

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 20

17<sup>th</sup> March 1927

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

## CONTENTS

**Ernst Meyer:** Geneva — the Array of the Bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union.

### Politics.

**Aquila:** The Italian Communists Arraigned before Mussolini's Exceptional Court.

**W. Winogradov:** The Fight for Tangier.

**V. Stern:** Reform of Taxation in Czechoslovakia.

### Hands off China.

**Appeal of the International Red Aid** against the Imperialist Terror in China.

### The Balkans.

**Chr. Kabatchieff:** The Situation in Bulgaria I.

### The Labour Movement.

**J. Jezierska:** The Struggle of the Italian Communists.

### The White Terror.

**The Hounding Down of Communists in Hungary.**

**Arthur Rosenberg:** The Budapest Police Admit the Tortures.

**Telegram of Protest** against the Cruel Mishandlings in Hungary.

**D. Ivanov:** The General Hunger Strike of 2500 Political Prisoners in Bulgaria.

### The XI. Party Conference of the C.P. of Germany.

**Speech of Comrade Jansen,** the Representative of the E. C. C. I. Report by Comrade Thälmann on the Political Situation and the Tasks of the C. P. G.

**Report by Comrade Dengel** on the Work of the C. P. G. since the X. Party Conference.

### Ten Years Ago.

**A Lecture on the February Revolution** given by Lenin in Zürich.

**N. Bukharin:** The Grouping of the Classes before March 1917.

**Chronicle of February Events.**

## Geneva — the Array of the Bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union.

By Ernst Meyer (Berlin).

Not much more than eight years have elapsed since the end of the world war, and once again the spectre of an imperialist war arises. Eight years ago, the Social Democrats and pacifists swore that that war should be the last. It was the League of Nations in particular which they welcomed as a guarantee of lasting peace, while any one that doubted that the imperialist States would ever seriously abandon their depredations, was cried down by the Social Democrats and pacifists as himself being a war agitator.

The German Social Democrats had only one objection to the League of Nations, viz., the non-participation of Germany. Now Germany, too, has been included in the League. But this very fact has greatly enhanced the danger of war. The admission of Germany was an expression of the fact that Germany is again beginning to play an active part as an imperialist State: it was effected for the express purpose of enrolling an invigorated capitalist Germany in the European alliance, so that it might serve the ends of the competitive Powers and might, before all else, be persuaded to join the interventionist policy of some of these Powers against Soviet Russia.

According to the unanimous opinions of all bourgeois politicians and diplomats, the "Anglo-Russian" difference, as they bashfully call Great Britain's anti-Russian intentions, dominates international politics at present. With great perseverance, Great Britain is attempting to gain all the Powers for its aims, and Germany, an industrial country with a population of 60 millions, is the main object of its attention in this regard. With blandishments and threats, Great Britain is trying to make Germany join the common action against the Soviet Union.

True, at the present moment, Sir Austen Chamberlain is anxious to veil his intentions from the eyes of the press reporters, and the German press, which is more obedient to the instructions of Lord d'Abernon than to those of the German Foreign Office, is naturally toned down accordingly. There are, however, sufficient articles to hand in proof of the fact that the German press is by no means blind to the real aims of Great Britain in regard to both Russia and Germany.

On March 1st, the "Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung" at Essen, the organ of the Ruhr industrialists, published an alarming article under the heading "British Pressure on Berlin in

the Moscow Question? Disquieting Reports on Anglo-French Intentions." This article reminded one of the warning articles published by the same paper in July 1914 and most emphatically opposing a war on the part of Germany against the Tsarist Russia of those times. The present article, obviously written in Berlin, deals with the preparations of Great Britain for a war against the Soviet Union, and states that Great Britain has already come to an understanding with France in regard to common action against Moscow and that the United States have declared their agreement to an intervention. It goes on to say:

"Seeing that in the case of an armed intervention in Russia, Germany could hardly remain unconcerned, both English and French reports received here seem to point to the fact Great Britain has already put out feelers with a view to united measures being taken against Russia.

"If matters continue to develop unfavourably for Great Britain in Eastern Asia and Great Britain itself continues to detect palpable signs of Communist propaganda to its own disadvantage, common Anglo-French proceedings in Berlin, possibly even acquiring the form of an ultimatum, are being discussed".

The very next day the paper in question was obliged, in response to representations on the part of the Foreign Office in Berlin, to appear to mitigate its unduly drastic characterisation of the French and British policy. In the issue of March 2nd, the information published the preceding day was designated as "Apprehensions and Conclusions",

"partly (!) far in excess of what can be considered justified on the strength of a tension which undoubtedly exists."

But this second article, too, betrays the serious character of the war preparations and the intended inclusion of Germany:

"In the face of further complications, which may result from the Anglo-Russian conflict, we must adhere to the principle of neutrality, a standpoint which the Western Powers themselves considered justified in their reference to concessions embodied in articles 16 & 17 of the League of Nations' memorandum at Locarno (the so-called "passage" paragraphs). Indeed, it may be to Great Britain's own advantage if the Russo-German relations remain as they are at present, since thereby the danger of a renewed general European war is lessened and the possibility remains of an amicable mediation such as may also one day appear desirable. In any case, Germany must not yield to a possible pressure from without in this connection, if its diplomatic position in Europe is not to be altogether compromised."

The "Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung", however, is the only larger newspaper in Germany that goes so far as to oppose the wishes of Great Britain even by the mere demand of a neutral attitude.

The other press organs and the capitalists influencing them most consistently pursue the Western directives and even take a war against Soviet Russia into account. On March 6th, the "Kölnische Zeitung", which is always in intimate touch with the Foreign Office in Berlin, discussed a speech of Briand's, who spoke as follows:

"What do we see to-day? A Germany that has turned most decidedly to the West in spite of its agreement with Russia, a Germany that has chosen, that has finally come to comprehend that its truest interests lie in an understanding with the Allies in general and France in particular."

Which assertion the "Kölnische Zeitung" underlines by remarking:

"This change has indeed come about, if Rapallo is taken to have represented an alliance with Russia, which it was not. There was no question of an alliance with Russia, which continues to oscillate between the character of a national State and that of an international revolutionary society; even the Socialists opposed any such idea. In this sense, we certainly have made our choice".

Yes, indeed; Germany, capitalist Germany, has chosen. And the Social Democrats have followed suit.

But the Germany of the workers led by the Communist Party, will make a very different choice, a choice in favour of the Soviet Union and against any intervention whatsoever.

## POLITICS

### The Italian Communists Arraigned before Mussolini's Exceptional Court.

By Aquila.

Since the following article was written the Fascist Exceptional Court has passed judgment. All but two of the accused have been declared guilty and have received sentences ranging from one year and ten months to ten years imprisonment. Ed.

On March 7th, the trial of the so-called "Courier Case" commenced in Rome against 41 Italian Communists before the "Exceptional Court for the Defence of the State". Among the accused there are the comrades Gramsci, Scicciomarro, Terracini, Riboldi, Buffoni, Alfani, Marchioro, Biboletti, Ferragni, Leali, Capasso, Stefanini, Tordoli, Salvati, Beludoli, Zamboni, Zavi, etc. It is the first great trial instituted by the "Exceptional Court" against our Italian comrades and against the Communist Party of Italy, but it is not the only one, for it initiates a whole series of trials, which, Mussolini hopes, will so intimidate the Italian workers, that they will refrain not only from all active participation in the Communist Party but also from all and every contact therewith. Two other cases, which are also to be tried before the Extraordinary Court, are already being prepared.

And what is the nature of this famous "Exceptional Court"? In one of its latest issues, the "Unità", the organ of the Italian Communist Party, now appearing illegally, answers the question as follows:

"The Exceptional Court is intended for civil-war purposes and was founded expressly for the civil war. The Exceptional Court is an internal organ of the Fascist Party, a tribunal of blackshirts."

Indeed, it is sufficiently characterised by the fact that it consists of a general as its chairman and of four other officers of the Fascist militia. The chairman, General Sanna, is not only a Fascist, but one of the most notorious butchers to be found in the Italian bourgeoisie.

Ever since the year 1923, functionaries and members of the Italian Communist Party have in a whole series of cases been brought before one court or another on the charge of "plotting against the State", "conspiracy", or "adherence to an organisation with criminal aims" (i. e. the Communist Party); and the like: the ordinary courts, however, almost invariably acquitted them.

This result, which may appear strange at first sight, is simply to be explained by the fact that the judges, appointed by former Liberal and Democratic Governments and educated on liberal and democratic lines, and themselves emanating from the middle or lower sections of the bourgeoisie, were, just like the Liberal and Democratic political parties representing these sections, from the very start adverse to Fascism and united in preserving the traditions of their jurisdictional practice. Although, e. g., in the trial of Bordiga-Grieco and comrades, a carefully selected court, composed after the removal of several individuals, was in charge of the case, the verdict declared that though the accused had fought against Fascism and had endangered the stability of the Fascist regime, Fascism could not be regarded as identical with the State, and the political activity of the accused could therefore not be considered as a "plot against the State", for which reason they could but be acquitted. Since that occasion, Mussolini managed to make the judges more subservient to his ends by repealing their "indeposability". (At the present time, judges who appear undesirable to the Fascists can at any moment be dismissed without notice or indemnity.)

Nevertheless, the issue of the trial, and of all future trials, against the Communists would not have been altogether a matter of course, as already appeared during the preparatory investigation, during which each of the police magistrates sought to procrastinate the matter and finally to shift the

responsibility onto other shoulders. The case started with certain arrests made by the police at **Bologna**. When the Bologna police magistrates, to whom the prisoners were referred after the lapse of some months, found they could make nothing of the "incriminating material" at their disposal, they declared the Bologna court to be incompetent and referred the unpromising case to their Milan colleagues. The relative documents lay for months in the files of the Milan court, until at length the Milan police magistrate followed the example of his Bologna colleague in declaring the Milan court to be equally incompetent and referring the case to **Rome**. But even in the capital, an examination of the "incriminating evidence" led to no better results.

This "evidence", as a matter of fact, could only prove one thing, viz., that comrade **Giacomo Stefanini** of **Udine** and comrade **Bonaventure Gidoni** of **Rovigno** had forwarded the mail of the Communist Party from the C. C. to the provincial organisations; they were couriers of the Italian Communist Party. Hence the name given to the whole case. At their arrest, letters of an altogether legal content were found on them, besides circulars and pamphlets of the Party. It is a fact that the Italian Communist Party has for years been forwarding its mail from one organisation to the other by means of special couriers, since if sent through the post the letters would be censored by the Fascists. There is, however, no law making it a matter of duty to forward letters through the post instead of by messenger. In the ordinary courts, the case thus made no progress, not because the investigating authorities acted at all in favour of the Communists, but because they feared to make themselves ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

The case was, therefore, removed from the charge of the police magistrates of the Roman court and transferred to the Exceptional Court, which proceeded in the matter on the strength of a charge of "conspiracy against the State" and "adherence to an organisation of criminal tendencies". The charge was represented by the provost-martial of the military tribunal of Milan.

The question of postal communication or communication by couriers, however, is no more than a pretext, and a very clumsy one at that. It is not on account of altogether non-existent "crimes" in the past that the trial is being held, but because of the revolutionary activity carried on by the Communist Party at present. The reformist trade union leaders have declared it "impossible to do anything" in Italy at present and have transferred the trade unions abroad. Their example was followed by the Right-Social Democratic adherents of Turati, the "Left" Social Democratic Maximalists, the Republicans, and the Democrats, in regard to their respective organisations.

The Communist Party, on the other hand, took occasion on the day on which its dissolution was declared, to proclaim to the workers in a pamphlet which was distributed in thousands of copies, that the decree of dissolution could naturally not make any alteration in the existence of the party and could not prevent its future activity. And in the four months which have elapsed since the publication of the decree, the Communist Party has sufficiently proved the fact of its existence. To mention only one such proof, it may be pointed out that our illegal party press in Italy is now publishing a larger issue than our legal party press did before its suppression.

The growing discontent in the country and the imperialist plans of the Italian bourgeoisie in its complete compliance with the British anti-Soviet-front policy, force Mussolini to suppress by all means at his command the Italian Communist Party, the one and only organisation of the Italian proletariat. Besides the physical extermination of the Communist Party functionaries, which is now to be achieved by means of their deportation, Mussolini's main object is the isolation of the Party from the masses.

The verdict to be passed on the 41 Italian comrades by the Exceptional Court, a verdict which, according to the discretion of this "court", may even imply capital punishment, is therefore directed against the whole Communist Party and the entire Italian proletariat. It should be one of the foremost duties of the workers of other countries to come to the aid of their Italian class comrades.

Action is urgently necessary. The Italian workers hope that their foreign class-comrades will leave no stone unturned by raising the matter in the factories, by public protest meetings, and representations to the foreign diplomatic representatives of the Fascist Government, to influence the outcome of the trial now before the "Exceptional Court" of Rome

## The Fight for Tangier.

By B. Winogradov, Moscow.

The fight of the imperialists for Tangier never ceases for a moment. The Franco-Spanish conference on the Tangier question which opened in Paris on February 10th is only a new episode in this fight.

It is said that Spain has two programmes in regard to Tangier. The first programme the maximal programme, provides for the transfer of Tangier to Spain. But, as the Spanish Fascists fully realise that the absorption of Tangier into the Spanish protectorate dominions in North Africa is an extraordinarily difficult matter, they have arranged a minimal programme, which demands the abolition of the post of the international administration of Tangier and the nomination of a Spanish controller in his place. It should be remarked that up to the present the administrator, to whose duties the international administration of the Tangier zone belongs, has been a Frenchman. Further, the "Minimal" programme of Primo de Rivera speaks of the renunciation of the Sultan of Morocco of his right to nominate his assigns to the administration of the Mussulman community and the Jewish community of Tangier. The actual purpose of this demand is to withdraw Tangier from the suzerainty of the Sultan of Morocco, the creature of France. In order that nothing may prevent Spain from carrying on in Tangier as it does at home, the "Minimal" programme also provides for the dissolution of the comic-opera "legislative" body of Tangier.

The claims of Primo de Rivera to the actual protectorate right over Tangier in no way correspond to the influence of Spain in international politics. The provocative methods of the Spanish Fascists — the claiming of a seat in the Council of the League of Nations and the subsequent threat of Spain's withdrawal from the League of Nations, as also the attempt to gain from the League the mandate for Tangier — are explained by the wish to wipe out the humiliation of the defeat experienced by the Spanish army at the hands of the Riff Cabyls. Primo de Rivera apparently desires to be celebrated in Spain for "Peaceful victories" in the diplomatic field.

Furthermore, Spain enjoys a certain amount of support from Mussolini in the Tangier question. The reason for this is that Fascist Italy feels slighted in regard to the Tangier question and to various other colonial questions. The particular cause of offence was that Italy was not invited to the British-French-Spanish conference of 1923, at which the so-called Tangier Statute was elaborated. As co-operation between Great Britain and Italy in colonial and other affairs is now an accomplished fact, Italy is all the more active, with British support, in its participation in the solving of the Tangier question. To this end Mussolini supports the Spanish claims, which must lead to the convocation of another conference on the Tangier question. If, however, Italy succeeds in getting representation at this conference, it will contrive to get something out of Tangier or compensatory concessions in some other colony.

Therefore, the two States "unsatisfied" in respect of Tangier — Italy and Spain — form a united front for the revision of the Tangier Statute.

The intrigues of Italy and Spain have also found expression in diplomatic documents. For instance, on August 7th, 1926, there was concluded in Madrid between Spain and Italy a treaty of friendship, of which Article 13 provides for the neutrality of the one contracting party in case the other party is attacked by a third State. There can be no doubt but that the third State is France.

As we have already mentioned, Great Britain, for its part, advocates inviting Italy to take part in a new conference on the Tangier question. Great Britain does not desire to leave the solution of the Tangier question to France and Spain, for every fresh division of North Africa seriously affects the strategic, political and economic interests of Great Britain. Tangier lies opposite the British base — Gibraltar. The transfer of Tangier to any particular State, for instance, France, and the conversion of Tangier into a base for the air and naval forces of one of the big powers would completely do away with the significance of Gibraltar, the gateway between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. It was for this reason that Great Britain, as early as the conference of Algieras in the year 1906, pro-

cured the neutralisation of the Tangier Zone (400 square miles with a population of 70,000) and the establishment of a special international regime there. At the above-mentioned conference of the year 1923, the neutralisation of the Tangier Zone was confirmed. Accordingly, upon the insistence of Great Britain, the erection of inland or coast defences of any kind in Tangier is forbidden.

But great Britain, though able to enforce the neutralisation of Tangier, was not in a position to prevent France from capturing the economic and administrative apparatus of the Zone. Furthermore, the whole Tangier Zone is under the sovereignty of the Sultan of Morocco, a fact which makes Tangier practically a French protectorate. It should be mentioned that Tangier borders immediately upon the Riff district, an area rich in salt, gold, lead, etc. The question of dominion over Tangier, therefore, coincides with the question of the "rounding off" of the French colonies in Africa at the expense of feeble Spain. The suppression of the insurrection of the Riff Cabyls has again brought the redistribution of North Africa on to the agenda. In this matter, as also in the Tangier question, France insists upon a solution of the question in direct opposition to Spain. Great Britain and Italy naturally cannot agree to this.

The distribution of power is obviously not changing in favour of France. Italy, which has developed into an imperial power of the highest rank, is also driving a wedge into Tangier by means of its claims. Great Britain, though it does not forget for a moment the necessity for the neutralisation of Tangier, supports the claims of Italy and in a certain degree those of Spain, too, because French dominion over Tangier would not be agreeable to Great Britain. The despatch of the biggest ships of the British navy to the Mediterranean, to Malta, constitutes an immediate threat to Southern France and to the line of communication Toulon-Bizerta, which connects France with its colonial possessions in Africa. Even now, the British squadron lying at Malta preponderates over the combined French and Italian fleets. The periodical "training manoeuvres" of the British fleet, in the region cutting the French line of communication (Balearic Isles) have long been the cause of "indignation" in the French Press. The French nationalists, therefore, are most eager for the official annexation of Tangier to the French possessions.

The Franco-Spanish conference being held in Paris will not lead to the elaboration of a new Tangier Statute. It can only be regarded as a prelude to a fresh intensification of the fight for Tangier which threatens to develop into open rupture between the opposing parties. The Soviet Union has the right to express its view regarding the Tangier question, because Russia was a signatory of the Algeciras Act. And, though France and Great Britain would not risk convoking a conference of all the Powers which signed the Algeciras Act (at the Conference of Algeciras there participated representatives from France, Germany, Great Britain, the United States, Italy, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Portugal and Morocco), and would not admit the Soviet Union to participation in such a conference, the Soviet Union can still find ways and means of exposing imperialist quarrels over Tangier and to give them their proper names without diplomatic colouring.

## Reform of Taxation in Czechoslovakia.

By V. Stern (Prague).

The new Government of the united bourgeoisie of all the nationalists in Czechoslovakia is busily at work. In the committees of the Parliament, taxation reform is being discussed which greatly aggravates the present unbearable system of taxation to the still greater disadvantage of the workers. In connection with this, there is the law with regard to municipal finances, which destroys the last remnants of municipal autonomy. And just at this time a new bill has been presented to the Chamber of Deputies, the administrative reform which was announced some time ago, a very masterpiece of reaction, a provocation to the whole working population and to all the national minorities, than which nothing worse can be imagined.

