

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 7. No. 27

PRESS28th April 1927**CORRESPONDENCE**

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

CONTENTS

To the Fight against the Imperialist Preparations for a New World War! May Day Appeal of the C. I. and Y. C. I. China.

Tang Shin She: Chiang-Kai-Shek's Services to the Imperialists up to the Present.

Stalin: The Questions of the Chinese Revolution.

Rykov: Who is Responsible for the Peking Raid?

The International Workers' Delegation in China.

Politics.

The Settlement of the Conflict between the Soviet Union and Switzerland.

P. R. Dietrich: The Political Situation in Germany.

J. B.: The Fight against the "Capitulations" in Egypt.

Economics.

Directions to the Sections of the Communist International for the Economic Conference of the League of Nations.

Union of Soviet Republics.

Resolution of the IV. Soviet Congress of the Soviet Union on the Foreign and Home Policy of the Government.

Resolution of the C. C. of the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union Regarding the Negotiations with the Metal Workers International.

Rescue Sacco and Vanzetti.

John dos Passos: Vanzetti in Prison.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

D. P.: The Struggle for Trade Union Unity in France.

First of May.

To the Working Men and Women of the Whole World.

Appeal of the International Red Aid on the Occasion of the 1st of May.

In the International.

The Fourth Conference of the Communist Party of Switzerland.

Ten Years Ago.

N. Lenin: A Shameless Lie of the Capitalists.

Lenin: Letters on Tactics.

Chronicle of Events.

To the Fight against the Imperialist Preparations for a New World War!

To the Fight against the Criminal War in China!

May Day Appeal of the Communist International and of the Young Communist International.

To all Proletarians, Workers, Suppressed Peoples, Soldiers and Sailors!

Moscow, 25th April 1927.

Comrades, Brothers,

On the First of May, the day of international solidarity, the Communist International summons all proletarians, all who are on the side of the workers to the fight against the criminal war in China, to the fight against the preparations for a new world war.

The Communist International tears the mask from the face of the enemies of the working class. The Communist International calls for a determined protest against the throttling of the Chinese revolution, to a protest not with words but with deeds.

The imperialists of all countries are concentrating their armies and fleets against revolutionary China.

After the bombardments in Syria, after the shameful Rif war, after the bloody suppression of the revolt in Java and Sumatra, the combined forces of the worst enemies of the working class, the bank and industrial oligarchs are occupying the

Chinese harbours; they are blockading the country and directing the mouths of their guns against Chinese towns; they are supporting and organising the native reactionary hangmen, the bands of Chang Tso-Lin and the traitor Chiang Kai Shek.

Workers, do not believe the shameful lies of the bourgeois press. Stigmatise with scorn the betrayers who speak of "protecting the lives of foreigners in China".

The imperialists are sending huge fleets to China in order to bombard revolutionary towns, in order to settle with the proletarians, to murder workers and peasants who have ventured to raise the banner of the proletarian struggle and of national liberation.

The war in China has already been going on for some time. Do not believe a word of the professional deceivers who wish you to cease from your vigilance! War is already there! Do not believe that it does not concern the European and American workers! The war against the Chinese people is the preliminary to a gigantic, monstrous, devastating new world war.

A monstrous provocation is already taking place in order to challenge the Soviet Union, the stronghold of the labour movement of the whole world, to war. The provocateurs are in the camp of the imperialists, before all in the camp of the English Conservative government, the leader of the League of Nations. The imperialists are systematically preparing for war against the Soviet Union and for the division of the spoil, which must finally lead them into war with each other. All countries will inevitably be drawn into these wars if the proletariat permits this new crime against humanity to be carried out. The imperialists are systematically preparing for this crime; they are concluding war alliances, they have agreed with Germany for the passage through this country of the combined troops of the imperialists in order to settle with the proletarian Republic.

They are arming with tremendous speed on the sea, under the sea, on land and in the air. These hangmen of humanity are preparing a chemical war of tremendous annihilating power. Almost everywhere they have placed in power the enemies of the working class: Poincaré in France, Hindenburg in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, Pilsudski in Poland and the "Die-Hards" in England. They are fettering the working class at home by means of misery in order the more easily to achieve their hangmen's work in "foreign policy". In England the fight of the masses must not be directed against the Chinese people, but against the Conservative government, which has become so insolent that it wishes to make the workers slaves, to deprive them of the right to strike, to shatter the trade unions and to throw back the labour movement more than a century. The French bourgeoisie is fettering the working class by a military law; the German bourgeoisie is weakening its working class by depriving it of the eight hour day. Italian fascism is proceeding with bloody suppressive measures against the labour organisations. The "enlightened democracy" of the United States is plundering Central and South America and China, executing innocent men and throttling the strikes of the workers.

The League of Nations unites the efforts of the imperialists. Under the pacifist mask of the League of Nations they are binding and throttling the Chinese people. Under the mask of peace they are preparing for a new world massacre of unprecedented extent. In making these preparations the bourgeoisie is using its social democratic agents in every possible way. There can be no greater treachery than, now, in face of the threatening danger, to persuade the workers that capitalism is now peaceful, that the League of Nations is an instrument of peace and that it is the task of the working class to support and democratise the League of Nations. In the time of preparation for war against the Soviet Union, there is nothing more shameful than the campaign of incitement against the proletarian Republic which is being conducted by the "international" social democracy, with the German social democratic Party of Noske, Scheidemann and Barbat at the head, with the support of the bourgeois press. There is no more shameful treachery to the working class than to vote for the military law as did the French socialists, than to support the government in the Chinese question as MacDonald, Thomas and Co. are doing in England, than to destroy trade union unity as the strike-breakers of the English general strike and their Amsterdam allies are doing.

Workers, proletarians! Against the forces of the counter-revolution there is rising the combined army of workers, the tremendous masses of men who only recently lay in profound slumber. The Soviet Union is growing stronger; the great Chinese revolution is marching forwards, in spite of the treachery of the bourgeoisie. In England, in this pirate fortress, this stronghold of world suppression and of colonial cruelties, preparations are being made for the fight.

Proletarians! Organise your forces!

On the First of May raise aloud your voices with indignation!

Make the bourgeoisie tremble in their baseness!

Prepare to convert the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war!

Workers! Remember how unexpectedly for the masses the world war broke out in 1914, how shamelessly the bourgeois and the social democratic press have lied! Glance at your wounds! Do not forget the hunger, the weeping of your children! Do not betray the memory of the slain!

Working women, peasant women! Do not betray your sons and husbands!

Cripples and invalids from the mass murder! Look at your comrades who beseech the speculators, debauchers, generals, the

bourgeois for alms! Line up in the united front of the irreconcilable, ruthless, active fight against war!

Soldiers, sailors! Prepare for resistance! Create secret organisations in order to turn your rifles to there where the people's interests demand! Prepare as systematically as the enemies of the people prepare. Learn from them! Do not allow yourselves to be fooled again! Do not throw your weapons away, but learn to use them rightly!

Young proletarians! Mobilise all your forces! Remember the trust bequeathed by your fallen leader! Be the advance-guard, the outpost against war!

The suppressed peoples of the world are groaning under the iron heel of imperialism. Raise your powerful voice against suppression! Hundreds of millions are with you! You are the most powerful historical force in the world! Close the ranks! Prevent by your activity your sons being used as cannon-fodder in the criminal war against China and against the forces of the international revolution!

Long live the Chinese revolution!

Down with the armaments for a new world war!

Long live the preparation of the war of the workers against capital!

Down with the League of Nations!

Long live the Soviet Union!

Long live the passing over of the soldiers of the imperialist armies to the side of the Chinese revolution!

Long live the international solidarity of all workers!

Long live the 1st of May, the review of the forces of the proletariat!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International.

The Executive Committee of the Young Communist International.

CHINA

Chiang-Kai-Shek's Services to the Imperialists up to the Present.

By Tang Shin She.

Chiang-Kai-Shek's formation of a "pure" Kuomintang Party, the formation of his new government in Nanking, his fight against the Bolsheviki, the expulsion of the Russian advisers from his army, his order to arrest the Communist Ministers, among whom he also includes the Left Kuomintang members as the Minister for Justice Professor Chü Tien, the Finance Minister Sung Sze Wen and the Minister for Transport Sun Fo (the son of Sun-Yat-Sen), his warrant for arrest against Borodin, (it was only in the last year that Chiang-Kai-Shek declared that Sun-Yat-Sen had said to him personally he must always approve the opinion of Borodin, and that he would always follow such a command of Sun Yat Sen) — all these acts are nothing but political manoeuvres ordered by the imperialists against the Chinese revolution, to which however no great importance is to be attached. The practical services which Chiang-Kai-Shek has rendered are: the slaughtering of numerous workers in Shanghai, Nanking and Canton and his sanction of the raids on the Soviet Russian Embassy and on the Consulate in Peking, as a result of which hundreds of the best revolutionaries were taken prisoners by Chang-Tso-Lin.

When, on the occasion of the first general strike of the Shanghai workers, from the 19th to 25th February, for the final overthrow of Sun Chuan Fang and in support of the revolutionary troops, the remnants of Sun Chuan Fang troops under the leadership of General Li Bau Chang saw themselves compelled to commence a retreat from the town, the Right Kuomintang leader Chang Chi approached them with the offer: "If you proceed to attack the Communists you can remain in Shanghai and you will be accepted as a whole into the revolutionary army". Thus numerous workers and petty bourgeois were at that time murdered in the open street at the instigation of the Right Kuomintang leaders. An organ of the Right, financed with Japanese money, the "Chang Nan Wan Pao" published a report of the executions with the sensational headline, "The responsibility of the Communists for the mass murder of the population of Shanghai". It was only after their second general strike that the workers were able, on the

21st March, to disarm and drive out the counter-revolutionary troops.

The raid on the Russian embassy in Peking took place on the 6th April; 75 Chinese and 22 Russians arrested. There exists not the least doubt that behind the raid there was the black hand of England. But later information goes to show that beside England and Chang Tso Lin, Japan and Chiang-Kai-Shek also had a hand in the game. Through the mediation of Japan, negotiations were instituted between Chang-Tso-Lin and Chiang-Kai-Shek already in January last; and in March these negotiations were very far advanced. On the 18th of February the Shanghai "Chen Pao" reported from Peking that "a foreign adviser in this town is striving with great energy to bring about an understanding between the North and the South. He returned to Peking from Kiukiang on the 16th inst., and as against the 7 conditions which had been submitted there, brought with him 4 conditions for the North. These were kept strictly secret; yet it is reported that Chiang-Kai-Shek is prepared to proceed against the Bolsheviks and extremists".

On the 10th of March a Japanese Telegraphic Agency reported from Peking:

"The efforts towards unity between the North and the South are now stronger than ever. Chiang-Kai-Shek has conveyed his conditions to Peking by a courier and his representative, Li-Chi-Tsen, has entered into negotiations with Chang-Tso-Lin.

From these reports it is to be seen that the representative of Chiang-Kai-Shek, Professor Li-Chi-Tseng agreed to the raid on the Russian Embassy. As a negotiator with Chang-Tso-Lin he did not even demand the release of the Chinese arrested in the Embassy, although they were all members of the Kuomintang.

After the raid in Peking Chiang-Kai-Shek proceeded to take action on his own territory against the revolutionaries. The Central Executive of the Kuomintang informed its members on the 14th of March that

"During a gigantic demonstration of welcome for Comrade Wang Chin, who has just arrived in Shanghai from Europe, Chiang-Kai-Shek caused the crowd to be fired upon, with the result that there were many killed and wounded. Following on this he had the provincial party leadership of Kiangsu and Shanghai dissolved, all functionaries arrested and a Party functionary of Szechuan, Yang Ngan Gung executed. After this the Shanghai workers defence corps was disbanded, and the Shanghai trade unions dissolved, which again involved the death of hundreds of workers, children and women. Chiang Kai-Shek is an open traitor; we call upon all members to fight against him."

After the 14th of March Chiang-Kai-Shek caused the same bloodshed in Nanking, Nanchow, Foochow and Canton. Never had a counter-revolutionary general acted so brutally as he. A bourgeois correspondent of the Berliner Tageblatt reported from Shanghai that there was a great deal of unnecessary bloodshed in connection with the events in Shanghai.

All the imperialists are now fawning on Chiang-Kai-Shek as their favourite. Money is being offered him from all sides. The Shanghai Chamber of Commerce has already paid out to him 15,000 dollars. While at the beginning it was intended to appoint as foreign Minister to the Chiang-Kai-Shek government a Japanese tool Huang Hu, there has now been appointed a tool of England, Wu Chau Chü who last year was driven out of Canton by Chiang-Kai-Shek on account of his connections with the Hongkong imperialists. Judging the situation generally, Chiang-Kai-Shek is collaborating more closely with Japan, for his whole treachery has been strongly supported by the Japanese. He even has a representative in Japan and also one in France, which is friendly to Japan.

The same Chinese bourgeoisie which yesterday denounced Chiang-Kai-Shek as a red spectre and supported Chang-Tso-Lin, Wu-Pei-Fu and Sun Chuang Fang against him, is now lauding him. The bank bourgeoisie Lau Djau Tong Chi (Association for the old means of transport), Chin Djau Tong Chi (Association for the new means of transport) and the Anfu party are acting as mediators between Chiang-Kai-Shek and Chang-Tso-Lin. The cunning Lien Du She (Association for the study of the Constitution) — also representative of the bank bourgeoisie — has caused two of its people to enter the Kuomintang direct as members; they will settle the financial and

foreign political questions for Chiang-Kai-Shek. In addition to all the reactionary parties there stand on the side of Chiang-Kai-Shek the anarchists, who play a role as intermediaries between Chiang-Kai-Shek, the Japanese, the French and Chang-Tso-Lin.

On the 18th of March the Kuomintang Central and the Kuomintang government expelled Chiang-Kai-Shek from the Party, removed him from his office as commander-in-chief and decided to send a punitive expedition against him. The whole membership and the revolutionary population have declared for the Central against Chiang-Kai-Shek.

The Questions of the Chinese Revolution.

Theses of Comrade Stalin for Propagandists, Approved by the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

I.

The Prospects of the Chinese Revolution.

The main facts determining the character of the Chinese revolution are:

a) The semi-colonial position of China and the financial and economic domination of imperialism.

b) The yoke of the remnants of feudalism, which is rendered more irksome by the yoke of militarism and of the bureaucracy.

c) The growing revolutionary struggle of the million masses of the workers and peasants against the yoke of the feudal landowners and the officials, against militarism and against imperialism.

d) The political weaknesses of the national bourgeoisie, its dependence upon imperialism, its fear of the drive of the revolutionary movement.

e) The growing revolutionary activity of the proletariat, the growth of its authority among the million masses of the toilers.

f) The existence of the proletarian dictatorship in the neighbourhood of China.

It follows from the above that there are two courses of development possible for the events in China. Either the national bourgeoisie will crush the proletariat and enter into a bargain with imperialism, and along with the latter undertake a campaign against the revolution in order to put an end to it by establishing the rule of capitalism. Or, the proletariat will push the national bourgeoisie on one side, confirm its own hegemony and lead with it the million masses of toilers in town and country in order to overcome the resistance of the national bourgeoisie, to achieve the full victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and then to lead it on to the path of the socialist revolution with all the consequences arising therefrom.

