

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2. No. 23

24th March 1927

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

Comrade Lenin's Speech at the Communist Fraction of the All-Russian Congress of Metal Workers.

At a meeting of the faction of the All-Russian Conference of Metal Workers held on the 6th of March, Comrade *Lenin* reported upon the internal and international position of the Soviet Republic. He was queted with a storm of applause. We give his speech in full.

** Comrades, allow me to interfere somewhat with the ordinary order and touch upon other themes than those on the agenda of your conference, in order to share with you my deductions and opinions upon the question of the most important problems of politics. We address ourselves, as is our ingrained habit, to you who, although not the official representatives of the different government institutions, yet in fact bear a large part of the work of the state. And you all know that the real work in the majority of our government institutions is being carried out by the representatives of the working class, among which the metal workers stand in the front rank.

This is the reason why I think, that in the present case, the alteration in the order of business will not seem misplaced, if I speak not so much of trade union and party questions, but concentrate my attention upon political questions concerning our internal and international position. For, according to my opinion, there is something in our home affairs, which looks like a certain change in the policy, and which requires special attention on the part of every party member, as well as on the part of every class-conscious worker, in order that this change in our policy should be entirely understood, and properly assimilated with the Soviet, party, trade union and other work.

Of course, you all know full well, comrades, that at the head of the international problems stands—Genoa. I cannot say that I am firmly convinced that it continues to stand there justifiably, but when we say "Genoa", we understand it to mean the well known conference, which was to take place in Italy at Genoa, the work for which had been nearly completed, and which, at the present time, unfortunately, seems to be in such an uncertain position, that no one knows (I even fear, that the initiators of Genoa themselves do not know anything definite) if it has any chance of taking place, or whether these chances are nil. In any case, we must say to ourselves, and to all those that have the slightest interest in the fate of the workers and peasants' Republic, that our position in that respect, i. e., in the question of the Genoa Conference, has, from the very beginning been a firm one and has remained such. It is not our fault, however, if someone else lacks not only firmness, but even elementary resolution, elementary ability to carry out his own intentions. We have, from the very beginning, stated that *we welcome Genoa and that we shall go to it*: we never intended to hide the fact, and knew very well that we were going to it as merchants, for trade with capitalist countries (as long as they have not yet gone to pieces) is necessary to us, and that we go there to negotiate politically suitable conditions of trade more correctly and more profitably, and nothing more. This, of course, is no secret for those capitalist countries, whose governments worked out the plan of the Genoa Conference. These governments are well aware that

the trade agreements connecting us with a number of capitalist countries are growing in importance, that the number of practical business deals is growing, that detailed plans are being negotiated by business enterprises, both Russian and foreign; and that most varied combinations have been arranged between the different foreign governments and the different branches of our industry—their numbers at present being very large. Therefore, the practical basis of what will be negotiated in Genoa is well known to the capitalist governments. And if, in addition to this basis, we find a superstructure of varied political arguments, propositions, projects, etc. it must be clearly understood that this is only a superstructure, very well constructed, invented and carried out by those who are interested in the same.

During the four years' existence of the Soviet power, we have naturally acquired practical experience (besides our already acquired theoretical knowledge) to be able to estimate in this diplomatic game, which has been unfolded according to the regulations of the old bourgeois diplomatic art by the representatives of the bourgeois countries. We understand perfectly well, what lies at the root of this game; we know that the basis of it is trade. *Bourgeois countries must trade with Russia*; they know that without certain forms of economic relations, disintegration will go further in their countries than it has gone up to the present. Notwithstanding their great conquests, and their everlasting boasting, with which they filled the papers and news dispatches of the whole world, their economics is bursting at the seams, for they cannot solve the simplest question—not constructing anew, but only reconstructing the old—which, after four years of "splendid conquests" they cannot bring to any satisfactory issue. They still turn around the problem of how, discussing this point in threes and fours and fives (you note that their numbers grow and make it extremely difficult to come to an agreement) to plan out such a combination which will learn to trade. I understand that Communists need time to learn to trade, and that anyone who wishes to learn the same, will in the first few years make the crudest blunders, but these may be forgiven him for it is something entirely new. Brains must be made more pliable, and must lay all aside Communist, or rather Russian sluggishness and much more besides. But that the representatives of the bourgeoisie should be forced to learn the rules of trading—which they have been carrying on for hundreds of years and upon which their whole existence is based—is rather strange.

We, however, are not so surprised at that. We long ago said that they did not estimate the imperialist war as correctly as we had estimated it. They estimated it from the point of view of what was under their very noses, and three years after their "gigantic victories" they still cannot find a way out of their position. We Communists said that we had estimated the war much more deeply and correctly, for its contradictions and misfortunes would have their effect upon a wider scale than had been anticipated by the capitalist governments. And, looking impartially at the bourgeois victorious states, we said: "They will remember our prophecies and our estimation of the war and its conse-

quences more than once". We are not surprised at the fact, that they have gotten into a blind alley, but at the same time we say: "Trade with capitalist countries is absolutely essential for us while they exist as such, we negotiate with them as merchants"; and that we can accomplish this is shown by the number of trade agreements which have been concluded with capitalist states. We cannot publish them before they are concluded. When a merchant and capitalist comes to us and says: "This should be kept a secret until we have come to the end of our negotiations", of course, from the commercial point of view, we cannot refuse him that. But we know exactly how many agreements are in negotiation; the list alone is several pages long, whilst among their numbers, there are dozens of concrete practical propositions with solid finance groups. Naturally, the representatives, of the bourgeois states, who are getting ready to meet at Genoa, know that as well as we do: what else might have happened, the connections of the bourgeois firms with their respective governments has certainly remained intact.

Therefore, if in foreign telegrams we come across information to the effect that they do not seem to be quite clear as to what will take place at Genoa, it is clear they are inventing something new, wishing to surprise the world with something to the effect that Russia intends to present new conditions. Allow me to tell them (I hope to be able to say it personally to Lloyd George at Genoa):

"You will not surprise anyone with this, gentlemen. You are business men and are carrying on business very smartly. We are only learning to trade and are doing so very badly. But we have dozens and hundreds of agreements and projected agreements, from which one may gather how we are doing business, the conditions upon which we intend to conclude business deals, and upon which we shall conclude them. And if we come across all sorts of reports in the newspapers, which are intended to frighten us, to the effect that we shall have to undergo a certain examination, then we coolly smile at that. We have been threatened before, and what is more, the threats were much more severe than those of a tradesman who is getting ready to bang the door, in proposing his very lowest price... We have had threats uttered from the mouths of cannon on the part of the Allied governments, who now hold practically the whole world in their hands. *We are not frightened by these threats. You gentlemen and European diplomats please do not forget this.* We are not at all anxious to keep our diplomatic prestige, our renown, a thing which is of utmost importance to your bourgeois governments. We shall not even speak of it officially. Nevertheless, we have not forgotten it. Not a single worker, not a single peasant has forgotten, and what is more, will ever forget, that he has fought for the workers' and peasants' power against the union of all the most powerful states, which had supported intervention. We have a whole collection of agreements, which had been concluded with the Koltchaks and Denikins during a period of several years. These have been published, we know of them—in fact, the whole world knows of them. Why then play at hide and seek, and put the matter in such a light as if we had all turned into "stupid jackasses"? Every peasant and worker knows that he fought against these powers and that they did not conquer him. And, if it so pleases you, gentlemen, the representatives of the bourgeois governments, to amuse yourselves and waste paper (you have more of it probably than necessary), and ink and to overload your wires and radio-stations with news to the effect that: 'We shall put Russia to the test', then we shall yet see, who does the testing. We have already been measured, not in words, nor in commerce and roubles, but with clubs. And we have certainly well earned the right by our bloody, heavy, and painful wounds, to say not only of ourselves but of our opponents that 'a beaten man, is worth two unbeaten ones'."