The system of taxation in Czechoslovakia is, without exaggeration, ten times more hostile to the workers and to all sec-

tions of the population who earn their living than is that in any other capitalist State in the world. Out of eight milliards of taxes, duties etc., the indirect taxes and duties alone have, in the last few years, amounted on an average to about 6½ milliards. Most of the direct taxes are also a burden on the worker. By far the largest part of the income tax, the only tax through which it is possible to mulct the possessing classes to any large extent without the possibility of their passing it on, is borne by small and very small incomes, and that in a way which seems hardly credible. The Democratic Czechoslovakian Republic has simply taken over mechanically the percentage of the income tax from the old Austrian Empire, although the Czech crown has only a tenth of the value of the old Austrian crown. Thus, the smallest incomes are taxed at a percentage which applied in the old Monarchy to incomes ten times as large. Furthermore, the Democratic Republic has still maintained the additional taxes which were introduced during the war. In the old Austrian Empire, the annual income below which exemption from income tax was granted, was 1600 crowns; it should now be 16,000 Czech crowns unless the Republic wishes to prove more reactionary than the Monarchy. It is, however, fixed at 6000 Czech crowns, and this brutal system of taxation is intensified in such a subtle way by the new bill, that Dr. Englis, the Minister of Finance, was in a position to say that he did not understand why the workers did not welcome the taxation reform as it introduced alleviation of taxation for all tax payers, including the workers.

This is, of course, a clumsy swindle and deception. Above all, the taxation reform does not touch the milliards collected by indirect taxation. They remain at the old level. That is to say, the notable increase of such indirect taxes, which have been made repeatedly in recent times simultaneously with the increase of customs tariffs, are maintained. On the other hand, really considerable remissions of taxation are granted to the capitalists with regard to many kinds of taxes. Above all they are granted an amnesty for the enormous sums by which they have defrauded the revenue in the past. Through the bill with regard to the stabilisation balance, profits will seem to be a smaller percentage of capital in consequence of the re-establishment of the assets of capital, and this in itself reduces the tax. It will be much easier for employers to conceal their profits by investing them and thus to make them quite free from taxation. The tax on unearned incomes is to be reduced, and that in a characteristic way in respect of interest on money deposited in the banks, a measure intended to make it easier for the banks to compete with the savings banks. The graduated house tax is being raised on the smallest buildings and cut down on larger ones. The tax on industries is also being increased for the smaller businesses, whereas the large employers, who run several enterprises are having, apart from great reduction of taxation, advantages played into their hands by the separate assessment of each business. The great reduction of income tax on the incomes of millionaires is particularly striking. Income tax is being reduced by 40,000 to 60,000 crowns on incomes of half a million. On incomes of 1 to 2 millions a year, the reduction is 140,000 to 250,000 crowns and, if anyone is so poor as only to earn ten millions a year, the new taxation reform makes him a present of no less than 1½ millions a year through reduction of taxation. This is only part of the many alleviations of taxation which the reform grants to the capitalists under every variety of title. A regulation which is typical of the character of the law is that which forbids public reports with regard to corruption by remission of taxation granted to millionaires, because the communications of the Communist Press regarding monstrous occurrences of this kind in recent years very naturally roused great excitement among the population.

The very core of the whole taxation reform, however, is the intention to make up the deficit in the National Budget due to all these remissions of taxation for the capitalists and landed proprietors out of the pockets of the workers. The taxation reform makes a show of reducing the taxes on the small incomes of the poor peasants, the tradesmen and the workers also. This, however, is so small that it only serves the purpose of concealing the character of the whole bill. The minimum standard of living for instance is only raised from 6000 to 7000 crowns and, with regard to taxes deducted from wages, to 10,000 crowns. On small incomes, the rate of taxation is only reduced by a fraction of 1%. But on the other hand, the legal deduction of income tax from wages is being introduced with the purpose of



getting hold of the whole tax of the workers, down to the last farthing, whereas, up to now, it has on the whole proved impossible to collect this tax because of its unbearable nature. The tax is deducted from wages even if the worker in question has not earned, in the year that comes into consideration, the Czechoslovakian minimum standard of living, because of prolonged unemployment. In that case he may try whether he can get back from the authorities the excess taxation he has paid. The employers are forbidden by law to pay the taxes for their employees as had been done in many cases. It became known through a secret circular letter of the Employers' Organisation that, more than a year ago, Dr. Englis, the Minister of Finance, had declared in his negotiations with the employers that he could only grant them alleviation of taxation in the taxation reform, if the deduction of income tax from wages were introduced by law, so that larger sums could be collected from the workers than had hitherto been the case. This is clear evidence of the true nature of the alleged alleviation of taxation for the workers.

## HANDS OFF CHINA

### Appeal of the International Red Aid against the Imperialist Terror in China.

Workers, Peasants and Working Intellectuals of all Countries!

Never has the Chinese people, which is suppressed and robbed by international capital, been so near its complete and final liberation as in these historical days when the national revolutionary armies of Canton have developed their attack in front of Shanghai, that citadel of the Labour movement in China, that centre of the capitalist subjugation of the country, that point of support of the rule of power of British, Japanese, American and French bourgeoisie.

Both the governing circles of Europe and America and the oppressed masses of the workers of Shanghai as well as the advancing battalions of the Canton fighters are well aware of the gigantic and decisive importance which the overthrow of the rule of power of the Shanghai exploiters would have on the thorn-strewn path of China's history.

"The conquest of Shanghai" — says the reactionary 'Morning Post' — by the National Government, would mean the danger of a victory of revolution and the beginning of the collapse of Britain's toil and efforts through so many years."

"The victory of Shanghai is a victory of our country, of which generations have dreamed" — stands on the banners of the weavers of Shanghai who are on strike."

"Soldiers! The days of decisive battles and victories have come," — in these words the Commander of the National army addresses those who are fighting for the liberation of China — "the days of battles for the conquest of the workers' town of Shanghai, for the liberation of hundreds of thousands of our best brothers, of victories, which will be a basis for a feast of joy of our whole nation."

The capitalist Governments have sent their iron-clads and cruisers, their air-craft and tanks, their troops, their colonial police and the White Guardist bands to help in preventing Shanghai slipping out of their hands.

At the same time they are resorting to "methods of calming" the population of Shanghai, which are described by the British Press as "very simple, but of extreme efficacy"; they are resorting to a mass terror which can only be compared with the cruelties of the foreign capitalists in the suppression of the Boxer insurrection.

Even the bourgeois journalists, eye-witnesses of the villainous deeds of their Governments in Shanghai make no secret of the fact that

"the beheading of persons suspected of agitation, wholesale executions and cruel tortures have become the only system of administration."

Workers acting as strike pickets are murdered, coolies who express their sympathy with the strikers and their faith in the victory of the national army, are executed, students who protest against the senseless wholesale murders and who enlighten the masses as to the real intentions of the imperialists of Great Britain, Japan and the United States, are beheaded.

The number of workers who were arrested in Shanghai alone in the course of last week, exceeds 4000, the number of those executed and beheaded — according to the data of the American bourgeois Press — is as high as 2000.

The White Terror is constantly becoming more intense and blood-stained.

Although the European and American imperialists hypocritically deny any participation in the orgies of bestial cruelty which are being practised on the workers of Shanghai and throw the blame for this unprecedented White Terror on the wicked advisers of Sun Chuan Fang, his reactionary Generals and the police, nevertheless they are the real organisers and inspirers of these "methods for ruling the masses". By continuing to provide the venal Generals with arms and other war material, to instruct them and to guide them, the imperialists are bearing the whole responsibility for the mountain of corpses of those who have been executed and beheaded, who have been cut in pieces, who have fallen victims to the hail of fire and to the tortures, or have become cripples, for these heroic sons of China who, through martyrdom and the agony of death are striving to free their country and to throw off the imperialist yoke.

Words do not suffice to pillory the crimes committed against the Chinese people by the rulers of the capitalist world who hand over the country to immeasurable suffering on the historic eve of its final liberation.

Workers of Europe and America, proletarians of Great Britain and Japan, of the United States, of Italy and France, workers in science, art and literature, honest fighters in the public life of all countries, millions who are perishing in their own blood need your help; the whole Chinese people calls for your help; its only crime is its fight for liberation and for the establishment of a State free from blood and serfdom.

All of you help! All of you protest!

Down with the imperialist terror in China!

Long live the international solidarity of the workers!

Long live the great Chinese people which is freeing itself from the serfdom of centuries!

The Executive of the International Red Aid.

## THE BALKANS

### The Situation in Bulgaria.

By Chr. Kabaktchiev.

I.

#### The Fascist Regime in Bulgaria.

It will now soon be four years that the Bulgarian people have been subjected to the Fascist rule established by the upheaval of June 9th, 1923. This regime, the outcome of a military conspiracy, has been maintained by means of a blood-thirsty form of terrorism such as is not to be found elsewhere in the modern history of the world and to which 20,000 of the best lives have been sacrificed.

The Fascist regime in Bulgaria differs from that in Italy, inasmuch as its victims are far more numerous, while at the same time it far surpasses both the Italian form of Fascism and all other reactionary regimes in the world in regard to cruelty. The Fascist rule in Bulgaria, moreover, differs from that in Italy also in regard to the forces which originated it and keep it up. As in Italy, the bourgeoisie in Bulgaria, seeing its power shattered after the war, is striving to restore its authority and stabilise its position by the aid of Fascism. But while in Italy Fascism has succeeded in recruiting part of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry and even part of the working class, disorganised and disappointed by the treachery of the Social Democratic Party, the Fascist rule in Bulgaria was established by the army and the military league, supported by some of the Macedonian nationalists. True, the Bulgarian bourgeoisie had founded its own Fascist organisations prior to June 9th, 1923, but they were very weak and therefore afforded little aid at the time of the upheaval.

After June 9th, 1923, the bourgeoisie profited by its accession to power for the purpose of developing its Fascist orga-

nisations, chief among which are the two associations of officers and petty-officers of the reserve and the "Kubraf" and "Rodna Sashitita" ("Home Defence") organisations. Besides these, they founded numerous "sport", "tourist" and other organisations, into which they herded large numbers of young people of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois classes, to be educated in a Fascist spirit and pressed into the service of the Fascist policy. But right down to the present day, the Bulgarian bourgeoisie has not yet succeeded in gaining the petty-bourgeois masses for Fascist organisations, while among the workers it has naturally had still less success. The main internal supports of the Fascist rule in Bulgaria to-day are the active and reserve commissioned and non-commissioned officers, together with the army, the administrative and police forces of the State which were reorganised and greatly increased by the bourgeoisie after June 9th, 1923, and the Fascist organisations which have grown in strength since the upheaval.

The Fascist rule in Bulgaria does not however depend solely on internal factors, it was rendered possible by the aid of the imperialist Governments of Europe, chief among them the Italian and British Governments, a support which it still enjoys to the full. The participation of the Italian and the British Governments in the upheaval of June 1923, is to-day a fully established fact. In order to withdraw Bulgaria from the sphere of influence of France, which favoured and encouraged the policy of Stambulinski — aiming at an approach between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia — the British and Italian Governments found willing tools in King Boris, the Officers League and the political staffs of the old bourgeois parties. With the aid of these factors, the said Governments succeeded in forcibly overthrowing the Stambulinski regime and in drawing Bulgaria into the Anglo-Italian spheres of influence.

On the eve of May 9th, the members of the Entente military control commissions in Bulgaria made tours of inspection throughout the country with a view to disorganising the military forces of the peasant Government, so that the success of the military league might be ensured. On the day of the upheaval, a British cruiser entered the harbour of Bourgas, the Bulgarian port on the Black Sea, only to retire when the success of the coup had been fully established. At the same time the British and Italian Governments gave Yugoslavia to understand that they would on no account suffer Yugoslav intervention in support of the Stambulinski Government.

It was not only that Italy and Great Britain granted the Bulgarian Fascists the fullest support for their seizure of power; they supported and saved the Fascist rule at the most critical moments. In March 1924, a serious quarrel broke out between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia in regard to the activity of the Macedonian organisations. This conflict threatened to bring about the downfall of the Zankov Government. The Italian and the British Government imperatively called upon Yugoslavia to hold its peace. Similarly, the intervention of Italy and Great Britain represented the salvation of the Fascist regime in Bulgaria during the armed conflict between Bulgaria and Greece in October 1925, and again after the presentation of the collective note in August 1926. Finally, the British Government helped Bulgaria's Fascist Government to strengthen its position by the grant of the so-called "Refugee Loan", which was not intended so much for the requirements of the refugees as to save the Bulgarian Government from an otherwise inevitable bankruptcy and the Bulgarian currency from a renewed depreciation, and to extend the influence of British capital and the British Government.

While the Governments of Italy and Great Britain thus actively and openly support the rule of the murderers of the Bulgarian people, the other imperialist Governments are doing the same thing in a more passive and covert manner. After Italy and Great Britain it is France in the first place which is responsible for the foreign political support of the Bulgarian Fascist rule. Not only did the French Government recognise the putschist Zankov Government; but France's agents in Bulgaria, in their protection of the French capital invested there, also supported the bourgeois parties in their fight against Stambulinski. The Bulgarian capitalists and their parties had succeeded in instilling the fear of the "Bolshevist" policy of Stambulinski into their French colleagues. By an intentional and sensational exaggeration of the "Bolshevist" danger, the Bulgarian bourgeoisie succeeded in gaining the support of the French Government for their bloodthirsty doings both before

and after June 9th, 1923. France, which during and after 1923 turned its attention mainly to its own financial crisis and to the events in the Ruhr district, Syria, and elsewhere, subsequently allowed Bulgaria to fall wholly under the influence of Great Britain and Italy.

Nowhere have the misdeeds of the bourgeois reaction assumed such appalling proportions as in Bulgaria. No nation in modern history has been involved in such tragic circumstances as the Bulgarian people, which is being exterminated wholesale by its own raging bourgeoisie, and that altogether systematically and continuously for the last three years or more. The Bulgarian nation is small, not exceeding five millions. Nevertheless, its tyrants, its hangmen and oppressors, murdered no fewer than 20,000 workers, peasants, teachers, lawyers, doctors, journalists, and writers, that is to say, the most active and intelligent and class-conscious representatives of all the working classes and professions. There is only one example in modern history which can be compared with the massacre organised by the Bulgarian bourgeoisie against its own people, and that is the sanguinary suppression of the Paris Commune.

One June 9th, 1923, and in the following few days, the conspirators, who had seized power by means of a surprise coup in the night, suppressed the consequent peasant revolt in certain districts by murdering thousands of peasants. They also most bestially murdered Prime Minister Stambulinski himself.

In September 1923, the reactionary Government organised the second massacre of the Bulgarian people, on a much larger and more cruel scale. On June 9th, the bourgeoisie had, by the aid of the hangmen it had hired in the shape of generals and professors, attacked and destroyed the Peasants' Union, a large and popular organisation among the Bulgarian peasantry. But the new Government did not feel secure, since the other great popular party, the Communist Party, representing the working class, still remained untouched. These two parties of the Bulgarian masses made the fatal mistake of not uniting their forces against the common enemy, but of allowing themselves to be beaten separately. And indeed, after June 9th, the usurpers directed their attacks against the Communist Party and provoked the great popular rising of September, which was suppressed in oceans of blood. In the actual civil war there were few victims; but regular orgies of blood were organised by the hangmen among the Bulgarian peasants and workers who had already laid down their arms or had never taken up arms at all. In this vile and bestial way some 15,000 persons were slaughtered.

The third massacre was instituted by the Government of June 9th among the Macedonian revolutionaries in September 1924. The very same Macedonian organisation, which had been exploited by the reactionary Government for its own ends on June 9th, 1923, was decimated by the murder of more than 200 of its leaders (including the well-known T. Alexandrov) because it had attempted to shake off the influence of the bourgeoisie and to pass over to the struggling peasants and workers with a view to waging a truly revolutionary fight for the liberation of the Macedonian people.

The fourth massacre carried out by this criminal Government was after the well-known attempt to wreck the Cathedral of Sofia in April 1925. The Government made use of this attempt, the timely revelation of which it had itself prevented, to murder all those involved and then to arrange a most terrible and revolting massacre in April and May 1925. All preparations had been made for this step by the Zankov Government; lists had been prepared of all the Communists and members of the Peasants League throughout the country who were marked down for extermination; bands of hired assassins, composed of officers, soldiers of Wrangel's army, and Macedonians, were trained by the police; General Volkov had issued secret orders for the merciless assassination of all those figuring on the lists. All that was wanted was the proper moment to execute this sadistic plan. At a signal given by the supreme authorities, 2000 defenceless prisoners, who had been dragged from their habitations by the police, were in the course of a few weeks handed over to the hangman.

These were the main stages of the first period, the Zankov period, of the black and bloody rule initiated on June 9th, 1923. It was characterised by a systematic murder of the people. We are only dealing with the wholesale murders; without enumerating countless individual murders and deeds of violence which were committed by the Fascist regime in Bulgaria. This regime may be said to have erected a pyramid of human bones which

should show the workers and peasants of all the world the blood baths which the Fascist reaction is preparing for the working class wherever the latter do not put a stop to this offensive of reaction and permit it to seize power and consolidate it.

(To be continued.)

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Struggle of the Italian Communists.

By J. Jezierska (Moscow).

However attentively we peruse the Italian press columns to-day, we cannot gather much from them in regard to the actual situation of the working masses. With a sort of blind terrorism, any utterance of dissatisfaction is suppressed, while the public is informed that there is no longer any class war in Italy, the Fascists having achieved the miracle of a harmonious concord between workers and employers.

A case recently reported from Parma is highly characteristic. The Parma glass factories had threatened to close down if they did not succeed in cutting down their workers' wages. The Fascist corporations inquired into the matter and declared the decision of the employers to be justified. The wages of the workers were reduced by an average of 10 lire daily, which, in the case of this comparatively well-paid class of operatives, represented about one third of their former total wages. Thereupon, it was triumphantly announced that by this "deed" the glass workers had demonstrated that they rated the interests of the "community" higher than their private interests, and the press called upon the other workers to imitate this good example. How the Parma workers actually responded to the procedure of the Fascist trade unions, is not to be seen from the press reports.

Similarly, the Italian press made no mention of the strike among the textile workers of Legnano, a strike caused through the retention by the administration of 87 lire in one month out of wages which had already been greatly reduced, this sum being intended for the Lictorial Loan; nor yet of the fact that by a unanimous strike the workers succeeded in forcing the managers to repeal the measure in question. The press refrained from stating that in many places the workers refused to subscribe to the loan in spite of the threat of dismissal, and showed so determined and unanimous a front that, at Cividale, e. g., the discharged ringleaders had to be reinstated again. The papers report nothing of the protests, not only of the workers but also of the petty bourgeoisie, against the new rent law, by which, in Naples, e. g., 30,000 families had become homeless, or against the high taxes, which caused the small shopkeepers to circulate a pamphlet accusing the Government of assisting only the big merchants while robbing the small business people of four fifths of their income by constant taxation. Nor have the newspapers said a word about the many spontaneous utterances made in favour of the exiles, of the demonstrations on the occasion of their embarkation, or of the collections made on their behalf.

All these circumstances are passed over in silence by the Italian press. But not even the Social Democratic labour leaders take any notice of them; indeed, Buozzi and in his adherents, in resolving on the transfer of the General Labour Federation abroad, openly declare that in Italy there is now "no more work to be done". The same standpoint is adopted by the leaders of the Maximalists, who have likewise declined to fight and have fled abroad. Only the Communists have refrained from deserting the country, seeking shelter in some safe port and railing at Mussolini under the protection of a momentarily anti-Italian French imperialism, preferring rather to remain in Italy and on the very spot to carry on the fight against Fascism with tenfold energy despite all terrorism and all reprisals.

The Communist Party has naturally had to endure very severe attacks. A great number of its leading members and numerous workers who sided with the Communists either actively or only in sentiment, have been condemned to lead an inactive existence on various small islands in the Mediterranean. Of these exiles who can already be numbered by the thousand, some 90 per cent. are Communists. The prisons are chock-full of Communists, members or friends of the Party, and in the next few days a monster trial of 50 Communists is to be held before the Extraordinary Military Court on the charge of

carrying on propaganda for the violent overthrow of the Fascist Government. In works and factories, workers are arrested in the midst of their occupation. It is on them that Mussolini takes revenge for the circulation of the Communist factory pamphlets and periodicals, which in spite of all measures of the police shoot up on all sides like mushrooms.

