of the VI. Congress.

On behalf of the delegation of the C. P. S. U., I must state that having analysed the draft letters on the German question proposed by the Commission, the delegation considers the drafts correct and moves their acceptance as a basis. Comrade Bell correctly pointed out here the necessity for a more detailed outline of some of the important Comintern problems which have been slightly touched upon in these letters. This should be taken into consideration both in the texts of the proposed letters and in the other Comintern documents. As stated, practice in the proletarian struggle at the present time has brought forward a series of new problems concerning the organisation of the working masses. This must find its expression in the resolutions of the Comintern. But this makes it the more necessary that the attempts at revising the main line of the VI. Congress should meet with determined condemnation and wholehearted resistance in the ranks of the Comintern.

DECLARATION

The English edition of "Inprecorr" No. 13 of 5th of March, page 234, contains an article by Comrade Remmele: "The Position in the Communist Party of Germany" in which it is maintained that the member of the E. C. C. I., Comrade Bela Kun, adopted a conciliatory standpoint by having attempted "to persuade Hausen to agree to everything at Moscow and to submit so that in Germany he could subsequently continue the fight against the Comintern and against the policy of the Party within the German Party".

The redaction of the "Inprecorr" has been informed by the Polit-Secretariat of the E. C. C. I. that Comrade Kun did not adopt a conciliatory standpoint and that Comrade Kun, both in the Hausen-Galm Commission as well as in the Presidium of the E. C. C. I., voted for the expulsion of Hausen and Galm and opposed the standpoint of the Rights and of the conciliators both orally and in the organs of the C. I.

Comrade Bela Kun has repeatedly declared that in a conversation with Hausen he called upon the latter to submit unconditionally to the decisions of the C. I. It is impossible to give any credence to the testimony of Hausen, who has been expelled from the Party, with regard to the character of this conversation, the less so as Comrade Bela Kun already by telegram, in the "Rote Fahne" of 9th February 1929, contradicted the slanderous assertions of Hausen and of the "Vorwärts", and the "Rote Fahne" itself stated that by this yet another calumnious assertion of the "Vorwärts" has been exposed.

TO OUR READERS!

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

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

For other countries the subscription rate is six dollars for one year.

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.**, whom all subscriptions should be sent. The subscription rates in the U. S. A. are, \$ 2 for three months, \$ 3.50 for six months and \$ 6 for one year.

The Business Manager