We have merited that in warfare. But in the sphere of commerce, it is unfortunate that we Communists have not had enough blows dealt us, but I hope that this deficiency will be remedied in the very near future, with equal success.

I have already mentioned that I hope to speak personally with Lloyd George at Genoa upon the above mentioned topic, and to tell him that *is useless to frighten us with trifles*, for those that do that will in the end only lose their prestige. I hope that sickness will not prevent me from doing this, for it has hindered me greatly from direct participation in politics and does not permit me to carry on my work in my capacity as Soviet official. I have grounds to think that in the course of the next few weeks I shall be able to return to my work again. *But will they, in threes and fours, and in the course of the next few weeks, come to some agreement concerning that which they have announced to the whole world—their supposed perfect agreement? I doubt that very much. I even go so far as to assert, that no one in*

the world is certain of that; and more, that they themselves do not know it—for when the victorious ones, who held the power of the whole world in their hands, met finally at Cannes, after having met many times previously—the number of their conferences was endless, even the European bourgeois papers make fun of them—they were unable to state definitely what they wanted.

From the point of view of practical problems, and not from that of diplomatic gambling, the present position has been most correctly pictured by Comrade Trotsky. The very next day after the receipt of the news that Genoa had been finally decided upon and that a perfect agreement had been arrived at, but that the wavering of one of the bourgeois governments (they have become suspiciously wavering) had brought about a slight delay, Comrade Trotsky published an army order:—

"Let every Red Army man master the international situation. We know as a fact, that they have a strong group that has a tendency to try intervention; again we shall be on our guard, but every Red Army man must know, what diplomatic play means, and what is the force of arms, which, up to the present, has always solved all class conflicts. *Let every Red Army man know what this game means, what the force of arms is like, and them we shall see.* However strong capitalism is in some capitalist countries, still it may only be tried by a few parties, parties not without influence. If the governments are so unstable as not 'to be able to keep their conferences at the appointed time', who knows in whose hands these governments may yet find themselves. We are well aware of the fact that they have powerful parties desiring war, and that they have powerful men in economics; we know everything, as well as the main point lying at the bottom of the economic agreements. We have outlived many hardships, and know what misfortunes and tortures we may have yet to bear, if a new war is forced upon us, and yet we say, that we shall bear this once more. *Let those try that dare do so.*" The deduction made by Comrade Trotsky, who published his firm appeal instead of diplomatic combinations, was that the international situation should be explained anew to every Red Army man, that is, that the postponement of the Genoa conference was due to the fact that the Italian Government was found to be unstable—which means the danger of a new war. *We shall attain the goal; every Red Army man shall understand this.* This will be done the more easily seeing that it is extremely difficult to find another such united family, as is the Red Army in Russia, which gets the truth not only from the newspapers, circulars and decrees, but also from its native villages, where it has seen the famine in all its nakedness and devastation, and knows the real cause of this, although it does not peruse the Paris editions of the Menshevik and Social Revolutionary press, which try to attribute these misfortunes to the malignity of the Bolsheviks. It has never before been as staunch as it is at present, in its desire to offer resistance to those that have carried on war against it and helped Koltchak and Denikin. We need have no fears on this account, for there is no need to organize new commissions for agitation and propaganda. *With regard to Genoa one must be able rigidly to distinguish the important points from those newspaper fables which are being printed by the bourgeoisie:* to the latter these fables seem infernal machines, but they do not scare us, for we have come across many of them before, and they are not even worth while wasting a faint smile over them. All attempts to impose conditions upon us as vanquished enemies are empty words, and it is not worth while paying any attention to these either. *As merchants, we have started negotiations with foreign firms, and know exactly what is owing us, as well as what we ourselves owe; we also know very well what their lawful profits may amount to, and what figures their extremely high profits may reach.* We note the increasing number of propositions; the number of agreements is growing and will still grow, quite independently of whatever frame the figure of the three and four so-called "victorious powers" may shape itself into, they certainly will be the losers from this postponement, for by this procrastination they will only prove to their own people that they do not know themselves what they want, and are suffering from a disease of the will. This disease consists of their utter impossibility to understand economics and politics, which we have been able to estimate more correctly and deeply than they have done. It will soon be ten years since we made this estimation, while the ensuing destruction and devastation do not seem at all clear to the bourgeois governments.

We have already clearly defined our own situation, and only say with firmness *that the retreat that we have started, can be stopped and will be stopped. Enough.* We clearly see and do not hide the fact the new economic policy is a retreat. We went farther than we could control it, but such is the logic of fighting tactics.

If any of you remember what took place in October 1917, or if any of you, at the time politically ignorant, have studied the situation later, you must surely know of the number of compromise proposals that were made by the Bolsheviks to the bourgeoisie. They said then: "Gentlemen, everything is going to pieces; whilst we shall attain power, and shall hold everything together. Would it not be better to compromise without scandal." We know that there were not only scandals but even attempts at insurrection, which were instigated by Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries. They had formerly stated: "We are ready to hand the power over to the Soviets at their first bidding." A few days ago, I went over an article of Kerensky's, written against Tchernoff in a Paris journal (there is much of that trash there) in which Kerensky states: "Did we hold on to power? Even during the Democratic Convention, I made a statement to the effect that if people could be found to take over the organization of a homogeneous government, the power would be handed over to such a government without violence."