Since the labour press has been prohibited, the "Unità" appears illegal, its printing and circulation being naturally connected with the greatest amount of difficulty and danger. Thus a mason at Como, who had been caught distributing Communist pamphlets and refused to tell who had commissioned him, was so maltreated by the Fascists that he remained lying on the road covered with blood and with the loss of one eye. In spite of such dangers, however, illegal Communist papers are eagerly distributed among the workers. Thus the month of January saw the publication not only of numerous pamphlets and several factory periodicals, but also of three issues of the "Unità", two of which discussed the situation in Italy, the regime of terror carried on against the workers, the economic crisis, the question of unemployment, Mussolini's adventurous foreign policy, etc., while the third was dedicated to the memory of Lenin, whose death-day also found honourable mention in many pamphlets and factory publications. The "Martello", the factory paper of the Fiat works, devoted the first two pages of its last special issue to portraits and utterances of, and to articles about, Lenin, while the third and fourth pages contained reports on the sad situation of the workers in Italy and, for the sake of contrast, on the life of the working classes in Soviet Russia. Finally, the paper contains an appeal by the Turin agitation committee for a united front against Fascism.

A whole series of other publications — among which the various juvenile journals were most numerous — appeared on January 21st, and contained articles in memory of Lenin, Karl Liebknecht, and Rosa Luxemburg, besides short paragraphs describing the situation in Italy. The Slovenian "Delo" also published a special Lenin issue, and it is probably in this connection, as also in connection with the fact that 90 per cent. of the Trieste workers refused to subscribe to the Lictorial Loan, that so many of our Triests comrades were recently arrested and deported, as was lately stated in the foreign press.

Special care has been taken in the publication of a richly illustrated and most instructive little newspaper for children — naturally also published illegal — which recently contained a biography of Lenin written in a manner suitable to children, and also told its readers all about the life led by the Red pioneers in Russia. It likewise contained an appeal to the children of the workers and peasants, in which the juvenile Communists in simple but eloquent words described the persecution they have to suffer and the aims they have in view.

At present, the Communist Party is the only active fighting workers' party in Italy. It was the only one to appeal to the workers to protest against the dissolution of the trade unions and the removal of the trade union centre abroad, and at the same time immediately by practical work to set about the reconstruction of the trade-union organisation deserted by the reformists. It is the only party to combat and undermine the Fascist regime, not only by influencing public opinion abroad, but also by daily work among the workers in the factories and the peasants in the open country. The agitation committees formed in all the larger towns and now in many cases assuming the form of self-defensive organisations, have developed under the influence of the Communists and attract the sympathies of ever wider circles among the non-party masses.

The tasks with which the Communist Party in Italy is faced are very great, but the Party is aware of its responsibility and the tactics it has adopted give proof of its capability to cope with these difficult problems.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### The Hounding Down of Communists in Hungary.

(Letter to the "Inprecorr".)

On February the 26th, the Hungarian police arrested Comrade Zoltan Szanto. Stefan Vagi, the leader of the Left Socialist Labour Party and a number of its functionaries were arrested on the previous day.

An unexampled agitation began in the Hungarian Press against the Communists and against the Socialist Labour Party of Hungary. The old wives' tales, which were dished up by the Press in connection with the arrests, were the outcome of the fear of the spectre of Communism cherished by the ruling classes of Hungary. According to the Press, whose news is obtained direct from the Governor of the city or from the Ministry of the Interior, it was of course again a case of "frustrating a putsch" which the Communists had intended to carry out on March 21st, the anniversary of the proclamation of the proletarian dictatorship in Hungary in 1919.

In order that the blood-hounds of the Hungarian political police could appear not only as "saviours from Bolshevism" in internal politics, but could also turn to account the tension between Great Britain and the Soviet Union and pose before the whole bourgeoisie of Europe, as an advanced post in the war for the destruction of Bolshevism, the silly stories appeared about Borodin being in Buda-Pest, about "Balkan Conferences", about a direct connection between Comrade Szanto and the Roumanian Communists, about mysterious "schools of agitation" in foreign countries, in which of course, the name of Bela Kun could not fail to appear. The moment for this campaign of lies was well chosen from the point of view of foreign policy! Chamberlain's Hungarian lackeys were to prove that the "Moscow agents", the Soviet Union, had their finger in the pie, wherever it was a case of "undermining work", of a "putch" against the existing order.

The blow, however, was not intended to be aimed against the Communist Party of Hungary alone which, during the seven years of the counter-revolution, has indefatigably and heroically built up its illegal organisations, at enormous sacrifice, under inexpressibly difficult circumstances of subterranean work and with the repeated loss of its best fighters, it was also aimed at the legal Left Socialist "Labour party", which has broken the monopoly of legality of Hungarian Social Democracy and gathered round itself wide strata of class-conscious workers during the less than two years of its legal existence. The police investigation and the examination of 70 arrested persons was, from the beginning, carried on in such a way that in any case confessions as to the connection between the C. P. of Hungary and the "Socialist Labour party of Hungary" could not but be extorted from those under arrest.

All the methods of the inquisition were applied! For ten days the police headquarters were turned into a torture chamber. The moaning and screaming of those being tortured filled even the neighbouring streets, the inhabitants of which complained of their night's rest being disturbed. The persons arrested were not "cross-examined", but were first "handled". They were beaten with oxhide, thongs, with whips and with sticks, tortured with red hot irons, they were suspended by their hands tied behind their backs. When they fainted, water was poured over them and when they returned to consciousness, the tortures were resumed. The actual "cross-examination" began after this. Anyone who refused to make a "confession", who refused to sign the ready-prepared statements, was kicked in the stomach and the chest, so that many, who were tuberculous, brought up blood during the cross-examination and were beaten by the detectives until they were half dead. Women were treated with special cruelty. They were all forced to strip themselves naked and to suffer the brutality of the beasts of detectives in addition to the strokes of the lash. An 18 year old girl only with difficulty escaped being violated.

Stefan Vagi and Zoltan Szanto were also ill-treated till blood was drawn. Alleged "confessions" of the other persons under arrest were presented to them and they were asked to confirm them. They were confronted by one another and by the others. Szanto refused to make any statement. Vagi only admitted that he was a Communist in the sense of the "Communist manifesto" and of scientific socialism. Thereupon they were also "taken in hand". Vagi, who is as strong as a lion, knocked down two detectives. Six men then threw themselves upon him. He was overpowered and cruelly tortured. The same thing happened to Comrade Szanto.

The Hungarian police do not even think it worth while to deny these barbarous tortures. Schweinitzer, a high police official, who personally conducted the tortures, cynically stated to representatives of the foreign Press that the methods of examination of Communists under arrest adopted by the Hungarian police were, as matter of fact, much milder than for

instance in Java and Sumatra, where Communists are executed without any fuss. This time, even the method of assassination is not wanting in Hungary. Franz Mozsi, a 17 year old peasant boy, who was arrested in Kaposvar, in the first days of March and was taken to Buda-Pest in chains under the escort of gendarmes, was dragged out of the train at Budafok by the gendarmes and treacherously shot. The police announced that Franz Mozsi had escaped.

The ruling classes of Hungary, however, are not satisfied with the police inquisition. Emmerich Hetenyi, the Deputy Chief Governor of the city, said, in an interview with the correspondent of the Vienna "Neue Freie Presse", that the Hungarian police were by no means under the illusion that they could exterminate the "Bolshevist machinations" for any length of time, but they would be glad if they succeeded in making the work of the C. P. of Hungary impossible "for two months". Thereupon the bourgeoisie demanded "preventive measures!"

Vary, the Chief Public Prosecutor, an ill-famed blood-hound of the counter-revolution, demanded on the very first day after the arrests that the Communists should be tried by court-martial. In Hungary, according to law, the court-martial can only acquit or pass a death sentence. And this trembling fear, this pathological campaign of lies, the police inquisition and the preparation of terrorist emergency legislation — all that because the ruling class of Hungary suddenly caught sight of the underground Communist Party through having arrested illegal revolutionaries at their work of party and mass organisation.

From the point of view of foreign policy, the connections are quite clear. It is a case of doing Austen Chamberlain a service, of sidling up still closer to Great Britain in the atmosphere of the conflict between Great Britain and the Soviet Union. The Hungarian Press, both the Government Press and that of the Opposition, encouraged Valo, the Hungarian Foreign Minister, who has gone to Geneva to the meeting of the League of Nations' Council, to present concrete suggestions for the formation of an international anti-Bolshevist front. It falls to Hungary's share to take the lead in this united front. The Hungarian patriots, who are suffering from megalomania, declare with cynical frankness, that only in this way can their small country, which was disarmed and humiliated by the Treaty of Trianon, regain any influence in foreign policy and attract the attention of the world.

Count Bethlen knows that an anti-Bolshevist united front is by no means so simple a matter and that the good-will and "heroism" of the Hungarian patriots will not suffice for its creation. He knows indeed, that the price of Hungary has greatly increased in recent times from the point of view of foreign policy, that Italy, in its policy of encircling Yugo-Slavia, sets great hopes on Hungary, that, just for this reason, Yugo-Slavia is also suing for Hungary's favour. But he also knows that the tension between Hungary and Roumania due to the confiscated possessions of the Hungarian magnates in Transylvania, the lack of clearness in the foreign political situation of Germany etc. give Hungary room for foreign political manoeuvres. And he openly declares that Hungary's foreign policy ought to agree with Stresemann's manoeuvres, as far as Chamberlain allows. For this reason Hungary, although it also keeps a door open towards Yugoslavia and pretends not to follow Anglo-Italian imperialism unconditionally, does nevertheless unconditionally co-operate in the anti-Bolshevist line of British imperialism.

What is the internal political background of the increased hunting for Communists of the Hungarian counter-revolution? The Government was triumphant in the elections under the sign of "consolidation" and of a "national united front". The crown of all this work of consolidation is to be the restoration of the Habsburg throne. The national united front, however, has a very poor footing. Land reform has been buried, of the land which has been divided up, the whole share of those who lack land, 200,000 catastral yoke, are lying fallow. The landowners are dissatisfied because they cannot collect the compensation money. Of 200,000 building sites, 180,000 are still unbuild upon. The discontent in the country is expressed in the fractional fights which are raging within the Government party. The Liberals are opposed by the agrarians, but even the group of "small farmers", which was decimated during the election, is uniting.

In these circumstances, a radical development towards the Left in the ranks of the urban workers is particularly dangerous. The Government is attempting to attract one section of the



workers into the "national united front". It is proclaiming an era of national social policy. Insurance for old age and invalidity is to be introduced. The autonomy of the workers' sick insurance society, which was completely nationalised in 1919, is to be restored, at least to a limited extent. The miners are permitted to concentrate their benefit societies. This social political sop, however, is made up for by the lash. The Government announces a trade union law. The trade unions are to be rendered non-political. The right to strike is to be regulated and the labour bureaus to be nationalised. A national inspection authority for the trade unions is to be created. The yellow trade unions, the efforts to bring about splits in the trade unions, are promoted by the authorities.

It follows from the very nature of things, that this "social political" course taken by the Government, must go hand in hand with a terrorist course directed against the Communists and against all Left elements of the Labour movement. Social Democracy will certainly be ready to enter into a bargain with regard to the trade unions, with regard to a pact for the nationalisation of the trade unions, which is being set in motion under cover of some kind of "parity"; the blow must be directed against those who expose the social political fraud, who, by their agitation for the defence of the trade unions, render it difficult for Social Democracy, to enter into a new pact with Bethlen, who are calling for the overthrow of the Bethlen regime and for a fight for the Republic and for a Workers' and Peasants' Government. This is the reason for court-martialling the Communists and destroying the legality of the "Socialist Labour Party". Social Democracy must be compelled to form a united front under the sign of combating Bolshevism.

To this purpose, it is not necessary to put any special pressure on Hugarian Social Democracy. In the midst of the wildest agitation against the Communists and the "Labour Party", in the darkest days of the police inquisition, the Social Democratic Party leaders and the Social Democratic parliamentary fraction passed a resolution in which the fight against Communism, the fight against the "rolling rouble" was described as one of the most urgent tasks of Hungarian Social Democracy. The Hungarian police took this resolution for what it was, an encouragement to apply intensified methods of torture towards the workers under arrest.

The Hungarian workers however will, in the future, help the Communist Party of Hungary more than ever to complete its illegal methods and to build up the Party.

## The Budapest Police Admit the Tortures.

By Arthur Rosenberg.

Berlin, March 14th, 1927.

In July 1926 I was in Budapest at the occasion of the trial against Rakosi. I had the opportunity to interview the police president Hetenyi. In the presence of an English journalist I asked him whether it was true that the political prisoners were maltreated in the Budapest police presidium. In the course of a longer conversation Mr. Hetenyi affirms solemnly and with his word of honour that prisoners had never been maltreated in the Budapest police presidium. The English witness of this conversation is able at any time to verify my statement.

In the course of the last few weeks the Berlin and Viennese press again reported terrible facts about many cases of maltreatment of arrested communists and socialists in the Budapest police presidium. On the 11th of this month I therefore sent a telegram to Mr. Hetenyi in Budapest, pointing to the strong rumours about new serious cases of maltreatment in the Budapest police presidium. I reminded him in my telegram of my conversation with him in July of last year and urged him to inform me by wire whether there was any truth in the rumours. Since that time three days have passed. Mr. Hetenyi has kept silent. This is the clearest and most doubtless admission that the reports on the shameful tortures against prisoners in Budapest are true. The heads of the Hungarian police do not even consider it necessary to deny, but manifest with cynical openness that they torture imprisoned workers. The rulers of Hungary wish to prove at any price their reliability to Chamberlain.

## Telegram of Protest against the Cruel Mishandlings in Hungary.

To the Prime Minister Count Bethlen, Budapest.

The undersigned note with indignation the fresh mishandlings of political prisoners by the Hungarian police. These mishandlings appear to be all the more cruel as the victims are people who can be accused of no other crime than attempting to form a school in Budapest.

We feel we are expressing the feelings of millions of men and women when we publicly raise our voice against these new political acts of brutality.

We expect that you, by causing a strict investigation by means of the appropriate institutions, will immediately release the innocently arrested and hand over to the court those responsible for the mishandlings.

Signed:

George Lansbury, M. P., Helen Crawford, author; Ellen Wilkinson, M. P.; Saklatvala, M. P., England. Albert Fournier, M. P.; Vernochet, President of the International of Educational Workers, France. Henriette Roland-Holst, authour; Williams John Kruyt, Holland. Dr. Tobler; Prof. Dr. Forel; Dr. Fritz Brupbacher, Switzerland. Raissa Adler; Dr. Egon Schönhof; Dr. Frischau; Austria. Landova-Stichova, M. P., University Professor Nejedly; Dr. I. U. Bartoschek, advocate; Prof. Dr. H. Hecht; Jan Skla, Substitute of the Primato of Prague, Czechoslovakia. Dr. Helene Stöcker, author; Prof. Joh. Resch, Remscheid, Georg Ledebour, author; Alfons Paquet, author; Prof. Dr. Karl Grünberg; Prof. Käthe Kollwitz, painter; Prof. Heinrich Zille; Fritz Unruh, author; Dr. Werthauer, Juridicial Council; Bruno W. Reimann, art critic; Dr. Ruben, author; Prof. Paul Oesterreich; Prof. Alfons Goldschmidt; Dr. Kurt Kersten, author; Franz Lehnhoff, Journalist, Germany.

## The General Hunger Strike of 2500 Political Prisoners in Bulgaria.

By D. Ivanov (Sofia).

For a week the public of the whole world has had its attention arrested by an event which is unique in its nature.

General hunger strike in the whole of the 22 district prisons of Bulgaria, behind the walls of which there are, in round numbers, 2500 political prisoners.

On the 28th February last all political prisoners in the Sofia Central prison, numbering 133, went on hunger strike. The demands which they have put forward are: 1. complete, unconditional amnesty; 2. immediate discussion of the amnesty Bill introduced into parliament by the Opposition; 3. against the unbearable prison regime which is worse than that for common criminals.

On the 2nd and 3rd March, 1927, a hunger strike of the political prisoners, was proclaimed in the district prisons of Philippopolis, T. Pazardshik, Schumla and Plevna with the same demands.

Soon afterwards the hunger strike extended to all the 22 district prisons of Bulgaria and embraced the whole of the 2500 political prisoners. All the political prisoners, without exception, joined in the hunger strike, women, old people and children, including in the district prison of Sofia a mother with a child of 18 months who was born in prison.

In the first days the government press denied that there was a hunger strike and characterised the reports of the Labour press concerning it as a provocation. At the same time, however, the Ljapitcheff government commenced reprisals against the prisoners on hunger strike. After the Sofia Public Prosecutor had cross-examined all the political prisoners in the Sofia Central prison they were all punished, on his orders, with one month's strict solitary confinement. This punishment was rendered more severe by the prohibition of all visits, all correspondence and the sending of food, tobacco and cigarettes from outside, i. e. from the relatives of the prisoners. Not content with that the political prisoners kept in solitary confinement were forbidden to leave their cells to go to the lavatory! These barbarous punishments and threats could not, however, break the spirit and the solidarity of the tormented and exhausted political prisoners of Bulgaria. The hunger strike is still going on. Even criminal prisoners joined in the hunger strike out of sympathy.



In spite of the conspiracy of silence of the whole of the bourgeois and also the social democratic press in the first days, the news regarding the general hunger strike spread like wild-fire, not only within the country but far beyond the borders of Bulgaria. The government press then began to "work on" the public. The government press, which at first denied the hunger strike, commenced an incitement against the political prisoners on hunger strike by stating:

"Prisons are not political clubs and the political prisoners have no right to carry on politics in prison. By declaring a hunger strike they only make matters worse for themselves..."

The government press then hastened to declare that the hunger strike was at an end. And finally, on the eighth day of the hunger strike in Sofia, as nothing else would avail, the independent paper "Novini" was confiscated and the whole of the editorial staff, right up to the last proof reader, was arrested! In this brutal manner the hangmen's government of Ljaptcheff is trying to throttle this paper which stood wholly on the side of the hunger strikers and constantly supplied the public with news and the appeals of the strikers and of those in sympathy with them.

In order to understand the general hunger strike of the political prisoners of Bulgaria who are in an advanced stage of physical exhaustion, one must call to mind the course of events regarding the fight for the amnesty. Already for months past a powerful movement for an amnesty has been spreading in Bulgaria. Not only the political prisoners and their relatives, but thousands of other people, in many cases including whole villages, have uninterruptedly demanded, in numerous memoranda and protests to the government and the press, a speedy and unconditional amnesty.

Even the bourgeois opposition parties were compelled to raise the demand for the amnesty and to introduce a bill providing for an amnesty even if only a limited one, the government, however, declared that it did not even think of passing an amnesty law, and its press declared that so long as the political prisoners did not show any signs of "remorse" they were "not worthy" of a political amnesty.

The Bulgarian parliament will rise on the 28th of March. This parliament, which approved all the bloody acts of terror, the blood baths and all the cruel deeds of the Zankov-Ljaptcheff governments, this parliament which shares the responsibility for the numerous victims of the white terror in Bulgaria and especially for the martyrdom of the political prisoners numbering more than 2000 who are now pining in prison, refuses even to discuss an amnesty. The demand of the Bulgarian people and especially the demand of those who are now on hunger strike is, that this parliament settles the question of the amnesty before it separates.

A great movement for an amnesty and against the exceptional laws in white Bulgaria has been proceeding for weeks past in the most important countries of Europe and America. Not only the international proletarian public is conducting this movement, but also broad sections of the bourgeois intelligentsia, the Left bourgeois press and various cultural associations and organisations are being swept along by the stream of this movement.

