

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 9. No. 28

PRESS14th June 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, Schloesstach 212, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

- I. Mingulin: The Struggle for the Bolshevisation of the Communist Party of the United States.
- Hands off the Soviet Union.**
"Isvestia": The Anti-Soviet Provocations in China Continue.
- Politics.**
R. Schüller: On the Situation in Austria. Austrian and German Fascism.
"Pravda": The Relations Between the Soviet Union and Great Britain.
- Against Imperialist War.**
Walter Gollmick: The Preparations of the Communist Party of Germany for the International Red Day. A Mass Mobilisation Against Imperialist War.
- The Labour Movement.**
A. G.: The Heroic Struggle of the Bombay Textile Workers.
- The White Terror.**
K. Leski: Latvia in the Service of Pilsudski. The Life of Comrade Paszyn in Danger!
Save Comrade Marcel Pauker! Appeal from the Executive Committee of the International Red Aid!
- Union of Soviet Republics.**
A. I. Rykov: The Foreign Political Situation of the Soviet Union, Full Text of the Address Held at the V. Soviet Congress of the Soviet Union (Conclusion).
- In the International.**
Expulsion of Liquidators from the C. P. of Czechoslovakia.
- Against Trotzkyism.**
Em. Yaroslavski: Further Decomposition in the Camp of the Trotzkyists. A Letter from Radek to Smilga.
- In the Camp of Social Democracy.**
Ph. Dengel: The Magdeburg Congress of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.
A. Jones: The Degeneration of the Labour Party.
- XVI. National Conference of the C. P. S. U.**
The Five-Year Plan for the Development of the National Economic System. Resolution upon the Reports of Comrades Rykov, Kshishanovski and Kuybyshev.
The Development of Agriculture and the Tax Alleviations for the Middle Peasantry. Resolution upon the Report of Comrade Kalinin.

The Struggle for the Bolshevisation of the Communist Party of the United States.

By I. Mingulin (Moscow).

The Address of the Executive Committee of the Communist International to all members of the Communist Party of the United States published in the Inprecorr No. 27 has attracted the attention of the whole Communist International.

For over a month the commission of the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. studied and discussed the situation of the American C. P. together with the responsible leaders of the C. I. The commission had sufficient material at its disposal to adopt a closely reasoned decision based upon a thorough study of the situation of the party. A special delegation came from America at the instructions of the Sixth Convention of the American C. P. in order to discuss all the differences in the American communist movement before the C. I. This delegation had every possibility of presenting all its arguments to the commission and of giving all information which it considered necessary and which was of interest for the commission. The

delegation took a great part in the discussion of all the questions dealt with by the commission, and it made its own proposals both in writing and by word of mouth. After all the material had been closely examined and discussed the commission adopted the draft of the Address which was then presented to the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. and confirmed by the latter.

The C. I. has seldom examined the situation of a party so carefully and in such detail. This circumstance alone shows how serious is the situation in which the American Party finds itself, and how serious are the measures which are alone able to bring the Party onto the path of development leading to a bolshevist mass party of the most numerous and up to the present most backward proletariat which is now developing revolutionary activity.

Two questions in particular were dealt with by the commission: the fatal, wearisome and characterless fractional struggle in the Party, and the struggle against the right-wing danger and against the conciliators.

The Communist Party of America is only now seriously facing the question of bolshevisation. The development of the Communist Party under the conditions of a very slow growth of the class struggle and the formation of the Party out of various national and social groups, were the sources of the extremely wearisome fractional struggles which were based upon no serious differences of principle.

The fractional struggle considerably increased the difficulty of developing the Party into a bolshevist mass party of the American proletariat. The fractional groupings, the fractional degeneration of a section of the leaders of the disputing groups, the approach to all fundamental questions from the standpoint of their utilisation in the fractional struggle, all this made it extremely difficult for the Party masses under the conditions created by the influence of American corruption, to solve the really fundamental questions. It made it difficult to clarify the real differences of opinion and to determine the political and organisational policy which would have made it possible to develop the Party along bolshevist lines. Only recently the fractional groups of the majority and the minority in the leadership commenced to develop into two political tendencies without losing their fractional character.

Under the cover of the fractional struggles the recent period, particularly after the Sixth World Congress, showed a speedy growth in the Party of the right-wing danger and of the conciliatory attitude towards it. As in the whole Comintern, the right-wing danger in the American Party and the growth of this danger are determined by the same phenomena which caused the so-called third period in the development of the social and economic conditions of the world: the undermining of the capitalist stabilisation, the intensification of the internal and external contradictions of capitalism, the intensification and revolutionisation of the class struggle of the proletariat and the growing counter-attacks of the working class against the united front of the employers and the reformists.

The specific characteristics of the third period are of especial significance for the United States. Not only does the growth of the internal and external contradictions of capitalism affect the United States, but the development of the United States in the present period represents one of the most decisive conditions of this intensification, the inevitable outbreak of these contradictions. The fundamental socio-economic contradictions of the third period, the contradictions between the growth of the productive forces and the progressive and tremendous lagging behind of the markets, is becoming more and more noticeable in the present stage of the development of United States Imperialism and that is natural, because this contradiction is expressed most openly upon the basis of the exceeding of the pre-war level of production by European capitalism. Therefore, the tremendous growth of militarism and of the aggressive imperialist policy of the United States.

The other side of this process is the increase of the tempo of the growth of the class contradictions in America, the growth and the intensification of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. This was shown very clearly by the strike wave which commenced with the grand strike of the miners and ended with the great strike movements in the textile industry. Against the will of the reformist leaders, this strike movement was under the influence and leadership of the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions.

This process which draws America more and more within the frame-work of the crisis of international capitalism, means that neither the economic nor the political situation of America, and still less the tactics of the Communist Party, even making allowance for all possible and unavoidable specific differences in the situation in the various countries, are fundamentally an exception from the general perspective of world development.

This situation faced the Party with two extremely concrete fundamental tasks: 1. The liquidation of the fractional struggle which took up the lion's share of the Party forces and which prevented the clarification of the political and practical tasks of the Party, and 2. in accordance with the work and decisions

of the Sixth World Congress, the determination of the tactical line guaranteeing the extension of the independent role of the Party in the class struggle of the proletariat, a speedy process-making for the development of the Party into a bolshevist mass party which would be the leader of the activities of the American proletariat. The Sixth World Congress placed the following tasks before the Party with all energy:

"The most important task of the Party", declares the resolution of the Congress, "consists in liquidating the fractional struggle which has no serious differences of opinion as its basis."

Then, the Sixth World Congress did no more than stress the demand which the Communist International had made to the Party repeatedly during the course of a number of years. The E. C. of the C. I. systematically and persistently demanded the liquidation of fractionalism in the party. (Fifth Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. of the C. I., 1925, Sixth Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. of the C. I., 1926, and the resolution of the E. C. of the C. I. on the American question on the 1st July 1927). On the other hand, the Sixth Congress seriously warned the Party leadership in connection with the political line of the Party, and pointed to a "series of mistakes" which had been made by the Party leadership. And after all this, despite the great increase in the tasks of the Party and despite the intensification of the class struggle, the Party leadership not only failed to carry out the fundamental directions of the C. I., but even increased and intensified its mistakes.

After the Sixth World Congress the fractional struggle in the Party took on an extremely sharp character. The struggle referred to the basic questions of the communist movement, both in America and on an international scale. But in this struggle the fundamental questions of principle were overwhelmed by characterless fractionalism so that the masses of the Party membership found it extremely difficult and almost impossible to solve the question of what differences of principle separated the fighting groups from one another and in their attitude towards the general policy of the C. I.

After the Sixth World Congress the Party leadership intensified its right-wing errors. The leaders of the Party, Comrades Lovestone and Pepper, developed a whole series of policy out of isolated right-wing errors. This was expressed in a number of questions such as the estimation of the world situation, the formulation of the question of the struggle against deviations and in particular of the struggle against the right-wing deviation (the majority declared and defended in its theses that the right-wing deviation was Trotskyism, and in this way completely confused the struggle against the real right-wing danger), in the question of the danger of war, in the estimation of the internal and external contradictions of imperialism, in the estimation of the situation of American imperialism, the radicalisation of the American working class, etc.

The conception of the exceptional position of America which proceeded from the principle that on the whole America was above the international crisis and that the development of American capitalism was not subject to the laws of the undermining of the capitalist stabilisation, this conception was the commencing point of individual right-wing errors and the development of these errors into a right-wing policy. Comrade Pepper supported this conception of the exceptional situation of America since the Ninth Plenary Session of the E. C. of the C. I. It is characteristic and typical of the right-wing opportunist essence of this conception that the question of the exceptional situation of America was developed immediately after the Ninth Plenary Session of the E. C. of the C. I. which had put forward the fundamental perspective of the development of the change in the tactics of the C. I. which was afterwards presented in its final form by the Sixth World Congress.

This theory of the exceptional position of America, which is to be seen in its most developed form in the opinions of Comrades Pepper and Lovestone, consists for instance in the following conception: a crisis of capitalism, but not for American capitalism (that is to say, the crisis does not exist for world capitalism); the radicalisation of the working masses, but not in America; the necessity of intensifying the struggle of reformism, but not in the United States; and the necessity for a struggle against the right-wing danger, but not in the American Party. This policy could only lead the Party into

slough of opportunism and transform it into a "left wing" of the Socialist Party.

The minority which showed an ultra-left tendency in the formulation of all these questions, was nevertheless not completely free either from this conception of the exceptional position of America, nor from the right-wing errors which it shared with the majority up to the Sixth World Congress. Even after the Sixth World Congress the minority was not quite free from these errors.

The struggle around all these important questions of principle was accompanied by characterless speculation, in particular on the part of the majority in the question of the situation in the C. P. of the Soviet Union and in the reservations of the minority with regard to the resolution of the Sixth World Congress concerning the situation in America; the minority exaggerated the right-wing errors of the majority whilst the majority did not fail to pay back the minority in its own coin and exaggerated the errors of the minority and described it as a right-wing Trotskyist group.

For the Communist International it was quite clear that this intensification of the fractional struggle was the reflection of the intensification of the class struggle in the country and that this demanded a change in the development of the Party, and a correction of the political line of the Party, and that neither of the two fractions, one of which had got itself completely tied up in the right-wing deviation under the ideological leadership of Comrades Pepper and Lovestone, was able to carry out this change.

The work of the Sixth Convention of the Party which represented an extremely favourable commencing point for the recovery of the Party, was being utilised solely for fractional purposes. For this reason the E. C. of the C. I. addressed an Open Letter to the Convention raising seriously the question of the Party crisis and above all the crisis in the leadership of the Party. The Open Letter raised the question of the necessity of a decisive mobilisation of the whole Party for the broadest possible self-criticism and for the proletarianisation of the leadership from above and below in order to liquidate the fractional struggle, to give the Party a correct political line and to lead it upon the broad path to revolutionary development. At this opportunity the E. C. of the C. I. made definite organisational proposals for the carrying out of the policy contained in the Open Letter.

Both fractions, and above all the majority with Comrade Lovestone at its head, flagrantly deceived the proletarian Convention and attempted to represent the policy of the E. C. of the C. I. as a fractional policy, as a policy making for the handing over of power from the majority to the minority. This was not the intention of the E. C. of the C. I., could not be its intention and is not its intention. Comrade Lovestone made attacks upon the Communist International which were absolutely impermissible for a communist. At the Convention the leaders of the majority conducted a bitter campaign against the correct policy of the E. C. of the C. I., against the delegation of the Communist International, and against the responsible leaders of the minority who represented the policy of the E. C. of the C. I. In this way the Convention which, according to the letter of the E. C. of the C. I., was to have been the commencing point of a real bolshevisation of the Party, became the arena of unprincipled, unbolshevist and right-wing opportunist manoeuvres and struggles against the C. I.

At the end of the Convention, when the leaders of the majority with Comrade Lovestone at their head saw that they would not be able to lead the Convention and the Party openly upon the opportunist and fractional path of a struggle against the C. I. they adopted the methods of diplomacy and petty-bourgeois back-stair politics, and without any discussion, presented a resolution proposing immediate organisational measures in the struggle against the right-wing danger in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This policy was continued after the Convention when Comrade Pepper was expelled although the majority had supported his opportunism even when he violated the discipline of the C. I.

This was the situation in which the situation in which the C. I. found the American Party after its Sixth Convention, a situation which showed that unless something drastic were

done, the Party would suffer a break-up and opportunist degeneration.

But this situation is in crass contradiction to the real character of our American Communist Party. The Party consists in its overwhelming majority of proletarians who are devoted to the C. I. and to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. In recent years the Party became more and more the party of the class struggle and led obstinate struggles of the workers, whereby its ranks were extended. The majority in the Party were in favour of the Lovestone group because, as the comrades of the majority themselves admit, they thought that this group represented the policy of the Comintern. The Party which voted for the Lovestone group wished to express thereby its devotion to the C. I. It voted against the minority because it wanted to liquidate the fractional struggle.

It is worthy of attention that the proletarian Convention which sent its delegation to discuss the American question, did not think for one moment that it would be necessary or possible to oppose the C. I. The Convention which sent its delegation, instructed it in order that there should be no doubt at all, from the beginning to accept every decision of the Comintern, because the Convention was never in any doubt as to the correctness of the policy of the C. I.

The Presidium adopted a decision in complete accordance with the circumstances and the tasks of the Party. In the given situation the E. C. of the C. I. cannot simply approach the Party again with an appeal to liquidate fractionalism. The liquidation of fractionalism in the present period demands inevitably a real mobilisation of the whole Party, if necessary against the will of a section of the leadership. It demands real guarantees for a correct political line, the real proletarianisation of the leadership from above and below, the real bolshevist unity of the Party and decisive organisational measures for the carrying out of all these tasks which alone can lead the Party out of the blind alley in which it has been dragged by its leaders.

The measures of the E. C. of the C. I. are in general the following: to enlarge the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Party by co-opting new comrades and conducting collective work; to remove temporarily Comrades Lovestone and Bittelman, as leaders of the fractional struggles, from their work in the American Party; to hand over the case of Comrade Pepper together with that of Comrade Lovestone who represented a right-wing opportunist policy in the Party under the cover of the majority of the Central Committee and violated the discipline of the C. I., to the International Control Commission; to clarify the situation and the tasks of the Party before the masses of the members; to criticise sharply the whole characterless fractional struggle around the most important fundamental questions; to expose the crass opportunist and fractional misrepresentations of the policy of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern in particular by the majority leadership under Comrades Pepper and Lovestone; to make it clear to the Party that a change of leadership from one fraction to the other, or the support of this or that fraction, cannot lead the Party onto the path of bolshevisation, and that only the decisive liquidation of all fractionalism, a radical improvement of the leadership of the Party **through and through** upon the basis of its proletarianisation, the complete and unreserved carrying out of the policy of the Sixth World Congress upon the basis of bolshevist self-criticism and a merciless struggle against the right-wing deviation and against the remnants of Trotskyism — this alone can lead the Party out of the blind alley and develop the Party upon the path of bolshevism, upon the path of its development to a capable, efficient, revolutionary communist mass party of the American proletariat. Such were the decision and the proposal of the commission of the Presidium.

The delegation of the majority answered this decision with an arch-fractional declaration, with a threat to split the Party, to conduct a struggle against the Comintern, with the accusation that the C. I. was pursuing a fractional policy and destroying the Party, etc. The delegation of the minority with Comrades Foster and Bittelman at the head accepted the letter of the E. C. of the C. I. without reservation. The declaration of the majority used the path of slandering the Comintern and misrepresenting its policy, it used the path of open threats, characteristic for all those groupings which have taken the path of the struggle against the C. I., supported the slanders of the renegades and, not content with this, gone over into

the camp of reformism, irrespective of whether they have taken the right-wing or "left-wing" path.

The second absolutely fractional and absolutely impermissible anti-Party declaration of Comrades Gitlow, Lovestone and others of 14th May is of the same character and represents the platform of a struggle against the C. I., a direct attempt to create the preliminary conditions for a break with the decisions of the C. I. and the disruption of the C. P. of America. But in the Presidium, despite the extended fractional right-wing opportunist and demagogic work of Comrades Lovestone and Gitlow a section of the delegation of the minority declared, when they saw that their leaders were taking the political path of right-wing disrupters, under the banner of a struggle against an allegedly undeserved and too strict criticism of the Executive against the leaders of the majority, that they would accept the decisions of the E. C. unreservedly and would carry them out. The same attitude was taken up by the students of the International Lenin School who formerly supported the majority.

The Communist Party of America is now experiencing a difficult moment of transformation in its history. In the years of stabilisation, in the years of a slow development of the class struggle and under the influence of great pressure from American corruption, and under the conditions of a characterless fractional struggle, considerable rottenness and opportunism had accumulated in the Party (as in other parties of the C. I. in the same degree) and this was expressed most strongly in the leadership of the Party. The elements of this rottenness and this opportunism had been purged from the minority group when Cannon and his supporters left through the "left-wing" door to the camp of Trotzkyist counter-revolution. The bolshevik parties all grow only by systematic cleanings from rottenness and opportunism. In connection with the intensification of the class struggle, the right-wing opportunism in the Party became the chief danger. Opportunism, driven onto the defensive, expressed itself chiefly in the right-wing danger and in a conciliatory attitude towards it, in a serious deviation from the policy of the Comintern towards the right, a deviation chiefly represented by the leadership of the majority.

The special nature of the right-wing deviation in the C. P. of America consists in the fact that the characterlessness of the fractional struggle also exercised a strong influence upon the right-wing danger. Whether the group with Comrade Lovestone at its head travels the path of the right-wing disrupters to the end, to the disruption of the Party, or whether it halts and refuses to give its hand openly to the right-wingers and to the conciliators, depends upon how far the Party mobilises its proletarian resistance and upon how far the opportunist influence of these elements has penetrated into the Party. But in any case, the C. I. will not budge an inch from its policy of liquidating the fractionalism of right-wing opportunism and the remnants of "left-wing" opportunism. If the right-wing disrupters leave the Party, this will only mean that there was opportunist rottenness in the Party which has now appeared openly and collected around the right-wing disrupters and without whom the Party will be easier able to travel along its revolutionary path.

This is the good influence of every such party crisis. When such crises arise, only a small group of mistaken and above all opportunist sectarians leave the Party. If they halt upon their disruptive path and remain in the Party, then they can only do this in bolshevik fashion by recognising their errors and carrying out the policy of the C. I.