We did not refuse to take over power. We even made statements to that effect early in June of 1917. In October 1917, this was carried through at the Conference of the Soviets for it received a Bolshevik majority. Then Kerensky turned to the Junkers, bolted to Krasnoe, and tried to mobilize the whole army against Petrograd. We broke their ribs somewhat and now offended, they exclaim: "What offenders, what usurpers, what hangmen!" Our answer to them is: "Blame your own selves, friends! Do not think that the Russian workers and peasants have forgotten your deeds! You called us out to a desperate fight in October 1917, in answer to which we put forward terror, a triple terror, and should it be once more necessary, and should you make fresh attempts we shall do it again!" Not a single worker or peasant doubts this necessity; with the exception of the intellectual jackdaws, no one doubts it. We carried on war amidst most difficult conditions, against an enemy exceeding 100 times our own forces; and naturally it was necessary to go very far in the application of strong measures, further probably than necessary, but we were forced by circumstances to have recourse to these, for our enemies thought that they would make an end of us. They were certain of being able to force us to submit to them. They announced that they would accept no compromises. We answered them: "If you think that we shall not have recourse to extreme Communist measures, then you are mistaken." We had decided upon extreme measures, and we succeeded. Now, we say that we cannot hold certain positions and we retreat, for we have conquered enough in order to secure the necessary positions. All the White Guard elements, with the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries at the head, triumph and exclaim: "Oh! you are retreating." Be merry! For you console yourselves. Our answer to them is:

"It is to our advantage when our enemy employs his time in self-consolation instead of hard work. Triumph! For you put us in a more advantageous position, by amusing yourselves with illusions. We have conquered difficult and important positions, and if beginning with 1917 and up to 1920 we had not conquered these positions, we should now be left without space upon which to retreat—geographically, economically and politically. We hold power in union with the peasants, and if you do not wish to agree to conditions which were offered you before the war, then after the war you will certainly be forced to accept worse conditions. This fact has been strictly inculcated in diplomatic, economic and political history since 1917 and up to 1920, so that is no mere boasting. This is merely stating facts, simply a reminder. If the capitalists had agreed to our conditions in 1917, they would now have five times more than they actually possess. You fought for three years. What did you get? Do you want to continue the fight? We know well, that not all among you are burning with the desire to fight. On the other hand, we also know, that in conditions of desperate hunger, with the present desperate state of industry all positions acquired since 1917 cannot be retained. We have given up quite a number of them. But now we can safely say, that retreats as far as the lights granted the capitalists are concerned, are at an end."

We have made a series of scouting movements in the way of signing agreements with Russian and foreign capitalists and now say, and I hope and am convinced that the Party Congress will state that fact officially on behalf of the governing party in Russia: "We can now stop our economic retreat. Enough. We shall not go further back and shall in the future busy ourselves with the correct division and grouping of our forces". When I say that we are stopping our economic retreat, it does not mean, that I am forgetting those diabolic difficulties in which we are placed, and that I wished to comfort you upon the point. The question of the limits of the retreat, and whether we are ceasing our retreat

or not, is not the same question as that of the difficulties before us. We know perfectly well all the difficulties that lie before us. We know what famine means in such a peasant country a Russia. We know that, as yet, we have not been able to overcome the misfortunes brought about by the famine. We know the meaning of a financial crisis in a country which is forced to trade, and in which the surplus of paper money has reached such an extent, as has never been seen by the world before. We are aware of all difficulties and know them to be tremendous. I am not afraid to say that they are infinite. This fact does not scare us. On the contrary, we draw our force from the fact that we tell the workers and peasants openly: "Here are the difficulties which lie before us, here is the danger that menaces us from the Western States. Let us unite and work together and look at our problems in the face". If we stop our retreat, it does not mean that we do not know of these dangers. We look at them in the face. We say: "Here is the main danger: the misfortunes caused by the war must be healed. We have not as yet got over our financial crisis. Therefore, the suspension of our retreat, must in no way be understood to mean, that we think that our foundation (the new economic policy) is firmly established, and that we may be calm upon that score. Nothing of the sort, the foundation has yet to be built."

We cannot yet look calmly at the future. We are encircled by many military dangers, of which I have already spoken at length; there are many even greater dangers within the country, where economic dangers exist which are based on the utter ruin of the peasantry, the famine, and the financial chaos. But if war will be imposed upon us we shall know how to fight. To direct a war is no easy matter. It was an easy matter for the foreign powers to carry on war in 1918 and continue it through 1919. But since then much water as well as blood has flowed under the bridge. The Western workers and peasants are not the same now as those of 1919. To hoodwink them by explaining to them that they are fighting the Germans, and that the Bolsheviks are their agents and nothing more is utterly impossible. We are not panic-stricken at our economic situation. At the present moment we have dozens of agreements signed with Russian and foreign capitalists. We know what difficulties are facing us and will still face us. We know the reasons that made the Russian capitalists sign agreements with us. We know the conditions upon which these agreements have been signed. The greater part of the capitalists negotiated terms as experts, specialists and business men. We are also merchants. Every merchant, however, takes a certain policy into account. And if he is not a merchant from an altogether savage country, he usually does not sign any obligations with a government that cannot guarantee the security of business agreements. The merchant that would do otherwise would no longer be a business man, but a fool. These latter are seldom to be found among business men, for the logic of commercial competition removes them from the battlefield. Our former calculation was as follows: "If Denikin has beaten us, now prove that we can beat him"; at present, however, the calculation is of a different nature: "If a merchant has beaten you, prove that you can make a bargain with him". We have proved this. We have a number of agreements signed with the greatest Russian and West European firms. We know what they risk; they know what our risks are.

At present, our problems have somewhat changed, and I should like to say a few words upon that point to complete my already too long report. In connection with the situation, since Genoa so hangs in the balance that it seems to have no end, and since we have to make so many compromises in our home policy, we must now firmly say: "Enough; on more compromising." If the capitalists think that we can be drawn further they must be told: "Enough, for tomorrow you will not get anything at all." If the history of the Soviet authority has taught them nothing, then leave them to their own fate. We have done what we could and we have announced it to the whole world. I hope that the coming Party Congress will confirm our determination to go no further on the road of the retreat. The retreat is at an end, and with it we shall change the nature of our work.

We must note, however, that up to the present, a certain nervousness, almost a sickness, is noticed in the discussions of this question, for many plans are made and resolutions carried through. I should like to emphasize the following. I have accidentally read some poetry of Mayakovsky printed in yesterday's number of the "Izvestia". I do not belong to those who worship Mayakovsky's poetic talent, for I am an incompetent judge of it. But I must say that for some time I have not felt such a pleasure, both politically and administratively, as when I read his verses. He makes a laughing stock of meetings and Communists that are everlasting in session. I am no judge of poetry, but I am certain that the political side is perfectly correct. We are really in the situation of people that are everlasting in session, organizing