The crisis of world imperialism and the existence of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, the experiences of which can be successfully made use of by the Chinese proletariat, considerably increase the possibility of achieving the second course of the Chinese revolution.

On the other hand, the facts go to prove that imperialism is attacking the Chinese revolution in a front united as regards the most essential questions; that there does not at present exist among the imperialists that split and that war which, for example, existed in the camp of the imperialists before the October Revolution and which weakened imperialism. This fact goes to indicate that the Chinese revolution will encounter far greater difficulties on its way to victory than did the revolution in Russia; that in the course of this revolution there will be incomparably more cases of desertion and treachery than in the period of the civil war in the Soviet Union.

Therefore, the fight between these two ways of the revolution is the characteristic feature of the Chinese revolution.

II.

The First Stage of the Chinese Revolution.

In the first period of the Chinese revolution, in the period of the first campaign against the North, when the national army approached the Yangtse and achieved victory after victory, when a powerful movement of the workers and the peasants could not yet develop, the national bourgeois (not the compradores) went with the revolution. This was the revolution of the united, entire national front. This does not mean that

there did not exist antagonisms between the revolution and the national bourgeoisie. This only means that the national bourgeoisie, by supporting the revolution, endeavoured to use it for its own purposes and to keep it within limits by diverting it chiefly to territorial demands.

The fight between the Right and the Left in the Kuomintang in this period was a reflection of these antagonisms. The attempt made by Chiang Kai-Shek in March 1926 to drive the Communists out of the Kuomintang was the first serious attempt of the national bourgeoisie to bridle the revolution. As is known, the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. was already at that time of the opinion that the policy of keeping the Communist Party within the Kuomintang must be maintained, that the "withdrawal or the expulsion of the Rights from the Kuomintang must be propagated" (April 1926).

This was the line of the further development of the revolution, of the close co-operation of the Left Wingers and the Communists within the Kuomintang and within the National government, of the consolidation of the unity of the Kuomintang, simultaneously with the exposure and the isolation of the Right, of the submission of the Right to the discipline of the Kuomintang, of making use of the Rights, of their connections and their experiences, so far as they submitted to the discipline of the Kuomintang, or of the expulsion of the Rights from the Kuomintang so far as they violated the discipline and practised treachery to the interests of the revolution.

The events which followed have fully and entirely proved the correctness of this line. The powerful development of the peasants' movement and the organisation of peasants' Leagues and peasant committees in the country, the tremendous wave of strikes in the towns and the formation of trades councils, the victorious advance of the national troops against Shanghai which was besieged by the fleet and the troops of the imperialists — all these and similar facts prove that the line laid down was the correct line. It is only this circumstance that can explain the fact that the attempts made by the Right in February 1927 to split the Kuomintang and to set up a new centre in Nanchang, was wrecked in face of the unanimous repulse by the revolutionary Kuomintang in Wuhan. But this attempt was a sign that a regrouping of class forces was rapidly proceeding in the country; that the Rights and the national bourgeoisie would not keep quiet, that they would increase their work against the revolution.

The C. C. of the C. P. S. U. was right, therefore, when it said in March 1927 that a) "at present the Chinese revolution is passing through a critical period in connection with the regrouping of class forces and the concentration of the imperialist armies, and that its further success can only be possible if there is a decisive course towards the development of the mass movement", that b) "the line must be maintained of arming the workers and peasants, of converting the peasant committees in the provinces into actual organs of power with armed self-defence corps", that c) "the Communist Party must not conceal the treacherous and reactionary policy of the Right Kuomintang members, and must mobilise the masses round the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China while exposing the Rights" (3rd March 1927).

It is therefore easy to understand that in the further course of the powerful sweep of the revolution on the one hand, and the attack of the imperialists in Shanghai on the other hand, that the national bourgeoisie was bound to go over to the camp of the counter-revolution, just as the occupation of Shanghai by the national troops and the strike of the Chinese workers was bound to unite the imperialists in an attempt to throttle the revolution. This is what actually occurred. The bombardment of Nanking serves in this respect as a signal for a new differentiation of the fighting forces in China. By firing on Nanking and delivering an ultimatum, the imperialists wished to say that they seek the support of the national bourgeoisie for the common fight against the revolution. By firing on meetings of workers and by organising a coup, Chiang-Kai-Shek replied, so to speak, to the summons of the imperialists that he is ready, together with the national bourgeoisie, to enter into a bargain with the imperialists against the workers and peasants.

III.

The Second Stage of the Chinese Revolution.

Chiang-Kai-Shek's coup means the desertion of the revolution by the national bourgeoisie, the rise of a centre of the

national counter-revolution and the pact of the Right with the imperialists against the Chinese revolution.

Chiang-Kai-Shek's coup means that from now on there will be in South China two camps, two governments, two armies, two centres: the centre of the revolution in Wuhan and the centre of the counter-revolution in Nanking.

Chiang-Kai-Shek's coup means that the revolution has entered on the second stage of its development, that there has commenced a turn from the revolution of the entire national united front to the revolution of the masses of workers and peasants numbering many millions, to the agrarian revolution which will increase and strengthen the fight against imperialism, against the gentry and the feudal landowners, against the militarists and against the counter-revolutionary group of Chiang-Kai-Shek.

This means that the struggle between the two ways of the revolution, between the supporters of its further development and the supporters of its liquidation will become more acute from day to day, thereby filling the entire present period of the revolution.

This means that the revolutionary Kuomintang in Wuhan, by a determined fight against militarism and imperialism, will in fact be converted into an organ of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry; the counter-revolutionary group of Chiang-Kai-Shek in Nanking however, by severing from the workers and peasants and approaching imperialism, will, in the last resort, share the fate of the militarists.

It follows from this that the policy of maintaining the unity of the Kuomintang, the policy of isolating the Rights within the Kuomintang and making use of them for the purpose of the revolution, already no longer corresponds with the new tasks of the revolution. This policy must give place to the policy of the determined expulsion of the Rights from the Kuomintang, the policy of a determined fight against the Right up to their complete liquidation, the policy of concentrating the whole power in the country in the hands of the revolutionary Kuomintang, of the Kuomintang without its Right elements, of the Kuomintang as a bloc between the Lefts and the Communists.

It further follows that the policy of close co-operation between the Lefts and the Communists within the Kuomintang in this stage acquires special force and special significance; that this co-operation reflects the alliance of the workers and peasants which is being formed outside of the Kuomintang, and that without such co-operation the victory of the revolution is impossible.

It further follows that the main source of the power of the revolutionary Kuomintang is the further development of the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants and the strengthening of their mass organisations, the revolutionary peasant committees, the workers' trade unions and the other revolutionary mass organisations as the elements which are to form the Soviets in the future; that the chief guarantee of the victory of the revolution is the growth of the revolutionary activity of the million masses of toilers, that the most important counter-measure against the counter-revolution, however, is the arming of the workers and peasants.

It follows, finally, that the Communist Party, while fighting in the same ranks as the revolutionary members of the Kuomintang, must more than ever preserve its independence as a necessary prerequisite for securing the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

IV.

The Errors of the Opposition.

The chief error of the Opposition (Comrade Radek and Co.) consists in failing to understand the revolution in China, in failing to perceive what stage the revolution is now passing through, in failing to understand its present international position.

The Opposition demands that the Chinese revolution shall develop at approximately the same rate as the October Revolution. The Opposition is dissatisfied because the workers of Shanghai have not undertaken a decisive fight against the imperialists and their lackeys. They do not understand, however, that the revolution in China cannot develop at such a rapid rate because, among other reasons, the international situation is at present less favourable than in the year 1917 (there is no war between the imperialists). They do not understand that

one cannot undertake a decisive struggle under unfavourable conditions, when the reserves had not yet been drawn in, just as, for example, the Bolsheviks did not undertake a decisive fight either in April or in July 1917. The Opposition does not understand that not to avoid a decisive fight under unfavourable conditions (when it is possible to avoid it) means rendering easier the work of the enemies of the revolution.

The Opposition demands the immediate creation of Soviets of workers peasants and soldiers' deputies in China. What does it mean to set up Soviets now? In the first place one cannot set them up at any moment one chooses; they can only be created in a period of a special rise of the revolutionary wave. In the second place the Soviets are not set up to serve as mere talking shops. They are set up before all as fighting organs against the existing power, as organs of the struggle for power. This was the case in the year 1905, as it was also the case in 1917.

But what would it mean to create Soviets at the present moment in the sphere of activity, for example, of the government of Wuhan? This would mean issuing the slogan of a fight against the existing power in this territory. This would mean issuing the slogan of creating new organs of power, the slogan of the fight against the power of the revolutionary Kuomintang; for in this territory there is at present no other power than the power of the revolutionary Kuomintang. This means confusing the task of creating and consolidating mass organisations of the workers and peasants in the shape of strike committees, peasants' leagues and peasants' committees, trades councils, factory committees etc., upon which the revolutionary Kuomintang is already based, with the task of setting up a Soviet system as a new type of State power in place of the revolutionary Kuomintang. This means failing to understand what stage the revolution in China is passing through at present. This means to place in the hands of the enemies of the Chinese people a new weapon for the fight against the revolution, for the creation of a new legend that in China there is taking place not a national revolution, but an artificial transplanting of the "Moscow Sovietisation".

The Opposition, by putting forward the slogan of creating Soviets at the present moment, is therefore playing into the hands of the enemies of the Chinese Revolution.

The Opposition considers the participation of the Communist Party in the Kuomintang as inexpedient. The Opposition therefore considers the withdrawal of the Communist Party from the Kuomintang to be expedient. What does the withdrawal of the Communist Party from the Kuomintang mean at the present moment, when the whole crowd of imperialists with all their hangers-on are demanding the expulsion of the Communists from the Kuomintang? It means to abandon the battle field and to leave in the lurch its allies in the Kuomintang, to the joy of the enemies of the revolution. This means to weaken the Communist Party, to undermine the revolutionary Kuomintang, to facilitate the work of the Cavaignacs of Shanghai and to deliver the flag of the Kuomintang, the most popular flag in China, into the hands of the Right Wing members of the Kuomintang. This is precisely what the imperialists, the militarists and the Right Wing members of the Kuomintang are demanding at the present moment.

It follows, therefore, that the Opposition, by advocating at the present moment the withdrawal of the Communist Party from the Kuomintang, is playing into the hands of the enemies of the Chinese Revolution.

The recently held Plenum of the C. C. of the Party therefore acted quite correctly when it decidedly rejected the platform of the Opposition.

Who is Responsible for Peking the Raid?

Verbatim Report of Comrade Rykov's Speech at the Soviet Congress of the R. S. F. S. R.

Comrades, a few days before the opening of the present Congress, part of our Peking Embassy was destroyed and a number of other events have happened which make it necessary to give a short explanation of these occurrences and of the exchange of Notes between us and the Peking Government in this connection.

The contents of the Notes are known to all present. As you know, the Federal Government resolved, as a sign of protest, to recall Comrade Tchernych, our chargé d'affaires to the Peking Government and a considerable section of our

representatives, only leaving behind the number of employees necessary to carry on the consular functions.

The provocative conspiracy against the Soviet Union.

You know from the papers the causes which prompted the Soviet Government to take this step. In recent times there have been occurrences in Chinese territory which are without precedent in the relations between States which are in official connection with one another. According to the data at our disposal it seems to be a question of an organised attack by the Chinese police on the offices and the residences of the military attaché and other officials of our Peking Embassy. The attack was accompanied by plunder, arrests, ill-treatment of and insults to women and children. Some of the premises are still occupied by the Chinese police or, as the foreign correspondents report, are "under the protection of a specially appointed protective police." During these last few days, the Government has received a number of communications to the effect that the Soviet authorities have been exposed to hostile attacks in other parts of China as well.

These actions, which border on crime, are characterised especially by two facts. Firstly, that these hostile actions which are organised and carried through by the official authorities, occurred all at the same time, and that their leaders are evidently in one centre, and that in a country, with the Government of which we are on friendly terms.

A second fact deserves special attention — that all these attacks, deeds of violence and plunder, that all these violations of diplomatic relations are taking place under the protection, nay even with the direct participation of the representatives of other countries which have no authority to interfere in the relations between China and the Soviet Union. In this case, they have obviously received special instruction from their Governments.

The temporal coincidence of these hostile actions throughout the whole Chinese territory in which, to-day, not one, but several Governments which are at war with one another, the support of these attacks by the diplomatic corps and finally the enrolment of the Russian White Guardists, who have fled to China, as mercenary "specialists" in these attacks on the Soviet authorities, indicate that we have undoubtedly to deal with a conspiracy which was worked out in advance and with provocation on a large scale against the Soviet Union. The raid on the premises of our military attaché in Peking took place at the same time as the provocation against our Shanghai Consulate, which is surrounded by troops, and as the searching of the Soviet trade mission in Tientsin. Shanghai is at present in no sense subordinate to the Peking Government, indeed a state of war exists between them. Nevertheless there are hands which have succeeded in bringing about a simultaneous attack on our Embassy in Peking and on our representatives in a number of Chinese towns and in organising these attacks, regardless of to which of the warring parties the territory belongs in which these representatives reside.

Who is responsible?

All this indicates that we have to do with a uniform plan which the Peking Government could not undertake and organise without the participation and indeed without a certain amount of guidance on the part of the imperialist Powers. Thus, not only the Peking Government, but in the same measure, the so-called Protocol Powers, which signed the Boxer protocol and whose representatives took part or helped in these deeds of violence, are responsible for all these extraordinary violations of our organisations and our representatives in Chinese territory. We see from this that Chang Tso-Lin's troops and the Peking police not only could not have plundered our Embassy without the permission of the representatives of the Powers, but they could not even have entered the territory of the international settlement in which the Embassy and the homes of the employees in its environment were situated.

This was of course a so insolent, provocative action, so unexampled in the relations between different States, that the Governments of some countries have already assured our Government in official communications that they had had no participation in this whole provocation, i. e. that they disclaim having taken any part in the violation of the elementary norms of international relationships and in the unprecedented deeds of robbery.

The Governments have officially assured us that their diplomatic representatives in China did not co-operate in per-

mitting such deeds of violence against the State institutions of the Soviet Union, and have emphasised that it happened without their knowledge and against their will. It is very characteristic however that, up to the present, we have received no such statement from the English and Italian Governments. The fact that not all countries, not all Governments, have, up to the present, disclaimed having had anything to do with this unprecedented provocation against the Soviet Union, points, without doubt, to the fact that there are Governments which either helped or co-operated with or guided the Peking Government in these actions.

As you know, foreign States behave in two different ways towards China. One way is the behaviour of the imperialist countries with the object of subjugating China. A whole system of unequal treaties, which China was compelled to conclude at one time, serves as the legal foundation for this behaviour; in reality however, it is based on the policy of the mailed fist.

A different relation exists between our State and China; this is a relation of complete equality of rights and of absolute renunciation of all humiliating treaties which might offend the dignity of the sovereignty of China. The well-known Treaty of Peking is the juridical basis of our relation and the actual foundation of a policy of peace and of living together on friendly terms. At present there is a certain competition, a certain struggle going on between these two principles, in which the imperialists are trying to convince everybody of the "cultural advantages" of their attitude towards China.