In any case, there is no doubt about the complete isolation of the opportunist disrupters from the overwhelming majority of the party. The acceptance of the decisions of the C. I. by a part of the delegation of the majority, by the students of the Lenin School, by the Political Bureau and by the Secretariat of the Party in New York, shows that the C. I. has given the Party a correct bolshevik policy and that the proletarian majority of the Party understands and accepts it.

The Party is experiencing a crisis of growth. Under the conditions of the growing class struggle, the transformation is taking place from a divided organisation rent with the opportunist fractional struggles organisation to a united bolshevik party. The transformation is difficult because the sickness of opportunism and fractionalism has taken a deep hold upon the organism of the Party. But the transformation itself

shows the growth of the Party and the inevitable demand of the extending class struggle of the proletariat: that the fractional struggle must be destroyed and that a really united Communist Party with a firm and determined bolshevik policy and leadership must be created to lead the proletariat in its struggle. The transformation and the crisis itself prove that the Party has grown and been steered for the solution of its tasks.

At the same time the crisis proves how urgent is this task, how great it is and what difficulties stand in the way of its solution. The present and the coming struggles will steel the Party still further, will make it into a bolshevik party in the eyes of the decisive majority of the American proletariat. Therefore the Party is taking its new path so confidently, because it knows that this is the way in which a bolshevik party grows by cleaning itself from all rottenness and opportunism and by fighting decisively against all opportunist misrepresentations of the Leninist policy.

Such a party need fear nothing, for its cause is certain of success. Only such a party will be able to solve in a revolutionary fashion the really tremendous practical tasks which are now facing the communist movement of America in connection with the increasing pressure of the bourgeoisie through the rationalisation. The growth of the contradictions of American capitalism, the growth of unemployment, the growing insecurity of the broad masses of the proletariat and the growing danger of war demand a great mobilisation and a firm united organisation from our Party. This task can only be performed by a bolshevik party cleaned of the petty-bourgeois rottenness of fractionalism and opportunism.

Success in the struggle for a bolshevik Communist Party of the United States is certain. The Party is carrying on the struggle upon the basis of the policy of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International under the slogans: For bolshevik unity, for the liquidation of all fractionalism, for the decisive proletarianisation of the whole leadership of the Party up to the Political Bureau and the Secretariat of the Party. Upon this basis broad possibilities of revolutionary struggles and victories open themselves up to the Party and to the revolutionary movement of the American proletariat and to the possibility of utilising the weakening of the power of American capitalism.

HANDS OFF THE SOVIET UNION

The Anti-Soviet Provocations in China Continue.

(Leading Article from the "Isvestia" on the 8th June.)

Ten days have passed since the local Chinese police made their monstrous and violent attack upon the General Consulate of the Soviet Union in Kharbin. The action of the authorities in Kharbin, which represents a very serious violation of the elementary principles of international law and of international custom, has called forth an adequate protest on the part of the Soviet Government. A note of the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, dated the 31st May, declares that the attitude of the local Chinese authorities was illegal and protests energetically in the name of the Government of the Soviet Union. The note demands the immediate release of all citizens of the Soviet Union arrested in the building of the Consulate and the return of all confiscated documents, monies and other property.

Although this note was handed to the Chinese Charge d'Affaires in Moscow over a week ago, no answer has been given up to the moment. But still further, the attitude of the local Chinese authorities shows that they intend to ignore the energetic demand of the Soviet Government that they should refrain from committing further provocative acts and further violations of existing treaties and agreements. The raid upon the General Consulate of the Soviet Union in Kharbin was only one link in a chain of such actions. This fact created a situation which is taking on an ever more serious character.

During the search of the Consulate thirty-nine Soviet citizens, including visitors to the Consulate, were arrested by

the Chinese police. These persons are still being held in prison by the Chinese authorities. It is only surprising that the number of arrested persons is so small, because the raid was made during the business hours of the General Consulate which serves an area containing an extremely large number of Soviet citizens, tens of thousands in fact. It is clear that the arrest of the persons found upon the premises of the General Consulate is just as great a violation of international law as the raid itself. These mass arrests mean the creation of a situation in which the simple visit to a Soviet Consulate by a citizen of the Soviet Union is regarded as a criminal act to be punished with arrest. That such a situation is intolerable, is perfectly clear.

But that is not all. The illegal raid upon the General Consulate is being used by the Chinese authorities as the commencing point of a new anti-Soviet campaign which is absolutely unique in its cynicism, its aggressiveness and the obvious fabrications and forgeries of "documents" alleged to have been found during the searches which are being used. The fact that these forgeries have been published, is not surprising, for the raid itself was nothing but an excuse for the Chinese authorities to publish them and thus "prove" that the existing agreements were broken by us, thus "justifying" the real violation of the agreements by the Chinese authorities. The publication of these forgeries is a proof that the Chinese authorities intend, despite the warning of the Soviet Government, to continue their policy of provocation and illegal violence.

On the day after the raid the Kharbin police issued an official declaration which for shameless and ridiculous lying is hard to equal. According to this declaration a "session of the Third International" was caught in the cellar of the General Consulate. The police also declare that they were able to confiscate documents, literature, arms and -- opium!

It hardly needs to be said that this police statement is a farrago of nonsensical and clumsy lying and has not even the appearance of truth. The fact is that the famous "cellar of the General Consulate" contains the canteen of the Consulate employees, and here the police were able to arrest only three or four persons whereas the other arrested persons were taken in the reception room of the pass department and in the official rooms of the various officers of the Consulate.

With regard to the "documents" allegedly found in the Consulate building, to judge by those published in the Kharbin newspapers, they give evidence of the primitive technique of the oriental forgery workshops as compared with the more efficient Western European anti-Soviet forgery shops. Drujelovski and Orlov would never have risked their reputations by sending out such clumsy work. For instance, a photograph published by the police contains "the record of a direct telephone conversation between the Consulate and the Comintern". This "record" is nothing but a photograph of an ordinary piece of paper with phantastic contents written by an ordinary typewriter. In addition, the orthography is the old style abolished in Russia since the revolution.

The contents of such forgeries are of no very great interest to us. But it is characteristic to note that in this case, despite the great demand in certain quarters abroad for anti-Soviet fairy-tales of all sorts, the "Kharbin finds" are not being taken up in the foreign press and that the newspapers and the telegraph agencies, naturally with the exception of the British Reuter agency which is prepared to accept anything as long as it is directed against the Soviet Union, continue to maintain an attitude of the deepest mistrust towards the "discoveries" of the Kharbin police.

The fact remains, however, that the Kharbin forgeries are being used by the Chinese authorities to conduct a furious campaign in the local Chinese and White Guardist press against the Soviet Union and against the Soviet Consulates. Characteristic of the hostile and impermissible tone of this campaign is that a Chinese newspaper appearing in Kharbin demands the arrest of the General Consul of the Soviet Union, Melnikov.

All these things represent the immediate logical sequel of the raid upon the Kharbin General Consulate. During the course of the last few days, however, the Chinese authorities have committed a provocative and illegal act which has no direct connection with the Kharbin events. On the day of the raid the General Consul of the Soviet Union in Mukden,

Kusnetzov, was in Kharbin on his way to Moscow where he intended to spend his leave. On the 30th May Kusnetzov received his diplomatic visum from the Chinese authorities to leave China. Despite this Kusnetzov was stopped on the way and requested to return to Kharbin. He protested energetically and was then permitted to continue his journey, but at the station Manchuria his compartment was surrounded by police and he was once again requested to return to Kharbin, allegedly for a "discussion" with the local authorities. Kusnetzov refused very definitely whereupon he was arrested and taken back to Kharbin under escort. On 4th June and under the pressure of an energetic protest by the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs to the Chinese Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, he was released.

The arrest of the General Consul Kusnetzov illustrates clearly both the illegality and the senselessness of the attitude adopted by the Chinese authorities recently towards the Consular representatives of the Soviet Union. As is known, China is carrying on a struggle for the abolition of consular jurisdiction and for the establishment of foreign relations upon the basis of the principles of equality and mutuality. In this question the Chinese government is faced with a united front of the imperialist powers and is not even completely recognised by these powers. The Chinese government is still striving to obtain equal treatment from these powers. And yet, under these circumstances, the Chinese authorities find nothing better to do than to violate flagrantly the elementary principles of international law where the representatives of the Soviet Union are concerned, the representatives of the only country which voluntarily abandoned the right of extraterritoriality in China and which voluntarily placed its relations to China upon the basis of complete and absolute equality and respect for the sovereignty of China.

The most bitter enemies of Chinese independence could find no better argument than that supplied to them by the attitude of the Chinese authorities towards the representatives of the Soviet Union, to support their thesis that China is incapable of administering its own affairs, that it is impossible to recognise the complete sovereignty of the Chinese authorities and that it is impossible to negotiate with the Chinese government upon a basis of equality. It must be pointed out that the affair of the arrest of fifteen Soviet citizens during the raid on the Soviet Embassy in Peking in 1927 and the raid itself were quoted by the imperialists, who were themselves the inspirers of the raid, more than once as an argument against the demands of the Chinese government for equal treatment and the abolition of the extraterritoriality. There is no doubt that the imperialists will similarly utilise the present action of the Chinese authorities in Manchuria.

For us, however, the most important side of the question is the situation which has been created between the Soviet Union and China. The Soviet Union cannot tolerate such lawlessness and such chicanery with regard to its consular representatives. The population of the Soviet Union is not prepared to tolerate a situation in which bands of Chinese police may break into the Consulates of the Soviet Union, confiscate the inviolable correspondence of the Consulate, and arrest Soviet citizens in the Consulate buildings, a situation in which the Chinese police may conduct a shameful and irresponsible campaign against the Consulate in the local press and a situation in which local authorities may arrest the General Consul of the Soviet Union. The note of the Soviet Government contained a firm and decisive warning, and the Chinese authorities deceive themselves if they believe that they can continue their policy of provocation and violence, their policy of lawless violation of the elementary rights and interests of their nearest neighbour, the Soviet Union, and its institutions.

The people of the Soviet Union demand an immediate answer to the note of the Soviet Government of the 31st May. They demand that the Chinese authorities should refrain from further illegal and provocative actions which go beyond the patience of the Soviet Union.

POLITICS

On the Situation in Austria.

Austrian and German Fascism.

By R. Schüller (Vienna).

The foreign-political significance and menace of Austrian Fascism have so far been underestimated by many. It cannot be denied, however, that the danger which Austrian Fascism constitutes to the working class of all Central Europe and also to the defence of the Soviet Union, deserves to be taken seriously.

Austrian Fascism is being prepared by the Government step by step and in the "Heimwehr" (Home defence) formations possesses an army of very many thousands. The actual number is variously estimated, the Heimwehr leaders themselves speaking of 80,000.

The Heimwehr is very well equipped, with serviceable uniforms of the pattern of the old Austrian army, steel helmets, and up-to-date arms. At their demonstrations they carry formidably infantry spades and axe-picks (a weapon of the Alpine troops); all the group leaders are armed with revolvers. The Heimwehr, however, also possesses rifles and machine-guns, with which the various units are photographed for publication. In the Tyrol and other Alpine regions they have also light mountain artillery.

The Heimwehr (i. e. the actual Heimwehr, besides which there are also Heimwehr trade unions) is divided on strictly military lines into detachments, companies, battalions, regiments, and divisions, which are under the command of ex-officers up to the rank of general. Active officers of the Federal Army, however, also take part in the training and command of the Heimwehr.

The connection between the Heimwehr on the one hand and the Federal Army, constabulary, and police on the other hand is most intimate. Not only does a great proportion of the armed forces of the State already consist of Heimwehr elements, it being practically impossible to enter the Army without a recommendation from the Heimwehr. Besides this, there can be no doubt that the arms and part of the other equipment of the Heimwehr are derived from the official army depots through the mediation of the Ministry of National Defence under the monarchist and Fascist Vaugin.

As a matter of fact, the Heimwehr in Austria is neither more nor less than a supplementary force to the army and police. This has been openly admitted by the official Government party in its organ, the "Reichspost", which has called the Heimwehr "a supplement to the power of the State".

We have here, therefore, a well-equipped and well-armed force of over 50,000 as a reinforcement to the Federal Army and the police.

How is it that such things can be brooked by the Powers, which according to the Peace Treaty permitted Austria a maximum of 30,000 troops, if they have not, indeed, their own imperialistic aims in view? The Austrian Heimwehr is in reality backed not only by the native bourgeoisie and Government but also by foreign imperialism.

It is Italy, Hungary, Germany, and ultimately even Great Britain, that are fostering and encouraging the Heimwehr Fascists of Austria.

These connections have not always been easily discernible. All the less so seeing that for a long time the Austrian bourgeoisie and the Christian Socialist Government Party long vacillated between the Little Entente and France on the one hand and Italy and Germany (with Great Britain in the background) on the other. To-day the orientation towards Italy, Hungary and Germany, is more and more apparent.

This development in relation to Italy has been recognisable in many things. In the first place the Seipel Government has capitulated all along the line in the matter of South Tyrol. Hitler, the leader of the German Fascists himself, it will be remembered, could not deny on trial that he had accepted money from Italy, and it has been proved that the Italians are financing the training of the Heimwehr in the Tyrol. The economic gravitation towards Italy has also become increasingly apparent, especially since the latter country has had the decision in regard to the relief credit to Austria to the extent of 100 million shillings, a credit of which Austria is urgently in need. This

approach has been completed by the understanding reached between the Italian Fascists and the Vatican, for in Austria the Heimwehr is very faithful to the Catholic church, so that no Heimwehr demonstration ever takes place without a mass or a blessing of banners.

As an accompaniment to the approach between the Austrian bourgeoisie and Fascism and Italy, there has also been approach in relation to the Hungary of Hortly. In this respect the relations have already progressed so far that the Hungarian police has just as free a hand in Vienna as in Budapest.

Great significance, meanwhile, attaches to the promotion of Austrian Fascism by the new imperialists of Germany to the co-operation of Fascism in these two countries, which has grown with the western orientation of Germany. We must call to mind the promise of "Augur", to the effect that Great Britain would sanction the union between Germany and Austria in the eventuality of the former country's joining the anti-Soviet front. As a matter of fact, the object, the propagation of which serves to cloak most of the aims of latter-day German imperialism and in which the secret threads of intrigue against the Soviet Union meet, is the "Anschluss" of Austria.

The support of Austrian Fascism by Germany is both direct and indirect. It is carried on indirectly through the Austrian Association of Industrialists and directly through the furnishing of German instructors for the Heimwehr and the co-operation of the Heimwehr with the Stahlhelm.

The Association of Industrialists in Austria is the pronounced leader, organiser and financier of the Heimwehr. It is the industrialists who pay for the Heimwehr and control the Fascist bourgeois bloc which formed the present Government. Within the Association again, the authoritative group is that of the heavy industry of Styria and Carinthia led by the Alpine Montan Gesellschaft and the Böhler A. G. And it is the Austrian heavy metal interests, united with the parallel interests in Germany by means of the International Steel Cartel, which is the chief organiser of Heimwehr Fascism in Austria.

The rôle played in the Heimwehr movement by Pabst, one of the murderers of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, is well known. It is a fact moreover, that within the Heimwehr the "active" Styrian wing, which is led by Pabst and Pfriemer and directly supported by the Alpine-Montan, is growing more and more predominant.

The co-operation between the German Stahlhelm and the Austrian Heimwehr is quite flagrantly apparent in connection with the Stahlhelm Congress in Bavaria. Not only did the Austrian "front-fighters" take part in the Stahlhelm parade, but 20,000 members of the Stahlhelm subsequently visited Innsbruck, whence they intend to make a tour of the Austrian provinces.

The "Anschluss" propaganda is, so to say, the bridge which is to serve in bringing about a Fascist-Social Democratic union front and in guaranteeing the co-operation of Stahlhelm Fascists and Social Fascism in the interest of the new German imperialism. Suffice it to cite one example to show how well this collaboration works. At Munich and Innsbruck the Stahlhelm and the Heimwehr just now demonstrated in favour of the "Anschluss"; in Vienna the same cause united the "Reichsbanner" and the Austrian Social Democratic "Republikanischer Schutzbund" (Republican Defence League), while at Klagenfurt the latter actually concerted with the Heimwehr in a similar demonstration.

The German bourgeoisie promotes Austrian Fascism not only from imperialist motives but also as a means of counter-revolutionary strategy against its own proletariat. A Fascist dictatorship in Austria, which would anticipate a culmination of the rising wave of revolution, would be a tremendous obstacle in the path of revolution in Germany. It is the object of the German imperialists to enable Fascism in Austria to gain a decisive victory before any really decisive fight can take place.

The co-operation of the Fascists in Germany and Austria is an enormous source of danger for the workers of these two countries. It is one of the factors drawing Austria actively into the anti-Soviet intrigues of the imperialist Powers and at the same time increasing the danger of war among the imperialist rivals in Central and Southern Europe.

Thus the danger of war is also acute for Austria itself, for which reason the 1st of August will be a significant date for that country too. It will drastically show up the connection between Fascism and imperialist war preparations and will be in a double sense a day of struggle against these sanguinary menaces.

The Relations Between the Soviet Union and Great Britain.

(Extract from the "Pravda" of the 8th June.)

The victory of the Labour Party at the British elections underlines one of the most acute questions of international politics, i. e. the question of the relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union. To be exact, the Diehards who have just resigned and whose "service" it was that the diplomatic relations between the two countries were broken off and that a strained atmosphere was created in Europe, were also faced with this problem in its whole extent. The question played no small role in the parliamentary elections, and the Labour Party which emerges victorious from the elections and which extracted no little political capital out of criticising the aggressive anti-Soviet policy of its predecessors, will, in all probability, be compelled to honour its electoral promises in the question. The re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union is not only of interest for the two countries immediately concerned, but is also a matter of great international significance.

Recently, the capitalist world has begun to show more and more interest for the Soviet Union, for by this time even the bitterest enemies of the Soviet Union have realised that their hopes for a "collapse" of the Soviets are illusory. On the contrary, the last Party Conference and the great plan of socialist reconstruction adopted by the Soviet Congress, must convince the whole world that we are carrying on reconstruction in deeds and not in words, to an extent unknown in any capitalist country. At the same time the capitalist countries are faced more and more urgently with the question of obtaining new markets.