commissions, working out plans—without end. There was a type of that sort in Russian life, the hero of a novel whose name was Oblomov. He lay in bed day and night making endless plans. Much time has elapsed since then, for Russia has undergone three revolutions, and still many Oblomovs remain. It is enough to look at the way we are incessantly meeting-making, how we work in our commissions to say that the spirit of the *old Oblomov is still strong with us, that he must be thoroughly washed, scraped, cleaned, thrashed and beaten before any good may be got out of him.* We must train ourselves to face our situation without illusions. We do not belong to the crew that writes the word "revolution" with a capital letter as do the Social-Revolutionaries. But we may quote Marx's words: "No less stupidities are made during revolution, but usually even more." We must face these stupidities soberly and without fear—we revolutionaries should at least learn this. There is much that cannot be taken away from this revolution which has finally conquered, and which the whole world recognizes, but we should in no way be bashful and nervous. The situation is such at present, that bearing upon the investigations made, we are checking off all that we have done—this check having a very important meaning, and from it we must make our way further. When we are faced with problems of winning victory over the capitalists we must resolutely mark our new path. *We must construct our organization in such a manner that experts should find themselves at the head of all enterprises.* Communists occupying positions as heads of institutions, perfectly honest, tested in the fight for Communism, people that have seen the inside of prisons, but that are devoid of administrative ability should be replaced. They may be endowed with the highest qualities as Communists, but still may be hoodwinked by the merchant. It is useless to leave these efficient, honest Communists, whose loyalty is not to be doubted, in positions that ought to be occupied by alert, honest salesmen, who will probably prove ten times more efficient than their predecessors. This is where the Oblomov of the Russian nation comes to the fore; for we have often appointed for practical work, Communists with perfect qualities, but entirely incompetent to carry out the work entrusted to them. We have gathered extensive material, serious works which would delight the heart of the most pedantic German scientist; we have heaps and heaps of papers, requiring some 50 years' work of the Department of Party History to register and sort them, while in practice, you will not be able to receive an answer from any official as to what responsibilities he bears. The practical application of decrees, of which we have more than necessary, and which we bake with the haste which is so well described in Mayakovsky's verses, is not regulated nor controlled. Are the resolutions concerning responsible Communist workers carried out in your institutions? Have these responsible workers the capacity to put an institution upon a working basis? No, this is nowhere to be seen, and that is why our domestic policy stands at the crossroads. What are commissions and meetings? They are often only a comedy. After we had started the cleansing of the Party, we told ourselves: "Grafters and thieves that have smuggled themselves into the Party must be thrown out"; and the Party has improved since? We have thrown out say a hundred thousand, but this is as yet only the beginning. We shall discuss this question at length at the coming Party Congress. And then I feel sure, that those tens of thousands, who are now organizing so many commissions, while they do not carry any practical work, and are unable to bear such, will undergo a similar fate as the rest. When we shall have thoroughly cleaned our ranks, our Party will then in reality start its real work and will handle it in the same manner as it was able to handle the military question. Of course, this work will probably take more than a year. We must show our unflinching resoluteness with regard to this problem. We need not be afraid that the character of our work is changed. Our worst domestic enemy is the Communist that occupies a responsible (or ordinary) Soviet post, enjoying general respect as an honest person. For he has not learnt to fight with bureaucracy, he cannot struggle with it and even encourages it. *We must free ourselves of this foe, and with the help of the conscious workers and peasant masses must be up against the common enemy, as well as against all absurdity and slovenliness which are to be met with everywhere, and must unanimously follow the vanguard of the Communist Party. There can be no hesitation upon that point.*

Before concluding, I will sum up. The game at Genoa, the game of leap-frog which is taking place around it, does not make us waver. We shall not be deceived anymore. *We shall turn to the businessman, making bargains, continuing our policy of compromises, but the limits are already set.* What concessions have already been made to the merchants in our agreements are so to say, a step backward in our legislation, and we shall not budge an inch more.

In connection with this resolution, our most important problems change entirely; especially so in the sphere of internal economic policy. We do not need new decrees, no new institutions, no new methods of strife. *What we need is to verify the ability of people and to control the accomplishment of practical work.* The next cleansing will tackle all the Communists that *imagine themselves administrators.* It would be much better that you should turn to agitational and propaganda work, or any other useful work, all you Communists that sit in commissions, wasting time and doing no work, fabricating intricate and useless methods, excusing yourselves by saying that as the new economic policy is in force, something new should be invented, while leaving your work to take care of itself. These people do not concern themselves with economizing a kopeck where possible and turning the same into double the amount if possible, but waste time making plans and estimates for Soviet billions and even trillions. We intend to turn our weapons against this foe. *The control of people and the practical carrying out of work—this is the fulcrum of our whole work, of our whole policy.* This is the work of years. We must officially state, on behalf of the Party, that the new nucleus of our work is to reform our ranks. Then will we be as victorious in this new sphere, as we have been in all others which the Bolshevik proletarian power, backed up by the peasant masses, has ever undertaken.

POLITICS

Haggling over the Orient.

by Arthur Rosenberg.

** Capitalist diplomacy hoped with the ending of the world war to solve at least one problem with which it had been occupied for fully a century. This was the so-called Eastern question and what in practice meant the settlement of the fate of Turkey—the Sick Man of Europe. The Entente had thought the world war would so solve the problem that the Sick Man would be cut into pieces whereby each of the great capitalist robber-states would, like Shylock, carry off its fat pound of flesh. It was with this end in view that the so-called Sèvres peace treaty between the Entente and Turkey was drawn up and signed in 1920.

But the robber-peace has just as little disposed of the Turkish problem as the corresponding treaty of Versailles has brought tranquillity to Central Europe. In the first place the various Shylocks cannot agree upon the size of the pieces of flesh which each of them is to have and in the second place the sick man exhibits a bodily strength with which one would not easily have credited him. He has laid about him furiously and brought his oppressors considerable perplexity. When the English laid their hands on Constantinople, there arose in Asia Minor a new Turkish government, the Government of Angora with Kemal Pasha at its head, who was able to organize the resistance of the Turkish people against the Western capitalist exploiters. Kemal in these efforts found a supporter in Soviet Russia. But beyond this, however, the diplomacy of Angora understood how to play off the differences between the Entente powers in a very skilful manner. He won over France, isolated England, and so today Kemal Pasha stands almost at his goal.

The Orient Conference which is now being held in Paris will put the concluding touches to the developments of the last few years. The English Foreign Minister Lord Curzon sits together with M. Poincaré with the Italian Chancellor playing a mute role, and in such wise will peace in the Near East be renewed. The French in fact have their contract with Kemal Pasha in their pocket already—that much talked-of agreement which secures far-reaching concessions on Turkish territory to French capital. In return the French have ceded to the Turks the province of Cilicia besides some districts to the east. This gift by France was very magnanimous, for the French Government has thus presented something which in no way belonged to her. Cilicia was much more a so-called mandate area which France administered on behalf of the League of Nations. The English simulated great moral indignation over this French breach of trust and they voiced loud cries of woe over those Armenian Christians in Cilicia who have again come under Turkish rule. But when the English press waxes morally indignant there is always a question of profit standing in the background. So is it the case this time. The English in fact fear that their control over Mesopotamia with its rich petroleum fields is threatened, so soon as the Turks establish themselves at the gateway of this valuable country. For the Mohammedans of Mesopotamia will not submit to being squeezed by English capital and they look to Kemal Pasha for liberation.