Under the influence of this powerful movement, the question of the amnesty in Bulgaria was discussed even in the League of Nations. And when M. Vandervelde, in delivering his report on the Bulgarian refugees question raised an appeal for a general amnesty in Bulgaria in connection with the question of "normalising the political life in Bulgaria", it came, as the bourgeois big telegraphic agencies report, to an "extremely painful incident". This "incident" is, however, very significant, for it shows who is actually behind the scenes and who is the most powerful supporter of the white regime of murder and cruelty in Bulgaria — no other person than Sir Austen Chamberlain, the British Foreign Minister. For Chamberlain held this question, which in comparison with the great questions of world politics appears so insignificant, to be of such importance that he did not leave the reply to the Bulgarian representative but, foaming with rage, himself protested against intervention in the inner affairs of a "sovereign people".

Now, when the source of the international terror is clearly laid bare before all the world, solidarity with the victims of the white terror in Bulgaria as well as in all other countries where the fascist reaction has the upper hand is all the more an undeniable duty. And especially for the working class in

"democratic" England, the government of which stands exposed as the actual wire-puller of murderous fascism in all countries, there arises now the responsible task of proclaiming their will with all means and with the greatest energy, and to arrange effective protest measures against the white terror and international fascism.

"Enough of the gallows, chains, dungeons, exceptional laws and political wholesale persecutions in this unhappy country! Give full, general, unconditional amnesty!" this cry of the political prisoners which they issued in their hunger strike proclamation, must everywhere find a response, and the fight for these demands must not cease until success has been achieved.

## THE XI. PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE C. P. OF GERMANY

### Speech of Comrade Jansen, the Representative of the E. C. C. I.

(Verbatim Report.)

Comrades, I am commissioned to bring you the revolutionary greetings of the Executive of the Communist International, and that not only to the 11th Party Conference of the Communist Party, but also to the workers of the Ruhr district, the workers of Essen, the miners, the metal workers, to the whole German proletariat (vociferous applause). I bring greetings also to the non-party, Social Democratic and even to the Christian Socialist workers (prolonged applause), the greater part of whom will march with us, if not to-morrow, then the day after to-morrow. Above all I bring the revolutionary greetings of the Executive of the Communist International to the vanguard of the German revolutionary proletariat, the Communist party of Germany, whose growth and whose strength are the growth and the strength of the Communist International and whose weaknesses are the weaknesses of the Communist International because they are of the same flesh and blood as the Communist International.

Comrades, my task has been described on the agenda as that of **reporting on the last Conference of the Enlarged Executive**. You will forgive me if I do not deal with all the questions of the Executive nor report in detail on the resolutions, because it would take too much time, and further I take for granted that the representatives at the Party Conference are familiar with the resolutions of the Enlarged Executive. Furthermore, it seems to me impossible to speak merely formally about the resolutions of the Enlarged Executive without touching on the latest happenings of immediate interest from the international point of view since the Plenary Meeting of the Executive. Let us think only of those questions of the Executive which have been most discussed in your Party:

#### The Russian Question.

How can I report on this question without mentioning the agitation which has been unfolded by our enemies against the policy of the Soviet Republic since the Plenary Meeting of the Executive, an agitation carried on not only by the renegades who have been expelled from the Communist party, but especially by the leaders of the German Social Democratic Party and finally by Chamberlain by means of his well-known "opposition attack" in the Russian question. These facts I must touch upon.

Although I have mentioned the attacks of the Russian Opposition and the anti-Soviet attacks of German Social Democracy, of the Communist renegades and Chamberlain in the same breath, I do not of course mean to imply that the comrades of the Russian Opposition, for instance, can be placed on the same level as the Social Democrats. No, politically of course they are far from being the same. The leaders of the Russian Opposition are guilty, as the Enlarged Executive has pronounced, merely of a **deviation** in the Russian question, of a social democratic deviation; the leaders of Social Democracy on the other hand are, in this question, guilty of a counter-revolutionary deviation, as are also the renegades who have been expelled from the Communist Party, the only difference being that the latter wish to hide their counter-revolutionary deviation under Left phrases. And finally Chamberlain has a deviation of his own in the Russian question, let us say an intervention deviation (laughter).

Among all these attacks against the Soviet Union, Chamberlain's Note of course demands the most serious attention. Chamberlain's protest was directed not only against the Russian Government, but also directly against us, against the Communist International and especially against Comrade Bukharin's speech. As you know, Comrade Bukharin had prophesied a revolutionary future for England and also a revolutionary future in the Chinese question. It is easy to understand that the prospects suggested in these two points give Chamberlain an unpleasant and uncanny impression. His Note is actually nothing but a protest against the revolutionary prospects of the British Empire. (Cries of: "Hear hear!") The Note is at the same time a protest against the revolutionary movement in China. (Cries of: "Hear! Hear!") Can it be said that the bourgeoisie is really so interested in the cause of China as to prompt it to appear on the scenes with such solemn Notes? Yes Comrades, I should like to suggest that China, i. e. the loot which is to be got out of China, is at present the most glorious dream of the English bourgeoisie, and it is very easy to understand the indignation which rises in the hearts of the representatives of the English bourgeoisie when this prey threatens to slip out of their hands. England has had many beautiful dreams of this kind, which have come to pass, India for instance was one of these dreams, Egypt another, both have come true and the English bourgeoisie thoroughly appreciates the real value of the dreams. Why should not their Chinese dream be fulfilled? It meets with resistance, however, on the part of the national revolutionary movement in China, which, for its part is joined by a spiritual alliance with the proletarian dictatorship of the Soviet Union. We see that the Government of the English bourgeoisie has reason enough for protesting vehemently.

I shall return a little later to the political consequences of this question, but for the moment I would ask you to direct your attention to the

#### Differences in the Russian Question

which were dealt with at the last Plenary Meeting. You will of course get the best picture of these questions, not from my report, but if you read and study the report and concluding words of Comrade Stalin at the Enlarged Executive and also the speech and later reports of Comrade Bukharin in regard to this question. Speaking generally, by the way, it would be good if we took more time to study our own material, our own literature. (Interjections: "Hear! Hear! Quite right!") I will not enter into theoretical discussions on the questions of the possibility of socialist construction in one country, as they were discussed at the Enlarged Executive, but I should like to tell you a few facts, and not only you, but through you the German proletariat as a whole, facts in illustration of the work of socialist construction in the only country in which it is being carried out at present, chiefly on the basis of communications made by Comrade Bukharin. Short as is the time since the first appearance of the new Russian Opposition, we can already record certain facts which help to show whether construction in one country is possible or impossible. We are already able to draw some kind of a balance, by no means a final one, but one which gives us information as to the first steps of socialist development. If any of our opponents imagine that in Soviet Russia we only indulge in idle talk as to whether socialism is possible or not, he is very much mistaken. In Russia we work.

First of all, work is being done there on the construction of the technical basis of socialism. Socialism needs a technical basis, even a basis of natural wealth. The successful building up of socialism would not be possible in any isolated country chosen at random. I might mention that even before the Russian October revolution in 1917, I had the opportunity of discussing with Comrade Lenin the possibility of constructing socialism in one definite country. On that occasion, the discussion was not about socialist construction in Russia but in a much smaller country. Lenin's first question was: "Have you arms?" — "We have very few." — "That is bad. Have you coal? Have you mines?" — "No." — "Have you no iron ore?" — "No." — It was evident that Lenin considered that the prospects for the construction of socialism in that country, if it remained isolated, were really very bad. Nevertheless he added: "You will soon be able to import all this from Russia." He was absolutely convinced in a few months the Russian proletariat would have the power in its hands, which is what actually happened. In Russia they have the natural requisites for socialist development in

ample measure. (You have them in Germany, you have no need to be uneasy on that account.) The technical basis in Soviet Russia, however, still needs a great deal of perfecting. They have had very little time for this purpose in the Soviet Union as yet, not even ten years. It should not be forgotten that the war, in the form of the war of intervention, in Russia, lasted till 1921, i. e. three years longer than in your country. During that time there could be no talk of constructive work, there could only be even very little talk of restoring the productive forces which had been destroyed. Now, after a time of working at restoration, things have got so far that it can be said that the period of restoration is on the whole at an end. Even the memorandum of the League of Nations to the World Economic Conference recognises that production in Soviet Russia has already reached the pre-war level and has even exceeded it by a little. In certain fields of production, they have already advanced much further, for instance in the field of the electrical industry, of the production of agricultural machinery etc. Constructive work as such, has only been introduced since 1922, but some results have already been achieved. Here are a few concrete examples: 10 new overland central plants have been built as for instance Volchovstroy, Shatur works etc.; in the metal industry, 7 large new works; in the electro-technical industry 6 new works; in coal mining 76 new pits have been completed and 19 more have been begun; in the petroleum industry, 5 new petroleum refineries; in the chemical industry 12 new factories, and a further 12 are being built; 1500 kilometers of new railways have been constructed; electric tramways have been laid down in 5 towns; 62 new factories for the working up of agricultural products; 47 grain elevators etc.

I will also give a few figures with regard to the investment of industrial capital: in the economic year 1923/24, it amounted to 225 million roubles, in the following year 385 millions, in the year after that 782 millions, in the current year it will amount to 1300 million roubles. When we consider how short the time has been, when we further consider that all this has had to be done out of our own resources without American credits, it must be said that something at least has been achieved under the lead of the Bolshevik Party. The annual outlay for housing construction in the economic year 1925/26 was 248 million roubles for 282,000 workers; in the current economic year an expenditure of 315 million roubles is provided for in the interest of 361,000 workers. From information received through Comrade Varga, I have an estimate as to the annual accumulation of 6 milliards of roubles in Soviet Russia, which is about equal to the sum which is at present being accumulated in Germany.

At the Enlarged Executive, Comrade Trotsky, as the chief speaker of the Russian Opposition, maintained that the Soviet Union is becoming more and more dependent on capitalist world economy and that the Soviet industry will be more and more under the control of this world economy. He reproached the other comrades with not understanding the laws of the world market, which nevertheless exert heavy pressure on the industry of the Soviet Union. What is the position with regard to this dependence on capitalist world economy? In so far, of course, as there is an exchange of goods between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world, it means that the former is to a certain degree dependent on the latter; as however this exchange of goods is being properly regulated by the Soviet Union, the Soviet industry may, at the same time, become more and more independent of the capitalist world market, and this is what is actually happening. It is true that the capitalist world had arranged its plans, relying on the Dawesation of Soviet Russia. This, however, did not come to pass. And it is good that this should be, for it is a question of the independence of the Soviet Union from capitalist world economics. It will be a different thing of course, when we have Soviet States in West Europe also; then there must be an intimate alliance.

The monopoly of foreign trade in the hands of the Soviet Government is a powerful means of regulating the exchange with the capitalist countries abroad. Imports and exports are not left to the arbitrary decision and the greed for profit of individual employers; they are systematically regulated by the functionaries of the Soviet Power, and the result is in accordance with this. For a time, trade balance of the Soviet Union was so adverse that it was really alarming. The result of intervention on the part of the Bolshevik policy with definite aims in view is that the trade balance is now on the credit side. Annual imports have now considerably decreased, annual exports on

construction of socialism in the Soviet Union but, on the contrary, to strengthen that faith.

Comrades, I have perhaps already spoken in too great detail about the every day economic work of the Russian proletariat and the economic policy of the C. P. S. U.

Now I will turn my attention to a few questions respecting the capitalist world. At our Plenary Meeting, the question of the relative stabilisation of some capitalist countries was very thoroughly discussed. Here also, in the discussion on the first point on the agenda, this question was brought forward, especially through attacks on the part of the ultra-Left comrades. At this point I find myself in an awkward situation; am I really to try first of all to prove that relative stabilisation exists here in Germany? (Cries of: Hear! Hear!). I think it is superfluous to prove that to you. Secondly, the German working class, which works in the factories, which sees before it the great unprecedented concentration of capital, which feels on its shoulders the pressure of concentrated capital and of rationalisation being put into effect, which is also a part of stabilisation — the German working class understands the matter. It does not dispute the fact of relative stabilisation.

It is true, in your draft resolution of the first point on the agenda it is quite rightly said that the present historical epoch is the epoch of the world revolution. This is not contradictory to the recognition of the fact that there is at present in several capitalist States, as compared with the years 1918/21, a certain stabilisation which covers a short period. Regarded as a whole epoch, it is an epoch of wars and revolutions, of revolutionary wars, of colonial wars, of imperialist wars and above all of proletarian revolutions. That is the chief characteristic of the whole long epoch. In this epoch, the capitalist world is faced not only by great difficulties but even by insoluble problems. This is clear and can be recognised without any difficulty.

In some countries however, the relative stabilisation of capital is at present a fact. This fact is a bad and unpleasant one. We should prefer that it did not exist. But we cannot replace facts by our wishes if we want to pursue serious politics. There are many other facts which are unpleasant for us, the very existence of capitalism is an execrable fact. We recognise this fact, but we do not take the attitude of slaves towards these facts. Our desire is to overcome, to remove these facts by the revolutionary movement. We must assume this active attitude towards the fact of relative stabilisation also. But why dispute these facts? Only he who does not understand or is otherwise incapable of carrying on the revolutionary fight in the right way, in a way appropriate to the circumstances of capitalist stabilisation, only he can desire to dispute this fact.

I do not of course for a moment say that all the people in the world who recognise capitalist stabilisation, not only relative, but even absolute stabilisation, are better politicians than Comrades Weber and Kötter. Personally, I even prefer to listen to Comrades Weber and Kötter, who deny any kind of stabilisation, than to Maslov who cynically prophesies that stabilisation will endure for many decades. But the clamour of Kötter and Weber against the existence of relative stabilisation proves in any case that they are simply incapable of understanding how revolutionary activity can and should be displayed in the right way in these circumstances of relative stabilisation.

When I heard the desperate way in which for instance Comrade Weber tried to prove that relative stabilisation does not exist, I thought of the saying: Much ado about nothing. (Hear! Hear!). This reminds me of an unpleasant experience in my childhood, — forgive me if I tell you this little incident. At my home, we had a large, black pig. Partly out of curiosity and partly out of respect for the monster, I climbed on to the wall of the pigsty; then however all was up with me; I fell into the monster's den. Of course I did, what any child of three years would do in a similar situation, I shut my eyes and screamed with all my might. (Loud laughter, applause.) Grown-ups rescued me; my black antagonist was not particularly disturbed by my screams. Later on my antagonist was slaughtered and even eaten. (Renewed laughter.)

Well then comrades, in politics, we must look facts in the face with our eyes open, however ugly and terrible they may appear. We must not let facts frighten us, not even such hog-gish facts as capitalist stabilisation. We must oppose it with our slogan: **The Socialist Revolution.** We are working with a definite purpose towards preparing for this revolution. The Communist Party will effectively accelerate the defeat of capitalist stabilisation by political fights carried on in the right way

and by hard daily work while bearing in mind the actual difficulties.

In this work, we have against us greater resistance than the Opposition of the ultra-Left. We have against us the whole Second International, above all, the S. P. of Germany, as the accomplice of capitalist stabilisation. The time has now come when we should draw up a public balance of the eight years' policy of the leaders of the S. P. of Germany since the war. If they do not do it themselves — and I suspect that they have no desire to do so — we ought to do it.

The first occurrence was the rescue of German capitalism by the S. P. of Germany. Kautsky's first slogan after the war was: the restoration of the productive forces of German capitalism. At the same time as he was making propaganda for this slogan, Noske was working by means of force to save German capitalism from the proletarian revolution. Later came the work of the leaders of the S. P. of Germany and of trade union bureaucracy for carrying through rationalisation in the factories. Add to that the whole Coalition policy which it carried on under the deceptive slogans "Economic Democracy and political Democracy". What has the German proletariat gained however as the result of this work? **Pauperisation and political reaction!** That is the result. Of course I do not say that that is exclusively the work of the German Social Democratic leaders; it is the result of their co-operation with the capitalists. (Hear! Hear!) Now, comrades, the time has come for you to reveal these revolting facts to the German working class seriously and without reserve.

We see from the fact of the process of radicalisation, which is going on among the working masses, that the C. P. of Germany has at present the best prospects of achieving success in this work of exposure. This demands an embittered fight, but at the same time a fight carried on in the right way against the leaders of the S. P. of Germany and against the so-called "Left" leaders of Social Democracy. It is undoubtedly true, as has been said by a delegate in this discussion, that Lenin maintained that, if we exaggerate the fight against centrism, we only help centrism. This is true, but I am absolutely convinced that, in the present situation, Lenin would altogether approve of the intensified fight against the Centrist leaders of the sham Left in the ranks of the S. P. of Germany. For these leaders of the sham Left, beginning with Levi, only offer cover to the disgusting behaviour of the Right Social Democrats. Of course, it is not possible to polish off these leaders with abstract slogans, still less with semi-Reformist practice — it is undoubtedly necessary to use elastic tactics against them — but at the same time the most intense struggle. The line to be taken by the Executive and the German party leaders is quite clear in this respect.

One thing has given me special pleasure in the discussion at this Party Conference, that the leading idea of almost all speakers in the discussion — with the exception of the ultra-Left — has been: **Away with empty phrases!** The Party Conference is prepared for the practical revolutionary tasks of the Communist Party. It seems to me that that is a great guarantee for the future. I am convinced that the Essen Party Conference will, in this respect, mean an important advance for the Communist Party. Your Party is earnestly trying, not only at its Party Conference, but in its daily revolutionary practice, with deliberate aim, to put into effect its revolutionary line in all fields of work, with the purpose of conquering the large factories, the trade unions etc. The whole Party — with the exception perhaps of a few ultra-Lefts — is well aware that systematic revolutionary work must be done, with much patience, zeal, energy and sense of responsibility.

I am firmly convinced that the leading organs of your Party — not only the central committee, but those of districts, towns, fractions and nuclei — will, more than ever, listen to the advice of those with practical experience, who are so numerous in the minor organisations of the Party, and, with these new forces, will enlarge the cadres of functionaries of the Party so as to be able to cope with the great tasks with which the C. P. of Germany is faced in the various fields of work, including the building up of mass organisations which sympathise with it, the intensive development of the distribution of newspapers etc. We representatives of the Executive do not doubt that the Party will understand and rightly carry out this "detail work". We subscribe to all the resolutions which have been passed with regard to this work, and consider it almost superfluous on our part to call attention once more at the Party Conference to the duties of the Party in this respect.

the contrary, have greatly increased. Russia itself has such great sources of wealth that the pressure of capitalist world industry cannot throttle it. This pressure can only spur the Soviet industry on to greater efforts and achievements.

But, said Comrade Trotsky, at our Plenary Meeting, everything depends on the rate of development, on the rate of the Socialist work of construction. What has the rate been in recent times? One fact is the increase of the production of raw materials in comparison to the economic year 1923/24. I give the figures for agriculture and for industry separately. In agriculture, the increase amounted to 27.6% in the economic year 1925/26, in industry, 120.7%. In the current economic year according to the control figures of the "Gos"plan: in agriculture (always in comparison with the economic year 1923/24) an increase of 34.4%, in industry of 152.8%. Thus we see a very rapid rate of development in industry as such and also as compared with the increase of agricultural production. In heavy industry, an increase of 24.9% can be recorded in the current economic year, in light industry, an increase of 17.3%. This shows that the more rapid development of heavy industry, of the production of means of production, predominates. The production of steam turbines has increased by 75% and that of boilers by 66% in comparison to last year. An in the Soviet Union large industry is as you know, entirely in the hands of the proletarian State, the rapid rate of development of large industry implies the greatest economic growth of power on the part of the proletariat which is at the helm.