Under these circumstances the presence of an important delegation of British industrialists in the Soviet Union was no accident, just as it is no accident that a delegation of American businessmen will visit the Soviet Union in the near future. Great transactions like our agreement with the General Electric Company and our agreement with the Ford Company which has just been made public, show that our relations with the United States are being placed upon a more and more secure basis. It is therefore by no means surprising that the formation of a Labour Government is causing lively comment in the whole international press, including the American press, concerning the expected re-opening of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

We of course are well aware that in its negotiations with the government of the Soviet Union, MacDonald's government will defend the interests of capitalism with the same devotion that any other bourgeois government would show. However, in connection with the results of the British elections, it is probable that when MacDonald carries out his election promises, then a change will take place in the relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union which will lead them out of the blind alley into which they were led by the Diehards.

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

The Preparations of the Communist Party of Germany for the International Red Day.

A Mass Mobilisation Against Imperialist War.

By Walter Gollmick (Berlin).

Together with the Communist Parties of all other countries, the Communist Party of Germany is taking all the measures necessary to make the International Red Day a day of the broadest working class and peasant masses in town and country against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union. The aim of the anti-war campaign of the Communist Parties is not to carry out any "putch" as the international Social Democracy, and particularly the German reformists, declare, for very obvious reasons. The aim of the Communist Parties is

not to organise a "putch" but to mobilise the masses against war.

The political character of this campaign in Germany is determined by the international situation and by the situation in Germany itself. The Communist Party of Germany therefore stresses the following factors in its campaign:

The danger of war is growing, all the disarmament conferences have broken down, whilst the agreement in the reparations question means the consolidation of the imperialist united front against the Soviet Union. The more the revolutionary power of the masses rises, the more intense become the preparations for war against the Soviet Union.

The Second International, which is a supplementary organisation of the League of Nations to confuse the masses with pacifist phrases and to organise an international anti-Bolshevik campaign, has deliberately placed itself and all its sections at the disposal of the imperialists in their preparations for war against the Soviet Union.

Bourgeois pacifism, which is chiefly utilised by the Social Democracy, attempts to deceive the masses by spreading illusions concerning the possibility of the prevention of war by disarmament, by committees of arbitration and by the League of Nations. The so-called "revolutionary" pacifists also try to detract the attention of the masses from the only real way to fight against war, by propagating individual refusal to do military service.

The only international organisation of the proletariat which carries on a revolutionary struggle against imperialist war is the Communist International.

In Germany the coalition government, under the leadership of the Social Democrats, has entered a new stage of armaments with the building of the armoured cruisers. With its "Programme of National Defence" the Social Democratic Party of Germany has once again declared itself in favour of the policy of the 4th August 1914, in favour of social imperialism. The bloody terror in the first days of May and the series of prohibitions issued against revolutionary organisations and against the revolutionary working-class press show what methods the bourgeoisie and the Social Democracy in Germany are using against the working-class movement in this period of preparations for war. The aim of the bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats in attempting to destroy the organisations of the revolutionary proletariat, is to break the forces of resistance to the threatening war. The growing reaction in cultural matters (the Concordat, the censorship, etc.) and the activities of bourgeois class justice (high treason trials against editors, the conviction of the "May criminals", etc.) also serve to further the preparations for war.

Upon the economic field capitalism has taken up the offensive with a view to cutting wages, increasing working hours and reducing the unemployment support in order to be able to hold its own in the increased competition for world markets which leads to imperialist conflicts. The system of compulsory arbitration, the strike breaking tactics and the disruption of the reformists, support the economic preparations of the German bourgeoisie for war.

The Party is working to spread these ideas amongst the broadest masses of the workers, and for this purpose it is organising preparatory meetings. In the inner-Party discussions and in the mass campaign to utilise the May events, the Party has declared the preparations of the anti-war demonstration to be the most important task of the immediate future. The danger of war will also play a considerable role in the public meetings held in connection with the Party Congress and in connection with the agitation against the Magdeburg Congress of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. The Party will also utilise the Tenth Anniversary of the signing of the Versailles Treaty by Hermann Mueller, i. e. the birth of the League of Nations (28th June), the Fortieth Anniversary of the foundation of the Second International (14th July) and the Fifteenth Anniversary of the Austrian ultimatum (28th July) for its anti-war campaign. On the 14th July the party will hold public meetings and demonstrations at which the speakers will refer to the

decisions of the Second International against war, to the treachery of the Second International and to the role of the Third International in connection with the anti-war Day. On the 28th July international meetings will take place with the representatives of other parties in Berlin, Hamburg, Koenigsberg, Danzig, Frankfurt-on-Main, Essen Munich, Leipzig, etc.

The bourgeoisie and the Social Democratic Party of Germany are preparing a great circus in connection with the anniversary of the proclamation of the Weimar on the 11th August 1919. In its preparatory campaign the Communist Party of Germany will describe this celebration as a patriotic celebration of the "national united front".

Organisationally the Party acts upon the assumption that the carrying out of the anti-war campaign must be preceded by a definite internal strengthening of the Party in the preparatory months when the tasks raised by the May events will be carried out: control of the leadership, above all in the large factories, the formation of a system of revolutionary shop stewards in the factories, the organisation and improvement of the composition of the women's departments, the election of women organisers in the factory groups, the organisation of demonstrations against the prohibitions, the formation of proletarian defence groups, the extension of the agitation and propaganda apparatus of the subordinate party organisations, the organisation of agitation and propaganda conferences in all districts, and the political influencing of the factories, etc.

For the preparation of the mass agitation, the Party is forming preparatory committees in the districts and in small towns, consisting of representatives of the Party, the Youth, the fraternal organisations, and of mass organisations and large factories. It is of especial importance that sport organisations should be represented on these committees. The working women must also be represented.

After the necessary ideological and political preparatory work, the party will commence to form **Anti-War Committees** in the factories to prepare the Red Day. These Anti-War Committees will be built upon the broadest possible basis.

In view of the fact that the organisational position of the Party amongst the masses of the working women and the working youth who play an important role in the war industries, is weak, the Party is taking **special measures** to mobilise these sections of the working class (women's delegate conferences and delegate conferences of the working youth, locally, in the districts and centrally). These women and youth conferences will also send representatives into the Anti-War Committees.

The anti-war agitation will be carried into the ranks of the farm labourers and poor peasants in connection with the question of taxation, the increase in the cost of living, etc.

The Party will organise **Anti-War Conferences** upon a broad basis in all towns and districts. Factory committees, individual representatives of the factory workers and proletarian mass organisations will be represented at these conferences. Apart from the factory delegate conferences, the Party will also utilise shop council conferences, conferences of the trade union opposition and conferences upon economic questions in order to strengthen the anti-war campaign. In all these conferences the necessary measures will be discussed in detail, and local anti-war committees will be formed. In the anti-war conferences, particular attention will be paid to the question of the struggle against the expected repressive measures of the bourgeoisie.

The Party will form a centralised leadership from the broad local anti-war committees and this central leadership will take all necessary steps before the 1st August to ensure that a broad mobilisation of the masses takes place despite all the repressive measures of the bourgeoisie.

In support of the anti-war campaign, the Party is issuing a whole series of propagandist pamphlets, and the Party press is paying the greatest attention to the questions of anti-war propaganda.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Heroic Struggle of the Bombay Textile Workers.

By A. G.

The magnificent strike of the Bombay textile workers, which embraces from 130,000 to 140,000 workers, developed from a number of small and isolated strikes. This great mass movement was preceded by a movement in the factories of the West concern. Approximately 15,000 workers in these factories were on strike at the beginning of March in support of a number of economic demands. 6,000 strikers, including the members of the shop councils, were dismissed and the employers commenced to take on new workers. The strike situation became acute. The workers demanded the re-employment of their dismissed fellow-workers and the recognition of the shop councils.

Then the measures against the workers organisations and against the leaders and officials of the working class movement commenced. On 20th March the trade union organisations were smashed and the editorial offices of working class newspapers raided and destroyed. Thirty-one workers leaders were flung into prison in Meerut. The revolutionary textile workers union "Girni Kamgar" (Red Flag), which already had 60,000 members strengthened its organisation in the factories and prepared itself for new struggles by electing factory workers to take the place of the leaders arrested by the police. Preparations were commenced for a general strike.

On the 25th April a mass meeting of textile workers decided to commence the general strike at 12 o'clock on the night of the 26th April. The strike commenced and, despite all the attempts of the reformist textile workers union to break the strike, developed into a tremendous proletarian mass movement. The head of the reformist union is Bachalo Joshi, and this union lost 2,000 members recently and has at the moment about 6,000.

The negotiations of the textile industrialists with the representatives of the "Red Flag" Union came to no result. Despite the difficulties, the strike continued. The demands of the strikers show their increasing class-consciousness, their growing solidarity, and the increasing importance attached by them to political demands. Apart from the demands for wage increase the following demands were put forward: Complete recognition of the "Red Flag" Union by the employers, complete recognition of the shop councils, and the re-instatement of all the strikers and of all the workers dismissed before the outbreak of the strike.

The struggle is extending and the police have fired upon the strikers. The "Bombay Chronicle" reprinted the bulletin of the "Red Flag" union declaring that in a private conference with the employers, the Bombay authorities promised the employers "to use the police force in order to destroy the activity of the 'Red Flag' union root and branch". The "Red Flag" Union which is leading the heroic struggle, declares in its bulletin "If the government thinks that it can break the strike and destroy our union with threats of persecution, then it is mistaken".

The growth of the movement of the Bombay textile workers coincides with the formation of a "Labour" Government with MacDonal at its head in the "Motherland" of India, Great Britain. The Bombay textile workers know now much of the "Labour" Government is worth. Bitter experience in the past has destroyed any illusions in this respect. The journal "The New Spark" which is appearing in Bombay in place of "The Spark" which was suppressed by the authorities, devotes a leading article in its first number to this question, from which the following extract is taken:

"No one who remembers the attitude of the former Labour Government towards India will be at all surprised to learn that none of the leaders of the Labour Party and of the trade unions protested against the arrest of 31 trade and trusted leaders of the Indian working class... The 'Labour' Government mobilised armed police and troops against the workers during its term of office just as the Baldwin government did after it... MacDonal's government did not make the least attempt to assist the starving textile workers."

The leaders of the Labour Party have forgotten nothing and have learned nothing, as shown by a compliment made to them by the organ of the Conservatives, "The Times" on the 9th May 1929 declaring: "The British trade union movement condemns the communist intrigues which led to the recent strikes and disturbances amongst the Bombay textile workers." The representatives of His Majesty the King of Great Britain and Empor of India, the British reformist labour leaders, have really earned this compliment.

The friends of the Indian working class movement are to be found in the camp of the revolution, in the camp of those who are destined to lead the proletariat to victory, in the camp of the international working class movement led by the Communist International and by the Red International of Labour Unions.

THE WHITE TERROR

Latvia in the Service of Pilsudski.

The Life of Comrade Paszyn in Danger!

By K. Leski (Warsaw).

Several days ago the Communist press reported that Comrade Jan Paszyn was arrested on Latvian territory on his way to the Soviet Union and handed over to the Polish police. Comrade Paszyn is now in a Warsaw prison. He is threatened with a long term of imprisonment, which means certain death.

Comrade Paszyn, a Warsaw metal worker, is one of the best fighters in the Polish revolutionary movement. His iron will and his complete devotion to the revolutionary cause quickly brought him into the forefront of the difficult fight of the Polish proletariat against its tormentors. Everywhere, at the factories and at meetings, he was the first at his post, inciting, full of energy and revolutionary initiative.

The significance of this excellent fighter was recognised most clearly by his opponents. Under the Czarist regime, later, during the German occupation, and to-day, in independent Poland under the knout of Pilsudski, he was constantly the big game that was stalked at every step.

The factory owners put him on the black-list, the "Socialist Labour representatives" from the P. P. S. threw him out of the Metal Workers' Union. The Secret Police of all governments of independent Poland never lost sight of him. The last time they got him they put him in gaol in Upper Silesia in the year 1924.

Comrade Paszyn wanted to get to the Soviet Union, to the home of those of all countries who are persecuted by the ruling classes. But on the journey the hand of the Latvian gendarmery fell upon him. The governments of all countries trample their "democratic" principles under foot as soon as it is a matter of destroying a revolutionary force. In their glowing hatred of the common enemy, the Soviet Union, the Poland of Pilsudski and bourgeois Latvia are chained together. They concluded a treaty of friendship in order to be of mutual assistance in the destruction of the Soviet Union. In the general staffs of these two states common plans are forged and elaborated, a common, armed attack upon the neighbouring territory is being prepared. They are leaving undone nothing that might contribute to undermine the strength of the hated enemy, to destroy this enemy.

The scoundrelly press made no mention of the disgraceful delivery of Comrade Paszyn into the hands of the Polish police. The Fascist press from the bourgeois and "Socialist" camp had not a word to report. For every blow that strikes the Polish Labour movement is welcomed by them.

But it will suffer a disappointment. New Paszyns will arise to take the place of the Paszyn who is now languishing in jail, ready to give their whole strength for the cause of the martyred Polish proletariat.

The Communist Party of Poland calls upon the working masses of Poland for an energetic protest action and fight for the liberation of Comrade Paszyn. And the international proletariat will support them in this fight.

Comrade Paszyn must be snatched out of the claws of the bloody hangmen.

Save Comrade Marcel Pauker!

Appeal from the Executive Committee of the International Red Aid.

To the Workers, Peasants and Progressive Intellectuals of all Countries.

Once more the National-Zaranistic Government of Roumania is committing a crime against the working class:

On May 3rd it had the revolutionary workers leader Marcel Pauker arrested.

The arrest of Pauker was an extraordinarily arbitrary act. While the Communist Party was still permitted under the law, Pauker was a member of its Executive Committee. In the big case against the Executive Committee of the Communist Party in the year 1925 he was condemned in his absence to ten years' imprisonment, also the charge against him merely stated that he had led the legal party and published articles in the legal Communist newspapers.

At the second trial, which took place in the middle of April, 1929, he was condemned — again in his absence — on account of several appeals, which appeared with his signature in the year 1922 — while his office was still legal — to imprisonment for life.

The arrest of Pauker is a logical continuation of the whole anti-Labour policy of the National-Zaranistic Government. Innumerable arrests and sentences to long terms of imprisonment for publishing legal newspapers, arrest of Dobrogeanu-Gherea, dissolution of the Unitarian Trade Unions, abolition of the whole of the revolutionary Labour press, breaking up of strike movements by the gendarmerie, creation of Fascist bands — those are all links in the single chain of persecutions of the working masses of Roumania.

The process of radicalisation among the toiling masses of Roumania, fomented by the growing unemployment, the miserable conditions of the peasants and, last but not least, through the disappointment of those strata who permitted themselves to be dazzled by the demagogy of the National-Zaranists during their opposition period, is causing the Government to resort to severer and severer measures of terror against the workers and is shortening the way to open Fascism.

Under the pressure of Roumanian and international Labour, the Government was obliged to decree an "amnesty", which is, however, totally inadequate and can only further disappoint the workers and peasants. But even on the basis of this amnesty Pauker should have been set free.

As a protest against his unlawful arrest he went on hunger strike the very same day. The Government replied to this act of protest with maltreatment and tried to feed him artificially, whereby he was bound. In response to these brutalities, Pauker aggravated his act of protest by adding a thirst strike to his hunger strike from May 8th. The warders forced salt water into him in order to make the torment of thirst intolerable and break his fighting spirit.

To-day Pauker is living through the 32nd days of his hunger strike and the 27th days of his thirst strike. Every day which he spends in prison increases the danger to his life. It is becoming more and more clear that the Government desires to murder this courageous revolutionary, just as the Liberal Government murdered Max Goldstein and Pavel Tkachenko.

Pauker is determined to carry on the fight until the end.

It is the task of the international proletariat to support him in this fight!

Save Comrade Marcel Pauker! Demand his immediate release!

Fight for a general, unconditional amnesty for all political prisoners in Roumania!

Protest against the dissolution of the revolutionary trade unions, against the persecution of the whole Labour movement, against the wave of terror of the Maniu Government!

Long live the international solidarity of the workers of all countries!

Moscow, June 4th, 1929.

The Executive Committee of the International Red Aid.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Foreign Political Situation of the Soviet Union.

Full Text of the Address Held at the V. Soviet Congress of the Soviet Union.

By A. I. Rykov.

(Conclusion.)

III. Kellogg Pact and Moscow Protocol.

The working class, and indeed all humanity, must realise the importance of the fact that under these conditions, and in view of the danger of such a war as this, still all our proposals for peace, disarmament, and restriction of armaments, have been rejected. This fact shows the emptiness of the hopes and the depth of the conscious hypocrisy of the League of Nations, which utilises its pacifist phrases as a cloak beneath which it aids the capitalist governments to arm and to prepare for war.

The cause of peace having reached this pass, and war armaments having attained this stage, the campaign connected with the Kellogg Pact developed. In view of our disarmament proposals, and of the wide movement in sympathy with us in every country, the bourgeois world found itself obliged to make at least a pacifist gesture of some sort. It is therefore not surprising that the Kellogg Pact put in an appearance. The Pact states*):

"The high parties concluding this agreement declare solemnly, on behalf of their peoples, that they condemn the appeal to war for the solution of international differences of opinion, and renounce it as medium of national politics in their relations to one another. The high parties concluding this agreement declare that disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature, which may arise between them, are to be settled or solved solely by peaceful methods."

The Kellogg Pact, signed in Paris on 28th August 1928, was offered in place of the peace policy of the Soviet Union and our disarmament proposals. At the same time it represented the first attempt of American diplomacy to play a leading role in international politics, and to create for itself an international system of its own as counter-weight to the League of Nations.

The circumstance alone, that the European states were forced against their will to sign the Kellogg Pact, bears witness to the greatly increased influence of the United States.

The Kellogg Pact cannot be regarded as a preventive of war, for it is a document containing no real security against war, and especially saying nothing about disarmament, or even about a restriction of armaments. The Kellogg Pact is therefore not to be confused with the question of really preventing wars.

It contains no guarantee that war does not break out. War is a breach of the agreement, since all the contracting parties agree to preserve peace, but none the less it is an error to suppose that the Kellogg Pact furnishes any real and actual measures for the prevention of war. From the very beginning this has been our standpoint with regard to the Kellogg Pact.