As Turkey has become the protégé of French capital, so English capital backs up Greece. As is known, however, the Greek offensive of last year in Asia Minor was utterly broken. The army of Kemal Pasha proved itself superior and the Greeks were driven back to the western coast. The workers and peasants of Greece have no desire to shed their blood in the interests of the Athens and London bankers. The powers that be in Greece are in a painful dilemma; the government crisis in Athens has become a permanent institution. The French government of course makes full use of the military and political weakness of Greece and thereby presses England to forsake her Greek protégé and so again restore "Peace" in the Near East.

The really most important points of controversy which are at present being deliberated in Paris are: first, the fate of Constantinople which is closely bound up with the question of Adrianople and the Straits; and secondly, the future of Smyrna. As has been said Constantinople is at the present time simply an English colony and the English capitalists wish to maintain this position as long as possible. For Constantinople is the key to the Black Sea. It is further the key to the southern entrance to Russia where English capital will make every effort to profit yet further from the political and economic possibilities which the possession of Constantinople confers. It is for this reason that the English make use of the slogan "the freedom of the Straits", the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, which has to be unconditionally assured. The securing of this freedom is according to the opinion of the English capitalists best accomplished if a British garrison is quartered in Constantinople. In Constantinople itself at the present day there also sits the Sultan and a sham government nominated by him. The actual Turkish government in Angora has sent its Foreign Minister Yussuf Kemal Bey to the Paris Conference. At the same time there is also present in Paris Marshall Izzet Pasha, the so-called Minister for Foreign Affairs of the puppet government in Constantinople. The "masters" of Constantinople do, under the existing circumstances, the wisest thing that is possible for them—they completely support the standpoint of Angora. The Turks demand in addition to Constantinople the return of the adjacent territory of Thrace with the important town of Adrianople as well, where at present the Greeks have quietly nestled themselves. If the Turks have their way in this respect, they will have beside the city of Constantinople itself a very important broad military bridgehead in Europe. Under the present circumstances this would be a very powerful position for France who stands behind Turkey. One can understand that the English are doing their utmost to repel Franco-Turkish encroachment here.

With regard to Smyrna, the Turks similarly demand the evacuation of this great seaport of Asia Minor by the Greeks. The English capitalists, however, desire to keep Smyrna for themselves in order not wholly to lose their influence over the commerce of Asia Minor. And here also they have a pretty sounding pretext: they must have guarantees that the Christian population of Smyrna and its neighborhood shall not come under Turkish rule. These guarantees are to consist in the setting up of a system of government for the province of Smyrna in which English businessmen shall have a free hand.

The position of the English negotiators in Paris is not a very favorable one. On account of the military failure of the Greeks and on account of the whole world situation France has all the trump cards in her hand. But in order to complete its misfortune the English government has but a few days ago experienced a slap from its own camp, which is unexampled in the history of diplomacy. The Mohammedan Indians take an extraordinary interest in the fate of Turkey. To them the Sultan is almost the same as the Pope is to the Catholics. The restoration and strengthening of the Western power of the Sultan is a slogan which is of extreme importance to the 50,000,000 Mohammedans of India. In this case religious demands coincide with the universal aversion to the foreign capitalist exploiters. For the Indian Mohammedan knows that this same English government that oppresses India also sets itself against Turkish independence. Now the crisis in India is approaching its highest point, and the situation of the English rulers there is becoming perilous. The Viceroy of India, Lord Reading, therefore decided on a desperate stroke. He despatched a telegram to London, which demanded in the name of the Indians the giving back of Constantinople and Smyrna to Turkey, and in his anxiety over the approaching Indian insurrection, Mr. Montagu, the Secretary for India, handed over this telegram to the press without previously acquainting Lloyd George with this step. The English statesmen who are specially responsible for Indian affairs thought this the only way to defer the Indian revolution; they publicly and openly before the world voiced the demands of the Mohammedans, in order to neutralize the Indian Mohammedans.

Lloyd George was indignant over the trick which Mr. Montagu had played him. Montagu was forced to resign, but the damage is not thereby remedied. When Poincaré sits opposite Lord Curzon in Paris, the Frenchman knows full well what a load lies on the shoulders of the Englishman. If the noble Lord sets himself against the Turkish demands, there arises in the background the spectre of India. The capitalist diplomats deliberate at the green table; they formulate new treaties. The uprising of the down-trodden peoples of the East, in India as well as in Egypt, in Syria as much as in Mesopotamia, will tear these beautiful treaties into shreds.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Lockout in England.

by W. Lada.

** Since the 11th of this month 300,000 members of the Amalgamated Engineering Union have been locked out. In a few days the lockout is to include several hundred thousand more workers—up to 700,000—who are engaged in the ship-building trades. From the 29th on the lockout will be extended to the shipbuilders and dock laborers whereby another million of workers will become unemployed. And this at a time in which the English working-class possesses about two million unemployed of which the Amalgamated Engineering Union alone counts 90-100,000 unemployed and about 76,000 part-time workers.

One might imagine that the employers have gone insane. But in reality they are pursuing a wise policy in this move. For months an active reduction of wages has been carried on in the English machine industry as well as in all the other industries. During the course of the year 1921, a reduction of 19 sh. 9 d. in the weekly wages has been put through. But with this the employers are by no means satisfied. They intend to force the trade-unions down upon their knees, concerning the most important questions. *They want to force the metal workers to give up one of the most important clauses of the collective agreement made in 1914, a clause which guarantees to the workers the right to decide upon over-time work, in excess of the maximum of 30 hours monthly agreed upon.* This question is the nucleus of the struggle. In the various conferences, which have been held since November 1921 between the workers and the employers, this question always turned out to be the nub of the controversy. The employers wanted to remain "masters in their own houses", "the trade-unions were not to interfere with the rights of the employer in the management of his own plant." In a notice that the Employers' Federation sent to the press the evening before the lockout, for the purpose of influencing public opinion, they maintained that the trade-unions did not have the right to interfere in the placing of certain workers at certain machines.

In spite of the fact that leaders of the Engineering Union as well as those of most of the English unions of skilled laborers—are very timid, they nevertheless rejected these demands. Recently in the "Daily Herald", a member of the Executive of the Engineering Union declared that the demands of the employers aimed at bringing the working-class back into conditions that were worse than those that existed in the year 1898. The General Secretary of the same union similarly declared that the employers intend perhaps not to destroy the trade-unions but to make them powerless. "They desire trade-unions as mutual aid societies—trade-unions that pay unemployment support to their members, that transfer the burdens of the old age pensions from the capitalists to the working-class." *As fighting organs the English capitalists do not want to suffer the trade-unions any longer,* and the "Daily Herald" correctly states the meaning of the whole struggle when it says that the employers are actually trying to re-introduce the "open shop".