The fact that the imperialists permit and organise such raids on us, has the double object of combating the Soviet Union and of special provocation against the Chinese people. The meaning, the significance of this is, that they want to show that it is impossible to live and "co-operate" with the Chinese people without the principles of the "Boxer protocol", without special privileges and advantages for foreigners and without humiliating the Chinese and subjugating them to the imperialists.

By provoking such raids, the imperialists want to revenge themselves for our renunciation of the "Boxer protocol" and to give practical evidence that such conflicts inevitably arise in carrying out the principle of treaties based on equal rights, conflicts which could be avoided if we were to act in common with them.

Attempts to "justify" the raid.

The Peking Government, in its Note, explains the fact of the destruction of the office of the military attaché by maintaining that Chinese citizens hostile to or obnoxious to the Peking Government had been sheltered there. For unknown reasons however, it omits to mention the fact that it made no communication either to our official representative in Peking or to the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs through its Moscow representative, before the raid (as is usually done in case of complaints). This whole argument has only been brought up now as a justification for the raid and for the misdeeds connected with it.

A number of representatives of the diplomatic corps and the Governments represented by them as well as a considerable section of the bourgeois Press are trying, with the same arguments, to conceal their direct co-operation in the raid. On this occasion, it would be a good plan to recall a few facts which illustrate the behaviour of the foreign Embassies during the numerous revolutionary stages of the civil war and the revolutionary conflicts in Chinese territory.

The so-called international parts of the town, in which the majority of the embassies and consulates are to be found, are to a certain degree, ex-territorial and are subordinated to the foreigners as regards administration. Consequently, the Chinese authorities cannot undertake any official proceedings in the territory of these parts of the town without the permission of the diplomatic corps. The present Doyen of the Peking diplomatic corps is the Dutch Ambassador Udendeyk, who gave Chang Tso-Lin's soldiers and the Chinese police permission to attack part of the Soviet Embassy. A few years ago however, when one of the former Chinese Governments was overthrown, this same Udendeyk gave refuge in the Dutch Embassy to a number of ex-Ministers of the Chinese Government which had been overthrown, in order to protect them against the persecution of the Chinese people. It has become an every-day occurrence in China for political leaders of the Opposition parties to be given shelter in the international settlement.

A few weeks ago, a still more characteristic case occurred. Desperate fighting took place round Shanghai; the Northern army was scattered and retreated in a panic; the diplomatic corps of Shanghai sheltered more than 200 soldiers from the Northern army in the territory of the international settlement and, after a few days, sent them to Tzindao where they joined the army of Chang Tso-Lin. After all this, in order to justify the raid, we are accused of having amongst the employees of our Embassy a few Chinese who are on the side of the Kuo Min Tang and not on that of Chang Tso-Lin. There are diplomats who regard this as interference in the Chinese civil war; whilst the same diplomats send whole divisions of troops to strengthen the Northern army of Chang Tso-Lin.

"Domiciliary visits" without witnesses.

Special attention should be called to the circumstances under which the so-called "searching" of the office of the military attaché and of the houses of the Embassy officials took place. The "search" was carried out in such a way that our Peking representative not only could not be present, but was not even informed as to what was going on. Not only documents were taken, but other things, furniture, clothing etc. and women and children were carried off. The organisers of the search-attack chose to carry out the search and the removal of all kinds of property and documents without our representative being present. No list was made of the things which were taken away, and the Government of the Soviet Union has no possibility of finding out what was removed from the buildings belonging to our employees and from the premises of the military attaché.

Interruption: Are there any troops to defend our Embassy?

Comrade Rykov: I am asked whether we have any troops of our own on Chinese territory to defend our Embassies. I must reply that our State has not a single division of our own soldiers on Chinese territory (prolonged applause).

Why do the imperialists wish to provoke conflicts between the Soviet Union and China?

What is the aim pursued by the instigators of this revolting breach of the most elementary standards of international intercourse? It would be nonsense to organise and carry out so extraordinary a deed of violence unless there were some political intention or some programme arranged for a period of greater or less duration. This is why I believe that the fundamental aim of these "occurrences" hostile to the Soviet Union is that the imperialists are trying to bring about conflicts between our Union and China.

The greatest danger for the imperialists is that the Chinese people, the most numerous people in the world, should free itself from its subjugation and try to attain complete national independence, national freedom, and that it wants to become an equal member of the family of nations. This movement is accompanied by an ever increasing display of friendship on the part of the Chinese people for our Union. In its fight for national liberation, the Chinese people meets with tremendous obstacles on the part of the Chinese militarists and of the whole capitalist world. The Soviet Union is the only country which shows genuine sympathy for this gigantic fight of the Chinese people for its liberation from the imperialist yoke. The Soviet Union has not sent and is not sending a single war-ship into a Chinese port, it has not a single member of the Red army on Chinese territory to interfere in the internal affairs of China (Applause).

The attitude of the Soviet Union makes intervention in China distinctly more difficult. This attitude, on the one hand, placed all the other Powers in an extremely uncomfortable position and, on the other hand, roused great sympathy among the Chinese people for the peoples of our Union. This is why the imperialists, in order the more easily to put into effect their hostile intentions towards both countries, are endeavouring to stir them up against one another. If the imperialists succeeded in stirring up these two States against one another, if they succeeded in bringing about an armed conflict between the Red army and the Chinese, though it were only in some corner of China, instead of a fight against the Chinese revolution, it might mean a serious blow for the Chinese revolution and for the liberation of the Chinese people. The imperialists hope to attain their end, the suppression of the Chinese revolution and the weakening of the Soviet Union, with great ease, through the noise of this provocation.

How are they proceeding?

The provocation of hostile action against the Soviet Union in China represents the first steps on the path towards the realisation of this chief aim of the imperialists. As a characteristic example of how the provocations against the Soviet Union are prepared, I will read you a document which only became known to us a few days ago.

It deals with a conference of the authorities of Charbin regarding measures to be taken against the Soviet agents. This conference took place at the command of the Supreme Staff of the "Angodsun", the so-called Northern army "for the pacification of China", whose Commander in Chief is Chang Tso-Lin.

I will read a characteristic section, from which we see that "the Commander in Chief, Chang Huan Tsan, commands the chiefs of the Secret Service Department to make exceptional and careful searches, to arrest the guilty parties and to hand them over to the court martial for punishment. The chiefs of the Secret Service Department are to mobilise all officers and non-commissioned officers and must absolutely find stores of Communist literature and of arms in the premises of the Soviet authorities (laughter), even if it be necessary, for this purpose, to make use of the stores of the chief police administration (Storm of laughter)."

This communication, the reliability of which we have no reason to doubt, seems to us extremely strange and wild, but such actions arise from the situation in China.

This shows that the attempts at provocation, the attempts to use all means to involve us in war-like action, are not exhausted by what is going on in Peking, Tientsin, Shanghai etc. These directions of an official representative of Chang Tso-Lin, who, by the bye, distinguished himself last year by his attacks on the Chinese Eastern railway, are a form of expressing the plan which is at present being carried out in China, and the component parts of which are the raid on our representative in Peking, the proceedings against our consulate in Shanghai, the domiciliary visits to our institutions in Tientsin. We must clearly understand that the attempt to involve us at any price in an armed conflict with the Chinese people...

(Cry of: Will not succeed!)

The object of these attempts was recently revealed by Chang Tso-Lin himself in an interview in which he begged the imperialists to help him against the Southern army and promised, in return, "to fight with his armies in the front rank against Bolshevism and against the Soviet Union."

The imperialists want to break up the Peking Treaty.

By provoking a war with China, the imperialists are trying, in the first place, to break up the Peking Treaty of 1924 between us and the Chinese people. This treaty thoroughly enraged the imperialists. The West European and American Press described this treaty as China's greatest international achievement. "The advantages of this treaty exceed the most extravagant dreams of China" — wrote the American newspaper "North China Star" in 1924. Our policy in China, our renunciation of the Boxer protocol, our renunciation of the privileges, of military occupation, finally the conclusion of a treaty based on equal rights will inevitably lead to the Chinese people demanding the abolition of the unequal treaties with the other Powers.

In regard to its relation to other States, the national movement demands, as the chief slogan of its foreign political programme everything that has already been put into effect by the Government of the Soviet Union in respect of China. By their attempts to compromise us in the eyes of China, by their attempts to call forth disputes between us and China, the imperialist Governments went at the same time to aim an annihilating blow at the Chinese revolution.

The Soviet Union clings with unshakeable determination to its peace policy.

Comrades, at the present Congress, I only intended to mention the questions which are connected with the most recent Note. As you see, this conflict which gave cause for the Notes between the Peking Government and ourselves, has, according to the intentions of its instigators and those responsible, gone beyond the limits mentioned in our Note, beyond the limits of our relations with China. The events which are developing in China, confirm in an illustrative way that a whole number or at least some of the imperialist States are involved.

The objective significance of these events lies in the attempts to provoke a war between China and our Union. I wished to emphasise at this Congress that we have replied and shall reply to this provocation that we intend to carry on our peace policy as obstinately as the Soviet Union has carried it on during the past years. (Applause, cries of: the provocative agents to the pillory!). Our demands on the Peking Government are as modest as they could be. They afford the Peking Government the opportunity of preventing the danger of fresh complications if only it has the good will to do so. We do not proceed to make reprisals or to occupy Chinese territory as an answer to a flagrant breach of a treaty based on the principle of equal rights and mutual respect. Any of the so-called "civilised" States, which has at its disposal our technical and other possibilities, would, were it in our position, immediately reply with a whole system of reprisals, occupation of territory and other measures corresponding to the policy of imperialism. As evidence of this, we need only mention the example of Nanking.

Our further measures towards settling the conflict which has arisen, will inevitably be directed towards maintaining and ensuring peace. But in this extremely tense situation, when the hostile forces are resorting to unprecedented provocation, the achievement of this end does not depend on us alone.

Comrades, I remember that during the imperialist war it was said that that side would win which had the strongest nerves. I should like to declare from this platform that, in the fight for our aims, both in illegal and legal fights and storms, we are so well steeled, that no one can reckon on the weakness of our nerves.

The International Workers Delegation in China.

The visit of the International Workers Delegation to China, consisting of Tom Mann (Great Britain), Earl Browder (United States) and Jaques Doriot (France), is an event of the greatest historical importance in the fight of the proletariat of the West and the toilers of the East against their common enemy, capitalist imperialism.

The object and purpose of the International Workers Delegation is the following:

1. To bring greeting and the expression of sympathy and solidarity to the National Revolutionary Government of China and the Kuomintang from the international proletariat.
2. To study the situation in China and to acquaint themselves intimately with the problems, aims, aspirations and obstacles to be overcome in the great struggle of the Chinese people against world imperialism.
3. To establish contact and a lasting militant alliance between the revolutionary labour movement of the world and the Chinese revolutionary liberation movement.
4. To encourage the Chinese people in their heroic struggle and to do everything possible to render moral and material aid to the Chinese revolutionary cause.
5. To utilise all the knowledge and information gathered by the Delegation in China for the purpose of mobilising the international labour movement to come to the aid of revolutionary China by preventing the imperialist powers from carrying out their predatory plans.

The visit of the Delegation has called forth the greatest interest and enthusiasm among the masses of Chinese workers and peasants, who see in the presence of the Delegation a tangible proof of the solidarity of the workers of the West in the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the East.

During its stay the delegation has addressed innumerable meetings and demonstrations held under the auspices of trade unions, peasants' organisations, and other revolutionary bodies. Every one of the numerous gatherings or functions attended by the delegation has been the scene of unbounded enthusiasm which has served to knit still more closely the bonds of international solidarity.

The first visits paid by the delegation after its arrival in revolutionary Canton were to the Kwangtung Provisional Government and the Kuomintang Party Committee. On the same day (February 19.) the Delegation visited the headquarters of the following labour organisations: The All-China Labour Federation, The Hong Kong Strike Committee, the Canton Workers Assembly and the Hong Kong General Federation. A joint meeting of the representatives of these organisations with the Delegations took place which was addressed by all members

of the Delegation. In the evening the Delegation was present at a reception banquet organised by the Provincial Government and the Provincial Committee of the Kuomintang. At this banquet there were present more than 500 representatives from various departments of the Government, the National Revolutionary Army, the Trade Unions, Peasant organisations and Womens and Students organisations. The Delegation was greeted by the representatives of all organisations. After speeches by each of the three delegates, who dealt with the attitude of the imperialists and also of the working class of his own country towards the Chinese Revolution, the gathering was addressed by the representative of the Communist International, M. N. Roy.

On the 21st February the members of the Delegation and the representative of the Communist International paid a visit to the Central Military and Political Academy of Whampoa, where they attended the weekly memorial meeting dedicated to the memory of Sun-Yat-Sen. Later a special meeting was called by the Academy at which there were present the entire student and teaching body of the Academy. After speeches by the delegates and the representative of the Communist International, the Delegation was greeted by representatives of the students and officers of the Academy. The Students' representative assured the Delegation that the Chinese revolution will not confine itself to narrow nationalism, but will link itself to the international revolutionary movement.

Of special interest and significance was the visit paid to the Hong Kong Strike Committee on February 22nd. This visit was, as expressed by Tom Mann, a real treat to the eyes, hearts and minds of the Delegates. The Delegation was present at a review of the Hong Kong strike pickets and of the Canton Workers Defence Corps, who went through their drills and manoeuvres to the visible admiration of the visiting delegates. But the hearts of the delegates were completely won by the impressive procession and drilling of more than a thousand uniformed children, the Pioneers, in age ranging from 5 to 15 years. A deep impression was made on the Delegation by the speech of Fong Kong, a ten year old Pioneer, who greeted the Delegation with an eloquent address. Tom Mann was moved to tears by the sight of this young representative of revolutionary China addressing the mass meeting and calling for world unity of all exploited classes and peoples in the great struggle against tyranny and oppression.

Later the Delegation attended a special meeting of the Strike Delegates, some 600 in number, who have conducted the Hong Kong strike for over a year and a half. Great enthusiasm was shown, especially when Tom Mann, after a stirring speech, gave the slogans of the meeting in the Chinese language. M. N. Roy greeted the strike leaders in the name of the Communist International, pointing out the leading role played by the Hong Kong and Shanghai working class in every critical moment of the Chinese Revolution, and pledging the Communist International to continue to mobilise the workers of the world to ally themselves with the Chinese people in the common struggle against the scourge of imperialism.

In the evening of the same day the delegates were present at a reception and banquet given by the Labour and Peasant organisations of Canton. A most cordial and brotherly atmosphere reigned at this banquet. It was like a hearty, convincing handshake of the working class of the West with the workers of the East. Workers' leaders of East and West recalled in their addresses some of the great battles of the working class in various countries. The British General Strike and the Miners' heroic struggle, the Hong Kong Strike, the Shanghai General Strike, the Passaic Textile Strike in America, the 24 hour General Strike in France against the Moroccan War etc. This truly international gathering closed with Tom Mann singing the Kuomintang song in the Chinese language, and with the singing of the "International".