The Soviet Government, whilst criticising and revealing the true import of the Pact, was nevertheless by no means inclined to make it easier for the leaders of the anti-Soviet bloc to find a formal possibility for an attack on the Soviet Union. It also took into account the circumstance that the Kellogg Pact, with all its defects, still imposes certain "moral obligations", and therewith renders the psychological preparation for war more difficult, if only in a very slight degree. These considerations induced the Soviet Government to join the Pact, and a note to this effect was sent to the French ambassador in September 1928. In this note the Soviet Government stated:

"Inasmuch as the Paris Pact objectively imposes certain obligations on the powers in the eyes of public

opinion, and gives the Soviet Government new possibilities of laying before the whole of participants in the Pact the question most important for peace, the question of disarmament, whose solution is the sole guarantee for the prevention of war, the Soviet Union declares itself ready to sign the Paris Pact."

It was not the intention of the imperialist powers signing the Kellogg Pact to renounce war in actual practice; this may be seen not only in the actual increase of armaments, but in the formal reservations made by the leading European great powers towards the Pact, reservations in some cases, Great Britain and France for instance, practically annulling the signatures. The British reservations were as follows:

"The welfare and integrity of certain regions of the world are of great and vital importance for the maintenance of peace and the protection of Great Britain. Great Britain cannot permit any interference in the situation of these regions. The defence of these regions is a question of self-protection for the British Empire."

Obviously the British Government did not refer here to its colonies, or it would have stated openly that the colonies of Great Britain were meant, whilst the reservation simply speaks of "certain regions of the world", that is, regions which it must be left for the British government to name, for instance China or some part of China. The real meaning of this reservation is that the British Government retains the right to break the Kellogg Pact whenever it thinks fit.

The French reservation consisted of the declaration that:

"In the new agreement nothing limits or compromises in any respect the right of self-protection. In this regard every nation is justified in defending its territory against the attacks or invasions of enemies. The nation alone is competent to decide whether circumstances demand that resort be made to war in the interests of its own defence."

Each nation is alone competent to decide whether the circumstances make war necessary for its "defence"! This means that the French Government retains the right to take up war against any state, "without violating the Kellogg Pact". Probably in such a case it would suffice for notice to be sent to Washington that war has been commenced in the interests of "self-defence". The French reservation deprives the signature to the Kellogg Pact of all sense. Up to the present even the most competent and neutral experts and members of the Commission have not been able to ascertain who was to blame, of all the warring states, in the Great War. But the French declare beforehand that they alone are competent to decide whether they are attacking or defending.

The French and the British reservations thus formally annul the contents of the Kellogg Pact at the moment when it is signed.

The Soviet Union too made its reservations to this Pact. Our note agreeing to sign pointed out, in the first place, the absence from the Pact of any obligations in the direction of disarmament*. This was followed by the reservations:

"...Every international war must be prohibited, either as medium of the so-called national politics, or in the interests of other aims. (For instance the suppression of national emancipation movements, etc.)..."

"...and such war action as for instance intervention, blockade, military occupation of foreign territory, foreign ports, etc."

"...To the non-peaceful actions to be prohibited by the Pact must be counted: the rupture of peaceful normal relations between the nations or the refusal to restore these, since such actions cut off the possibility of peaceful methods of settling disputes, render relations strained, and further the creation of an atmosphere favourable to the outbreak of war."

"The Soviet Government can at the same time not declare itself agreed with various other reservations which may be used for the justification of war, especially not with those reservations made in the above mentioned correspondence, and eliminating from the Pact those decisions given by the statutes of the League of Nations and the agreements of Locarno."

The most superficial comparison of these reservations demonstrates the profound difference of principle in the policies

* All the following quotations are re-translated from Russian. Ed.

of the Soviet Government and the bourgeois states in this question.

This is the history of the Kellogg Pact; the Pact which has raised so much dust, and was pushed forward in place of our struggle for disarmament.

We not only signed and ratified the Kellogg Pact sooner than the others, but have found it necessary to utilise it for the firmer establishment of peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and its neighbouring states. Since we were convinced that the ratification of the Kellogg Pact would be a very lengthy process (and we have been right in this assumption, the Pact has not come into force yet), we undertook a measure which represents a great success of our policy for the strengthening of peaceful relations, and is of service to our interests; we proposed to our neighbours that they should sign the Pact without waiting for its coming into force, that is before it was ratified by all its original participants. Much effort and time were needed to convert our peaceful initiative into actual deed, and to overcome the resistance of some governments. The Moscow Protocol was signed on 9th February 1929 by the Soviet Union, Poland, Esthonia, Latvia, and Roumania. Later on we were joined by Turkey, Persia, Lithuania, and the Free City of Danzig.

If we draw the balance of our foreign policy in the years since the IV. Soviet Congress, the utter lack of result of all the work of the Preparatory Disarmament Commission is particularly conspicuous. At the same time we beg to state that there is no substantiation whatever for the hopes of those politicians and literates who assume that we shall abandon our struggle for peace solely because the Preparatory Commission of the League of Nations has rejected the proposals of the Soviet Union. Our struggle for peace will be carried on on a larger scale than ever, and with unabated energy. We as Marxists must however recollect that in all diplomatic relations, and in all activity with respect to the questions of disarmament, of peace, and of international politics, the decisive factors are interests of an international economic nature.

IV. The Fundamental Features of the Present International Situation.

The fundamental features of the present structure of world capitalism are on the one hand the extremely rapid growth of great economic combines of a monopolist character, sometimes within the boundaries of a single state, sometimes on an international scale, based upon the rapid advance of technics and the great achievements of rationalisation, and on the other hand the ever increasing competition among the countries for the markets, for the profits, and the aggravation of class antagonism within the separate states themselves.

A theory has arisen in Europe of late, in the circles around the II. International, giving very clear expression to the going over of the II. International into the bourgeois camp. The essential purport of this theory is that the merging of individual undertakings into great trusts, combines, etc., proves the peaceful character of post-war capitalism. In actual fact the contrary is the case, the struggle among the countries, and the class war in the countries themselves being aggravated and increased in proportion as the colliding forces are strengthened and organised by the establishment of all these cartels and trusts, and by the growth of capitalist organisations within each state. The "organised capitalism" of Social Democracy does not bring peace, but a sharp sword affording an extraordinarily long reach.

Every change which takes place in the sphere of technics, of rationalisation, of the forms of capitalist organisation, adds to the burden resting on the shoulders of the working class and the peasantry. A few examples will suffice to show how technical progress is made to worsen the position of the working class to an enormous extent, and to cause inevitably an aggravation of class antagonisms in a bourgeois state of society. The mechanised coal supply has for instance enabled the Brooklyn Electric Works, which consume 328 tons of coal hourly, to carry on work with a greatly reduced staff and without stokers. One of the works on Niagara Falls, with a capacity of 500,000 kilowatts, needs a total of only eight workers, working in shifts. The weaving mills which have introduced automatic looms only require one weaver to 24 looms, whilst a comparatively short time ago one weaver

was employed to every four or six looms. In the works of one of the United States trusts less than 48 hours elapse between the delivery of the iron and its conversion into rails.

The progress of technics has enabled a great industrial firm in the United States to announce that the perfected machines now available for the manufacture of buttons, dispensing with the need of any mental effort on the part of the workers, enable it to employ mentally defective and disabled persons from the hospitals and lunatic asylums. Another firm (textile) declares — in the textile industry, it may be observed, it has long been the custom to employ children, whose mental capacity does not differ greatly from that of backward adults, — that it no longer needs skilled workers or indeed any normal adult workers at all.

Industrialisation with the aid of the mentally defective — this is the essence of what capitalist rationalisation represents. It suppresses, cripples, makes superfluous, and exploits with the utmost brutality hundreds of millions of human beings at home and in the colonies, and swells the number of unemployed into the uncountable.

Unemployment is increasing. In Germany the number had reached three million at the beginning of this year, in Great Britain approximately two million, in the United States four million. At the same time wages fall. The labour movement, and the struggle of the bourgeoisie against the working class, are intensifying.

Not long ago the foreign press again organised a campaign maintaining that we are the "originators" and organisers of the May-Day celebrations all over the world. That is to say, the authors of this assertion are unacquainted with the most elementary facts of the history of the labour movement. Every schoolboy in the Soviet Union knows that the working classes of all the capitalist countries celebrated the 1st of May long before the October Revolution. No doubt there are many comrades in this hall who suffered imprisonment years ago, in the Tzar's day, for following the slogan of the II. International, today unfaithful to the idea of the class struggle of the proletariat, for following, I repeat, the call of the II. International to celebrate the 1st of May. It is not on our account that the May-Day celebrations have become such a bone of contention in the capitalist countries today, but in virtue of the logic of the development of class antagonism. Surely a maximum of narrow-mindedness is required to ascribe the inevitable consequences of the objective course of things to the "wiles of Moscow".

The II. International, at the time of its founding and for many years afterwards, agitated for the May-Day celebration. Why is no blame attributed to it for the celebration of 1st of May?

The May-Day celebration is an expression of class war. In the present increasingly acute situation, in the atmosphere engendered by the ever increasing want and misery of great strata of the working class, the class struggle is bound to develop both in the capitalist countries and in the colonies. The capitalist world is carrying on stubborn fight against the working class, and is striving to build up its own welfare at the expense of the workers, whilst at the same time avoiding an acute crisis. The crisis can however not be avoided. Already the productive capacity of the industrial equipment of Europe is only being utilised to the extent of two thirds, that of the United States even less, about one half.

The threatening crisis is accompanied among the capitalists by sharper competition, and not merely the competition of individual manufacturers among themselves, but that of the giants of production combining certain branches of industry in many countries.

This collision of mighty and growing organisations, this inevitable aggravation of the struggle between them, explains why the capitalist governments will not and cannot disarm. In the contrary, under these conditions armament is bound to increase, the danger of war to approach nearer. The commencement of the struggle between the two Titans of the capitalist world, the United States and Great Britain, is the clearest and most decided expression of the antagonism inherent in the capitalist world. I draw your attention to the disagreements on this question among numerous statesmen and journalists, both in the parliaments and in the press.

The tension in the antagonisms between Great Britain and the United States is now being acknowledged by the representatives of the governments of these countries. This may be seen from the following passage from a speech by the well-known Senator Borah:

"If the United States cannot ensure security for their trade by means of agreements, treaties, and laws, they will attain this object by means of the supremacy of their fleet. Great Britain must either give up its rule of the sea, or come to an agreement on disarmament, or build a fleet adapted to the strength of the fleet of the United States, England will not do this, for it is very well aware that it is unable to do so. England knows our fleet programme very well, and knows that we can build as many cruisers as we need."

The following passage, again from Senator Borah, characterises equally well the situation:

"We are witnessing the beginning of the Anglo-American competitive struggle on the seas. The present situation differs in nothing from that which developed between Great Britain and Germany in the period from 1905 to 1914. To be sure, so far as the governments are concerned, the customary mutual assurances of unbounded friendship, and of total absence of intention to take up competition on the seas, will be exchanged. The declarations passing between Germany and England in the 1914 period were of the same kind."

Politicians of insight in Great Britain have formed the same judgment on the situation. The secret thoughts of the British found utterance in that influential periodical, "The Economist", as follows:

"The lessons taught by history must convince the American that — should the question arise of wresting the 'rule of the seas' from our hands by force — there is no reason to assume that we should let it be taken from us without desperate resistance. On the other hand, it is as little probable that the United States will be able to refrain from making the attempt to wrest it (the rule of the seas) from our hands as we could content ourselves at the time to leave the rule of the seas in the hands of the Spaniards."

The reference to 1905/14 recalls the period of immediate preparation for imperialist war.

The antagonisms existing between the separate capitalist countries, large and small, are pressed into the background. The forces of the majority of the capitalist countries are divided between the two main lines of force, the lines of the Anglo-American relations. This does not mean that the antagonisms for instance between France and Germany, or between France and Italy, have disappeared. But these can only carry on their conflicts by never letting out of their sight the decisive distribution of forces in the world.

Present day relations within the capitalist world are very accurately characterised by a contributor to the "Economist" (1st. December 1928). The writer draws an outline of what would happen if the present state of things were permitted to develop undisturbed, and we were to swim with the tide. This he describes as follows:

"Were events to develop along their traditional lines, then the powers which were jointly victorious in the war of 1914/18 would soon split into two camps, whose struggle would then give rise to a war in 1945 or 1950. One side of the scales would contain the greatest of these powers, the United States, alone. On the other side of the scale the next strongest power, Great Britain, would try to preserve the balance by embracing France in the arms of a new Entente. The United States, seeing France and Great Britain on the anti-American side of the scale, would endeavour to create a preponderance in their favour by clasping to their breast France's opponents in Europe, both Italy and Germany (a brilliant finale for Locarno). The whole world would be actually drawn into the struggle, with the exception of the Soviet Union, which in its capacity of 'tertius gaudens' would look on at the to it agreeable spectacle of a war of extermination among the capitalist powers."

To me it seems that this forecast may not differ greatly from what may actually happen. Still it contains two errors: 1. A war against the Soviet Union is highly probable; 2. the rôle of "tertius gaudens" is not a bad one in itself, but we should certainly not play it as a delighted onlooker, but should use it to help in making the new really the last war that mankind will experience. (Applause).

Upon this military and political ground many military and political alliances are now springing up. The most interesting of these are the Anglo-French agreement, directed, so far as can be judged, both against the Soviet Union and against the United States of North America, and the notorious war pact between Poland and Roumania.

Numerous other alliances are existing at the present time in capitalist Europe, showing how sides are to be taken among the possible opponents of the impending fresh international massacre.

A few years ago the well-known champion of a Pan-European, Coudenhove-Kalergi, pointed out that as result of the Versailles peace there are now twelve Alsace-Lorraines in Europe, each sufficing in itself to unchain a new imperialist war. Twelve Alsace-Lorraines! The small states are greatly in error in clinging to the illusion that they can remain silent spectators of the game played by the great powers, or that they could carry on a little war in Europe today without being interfered with by the great powers. In a great war nobody will take the small states into account. Their position will be ten times worse than that of Belgium in the last war, and under the present conditions of extreme tension any little war may lead at any moment to intervention from the "great lords", and therewith to a great imperialist war. Any collision between the "great" powers, bringing into play the strategic considerations and methods of modern warfare, may expose the small states to practical extermination.

Therefore the instinct of self-preservation should induce these small states to turn, not to the makers of the coming war, but to the bearers and champions of peace. Their policy must be an expressly peace policy, not an endeavour to take sides with this or that military camp. It is solely by means of a consistent peace policy that they can preserve their national independence, secure their independent existence, and save their population from the horrors of war capitalism.

V. The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union.

The realisation of the Five-Year Plan entails a considerable increase in our exports, and also in our imports of machinery, etc., for our industry, agriculture, and transport service. Hence the development of peaceful relations, and the conclusion of trade agreements, are no less important to us than formerly, but much more. The Five-Year Plan requires systematic and consistent work during a number of years. Therefore we make it our object to attain such a degree of steadiness and permanence in our relations to the various states, that no gaps or losses are here incurred, detrimental to the accomplishment of the enormous tasks imposed by the Five-Year Plan.

With regard to international relations, especially the development of business connections, we recently concluded, with considerable success and to the advantage of both parties, the negotiations with Germany; on 21st December 1928 the protocol was signed developing and extending the system of trade and economic relations established between us and Germany by the trade agreement of 1925. Germany was the first country to enter into a financial and credit agreement with us in the sphere of commercial intercourse, and has thereby secured comprehensive orders from us for the German industries, and greatly facilitated our imports from Germany. The practical execution of the agreement has convinced German economic circles that we have been even more punctual, if we may so express it, than the proverbially accurate German, and have frequently made payments before these were due. The standpoint adopted by German economic circles is advantageous to both parties. Another agreement recently signed between us and Germany is the arbitration agreement. This is based on the principle of equal representation of both parties, and ensures the rapid settlement of disputes on peaceful lines.

It need not be said that occasional misunderstandings have arisen between us and Germany, but these have invariably been

satisfactorily settled. Just at the present juncture we are not quite satisfied with the procedure of the German authorities investigating the activities of the White Guardists who have been fabricating in Berlin political documents against the Soviet Government. Our demands are not motivated by a mere wish to have certain criminals punished, but by the wish to have a matter perfectly cleared up which is of international importance, and concerns the Soviet Union. The documents forged by this and similar bands of rogues have played considerable rôle at times, the alleged "Zinoviev letter" for instance, which influenced the last general election in Great Britain. These forgeries have complicated the diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and other states, and have effected the activities of international diplomacy. It is not merely a matter of an organisation of rogues, but of an organisation of political criminals, an organisation which has had the entry into the houses of the uppermost stratum of the bourgeoisie and of bourgeois diplomacy. (Applause.)

The Soviet Congress of 1922 recommended the Rapallo Agreement as a model agreement for the regulation of relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries surrounding it. Today, after almost eight years of normal relations with Germany, we can place on record the correctness and advantageousness of the bases upon which these relations have been built up, and upon which they must continue to develop in the future.

I have already referred in detail to our relations with Great Britain. Up to the present diplomatic relations have not been resumed with Great Britain. It will also be known to you that the Conservative government did not gain those ends which it hoped to encompass by the rupture with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, there is objective evidence of the disadvantage at which important branches of British national economy, especially the export trade of Great Britain, have been placed by the absence of a normal basis for trade intercourse with during the last two years. This explains that sounder trend of feeling observable in British economics, and calling for the resumption of relations as a necessity. It was this trend led to the visit to the Soviet Union of one hundred representatives of the British business world.

Even now, although such brusqueness towards the Soviet Union is no longer to be recorded as that of the last election period, still the Prime Minister Baldwin, speaking of the drawbacks and uncertainties of relations with the Soviet Union, declared that he could not recommend the development of trade with our Union.

In this speech Mr. Baldwin advanced a new thesis, one never yet adduced by any leading member of the Conservative Government. During the past two years Conservative leaders have constantly insisted on the possibility of developing commercial intercourse with the Soviet Union without the restoration of normal political relations. They have not denied the advantages of trade relations with the Soviet Union. But now the head of the Conservative cabinet seeks to demonstrate the disadvantage even of trade with the Soviet Union.

It is superfluous to refute this assertion, since the facts themselves prove the contrary so obviously that no single instance can be stated in which commercial intercourse with us has been disadvantageous to those dealing with us, or in which our organisations have failed to meet obligations. The extent of the trade business carried on in any country is of course determined by the juridical, legal, and financial conditions imposed on our trade in that country.