The leaders of the Engineering Union would not, however, be so willing to fight, if the masses, who do not want to know anything of the demands of the employers, did not stand behind them. As a result of a general ballot the ultimatum of the employers was rejected by a vote of 50,240 against 35,525; those that abstained from voting are probably on the side of those which show the most energy. Voices are already being heard from among the organized rejecting any compromise with the employers, and demanding a struggle; we need merely to mention these from Southend, Lewisham, Nottingham, Liverpool, Lincoln, etc. Everywhere there is a demand that the employes of other industries come to the assistance of the metal workers, that the Labor Party and the General Council of the Trade Unions find ways and means to support the fighters in their resistance against the offensive of the employers; it is maintained that the

interests of the whole British working-class is concerned. The unemployed, who comprise 26% of the membership of the Engineering Union, declared at Sheffield, Southmark and Willersden, then readiness to support their struggling class comrades. It has been proposed to create common committees of both workers and unemployed for the purpose of carrying on the struggle.

This watchfulness on the part of the masses is absolutely necessary. For "All Power", the official organ of the Red Trade Union International, points out that while the leaders are at present using radical phrases, the Executive of the Amalgamated Engineering Union is pursuing a rather equivocal policy toward the district committees. On the other hand it is certain that neither the government nor the employers will neglect to work for victory on the side of capital. Lloyd George has already declared in his very characteristic way that he would act the moment it seemed suitable to him. This statement reminds one of the attitude of the government during the strike of the miners last spring. In a similar manner Chamberlain declared in the House of Commons that it is desirable that the conflict be settled without the interference of a third party. At the same time a Communist hunt has begun and the political police (Scotland Yard) has trumped up a circular letter of the Communist Party on the coming lockout as the discovery of a "Communist plot". From these beginnings one can surmise that the bourgeoisie will not give up an attempt to bring the trade-union leaders upon their side.

From the 29th on the fighting front will be enlarged as has already been stated above, by the lockout of the shipbuilders. These do not want to accept a weekly reduction of 26 sh. 6 d. in wages. In the last general conferences of the employers and employees, 50 different trade-unions were represented. All were of one accord that the attack of the employers be repulsed by means of a struggle. *The question involved is this—during the next days or weeks 7-8,000,000 workers—family members included—will remain unemployed.* The gigantic struggle of the English working-class approaches in importance that of the miners last year. *It is no longer merely an economic struggle, it is a struggle for power, and therefore a political struggle.* It depends upon the leaders whether they will develop the struggle sufficiently; for this purpose our comrades are doing everything possible within their power, as their circular letter, "exposed" by Scotland Yard, shows. And the working-classes of the other countries should remember that the struggle of the English working-class is their struggle. *The international united front must not remain an empty word. The workers of all countries must come to the aid of the English metal workers!*

On the Negotiations of Ole. O. Lian with Amsterdam.

In No. 19 of the "Correspondence" we reprinted a report, taken from the Christiania "Social-Demokraten", of the negotiations which the chairman of the Norwegian Trade Union Federation Ole O. Lian, carried on during February in Brussels with the Executive of the Amsterdam Trade Union International. Before we are able to bring authentic reports on the attitude of the leading authorities of the Communist International and the Red Trade Union International towards these negotiations, the following extract from the report of the activity of the Executive Bureau of the Red Trade Union International which bears upon the negotiations mentioned above will be of value. The decision of the R. T. U. I. brings the whole matter in an entirely different light than that to be inferred from the telegrams brought by a section of the labor press. We take the abstract of the "Proceedings of the Executive Bureau" from the official organ of the Executive Bureau of the Red Trade Union International, issue of February 21, 1922.

The Editor.

Extract from the Report of the Activity of the Executive Bureau.

**** Re Proposal of the Norwegian Trade Union Federation:** The Bureau of the Norwegian Trade Union Federation has informed the Executive Bureau of the R. T. U. I. in its communication of January 17th, 1922, that in accordance with the results of the meeting of the Norwegian Bureau of Jan. 16th, 1922, the Norwegian Bureau submits to the Executive Bureau the following proposal:

"The Norwegian Bureau proposes to the Red Trade Union International at Moscow and to the International Federation of Labor at Amsterdam, that they call an international conference of

the representatives of the trade-union organizations of the world as soon as possible. This conference would in the first place have to examine the question of common action of the entire working-class against the capitalist class of all countries, and discuss the measures, which the proletariat shall take to secure its peace."

In a telegram of the 8th of February the Norwegian Bureau stated that it had received the acceptance on the part of Amsterdam to carry on direct personal negotiations with the Norwegian Bureau on this question; these were fixed for the 16th of February in Brussels.

The Executive Bureau has decided to place the proposal of the Norwegian comrades upon the agenda of the meeting of Central Council. It has further proposed to all the organizations belonging to the Red Trade Union International not to begin any negotiations with the Amsterdam Trade Union International without the permission of the R. T. U. I. The Executive Bureau has proposed that those organizations which belong to the Amsterdam International but which are in sympathy with the platform of the R. T. U. I., in case of similar attempts, turn to the Amsterdam International only after they have previously discussed the matter with the R. T. U. I. and have heard its decisions.

IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Commerce and the Proletarian State.

The Problem of Controlling Commerce in the Workers' and Peasants' Republic.

(Taken from the Moscow "Ekonomicheskaya Zhisn").

** Up to the present the new principle of commercial freedom found expression in decrees defining the rights and privileges of the cooperatives in the domain of commerce. We thought that the cooperatives would succeed in conquering an important position in the market. But the right given to government enterprises of selling a part of their products and the development of the lease system have thrown into the market a number of products which could not be introduced into the cooperative market. Due to a certain weakness in the organization of the cooperatives private trade has developed to such an extent that not only do the cooperatives no longer control the market, but they are even obliged to employ private persons. Our commercial policy should take notice of these facts and consider it its duty, firstly, to grant to state and cooperative commerce such privileges as will gradually enable them to dominate the market, and secondly, to make private commerce dependent upon the state through the granting of credits.

One of our most important tasks consists in creating the legal basis, without which private commerce will inevitably assume the character of usurious speculation. First of all we must pass laws determining exactly the articles that may be made the objects of trade. Land for instance, should not be made an object for trade.

Then we must determine the various kinds of commercial contracts, in order that the two contracting parties may be enabled to come before a court. We must furthermore determine and define the means and forms of credit (exchange, obligations, etc.), as well as the registration of commercial contracts, the responsibilities of marchants and commercial firms, etc.

State commerce consists in the sale of those products that constitute a government monopoly and of such products that are exempted from the monopoly in order to increase the government revenue, and finally in the purchase of certain products to be used by consumers supplied by the state.

With the passing of the old type of government monopoly which consisted in the complete withdrawal of certain products from the market, and with the introduction of the new type of fiscal monopoly, a certain haziness marks the definition of state commerce. That as why the People's Commissariat of Finance, the Supreme Council of National Economy and the People's Commissariat for Food should determine exactly what comes under state commerce. Besides, mixed commercial companies ought to be formed, in which the government should own a certain number of shares, share in the profits and control the work.