The huge demonstration held on February 23, on the Sun Yat Sen University Campus was unique in its nature. At this demonstration over 10,000 workers, peasants, students, women, soldiers, and merchants delegated by their respective organisations came to hear the message of the International Workers Delegation. The sentiments of the Canton organisations which participated in this mass meeting, and of the Canton masses are best expressed in the slogan written on the banner presented to the Delegation by the meeting. The inscription reads:

"To the International Workers Delegation, to the leaders and general staff of the world's working class. The

alliance of the world proletariat with the oppressed peoples will free the world from the curse of imperialism and reaction, and will create a new and free world on the ruins of the old."

Each of the international delegates, as well as the representative of the Communist International, spoke on each of the three platforms erected on the University campus. The enthusiasm of the masses grew ever more visible and expressive as each of the international delegates made the round of all these platforms. A conspicuous and popular figure on each was Tom Mann, representative of the revolutionary workers of Great Britain, who led the cheers and shouted the slogans in chorus with the masses he addressed.

30,000 Peasants Demonstrate with International Workers Delegation.

An impressive mass meeting and demonstration of peasants was held on February 26 by the Peasants' League of Kwantung to meet the Delegation. The demonstration was attended by approximately 30,000 peasants. Numerous strains filled with peasants, many of whom had come tremendous distances, rolled into the Shek Wai-long Station throughout the morning and into the afternoon.

Out on the field, on the speakers' platform, there was to be seen a large portrait of Sun-Yat-Sen, attended on either side by portraits of Lenin and Karl Marx. The delegates were impressed by the presence of drilled companies of peasant women, and also of peasant children, who lent special colour and life to the very enthusiastic meeting. After the meeting there was a procession, in which the international delegates took part, carrying banners that had been brought to the meeting by the peasants. The unity of the revolutionary peasantry of China with the working class of the world received on this occasion a visible and concrete form.

On February 27, a special mass meeting was organised by a joint committee of the All-China Seamen's Union and the Railwaymen's Union of Kwantung. About 1500 delegates, principally from the railwaymen, participated; delegates from all ship committees of the Seamen's Union which were in port, were also present. The chairman of the Seamen's Union, Sou Sheu-ying, who is at the same time chairman of the All-China Labour Federation, delivered a stirring speech of welcome to the delegates, in which he emphasised the significance of the International Delegation's visit to China.

March 1st, was, so to speak, another Trade Union day for the Delegation. Three Labour organisations arranged special meetings and receptions for the delegation: the Photographers' Union, the Union of Hotel and Restaurant Workers, and the Shop Employees Union.

In the evening of the same day the delegates were given a reception by the delegate body of the Relief Association of Canton, an organisation connected with the International Red Aid. This is a real mass organisation, with over a quarter of a million members. It is engaged in relief work for the Shanghai strikers, for the dependents of soldiers fighting at the front, and generally for the victims of the revolutionary struggle.

A Day with the Students.

On March 2nd a special reception for the International Delegation was organised by the Students Union at the Sun Yat Sen University. From the same platform from which Dr. Sun first pronounced many of his famous teachings, the international labour delegates addressed a thousand students of the University. The chairman of the meeting was the director of the University, Dr. Chu Chia-hua. Tom Mann, the British delegate received an especially enthusiastic welcome when he denounced the atrocities of British imperialism in China, and when he predicted a new era of liberation from the curse of imperialism, to be effected by the alliance of the revolutionary working class of the imperialist countries with the oppressed peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial lands.

A Visit to the Kuomintang.

In the afternoon of March 2, Hong Kong branch of the Kuomintang gave a reception and banquet to the Delegation. Fon King, who delivered the address of welcome, gave a brief review of the history and activities of this organisation, and depicted the terrorism which the Hong Kong Kuomintang had to suffer at the hands of the British imperialists. Earl Browder, speaking for the delegation, said: "the imperialists bind the masses of our countries by representing the Chinese people as an impenetrable mystery. They have coined a special term,

'Chinese puzzle', to signify anything no mortal can understand. Our first message to the masses upon our return shall be, that the 'Chinese Puzzle' is an imperialist lie, that in every way we are your brothers, that your problems are much the same as ours, your ideals the same, your goal the same, your enemies the same."

* * *

From the foregoing, which represents the briefest outline of the activities of the International Workers Delegation, it will be seen that the visit of these representatives of the workers of the West has called forth the greatest enthusiasm and response among the toiling masses of revolutionary China, who will be encouraged and strengthened in their determination to throw off the yoke of foreign imperialism, in spite of all difficulties and temporary set-backs. At the same time the visit should serve to arouse and increase the interest of the workers of the capitalist countries in the heroic struggle of their brothers in the Far East and enhance the feeling of solidarity of the Western proletariat for the liberation movements of the oppressed colonial peoples.

POLITICS

The Settlement of the Conflict between the Soviet Union and Switzerland.

From the "Isvestia" of 16th April 1927.

In Berlin the Political representative of the Soviet Union, Comrade Krestinski, and the Swiss Ambassador, Herr Rüfenbach, have signed a protocol by which the conflict between the Soviet Union and Switzerland which had lasted for nearly four years, is settled.

As is known, the conflict between the Soviet Union and Switzerland arose after the murder of the Soviet delegate, Comrade Vorovsky and the wounding of his assistants, Arens and Divilkovsky at the time of the Conference of Lausanne in May 1923. The attitude of the Swiss government, which not only did not adopt any measures to safeguard Comrade Vorovsky, but promoted in every way the furious fascist propaganda which demanded that the Soviet delegates be got out of the way by any means whatever, compelled the Soviet government to demand of the Swiss government that the latter recognise its share of responsibility for the murder of Vorovsky. As is also known, the Swiss government not only lacked the courage to confess its guilt, but denied it in every way even in defiance of the indisputable facts.

After repeated attempts to obtain from the Swiss government the satisfaction upon which public opinion in the Soviet Union insisted, the government of the Soviet Union replied to such behaviour on the part of the Swiss government with a declaration of a boycott against Switzerland. A decree of the Central Executive Committee forbade citizens of the Soviet Union to enter Swiss territory and also forbade the Soviet economic organisations to conclude any business with Swiss citizens and Swiss firms.

The indignation of public opinion in the Soviet Union against Switzerland increased still further when, in the Autumn of 1923, the Court of Lausanne acquitted the murderer of Comrade Vorovsky, the white-guardist fascist Konradi. Of course the Swiss government continually pointed to the "independence" of the court and to the utter lack of any possibility of influencing its decisions. In the meantime the undisguised incitement against Comrade Vorovsky which did not cease even after he had been murdered, as well as the praise of the heroic "act" of the murderer Konradi, created a certain atmosphere which favoured his acquittal by the court. The Swiss government did nothing to dispel this atmosphere.

The recent negotiations, which ended with the signing of the protocol regarding the settlement of the conflict on the 14th of April, represent a second attempt to regulate the mutual relations between the Soviet Union and Switzerland. It should be remarked, however, that these two attempts had as their basis certain facts which lie, so to speak, outside the sphere of the immediate relations between the Soviet Union and Switzerland.

Switzerland is the seat of the League of Nations and at the same time the meeting place of a whole number of conferences which are convened by the League of Nations. As is known, the leaders of the League of Nations, have in the course of the last year or so made a number of attempts to get the Soviet

Union to participate in all sorts of Conferences. In this they have made use of Switzerland, or rather the existence of the conflict between the Soviet Union and Switzerland to carry out tactical manoeuvres against the Soviet Union.

Thus, for example, on the 12th December 1925 they invited the Soviet Union to the meeting of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, which meeting was originally fixed for the 15th February 1926 but was later postponed to May of the same year. The Powers which invited the Soviet Union to the Conference of Geneva must have known that the Soviet Union, in spite of its desire to take part in the Conference, would not and could not send its delegates to Switzerland. Already before the official invitations were sent out, our press raised this question and declared that the invitation to Geneva would be regarded by the public opinion of the Soviet Union as a provocation having as its real object to exclude the Soviet Union from participating in the Conference.

Directly in connection with this invitation differences of opinion arose last year among the leaders of the League. Some of the Powers which were responsible for the invitations, as for example France, were at the moment, for various reasons, interested in the Soviet Union's participation in the Conference. In view of this circumstance the French government offered the government of the Soviet Union its services as mediator in settling the dispute between the Soviet Union and Switzerland.

The government of the Soviet Union, which, as always proceeded from those general peace principles which determine its policy, and did not desire to place the Swiss government in a humiliating position, informed the French government that it accepted its mediation and at the same time announced those of its minimum demands the fulfilment of which by the Swiss government would be regarded by the government of the Soviet Union as a settlement of the dispute. These demands included in the first place the immediate and definite expression of regret on the part of the Swiss government for the murder which had been committed, and secondly, in view of the serious character of the incident, as a token of this regret to fix a certain sum of money as an indemnity, to the daughter of the murdered Comrade Vorovsky.

During the negotiations which took place last year the Swiss government did not show an express desire to settle the dispute and to fulfil the just demand of the government of the Soviet Union. With an unjustifiable obstinacy the Swiss government clung to certain sentences and words by means of which it had to express its attitude to the cause of this dispute. The mediation of the French government did not lead to any result, and at the beginning of February 1926 the negotiations regarding the settlement of the conflict were broken off.

After that there arose among the leaders of the League of Nations the desire to get the Soviet Union to participate in a number of Conferences which took place on Swiss territory. Every time the Soviet government received the respective invitation, it rejected it and pointed to the impossibility of a delegate of the Soviet Union entering Swiss territory. The consistent attitude of the Soviet government forced the leaders of the League of Nations repeatedly to raise the question of transferring the seat of a number of Conferences to another country. This prospect caused the Swiss statesmen great fears and was, of course, bound to lead to a more yielding attitude on their part.

In Spring of this year there is to take place in Switzerland the Economic Conference convened by the League of Nations, and in Autumn the Disarmament Conference. It appears that this time, for various reasons, the leaders of the League of Nations desired the participation of the Soviet Union in these Conferences. In view of this situation the Swiss government entered into direct negotiations with the Soviet government and agreed to that form of the settlement of the conflict which is laid down in the Protocol.

The Soviet government did not insist upon single sentences and words. True to its principles, it did not wish to submit demands to the Swiss government which are incompatible with the latter's sovereignty. Although the signed Protocol does not completely fulfil the just demands of the public opinion of the Soviet Union, nevertheless it fills in its two points (expression of regret for the murder and agreement to pay compensation to the daughter of Comrade Vorovsky) the main formulations which the Soviet government put forward in the Summer of 1923.

The peoples of the Soviet Union make no claims on the Swiss people; they are prepared, not only to settle the dispute,

but also to do everything possible in order to bring about normal relations between the two countries. It rests with the Swiss government in the future to draw the appropriate conclusions which are capable of furthering the real interests of the peoples of both countries.

The Political Situation in Germany.

By P. R. Dietrich (Berlin).

For the last three months the Government of the bourgeois bloc has been ruling Germany. Its governmental activity up to the present has fully sufficed to prove not only to the working class but also to the petty-bourgeois and petty-peasant circles, that it is pronouncedly an instrument in the hands of the big trusts and combines, a weapon against the entire working population of the country.

The process of "rationalisation" has been carried on in a more intensified form than before. The average level of production during the last three months has been maintained at the relatively considerable height it attained in the last quarter of 1926. At the same time, prices have been maintained on that level, too, so that the profits of rationalisation have continued undiminished. This is proved, *inter alia*, by fact that by reason of the unusually large profits derived at present by the German bourgeoisie from the home market, Germany's urgent desire to export to the world markets has markedly abated.

Parallel with the more rigorous continuation of methods of rationalisation in German economy, we have experienced a renewed general attack on the living conditions of the German worker. Though nominal wages have remained practically unchanged since September 1926, actual wages have declined, as is shown by the rise in the official cost-of-living index figure from 142 in September 1926 to 145.4 in February 1927. The low level of weekly wage rates is systematically exploited by employers for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear on the workers in regard to overtime and to sweated job-wage stipulations.

Added to the fall of actual wages, there is the rise of dwelling rents by 10 per cent., put into effect on April 1st, 1927, and the augmentation of the duty on flour from 10 marks to 11.50 marks per 100 kilogrammes, which in the case of a family of five means a surplus onus on the household of about 70 marks a year. Furthermore, the Government intends to raise the duty on sugar and is likely to accede to the demand of the agrarians for the prevention of the free importation of frozen meat, so that the meat prices, too, will again be caused to rise. Whereas new sources of profit are thus opened up for the employers and the big land-owners, the living conditions of the German working class have markedly deteriorated and will continue to deteriorate.

The same tendency is observable if we regard the budget of the German Government, which occupied the Reichstag up to the time of the Easter vacations. The budget submitted by the Marx-Hergt-Keudell Government taxes the entire German population to an aggregate extent of about 15,000 million marks, if we add the communal and other taxes to the main items. By far the greater part of this onus rests on the shoulders of the broad masses. The State budget is particularly characterised by the fact that the German army and navy figure at the tremendous sum of 700 million marks, while the expenditure for the so-called productive unemployment relief has been curtailed by 50 millions. The item for the technical emergency service was maintained at its old figure. On the other hand, the expenditure for child relief was abridged in comparison with the last budget. The dole for the benefit of necessitous teachers was struck off the list, but the so-called church funds, a subsidy for the clergy, figures higher in the new budget than in the last. Yet another instance to illustrate the character of the budget: By reason of the reactionary financial settlement, Bavaria received a special subvention of 45 millions for the purpose of covering its surplus expenditure for its swollen reactionary bureaucratic apparatus and its policy of subsidising the church.

Together with the settlement of the reactionary budget, the bourgeois-bloc Government passed an emergency labour law, which provides for the following legal regulation of working hours. The stipulation whereby the eight-hour day can be lengthened to ten hours by a tariff agreement or by an official decree, continues to obtain. This ten-hour day can be exceeded even without any official sanction in the case of temporary work undertaken in emergency situations or for the purpose of preventing the waste of raw materials or the failure of the fruits

of labour. The consequence of the emergency legislation passed by the Government parties is the yet greater possibility of exceeding even the ten-hour day. The regulation in regard to the payment of a wage premium for overtime now obtains only in respect of a very limited portion of the overtime work, and even in this connection so many clauses have been allowed to remain undecided that the employers get practically out of paying any premium at all for overtime.

In a cultural sense, too, the reactionary elements have made considerable headway under the bourgeois-bloc Government. The law against the immoral and indecent in art and literature, the public entertainment laws against juveniles, the brutal forensic campaign against authors and publishers, the numerous lawsuits in regard to productions of art allegedly endangering the State, the persecution even of composers and other employees of the printing-works, and the bullying tactics employed against the juvenile and children's movement, all show that the Government of the bourgeois bloc is very ready to satisfy the demands of cultural reaction. A new coup, meanwhile, is being prepared by the bourgeois-bloc Government in the form of the educational law of the realm and the concordat negotiations, purporting to complete the clerification of the entire system of education from the elementary schools to the universities and to render the schools and the teachers mere tools in the hands of the clergy.

The German bourgeoisie, however, is not content with the economic and cultural subjugation of the German working class. It is no mere coincidence, that at the time of the general political and economic offensive of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, one week after the 1st of May, the Fascists from all parts of the realm should assemble in Berlin under the lead of the "Stahlhelm". The tone of the Fascist press, the unheard-of, daily recurrent provocations, the sanguinary episodes in Berlin and throughout the country, clearly illustrate the designs of the bourgeoisie backing the Stahlhelm and the other Fascist organisations. On May 8th, says the official organ of the Stahlhelm union, the German public shall see that Berlin is not governed by the "Red rabble".