With reference to our attitude in the question of relations with Great Britain, this was stated unequivocally in the recently published declaration of the representative of the governmental commission for the negotiations with the British industrialists, Comrade Pyatakof. We are of the opinion that there is every possibility of settling all contentions on the basis of the agreement of 1924 with the MacDonald Government.

I now pass on to another great power, the United States of North America. Here an intense development may be observed in our relations, both with respect to such questions as the technical advising of our economy by the technically highly developed economy of America.

We have not only to place on record that the engineer Cooper, collaborating as consulting engineer in the building of the water power station on the rapids of the Dniepr, greatly furthered that undertaking, but we can report at the same time

that a large number of other competent and well informed American engineers have aided our builders with their advice, and have enabled our technicians to gain an insight into industries and methods of production of the United States. At the present time negotiations are being carried on with large American firms with the purpose of securing further advisory collaboration on the basis of agreements. Our relations with the United States being developed to this extent, the absence of diplomatic relations becomes at this stage more than a mere hindrance. It is a unique incongruity. Any further development of our present relations will naturally be hampered by this obstacle, for it will not only be merely inconvenient for us to carry on extensive economic and trading business without the possibility of diplomatic and legal protection, it will probably prove that the risk involved is too great.

Relations with France are at a standstill at the point where Rakovsky's departure left them. A savant of the Soviet Union, Professor Bakhmetyev, has discovered a method of interrupting the vital processes of animal organisms by freezing. This is called anabiosis. Our relations with France are in just this condition, but through no fault of ours. No change has taken place since Rakovsky submitted his proposals in connection with the work of the commission investigating all the problems involved in the debt and credit question. We have received no reply to these proposals, nor to the proposal for the conclusion of a political non-aggression pact.

Besides this, the policy pursued by the French Government with regard to us, during the last two years, has been distinguished by no inconsiderable number of acts which can scarcely be designated as showing any sincere desire for the establishment of friendly relations.

Relations with Italy develop perfectly normally, with the exception of the signing by Italy, in 1927, of the protocol confirming the alleged right of Roumania to Bessarabia. It need not be said that this cannot shake our standpoint with regard to this region, occupied by force.

When referring above to the signing of the Moscow Protocol, I mentioned that our present relations with our neighbouring states have certainly greatly improved. We are however of the opinion that the signing of this Protocol must be followed by action lending it strength and permanence. Inasmuch as the states concerned have signed a Protocol agreeing to abstain from armed conflicts among themselves, we can naturally assume that they are willing not only not to carry on wars, but to cultivate mutual friendly relations by every possible means. The natural result would be endeavours towards the further realisation of peaceful intentions expressed in the Protocol. These intentions should find utterance in an all-round stimulation of peaceful intercourse among the individual participants in the Protocol.

If the Protocol is not to remain a mere declaration, but to be converted into actual deed, it must be accompanied by corresponding measures on the part of the signatories for the strengthening and development of peaceful collaboration. Endeavours of this nature — I declare this in all seriousness and responsibility — are being made by the Government of the Soviet Union. Such endeavours can however unfortunately not be observed in the attitude of some of the signatories of the Moscow Protocol towards the Soviet Union, at least not in actual deeds we only need to recollect the recent events in Warsaw, the mitigated punishment for the White Guardist Wojcechowski, assassinator of our trade representative in Poland, Comrade Lisarev; the vile calumniations uttered by Wojcechowski's counsel, who was not even called to order by the president of the court; the campaign of slander against the Soviet Union in the Polish press, — all this shows that the new Polish Government is leaving the ground of the Moscow Protocol.

We deem it necessary to call the special attention of the public opinion of both parties to the extreme importance of the establishment of not merely formally normal relations between Poland and the Soviet Union, in the interests of both countries, and in the interests of general peace. We have declared on several occasions — I confirm this once more — our earnest desire to secure established peaceful relations with Poland. We have proposed to Poland the conclusion of a non-aggression pact; we have proposed to Poland that effectual measures be taken for ensuring peace with regard to the frontiers; and Poland knows very well that our proposals do not arise from cowardice (for it is certainly a universally known fact that if we are attacked and forced to fight, we shall fight energetically.

and know how to fight). (A voice: Hear, hear! Applause.) Our policy towards Poland has always been, and continues to be, founded on the conviction that the securing of peaceful relations is to the advantage of both peoples, both states.

A few days ago we signed the trade agreement with Esthonia. This agreement must and can play an important part in the activising of economic relations between the Soviet Union and Esthonia, and in the firmer establishment of political relations.

Finland has not yet joined the Moscow Protocol. We were however recently informed that Finland, though it has not yet formally agreed to the Moscow Protocol, feels itself affiliated to this Protocol to a certain extent. This means that the last of the states on the immediate boundaries of the Soviet Union will shortly sign the Moscow Protocol.

Our relations with Roumania are a chapter in themselves. They pivot on the question of Bessarabia. In Roumania the attempt has been made to interpret the mutual signing of the Moscow Protocol, which deals with the rejection of war as a means of national policy, to mean that we renounce Bessarabia, and recognise the provoking occupation rule now obtaining there. To this we reply that in the Bessarabian question we maintain our former standpoint. (Applause.)

Let the Bessarabians living in Bessarabia decide by a plebiscite to whom they wish to belong, to Roumania or to us. We propose to Roumania nothing more nor less than an honourable and objective plebiscite, organised without the slightest pressure from one side or the other, in order, to ascertain the wishes of the Bessarabian people. (Applause.)

Our relations with Japan continue to develop on entirely normal lines. In the present year the fisheries agreement signed in 1928 between the Soviet Union and Japan has come fully into force. This agreement forms a basis for the satisfactory settlement of all the various matters of dispute arising in this connection. We hope that with the support of the Japanese Government further success will be gained in the development and firmer establishment of political and economic relations between the two countries.

Our relations with Persia too are developing normally. Persia's signature to the Moscow Protocol, and the existence of a neutrality and non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Persia, and of a trade agreement, signify a step forward in our relations to this state. The declaration made by the Persian Government on its non-intervention in the events in Afghanistan bears witness to the conformity of standpoint existing between the Soviet Government and the Persian in the question of the national independence of Afghanistan.

Our relations with Turkey are influenced not only by the necessity of strengthening reciprocal relations, but have in view at the same time the consolidation of peace in the Near East. Turkey's affiliation to the Moscow Protocol has been a fresh expression of these relations, and of co-operation for the maintenance of peace, and for the development of political and economic relations.

Turning to Afghanistan, I must state with great regret that the inner crisis, complicated by national racial and social antagonisms, now being passed through by the people of Afghanistan, is not yet ended.

Afghanistan, which has been able to record much success in the ten years of its existence as independent state, despite great internal difficulties in the restoration of its national economy, has now been plunged for a year into a profound crisis, caused by the opposition of reactionary forces, actively supported from outside. I must further draw attention to the strained situation on some sections of the frontier between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, abutting on territory upon which Aman Ullah's organs have been liquidated. I refer to the increasing banditry. This finds suitable soil for its growth in these districts of Afghanistan, and the authorities, whilst not actually taking part in the formation and provisioning of the bands, take no measures to prevent them from crossing the Soviet Union frontier. We continue our policy of absolute non-interference in the inner affairs of the Afghan people. I hope that the progressive forces developed in Afghanistan during the ten years of the regime of independence will defeat the reactionary elements, and maintain their independence and influence.

In consequence of direct resistance on the part of the Czechoslovakian government, we have not yet arrived at normal political relations with this country. Therefore the economic connections between the two countries too have not been able to develop adequately. The news received a few days ago of the intention of Czechoslovakia to express its relations to the Soviet Union by combining with the whole Little Entente including Roumania, although this is occupying Bessarabia, evinces tendencies and demands on the part of this government from which little good can come.

The political and financial economic apparatus set in motion by the forces aggressive to the Soviet Union has not been able to effect what its instigators hoped from it. The economic pressure exercised upon the Soviet Union has not hampered either the tempo or the extent of our socialist advancement. The plans for an economic blockade against us have again failed.

Of late we have been able to observe numerous phenomena bearing witness to an increased tendency to establish peaceful economic relations with us.

In my opinion we can draw from all that I have said here the definite conclusion that though the elements of an aggressive attitude, and of the possibility of an attack upon our state, certainly exist, still our policy of struggle for peace, and for the prolongation of the pause for breath, is not being defeated. Our whole policy must continue to fight for peace with every force at our disposal, every available means and possibility, and at the same time to cultivate business relations with all states. Since, however, aggressive factors, the danger of war and the threat of an interruption of the peaceful pause for breath exist, we must on no account neglect, even for a moment, the strengthening of the self-defensive capacity of our state and our country. (Enthusiastic and prolonged applause.)

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Expulsion of Liquidators from the C. P. of Czechoslovakia.

Prague, 6th June 1929.

The Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia which has just concluded decided unanimously after a thorough discussion to expel the following from the Party: Vaclav Bolen, Vaclav Houser, Bohuslav Jilek, Alois Muna, Alois Neurath, Josef Skalek and Frantisek Touzil.

The statement of the C. C. points out that the united group of liquidators around Hais, Jilek and Neurath have developed into a counter-revolutionary group politically hostile to the Party, to the Communist International and to the Soviet Union.

The expelled refused to abandon the platform of Hais and declared openly that they would continue their struggle against the Communist International. The statement of Jilek that the Communist International was pursuing a counter-revolutionary policy, and of Bolen that the authority of the Communist International was all humbug, places them in the ranks of the enemies of the C. I. They took up a counter-revolutionary attitude to the heroic struggles of the Berlin proletariat, by accusing the Communist Party of Germany of putchism, and described the international action against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union which is being prepared, also as putchism. They deny the danger of war and in this way assist the Social Democrats to deceive the workers. They support and propagate in their newspapers the attitude of Hais to the struggles of the workers.

Hais is openly on the side of the reformists, the government and the capitalists and rejects the struggle of the Slovakian land workers as "unjustifiable".

Recently the preparations of the liquidators for the formation of an anti-Communist Party have increased. They have formed a central organ and a provincial organ and an oppositional parliamentary fraction which co-operates with the bourgeois parliamentary institutions. In the ranks of the members of the trade unions and of the other mass organisations, they are, however, completely isolated.

AGAINST TROTZKYISM

Further Decomposition in the Camp of the Trotzkyists.

A Letter from Radek to Smilga.

By Em. Yaroslavski.

Trotsky exposed himself rather quickly outside the Soviet Union. It would be difficult to find in the history of our Party such a sudden and complete fall. That is a catastrophe for those who bound up their fate with Trotzkyism. We think that they have now all come to their conclusions about the attitude of Trotsky abroad. A part of them carried out their conclusions to their logical end, others fear to admit even to themselves and still more to others that it is difficult for them to justify Trotsky's attitude without violating their own political conscience. Of course, we know that amongst the Trotzkyists there are people who can sink still lower than Trotsky himself. We might count M. I. Muralov as one of these persons. The letter spread by the Trotzkyists in his name and addressed to "Dear Vassil" provokes very sad thoughts. This letter is directed mostly against Radek and Smilga*). Muralov attempts to prove that Smilga and Radek were wrong to appeal to the tradition of the Bolsheviks and of the left-wing of the Second International when criticising the article of Trotsky in the bourgeois press and that Marx and Engels were supporters of the participation of socialists in the bourgeois press.

"They (Smilga and Radek) do not understand", writes Muralov, "that the situation in which the bolsheviks had to abandon any co-operation in the bourgeoisie press, was such that co-operation at the time would have been damaging to the development of the class-consciousness of the workers."

According to the opinion of Muralov and his supporters therefore co-operation in the bourgeois press is useful and necessary for the "development of the class-consciousness of the workers" at a time when the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Soviet Power exist, at a time when a widespread communist and socialist press, and the organisations of the Communist International exist. Such a defence of renegacy cannot be tolerated even by those who have remained in the ranks of the Trotzkyists. No longer are individuals breaking away from the Trotzkyists, but whole groups. Every new decision of the Party, and particularly the decisions of the 16th National Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, hammers a new wedge into the illegal Trotzkyism and compels those who have wandered into its blind alley, to seek a way out. People who worked together with Trotsky for years, such as Radek, can no longer stand it. We reproduce here a letter written by Radek on 19th May 1929 to his nearest fractional friend I. Smilga:

"I begin my letter with your favourite expression: 'The affair is developing at a tremendous pace'. The attitude of our theses that the opposition should turn towards the Party and aim at giving the Party a correct class attitude, should become the left-wing of the Party, has been defeated. I am sending you the theses of the Moscow comrades and the letter of Trotsky 'To the Russian Workers'. Taken as a whole they mean a proclamation of disruption by Trotsky. In order to spare you a detailed study of these theses, I will touch upon the most important points:

1. At a moment when even the blind can see that the main question is how the opposition can be turned towards the Party which is carrying on great class struggles, these people have decided to form their own organisation. They sign their material already as 'The National League of Bolshevik Leninists'. All of us, Leo (Trotsky) included, were opposed to the formation of the

*) In this letter, as in many other letters written by the Trotzkyists, attention is also paid to my person. I would like to declare once and for all that the choice abuse with which I am showered in these letters does not touch me in the least. I defend the interests of the Party without bothering about such abuse. I can only advise the Trotzkyists not to waste so much paper. Em. Y.

'Leninbund', even at a time when in our opinion everything was going over to the right, and now they are binding themselves organisationally. As we cannot assume that three or four unknown people have done this on their own initiative, without asking anyone, it is clear that they are acting under the cloak of some conference or the other upon the basis of the instructions of L. D. (Trotsky).

2. The theses published by this 'National League' represent a complete and undoubted liquidation of the platform:

a) In the Chinese question they place themselves upon the basis of the permanent revolution and declare that they have the right to revise Lenin's basic conception upon the basis of experience, namely when and in what questions Trotsky considers it advisable.

b) In the question of the character of the Soviet Power they give a formulation which would apply completely to the government of Scheidemann-Noske in Germany or to the government of the Labour Party in Great Britain. The Soviet Power, they say, is a block of the reactionary workers and the rural petty bourgeoisie, having, however, a proletarian basis, and therefore our attitude towards it is reformist. Kerenski and Tseretelli, however, also represented a block of the reactionary workers and the village bourgeoisie and they also had, up to a certain period, a proletarian basis. And nevertheless the bolsheviks did not conceive of reforming this block! The Government Scheidemann-Noske in Germany or the MacDonald Government in Great Britain also had a proletarian basis, but only the left-wing Social Democrats in Germany and the I. L. P. in Great Britain took up a reformist attitude to them.

c) In answer to the question upon what lever the opposition should throw its weight, Trotsky answers: secret voting in the Party and in the trade unions. The theses regard this question as subordinate and do not even sum up enough courage to reject this counter-revolutionary slogan, they only water it down.

d) With regard to the most important question, the question of co-operation in the bourgeois press, which is equivalent to the question of whether everything is permissible in the struggle against Stalin and the Soviet Power, they answer, yes, everything is permissible. In addition they propose to make the opposition an asylum for homeless Bolshevik Leninists. After they have attacked up, they permit us to remain in the opposition with our special standpoint.

The letter of Trotsky 'To the Russian Workers' is a shameful document. The most important point about it is that it justifies any further shamelessness. If in February 1929 Trotsky had the right to tell the truth in the bourgeois press, why shouldn't he have the right to do the same in all the months of this year and in all the following years? If it is a virtue to issue Lenin's works with the money of the bourgeois press, why should this virtue remain an episode?

That is the contents of this document. What conclusions must we draw from it? The first conclusion is: We must face the truth, and that is that they have disrupted the opposition and that we have nothing in common with them. Those who accept these theses form a new party with a special programme (See Trotsky's: 'Criticism of the Programme of the Comintern' with his rejection of Leninism for the whole Orient), with special tactics, with special organisational principles (see Trotsky's arguments in favour of the demand for inner-party democracy for the right-wingers in his article 'Concerning the Right-wing Bloc and other Nonsense'), with a special organisation. Neither I nor you nor Eugen (Preobrashenski) have anything in common with them and to-morrow hundreds and thousands of comrades who are not the sort of people who are prepared to swallow everything, will also break with them. Those who will still go with them will be a mixture of menshevist and syndicalist elements which will break up in a hundred directions after a certain space of time.

After I had read this document and thought over it, I would have liked to send a telegram to the 'Pravda' immediately declaring that I had nothing to do with this 'National League'. I refrained from doing so because I am firmly convinced that in the immediate future we shall do it together, you, Eugen and a number of other comrades.

The illusions which you still have in your letter of 6th May, that we might bring over the center of our fraction, have already been liquidated. The so-called center is only a letter-box of Trotzky and it would be a mistake to believe that we could win it by sticking our letters into it too. I am no supporter of the Trotzkyist philosophy and therefore do not believe that he has won this letter-box by intrigues or other devilish means. He only reflects the opinions of the major portion of the oppositional intelligentsia which is striving to utilise the discontent of a section of the workers brought about by the serious economic situation.

Anyone who says to these people that when the Party is carrying on a severe struggle with the petty-bourgeois elements in the country, for the dictatorship and for socialism and that we must also take part in the struggle for the improvement of the situation of the workers, for the increase of the productivity of labour and in support of the party, is rejected by these people. What sort of tone these, our 'allies' use towards us, you can see from the writings of Muralov who has not only lost the last remnants of his understanding, which was never very great, but also the honesty and conscience for which we held him in high regard. I have been too much under fire for such things to make even the least impression upon me and have therefore not the least intention to answer, but this will show you that we cannot remain one single day longer under the same roof with these people.

Shall we abandon the struggle to win the best elements amongst those who are banished, after this breach? Not at all. We shall continue this struggle with all possible energy, determination and ruthlessness. It is just for this reason that we must make the breach before and then attack as our bolshevist god commands. The situation, has, however, further consequences. We considered that the opposition was the defender of the October Revolution. This dream is past. We will now have to mobilise all our forces in order to save the best elements in the opposition for the October Revolution. That is the bitter and brutal truth, but it is better than any illusions. The consequence of the destruction of these illusions is that there is simply no left wing and we must draw our own conclusions from this fact. I expect your arrival here.

Tomsk, 19th May 1929.

K. Radek."

What are the conclusions from this letter? The opposition is no left wing, as it called itself. According to the words of Radek it has sunk into a block of menshevist and syndicalist elements. The newly proclaimed "National League of Bolshevist Leninists" is a letter-box for Trotzky. But why such an expensive letter-box when one might send letters to a perfectly legal address: "Mr. Trotzky, collaborator of the 'Daily Express'?"