Since the economic organs of the state carry on their commercial activities on the basis and principles of private commerce, the factories and the trusts will be able to sell their products, but under no circumstances their initial material and means of production which they either receive from the state or produce for themselves. These factories can buy the necessary materials, machines and food supplies for their workers, but they

can not buy the products that do not correspond to their own production. The objects of trade for the cooperatives are the products and means of production of the smaller enterprises as well as articles of consumption. Should some government enterprises be in need of such products, they are then to apply to the cooperatives with the money necessary for their purchase or with exchangeable merchandise. Control of credit enables the state to exercise its influence upon commerce. It is thus enabled to concentrate in its own hands the control and direction of commercial enterprises, without directly undertaking them itself. But for this purpose it is necessary that commerce should already have undergone sufficient development in order that credit can begin to play a decisive role. Hence the necessity of creating a whole series of credit establishments, as for example, credit banks, agricultural credit cooperatives, etc. Besides these, we may permit the establishment of private banks, whose are statutes are to be sanctioned by the state. Then, subsidiary to the State Bank, we should organize special central banks, either mixed or state banks, part of whose shares should be held by the State Bank which is to exercise its control over them.

Much attention ought to be paid to the merchandise markets and fairs. Not only the government enterprises and the cooperatives should be permitted to participate in all the markets and fairs, but also the private commercial enterprises. Our means of transportation being poor, we should also pay great attention to the organization and development of local as well as central markets. Fairs should be organized regularly; central fairs, district fairs and, above all, local fairs.

The local Soviets should create special organs for controlling commerce.

We shall not here discuss the question of creating a Commissariat of Commerce; we shall point out the necessity however, of immediately creating a government organ, which may assume, for example the form of a commission operating under the Council of Labor and Defense, and which is to occupy itself chiefly with the question of preparing a commercial legal code, the gathering and preparation of material on the state of the market, and which is to take the initiative of preparing decrees adaptable to the practical conditions of life.

THE COMMUNIST YOUTH

The Communist International for Juvenile Labor.

** While reformist trade-unions and social-democratic parties keep the young workers aloof from the class struggle and wage no serious campaign for their vital interests, the Communist International has again made good its claim that it stands for the interests of the *entire* working class. Revolutionary labor cannot calmly look on while capitalism in its death agonies destroys and pushes into the abyss of degradation the live forces of production, the source of labor's future—the young generation of the working class. Nor can it permit of capitalism using cheap juvenile labor as a means with which to oppress the adult workers. The session of the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International therefore decided, upon the motion of the Young Communist International, to demand of the other international labor organizations that they take up the fight for the vital demands of the working youth together with their other pressing demands and to request that the youth be assigned a special point on the agenda of the international conference.

In January representatives of the Amsterdam, Right Socialist and the Viennese Centrist Internationals of Youth assembled in Leipzig in order to consider the question of unity. At this unity conference of which the masses of young workers and the members of the Centrist International of Youth only learned afterwards, no word was said about the necessary struggle for the most important economic demands of the young workers which juvenile labor in all countries is determined to wage. Of even greater importance is the fact that at their joint conference neither of the two organizations mentioned the question of the necessary cooperation with the Young Communist International whose ranks contain the overwhelming majority of all the organized young workers of the world.

We publish below the motion of the Y.C.I. and the resolution adopted at the session of the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International.

To the Executive Committee of the Communist International!
To the Executive Bureau of the Red Trade Union International.

Dear Comrades!

The Vienna Second-and-a-Half International has called an international conference of all labor parties which is to con-

sider the problem of the struggle of the proletariat against the capitalist offensive.

The Young Communist International, thinks it its duty to point out the perilous situation of the younger generation of the proletariat. Juvenile labor is the physically weakest section of the working class. Hence it is but natural that the world-wide offensive of capital (wage reductions, lengthening of working hours, etc.) and the industrial crises with their widespread unemployment should hit the young workers hardest. *Both the physical and mental development of the growing up generation are gravely imperilled.*

The defense of the working youth against pauperization must, in our opinion, become the slogan of the entire working class and especially of its parties and trade-unions. This struggle is part of the general fight of the proletariat against the offensive of capitalism, a section of tremendous significance for the entire working class. First because the capitalists are endeavoring to exploit juvenile labor which is more docile and cheaper, in their attempts at defeating the demands of the adult workers. Juvenile labor is principally used for the victimizing of adult workers which is of special danger in periods of unemployment, when the supply on the labour market far exceeds the demand. Secondly, because the problem of the young workers is the problem of the immediate future of the entire proletariat, of the development the struggle of emancipation and its victory thereon.

Hence, the Young Communist International holds that the united front of all proletarians, of all parties and organisations in their struggle against must simultaneously be a united front of juvenile and adult labor. Just as the working class with regard to its present and future must be interested in saving its younger generation from pauperization, juvenile labor understands that its situation can only be improved by means of the struggle of the entire proletariat against capitalism. Juvenile labor is flesh of the flesh and blood of the blood of the proletariat, and must as such participate in the united struggle of the proletarian masses against capitalism. Adult labor will find the young workers to be true and active allies in the common struggle.

Up until now the organizations of adult labor have unfortunately not paid sufficient attention to the young workers, their unbearable condition, their demands resulting from their situation in the process of production and from both the physical and the mental characteristics of their age. On the other hand, however, the broad masses of young workers have so far not participated sufficiently in the struggle of the proletariat. On the basis of these facts the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International requests that you consider the following proposals and effect their acceptance on the part of other proletarian organisations.

I. That a point—"struggle against the degradation of juvenile labor"—be put on the agenda of the coming conference.

II. That representatives of the international organizations of juvenile labor be admitted to the conference on an equal footing with the other participating organizations. (*Young Communist International, International Federation of Socialist Youth Organizations, and the Young Workers' International.*) Juvenile labor must have a voice in deciding the fate of the proletariat, of which it is a part, and in deciding its own fate.

With fraternal Communist greetings
The E. C. of the Y. C. I.

Resolution of the Executive Committee of the Comintern on the

Struggle against the Pauperisation of the Working Youth.

The delegates to the session of the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International have taken due cognizance of the report of the Young Communist International emphasising the extremely serious condition of juvenile labor which is being aggravated by the world crisis and the international aggression of capital.

Both the Communist International and the Red Trade Union International are fully conscious of the great importance of the situation of the youth as well as its active participation in the fight of the proletariat for its emancipation. The Communist International and the Red Trade Union International declare their solidarity with the attitude of the Young Communist International and wish to stress the necessity for enrolling the young workers in labor's united front against the capitalist offensive. Therefore both the Communist International and the Red Trade Unions International endorse the proposal of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International.