What does the worker get in Soviet Russia? Of course, thanks to the reports of the workers' delegation who have been in Soviet Russia, you, and many hundreds of thousands of German workers know all about that. Nevertheless I will give you a few brief data. Actual wages in Russia are at present at the level of pre-war times. To this must be added numerous social advantages: very low, almost nominal rents, holiday on full pay, hospitals in which the workers are treated free of cost, convalescent homes, clubs, theatres, advantages with regard to school attendance. For women especially, full wages 8 weeks before and 4 weeks after the birth of a child, crèches in all factories, especial extra payment for women suckling their babies etc. The result is an astonishing decrease of infant mortality in the industrial districts. Not only are scholarship being given to proletarian students, but it is being made generally possible for them to study. The wireless is being spread all over the country. Large allocations are being made for natural science etc.

The class struggle is of course also being carried on in Soviet Russia in the sphere of industrial work. Socialist construction means at the same time the class struggle against private capital and against the Kulaks. First of all, we can record considerable success in the fight against private capital. In the economic year 1923/24, 27.7% of the whole production of raw materials fell to the share of private capital and smaller industry, in the following year it was 16.9% and in this economic year it will presumably be 15.3%. Trade is developing on the same lines; the share of private capital in trade has, as regards wholesale trade, fallen from 21.8% to 9.4%; in retail trade from 41% to 24%. This of course would not have been possible unless the policy had been one of definite aims. In this respect, the co-operatives, the management of State trading and system in the whole work of economics are the most important factors. Other means also have been applied, however, in the domain of the economic fight against private capital. Thus for instance, last year, the taxation of private capital was considerably increased, special railway tariffs for private trade were fixed and special administrative regulations introduced etc. At the Plenary Meeting Comrade Stalin called special attention to the defeat of private capital and pointed out that, according to the words of Lenin himself, this means the construction of the very foundation of socialism.

In Soviet Russia, industrialisation is carried on exactly in the spirit of Lenin, so that it does not, as in the capitalist world, lead to the ruin of the middle peasantry, to its proletarianisation, but tends to raise the economic level of the poor and middle masses of peasants. Lenin's instructions with regard to this question are to produce more cheaply than the capitalist, so that, on this basis, the peasants may be driven to become adherents of the proletarian dictatorship in order to preserve their own interests, so that in this way an alliance may be established between town and country. The Russian Opposition had a different conception of this question. I say deliberately had, for it seems as though at the present moment, it were beating a retreat on this point. The Opposition had prophesied that with the deve-

lopment of Kulakism in the Soviet Union, great political conflicts and complications would occur. The Opposition maintained that, unless their line was followed in the peasant question, an increased shortage of goods would result, which would bring serious political consequences in its train. Things turned out quite differently. There was no intensification but a decrease in the shortage of goods, thanks chiefly to the increase of industrial production. The chief argument of the Russian Opposition, however, was a different one. They said: The Kulak has grown, and the Stalin leadership of the Party has not noticed this danger; the Kulak has frustrated all the plans of the Soviet Government in its campaign for the purchase of grain, and this Kulak danger is steadily growing, so that it will finally endanger even the policy of the proletarian dictatorship. Had the Russian Opposition been right in its assertions, far greater difficulties would have arisen in the economic year 1926/27, above all in the campaign of Russian national economy for the purchase of grain, than in 1925 when the alarming prophesies were made. The contrary has happened. The fact is that, as compared with 1925, much more grain was bought in 1926, of course according to definite, purposeful plans. I am in a position to say that everything did not go quite according to plan; as a matter of fact, in this case, things went better than had been planned. The plan was built up according to the various months. In September this plan was carried out by 125%, in October by 127% and in November by 140%. Similar examples are not uncommon in the history of the Bolshevik Party of the Soviet Union; the whole force of the Party has been concentrated on some task demanding a special impetus, and then very often more has been accomplished than had been planned. In the case in question, they have actually succeeded in capturing the grain market from the Kulaks. This fact, which contradicts the prophesies of the leaders of the Russian Opposition, really demonstrates, as Comrade Bukharin has said, the "collapse of the economic policy of the Russian Opposition", needless to say also the collapse of the prophesies and invective of the German ultra-Left, which raised so much clamour about the "Kulakising" of the Soviet Union; indeed, for a time, these people even wanted to "Kulakise" the whole Comintern. Now the Russian Opposition speaks in subdued tones of the Kulaks. At the last meeting of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U., the Opposition leaders were obliged to vote for the resolutions of the Politbureau. (Cries of: Hear! Hear!) And here, I have not heard anything more of Comrade Bartels, for instance, repeating his asseverations about "Kulakisation". If nevertheless, he still wishes to prove that the economic policy of the C. P. S. U. in Russia leads to "Kulakisation", I urgently beg him to come out with his proofs on this platform. (Cries of: He still has his old notes!).

Of course Comrades, what I have mentioned here is, first of all, only the beginning of socialist development in Soviet Russia. And secondly, there are not only achievements in the work of construction in the Soviet Union, but there are great obstacles and problems which still cause great difficulties, for instance the question of unemployment. The character of the question there, however, is different from what it is in the capitalist countries, Germany for instance. Unemployment in Soviet Russia is not caused by the dismissal of workers, but by the influx of the surplus population from the country. Apart from this, there are also great difficulties in the question of raw materials and in the price policy, although the Soviet national economy of — as Lenin said — "a consistently socialist type", has already to a large extent captured the market. Difficulties exist, but they are not insuperable.

Practice also shows that there is no point at which one can draw a limit and say that beyond that the work of socialist construction cannot go. It cannot be said that the proletariat of the Soviet Union is incapable of building up socialism to a finish, provided it is protected from the attacks of the capitalist world. The foundations of socialism will be successfully laid, even without American and other credits. The clamour about the impossibility of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, in a single country, only serves the purposes of the enemies of Soviet Russia, of the enemies of the revolutionary Labour movement throughout the world. (Cries of: Hear! Hear!). This is why we call this clamour a Social Democratic deviation, because its effect is the same as that of the agitation of the Social Democrats. Our task is not to deprive the workers in the capitalist countries of their faith in the possibility of the



Instead of that, I should like to direct the attention of the Party Conference to the main points on which the Party should concentrate its political campaigns and mass actions in the immediate future, i. e. against the policy of Social Democracy and against imperialist preparations for war. Against Social Democracy from two points of view: Against its coalition policy and against its trade union policy. The bourgeois Block in Germany cannot be regarded as a transient episode. By this formation of a block, the Social Democratic leaders have got into a blind alley and we must now make it clear to the workers that, by the Coalition policy it has pursued up to now, German Social Democracy has not only gone bankrupt, but has been guilty of continued criminal betrayal of the working class.

With regard to the trade union policy of Social Democracy, I will not anticipate the discussion on the trade union question. I will only remind you of the three points on which, in my opinion, attention should be concentrated; these are the questions of rationalisation, the questions of unemployment, in both of which Social Democracy is equally responsible with the bourgeoisie — and then the political and organisatory development of the trade unions into an instrument in the fight against concentrated trust capital (industrial unions, conferences for the respective factory combinations or trusts etc.). Of course, such a fact as that which occurred two years ago at the Breslau Trade Union Congress, at which we were represented by only a few delegates, must and shall not repeat itself.

The greatest activity of the German Communist Party is further necessary in the fight against the preparations for war, and that not only against the preparations for an imperialist war. We know that a world war is not only being prepared, but that in China it has actually begun. In China, the imperialist war is being waged against the Chinese people, which is fighting for its liberation. The C. P. of Germany must watch the course of this war with the greatest attention and must display much international activity in this matter.

The Chinese war however is being more and more combined with preparations for the imperialist war against the Soviet Union. We do not, of course, prophesy, that this war will come to pass within a few months, but that preparations for it are being made, is a fact. Chamberlain's Note, to which I have already referred, is not only insulting, but it is a link in the chain of the preparations for intervention. Persons, who are quite familiar with the history of English diplomacy, testify with all their expert knowledge that the work of the English Government with regard to the Soviet Union is at present exactly according to the same traditional, almost stereotyped stencil, with which the English Government has always prepared its great imperialist wars.

Why war is being prepared against the Soviet Union, needs no explanation. As is well known, a tyrant in France, once said in the times of absolutism: "Legality is stifling us." At present it seems as though the Government of the English Empire felt: peace is stifling us. In the present day, the Governments of the Imperialist Powers are the actual disturbers of the peace of the world. The more they see that they cannot achieve success in forcing a Dawes plan on the Soviet Union, the more they will continue to weave their aggressive plans.

Yes indeed, Soviet Russia will defend itself, Soviet Russia is preparing to parry the attack. That we can say openly. In Soviet Russia they clearly understand that for this purpose not only grain, electricity, tramways, textile factories and so on are necessary, but also rifles and guns, nay, even aircraft and shells. (Loud applause.) We admit quite openly that in Soviet Russia these things are also being produced, and produced with great industry, however painful it may be to the Social Democratic leaders and their masters. (Cry of: and to MacDonald!). Maybe, foreign specialists are being employed in the preparation of these things (loud clapping), at least as far as one can judge from the anxiety of "Vorwärts" lest any military secrets of the German bourgeoisie might have fallen into the hands of the Bolsheviki. Yes indeed, we say, that to defend itself, to prepare for violent resistance, that is the international right and the international duty of the Soviet Union. (Applause.) We have already said, at the Enlarged E. C. C. I., that to be strong is the first international duty of the Soviet Union.

In all capitalist countries also, it is the first proletarian duty of the Communist Parties to become stronger, much stronger than hitherto. At the same time, it is the best preparation for protecting the Soviet Union against the imminent danger of an imperialist war. Even Comrade Bartels has at last realised

that this protection is a duty. He is now calling upon the workers of the capitalist countries to stop at once preparing any arms, munitions etc. which could be used against the Soviet Union; he demands that conferences of transport workers etc. be summoned at once — rather too much of a good thing. But when, at the same time, he calls for solidarity with the apostles of the "Second Revolution" in Russia, we must say that his friendship with the Soviet Union does not seem to be quite straightforward. (Cries of: Very true!). We will book this expression of Bartels on the credit side, not however for him but for the ultra-Left workers who, it seems, are compelling their own leaders to abandon once for all the ambiguous position they have held hitherto in this question. (Cries of: Bartels or Grylevicz!).

Comrade Bartels has expressly declared his solidarity with all Communist renegades who have been excluded, even with Schwarz, Korsch . . . (protests). Good, we will accept any withdrawal on your part. (Applause.) And we could have told you in advance that the ultra-Left workers would not allow you to maintain an ambiguous attitude in this question for long.

Stresemann seems to act in exactly the opposite way to Comrade Bartels. He was also formerly ambiguous in his attitude towards the Russian question. Now he is steering a clear course (as far as a diplomat as such can steer a clear course) in the direction of the English plans against the Soviet Union. Of course it is not a case of his personal opinion, but of him as representative of the German bourgeoisie which has, so to speak, assumed comfortable proportions. There is a difference in the attitude of bourgeois Germany in the years 1919—1923 and the year 1927. At that time, Lenin emphasised that Germany, as compared with the imperialist countries, was a subjugated country. Lenin would not say that now, comrades. He would certainly agree with us that Germany is now an imperialist country. We must not fail to recognise this difference.

The day after to-morrow, Dr. Stresemann, as the representative of the German bourgeoisie, will open the Meeting of the imperialist League of Nations in Geneva and will conduct the proceedings. I speak of "conducting" with a certain modification, for, as a matter of fact, the leading part of the representative of the German bourgeoisie in the League of Nations is about the same as was the so-called leading part of the German Social Democrats in the Coalition Governments. In reality, the English Government takes the lead.

There are two Internationals in the world. The first is the proletarian one, which we represent. The second, which meets to-morrow in Geneva, is the capitalist one. Our International is growing, Comrades. It grows slowly, it is true, far more slowly than we had hoped and than we had often believed. Our Parties in the capitalist countries are still burdened with many weaknesses and defects, but in spite of the difficult circumstances, we yet advance. Our Parties have learnt by now to work, even under the most difficult circumstances. We have Parties which work under such difficult illegal circumstances that, seen from the point of view of traditional legality, it seems almost impossible to accomplish anything in those countries. Nevertheless, the influence of our Parties on the masses is extending, and viable factory nuclei are being constructed everywhere, even in the prisons. From this we see that the same must be possible in Germany in all large factories.

The ultra-Lefts have maintained that we wish to dissolve the Communist International. That is nonsense, comrades, those people are fools. Let us first liquidate capitalism and then construct socialism throughout the world. The Communist International will not be dissolved until this has been accomplished. (Bravo, prolonged applause.) And by that time the bones of the last ultra-Left leader will long have been dissolved. (General laughter and applause. Cries of: Hear! Hear!).

It is fortunate that the German Communist Party has already succeeded in establishing an uninterrupted connection with the broad masses of workers. This connection is not yet strong enough, but it exists. We must get hold of the masses of the non-party workers and of the Left Social Democrats more firmly and on a far wider scale. This requires that the international rôle played by the C. P. of Germany should be increased. The whole development of our movement tends in this direction. The revolutionary development makes demands on your Party not only in specially German questions, but also in an international measure. In future it will not be as necessary, as it has been hitherto, for the other Parties of Western Europe to turn their eyes exclusively towards Moscow in questions of their



international campaigns. It would be a good thing if the comrades of the other Parties would be more willing to follow the example of the C. P. of Germany. It would be to the purpose to develop the "Rote Fahne" far more than hitherto into an organ which gives the tone to the revolutionary movement in Western Europe as a whole. This is the direction in which you must work.

Your Party has plenty of splendid revolutionary people in its ranks. It cannot be so difficult for you to form cadres as it is in some other countries, for your workers have great revolutionary experience in fighting, and that is the chief thing. You have already reached a level of revolutionary development, from which further Bolshevik training is comparatively easy. Your experience of the treacherous Social Democratic policy has inspired you with a deep hatred for opportunism. It is true that the ultra-Left leaders have often abused this hatred of the revolutionary German workers, but in itself, this hatred is a very valuable thing. The leading organs of the Party ought to understand how to make the best use of the collective revolutionary experiences which are at the disposal of your Party in the persons of thousands of functionaries and tens of thousands of candidates to become new functionaries, and how to distribute the work well.

Concentration of forces is necessary, but not exactly in the way that Comrade Böttcher has suggested to you. It seems to me that he has confounded some things. Within a certain fundamental scope, ideological differences of opinion are permitted within the Communist Party, as are also the exchange of opinion and criticism inside the Party, in so far as they do not lead to disorganising fractions. The leaders of the Party however must be much more united than is the Party as a whole. A minority in the leading bodies can of course represent certain deviations, but the majority of the leaders must be able to guide the Party harmoniously; this applies not only to the central committee, but also to the leading organs in the districts, in the factories and everywhere. Further, in our activities, in our fight against the enemy, revolutionary discipline must be maintained; otherwise a successful revolutionary fight is out of the question. Without discipline — I address this especially to the ultra-Left workers — without firm revolutionary discipline, the Party will never be victorious. The capitalists are forming steel trusts. Our organisation must also be a steel trust, both in a German and in an international measure. (Voiceferous applause.)

Comrades, the time we are passing through is pregnant with new struggles. The external events alone, which are developing everywhere are of a magnitude, which history has never seen. This fact, that we are passing through a time of the greatest struggles, is by no means contradictory to the recognition of the fact of relative stabilisation in part of the capitalist world; on the contrary, this stabilisation must inevitably lead to mighty collisions.

The chief demand that we make to the imperialist Powers at the present moment is: **Peace!** Not that we reject all war on principle. There may be wars of a progressive nature. There are such things as wars which may end with the victory of the proletariat. As regards the imperialist war machinations however, which are now going on, we make the demand: peace, so that we may turn to account the precious time we still have left for the purpose of preparing the revolutionary movement. We must, throughout the capitalist world — and this is above all the task of the German Party — mobilise the masses of the working people against the war which is being waged by the imperialist Powers in China and which is being prepared against the Soviet Union.

We demand peace, but we are not afraid of war. On the day, when the world bourgeoisie makes up its mind to the great international collision between the forces of revolution and counter-revolution — and this collision will inevitably come one day — on the day when world imperialism points its weapons at the breast of the Russian revolution, we shall say to the chief representative of the international counter-revolution: Come on then, Sir! It is not the first time that intervention has been attempted against the proletarian dictatorship in Russia, against the shelter of the world revolution. Now the times are different. Now, we have far more allies in all the countries of the world. And now, we ourselves have learnt to fight better than we did. (Vociferous applause. Singing of the "International").

## Report by Comrade Thaelmann on the Political Situation and the Tasks of the C. P. G.

(Full Report.)

Comrades, the few weeks which have passed since the meeting of the Enlarged Executive have matured a number of significant occurrences which demonstrate the relativity of stabilisation in the present stage of the world revolution. These are:

1. The Fascist putsch in Lithuania.
2. The immense progress of the Chinese revolution.
3. The American assaults on Mexico and Nicaragua.
4. The formation of the Government of the bourgeois bloc in Germany.
5. England's threatening Note to Soviet Russia.

All these events show that both national and international dissensions are becoming more acute. They show the whole relativity, the restricted, contradictory character of the stabilisation. Capitalist stabilisation is no all-embracing, complete world phenomenon, but a partial stabilisation extending to a number of capitalist countries. In large sections of the world, there is no question of stabilisation. The Chinese revolution is the prelude of a general revolution of the suppressed peoples of the East against imperialism. At the Brussels Congress, at which 37 countries were represented by 174 delegates, we were made aware of its great significance for the proletarian world revolution. The Chinese revolution is in close alliance with the Soviet Union. The insurgent colonial peoples are the reserve army of the proletarian revolution. They strike at the strongest root of the world supremacy of imperialism. We proclaim our complete solidarity with the victorious Canton army, but above all with the young Chinese working class. (Applause.)

Our whole Party and the German working class as one man must do everything in their power to protect the Chinese revolution from the dangers which threaten it and to make possible its socialist development.

The greatest factor in the world which challenges capitalist stabilisation, is the **Soviet Union**.

Socialist construction has developed at a rapid pace. The last Conference of the Russian Central Executive Committee was able to record a number of facts which confirm the wisdom of the Leninist line taken by our brother Party in Russia. What we, in the German Party, heard from the Opposition, its pessimistic prophecies as to the economic difficulties of the Soviet Union, has been refuted by actual events.

To these two centres of power we must add a third factor, which threatens capitalist stabilisation from within — the **class struggle of the European and of the German proletariat in the period of relative stabilisation**. Thus a **triple alliance of revolutionary forces** comes into being: the first State of the proletarian dictatorship, the insurrection of the colonial peoples and the revolutionary fight of the European proletariat.

America, England and Germany are the centre of capitalist stabilisation. In **America**, we see that capitalism continues to develop in an ascending line.

The **world Empire of Britain**, it is true, is on the decline, but just for that reason the English bourgeoisie is making the most desperate and brutal efforts at stabilisation. For six months we experienced the most violent struggles which is an accompanying symptom of capitalist rationalisation.

### Imperialism and the Danger of War.

It may be said that even in the countries where capitalist stabilisation is most pronounced, it by no means implies a smooth path for capital. The internal antagonisms of world capital are not mitigated but intensified. This has been seen in various countries; the fight for markets is already assuming the form of serious imperialist conflicts. Since 1918, the danger of war has never been so imminent as at present.

We can recognise three large main groups.

1. The conflicts of the imperialist States among themselves. The most serious are at present in the Balkans, the Mediterranean and the Pacific.

2. The colonial fights of the imperialist robbers against the oppressed peoples of the whole world.

The third main line of attack of imperialism is directed against the **Union of Socialist Soviet Republics**. We must ask why the main line of the imperialist fights is directed against the Soviet Union? Because the proletarian dictatorship has con-

solidated itself in the last few years. World imperialism is afraid of the growing strength of the proletariat.

#### A Few Facts which Prove the Imminent Danger of War.

The Lithuanian military, putsch, the shell campaign of the German Social Democrats, Chamberlain's Note, only serve the purpose of preparing the attack against the Soviet Union. The imperialism of the whole world is engaged in a fight with the Soviet Union. Two views of life are wrestling with one another. The imperialists are not wholly united amongst themselves. They are wrestling with one another but against the Soviet Union they fight in common.