A further conclusion: The opposition as a whole, even in the eyes of its members, is not in the least the defender of the October Revolution. One can still save individuals from the opposition who, after openly admitting their errors, will return to the Party and fight with it for the defence of the October Revolution.

Radek's letter proves still more. The ideological differentiation and the ideological collapse of the opposition is proceeding at an increased speed. One section of the opposition is moving farther and farther away from the Party, so that those who still consider themselves capable of a return to the Party, capable of political life, begin to recognise that they must act far more quickly and determine their attitude to the opposition and to the Party with all possible speed. The "platform" has long ago ceased to be a document upon which any member of the opposition can take his stand. They cannot do this because some of them have developed much farther towards the right whilst the others are about to return to the Party. All compromising formulations, all halfheartedness, all leaving open of back doors are damaging and useless. Whoever has really recognised that Trotzkyism is damaging, that the Trotzkyist opposition has developed into a mixture of menshevist and syndicalist elements, must quickly leave the opposition without looking back and then "attack as our bolshevist god demands", but against those who continue their disgusting, damaging and anti-Bolshevist machinations.

IN THE CAMP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The Magdeburg Congress of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

By Ph. Dengel (Berlin).

Both in the C. P. of Germany and in the Comintern there were once comrades who believed that August 4th, 1914, marked the termination of the development of reformism in Germany this false conception of the character of the Social Democratic was particularly pronounced after the Kiel Congress where Hilferding set forth the theories of social imperialism and of the realisation of Socialism within the capitalist order of society and the necessity of supporting and promoting the capitalist development. This theory, it is true, even now forms the foundation of the entire policy of the S. P. G. and, indeed, the foundation of the policy of all parties of the Second International. Nevertheless, the S. P. G. did not draw the line at the Kiel Congress either in its ideology or in the practice of its policy.

Breitscheid, who submitted the report of the Social Democratic Party in the Reichstag at the Magdeburg Congress was obliged to admit that the Coalition Government had carried on the policy of the bourgeois-bloc Government in practically all its details. The critical position of German imperialism permits the Social Democrats moderate scope for their manoeuvres, which are more and more restricted. At the Party Congress one after another of the Social Democratic "statesmen" rose and set forth the necessity of restrictions in the future, also in the opposition, the electional campaigns, the demands and promises. The demagogic manoeuvres in Parliament would also have to be restricted considerably. In other words, the S. P. G. must be more openly ready than hitherto to defend the interests of capitalism against those of the proletariat and more frequently advocate the imperialist war policy of the bourgeoisie. Approbation of the construction of armoured cruisers, the social and taxation policy of men like Wissell and Hilferding, and the quashing of economic struggles have weakened the influence of the S. P. G. among the workers; nevertheless, this anti-proletarian policy is to be, and must be, continued.

There could be no doubt but that an attempt would be made to justify this Social-Fascist policy at the Party Congress. This was done at the opening session by the address of the chairman Wels. The speech in question, which has been supplemented by a number of other addresses at the Party Congress, especially by that of Chancellor Hermann Müller, was characterised by an unexcelled agitation against the Communist Party. It contained the following passage:

"The very latest instructions lie in the direction of a vigorous continuation of the proletarian revolution on the 'Anti-War Day' (August 1st) with an exploitation of the political and technical knowledge gained on May 1st. This is an open encouragement to renewed patches."

The sense of this explanation is neither more nor less than that of preparing the Social Democratic Party for the prohibition of the Communist Party.

But Wels went yet further. He, the man of blood who is also guilty of more than 10,000 workers having been butchered in the name of democracy, threatens with a dictatorship. What dictatorship would it be? Naturally not that of the proletariat but rather a dictatorship against the proletariat. Wels's utterance in regard to a dictatorship at the Magdeburg Party Congress which he made there amid general applause, cannot be interpreted save as a readiness on the part of the Social Democrats to take part in a bare Fascist dictatorship against the proletariat.

And what rôle did the "Left" play in this matter? The "Left" have made great progress since the Kiel Party Congress. The development of their Party, their control of the State apparatus, and the serious crisis of capitalism forced them to get rid of a great part of their "Left" phraseology. In the matter of the Coalition they capitulated unconditionally. They were still allowed to speak against the grant of the armoured cruiser, Hermann Müller making them appear ridiculous by telling them that if they absolutely wanted to make opposition there were more important questions on the tapis than the construction of the armoured cruiser.

If 138 delegates against 277 refused to allow the armoured-cruiser question to be quashed by a return to the order of the day and if 147 against 244 turned down the passing of the military programme, this is symptomatic of the great fermentation in the Social Democratic organisation. The pressure of the workers forces the "Left" to mask their complete capitulation under a show of opposition, or of what their spokesman, Seydewitz, calls opposition. In reality, the "Left" played into the hands of the Party leaders. By their apparently oppositional phrases in regard to problems long settled and out of date, they managed to detract attention from the most important questions dominating the Party Congress.

The capitalist world is making feverish preparations for renewed warfare. The political and economic front against the Soviet Union is turning more and more obviously into a military one. As imperialist politicians, the Social Democratic leaders understand that the time of preparations cannot last very much longer. They therefore require an ideology with which to prepare their adherents for a participation in the coming war.

Naturally even now it would be too risky to speak openly. Dittmann, who reported on the military programme, no longer spoke generally of the peaceful development of capitalism, but still made it appear as though his bourgeoisie were peaceably inclined.

"In its own interest as a class, the German bourgeoisie advocates a policy of peace and conciliation. The reluctance to disarm on the part of the victorious Powers naturally hampers the pacifism of the German bourgeoisie and strengthens nationalism and chauvinism."

The decisive section of the military programme is Paragraph No. 3, which reads as follows:

"The most effective defence of the German Republic lies in the German foreign policy, which is directed towards an understanding among the nations and towards the maintenance of peace. For the present, however, the policy of imperialist and Fascist states still threatens to lead to counter-revolutionary interventions and new wars. Germany may be made into a jumping-off ground in this respect and be involved against its will in sanguinary complications. As long as these dangers last, the German Republic requires an army for the protection of its neutrality and of the political, economic, and social achievements of the working class."

The argument by which it is thought possible to bait the workers is thus as follows: The German bourgeoisie is pacific; we Social Democrats support this pacific policy. But there are imperialist and quite particularly Fascist states which refuse to disarm and therefore make a complete disarmament in Germany impossible. For this reason the Social Democratic Party is in favour of the army, which, as Severing says, "must be given not only financial but also moral credit."

The "Left" have set up a military programme of their own in face of the official one. It is impossible for us here to enter into the half-statements and contradictions contained therein. What is more important is the attitude of the "Left" at the Party Congress itself. All its speakers, quite particularly Seydewitz and Rosenfeld, expressed their concurrence with the resolutions of the Kiel Party Congress, with the Coalition policy and the entire practical policy of their Party. They thus render their "opposition on principle" to the military programme a farce. The official military programme is nothing but a necessary supplement to the policy established at the Kiel Party Congress. To acquiesce the practical war policy of their Party and then to oppose the consequential military programme of the Party with another programme which lays claim to being on the basis of the revolutionary class-struggle, suffices to show up the rôle of the "Left" in the Social-Fascist party of murderers.

Paul Levi, the chief spokesman of the "Left" on the military programme managed to speak of the tasks of the proletariat in warfare and at the same time to detract from the policy of his Party at the present time. Never a word did he say of the immanent laws of capitalism, nor of the rôle of wars in the age of imperialism, nor yet of the rôle of the German imperialist bourgeoisie in the preparation of coming wars, still less of the rôle which his Party will play as a partner of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Not even to the twaddle of Dittmann, who declared the German worker must defend his

German country for the reason of having far more of Socialism to defend there than the Russian worker has in the Soviet Union, did Levi find a word in reply.

Even after this Party Congress, after this subordination to a policy of oppression of the working class by Fascist methods and to the war policy of their Party, the "Left" wing of the S. P. G. will continue to attempt to maintain the illusions of their worker adherents in regard to the peace policy of their Party. They will do so especially with reference to the alleged strengthening of their influence within the Party. And at the same time they will second the ideological war preparations of their Party with all their power by means of a particularly infamous agitation against the Soviet Union. The truism that it is the "Left" within the Social Democratic Party that are the most dangerous enemies of class-warfare and Communism, holds good more than ever at the present time. It is therefore up to us to wage the fight against these "Left" elements with all the means at our disposal.

The Degeneration of the Labour Party.

By A. Jones (London).

During the whole of its history, the Labour Party could never be considered a real working-class party. At its birth, its cradle was surrounded by disgruntled Liberal politicians, some trade union bureaucrats, and a sprinkling of Socialists. In its struggle to free itself from its early Liberal traditions, it graduated more and more towards the trade unions, which soon became its chief prop and mainstay. But as the goal of government began to loom nearer and nearer, new forces began to permeate its ranks. What we may call the "bourgeoisification" of the Labour Party really began with the change in its constitution in 1918 to allow for individual membership of the Party. But what was a gradual process from 1918 to 1923, became a veritable transformation with the first taste of power, not only in composition, but even more so in outlook and in policy.

It is significant that "Vorwärts" recently boasted that its brother party in Great Britain contained among its leading members a number of military, naval and air experts of high rank (thus proving its fitness along with other bourgeois parties to conduct war). We are now in possession of the biographies of the new members of parliament, and the biographies of many of the Labour members, particularly the recent recruits to the Party, are very illuminating. Let them speak for themselves.

W. S. Sanders, the gentleman who succeeded in defeating Comrade Saklatvala, was during the war employed by the British Government as one of their most important recruiting agents, for which he was rewarded by being appointed deputy-chief of the Administrative Section of the International Labour Office.

The peerage and aristocracy is quite well represented. The daughter and son-in-law of the late Lord Curzon, Sir Oswald and Lady Cynthia Mosley both of whom enter the new Parliament, are already well-known in the Labour movement. Lieutenant-Commander Kenworthy, besides being a naval expert, is the son of Lord Strabolgi. A newcomer, Mr. R. D. Denman, is a brother of Lord Denman, and was a Liberal M. P. until 1918. Mr. Hugh Dalton is the son of a late chaplain of the Court.

Employers of labour and representatives of Big Business apparently do not find it unprofitable to join the Labour Party. The new Labour member for Ormskirk, S. T. Rosbotham, is "one of the largest employers of labour in the Ormskirk district" ("Times" 1. June 1929) and was for forty years connected with the Conservative Party. G. M. Gillett is a partner in the well-known banking firm of Gillett's Discount Bank. G. R. Strauss, son of a former Tory M. P., is a metal merchant. C. H. Wilson, who was also opposed by a Communist candidate, Comrade Fletcher, in Sheffield, is a director of the Sheffield Smelting Co. Ltd. W. Leach is a textile manufacturer. P. Freeman is a director of a firm of tobacco manufacturers. Oliver Baldwin, the son of Stanley, has not only the claim of big business interests, but served his country in the "holy" war which Great Britain waged against the first Workers Republic, fighting besides Denikin in 1919.

It would be doing an injustice to the Labour Party to omit to mention the great pillars of the Church who adorn its ranks. Among the new M. P.s is the Rev. Gordon Lang, who is a relative of the Archbishop of Canterbury. There are four other ministers of religion among the successful candidates. Another "notable" figure is the new Labour member for Chatham, F. Markham, who is Secretary to the London School of Economics, and assisted the late Sir Sidney Lee in writing the official biography of King Edward VII, being later commissioned to complete the royal biography. The number of lawyers, professors, etc., are too numerous to mention.

It is thus not a matter for surprise that the sweeping victory of Labour at the polls, with its foregone conclusion of the formation of a Labour Government, left not only the bourgeois press unperturbed, but had no reaction whatever on the Stock Exchange. They know they have nothing to fear.

XVI. NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE C. P. S. U.

The Five-Year Plan for the Development of the National Economic System.

Resolution upon the Reports of Comrades Rykov,
Kshishanovski and Kuybyshev.

(Unanimously Adopted.)

I.

1. After hearing the reports on the five-year plan for the national economic development of the Soviet Union, the XVI. National Conference established that the achievements provided by the five-year plan with regard to the general growth of economy would figure as follows:

a) Whereas the total sum of capital investments in the five-year period from 1923/24 to 1927/28 amounted to 26,500 millions, the volume of capital investments for the national economic system between 1928/29 and 1932/33 (the economic year always being reckoned from October 1st to September 30th of the following year. Ed.) has been put at 64,000 millions. While in the past five years the industrial investments figured at 4400 million roubles, they have been estimated for the next five years at 16,400 millions. The corresponding sums for agricultural purposes in the two five-year periods are 15,000 millions and 23,200 millions, respectively; those for transports 2700 millions and 10,000 millions, and those for electrification 900 millions and 3100 millions.

b) Thanks to these investments, the sum total of the basic wealth of the country will rise from 70,000 millions in 1927/28 to 128,000 millions in 1932/33, i. e. by 82 per cent. The basic wealth of all industry will rise from 9200 to 23,100 million roubles, that of electrification from 1000 to 5000 millions, i. e. fivefold, that of railway-transport from 10,000 to 17,000 millions, or by 70 per cent., and that of agriculture from 28,700 to 38,000 million roubles, i. e. by 35 per cent.

c) The gigantic advance of capital investments is accompanied by a corresponding growth of output throughout industry. It will advance from 18,300 millions in 1927/28 to 43,200 millions in 1932/33, which will be more than three times the pre-war production. In agriculture there will be a corresponding rise from 16,600 to 25,800 million roubles, or to more than one and a half times the pre-war output. The carriage of the railways will advance from 88,000 to 163,000 million ton-kilometres. The net output of the entire national economy will be raised from 24,400 million to 49,700 million roubles.

d) In keeping with the general idea of the industrialisation of the country, the consolidation of the defensive capacity of the Union, and its independence from capitalist countries, the capital-investments in industry are devoted primarily to such industrial branches as the manufacture of means of production, 78 per cent. of all capital investments will be employed to this end. In consequence the output of these branches of industry will grow far more rapidly. Whereas the entire production of indu-

stry covered by the five-year plan will rise to 280 per cent. of its present extent, the total output of that section of industry which is employed in producing the means of production will increase to 330 per cent. of its present extent.

As regards electrification, the plan provides for the construction of 42 new overland centres (including the water-power works of Dneprostroy and Svirstroy, the peat-fuel power work in the Vishera region and others and the power works of Dobriki, in the Moscow coal district, in Suyef and the Donez basin etc.). This tremendous building activity is to raise the output of power from 5000 to 22,000 million kilowatt-hours by the close of the five-year period.

The development of heavy metallurgy is to be promoted by the construction of new and powerful metallurgical works in Magnitogorsk, Telbes, Dneprovsk, Krivoy Rog, and other places. The construction of new, and the reconstruction of existing works will entail an increase in the annual output of cast iron from 3.5 million to 10 million tons by the close of 1932/33.

In the hard-coal industry a great activity is planned by the Donez basin and in the Ural district, the Kusnetzki basin, and the Moscow coal region, the annual output being increased from 35 million tons in the year 1927/28 to 75 million tons in 1932/33.

The reconstruction of old and construction of new engineering works (e. g. of automobile works and tractor works at Stalingrad and in the Ural district, of heavy engineering works at Sverdlovsk, of a factory for agricultural machinery at Rostov, and of various tool factories etc.) will render possible an increase of the engineering-industry by 350% and of the production of agricultural machinery by 400%.

In the chemical industry the construction of chemical works is envisaged (at Beresniakov, in Moscow, in the Donez basin, etc.), calculated to raise the output of chemical fertilisers to more than 8 million tons in 1932/33 as against no more than 175,000 tons in 1927/28.

e) The fact that the projected rate of development of Soviet economy is materially greater than the rate of development of any capitalist country, will cause the rôle played by the Soviet Union in world production to change considerably even within the next five years. In cast iron production the Soviet Union will advance from sixth to third place (immediately after Germany and the United States), while in the output of hard coal it will move from fifth place to fourth (after the United States, Great Britain, and Germany).

2. The Conference has established that the general growth of economy according to the five-year plan will assume the direction of a decided growth of the socialist section of economy in town and country at the cost of the capitalist elements, as may be seen by the following figures:

a) The structure of the basic wealth of the country changes as follows (in a percentage proportion to the total at the end of each respective year):

Socialised Sections:	1927/28	1932/33
State Section	51.0	63.6
Co-operatives	1.7	5.3
Private Section	47.3	31.1

b) Accordingly, the proportion of the socialist section in the entire production increases as follows:

	1927/28	1932/33
In Industry	80 per cent.	92 per cent.
In Agriculture	2 per cent.	15 per cent.
In Retail Trade	75 per cent.	91 per cent.

The building program of the socialised sector of agriculture (Soviet farms and collective undertakings) brings about a material change. The area of land cultivated by the socialised sector of agriculture will rise by 1933 to 26 million Hectares (17.5% of the total area of land under cultivation), and in the same year it will account for 15.5% of the total agricultural production and for 43% of the total amount of grain sent to the market. (From the harvest of 1932, the socialised sector will represent 13% of the total area of cultivated land). As a result of the projected inclusion of 20 millions of persons into the socialised sector, the private sector of agriculture will cease its numerical growth. The (old and new) Soviet farms will provide from the 1932 harvest no less than 34 million cwts of commodity grain.

and the collective undertakings will provide no less than 50 million cwts, which together makes 84 million cwts or over 500 million poods of commodity grain.

c) The most important index figures for the growth of the co-operatives may be seen by the following computation:

	1927/28	1932/33
1. Share of Collective Farms in Total Output	1.0 per cent.	11.8 per cent.
2. Share of Co-operative Small Industries in Output of all Small Industries	19.4 per cent.	53.3 per cent.
3. Co-operative Share in Retail Trade	60.2 per cent.	78.9 per cent.
4. Number of Agricultural Productive Co-operatives	0.5 millions (37.5% of all undertakings)	23.58 millions 85.0%
5. Urban population covered by Co-operatives	8.7 millions	16.5 millions
6. Rural population ditto	13.9 millions	31.8 millions

This very material strengthening of the Socialist elements throughout the national economy in the production and distribution of goods with elaboration of the system of machine and tractor stations and a liberal practice of contracts of supply, which is reckoned to cover 85 per cent. of the grain cultivation by the close of the five-year period, represents a consolidation of the leading rôle of the workers and provides a new form of alliance between town and country, leading to a wholesale transformation in agriculture on the basis of more perfected technics and of a collective system.