The question of the situation of the working youth must be discussed at the first conference called to meet the employers' offensive, because that offensive seriously threatens not only the

present generation of workers, but also constitutes—reacting, as it does, upon the situation of the juvenile labor—a peril for the future generations of the working class. Hence we propose that the fight against the pauperization of the working youth be made a special point on the agenda. The organizations of the world's proletariat are face to face with a number of urgent questions concerning the working youth, which must be solved at all costs

1—in order to defeat capital's attempts at making the cheap labor of minors a weapon with which to victimize adult labor;

2—to save the growing-up generation of the working class from going under in the morass of both physical and mental misery.

The Communist International and the Red Trade Union International call upon all youth organisations, labor parties and trade-unions thoroughly to discuss these proposals and demands and to give them publicity in their papers and meetings.

Following is the list of demands of especial importance in the defensive fight against the offensive of capital:—

I.

General Demands for Minors up to 18 Years of Age.

1. Minimum wages, corresponding to the minimum cost of living.
2. Fight against the violation of the eight-hour day, against trade education after working hours and for the establishment of the six-hour day for minors.
3. Provision for the young unemployed.
4. Establishment of educational shops for the young unemployed.
5. 44 hours week-end rest.
6. Four weeks' annual vacation with pay.
7. Prohibition of night and Sunday work.
8. Abolition of the work of minors in trades and factories which are injurious to their health. (Certain branches of the chemical industry, underground work in mines, etc.)

II.

For Apprentices.

1. Limitation of the number of apprentices.
2. Abolition of individual indentures; apprentices to be included in collective agreements.
3. Control of the employment of apprentices by the trade-unions and the shop councils.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The Social Revolutionaries Protest!

by Paul Frölich (Berlin).

** The Social Revolutionaries protest against the trial of the Central Committee of their Party for robbery, murder, and counter-revolutionary conspiracy. They protest, and in the same breath they admit their guilt. In an exposé which even the "Vorwärts" only ventures to repeat in a summary they declare that: "The Social Revolutionary Party therefore held themselves at that time to have the right to resist these (the Bolsheviks) with weapons in the hand". That is an open confession of the crimes of which the Social Revolutionaries are accused: the murder of Volodarsky, the attempted assassination of Lenin, the expropriations, the conspiracies and risings with the Czecho-Slovaks, with Koltchak, etc. It is a full admission, for they do not venture to deny even one of the charges now supported with names and dates. The confession is further confirmed by the signature of the same Tchernoff who does not dare to utter a word in denial of the crimes specially laid to his charge. Or are the Social Revolutionaries of the opinion that precisely ascertained facts are adequately answered by the general designation—"lies"? Or that it suffices to rail at the "Tcheka-man" Semenov, who was one of their acknowledged leaders and a tool of their Central Committee until the moment when he recognised with horror that he was serving the counter-revolution? Do they consider it sufficient to suppress the fact that the "adventurer" Savinkoff was the head of the Social Revolutionary Party? They admit having fought against the Soviet power with weapons in their hands. And these weapons were the revolver, poison, bombs, and the sabre of the Czar's generals.

The Social Revolutionaries betray their reasons for plunging the Russian empire for years into the disorder and ruin of civil war. It was the Bolsheviks who began the civil war; for "they overthrew a government with a Socialist majority". Yes, this was the frightful deed committed by the Bolsheviks. And in committing it they were supported by the overwhelming majority of the Soviets of the workers, peasants,

and soldiers. They overthrew a government with a "Socialist" majority, a government which threatened to destroy the revolution, which took up the work of the bourgeoisie, sold the peasants to the landlords, sent Russian workmen and peasants to their death in the service of English and French imperialists, and showered the blessings of democracy and White Justice on the revolutionists. The Bolsheviks overthrew the Russian "Socialist" government, and by this act saved the revolution. When the Social Revolutionaries call this the beginning of the civil war, then they openly take sides for the counter-revolutionary civil war. And it is actually the fact that Savinkoff, Tchernoff, Gotz, and the rest of their company, merely continued to carry on the same activity as they had exercised with the aid of governmental power, only now with the aid of revolvers and bombs, conspiracies and riots. By these and all other means they served the enemy of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie. And when they now refer to the civil war as "long since ended", it is only because they lack two things essential for civil war at the present time—the objective possibility, and the required confidence in themselves. Let there be only the slightest opening, and they are on the spot. This was proved at Kronstadt.

These Social Revolutionary gentlemen seek to hide their present crimes behind the halo of their past, and the "Vorwärts" identifies them as the heroes of 1905. It is not our present task to set an estimate on their historical rôle as one-time revolutionary party. In all revolutions there have been Girondists who fought in the army of the revolution in their best days, until they deserted and betrayed the revolution. What laughter would shake the world if the leaders of the German Social Democracy should attempt to justify their present crimes by recalling their past as class fighters: Noske, who wades in the blood of the workers; Hörsing, the agent provocateur; Ebert, who signed the death warrants of revolutionary workmen; Hofmann, who had Leviné murdered!

The Social Revolutionaries are right indeed when they appeal to an International demoralized by the bloodshed of an imperialistic war to help them against the tribunal of the revolution; when they appeal to the German government party, the history of whose courts of justice is written in the blood of the workers, and soiled with the filth of corruption; to the Czech government party, which throws workmen into prison, and persecutes Hungarian fugitives just as its "dear friend" the Austrian Social Democracy; to Henderson and his associates, who do not raise a finger against the atrocities in Egypt, India, and South Africa; to Renaudel and the other "Briands", who backed them up in all their conspiracies against the Soviet power.

The Social Revolutionaries are right indeed when they protest. Just as the working class protests, and summons to combat against the courts of the bourgeoisie, and against the organized murder in Hungary and Italy, just so may they protest against the justice of the proletariat. The working class protests because the revolution is the victim of the White Justice. The Social Revolutionaries protest because the revolutionary Tribunal attacks the counter-revolution, the associates and tools of the international capitalist class. The justice to which the Social Revolutionaries appeal with their outcry, is the justice that will condemn them in history.

The Mensheviks are also raising a protest. Could they possibly remain behind when anything is going on against the Bolsheviks? Could they stand on one side when the "humanity" of the counter-revolution is being appealed to? They have every reason to exercise solidarity with the Social Revolutionary criminals, for they were united with them under Milioukoff and Kerensky, and furthered their efforts, secretly and openly, in the civil war against the proletariat.

They threaten to destroy the united front. How dreadful! They have been looking long enough for a plausible excuse to sabotage the united front. Without any party themselves, without any possibility of initiative, they work as interpreters of the weaknesses of their associates. The party leaders of the Internationals 2 and 2½ reject the united front for it signifies—resistance against the plundering intentions of the capitalists, a fight for the morsel of bread still in the hands of the workers, class war against the imperialist conspirators against Soviet Russia. They shirk the battle, and therefore they do not want any united front. But who would dare to admit this openly? And because they do not dare to do this, they prefer to sow confusion among the working class by slandering the Communists, the faithful vanguard of the proletariat. Full enlightenment on the counter-revolutionary crimes is thus an imperative necessity. The truth must not be hidden nor intimidated. The truth must out.