The geographical situation of Germany in itself involves Germany being drawn into a war against the Soviet Union. The whole policy of the German bourgeoisie, however, is steering further and further away from the Soviet Union. We see that France and England are making great concessions to the German bourgeoisie. At the moment, the negotiations for the commercial treaty between Germany and Poland are not yet concluded, and we see how England is intervening and is trying to remove the commercial difficulties between Germany and Poland. This interest of England in the commercial undertakings of the German bourgeoisie is intended to drive Germany completely into the front against the Soviet Union.

We must further recognise that it is not only the war technique which is decisive, but that the ideological influence on the masses at the outbreak of a war is of particular importance. To-day, just as in 1914, the 2nd International, the International of Social Democracy and the Amsterdam International are the chief factors of ideological influence on the working strata, especially on the proletariat.

We must prevent a repetition of August the 4th 1914, the day on which war took the masses by surprise and drove them to the slaughter.

For this reason we must concern ourselves with the theory of the 2nd International. In our theses we have already recorded Kautsky's attitude towards ultra-imperialism. In the journal "Die Gesellschaft" No. 5, 1926, Hilferding, the leading theorist of Social Democracy, writes as follows: "The war is over and its immediate effect has been to make it economically and politically impossible that there should be a fresh decision in the question of power between the leading capitalist States." Hilferding wrote this in 1926, when war was not only on the order of the day, but had already begun in China. The agreement between the 2nd International and the imperialist policy of the world bourgeoisie is concealed behind all these theories. In the colonial question, German Social Democracy also takes entirely the point of view of capitalism. It plays an important part in the ideological preparation for the war of intervention. The Social Democratic Press service writes:

"The Social Democrats have always taken this standpoint in our own fight against the Bolshevik work of destruction in the international Labour movement, and it would be neither logical nor honest if we were to take a different standpoint with regard to Chamberlain's accusations."

They agree completely with Chamberlain then. This is only one side of the campaign of intervention. Wels openly advocates intervention. Otto Bauer writes: "Hands off the Soviet Union!", but his real intention is to distract the workers from the actual policy of the 2nd International towards the Soviet Union. They denounce the Soviet Union as a "capitalist country", in order to deprive it of the sympathies of the workers.

The shell campaign against the Soviet Union can also be understood in this connection. Why does not Social Democracy direct its front against the national militia, so that this might be dissolved as the Communist Party demanded? Why did Social Democracy place the shell campaign in the foreground and use it in an attack on the Soviet Union, on the Communist Party and on the revolutionary proletariat? With the object of influencing ideologically the proletarian masses who are inclined to sympathise with the Soviet Union and of persuading them to support the imperialist policy of the S. P. of Germany. This is why Social Democracy resorts to the vilest and most cunning methods of deceiving the proletariat.

Maslov too conforms entirely with "Vorwärts" and with Social Democracy. In the latest documents, which are known as the "platform" even to the Party Conference, which was originally to have taken place in October and November, we can find some interesting parts which are in no way distinguished from the ideology and policy of Social Democracy.

In Germany, there is a compact front from the Communist Labour Party of Germany through Maslov and Social Democracy to General Hoffmann who, in a letter to the Americans, written on February 5th, says: "I also am convinced that the question of civilisation or Bolshevism will be fought out with arms. I hope, that when this day comes, my fatherland will be on the side of the civilised States. I shall do everything in my power to bring this about."

#### Our Chief International Tasks.

Our chief international tasks are as follows:

Firstly the fight against the danger of war. In this connection I would emphasise that we can only fulfil these tasks by strengthening our position to the utmost and that we shall only gain our point by relentless detail work, especially in the factories and trade unions and in the most important branches of industry, which will be decisive for the issue of war.

As regards the prevention of attempts at intervention against the Soviet Union, it is necessary that we should hinder any transport of arms.

Furthermore, it is important that we should make it known that at the outbreak of a war we should act on Leninist lines. We must combat the White Guardist fraud in every way, we must use all the means in our power to convert the imperialist war into a civil war. This should be the basis of our policy.

We should regard the defence of the Soviet Union against imperialist attacks as the second chief international task.

The third main task is the fight for international trade union unity.

As the fourth main international task, we have to take measures against international Fascism. The most important task as an international task is that against international Fascism, the weapon of the proletarian united front against Fascism in all countries, especially in Germany. We can only carry out these national tasks, which have an international character, if we recognise that this is only possible under the firm lead of the Communist International, the world party.

#### German Imperialism.

We have seen that the economic situation of the German proletariat in 1923 was the starting point of the consolidation of the German bourgeoisie, and from the moment when the proletariat was defeated in a revolutionary situation, begins the turning point of the political and economic development of the German bourgeoisie. From 1918 to 1923, Germany was a defeated country, occupied by hostile troops, in a condition of unprecedented oppression, when French imperialism had occupied the Ruhr district, and Germany was unable to carry on any independent policy. In that situation there was an entire absence of the objective prerequisites for an imperialist policy. This is why to-day the attitude of our Party to the national question is different from what it was then.

What is the great difference in German development? The change that took place between 1923 and 1926 is characterised by three special events; firstly the defeat of the German proletariat in October, secondly the stabilisation of the mark, thirdly the evacuation of the Ruhr district.

A new tendency in the economic development dates from that time. Capitalist concentration took the place of inflation concerns.

A further characteristic feature is the resumption of the export of capital. It is true that the statistics at our disposal are only estimates, but the estimate for 1926 already records the export of capital to the amount of 1.8 milliards in gold.

It is interesting to note the increasing participation of the State in capitalist industry. This is seen in the first place in the granting of State guarantees for export credits and in the participation of the State in credit banks.

The increased capability of the German apparatus of production however encounters the barriers of a shrunken world market. These difficulties in foreign markets have their counterpart in the difficulties in the home market and in the growing burden of reparations.

The gigantic unemployment is a living sign of the chronic crisis in German capitalism. In spite of the reduction of the costs of production and of capitalist concentration, the prices of goods are not reduced but increased.

The capitalists are increasing exports at the cost of the home market. With this object in view, they are introducing certain

measures against the working people. There is for instance a difference of 25% between the prices of some products in the foreign and home markets. All this drives German capitalism to a relentless exploitation of the working class. The whole process which is being carried on by the bourgeoisie shows that exploitation is being intensified. The intensity of work has been increased by 30, 50, nay even 100%. In mining there is an increase of 131% in proportion to pre-war times, in the steel industry of 129.5%. Productivity has increased as much as this per head.

Another question in connection with capitalist rationalisation is the change of technique in production and a social re-grouping in the works. Capitalism is trying to introduce large numbers of women and juveniles into the factories in order to beat wages still more. I will give one example which will make the situation clear to every comrade. In 1907, one third of the female population was working for pay, in 1925 as much as half of the female population was doing so.

Our tasks with regard to the **organisation of women in factories and trade unions** and the questions of work among women in general are still awaiting solution.

As regards the exploitation of the youth, I need not go into details. Comrades! The result of the economic and political development is the bourgeois bloc which did not spring up in a single night, but is the political expression of a number of factors in our development. The significance of the formation of this Government, however, is further intensified by the seriousness of the present political situation as a whole. First of all the fact that the antagonisms between the capitalist parties, which only a year ago and in the period since the Dawes scheme were expressed in the question of protective tariffs, in the question "republic or monarchy" and in other things, are, to a large extent, removed. Secondly the transition of the German National militia to England's policy which is hostile to the Soviet Union; thirdly the commencement of a fresh attack on the standard of living of the German working class.

The bourgeois Bloc is the government of the strong hand which will in the next few months ruthlessly beat down the beginnings of the Labour struggles. The political reaction which is showing its head in Germany to-day, is already distinctly noticeable in various spheres; in the cutting down of the whole social policy, in the liquidation of the last remnants of the November revolution, which has already been begun, in the cultural reaction, in the shameful verdicts of the national courts of justice which place our communist literature outside the law. The Hindenburg Government is aiming at **prohibiting our Communist Party**. We must do everything we can to prevent that.

At the 11th Party Conference we must say that our legality as a party is not guaranteed by any "Democracy" or Constitution, but by how strongly we are rooted in the working class, how far we are in a position to mobilise the proletarian masses in the defence of their interests.

The German bourgeoisie has allies with whose help it is carrying out its political aims. On the one side, the Fascist unions are adding to their strength. The "Steel Helmet" day on May 7th and 8th should not be underrated, and if the Steel Helmets come to Berlin, the Red masses of Berlin will show the Fascists that they know how to play the man. (Bravo!)

The S. P. of Germany is undoubtedly another main support of the German bourgeoisie. German Social Democracy is supporting the consolidation of the capitalist power in Germany. It might be said that the S. P. of Germany is the party of capitalist stabilisation. In every question we should carry on a fierce campaign against Social Democracy.

The Social Democratic leadership will tend to develop more and more towards the Right. The more recent expressions of opinion of leading Social Democrats are characteristic of this.

The fundamental contradiction in the policy of the Social Democratic Party is however that, on the one hand, in order to support the policy of the bourgeoisie, it dare not lose its influence on the masses, while, on the other hand, in order not to lose its influence over the masses, it dare not sail openly under the flag of the bourgeoisie. The more sharply these class contradictions in Germany, which show themselves in rationalisation, are thrown into relief, the deeper will be this fundamental contradiction in Social Democratic policy.

It seems to me that it is necessary to characterise the Left leaders of the S. P. of Germany. We state that the Left leaders are in essentials entirely in agreement with the party leaders

and their policy. They approve of the League of Nations' policy, of the imperialist policy, of the theory of industrial Democracy and of the attitude towards international trade union unity, thus, in essentials, they approve of the policy of the leaders. But, comrades, many workers will ask: Why then a Left S. P. of Germany? Because the Social Democratic workers are driven into opposition by the intensification of the class contradictions. The Left Social Democrats are trying to erect a barrier over which the Social Democratic workers will not join the Communist Party, and that is why this policy is dangerous. We must particularly call the attention of the workers to the fact that the strength of the Left Social Democratic leaders lies in their knowing how to put into words the radical attitude of the workers of the real Opposition whilst they carry out all the practical activities of the party leaders.

What should be the line and the direction, comrades, of our fight against the whole S. P. of Germany?

The first essential is, on this occasion, to show up the bourgeois character of the S. P. of Germany in every sphere, especially its role as an imperialist party.

#### Our Relation to the Social Democratic Workers.

We must carry on a relentless fight for the purpose of unmasking the Social Democratic leaders, for the purpose of driving them out of the Labour movement. This is our chief task.

Much has changed in the Party in the methods of the fight against the S. P. of Germany since the time of the Open Letter. Before the Open Letter, there existed a certain fisticuffs policy. To-day, following the line of the Open Letter, we see a decided turn towards a policy of objective discussion of matters with the Social Democratic workers. That, however, is by no means enough. We need more than that, we need in our own ranks a conviction of the importance of trade union work. The greatest weakness of our policy is still in this sphere. On the other hand we must avoid behaving as though we placed the Social Democratic worker on a level with the Communists, in applying the tactics of the united front. They are indeed our class brothers, but they are in error, they have a false ideology, they have been led astray by the Social Democratic leaders; we will however teach them — not with clubs, but by friendly persuasion.

#### The Fight against the Left Leaders of the S. P. of Germany.

Secondly, we must carry on a most intense fight against the Left Social Democratic leaders, because they cover the treachery of their party by their sham opposition. The first time we, in Germany succeeded in achieving real success in a fundamental form against the Left S. P. of Germany, even in a difficult situation, was during the election campaign in Saxony. In addition to this, by voting for the Social Democratic Prime Minister in Saxony, we made it impossible for the Left leaders of the S. P. of Germany to declare that the Communists had the Government of the bourgeois Bloc in Saxony on their conscience because they had not voted for the Social Democratic Prime Minister.

#### Deviations to the Right.

On the other side, we see great weaknesses. Those in Mecklenburg have already been pointed out. Still worse than Mecklenburg is the mistake made by the Communists in Hessen-Frankfurt at the election of President Friedensburg where they abstained from voting without any reason, at the election of the President of the Government. Just with regard to the Left S. P. of Germany, our task is, not to build on the basis of the illusions of the Social Democratic workers, as for instance Brandler put it at the Leipzig Party Conference, but to abolish these illusions in an obstinate fight, drawing a sharp line of demarcation between ourselves and the S. P. of Germany.

#### The Labour Opposition in the S. P. of Germany.

The third main task which is of great importance in connection with our fight against the S. P. of Germany, is our attitude towards the proletarian Opposition in the S. P. of Germany. We can enumerate the stages of development of this proletarian Opposition:

1. The majority of the workers' delegation to Soviet Russia consisted of Social Democratic workers.

2. 137 workers of the S.P. of Germany took part in the Congress of the workers.

3. The split in the Berlin Young Workers' League shows the strength of the Opposition there.

4. The opposition in the "Reichsbanner", which is still weak, but exists in places.

5. The movement for a united front, which finds expression in the formation of various committees for unity, in the trade union opposition, in the Russia committees.

In this domain, we have by no means fulfilled our tasks. This opposition is already convinced of the correctness of our policy in certain questions, for instance in our judgement with regard to Soviet Russia, in the question of imperialism and of international trade union unity.

We must win over this Labour Opposition in every question, we must try, by the greatest variety of methods to promote their activities. On this occasion, I can only give a few fundamental ideas:

1. **Direct approach** to workers of the Opposition, wherever we meet them;

2. **Getting into touch** in every possible way in individual places, industrial districts and, if possible, rural districts;

3. **Developing the organisatory connection** with the workers of the Opposition over the heads of the Left and Right leaders of the S.P. of Germany.

4. Our Press must find the right tone for winning over these workers of the S.P. of Germany.

Finally, the district leaders and all workers in the factories must carefully observe such tendencies, as they are of great significance for the growth of the Communist movement.

#### Revolutionary Work in the Trade Unions.

Our political work in the trade unions is connected with this. The greatest source of the vital strength of Social Democracy is its great influence in the trade unions and the factories. We must break this influence if we would lead the workers into the fight. What did we do in the English miners' fight? Could we mobilise the masses alone without a firmly established influence in the trade unions? The comrades in the Ruhr district can tell a tale of the efforts we made to get the workers out of the factories, but the influence of our comrades in the factories and trade unions was still too insignificant. The struggle between the S.P. of Germany and the C.P. of Germany will be decided in the free trade unions. It is necessary to declare that the future of the German revolution depends on the issue of this enormously hard fight. Just in the present period of stabilisation an added significance attaches to the trade unions, because they are the widest and most elementary mass organisation of the German proletariat.

#### Against Economic Democracy and in Favour of the Class Struggle.

In the journal of the A. D. G. B., Nr. 51, 1926, it is stated:

"Democratic collaboration in the State and in economics alone and not a fight for a share in the results of labour, in profit, will make the total economy serviceable to the general well-being of mankind."

This means that, instead of fighting against the capitalist economy, which is out for profits, they advocate co-operating in capitalist economy. The A. D. G. B. is now making propaganda for an economic democracy against the class struggle! And that just when the question of a fight for wages will be playing a very prominent part in the immediate future!

The S.P. of Germany is in favour of capitalist stabilisation.

In the question of hours of work also, the trade union bureaucracy is even in favour of economics based on over-time.

We see, however, that the year 1927 offers great possibilities of really enlisting the workers in decisive economic struggles. Taking all in all, it can be said that in the first half of 1927 about three or four million workers will be drawn into the wages movement. This means that if the Party were a force in the trade unions, we could introduce great difficulties into the present process of relative stabilisation.

#### Work among the Middle Classes.

In work among the middle classes we have points of contact in a great variety of fields, for instance in the question of the burden of taxation, in the question of the raising of rents etc. In the same way we have succeeded in gaining influence among

the peasants, whose economic situation is rendered more difficult by the pressure of taxation.

#### The General Line of our Policy.

In the future, the daily struggles of the German workers must be the centre point of our whole activity. On no account of course, must we forget the general lines of our Party. They consist above all in a **correct application of the tactics of the united front** with the object of winning over the majority of the working class in Germany, of organising a defensive fight, of organising the proletarian revolution. In Germany, we have real reason to anticipate great proletarian mass fights. The working class is becoming radicalised. The influence of the Social Democratic leaders is being forced into the background step by step. Broad strata of the workers are coming over to Communism in various ways.

We cannot achieve our task unless we keep our political line free from all opportunist deviations. This is why we carry on such a vast and hard fight against all non-Bolshevist tendencies and groups within our Party. I repeat that, had the ultra-Lefts been victorious in this fight, the largest Communist Party in Western Europe would to-day be an instrument in the hands of the enemies of Soviet Russia. We shall never of course make any concessions to the Right side or to Right tendencies, even when we have carried to a successful end the fight against the ultra-Left deviations. The experiences through which the German Party has passed, belong to the straight course of Bolshevik development. The year 1923 taught us its lessons. The discussions which have taken place since in the Party, have brought it on to a higher level and have made our functionaries realise the importance of applying the tactics of the united front. The tactics of the united front applied in 1923 developed into a coalition policy with Social Democracy.

Ruth Fischer and Maslov made other political mistakes. They did not apply the tactics of the united front at all, but struck out a course which concealed its passivity under sham radical slogans. We maintain that the tactics of the united front do not mean giving up our communist point of view, do not mean liquidating the Communist Party in favour of Social Democracy, but that, on the contrary, they are a method of winning over the masses for the tasks of the revolution and for the highest display of their activities.

The Party Conference must be held under the banner of two general tasks, firstly that of the **internal consolidation of the Party**, secondly that of the winning of the German working class by the Communist Party. This fight must develop between us and Social Democracy; it is entering on an acute stage.

Our task must be to create new cadres, to train new functionaries, to fill our Party with fresh and vigorous blood, so as to strengthen our vanguard, for we can in no way carry out our great tasks with those sections of the workers which at present belong to us.

We must exercise **ruthless self-criticism** in order to draw the practical conclusions for the right application of our policy. The Party as a whole must learn and think and feel with the working masses and must act with and for them.

Strenuous collective work is necessary both among the leaders of the Party and in its subordinate management. Not only the Communists, but the whole German proletariat must be convinced of the correctness of our policy.

When the "Westminster Gazette" writes that Germany is the firmest bulwark against Bolshevism, it seems to me we should learn from the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie does not discuss, but acts against the revolution. The German Party must defeat the enemy, the bourgeoisie and Social Democracy and must make Germany the firmest bulwark of Bolshevism.

If we wish to be the advance guard of the proletariat, if we wish to fulfil our task in history, we must show, even between two waves of revolution, that we are able to inspire the proletariat with courage and faith in its own strength — even in the present stage of development when there is no prospect of the proletarian dictatorship being on the order of the day either to-day or to-morrow. Let us show more courage within our own ranks! Let us display more activity within our own ranks! And when the Party Conference is over, away with discussions within the Party! Forwards, into new life, into new work, in the interest of the victory of the German proletarian revolution! (Vociferous applause.)



## Report by Comrade Dengel on the Work of the C. P. G. since the X. Party Conference.

(Full Report.)

In the first place we must compare the demands presented to the German Communist Party in the form of the Open Letter, with what has actually been done by the German Party with a view to carrying out these demands.

### The Party's relations to the Comintern

have changed. By serious work we have come to recognise and have made plain to the Party, that the unworthy attempts of persons like Maslow and Ruth Fischer to drive a wedge between the German Communist Party and the Comintern, must needs lead to the ruin of the former. We have explained this to the Party, and I believe that the great majority of the German Party fully recognises it. The tremendous tasks with which the German Communist Party is faced cannot be solved save on the basis of Leninism. We know very well, comrades, that any attempt at creating a so-called West-European Communism will but lead to the camp of reformism. We are aware that in the German Party such attempts are by no means new; it was Levi and his adherents that first made this experiment of a West-European Communism. Levi ended in the Social Democratic Party. In the French Communist Party, again, it was Souvarine, Frossard, and others, that made the same attempt. Often such opportunist experiments are disguised in a sham radical garb.