Just as the Social Democratic Party and the A. D. G. B. have failed to put up a serious fight against the capitalist offensive and the cultural reaction, and just as they have refrained from calling up the working masses to serious resistance to the labour emergency laws of the bourgeois-bloc Government, they are altogether unwilling to organise the fight against the Fascist auxiliary troops of the German bourgeoisie. The attitude of the Social Democrats towards the Fascist parade on May 8th, is characterised by the speech held recently by Hörsing, the Social Democratic leader of the "Reichsbanner", on the occasion of the great meeting of that organisation in Berlin. In the course of this speech he said: "In no country of Europe is the patience and forbearance of the constitutional republicans in dealing with the enemies of the Republic, the political bandits of the Right and the Left, so great as it is in Germany." What Hörsing says of the "bandits of the Right" need naturally not be taken too seriously, especially since these reactionary bandits have turned into republican bandits by reason of their profession of allegiance to the Republic. His mention of bandits of the Left", however, gave the signal to the bourgeoisie for a renewed campaign against the Communists. In regard to the Stahlhelm day, Hörsing contented himself with advising his followers to "ignore" the Stahlhelm parade. This is what is meant by a "loyal opposition" which practically amounts to a sufferance of, and connivance at, this new anti-Bolshevist ally.

The virulent anti-Communist campaign of the Social Democratic leaders of the Reichsbanner, the pretended opposition of the S. P. G. and the A. D. G. B. to the capitalistic methods of rationalisation and cultural reaction, cannot prevent the will for a united militant action of the German working class from growing stronger and stronger among the Social Democratic workers. During the last few weeks many German towns have seen Social Democratic workers and proletarian members of the Reichsbanner joining forces with Communist workers against the threatening imperialist danger of war, the offensive of the capitalists, and the cultural reaction. In spite of the sabotage of the S. P. G. leaders and the trade union bureaucrats, the 1st of May, 1927, will be marked by the unity of German workers, the growing resistance offered by the workers to the economic, political, and cultural reaction, and a united front against the imperialist war-propagandists and their accomplices in the camp of the Social Democratic Party and the Second International.

The Fight against the "Capitulations" in Egypt.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

Egypt is the only country, apart from China, in which there still formally exist capitulations, that is to say special rights and privileges for the citizens of foreign imperialist States. The origin of the Egyptian capitulations is to be traced to the capitulation rights which were enforced upon the Turkish Empire by the European States in the 19th century. And although Egypt was the first country to be freed from the "yoke of Ottoman despotism" and to be converted into a protectorate of the great civilising power, Great Britain, nevertheless even under the English protectorate the regime of capitulations still continues. This was the compensation which England had to pay to her rivals — France, Italy and Germany — for the latter's recognition of the British protectorate. By means of the capitulations, not only the ruling English, but also more or less big colonies of other European powers exist as parasites on the living body of the Egyptian people.

This state of affairs was in no way altered when the Ottoman Empire finally collapsed after the world war. Everywhere in all provinces of the former Ottoman Empire the capitulations were abolished shortly after the conclusion of peace. With a stroke of the pen the special privileges of foreigners were abolished by the French mandatory power in Syria, and by the English in Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq. The English and French administrations which were set up in these countries realised only too well to what an unbearable state of affairs, from the political and economic standpoint, the retention of the capitulations would be bound to lead. Apart from America, which also was granted certain compensations, there was no Power in these countries which have placed obstacles in the way of the abolition of the capitulations in these countries.

In 1922, under the Lausanne Treaty, the capitulations were also abolished in the territory of the newly-arisen national independent Turkey; nor did the rulers of Arabia think of granting special rights to foreigners.

Egypt alone remained burdened with the capitulation regime. The independence of Egypt was formally proclaimed; the country received its own king, its own government, a parliament and a Senate. But this independence was reduced to an empty formula, not only by the continued occupation of the country by British troops, the retention by British officials of all the most important administrative posts, but before all by the continued existence of the capitulations.

It is to be seen, therefore, that the fight for Egyptian independence is closely bound up with the abolition of the capitulations. All the Egyptian parties have included in their programmes the demand for the abolition of this institution which is so disastrous and humiliating for the country. But all attempts to abolish the capitulations have up to now been frustrated by the resistance of the interested Powers. England, France, Italy, Greece, Spain and the other countries plainly and emphatically declare that they will not renounce the rights of their citizens to be free from taxation, to recognise only the Consular courts and to be exempt from the jurisdiction of the Egyptian courts.

It is in vain that the Egyptian government proves by means of statistics that the capitulations render Egypt a perfect paradise for foreign criminals, smugglers, swindlers etc. It is in vain that it points out the tremendous injury caused every year to Egyptian national economy by the capitulations. Equally vain are the attempts to bring about a temporary compromise solution, as for instance, extension of the jurisdiction of the so-called mixed courts (in which foreign and Egyptian judges take part), limitation of the jurisdiction of the Consular courts to exceptional cases, liability of foreigners to pay certain taxes. The Powers obstinately refuse to give way an inch in this matter.

It is characteristic how quickly Germany, whose capitulation rights were abolished in the war, but were then given back by the English, has again resumed her place in the imperialist united front. The German representative refused the request of the Egyptian government that the capitulations be abolished just as emphatically as did the representatives of the other countries. Germany cannot alone renounce her privileges.

In view of the failure of the negotiations, the Egyptian press is pointing out more and more the necessity of using other means in order to force the obstinate foreign powers to give up their privileges. At the same time the Egyptian press does not

fail to call attention to the Chinese example, and there are tendencies to continue the campaign against the capitulations with revolutionary means.

ECONOMICS

Directions to the Sections of the Communist International for the Economic Conference of the League of Nations.

I.

1. If the original object of the Economic Conference planned by the imperialist States was rather that of propaganda in favour of the League of Nations, the aspect of affairs has now altogether changed. For Great Britain the Economic Conference, which is to meet in May, is a further factor in the anti-Soviet front which is being formed under British lead. There can be no doubt of this. It is confirmed by the growing interest of Great Britain in the Conference. When the first preparations for the Conference were being made, the British public took little interest in the preliminaries. The plans worked out by the French were regarded in Great Britain as Utopian and reactionary.

2. Great Britain is consciously and consequentially continuing its Geneva policy. At the moment its efforts are concentrated on Germany and Poland.

In the latter respect, we have the British promotion of the attempted approach between Poland and Lithuania. These problems contain the key to the inclusion of Germany in the anti-Soviet front. Polish concessions on Lithuanian territory might afford Poland a new channel for navigation and a harbour on the Baltic. In this manner the question of the Danzig corridor would lose in importance in the eyes of Poland, and a settlement of the corridor problem in favour of Germany would become conceivable and possible.

For Germany there are two other questions which can only be solved by means of an understanding with the Entente: 1. the permission to keep a standing army, which would be one of the main presumptions for an effective imperialistic activity on the part of Germany; 2. the question of colonies, which is likewise only to be solved by means of an understanding with Great Britain. As the price of an inclusion of Germany in the anti-Soviet front, Great Britain would doubtless consider the sacrifice of some of the less valuable trade areas.

Added to this, we have Great Britain's Balkan policy, which is part of its general policy of encircling the Soviet Union. Both in the Balkans, i. e. in Albania, etc., and in Africa, Italy cannot advance without the support of Great Britain. Besides backing Great Britain's policy in the rest of the world, Italy has now confirmed its foreign policy in an anti-Soviet sense by the recognition of Roumania's annexation of Bessarabia. That, in broad outlines, is the policy of Great Britain, which is bound to find its expression, more or less veiled, at the forthcoming International Economic Conference.

3. As the political side of the anti-Soviet bloc will doubtless not be broached openly at the World Economic Conference, the same tendencies will find expression by means of economic questions, in which respect we may distinguish between a direct and an indirect line of action.

The former will take the form of an attack on the foreign trade monopoly of the Soviet Union, based on the recognition that this is one of the most decisive economic weapons of the Soviet Union against the capitalist world. It will be pointed out that no reasonable commercial connection can be entertained with a country possessing a foreign trade monopoly. In the same connection it will be remarked that the European economic crisis can only be solved by an inclusion of the Russian market in the world's economy. Nor can there be any doubt as to the further trend of the arguments to be advanced. If the Soviet Union does not abolish its foreign trade monopoly, which it cannot very well do, there is nothing left but to limit the economic traffic with such a country to the barest minimum. This is the line of attack most likely to be taken up against the Soviet Union at the World Economic Conference.

It will be indirectly continued by the British attempts to effect a financial boycott by the capitalist countries in regard to the Soviet Union. In the first place it will be a question of preventing any long-termed goods credits, such as have been

granted, albeit hesitatingly, by Germany of late. An attempt at the boycotting of exports to the Soviet Union will complete the general programme.

Great Britain, which is at the moment the decisive factor at the Conference, aims at achieving the economic boycott of the Soviet Union by new means. We should not, however, overlook the difficulties which lie in the way of Great Britain in this respect.

4. The **Pan-Europe problem**, which is not without importance in connection with the Conference, is at present based on the co-operation of the European States under French hegemony and the association of this bloc with the Anglo-American world for the purpose of a struggle against the Soviet Union, the Anglo-French differences being temporarily relegated to the background. This object has during the last few weeks been expressed clearly enough by the adherents of the Pan-Europe movement.

5. In the same connection, importance attaches to the policy of the **Second International** towards the World Economic Conference. The Second International aims at awakening new illusions among the working classes, as though conferences among representatives of the imperialistic States could help to solve the contradictions arising from the anarchistic system of capitalism. Here again it is a question of diverting the attention of the working masses from capitalism on an international scale and of veiling the assistance rendered by the Second International to the British policy of preparation for war against the Soviet Union.

In this connection reference may be made to the clever differentiation in the policy of the Second International on a national scale, which attempts to do justice both to the opinions of the masses and to special national requirements. In this sense we have the latest attempts in Germany which aim at pointing out a difference between the Government of the Soviet Union, or the C. P. S. U., and the proletariat of Soviet Russia. In the case of a fight on the part of Great Britain, it is argued, it would be obviously necessary to defend the proletariat of the Soviet Union, although the policy of the Government of the Soviet Union does not differ very much from that of the British Government.

6. These are the main points in the collaboration of the Second International with British imperialism, which is in the first place directed against the international working class and its bulwark, the Soviet Union. And such will presumably be the common line adopted by all who take part in the Conference.

But beyond this the Conference is, of special importance for the working class of the capitalist countries, inasmuch as it is intended to promote the **international concentration of the capitalist trusts and monopolies** within such limits as shall prove feasible. Here it is the question of **organising a uniform international fight against the wage and working conditions of the working class of the European countries, an attempt at "rationalisation" on an international basis.** For the support of these plans the reformists are attempting to exploit the trade union and co-operative organisations, and to cause them to enter into a working community with the League of Nations and its Economic Conference. Accordingly, the capitalist Governments have appointed "trustworthy" representatives of the trade-union bureaucracy as members of their delegations to Geneva, and the International Co-operative Alliance has been accorded direct representation. Thus renewed and urgent importance attaches to the Communist demands for **international trade-union unity** and to the necessity of the close alliance between trade unions and co-operatives, not for collaboration with capital but for the struggle against it.

II.

1. A further task, which may perhaps permit of a partial solution, is the struggle of the imperialist States against such agrarian States as are still in process of developing into industrial countries. In other words, a fight against the protective and export duties of such States. By the elimination or essential reduction of the customs duties in these countries it is hoped that their industrialisation may be hindered so that they may be made completely dependent on their imperialist neighbours. Indirectly, this fight is waged by means of propaganda against "shortsighted imperialism". By fostering their own industries, the small countries produce too dear; thus the high cost of production places too heavy a burden on the consumer, and the general turnover of goods is restricted.

2. Another question brought up by the Conference concerns the differences among the imperialist States themselves, which even find expression in the material prepared by the League of Nations. Meanwhile it may be read between the lines that the Conference is not in a position to solve these problems. Nor is it likely that the differences in question will find expression at the Conference itself, which as far as this delicate problem is concerned has only the value of a public discussion and cannot result in any binding decisions. This fact is reflected in the nature of the delegations, which comprise only experts but no responsible representatives of the Governments.

The differences existing among the imperialist groups are either general differences of a political nature or else the antagonism between industrial capital on the one hand and banking capital on the other.

Thus the **Bankers' Memorandum** declared that prices in general had been augmented by artificial means. Customs barriers ought to be eliminated. A somewhat more cautious tone was adopted by the **Memorandum of the International Chamber of Commerce**, which only required a reduction of the customs rates by the individual countries. If, however, we bear in mind the verdict which this memorandum met with the world over, we can see clearly that it was nothing but a striking proof of the insoluble contradictions in which the capitalist world has been again involved since the world war.

Thus **Coolidge** declared that a considerable difference existed between the methods and customs systems of the European States and those of the **United States of America**. In his opinion, indeed, the memorandum was without value save for the European States. **Mellon** declared that the present American customs system had led to greater prosperity in American economy and that it must not be disturbed. If, nevertheless, certain representatives of American high finance acceded to the memorandum, this only serves to show the differences existing within the United States, too between such forces as desire to force capital exportation and such as rule the American market.

Nor was the memorandum any better received in the European States, indeed, it came to pass that the representatives of certain States even retracted their signatures.

It was not, however, until the first echo aroused by the preparations for the Conference, that the abyssal differences between the imperialist States became fully apparent. **Great Britain** pointed out that its vital interests were centred not in European problems, but in the questions of the **Soviet Union, China, India, and Turkey.**

On the other hand, the attitude of the British delegates at the preliminary conference was directed towards the suppression of the **Franco-German rapprochement.**

The **United States**, meanwhile, have assumed a waiting attitude towards the Conference. France hopes to make use of the Conference for the purpose of strengthening its position on the European Continent and of counteracting the constantly growing influence of American financial capital in Europe. In this connection, it is the Pan-Europe propaganda in particular that play an important part.

Germany, again, voiced the special interests of its heavy industries, which sought by means of an understanding with French heavy industries to create an iron and steel monopoly on the European Continent.

The more countries, the more differences. Nor can such problems be solved by mere compromise or removed by declarations and resolutions. Thus the "**Conference for International Economic Peace**" reflects the war in the ranks of the imperialist States, and it is only the Second International that could believe this Conference to be a means of solving the capitalistic contradictions.

III.

The agenda of the Conference does not contain a single question representing the requirements of the **working class of Europe.** The unemployment problem has been barred from the agenda. Questions concerning wages and working hours simply do not exist for the representatives of the imperialists and their adherents. On the other hand, the Conference will be used for the purpose of preparing an attack on an international basis against the wage and labour conditions of the working class, an attack which the workers of the world can only meet by the creation of an internationally united and militant trade union movement.

But it is not only for this reason that a watchful eye must be kept on this Conference by the working class. It is in close connection with the menace of war, which it is the duty of the international working class to combat. At the same time there can be no doubt but that the illusions entertained by the Second International will be cruelly dispelled by the outcome of the Conference. Furthermore, the Conference demonstrates to the working class the existing imperialist antagonisms, which contain the germs of armed conflicts between the imperialist groups and which can only be solved by the overthrow of the capitalist order of economy.