3. The Conference has further established:

a) That, calculated on the basis of unchanged prices, the national income will grow from 24,400 million roubles in 1927/28 to 49,700 millions in 1932/33, which means an increase by 103 per cent. This represents a yearly increase of more than 12 per cent., a rate surpassing the growth of the national income in pre-war Russia by more than fourfold and also considerably excelling the growth in any capitalist country.

b) The social structure of the national income is primarily characterised by the increase in real wages of the industrial workers, which by the end of the five-year period is to amount to 71 per cent., the percentage share of the income of the entire working class in proportion to the aggregate national income figuring at 37, instead of 32.1, per cent. The income of the entire agricultural population will have grown by the end of the five-years by 67 per cent. The relative share of this income in the entire national income will in view of the rapid growth of industry recede from 49.8 to 42.5 per cent.

c) The increase in the State budget (net) is characterised by the fact that the total sum of the year's budgets in the coming five-year period will amount to 51,000 million roubles, as against 19,000 millions in the past five years (an increase by 166.7 per cent.). The budget for the year 1932/33 will absorb 30.9 per cent. of the national income, as against 25.9 per cent. in 1928/29. This growth of the budget will render possible not only a consolidation of the defensive resources of the country but also a fourfold (393 per cent.) increase of the sums employed for the financing of national economy and a threefold (276 per cent.) increase of the social and cultural expenditure.

d) The five-year plan provides for a pronounced growth both of the reserves of commodities and currency.

II.

The plan fully guarantees:

a) The maximum development of the output of means of production as the basis for the industrialisation of the country.

b) A decided strengthening of the Socialist section in town and country at the cost of the capitalist elements in economy, the recruiting of the millions of the peasantry for constructive Socialist work upon the basis of co-operation, and an all-round assistance of the poor and middle individual farms in their fight against exploitation by the kulaks.

c) The elimination of the extreme backwardness of agriculture in comparison to industry and, essentially, a solution of the grain problem.

d) A considerable improvement in the material and cultural standard of living of the working class and of the working masses in the country.

e) The consolidation of the leading rôle of the working class on the basis of the development of new forms of alliance with the main mass of the peasantry.

f) The consolidation of the economic and political positions of the proletarian dictatorship in its fight against the enemies of the working class at home and abroad.

g) The cultural and economic advance of the national republics and of the backward districts and provinces.

h) A pronounced consolidation of the defensive capacity of the country.

i) A great step forwards towards the realisation of the Party's object of catching up and outdistancing the advanced capitalist countries in a technical and economic direction!

In view of the above and in view of the figures given in section I. regarding the five-year plan, the Conference resolves to approve the five-year plan of the State Economic Plan Commission, which has been confirmed by the Council of Peoples Commissars of the Soviet Union, as a plan in keeping with the directives of the XV. Party Congress.

III.

The realisation of the five-year plan, which represents a programme of the developed Socialist offensive, is connected with the task of overcoming tremendous difficulties both of an internal and of an external nature. These difficulties arise from the entire character of the plan itself, as conditioned by the technical and economic backwardness of the country, from the complicated nature of the task of reconstructing many millions of dispersed and split-up farms on the basis of collective activity, and finally from the capitalist encirclement of our country. They are increased by the intensification of the class struggle and by the resistance of the capitalist elements, which are being inevitably ousted by the growing offensive of the Socialist proletariat.

These difficulties can only be overcome by a definite improvement of the quality of work and of working discipline in all branches of economy. Reduction of the prime costs of industrial output by 35 per cent. in five years; reduction of the costs of building by 50 per cent., increase of the productivity of labour in industry by 110 per cent., increase of the productivity of the soil by 35 per cent., enlargement of the area under cultivation by 22 per cent., unconditional execution of the programme of developing the Soviet estates and collective farms, decided opposition to all sloth and negligence in production, consolidation of working discipline, Socialist rationalisation of production, provision of industry and agriculture with the necessary cadres of leaders and education of new cadres of Red specialists from among the working class, finally development of such functions in the economic system as tend to regulate planned economy — such are the elementary and indispensable conditions of a general economic nature for the mastery of all difficulties in the realisation of the five-year plan.

The Conference considers it necessary to point out that the mastery of these difficulties and the realisation of the five-year plan are only possible on the basis of a tremendous increase in the activity and organisation of the working masses in general and of the working class in particular both in Socialist construction and in the administration of economy on the strength of an all-round development of Socialist competition and a powerful use of self-criticism on the part of the millions in regard to the bureaucratic abuses in the State apparatus.

The difficulties of the period of Socialist reconstruction, particularly in view of an accentuation of the class struggle, inevitably call forth vacillations among the petty-bourgeois sections of the population. These vacillations are likewise reflected in certain sections of the working class and even inside the Party. These vacillations reflect the influence of petty-bourgeois elements and are expressed in deviations from the general policy of the Party in certain main questions, especially with reference to the rate of Socialist industrialisation, the development of the Socialist offensive against the kulaks and against the capitalist elements in general, and the consolidation of Socialist forms of economy in the rural districts.

In this connection the Right deviation is under existing circumstances the greatest danger inside the Party. It is the

embodiment of a direct renunciation of the Leninist policy of the Party and an open opportunist abandonment of Leninist positions under the attack of the class enemies. Only a ruthless rejection all vacillations in the pursuance of the general Bolshevik directives — the realisation of which stands for the consolidation of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry — with a further consolidation of the leading rôle of the working class, can ensure the solution of the tasks of Socialist construction contained in the five-year plan.

The Conference is firmly convinced that the Party will deal not only the deviation to the Right but also all conciliatory tendencies in regard to deviations from Leninist directives an annihilating blow.

At the head of the working masses, the Party marches confidently onward on the path of the Socialist reconstruction of the whole economic system and mobilises the broad masses of toilers under the guidance of the working class for the task of overcoming all difficulties and of realising the five-year plan of economic construction.

The Development of Agriculture and the Tax Alleviations for the Middle Peasantry.

Resolution upon the Report of Comrade Kalinin.

(Unanimously Adopted.)

1.

1. The reconstruction period led to the result that the poor and middle peasantry appropriated not only the land allotted to them, but also the greater part of the land of the former landowners, the State lands ceded to them, and those kulak estates taken from the kulaks. Despite the advancing differentiation of the village, the middle peasant has established himself as the central figure of agriculture. At the same time the poor and middle peasantry have been provided to an ever increasing extent with the means of production; their agricultural and general cultural level has been raised. From year to year the supply of draught animals for the peasant farms has improved. To-day the peasant farms possess more agricultural machinery than before the war. The commassation organisations embracing several villages extend their field of work over about one third of the total area of land, those whose work is confined to one village affect about one fifth of the total area. The area cultivated on the multiple field system has increased to 10 million hectares. Sorted seed will be sown in 1929 on about one tenth of the total grain growing area. A number of technical plants, the cultivation of which belonged to the privileges of the landowner before the war (the beetroot for instance), are now being steadily cultivated in the fields of the peasantry, and the cultivation of technical raw materials exceeds the pre-war level by over 60 per cent. The industrialisation of agriculture is spreading to one branch of production after another (industries working up oil, flax, potatoes, vegetables, fruit, animal products, etc.). The provision of agricultural machinery in 1928/29 is 2½ times greater than before the war. For the first time chemical fertilisers are being used for technical plants in the fields of our peasantry. The agricultural co-operatives embrace more than one third of all peasant farms.

Tractors, which were utterly unknown on the peasant farm before the revolution, are now being increasingly employed from year to year (by 1928 the number of tractors at work had risen to 36,000). The number of collective farms increases every year (last year the number was doubled, reaching 37,000 by 1st October 1928), and their work gains steadily in efficiency. The old Soviet farms are being extended and new ones organised (in the current year the area cultivated by the Soviet farms was 1,500,000 hectares).

2. But whilst agriculture as a whole is thus progressing, certain branches of it, especially grain growing, show a distinct retardation in their rates of development. The reason of this reduced speed of agricultural development, and of the extremely small proportion of agricultural produce sold as commodities, is to be sought in the scattered nature of peasant farming (the number of peasant farms increased during the revolution from 10 to 25 million), in its quasi natural economic character, (the

proportion of agricultural products coming into the market as commodities is only about half as great, per centually, as before the war), and in the low level of agricultural technique and culture. Whilst the reconstruction period has made it possible for the small individual farms to make rapid progress, thanks chiefly to the appropriation of the former landowner estates and of the State and kulak farms, the completion of the reconstruction work now enables us to see how limited are the possibilities of development of the small agricultural undertaking, and especially how small the possibility that will increase its output of market commodities so long as it retains its present size and its present methods of production. That the speed of agricultural development falls far short of that of industry is a fact bound to lead to difficulties in the regulation of both the food and the raw material supplies, the more so when we take into consideration the rapidly growing demand for grain and raw materials.

Hence, persevering and systematic work for the reconstruction of agriculture is an urgent necessity: the establishment of socialised agricultural large-scale production on a basis of the highest level of technical progress this to be combined with the simultaneous promotion of the development of the small and middle individual peasant farms.

3. The establishment of large-scale agricultural production undoubtedly the most effectual method of overcoming the backwardness of agriculture, can only be achieved in one of two ways: Either by the formation of large capitalist or of peasant undertakings, or by the formation of socialist agricultural undertakings on a large scale (Soviet farms, combination of small farms in collective undertakings, communes, production co-operatives and societies, etc.). The answer to the question whether the masses of the peasantry are to remain the faithful allies of the working class, or to let themselves be estranged from the workers by the bourgeoisie, depends upon the direction taken by the development of agriculture — whether towards socialism or capitalism, and therefore upon those who will have the leadership of the development of agriculture, the kulaks or the socialist State. The capitalist development of the village signifies, as shown in the examples afforded by the capitalist countries, that a powerful capitalist class (kulaks) is formed in the village, and that this, by means of the ruthless exploitation of millions of small undertakings, and by means of destroying and absorbing these undertakings, contrives to concentrate in its own hands the bulk of the means of production and the main mass of agricultural production.

The Soviet power opposes to this capitalist method of creating a great individual agricultural system the proletarian method of creating a great socialised system, to be realised by co-operative production, and by collectivising the small and dwarf undertakings, with the aid and guidance of the Soviet power, so that their collective efforts may enable them to join together in larger units, and to rise to a higher level of technique and culture. This path of development, the sole path of emancipation for the millions of the peasant masses from ruin and misery, does not merely mean the restriction of the agriculture capitalist elements in the village, but at the same time their supersession by a great socialised (state and co-operative) agricultural system. Here the Communist Party is guided by Lenin's words on this subject:

"If the peasant agriculture can develop further, that is the way of further transition, too, must be firmly secured. But the further transition consists of the gradual joining together of the last advantageous and most backward small individual peasant farms, and their organisation in one socialised large-scale agricultural system."

4. The Soviet power and the Communist Party, in fulfilling the task of the accelerating the advance of agriculture, and of establishing socialised large-scale agricultural production, base their measures on the present stage of development of the Soviet Union:

a) On the rapid development of industry, and especially on the rapid growth of the production of agricultural machinery;

b) on the systematic regulation of national economy, combining the development of agriculture with the rapid growth of industry;

c) on the nationalisation of the land, which cheapens agricultural production and enables the peasants to expend for pur-

poses of production means which, under conditions of private property in land, they would have to employ for the purchase of land;

d) on the systematic restrictions placed upon the growth of capitalism in the village, by which the poor and middle peasants are freed from the yoke of the kulak, and their economic advance made possible;

e) on the growth of co-operation in production, enabling the small and dwarf undertakings, by means of combination in the process of production, to enjoy those advantages of large-scale production which, in a capitalist state of society, are only open to the big peasants;

f) on the general application of the nationalised credit system and of the state budget for the advancement of agriculture;

g) on the unconditional support afforded by the policy of the Party for the promotion of agriculture by the working class and by the working masses of the village.

Hence, whilst the essential completion of the reconstruction period has made apparent the limited possibilities of a continued rapid advance of the small farms, at the same time the means at the disposal of the proletarian State have grown both qualitatively and quantitatively, and these are means which will enable it to utilise the advantages of the Soviet system for accelerating the speed of development of agriculture on the basis of the latest mechanical technics, and for combining the small agricultural undertakings on the basis of collective work.

5. In the land of the Soviets socialised large-scale agriculture does not develop by absorbing, destroying, annihilating, and ruining the small and dwarf undertakings, nor by fighting against these, but by strengthening these units economically, promoting their growth, and raising them to the highest level of technics, culture, and organisation. **Socialised large-scale agriculture does not oppose the poor and middle peasant farm as a hostile force, but stands shoulder to shoulder with it, as a helper, as an example showing the advantages of the large-scale undertaking as organiser of support for the small and middle undertakings during their gradual combination in large-scale undertakings.** It is on these lines that the Party carries on its practical work in the village: it combines the giving of economic, technical, and agricultural support to the poor, middle, and individual undertakings — arousing thereby more and more the immediate interest of the poor and middle peasantry in the improvement of their own farms — with the firmer establishment and extension of the position of the State agricultural large-scale undertakings and the collective farms.

The most effectual method of accomplishing the absolutely necessary intensification of agricultural labour productivity being the establishment of socialised large-scale agriculture, the Party and the Soviet power must continue their work uninteruptedly from year to year in accordance with the extension of the material basis provided by industry at the task of furthering the organisation of the growth of the collective undertakings, and must extend to these a steadily growing financial and material support.

At the same time the Party takes into account that the individual poor and middle peasant farms will continue to form the main factor in the growth of agricultural production during the next few years, and that the small undertaking has not yet by any means exhausted its possibilities, nor will it exhaust them for some time to come.

Therefore the Party must strive to overcome the technical, cultural, and organisational backwardness of the poor and middle peasant farm, to increase its yield, and to extend the area of the land it cultivates, and must constantly intensify its efforts in this direction.

It is only in this way — the combination of work for the accomplishment of the most important task, that of organising a large-scale socialised agriculture, with the daily work entailed by the extensive organisational, technical, and economic aid to be given to the individual small and medium peasant farms, and with the task of further restricting the expansion of the big peasant — that the Party can fulfil the task confronting it: that of organiser and leader in the raising of the working productivity of agriculture.

Besides the old forms of collaboration with the main masses of the peasantry by the development and increase of commodity between industry and agriculture, and the development of the co-operative forms of commercial intercourse between town and country, new forms of collaboration are now coming to the front, and developing on the basis of a productive connection between the working class and the peasantry.

If the peasantry has held to the working class up to now mainly because it has had faith in the results of the revolutionary work of the latter (extermination of the landowning class and transference of the land to the peasantry), and if this faith is to be maintained and confirmed in the present stage of development, then this can only be done if the Soviet power provides systematic aid to the production efforts of the poor and middle peasantry, enabling these to increase the productivity of agricultural labour.

The most important methods of solving this task, and the most important new forms of collaboration, acquiring greater importance year by year, are:

a) The organisation of new Soviet farms and the improvement of work on the old Soviet farms, making these into great agricultural factories and centres for lending all-round aid to the individual farms of the middle and poor peasantry;

b) the formation of new collective farming undertakings and the expansion of the old, as the highest forms of productive co-operation, and of the gathering together of the scattered peasant farms in socialised undertakings;

c) the laying down of a broad network of State and co-operative machine and tractor stations, as one of the methods for the socialisation of the most important processes of production among the whole mass of individual undertakings;

d) the general development of the productive co-operatives, accompanied by a constant and increasing strengthening of the elements of socialised agricultural enterprise within them;

e) the further development of the widespread supply contract system for agricultural products, not only as a connecting form of agricultural industrial development, but at the same time as a method for increasing the productivity of the poor and middle farms;

f) the development of the work being done by the State and co-operative organs for the increased yield per unit of land in the small and dwarf farming undertakings, and for the utilisation of the means and possibilities already existing for increasing the productivity of the small and middle farms (co-massation, loan centres, seed cleaning centres, repair shops, war on insect and other pests, replacement of unsorted seed by sorted, etc.).

6. In the question of the possibility of the actual introduction of new forms of collaboration, a decisive rôle is played by the further development of industry. The Party, in its efforts for the industrialisation of the country, proceeds from the standpoint that in the country of the proletarian dictatorship the development of industry "must create the material basis for a mighty increase of the productivity of agricultural labour, in that it thereby induces the small farmers, in view of the example furnished and for their own advantage, to go over to the collective, machine-using large-scale agricultural undertaking". (Lenin, Resolution of the Second World Congress of the C. I. on the agrarian question.)

While in a capitalist state of society industry applies itself, even in its initial stages of development, to supplying foreign markets and the colonies, and in its highest stage of development serves military and imperialist ends, in the Soviet State industry serves the object — and with increasing efficiency with its increasing powers — of promoting the technical and cultural advance of the main mass of the peasant farms, and the creation of a great State and collective agricultural system. The experience of the last few years fully confirm this. The main method of accelerating the upward movement of agriculture, and of consolidating those forms of collaboration corresponding to the new stage of agricultural development, lies in the further expansion of industry. This is the first premise for the advancement of agriculture itself, for the emancipation of the peasants from poverty, and for the gathering together of the scattered peasant undertakings in one large socialised agricultural system.

This is the general line of the Party in the peasant question at the present stage of socialist construction. This line is laid down entirely on the Leninist methods of the consolidation of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, and derives authority from the decisions of the 15th Party Congress.

II.

The Chief Errors of the Rights in the Peasant Question.

The carrying out of the general line of the Party in the peasant question demands long years of tense exertion of the whole of the forces in the working class, and encounters the difficulties inherent in the present stage of capitalist encirclement, of technical and economic backwardness of the country, of the numerical preponderance of the petty-bourgeois elements in the population, and of the growing resistance of the capitalist elements to the socialist offensive. Under these conditions the progress of the building up of socialism is inevitably accompanied by certain waverings in the petty-bourgeois strata have succumbed to the influence of the petty-bourgeois elements, and among certain strata of the working class. These waverings again find expression among some strata of the Party, which and deviate from the general line of the Party in the direction of an adaption of the Party policy to bourgeois ideology. This is the source of the vacillations and errors of the Right elements of the Party, and these vacillations are especially dangerous under the present circumstances.