I believe that the relations between the German Communist Party and the Comintern show more clearly than all else that the sham revolutionary garb is flimsy and will tear at the slightest breath of wind. I believe the German Party has finally come to recognise this fact. And those who to-day still adhere to Ruth Fischer and Maslow, and who therefore stand outside the Party, who still consider these as their leaders, I should like to confront with the words used by Zinoviev in his speech in connection with the preparation of the Open Letter, when he said that the very assertion that the Executive, the leadership of the Leninist World Party wished to push the World Party to the Right, was in itself an act of treachery.

I believe that what Zinoviev then said still fully and wholly applies at the present time. The attempts now made on the part of the Opposition — tendencies introduced from without — to cast suspicion on the Comintern of an inclination to the Right, of a depreciatory attitude towards Leninism, of a substitution of Stalinism for Leninism — all such attempts, inciting the members of the Party as they do, are and can be nothing else than treason against the Comintern.

Under the same head I must mention the relations between the German Communist Party and its brother parties. You all know how, in her insane self-conceit, Ruth Fischer attempted to speak contemptuously of our brother parties in Western Europe, of our comrades in Great Britain, in France, and so forth. She was three days in England and on her return she said to her friends: "If I could have the English Party in my hands for three weeks, I should make a real Communist Party out of it." Such megalomania as this characterises the attitude of these people towards our brother parties. It not only proves the despicable nature of the attitude as such, but also that they have grasped nothing of Leninism, of the revolutionary struggle. I believe that the attitude towards our brother parties, too, has changed and has become truly brotherly. In this respect the German Party has, I think, fairly well fulfilled its task.

Now to the second point, to

### Democracy within the Party.

As regards the conduct of the Party, the preconditions for inner-Party democracy, have been fulfilled, not to a hundred, but to 95 per cent. Perhaps the one or the others will say this is not true. It is a well-known fact that the ultra-Left make just this item the subject of their most violent attacks on the Party administration, affirming that we have, not only once, but constantly, violated Party Democracy. Well, you all know, that in connection with the reorganisation of the Party on a basis of factory nuclei, we thoroughly discussed all political questions

in the latter. We visited every single nucleus and attempted to get the participation of all comrades, and to have their decisions in these matters. When was such a thing done before in the history of the Party? Only the other day, a group of members of the Opposition attempted to submit to us a resolution directed against the alleged misuse of the factory nuclei. It is naturally easier, Comrades of the Opposition, to submit a few questions in a demagogic manner in a great assembly, without drilling into the heads of our comrades what is the real issue. That would be Ruth Fischer's way of doing it. A dazzling outside effect, but no real work. (Applause.) We penetrated into the nuclei, and are proud that it was just in Berlin that this work was done most thoroughly. (Applause.) We are proud of having employed all our efforts, the entire Party apparatus, as you would say, for the purpose of penetrating into the nuclei with a view to winning the comrades, by means of persistent work, for the policy of the Party.

I believe that this is an achievement of internal Party Democracy, such as is requisite. I must admit, comrades, that so very pronounced a measure of this inner-Party Democracy has not yet been effected throughout the Party, a fact which may be explained by the weakness of the Party organisation.

You know very well that it is only in some of the districts that the establishment of factory nuclei has been seriously carried out; in a great part of the districts, including important industrial towns, this task has not yet been completely fulfilled. In the Ruhr district, in the Lower Rhine region, and in the district of Halle and Merseburg, the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei has only just been commenced. It is obvious that just there, where the Party is still devoid of this Bolshevik basis of organisation, this task of establishing the internal Party Democracy could naturally not be carried out in the same measure, as has, e. g., been done in Berlin. As regards the bringing of new forces of workers, there is still much to be desired in the German Party. We still confine ourselves too much to the staff of functionaries we now possess. Far too few new workers are brought in from the ranks of the Party, and far too little new working forces are brought into the Party. We need a great stock of new working forces. We have not yet found the right way, nor have you in the factories found the right way, and herein lies one of the most important tasks, the solution of which will have to be taken seriously in hand.

As regards the demand in the Open Letter that the Party recruit the best forces of the former Opposition for its own purposes, the Party leadership has sincerely endeavoured to fulfil this behest to the full. We understand, nay, we know very well, that in a whole series of districts this task has not yet been definitely carried through. This may be explained as due to certain restrictions, to a certain weakness, with which the Party is still encumbered from former times. It is essential — and this must be reiterated most emphatically — that these limitations be overcome.

We are forced, moreover, to work with administrative means. We have, however, employed not only administrative means, but have attempted, to the very limits of our patience, to retain comrades in the Party by means of persuasion, when they already stood with both feet outside our Party borders. (Cries of: "Very true".) At the last moment, when the C. C. was already occupied with the question of the expulsion of Urbahns, Schwan, and Scholem from the Party, we still stretched out the hand to these former comrades, so that even Weber tried to persuade them to accept our conditions. And what did we demand of these comrades? We demanded that they should recognise Party discipline. You know that a Communist Party cannot exist if it does not recognise this Leninist Party discipline. You know that a party must needs be dismembered and destroyed if this discipline is not carried out. We are neither a bourgeois nor a Social Democratic party, in which the most heterogeneous elements can find accommodation. You know that the task of organising revolutionary struggle and of preparing for revolution can only be effected by a party which is united, by a party which acknowledges a leadership, elected at a party conference. Comrades, it is only in cases when former comrades have in their political opinions completely abandoned the standpoint of the Comintern, as was, e. g., the case in regard to Schwarz and Korsch, that we separated from such former comrades. Only in cases, when comrades committed one breach of discipline after another, when comrades sought to vilify and befoul the Party, have we had recourse to administrative means.



I do not wish to say that mistakes have not occurred in the employment of such means. In connection with mistakes of this kind, the C. C. has several times been obliged to intervene, so as to make good the errors committed in certain districts. But speaking in general, and also as concerns the work done in the districts, the Party has endeavoured to maintain its unity with a very minimum of administrative measures.

Now as regards the question of Party education. In certain questions of party education, the Party has done its duty, inasmuch as the Party has really adopted the method of carrying all important and momentous political questions into the last factory nucleus. Never before could it be recorded in the Party that important discussions found a participation of from 30 to 40 per cent. of the membership. That is party education; it is, indeed, the most effective form of party education. We must not cease in this method of not only putting forward political questions in eloquent terms at big assemblies, but rather of carrying them into the factory nuclei, where the actual majority of the Party can be personally confronted therewith. But as regards the particular questions of party education, the tasks to be solved by the Agitprop department, we cannot be said to have done our duty. It is only quite recently that this work has made more satisfactory progress. It is only quite of late that systematic activity has been commenced in this regard. The C. C. has resolved that for the first time for many years, a Party school be opened on April 1st. (Cheers.) We shall try to institute a second such Party school in the autumn.

#### The Tactics of the United Front.

In regard to the carrying out of united front tactics, three separate groups of errors must be distinguished. In the first place, we have paid far too little attention to the movement within the German Socialist Party, the trade unions, and the factories. One of the greatest weaknesses of the Party, which still exists at the present time, is the fact that we are still far too abstract as regards our agitation. A yet greater weakness is that of standardisation. (Cries of: "Very true!") Instead of lively penetration, and instead of the adoption of united front tactics in the individual districts, we make the mistake of transferring the general campaigns of the Party, in some cases quite schematically, from one district to the other. In the same connection, our Press treats the trade-union question in an extremely step-motherly fashion. ("Very true!")

The second group of mistakes consists in the fact that in the Party, and even in such circles thereof as are at present supporting the standpoint of the Party majority, there are still grave obstacles to a united front policy, obstacles which have remained to us from the past. This, too, must be avowed quite openly. I need only call to mind that a relatively large percentage of comrades capable of organisation, are not yet organised in the trade unions, and that even among the comrades who voted in favour of the C. C. there were a number who were frankly sceptical in regard to the united front tactics.

The basis of these tactics must continue to consist in brotherly and comrade-like relations between Social Democratic and Communist workers, in spite of all existing differences and of the necessity of expressing them clearly and openly.

A third source of danger for the united-front tactics lies in the opportunist way in which these tactics are applied. Last year we saw to our great regret that very many of our factory councils in the factories acted in anything but a Communist or revolutionary spirit.

Numerous opportunist errors were committed in our municipal councils. This is to be explained by the fact that a great many of our comrades have failed to recognise that the carrying out of united front tactics is liable to harm the Party in the long run, if a complete, pronounced, and lasting separation from the Social Democratic Party is not observed in this connection.

In the same sense, serious mistakes have also on occasion occurred in certain provincial diets. Mecklenburg is a case in point. The Communist fraction in that country is partly responsible for the mistakes and crimes of which the coalition Government of Mecklenburg is guilty against the proletariat. For some months the Government found support in the attitude of the Communists, who thus debased themselves to a compromising Coalition policy. The C. C. of the Party did not for a moment hesitate to disavow to the whole Party this opportunist attitude of the local leadership and of the fraction in the diet. This attitude in Mecklenburg, which is also to be observed in the new formation of the Government, is an outcome of the general

weakness of the Party. Nor is this opportunist policy a thing of to-day, since in the past, too, the Party often failed to dissociate itself sufficiently from the Social Democratic Party.

We can cite another example to show how harmful such an opportunist policy may be for the Party. This is the case of Lubeck, where we consequently suffered a defeat at the elections.

Nor should I omit to mention the outcome of the elections in Thuringia; for there, too, deviations occurred among our comrades which must certainly be designated as Right deviations.

I now come to speak of the great campaign carried out by our Party, the campaign for the

#### Expropriation of the former Reigning Families.

What were the good aspects of this campaign? They consist in the fact that for the first time in Germany, a big strategic manoeuvre of united front tactics was carried out. You are aware that, when first this question came up in December, the "Vorwärts" turned against it and attempted to ridicule it in the eyes of the Social Democratic workers. That has not been forgotten. The second matter of importance was the fact that we did not lose a moment in stressing our independence of the Social Democratic Party. It was in common with the Social Democratic workers that we wished to carry through the measures in question, not with the Social Democratic leaders. And it is perhaps our greatest achievement that, in spite of the resistance of the Social Democratic leaders, we succeeded in bringing about common action in thousands of places between the Communist and the Social Democratic workers. I believe, moreover, that we have succeeded, for more than the present moment, in realising at least a partial approach between Communist and Social Democratic workers, such as is necessary if we are to find any power or possibility at all to exercise effective influence on the Social Democratic workers.

There are also drawbacks to this campaign. We know that after the heavy reverses of October and the serious economic defeats suffered in 1924, the movement greatly receded in the factories, while the morale of the workers in the factories decreased pronouncedly. Well, in this campaign we had the opportunity to resume factory meetings in a great number of concerns. Of this opportunity the Party made insufficient use. Another mistake lay in our failure to exploit this campaign for the purpose of strengthening the organisation of our Party. Finally, Comrades, we failed to form an adequate connection between this action of ours for the expropriation of the former reigning houses and the mobilisation of large masses of workers on the one hand, and our general political tasks on the other, chief among them the mobilisation of the workers for an economic offensive.

My next point is the

#### Congress of Workers.

The main object of the congress of the workers lay in the attempt to maintain the united front existing in the question of the expropriation of the princes, to extend it, and to develop it into a united front in economic questions as well. An attempt had to be made to continue the fight for expropriation in the form of a fight against capitalist stabilisation. Comrades, you will be glad to hear that we have succeeded partially at least in the realisation of this aim.

We must, however, have no illusions in regard to the weaknesses revealed on the occasion of the congress in question. On the other hand, if we look at the bright side of things, we can congratulate ourselves on having succeeded, for the first time, in interesting broad sections of the middle classes, the small peasants, etc., in this congress.

A few words on the

#### Elections in Saxony.

After the Saxon elections, we declared our willingness to tolerate a Social Democratic minority Government provided that the party in question would put through a programme at least somewhat in conformity with the demands of the Communists. Without even waiting for these stipulations to be accepted, we were willing to elect a Social Democratic Prime Minister. I must say I believe these tactics to have been altogether correct. Had we from the very start pursued a different policy, in which connection certain mistakes were made by some comrades of the Political Bureau, we should only have made it easier for the Social Democratic Party to carry out their manoeuvre with regard to the Social Democratic workers and to prepare the way which the Left Social Democracy is actually about to pursue, the way leading to the Great Coalition.

Comrade Heckert will not only outline our tasks for the future in connection with the trade unions, but will also enter into the work of the Party in this connection in the past. In this point, too, it must be remarked — and Comrade Thälmann will corroborate this — that the Party is still far from having fulfilled the tasks set forth in the Open Letter. Suffice it for me to state, that the Party Conference must really represent a very serious call to trade-union work. The un-Bolshevist and un-Leninist attitude observed towards trade-union work must come to an end.

Let me also say a few words on the subject of

#### Work among the Unemployed.

We have been reproached by the Opposition for having acted in an opportunist sense in regard to the question of work among the unemployed. The resolutions of November 1925 show that from the very beginning the leadership of the Party demanded that wherever there are unemployed the Party must make an attempt to get the leadership of the unemployed movement into its own hands. And, indeed, the Party set itself energetically to this task, particularly towards the end of 1925 and early in 1926. It was a matter of necessity that the Party had to push forward the biggest districts in the matter of the leadership of the unemployment movement. But the attitude of the Party in this connection cannot be said to have been wrong from the very beginning. This is shown quite plainly by the resolutions of November.

Next to the problem of

#### Work among the Peasantry.

The Communist Parties in Western Europe, which have grown out of the Social Democratic Parties, were very slow in taking in hand the problem of agitation in the open country. In Germany, too, it was most unsystematically and, we may even say, dilettantishly, that the Communist Party first took up agitation among the smaller and middling peasant farmers. We attempted last year to put a greater degree of system into this work. The work is still in its initial stage, but its general directives are good. The defeat of Fascism, which is bound to come one day, should not be left exclusively to the industrial workers. We need the support of the open country. In face of this serious fact, it is necessary that the districts should occupy themselves more with this question.

As regards our work among the middle classes, it is as yet of an extremely sporadic nature and greatly dependent on chance. By a consistent and systematic policy, quite especially in the Parliaments, we must show these classes that in the process of their proletarianisation they have only one possible support, viz., the Communist Party.

As for our municipal policy, the Party is guilty of numerous mistakes in the matter of united front tactics in relation to the middle classes, in regard to which our policy will certainly have to be pursued far more consistently in future.

I come now to my final point, i. e. the

#### Problem of Party Organisation.

From five to ten thousand new Communist workers might very well be gained for the Party every month in all the 28 districts. We must absolutely secure a footing in the big factories, for there we have the heart and the great majority of the working class. We must do our level best to systematise and develop our work in the big concerns and to display the greatest energy just in that direction.

I believe it may be said in general that the time that has elapsed since the receipt of the Open Letter has been a time full of lessons for the Communist Party in Germany. We have made an attempt to overcome the serious mistakes made by the Party in the past, whether they were of a Right or of an ultra-Left nature. The chief reason of these mistakes lay in the fact that, as we can frankly say to-day, our time was mainly taken up by our struggle against those who were out to spoil the Party. For many months three quarters or four fifths of our work had to be devoted to this purpose.

But the present Party Conference, which will show to the world the united strength of the German Communist Party, and will speak a strong word against all those who may still intend in the future to continue their disruptive activity in the Party will also give the Party leaders strength to overcome the obstacles still existing and to develop the energy requisite for the realisation of the Party's aims. (Prolonged and vociferous applause.)

## TEN YEARS AGO

### A Lecture on the February Revolution given by Lenin in Zürich.

*The following extract of a lecture delivered by Comrade Lenin in Zurich shortly before his departure for Russia was published in the Zurich "Volksrecht" on March 31st and April 1st 1917. The Lenin Institute comments on the printed extract as follows:*

*The style of the report printed by the "Volksrecht" compels us to reject the idea that it represents the usual notes of a reporter. On the contrary, the exactness and the sharp outlines of the political characterisation, the clearness of the main idea, the concentration of the representation and the strict formulation of the tasks of the day lead us to the conclusion that the report was either sketched by Lenin himself or that the "Volksrecht" took it from detailed notes on the lecture written by Lenin himself.*

*Ed.*

The most important precondition for the "miracle" of the overthrow of the Government in Russia was the "great insurrection" of 1905 to 1907, which was so meanly soiled by the present-day masters of the situation, the Gutchkovs and Miljukovs who are now rejoicing over the "glorious revolution" in 1917. If the revolution of 1905 had not dug up the soil, if it had not opened the eyes of all the classes and parties concerned and revealed to them the whole barbarity and savageness of the Tsarist bands, a speedy victory would have been impossible in 1917.

This extraordinary coincidence of conditions made it possible in 1917 to unite all the blows which were aimed at Tsarism by the different social forces.

Firstly: Anglo-French financial capital which is supreme throughout the world and which plunders the world, was against the revolution in 1905 and helped Tsarism to stifle it. (The milliard loan in 1906!) Now, it has taken an active part in the revolution by organising the attack of the Gutchkov and Miljukovs and of the upper strata of the military in order to de-throne Nicholas II.

From the standpoint of world politics and of international financial capital, the Gutchkov and Miljukov Government is simply a clerk in the bank of England, and France, a means for prolonging the imperialist slaughter of the peoples.

Secondly: The defeats of the Tsarist Monarchy made a clean sweep of the staff of officers and created new, young, bourgeois cadres.

Thirdly: The whole Russian bourgeoisie which, between 1905 and 1914 and especially between 1914 and 1917 has rapidly become organised, joined with the aristocracy in fighting against the decaying Tsarism in the desire to enrich itself by plundering Armenia, Constantinople, Galicia etc.

Fourthly and finally — and this is the most important point: a deep and rushing proletarian movement joined the imperialist forces. The proletariat made this revolution, it demanded, peace, bread and freedom. It had nothing in common with the imperialist bourgeoisie and it carried with it the majority of the army which of course consists of workers and peasants!

The transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war has begun. This is the source of the ambiguous character of this revolution, which is the first stage of the first revolution born of imperialist war.

The Government of Gutchkov and Miljukov, the Government of Junkers and capitalists, cannot give the people peace, bread, nor freedom. It is a Government for carrying on the predatory war, which openly declares that it will be loyal to the international treaties concluded by the Tsar. These treaties are predatory treaties. This Government could, at the best postpone the crisis, but it is incapable of freeing the country from starvation. It is not even capable of giving us freedom, however much it may promise it; for it is closely related to the interests of the aristocratic landowners and the capitalists.

For this reason, it would be the most stupid thing we could do to adopt the tactics of confidence in and support of this Government in the alleged interest of the "fight against reaction". For such a fight, the arming of the proletariat is the only serious, the most actual guarantee both against the Tsarist counter-revolution and against the attempts of the Gutchkovs and Miljukovs to restore the monarchy.

Skobelev, the Social Democratic deputy, was quite right when he said that Russia "is on the eve of the second actual revolution". The organisation of this revolution exists. This is the **Council of the Delegates of the Workers and Soldiers**, which has not been maligned for nothing by the agents of Anglo-French capital, the correspondents of the "Times" and the "Temps".

After a close examination of the news given us by the Press about the Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates, we can observe, that there are three tendencies among them. The first tendency is most closely allied to Social Patriotism. It has confidence in Kerensky, the Minister of Justice, that hero of the spoken word, a peasant in the hands of Gutchkov and Miljukov. He is not grudging with empty phrases in the spirit of the Social patriots and social pacifists of Western Europe. As a matter of fact however, he is "reconciling" the workers to the prolongation of the predatory war. The imperialist bourgeoisie speaks to the workers through the mouth of Kerensky as follows: we are giving you the republic and the eight hour day (which has actually been introduced in St. Petersburg), we promise you all kinds of liberties, but all in order that you may help us to rob Turkey and Austria, to snatch its prey from German imperialism, and on the other hand, to ensure Anglo-French imperialism its prey.