And in this direction the way is open to the international working class. Under the leadership of the proletariat, the working masses of all lands must fight for an economic order which will do justice to their interests. If this fight is to be waged successfully, however, the first presumption is **unity among the proletarian forces**, together with the **guarantee of Socialist construction** in those countries in which the **proletarian revolution has been victorious**. The unmasking of the initiators of the Geneva Economic Conference and their accomplices contribute to unite the proletarians of all countries under our slogans:

Peace with the Soviet Union!

Way for the Chinese Revolution!

International Trade Union Unity!

Militant Collaboration of the Trade Unions and Co-operatives!

The burning questions of the times can be solved by no conference of imperialist robbers, but solely by the revolutionary fight of the world proletariat for the victory of Socialism!

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS

Resolution of the IV. Soviet Congress of the Soviet Union on the Foreign and Home Policy of the Government.

Moscow, 20th April 1927.

After hearing the concluding speech of comrade Rykov, the soviet congress unanimously adopted the following decision:

The fourth soviet congress of the U. S. S. R. after having heard and discussed the report of the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Soviet Union, Rykov, completely approves of the activity of the government and of its future political and economic programme.

The congress records the fact that the activity of the government with regard to the development and consolidation of the relations of the Soviet Union with capitalist countries has been rendered more difficult in consequence of the **growing hostility of the governments of a number of capitalist countries towards the Soviet Union**. The cause of this growing hostility is, in the opinion of the congress, to be found in the fact that the existence of the workers state and its successful efforts to build up socialism whilst rejecting all forms of national oppression and exploitation, progressively weakens the positions of the world bourgeoisie against the exploited and oppressed working class of the capitalist countries and against the peoples of the colonial countries.

The congress draws the attention of all toilers anxiously to the **extremely rapid intensification of the aggressive attitude of the world bourgeoisie towards the Soviet Union in the last time**. The very peculiar "warning" Note of Great Britain and the insolent violence, unprecedented in the history of international relationships, shown to the diplomatic institutions of the Soviet Union in Peking and Shanghai, violence perpetrated with provocative intent, force the Soviet Union to be on its guard. The congress instructs the government to be prepared to counter all attempts to force the Soviet Union into war and to do everything possible to avoid war.

The congress warns the whole world that the policy of the international bourgeoisie towards the Soviet Union and towards the movement of the workers and peasants of China for national emancipation, is threatening the world with the **danger of a new world war**.

The congress expresses its sympathy with the movement of the people of China for national freedom and approves completely of the policy of the government of the Soviet Union

towards China which is based upon a complete recognition of the absolute sovereignty of China, upon complete equality and upon the absolute abandonment by the Soviet Union of all special rights and privileges enjoyed by foreigners in China.

The congress draws the attention of the peoples of the whole world to the undoubted fact that the Soviet Union is the only State in the world pursuing a direct and open policy of peace in accordance with the interests of the whole of humanity. The congress completely approves of this policy of peace and instructs the government of the Soviet Union to continue it ceaselessly and to endeavour to establish and consolidate friendly relations with all foreign States. The congress records with satisfaction that these efforts of the Soviet Union have found response in a number of States and that in consequence the extension of the economic relations with these States have proved the correctness of this policy.

The congress approves completely of the measures of the government to industrialise the country and the congress is of the opinion that the industrialisation policy has proved to be perfectly correct in the period which has passed since the third soviet congress of the Soviet Union. The congress records the fact that the result of this policy was a very considerable consolidation of the basis for the work of building up socialism in the country as evidenced by the speedy growth of the large-scale industry in the hands of the State, by the rapid extension of those branches of industry producing the means of production, by the steady numerical growth of the working class and the improvement of its material position, by the socialisation of commodity circulation, by the success obtained in the campaign to drive private capital out of its economic positions, by the strengthened co-operative organisation of the population and finally, by the process of intensification and rationalisation of agricultural production.

The congress records the fact that all this progress is due to the measures adopted by the government to consolidate the economic alliance between town and country and in particular to the measures adopted to lower the prices of industrial goods, to reduce the weight of taxation upon the propertyless and middle sections of the peasantry and to develop the system of agricultural credits etc.

The congress approves of the activity of the government to revive the work of the soviets and to draw broad masses of the toilers into this work. The congress records with particular satisfaction that the last election campaign in relation to the soviet elections was successful and showed an increased activity of the workers and peasants in the socialist constructive work in the country.

The congress approves of the activity of the government with regard to the carrying out of the instructions of the last congress in the question of the nationalities. The congress refers particularly to the consolidation and strengthening of the material basis for the State development of the affiliated and autonomous republics and territories, the extension of their budgetary rights and the increase of the sums granted by the Soviet Union to assist the national budgets of the poorer republics. The carrying out of these measures has assured the systematic economic progress of the economically backward peoples of the Soviet Union together with a continued development of their cultural and social life.

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union Regarding the Negotiations with the Metal Workers' International.

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union*) approves of the attitude taken by the delegation of the Union at the Conference with the representatives of the Metal Workers' International, held in Berlin on February 7th 1927.

The Plenum records that the representatives of the M. W. I. proved, during the negotiations, to be decided opponents to the unity of the international metal workers' movement.

The attitude of the representatives of the M. W. I. at the Conference in Berlin shows that the delegation of the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union was invited exclusively with the object of giving the impression that the International

*) The Plenum sat from March 21st to 27th 1927.

aims at unity. The leaders of the M. W. I. had resolved in advance to break off negotiations. This explains why the provocative demand was made to the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union that it should dissolve the revolutionary organisations of the metal workers in Czechoslovakia and in France and disperse the nuclei and Communist fractions.

The Plenum considers it necessary to lay special stress on the circumstance that, after the negotiations in Berlin, the leaders of the M. W. I. have systematically misrepresented facts and deliberately spread mendacious reports about the course taken by the Berlin negotiations, instead of publishing the original documents (the stenogram of the negotiations).

The Plenum emphasises two chief factors:

1. The assertion that the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union had declined to join the International.

2. The assertion that the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union was opposed to the American metal workers being admitted to the International.

Both assertions are in absolute contradiction to the attitude actually taken by the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union.

The Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union rejected the proposal concerning the dissolution of the revolutionary organisations, but it did not refuse to join the International and to support the efforts to unite the metal workers in the countries where a split has taken place. The Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union has no authority to disperse the independent organisations in France and Czechoslovakia which it did not create.

The Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union criticised and will continue to criticise the unprincipled behaviour of the leaders of the M. W. I. towards the anti-socialist leaders of the American trade union movement; the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union always has been however and still is a partisan of the union of the metal workers of all countries and continents, including the metal workers of America, into one, united International.

The Plenum approves of the complete stenogram of the negotiations being published in the organ of the I. P. C. of the revolutionary metal workers and calls upon the members of the Union to study this document.

The Plenum of the Central Committee does not regard as a coincidence the lack of principle and the extremely accommodating spirit shown by the leaders of the M. W. I. towards America and the accentuated hostility they showed to those metal workers organisations which hold the revolutionary class standpoint. The Plenum of the C. C. of the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union sees in this a sudden change of course on the part of the Amsterdam International as a whole and of the Metal Workers' International towards the "American" methods of co-operation between the classes. In the present circumstances, a course in this direction means a maximum weakening of the working class in its fight against concentrated capital.

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union declares that the metal workers of the Soviet Union will counteract this injurious course which threatens the international proletariat and calls upon the metal workers of all countries to join in the fight against the attempts made by Amsterdam to destroy the last remnants of the class traditions of the European proletariat.

The Metal Workers' Union of the Soviet Union will continue in the future to fight for international unity, for a united International of the metal workers, which is capable of fighting, for an International of all metal workers from Shanghai to New York.

RESCUE SACCO AND VANZETTI

Vanzetti in Prison.

By John dos Passos.

(Defence Committee for Sacco and Vanzetti.)

The Charleston prison is built, like a church, in the shape of a cross. Visitors wait in a sort of chancel and are admitted into the transept where, in a catholic church, the high altar would stand. There, facing a warder seated at a desk, one sees a semi-circle of benches. On all the benches couples are seated who talk with each other in subdued voices.

Of each of these couples one is a prisoner, the other a friend, a brother or a wife. The visitors from the outer world sit un-

comfortably there; they feel ashamed of the freshness of their cheeks, of the suggestion of freedom conveyed by their clothing. Like visitors to a hospital they wish they were outside again, and then feel ashamed of this wish.

On one of the benches there sits Vanzetti with broad chin and peaceful countenance. His look is perfectly calm and serene. His lips do not tremble when he smiles under his thick moustache. But this is the calm of a man who stands with his back to the wall . . .

"Now what do you think of things?" we ask each other. The trial is something separate and apart, something far remote like a prizefight heard over the wireless. "Very bad," says Vanzetti. "I have to work very, very hard now. There are many things which I should like to write, and perhaps I have not much time." He has about three hours in the day free in which to read newspapers and write letters and articles. The rest of the time he spends in the workshop making number plates for motor cars. "But it is so hard to write in prison. Formerly I used to be able to do nine or eleven hours hard work a day and then sit down and write. Then it just streamed out of me, straight from the heart. Often I had no need to make an alteration or improvement in an article. But now I have to think out each word. It is so hard to write in a cell."

Somehow we got talking about the chaplains. Both the catholic priest and the protestant pastor had written articles and made public declarations against him. It is demoralising for the other prisoners when an arrested murderer year in and year out escapes the electric chair, as is the case here. "They hate me because I am an atheist," said Vanzetti. "If I were to come humbly to them and say, 'Father, I am distressed, please give me absolution', then they would help me." They feel bitter towards him, as like doctors towards a sick person who will not take their medicine.

The time grew short. The hour was nearing its end. And how would it stand with a compromise? What if, as a result of a change of front on the part of many eminent people in Boston and as a result of the "Boston Herald" coming forward with the demand for an impartial investigation of the case, a revision of the sentence or a pardon were to be offered him. Since the case of Tom Mooney it has become the fashion to imprison a man for life when no other crime can be proved against him than that of being a radical.

"Tell them," said Vanzetti calmly, without a tremor in his voice, "that I shall refuse to ask for a pardon or a revision of the sentence or anything else. Why should I do so when I am innocent?"

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Struggle for Trade Union Unity in France.

By D. P.

Jouhaux hesitated long before replying to the proposal of the French revolutionary Trade Union Federation (C. G. T. U.) that the capitalist offensive be answered by the unity of the trade union movement. The proposal of the Unitarian Federation of Trade Unions surprised him at a moment when he was engaged in the "National Economic Council" in introducing, in collaboration with Poincaré, the stabilisation of French capitalism at the cost of the interests of the proletarian masses. He could naturally not altogether refuse to answer. The demand for unity in the labour movement is growing and strengthening under the pressure of stabilisation, which is primarily expressed in the fact that the number of unemployed is unnoticeably but continually on the increase, while at the same time capital is organising an attack on the wages of those who are not yet out of work. This desire for unity finds its expression in a series of common counter-offensives on the part of the workers in the revolutionary and reformist trade unions as well as in the development of the unemployment movement, which latter of course has no regard for the barriers existing between the individual trade unions.

Under such circumstances, the reformist Trade Union Federation (C. G. T.) could not ignore the suggestion of the revolutionary Federation. This suggestion was remarkable for its brevity and simplicity, and the friends of Jouhaux knew

very well that it would meet with a great response among the organised workers.

The suggestion of the C. G. T. U. pointed out that under the present circumstances, in view of the unemployment and the increased efforts of the capitalists, it is out of the question that the divided state of the trade unions should be tolerated any longer. With a view putting an end to this division in the trade union movement, the C. G. T. U. proposed that a commission consisting of an equal number of representatives of each of the leading organs of the two trade union federations be immediately called together for the purpose of preparing a direct amalgamation of all trade unions. The work of amalgamation was to culminate in the convocation of a congress, which would have crowned the formation of a united militant trade union centre.

It is difficult, nay impossible, to oppose such a suggestion as this. The position of the reformists became yet more complicated by reason of the fact that at the commencement of the present year the reformist union of railwaymen applied, with the sanction of the C. G. T., to the revolutionary railwaymen's union suggesting that a united union be formed. The reformist union fervently hoped that the revolutionary union would reject this proposal, which was purposely made as unacceptable and provocative as possible. Fundamentally, the entire suggestion of unity was directed against the policy of the revolutionary trade union federation and against the rôle played by the Communist Party in these trade unions. The reformists counted on a decisive refusal, which would render it possible for them to tell the workers that the revolutionary trade unionists only talk about a united front but in reality oppose trade union unity.

Their hopes, however, were not fulfilled. The revolutionary workers replied in detail to all the political attacks of the reformists and concluded their reply by directly approaching the question of an actual and immediate realisation of trade union unity in its entire extent. At the same time — on January 28th — the C. G. T. U. applied to the C. G. T. with the proposal described above.

And now, at last, we have the answer of M. Jouhaux and his advisers: an answer which is truly significant. We know very well that not only in France but in all the world, it is the united front with capitalism which the reformists have at heart, far rather than the realisation of a united front of the proletariat for the purpose of combating the attacks of the capitalists. At bottom it is difficult to draw the line between M. Green of the American Federation of Labour and the "Socialist" gentlemen of the European trade union federations, whether it is a question of the struggle against the revolutionaries and Communists or of co-operation with the capitalists. Even the bureaucrats of the British trade unions are greatly occupied at present in expelling the Communists and the adherents of the Minority Movement from the trade unions, in order to be able to carry out without let or hindrance their programme of "peace in industry". M. Jouhaux, meanwhile, has surpassed all his colleagues. He knows and understands very well that the C. G. T. U. represents a greater number of workers and is of greater weight in the class struggle of the French proletariat than the reformist trade unions under his own lead. He knows more than that. The C. G. T. U. must wage a bitter fight not only against the efforts of the capitalists, but also against the reformist leaders, who, as usual, are hand in glove with the capitalists. Notwithstanding which fact, the C. G. T. U. is growing in size and strength and numbers as the organisation which is really leading the fight of the French workers.

We know very well that M. Jouhaux does not desire unity. It seems to us that in the lapse of two months he might and should have concocted a more sagacious reply. For his answer is in fact no more than this: that he kindly permits the members of the C. G. T. U. to enter the reformist trade unions under his lead on condition that they break off all connection with the Communist Party and refrain from disturbing him in his betrayal of the interests of the working classes, both in the National Economic Council and in the magnificent League of Nations.

But Jouhaux is mistaken if he thinks that this answer of his can put a stop to the struggle of the French workers, who are striving to create united fighting unions. The fight for unity in the trade union movement in France has become a matter of the masses of the proletariat, which fact is a sufficient earnest of its ultimate victory.

FIRST OF MAY

To the Working Men and Women of the Whole World!

From the Appeal of the R. I. L. U. for the 1st of May.

The festive day of the world proletariat, the First of May, is approaching this year under conditions which are characterised by a tremendous outbreak of world reaction.

The position of the working class in the whole bourgeois world is deteriorating more and more. The rationalisation of production is being ruthlessly carried out at the cost of the working class. The competition between the capitalist countries is becoming more and more acute. In their fight on the world market the employers step over the bodies of the workers.