The most important of these errors of the Right in the peasant question may be summed up as follows:

1. In spite of the decision of the XV. Party Congress, the representatives of the Right deviation endeavour to hamper the development of the Soviet farms and collective agricultural undertakings, although this development is of decisive importance not only for the future of the Soviet country, since these forms of agriculture will assume dominant positions in it, but also for the present situation, since the Soviet State opposes its State and collective forms of large-scale agricultural enterprise to the creation of great agricultural undertakings of the kulak type. The course adopted by the Right in rejecting the organisation of great socialist grain factories and the steadily increasing promotion of collective agricultural undertakings, and in rejecting the systematic and determined re-organisation of agriculture on a large-scale basis, is regarded by the Party as an actual desertion into the camp of the kulaks, as an actual renunciation of the leading rôle of the working class in the development of agricultural production. The Party rejects this Right deviation from the Party line with the same decision with which it rejected, some years ago, that Trotzkyist distortion of the Party line which headed for the dissolution of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

2. In spite of the undeniable symptoms of growth in agriculture, and of its qualitative progress, the representatives of the Right deviation conceal their opportunist platform in the question of the direction to be pursued by agricultural development behind a lot of talk about the "degradation of agriculture". These outcries from the Right on the "degradation of agriculture", and their anti-Leninist theory of "constant concessions" to the petty-bourgeois strata of the village (abandonment of the control exercised by the State on the markets, abandonment of the individual taxation of the upper Kulak stratum, the abandonment of the policy of increasing the pressure upon the Kulaks and of using temporary exceptional measures against them under certain circumstances, and against their attempts to undermine the price policy of the soviet power, whilst at the same time securing the social support of the measures of the soviet power by the masses of the poor and middle peasants) represent in actual practice the ideological reflection of the pressure on the Soviet State of the capitalist elements striving to lead the village into capitalist paths. The Party decisively rejects the capitulatory standpoint of the Right, for its practical consequence would be the abandonment of the proletarian leadership of the peasantry.

3. Despite the decisions of the XV. Party Congress, the representatives of the Right deviation are striving to substitute the Party line of "intensified offensive against the kulaks" by a policy of living peacefully together with the kulak and waiting until the "kulak grows into socialism", in actual practice this means the adoption of a course on the part of the Right ele-

ments, leading to the rejection of the main line of the Party directed towards the abolition of class antagonism. The line of the Right leads to the perpetuation of the exploitation of the poor and middle peasant masses by the kulaks.

Out of this arises the opportunist denial of the fact of the intensification of the class struggle in the village, and this although Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the proletarian dictatorship does not mean the cessation of class warfare, but its continuation in new and often most acute forms, especially in connection with the successful supplanting of the capitalist elements by the socialist under the conditions given by the N.E.P. The Party decidedly rejects the anti-Leninist theory that the kulak will grow into socialism, for this is a theory tending to disarm the working class in the presence of its class enemies to lull to sleep its revolutionary watchfulness, and to weaken its fighting capacity for overcoming economic difficulties on the general line laid down by the Party.

4. The representatives of the Right deviation attempt to conceal the rôle and importance of the independent organisation of the broad masses of the rural poor. These attempts, or the maintenance of silence with regard to this most important Party task, are directed in actual practice not only against the village poor, but at the same time against the middle peasant, for the organisation of the poor peasantry has for its aim the strengthening of the fulcrums of the Soviet power in the village, the offering of increased resistance to the kulak, and the firmer establishment of the alliance between the village poor and the middle peasantry with the aid of these fulcrums. The Party energetically rejects these attempts to drag it into the morass of opportunism represented by the abandonment of the work on the consolidation of the positions of the Party in the village, and by granting the Kulak free hand in the struggle against the village poor.

5. The C. C. has mobilised the will and activity of the working class for the realisation of industrialisation at a maximum speed, in conjunction with measures for the economic uplift of the broad masses of the peasantry and the organisation of specialised large-scale agricultural undertakings. In opposition to Lenin's direct reference to the fact that "the material basis of socialism can only be a great engineering industry, which is also capable of reorganising agriculture", the representatives of the Right deviation are endeavouring to reduce the speed of industrial development.

The Party decidedly rejects this standpoint. Not capitulation by a slowing down of the pace of development of industry, but a firmer establishment of collaboration by means of intensified industrialisation, and by means of the rapid development of those branches of industry which serve to provide the means of production for agriculture which is now in process of re-organisation — this is the standpoint of the Party.

The main errors of the Right elements of the Party, and also the tendency to adopt a conciliatory attitude towards these errors, represent at the present juncture the chief danger against which the efforts of the Party must be directed. The Conference is of the opinion that unless this danger is overcome, it is impossible to surmount successfully the difficulties opposing the development and reconstruction of agriculture.

The Party will continue, in the future as in the past, to carry out determinedly the Leninist slogan: sustained by the village poor, firm alliance with the middle peasant, war against the kulak. The Party strides forward on the path pointed out by Lenin, and with that same determination with which it once rejected the Trotzkyist renunciation of the alliance with the middle peasantry, it now rejects the course being pursued by the Right towards the renunciation of the leading rôle of the working class in the development of agriculture. It is only in this way that the Party can fulfil the task set it: the task of establishing more firmly the alliance with the middle peasant and strengthening the leading rôle of the working class in the alliance, the task of creating socialised large-scale agricultural undertakings, and the task of raising the whole mass of poor and middle peasant farms to the highest level of technics, culture, and organisation.

III.

Practical Measures for Strengthening the New Forms of Alliance Between the Working Class and the Peasantry, and for Lessening the Taxation of the Middle Peasants.

1. The Conference draws the special attention of the Party to the necessity of strenuous and persevering work for the eve-

tion of the decree of the C. E. C. in regard to increasing the yield of the soil. Of special importance is the carrying out of the following measures within the periods and to the extent stated in the decree, ensuring an increased yield from our soil of at least 30 to 35 per cent. before the expiration of the five-year term:

a) Shortening of the terms fixed by the governments of the republics for the re-ordering of the irrational distribution of land, and for the carrying out in particular of the simplest forms of this preliminary to the clearing of the soil, thereby removing those essential disadvantages entailed by: too great distances between fields and the farm to which they belong; various fields belonging to one farm but divided from one another and lying in different parts of the village district, etc.;

b) replacement of less productive and impure seed, for all the most important plants cultivated, by improved and sorted seed, within five years;

c) the provision, within the next two or three years, of all the machinery required by agriculture for cleaning and sorting every kind of grain, and the organisation of the general compulsory cleaning and sorting of seed, and destruction of weeds;

d) the furtherance of the production of means for the extermination of pests, within the next two or three years, to an extent fully meeting the requirements of agriculture; the organisation of a mass campaign against pests;

e) the development of a network of hiring centres and repair shops on a scale ensuring the uninterrupted utilisation of the existing agricultural machinery; the masses of the poor and middle peasant farms to be given the possibility of making use of complicated machinery;

f) the mass dissemination of the simplest agrarian measures, as stated in the decree of the C. E. C. of the Soviet Union concerning measures for increasing the yield of the soil";

g) the spread of agricultural knowledge and the augmentation of the aid given to the peasantry by scientifically trained experts (agronomists).

2. The Conference fully confirms the fundamental principles of the law on agricultural taxation, which exempts the economically weak farms (35% of all farms) entirely from taxation, and grants considerable privileges to the collective farms, at the same time imposing on the most expressly kulak undertakings (4 to 5% of all farms) 30 to 40% of the total sum to be raised. The Conference fully confirms the measures taken by the C. C. of the Party for the alleviation of the taxation of the middle peasantry; the Conference here takes as a basis the standpoint that these measures, taken in conjunction with the raising of the grain prices already effected, ought to secure the interest of the middle peasants in the carrying out of such measures as are calculated to raise the cultural and technical level of their farms. The Conference fully confirms, in particular, the reduction of the revenues from the agricultural tax by at least 50 million roubles; the exemption from any taxation whatever, for the next two years, of areas newly brought into cultivation by the poor and middle peasantry; tax abatements for those poor and middle peasants who carry out the measures laid down in the decree for increasing the yield of the soil; the categorical prohibition of the application of the paragraphs referring to individual taxation to the middle peasant farms; the establishment of standards of profitability for tillage, live stock rearing, and pasture, and of a scale of progressive taxation extending over three years; taxation abatements for peasant farms supporting many persons; abatements for farms working on the multiple field system; at the same time complete maintenance of the system of individual taxation of the richest section of the kulak farms (2 to 3% of all farms in the whole Soviet Union).

The Conference calls upon all Party and Soviet workers, when engaged in the practical application of taxation, to adhere strictly to the revolutionary law and to prevent any deviations from the valid legal regulations which tend to worsen the position of the taxpayer. Special attention must be paid to the question of the rules of guidance to be adopted in the application of the agricultural single tax by all local Party and Soviet organs, for every infringement of revolutionary law in this sphere is particularly detrimental from the viewpoint of the strengthening of the confidence felt by the peasantry in the Soviet power, and of the firmer establishment of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

3. In spite of a number of Party decisions, and especially in spite of the decisions of the 14th Party Congress, work towards gathering the peasantry together in production co-operatives has

not yet been accorded due attention in the activities of the agricultural co-operative movement. In this connection the activities of the agricultural co-operative system cannot be designated as satisfactory; it is not satisfactory either along the line of furtherance and organisation of the growth of the great collective agricultural undertakings, or along the line of agronomical and technical aid to the individual farms of the poor and middle peasantry.

The Conference calls upon all Communists working in the agricultural co-operative system to intensify their efforts for the fulfilment of the directives issued by the 15th Party Congress, by means of the following measures: a) the inclusion of increasing numbers of poor and middle peasantry in the co-operative organisations; b) more energetic intensification of work on the basis of trading activities, and of effort for the actual combination in production co-operatives of the peasant farms; c) untiring efforts to combine the simple co-operative production associations in great collective undertakings; d) promotion of the development of undertakings working up agricultural products, for which purpose the participation of the means of the rural population itself is to be brought about to a wide extent; e) maximum development of self-activity, initiative, and self-criticism among the co-operating population.

The system of supply contracts, as applied to the work of the agricultural co-operatives, must become one of the leading methods for the promotion of production, and for the improvement and reconstruction of agriculture, by means of the inclusion in the contracts of the needful minimum of simple agronomical measures, which are made obligatory for the farms entering into contracts: security of the necessary agronomic aid for the farms taking part in the agreement; detailed discussion of the supply contracts at the peasants' meetings; furnishing of the contracting parties, with agricultural machinery, seed, artificial fertilisers, and credit.

4. The Conference fully confirms the decision of the Plenum of the C. C. on the organisation of new Soviet farms on a scale guaranteeing the annual production of at least 1,646,200 tons of grain for the market by 1932; at the same time the Conference confirms the practical measures taken for the execution of these tasks. The Conference, which considers the task thus set to be the minimum, instructs the C. C. of the Party to seek for further land available for grain-growing, in order to organise further grain factories and to ensure that by the end of the five-year term 10 to 12 million hectares will be secured to the grain trust as reserve for the further development of Soviet farms.

The Conference places on record that the work done for the expansion and improvement of the old Soviet farms has been inadequate, and approves the decisions of the Pol. Bureau on the reports sent in by the State Agricultural Syndicate of the Sugar Trust and by the association of Ukrainian Soviet farms; these decisions advocated the strengthening of the old Soviet farms; the Conference commissions the Party organisations to ensure the complete execution of these decisions.

5. The Conference, which fully confirms the measures taken by the C. C. for the material and financial support of the collective farming movement, emphasises that the vitality of the collective farming movement finds proof in the fact that the collective farms are growing on the basis of self-activity, initiative arising from below, from the peasant masses themselves, and that the advantages of large-scale enterprise are already being shown in the collectives (on the collective farms the harvest yield is greater than on the middle peasant farms; the proportion of products reaching the market is considerably higher than in the individual undertakings; the multiple field system and the better cultivation of the soil are becoming increasingly common). The Conference points out as an especially important feature of the collective movement of late the tendency on the part of not only the poor peasant strata of the village to join in collective farms, but at the same time of the middle peasants, who combine their machinery and live stock in collective undertakings. The main defect of the collective farming movement in its present stage of development is the circumstance that its organisational range and the strengthening of its technical basis are noticeably far behind the impetus and needs of the movement from below.

Therefore, the Conference draws the special attention of the Party organisations to the necessity of:

a) Securing for the collectives increasing supplies of complicated machines, especially tractors;

b) Reinforcing the activities towards the socialisation of the process of production in co-operatives for the joint cultivation of the land, whereby every possible financial, material, and organisational aid is to be given for promoting the transition of these co-operatives into higher forms of the co-operative movement (communes, "artels").

c) Giving all-round support to the initiative towards the transition of whole villages and communities to collective forms of work, for which purpose mass supply contracts are to be employed for the sowing of sorted seed over large areas, and for securing machinery and tractor stations and gangs, these being an extremely important factor in the present period. At the same time all measures are to be taken for overcoming the resistance of the Kulak and for gradually forming collective farms on this basis.

d) The utmost possible promotion of the advancing progress of enlarging the old collective farms by the admission of new members, and by the organisation of branch associations of the collective farms as production and organisation centres of the collective farms in the corresponding districts.

e) The special promotion and efficient support of the great collective farms, which are able to supply a maximum of market commodities and are already working at the highest point of up-to-date technics and agronomical science.

f) The strengthening of the operative and systematic leadership of the collectivisation by the co-operative associations.

In addition to the above, the Party organisations must bear in mind that the success of the collective farming movement is ensured by the consciousness, the activity, the training, and the initiative of the members of the collective farms. Therefore, a determined reinforcement of general political and cultural work is necessary in the collectives. The most conscious members of the collective farms, those most devoted to the cause of socialism, must join the ranks of the Young Communist League and the Communist Party, in order that the importance of the Party in the village sections of the farming collectives may grow in proportion to the increasing activities of the collective farming movement.

The Conference draws the special attention of the C. C. to the necessity of effecting a radical improvement in the formation of cadres of specialists and organisers for the Soviet and collective farms, and of securing the development of the scientific work and the investigations into the problems of the organisation and the rationalisation of industrialised agriculture. The Conference fully confirms the extension of the program of production for the tractor factory in course of construction in Stalingrad (40,000 tractors yearly instead of the 20,000 originally planned) for the purpose of the technicalisation of the collective and Soviet farms, and draws the special attention of the C. C. to the necessity of beginning with the building of a new tractor factory in the coming year, and of promoting the production of other machines in accordance with the present day level of technics and the requirements of production on a large scale ("Combine" machines and other implements attached to the tractors, row sowing machines, etc.).

The Conference, in accordance with the tasks incumbent on the Party for the strengthening and development of new forms of the close alliance between the working class and the peasantry, calls upon the Soviet farms and the agricultural collectives to extend the all-round aid given to the poor and middle peasantry (production of sorted seed and breeding cattle, repair and hiring out of agricultural machinery, extermination of pests etc.).

Immediate measures are necessary for the financial consolidation and development of the existing network of experimental institutions and agricultural high schools, and also for the foundation of new scientific institutions for agricultural experiments and investigations.

b. In consideration of the fact that in spite of a number of Party decisions the questions incidental to the increased productivity of agriculture have received only inadequate attention from the local Soviet organs, and of the fact that the changes effected in this direction during the seed campaign have proved to be still insufficient, the Conference commissions all Party organisations to:

a) Intensify the work of the local Soviets for the support of village production, that is, at the Soviet congresses, the report meetings, etc. One criterion of the success of this work on the part of the executive committees of the Soviets for the defence

of the interests of the poor and middle peasant masses against exploitation by the kulaks and all other capitalist elements of the village, must be the degree to which they have made themselves the leaders of the promotion of agriculture, the degree to which they have become the organisers of the great socialised agricultural system and of the provision of the means of production for the individual farms of the poor and middle peasantry.

b) The expenditure of the means granted by the Soviet power for agriculture must be as much under public control as the enlargement of existing factories and the building of new ones now under the control of the urban workers.

c) The activities of the agricultural commissions (sections of the village Soviets and the sub-district and district executive committees) must be stimulated and increased. These commissions must include members of the collective farms, officials of the Soviet farms, representatives of the peasant committees for mutual assistance, and peasants farming individual poor and middle peasant farms willing to conduct their farms upon modern lines; the activities of the agricultural sections are to be regulated in accordance to the example furnished by the activities of the production consultations in the industrial undertakings.

d) To support with all the means in their power the growing movement amongst the Red Army men to unite their individual farms into collective undertakings; to popularise collectivisation in the Red Army, and to strengthen the work of the training of leaders of the process of collectivisation amongst the more progressive Red Army men.

e) The work of the land authorities is to be increased and improved. In view of the importance of the new forms of close alliance with the peasantry for the work of the land authorities, any relic of any description from the days of the war limitedness of the land authorities must be eliminated from these bodies, which at that time confined their efforts to gathering prosperous individual farms. The land authorities must become the organisers of our great socialised agriculture, the leaders of the agronomical revolution of agriculture, and must thereby gather together the millions of the poor and middle peasantry in this revolution, and engage the services of agronomists and all organisational forces in its cause.

7. The Conference fully confirms the measures taken by the C. C. for strengthening the organisations of the village poor. The Conference, which considers the success gained in this direction to be entirely inadequate, commissions the Party organisations to intensify even more the work for the organisation of the village poor, and to increase their efforts for the gathering together of the village poor into a real support of the working class in the village.

The new period, and the new forms of the close alliance between the working class and the peasantry, call for a considerable strengthening of the relations between the proletariat in town and the village, as a means of strengthening the leadership rôle of the working class. The tasks set by Lenin in 1923 for the development of the relations between the workers and peasants, and the creation of various forms of community between them, are under the present circumstances among the most important duties and tasks of the working class in the struggle for the socialist re-organisation of the village. For this purpose it is unconditionally necessary to further and augment the work of the patronage societies, to go forward to the organisation of a number of voluntary associations (Party, trade union, and every description of other works associations), which take up the task of systematically helping the village in its co-operative and socialist advancement. The experience gained in the formation of special workers' societies, working for the increase of the yield of the soil, must receive every support from the Party. The initiative of the workers in sending workers' brigades to the villages to help the poor and middle peasantry to aid the progress of the co-operation of agriculture, and to draw more closely the ties between the poor and middle peasantry in their struggle against the Kulak, must be given far-reaching support.

In view of this fact the Conference lays special stress on the development of this method of sending workers' brigades, being one of the most lively forms of contact between the working class and the peasantry, and one strengthening the leadership rôle of the working class in the village.