Another tendency is represented by our Party, that of the **Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Russia**. An extract from the manifesto of our Party has been published in the papers. The manifesto appeared in St. Petersburg on March 18th. It puts forward the following demands: a democratic republic, the eight hour day, confiscation of the lands of the aristocracy for the benefit of the peasants, confiscation of the grain reserves, that peace negotiations be immediately started, not by the Government of Gutchkov and Miljukov but by the Council of Workers' and Peasants' Delegates. According to the words of the manifesto, this Council is the real, revolutionary Government. (The correspondents of the "Times" and the "Temps" always speak of two Governments in Russia). Peace negotiations should be carried on, not with the bourgeois Governments, but with the proletariat of all the countries at war. The manifesto calls upon all workers, peasants and soldiers to send delegates to the Delegates' Council.

These are the only possible socialist and revolutionary tactics.

The third tendency is represented by Tcheidse and his friends. They are constantly vacillating, which is also reflected in the verdicts of the "Times" and the "Temps", which either praise or blame. When Tcheidse refused to join the second provisional Government, when he declared the war to be an imperialist war, he was carrying on a proletarian policy, but when Tcheidse takes part in the first Government (Duma Committee), when, in point 3 of his appeal, he demands that the representatives of the Russian workers should take an adequate share in the Government (participation of the internationalists in the Government of the imperialist war!), when, in common with Skobelev, he calls upon this imperialist Government to enter on peace negotiations (instead of declaring to the workers that the bourgeoisie is bound hand and foot to the interests of financial capital and that it is not able to detach itself from imperialism), when Tcheidse's friends, Tuljakov and Skobelev, commissioned by the Government of Gutchkov and Miljukov, travel about in order to calm the soldiers who are revolting against the Liberal bourgeois Generals (murder of Admiral Repenin), then Tcheidse and his friends are carrying on the worst policy of the bourgeoisie and are injuring the revolution.

What tactics should the proletariat adopt? We are at the transition from the first stage of the revolution to the second, from the revolt against Tsarism to a revolt against the bourgeoisie, against imperialist war, in the transition to the Convention which may develop out of the Constituent Assembly, when the Government actually keeps its promise and summons the Assembly.

Our special task at the present moment is that of **organising the proletariat**. But not in the stereotyped form of organisation, which satisfies the traitors to socialism, the social patriots, the opportunists in all countries, but in the form of **revolutionary organisation**. This organisation is first of all to be a general one and secondly it is to unite in itself the **military and State functions**.

Marx teaches us from the experience of the Commune of 1871 that "the working class cannot simply take possessions of the finished machine of State and set it in motion for its own purposes". The proletariat should and must break this machine (army, police, bureaucracy). This is what the opportunists either deny or hush up. This is the **most important practical lesson of the Commune and of the Russian revolution of 1905**.

We are distinguished from the anarchists in that we recognise the necessity of the State for the revolutionary upheaval. We are distinguished from the opportunists and Kautskyans in that we say: we do not need a "finished" machinery of State, as it exists in the Democratic bourgeois Republics, but the **direct power of armed and organised workers**. That is the State that we need. That is what were in essentials the Commune of 1871 and the **Council of Workers' Delegates in Russia in 1905 and 1917**. We must continue to build on this foundation.

Our conditions of peace are as follows: 1. The Council of Workers' Delegates, as a revolutionary Government declares at once that it will not hold itself bound by any treaties made by Tsarism and by the bourgeoisie; 2. it will at once make public all these predatory treaties; 3. it publicly proposes an immediate armistice to all those at war; 4. as the basis of peace: the liberation of all colonies and of all oppressed nations; 5. a declaration of non-confidence in all bourgeois Governments, an appeal to the working class to overthrow these Governments; 6. the war debts that have been made by the bourgeoisie are to be paid exclusively by the capitalists.

This is a policy which would have the effect of immediately bringing the majority of the workers and the poor peasants on to the side of Social Democracy. The confiscation of the landed property of the aristocracy would be assured — that, however, is by no means socialism.

For such proposals of peace we also would be inclined to carry on a revolutionary war. In such a revolutionary war, we could rely on the help of the revolutionary proletariat.

## The Grouping of the Classes Before March 1917.

By N. Bukharin.

We have taken the following analysis from Comrade Bukharin's brochure "Class Struggle and Revolution in Russia." Ed.

In the days of Nicholas II, the ruling class, in the true sense of the word, i. e. the class of the landed proprietors, was a **semi-serf-owning type**. These gentlemen did not cultivate their own land. They had inherited enormous estates from their fathers and grandfathers, who had owned serfs and, turning to account the growing demand for land on the part of the peasants, they preferred to hand over their land to the peasants, the "paupers", for which the latter had to pay a "starvation rent" and were forced into the dependence of serfdom. Although they were **large landowners**, they tried to cultivate their land on the lines of **small farming** adopted by the poor peasants, whom they exploited in every way. As a parasitic class par excellence, they had an absolutely certain, steady income, as the colossal demand for land on the part of the landless peasants caused a constant rise in the price of leasehold land. The chief aim of this class was to preserve their divine right to possess land. Being, to the marrow of their bones, descendants of serfowners, they could not be other than reactionary. Markov II, a Duma deputy, who regarded the gallows and the knout as the ideal supports of the Russian Empire, was justly considered the ideologist of this class; Purishkevitch, who raised the genuine, low, abusive language of the Russians to the dignity of his every-day political jargon, was their political agitator. The upper strata of the organisation of this class, leaving out of account the power of the State, were based on the so-called "Assemblies of the United Aristocracy", the lowest strata were recruited from the filthiest scum of society which abounded in the thieves' dens, brothels and tea-houses of the "Russian People's League".

The "noble aristocracy" was the chief pillar of the throne, whereas the **industrial bourgeoisie** only had a small share in the power. Only one of its fractions — the one which was most closely allied with the Government, through commissions from

the State and financial operations, a Government which, in spite of its **technical backwardness**, threw thanks to the "national property" stolen by it with the help of the machinery of State — only that one fraction of the bourgeoisie formed a component part of the administrative apparatus of the country. The **technically progressive bourgeoisie**, which was represented ideologically by the so-called "Liberal society", took up the position of "His Majesty's opposition" and whimpered helplessly about the "suppression of independent activity", about a lack of "initiative", about "lack of freedom to develop the vital forces of the country".

The petty bourgeoisie and above all the peasantry were not only without influence on the course of the „affairs of State", but were also exposed to persecution whenever their "public opinion" tried to express itself. The pith of the peasantry was and still is the group of "paupers" with small parcel of land who rented the land they farmed, starved and gave all their strength to the landowners and the State. Hunger for land and hunger pure and simple are the chief features of their existence. Their endeavour to obtain the land of the landed proprietors is as characteristic of them as is the endeavour of the landowner to maintain it for his own use.

Whereas in the time of Nicholas, the landowners formed the oppressing class par excellence, the **proletariat** was the oppressed class par excellence and that, not because the standard of living of the working class was lower than that of the "pauper" in the country. In many cases it was undoubtedly higher. The working class, however, had long been in the arena of the political fight. It appeared on the scenes as the pioneer of revolution, as the original source of revolutionary energy. This is why the whole weight of reprisals fell above all on the proletariat.

During the period 1907/1914, i. e. after the revolution of 1905—1907 had been drowned in the blood of the December insurgents in Moscow and the wave of punitive expeditions flooded the whole of Russia, the **revolutionary method** of solving the contradictions in Russian realities were for a time placed in the background. Nevertheless a number of changes took place below the surface of social life, in its **economics**.

The capitalist elements grew considerably stronger in the domain of **agricultural production**. The mobilisation of the land found expression in that part of the estates which formerly belonged to the landed proprietors passed into the hands of the wealthy strata of the peasantry. Frightened by the agrarian movement, the representatives of the "noble aristocracy" in some places broke up their hereditary estates by selling them (directly — or, what was more advantageous for them — through the Peasants' Bank) to the rural bourgeoisie or to the middle peasants. On the other hand, the process of the strengthening of the thin layer of the "upper class" among the peasantry developed thanks to the so-called "**agrarian legislation**" of Stolypin.

This statesman, who well deserved the honourable title of "hangman", who covered the land with gallows, who nourished Asev in his policeman's bosom, raised the system of police informers and provocation to the level of a fundamental principle of State and tried vainly to play the part of a Russian Bismarck, from whom he was only distinguished by a lack of intelligence. (This by the bye did not prevent the representatives of Russian Liberalism, Messrs Struve and Isgojev from submissively prostrating themselves before the boots of this gendarme and hero). As an adherent of the openly cynical policy of "pressure on the law", Stolypin tried to "put a stake on the strong", and believed that with his law of November 9th he could, by plundering the land belonging to the communities, create a "pillar of the throne" from the **rural population**, personified in the class of "vampires", side by side with the nobility. Stolypin lost the game, but his policy undoubtedly strengthened the capitalist strata of the peasants.

The changed conditions of the **agricultural world market** were of even greater significance. The agricultural crisis disappeared, the crisis which, caused by the import of cheap transatlantic corn, had oppressed European agriculture since the eighties. The unusual drop in prices was followed by a still more unusual rise. The European agrarians sighed with relief. The increase of prices, which is a curse for the urban proletariat, is the source of large profits for the land monopolists. The export trade with corn and the extension of capitalist agriculture became more advantageous than the extortion of starvation rents. Thus the consequences of the changed conditions of the world market were, an increase of exports, the technical organisation of the wholesale export trade (the construction of elevators according

to American patterns etc.) and the fact that the landowners changed over to carrying on cultivation on rational, capitalist lines. The uncouth landowner of the old type turned into a modern "agrarian". The boorish adherents of serfdom retired before the "civilised" and "enlightened" capitalist landowners, who understood both agricultural machinery and Chili saltpetre; in the place of the extortion of starvation rents the refined system of the exploitation of wage labour asserted itself; the sweating of serfs yielded its place to the capitalist system and, instead of the clumsy figure of Markov II, a perfumed "Prince Lvov" in white gloves took his place in the foreground.

In the domain of industry, **financial capital** sprang into life and formed itself during the counter-revolution of 1907—1914, formed syndicates and trusts, linked them with banks and surrounded a number of branches of industry with a firm ring of monopolist associations. The sponsor of Russian financial capital was **financial capital from "abroad"**, the capital of France, Germany, England and Belgium; its substance and its personification in the form of managers of industrial undertakings and directors of bank "worked" zealously on Russian soil and did a good deal to promote the rapid growth of the newest forms of organisation of European and American capitalism. Simultaneously with financial capitalism, a new, hitherto unknown formation of the **imperialist bourgeoisie** came into being, whose political representative was the so-called "party for the freedom of the people". The former Liberal Opposition which leaned on the technically progressive bourgeoisie, turned into the party of belligerent imperialism; the good-tempered Liberal professor, sympathising with the people, turned into a kind of senile Tchuprov or Kablukov, into a wicked defender of the Great Power, into a cold worshipper of the divine right of the "State" and especially of its military attributes. The slogan of "Great Russia" formed on the German model ("Great Germany") (under "greatness" we should understand in this case the stifling of all small peoples and, if possible, of all the rest), the pan-Slave agitation, the increased propaganda for the creation of "national signs of culture" (in the first place the army and navy) and the "revelation of the national physiognomy" — all this imperialist humbug found in Peter Struve, a renegade from Social Democracy, its first apostle. The collection "Viechi", the newspaper "Russkaja Mysl", the close alliance of "science" in the person of Struve with "industry" in the person of the Moscow leader and Meacenas P. Riabushinsky, began to serve as theoretical strongholds of Russian imperialism. Its recognised political leader was the head of the cadets, Professor Miljukov. It is a true saying that for any form of baseness a professor is to be found.

Thus, under the wing of raging counter-revolution, the "**progressive capitalist**" imperialist Opposition grew up, supporting itself on the "enlightened" landowners and on financial capital.

Since the Spring of 1911, the economic fight of the **working class** was renewed on the background of the industrial boom which was just beginning to make its appearance. Whilst flaring up more and more, this fight is assuming a glaringly pronounced political character. In the years 1913/1914, the number of persons who went on strike almost reached as high as that of the "mad" year 1905. Whilst the imperialist patriotic madness of the Liberals is developing, the wave of a new revolution is clearly seen in the distance. Barricades were erected in St. Petersburg. This happened exactly at the time when M. Poincare, the President of the French Republic, came to pay his respects to the Tsar with the object of making preparations for a new war. His republican ear was greeted with the cries of the St. Petersburg proletariat: "Down with the Tsar!"

The outbreak of the world war dispersed the revolution in the autumn of 1914. The slaughter prepared by the crowned butchers of the "civilised" countries, gave a colossal impetus to militarism everywhere. The disobedient proletariat was bound fast in iron by the military terror. The collapse of the 2nd International and the treachery of opportunist Social Democracy weakened the revolutionary will. The imperialist lusts of the ruling classes caused a close bloc to be formed between them, the landowners of the old type were joined with their "enlightened" opponents. Is it worth while to take individual differences of opinion into consideration when the common cause of international plunder is at stake? Is it not necessary first of all to slay the tasty prey with united forces and then to divide it up? And is it not the "sacred" duty of all to form one united front of those in possession, in case there should be a rise of the „revolting slaves"? Thus arose the civil peace the very name of which



stinks of the Junker stable at a distance of ten kilometers. The idyll reached its zenith when the cadet Miljukov publicly and "to the horror of the enemy" embraced Purishkevitch, the offspring of the very organisation, which had once, by the hand of hired murderers, aimed a deadly blow at Miljukov's colleagues Jollov and Herzenstein. Nevertheless, this celebration of truly Christian all-round forgiveness had a deep social significance; that was the conspiracy of a band of robbers, the members of which all swore fidelity to one another in the name of the blood which they had shed during their dissensions in the past. That it was really a question of robbery was announced by no less a person than Miljukov himself, from the Dardanelles. This leader of Russian imperialism, who had for a long time had the run of the Imperial Ministry for Foreign Affairs, set up a fairly frank "war programme", the intention of which was to take possession of Galicia, "Ugria", Posen, part of East Prussia, Constantinople and the Dardanelles, Adrianople, the shore of the Sea of Marmora, Turkish Armenia etc. The imperialist lusts of financial capital corresponded with the semi-feudal rapacity of Tsarism. Their common aim united them into one bloc.

This bloc, however, proved to be transient. Certainly not because the bourgeoisie was consumed with a love of freedom, but because the power of the State of the adherents of serfdom proved to be an all too dishonest and unreliable helpmate of financial capital. The serf-owning landed proprietors are at bottom a class which is outside the sphere of productive work; the "social function" of these "nobles" consists in consuming and squandering the sums which they acquire by their merciless plunder of the peasants, whilst the degree of their "culture" depends exclusively on the geographical position of the restaurant where they revel in luxury, and on the nationality of their "pretty ladies". If this is true of the whole class of the adherents of serfdom, this applies in still greater measure to their "skilled" members, the ruling bureaucracy and the "Court". The Court of Nicholas was a regular brothel of unbridled and perverse corruption of morals, where an unhealthy eroticism was intertwined with religious mania and excessive orgies alternated with religious services. The heads of the State administration were in essentials an exact copy of the thieves' brothel of Vera Tchebyriak.

When, on the highest rungs of the social ladder, the individual acts of the vile drama were played, each of which had its own name (the "Miassoviedoiad", the "Suchomlinoviad", the "Rasputiniad"), the bourgeoisie of the Opposition, which had entrenched itself in the league of the Semstvo and the towns, and partly in the Imperial Duma, whispered: vileness! immorality! whilst the people cried: "Down with the traitors! Down with the Tsar! Down with the thieves!" The imperialist bourgeoisie made propaganda for the dethronement of the Tsar and dallied with the cynical Bourbon Nicolai Nicolaievitch; the petty bourgeoisie got excited and indignant, the proletariat, with decision, issued its slogan: "Down with Tsarism! Long live the Democratic Republic!"

Even during the first revolution (1905—1907), it became clear that the chief driving force of the revolutionary current was the proletariat. And it was just this comparative maturity of the proletariat which appeared on the scenes with its class aims and under the lead of its class party — Social Democracy — it was just this circumstance which drove the so-called "progressive bourgeoisie" into the camp of the counter-revolution. Even during the first period of revolution, the cadets were almost in power, they carried on negotiations with the Tsarist rule with a view to joining the Ministry. The defeat of the revolution postponed their prospects for a few years.

Whilst in 1905 to 1907 the proletariat appeared as the recognised leader in the fight against Tsarism, its role in this capacity became more evident during the war. The proletariat was the only class which tried to oppose the supreme power in open street fights. The shooting down of workers in Kostroma, Ivanov-Vosnessensk etc. was a malicious counter-attack on the part of Tsarism. The war, however, stirred up the workers systematically to revolt; the changes in the factory law, the increased pressure of all the police functionaries, the dispersal of the Labour organisations, the increase of prices and starvation, the decimating losses on the battle-field — all this led to a spontaneous rise of the proletarian masses.

The large masses of the peasantry suffered no less from the

war which robbed them of their peasant farming, providing them with depreciated paper money instead of with agricultural implements. "Peace, bread and freedom!" echoed from the working class districts; "peace, land and freedom!" answered the country sonorously.

A third force, which made itself strongly felt, was the army. Betrayed by the Tsar, his Ministers and his officials, robbed on all sides, exposed to the unbridled arbitrary rule of ultra-reactionary generals — many of whom were "promoted" after they had gained sufficient experience in the punitive expeditions against the workers and peasants — the army could not keep quiet. It consisted mainly of peasants and workers. Military restraint slackened, the "fear of authority" relaxed for a moment and the classes composing the army began to express themselves with all their force. The tornado of the revolution reached this last support of the throne. Having roused into life the masses of peasants who had up to then been stagnant, having cast millions into the whirlpool of war, Tsarism was no longer able to master the forces which it had conjured up. In March 1917, in the month with which so many heroic events in the history of the world are connected, the double-headed bird of prey, the Russian eagle, had both its heads cut off.

## Chronicle of February Events.

March 13th (February 28th).

The Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet proceeded to form district committees and to found a workers' militia.

The first number of the "Isvestija" (official organ of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet) appeared. It contained an appeal of the Soviet which, among other things, demanded that the Constituent Assembly be summoned on the basis of a general, secret, direct and equal suffrage.

An appeal of the Petrograd "Inter-district Committees of the R. S. D. L. P." (a "super-fractional organisation" the members of which consisted to a large extent of Trotskyists and Left Mensheviks and went over in a body to the Bolsheviks in July 1917. — Ed.) in common with the S. R., to the soldiers demanding the occupation of the telegraph and telephone offices, the stations etc.

The bourgeois organisation, the "Provisional Committee of the National Duma", nominated its commissaries as heads of the different Ministries.

The Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet settled questions of internal organisation, agitation and other questions. On that day it did not take up any attitude with regard to the question of power.

The strike movement in Moscow was intensified. The police were disarmed. One body of troops after another joined the revolution.

March 14th (March 1st).

The Wyborg district organisation of the Bolsheviks took up a definite attitude to the question of power at an open meeting. The speaker emphasised that it is necessary to create an organ for the insurrection which could spread the victory of the revolution from Petrograd to the whole country, and that this should be a provisional revolutionary government created by the Petrograd Soviet. This Government should restore all the political rights of freedom, overthrow the counter-revolutionary National Duma and summon a Constituent Assembly on the basis of a general, secret, direct and equal suffrage.

The Executive of the Petrograd Soviet opposes joining a coalition government with the bourgeois by 13 votes to 8. In a meeting held in common between the "Provisional Committee of the National Duma" and the (opportunist) representatives of the Petrograd Soviet however, an agreement was arrived at with regard to the formation of a purely bourgeois government by the Duma Committee. The conditions were previously confirmed by the Plenary Meeting of the Soviet.