There is only one way out of this situation: the setting up of a united front of the entire working class and the creation of a united trade union International for the purpose of a ruthless fight having for its ultimate object the overthrow of capitalism.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions calls upon, the whole proletariat, all the suppressed and disinherited of the whole world, to lay down their work on the 1st of May. On this day of struggle, go into the streets with the following slogans:

War on War!

Hands of China!

Down with the Chinese counter-revolution which is acting in agreement with the imperialists!

Down with the League of Nations, the insurance company for the booty of the imperialist robbers!

Down with the International Labour Office, the organ of collaboration of the classes which delivers the proletariat over to the bourgeoisie!

Down with inner treachery in the camp of the working class!

A Working day of six hours at most for work in mines, in industries injurious to health and for young workers under 18 years, and eight hours at the most for all other workers!

The standard of living of the working class must be raised!

Equal pay for equal work!

State insurance for the unemployed to the amount of the existence minimum!

Full freedom for trade union organisation!

Down with fascism and the fascist trade unions!

Workers Democracy in the trade unions; down with the trade union bureaucrats!

Complete freedom of opinion within the trade unions!

Down with class collaboration in every shape and form!

Working Youth, into the trade unions!

United organisation of the trade unions in every country!

Alliance of the workers in all countries with the working class of the Soviet Union!

Alliance of the workers of the West with the peoples of the suppressed East!

United front of the workers of all political tendencies and of non-Party workers against capital!

United Trade Union International for all races and Continents based on the principle of the class struggle!

Proletarians and oppressed peoples of all countries, unite!

Moscow, 15th April 1927.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions.

Appeal of the International Red Aid on the Occasion of the First of May.

To the Workers of the Whole World!

The International Red Aid, in the inexorable class war which is raging in the whole world, has set itself the task to protect the victims of this gigantic fight, to mitigate the misery of the prisoners and to support the wives and children of the victims of class justice.

On the 1st of May the workers of the whole world still demonstrate for the eight hour day and world peace. It is only in Russia that the working class has taken political power into

its own hands and thereby, in spite of all the difficulties of socialist construction, secured the eight hour day and social protection. All the more therefore it has to concern itself for world peace, because the imperialist robber States are lying in wait and preparing to make war on Soviet Russia.

The struggle for freedom of the Chinese people is most seriously threatened; the commercial bourgeoisie who play an important part in the Kuomintang and who rule the generals, are striving to come to an understanding with the imperialist robber States in order along with them to repulse the class claims of the suppressed workers and peasants.

In capitalist countries as England and Germany the workers are being deprived of the right of combination and the right to strike; fighting workers are thrown into prison, and in spite of the formal democracy the capitalists are ruling by means of brutal dictatorship. In countries such as Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Lithuania, the bourgeoisie is defending its rule by means of martial law, the gallows and shootings. The white terror and fascism are holding bloody orgies; in America the capitalists are dragging Sacco and Vanzetti to the electric chair, violating the small Central and South American States and conducting the class war against striking workers by means of Pinkerton and Ku-Klux-Klan bandits.

The most worthy celebration of May Day is the most self-sacrificing, active support of the imprisoned and their dependents. Therefore, rally on the 1st of May to the fight for an amnesty for the victims of the class war, for the abolition of the barbarous prison regime, against the horrors of the prisons, against class and vindictive justice, against the robbery of the right of combination and the right to strike, for the eight hour day, against the white terror and fascism and against the suppression of the national minorities.

Collect for the Red Aid at the May Day Festivals! Recruit members for the Red Aid and at the May Demonstrations raise the slogans:

Against Fascism and White Terror!

Against Imperialism and the Danger of war!

Against reactionary legislation and bourgeois, class justice!

For a complete amnesty for all political prisoners!

For the unrestricted right of asylum of political emigrants!

For legalising aid for the prisoners in the countries of the white terror!

For the building up of Red Aid organisations in all countries!

Long live international solidarity!

Long live the First of May!

The Executive Committee of the International Red Aid.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Fourth Conference of the Communist Party of Switzerland.

Basle, 17th April 1927.

The fourth conference of the Communist Party of Switzerland was opened on the 16th April 1927 in the People's House in Basle. The conference is taking place in a town in which the Communist Party has in general the leading rôle in the working class movement.

There were fraternal delegates present from the German, French and Italian-Swiss Communist Parties. There were 22 delegates from territorial branches, 22 delegates from factory nuclei and 29 delegates from local sections. Further, there were present, 9 members of the Central Committee of the Party, 3 members of the Young Communist League, 3 auditors and 22 guests. The conference is also very well attended by spectators.

The agenda includes a discussion of the present international situation, the question of the struggle with fascism and the deprivation of political rights suffered by the state employees. Further, the question of re-organisational work, the strengthening and activation of the factory nuclei and the new organisational statutes.

The conference was opened with the official news of the settlement of the diplomatic conflict between the Swiss government and the government of the Soviet Union which was caused by the murder of the soviet representative in Lausanne, comrade Vorovsky. The pressure of reaction and fascism in Switzerland had succeeded in preventing a settlement up till now. In a resolution which was adopted unanimously, the conference wel-

comed the settlement of the conflict and expressed its satisfaction at the fulfillment by the Swiss government of the basic conditions laid down by the Soviet government. The fulfillment of these conditions by the Swiss government is regarded as a sign of the strengthening international position of the Soviet Union and the demand has been raised that the Soviet government be recognised by the Swiss government de facto and de jure.

Comrade Welti (Basle) welcomed the conference in a speech of greetings in the name of the Central Committee of the Party. He expressed satisfaction at the successes of the Chinese national revolution and of the Russian workers revolution which will now celebrate its 10th anniversary. Eighty years had passed, he declared since the publication of the "Communist Manifesto" and eight years of work since the foundation of the Communist International.

The Party conference decided to send a telegram of sympathy to the leaders of the Chinese revolution and a telegram of greetings to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The latter telegram stresses especially the work of socialist construction carried on in the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Communist Party and refers with satisfaction to the peaceful policy of the Soviet government as laid down in the Note delivered to the Chinese reactionary government.

A telegram of greetings was read from the Communist Party of Germany amidst great applause. The elections to the Presidium and to the conference commissions took place without discussion. Speeches of greeting were made to the conference by a representative of the Red Aid section in Switzerland and representatives of the Basle Trades Council, the Central Committee of the Y. C. L., the C. P. in Alsace-Lorraine, the Baden district organisation of the German C. P. An official of the Red Front Fighters League greeted the conference in the name of a group of Red Front Fighters who had just arrived and demanded that an international defence front be formed against fascism by workers defence corps. A colony of Swiss comrades in Moscow sent a letter of greetings to the conference.

The Swiss Trades Union Federation had also been invited to send a representative to the conference, but declared that it would only send a representative if the Communist Party would revise its decisions concerning the formation of fractions inside the trade unions.

The political report of the Central Committee was made by comrade Welti

who presented a good picture of the economic and political situation in Switzerland. The economic situation of the country, he declared, was characterised by a permanent uncertainty. Booms were of short duration and the export industry was faced with difficulties of placing its goods on the world market. However, the net profits and dividends of large-scale industry were increasing. The national and local authorities made ever fewer demands upon the money market and a considerable export of capital was taking place. This had as its consequence an ever closer alliance of the Swiss bourgeoisie with the imperialist great powers. The export of capital resulted also in an increase in the rate of interest for agricultural credit and this had caused a crisis in agriculture which was still present. The Swiss bourgeoisie was endeavouring to bring about a decrease in the cost of production by reducing wages, lengthening working hours and carrying out a rationalisation. The wages of industrial workers had sunk by 20 and in some cases by 40%. The power of finance capital was becoming ever greater. There were 45,000 unemployed in the country representing 10% of the industrial proletariat. There were no signs of any general economic betterment to be recorded and violent labour struggles were to be expected.

There was no real basis for the illusions of the reformists. The policy of the reformist trade unionist and social democratic leaders is directed towards co-operation with the employers and with the bourgeois state and towards the avoidance of labour struggles. The shameful approval of a so-called "social Insurance" based upon the taxation of articles of mass consumption (Tobacco, alcohol etc.) and upon the high contributions of the workers, had been one of the results of this policy. These leaders were preparing no struggle against the coming law to rob Swiss civil servants of the right to strike and to organise themselves in trade unions and to force them to work for low wages.

Social democracy is becoming ever more quickly the left-wing of the bourgeoisie. Despite all its revolutionary phrases it

had joined the II. International of social patriots and expressed itself in favour of co-operation with the League of Nations in Geneva and with the International Labour Office.

The struggle of the Communist Party of Switzerland is directed against the rationalisation, against the impoverishment of the unemployed, against the high customs duties and against the danger of war. Efforts must be made to unite all revolutionary proletarian forces and to exercise mutual support in economic and political struggles despite the sabotage of the reformists. Demands must be made for the protection of tenants, for an increase of building activities for dwelling houses, for the introduction of a real system of social insurance and the reduction of the interest on mortgages etc.

The struggle for the international unity of the trade union movement and against the danger of war is the foremost task.

Comrade Bodemann then delivered his report upon organisational questions.

TEN YEARS AGO

A Shameless Lie of the Capitalists.

By N. Lenin.

(Published on April 25th, 1917).

It is not enough for the capitalist newspapers to lie and carry on a pogrom agitation against the "Pravda", for the "Rjetch" (the organ of the Cadets. — Editor) to compete in this respect with the "Russkaja Wolja", of which it itself can only speak with contempt.

Now, even the Ministers of the capitalist Government have begun to speak in the language of the "Russkaja Wolja". To-day's "Rjetch" quotes the words of Minister Nekrassov who, at a meeting of the Cadet party in Moscow on April 9th (22nd) said as follows:

"The preaching of force which now echoes from the Kammenno-Ostrovsky Prospect, is terrible."

The Minister, who is imitating the "Russkaja Wolja", is lying unscrupulously, is deceiving the people, is helping the pogrom agitators, is hiding behind their back and has not the courage openly to name a speaker or a party.

The worthy Minister prefers dark hints — perhaps there will be someone who does not understand them!

But anyone who understands the least thing about politics understands it — the worthy Minister is speaking of the "Pravda", the organ of the C. C. of the Russian Social Democratic Labour party and of those who share its views.

You are lying, Honourable Minister, honourable member of the party of the "people's freedom". It is Gutchkov, who is preaching force, when he threatens the soldiers with severe penalties for deposing their officers. It is your friend the "Russkaja Wolja", the pogrom paper of the pogrom "republicans" which is preaching force.

The "Pravda" and those who share its views, are not only not preaching force, but are saying clearly, exactly and decidedly that for us the fulcrum of our work is at the present moment the enlightenment of the proletarian masses as to their proletarian duties, in distinction from the petty bourgeoisie which is stupefied by the chauvinist vapours.

As long as you, worthy capitalists, Gutchkov & Co., confine yourselves to threatening us with the use of force, as long as you do not use force, as long as the Soviets of the Workers' and Soldiers' deputies continue to exist, as long as you do not put into force your threats against the Soviets (Mr. Wilton for instance, the "Times" correspondent, a fellow-worker of Miljukov's, publishes such threats), as long as you do not proceed against the masses with force, we, the adherents of the "Pravda", declare and repeat that we recognise the Soviets of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies as the only possible form of government.

A fight for influence over the proletarian masses, a fight for influence in the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, enlightenment as to their tactical mistakes, enlightenment as to the deceitful character of the stupefying drug of chauvinism (of the revolutionary defence of the country) — these are our tactics, these are the tactics of all the adherents of the "Pravda", these are the tactics of our whole Party, now and as long as you, worthy capitalists, in whose hands is the command of the army, do not proceed to use force.

Minister Nekrassov knows this very well, even if only from the quotations which the "Rjetch" itself cannot avoid quoting. The worthy minister is imitating the "Russkaja Wolja"; he wishes by means of lies, calumnies, agitation and threats of pogroms to prevent light being calmly thrown on the truth.

You will not succeed, Mr. Nekrassov & Co., you will not succeed! The workers and soldiers want to know the truth, they want to see clear in the questions of war, peace and the construction of the State. And they are already beginning to see clear.

Letters on Tactics.

By N. Lenin.

(Written in April 1917.)

Preface.

On April 4th 1917, I had the opportunity of speaking at a meeting of Bolsheviki in Petrograd on the theme suggested by the title of this article. It was a meeting of the delegates to the All-Russian Conference of the Soviets of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, delegates who had to return home and could not therefore grant me any delay. At the end of the meeting, the chairman, Comrade G. Zinoviev, proposed in the name of the whole assembly, that I should immediately repeat my lecture at the meeting both of the Bolshevik and of the Menshevik delegates who intended to discuss the question of the union of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party.

Difficult as it was for me to repeat my lecture at once, I did not feel justified in saying no, since both those who shared my views and the Menshevik demanded it, and they could actually grant me no time because of their departure.

In the course of the lecture, I made known my theses which were published in No. 26 of the "Pravda" of April 7th 1917.

Both the theses and my lecture evoked differences of opinion among the Bolsheviki themselves and also among the editorial staff of the "Pravda". After a number of discussions, we arrived at the unanimous conclusion that it would be most to the purpose to discuss these differences of opinion openly, and in that way to provide material for the National Conference of our party (the S. D. L. P. of Russia united by the Central Committee) which was to meet in Petrograd on April 20th 1917.

In accordance with this resolution in favour of a discussion, I am publishing the following letters without claiming that they are an all-round investigation of the question, but merely with the desire of sketching the chief arguments which are of particular importance for the practical tasks of the movement of the working class.

First Letter.

Estimate of the Situation.

Marxism demands of us the most exact, objectively controllable consideration of the reciprocal relations between the classes and of the concrete peculiarities of every historical situation. We Bolsheviki have always tried to do justice to this demand which is absolutely necessary from the standpoint of any politics which are to have a scientific basis.

Marx and Engels always said: "Our doctrine is no dogma, but a training for action." They were justified in ridiculing the learning by heart and simple repetition of "formulae" which, at the best, can merely outline the general duties, the general tasks, which must necessarily experience alterations according to the concrete economic and political situation of every special stage of the historical process.

By what exactly established, objective facts should the party of the revolutionary proletariat be guided at the moment in determining its duties and the forms of its activities?

Both in my first "Letter from afar". ("The first Stage of the first Revolution"), which was published in Nos. 14 and 15 of the "Pravda" on March 21st and 22nd 1917, and in my theses, I define the "peculiarity of the present situation in Russia" as a transition from the first to the second stage of the revolution. For this reason I considered that the fundamental slogan for the "task of the day" at the present moment should be: "Workers, you have performed miracles of proletarian heroism, of national heroism in the civil war against Tsarism. You must perform miracles of proletarian organisation, in order to prepare your victory in the second stage."

What characterises this stage?

The passing of the power of the State into the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Until the February-March revolution in 1917, the power of the State in Russia was in the hands of the one old class, i. e. the class of the feudal aristocratic landowners, with Nicholas Romanov at the head.

Since that revolution, the power has been in the hands of another, new class, i. e. that of the bourgeoisie.

The passing of the power of the State from the hands of one class into the hands of another class, is the first and most important characteristic of a revolution, both in the strictly scientific and the practical political significance of this idea.

In this respect, the bourgeois or bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia is concluded.

Here we become aware of the resistance of those who think otherwise, who like to call themselves the "old Bolsheviks" saying: Have we not always maintained that the bourgeois democratic revolution will only be concluded with the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry? Can it be said that the agrarian revolution, which is also bourgeois democratic, is concluded? Is it not, on the contrary, a fact that it has not yet begun?

I reply, The Bolshevik slogans and reasoning have in general been confirmed by history, but looked at concretely, things have developed quite differently from what anyone could have expected, that is in a more original, peculiar and variegated way.

To ignore this fact, to forget it, would mean putting ourselves on the same plane with the "old Bolsheviks", who have repeatedly cut a sad figure in the history of our party by repeating a formula mechanically learnt by heart instead of inquiring into the special characteristics of the new, living reality.

In the Russian revolution, the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" has already become a reality*); for this "formula" only considers the reciprocal relations between the classes and not the concrete political institution, which makes this reciprocal relation, a reality. The "Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies" is in itself the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry", made a reality by life.

This formula is already obsolete. Life has taken it out of the domain of formula into the domain of reality, has given it flesh and blood, has imparted concrete form to it and thus modified it.

Another, a new task is already on the order of the day, that of a split between the proletarian elements (those who are internationalist, "Communist", opposed to the defence of the country and in favour of a transition to the Commune) within this dictatorship and the elements of the small property owners and the petty bourgeoisie (Tcheidse, Zeretelli, Steklov, the Social Revolutionaries etc. and other revolutionary defenders of the country, the opponents of the Commune movement, the adherents of the "support" of the bourgeoisie and of the bourgeois Government).

Anyone who nowadays merely speaks of the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" has dropped out of the race of life, he has in reality gone over to the petty bourgeoisie and is against the proletarian class war; he should be placed in the archives of the "Bolshevik" pre-revolutionary curiosities (it might be called "The Archives of the Old Bolsheviks").

The revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry has become a reality, but in a most original way, with a number of extremely important modifications. I will deal with them specially in one of the next letters. The point now is to absorb the indisputable truth that a Marxist ought to consider the living life, the exact facts of reality and not to cling to the theory of yesterday which, like every theory, at the best only outlines the general line of principles, only approaches a grasp of the many-sidedness of life.

"All theory, dear friend, is grey, but the golden tree of life is green."

Anyone who, in the old way, raises the question as to whether the bourgeois revolution is "concluded" is sacrificing living Marxism to the dead letter.

The old way puts it: The rule of the bourgeoisie can and must be followed by the rule of the proletariat and the peasantry.

In actual life, things have already turned out differently; an

*) In a certain form and to a certain degree.

extremely original, new, unprecedented interweaving of one with the other has taken place. Side by side, together and simultaneously, we have both the rule of the bourgeoisie (the Government of Lwow and Gutchkov) and the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, which voluntarily cedes the power to the bourgeoisie and voluntarily makes itself an appendage of the bourgeoisie.

For, it must not be forgotten that in Petrograd the power is actually in the hands of the workers and soldiers; the new Government has no power and can exercise no power over them, for there is neither a police, nor an army separated from the people, nor an officialdom which dominates over the people. This is a fact. This is especially a fact which is characteristic of a State according to the type of the Paris Commune. This fact does not fit in to the old scheme. We ought to understand how to adapt schemes to life and ought to give up altogether repeating words about the "dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" which no longer have any sense.

Let us tackle the question from another side, in order to throw better light on it.

The Marxist must not leave the exact foundation of the analysis of class relationships. The power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie. And the mass of the peasants — does it not also form a bourgeoisie of a special kind, of a special stratification, of a special character? From what then do we conclude that this stratum cannot come into power through the "completion" of the bourgeois democratic revolution? Why should this be impossible?

This is how the old Bolsheviks often argue.

I reply — it is undoubtedly possible. But in judging the significance of the moment, the Marxist must not start from what is possible, but from the actual reality.

Reality however shows us the fact that the freely elected Soldiers and Peasants' Soviets voluntarily join the second, subsidiary government, that they supplement, develop and protect it of their own free will. And in the same way, they voluntarily cede the power to the bourgeoisie, — a phenomenon which does not in the least "disturb" the theory of Marxism, for we have always known and have repeatedly pointed out that the bourgeoisie does not maintain itself by force alone but also thanks to the lack of consciousness, the habits due to intimidation and the lack of organisation of the masses.

And now, in view of this reality of the present day, it would be simply ridiculous to turn away from facts and speak of "possibilities".

It is possible that the peasantry will seize the whole land and the whole power. I not only do not forget this possibility, do not restrict my field of vision to the present day, but I directly and exactly formulate the agrarian programme in consideration of the new phenomenon, i. e. the deep split between the agricultural workers and the poorest peasants on the one hand and the landowners on the other hand.

Something else is possible however; it is possible, that the peasants will listen to the advice of the petty bourgeois party of the Social Revolutionaries who have succumbed to the influence of the bourgeoisie, who have gone over to the defence of the country and who console themselves with promises of the Constituent Assembly although the writs have not yet even been issued for the election*).

It is possible that the peasants will keep to their pact with the bourgeoisie, will continue the pact which they have now concluded through the medium of the Soviets of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, not only in form, but in deed.

Many things are possible. It would be the greatest mistake were we to forget the agrarian movement and the agrarian programme. But it would be equally wrong to forget the reality which points to the fact of the agreement — or, if we want to use a more exact, less legal and more economic class expression — the fact of the class collaboration between the bourgeoisie and the peasantry.

*) Lest my words be misinterpreted, I will anticipate at once: I am absolutely in favour of the Soviets of Agricultural Workers and Peasants immediately taking possession of the whole soil, but of their preserving strict discipline and order themselves, not permitting the least injury to machines, buildings and stocks of cattle, in no way disorganising agriculture and the production of corn, but increasing them, for the soldiers need twice as much bread and the people must not starve.

When this fact ceases to be a fact, when the peasantry has separated from the bourgeoisie, when it has taken possession of the land in defiance of the bourgeoisie, when it has seized the power of the Government from the bourgeoisie — then there will be a new stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution; it is of this that I want particularly to speak.

A Marxist who, now, when the peasantry has concluded a pact with the bourgeoisie, were to forget his bounden duty for the sake of the possibility of such a stage in the future, would become a petty bourgeois, for he would, in reality, be preaching confidence in the petty bourgeoisie to the proletariat ("it, the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, must separate from the bourgeoisie, even within the scope of the bourgeois democratic revolution"). This would mean that for the sake of the "possibility" of a pleasant and sweet future, in which the peasantry would not form the tail of the bourgeoisie, in which the Social Revolutionaries, Tcheidse, Zeretelli and Steklov would not be an appendage of the bourgeois Government — that for the sake of the "possibility" of a pleasant future, he would forget the unpleasant present in which the peasantry form for the time being the tail of the bourgeoisie, in which the Social Revolutionaries and the Social Democrats do not, for the time being, give up the role of an appendage of the bourgeois Government, of the opposition of "His Majesty" Lwow.

The person selected by us as an example would resemble a sickly-sweet Louis Blanc, a sickly-sweet Kautskyan, but in no way a revolutionary Marxist.

But are we not in danger of falling into subjectivism, into the desire to "overleap" the incomplete revolution, the bourgeois democratic revolution — which the peasant movement has not yet liquidated — and thus to arrive at the socialist revolution?

This danger might threaten me, were I to say: "Down with the Tsar, let us have a Labour Government". But I have not said this, I have said something else. I said that there can be no other government (not a bourgeois one) in Russia, except that of the Soviets of the Deputies of the workers, agricultural workers, soldiers and peasants. I said that at present the power of the Government in Russia can only pass from the Gutchkovs and Lwows to these Soviets, and it is just in them that the peasantry, the soldiers and the petty bourgeoisie predominate, if we wish to use a scientific Marxist expression, if we do not want to use an every-day expression, but the class characteristics.

In my theses, I have absolutely refrained from overleaping the peasant and other petty bourgeois movements which are still in existence, from any playing with the "conquest of power" by the Labour Government, from any kind of Blanquist adventure, for I have directly referred to the experiences of the Paris Commune. As is well known, Marx in 1871 and Engels in 1891 pointed out in detail that this experience absolutely excludes Blanquism, that it guarantees the direct immediate and unconditional rule of the majority and the activity of the masses merely in the measure of the conscious action of the majority.

In the theses, I have, in a quite definite way, concentrated things on the fight for influence within the Soviets of the workers, agricultural labourers, soldiers and peasants. In order to leave no possibility of a trace of doubt in this respect, I have, in the theses, twice emphasised the necessity of a patient, persistent work of "enlightenment", adapted to "the practical needs of the masses".

Those who are ignorant of or renegades from Marxism, such as Mr. Plechanov etc., may clamour about anarchism, Blanquism etc. Anyone who wants to think and learn must understand that Blanquism is a seizure of power by the minority, whereas the Workers' Soviets are decidedly the direct and immediate organisation of the majority of the people. The work, which in the end is nothing more nor less than a fight for influence within such Soviets, cannot, really cannot drift into the swamp of Blanquism. It cannot drift into the swamp of anarchism, for anarchism is a denial of the necessity of a State and the power of State for the epoch of the transition from the rule of the bourgeoisie to the rule of the proletariat. I however advocate, with a clearness which excludes any misunderstanding, the necessity of the State for this epoch, but, in accordance with Marx and with the experiences of the Paris Commune, not of the usual, parliamentary bourgeois State, but of a State without a standing army, without a police opposed to the people, without an immense number of officials dominating the people.

When Plechanov, in his newspaper "Jedinstvo", inveighs with all his might against anarchism, he only gives further evidence of his breach with Marxism. In reply to my challenge in the "Pravda" (No. 26) that he should relate what Marx and Engels taught about the State in the years 1871, 1872, 1875, Plechanov can only answer with silence with regard to the nature of the question, and a storm of abuse in the spirit of the embittered bourgeoisie.

Plechanov, the ex-Marxist, has absolutely failed to understand the doctrines of Marxism about the State. Traces of this lack of understanding are to be found in his German brochure about anarchism as well as in other places.

* * *

Let us now consider in what way Comrade L. Kamenev formulates his "differences of opinion" with my theses and with the above mentioned views in his short article in No. 27 of the "Pravda". This will help us to understand them more exactly.

"As regards Comrade Lenin's general scheme", writes Comrade Kamenev, "it seems to us unacceptable, in that it starts from the recognition that the bourgeois democratic revolution is concluded and calculates that this revolution will be immediately transformed into a socialist one..."

There are two big mistakes in this.

The first is that the question of the bourgeois democratic revolution being "concluded" is put in the wrong way. An abstract, simple, if we may put it in this way, monotonous conception is given to this question, which does not correspond to the objective reality. Anyone who puts the question in this way, who now asks whether the bourgeois democratic revolution is concluded and nothing further — deprives himself of the possibility of seeing the extraordinarily complicated truth, which at least has two aspects. This — in theory. And in practice he capitulates feebly to petty bourgeois revolutionarism.

As a matter of fact, reality shows us both the passing of the power into the hands of the bourgeoisie (the "completed" bourgeois democratic revolution of the ordinary type) and, by the side of the real Government, the existence of a secondary government which represents the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry". This latter "subsidiary Government" has itself ceded the power to the bourgeoisie, has chained itself to the bourgeois Government.

Is this reality grasped by the old-Bolshevist formula of Comrade Kamenev: "The bourgeois democratic revolution is not concluded"?

No, the formula is obsolete. It does not apply. It is dead. Attempts made to revive it will be in vain.

The second mistake, the practical question. Who knows whether it is possible at present for a special "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry", detached from the bourgeois Government, to exist in Russia? Marxist tactics cannot be built up on an unknown quantity.

But if this cannot be, the only way is an immediate, resolute, inflexible detachment of the proletarian Communist elements from the petty bourgeois movement.

Why?

Because the whole petty bourgeoisie has, not by chance but driven by necessity, taken its orientation towards chauvinism (= defence of the country), towards "supporting" the bourgeoisie, towards dependence on it, towards fear of not getting on without it etc.

How can the petty bourgeoisie be pushed into power, when the same petty bourgeoisie could seize the power now, but will not?

Only by the detachment of the proletarian Communist Party, of the proletarian class war, which is free from the timidity of these petty bourgeois. Nothing but a union of the proletarians — who are free from the influence of the petty bourgeoisie in deed and not only in word — can make things so "hot" for the petty bourgeoisie that, in certain circumstances, they will have to seize the power; it is not even out of the question that Gutchkov and Miljukov — again in certain circumstances — will advocate the sole rule of Tcheidse, Zeretelli, the Social Revolutionaries and Steklov, for after all they are all "defenders of the country".

Anyone who separates the proletarian elements of the Soviets (i. e. the proletarian Communist Party) from the petty bourgeois elements, immediately, without delay and irrevocably, gives the right expression to the interests of the movement in

the two cases which are possible; both in the case that Russia were to experience a special, independent "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry", which is not subordinate to the bourgeois, and in the case of the petty bourgeoisie not being able to detach itself from the bourgeoisie and swinging eternally (i. e. until socialism is established) between us and it.

Anyone who allows himself to be guided in his activities merely by the formula "The bourgeois democratic revolution is not concluded", undertakes a kind of guarantee that the petty bourgeoisie is perfectly capable of being independent of the bourgeoisie. In doing so, he capitulates at that very moment and surrenders unconditionally to the petty bourgeoisie.

Apropos. With regard to the "formula" of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, I would recall that, in my article "Two Kinds of Tactics" (in July 1905) I specially emphasised:

"The revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry has, like everything else in the world, a past and a future. Its past is absolutism, feudalism, monarchy, privileges ... Its future — a fight against private property, a fight of the wage earners against the employers, a fight for socialism..."

The mistake made by Comrade Kamenev is that in 1917 he only sees the past of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship etc. In reality however, its future has already begun, for the interests and the policy of the wage earners and the small undertakers have already taken different lines, and that in such an important a question as the defence of the country and the relation to the imperialist war.

This brings me to the second mistake in the remarks of Comrade Kamenev which I have quoted. He reproaches me with my scheme being "calculated on the immediate transformation of this revolution (bourgeois democratic) into a socialist one".

This is not true. Not only do I not "calculate" on the "immediate transformation" of our revolution into a socialist one, but I actually caution against it, when in thesis No. 8, I state "It is not the introduction of socialism which is our immediate task..."

Is it not clear that anyone who reckons on the immediate transformation of our revolution into a socialist one, could not resist the immediate task of the introduction of socialism?

More than this, it is not possible in Russia even to "introduce at once" the "Commune State" (i. e. a State organised according to the type of the Paris Commune), because, for that it would be necessary that the majority of the deputies in all (or in most) Soviets should clearly recognise the whole error and the whole harm of the tactics and the policy of the Social Revolutionaries, of Tcheidse, Zeretelli, Steklov etc. I have declared in plain language that in this respect I only count on a "patient" enlightenment (is it a case of being patient in order to bring about a change which can be realised "at once"?).

Comrade Kamenev has made a rather "impatient" start and has repeated the bourgeois prejudice against the Paris Commune that it wanted to introduce socialism "without delay". This is not true; the Commune unfortunately hesitated too long over the introduction of socialism. The true significance of the Commune is not where the bourgeoisie usually looks for it, but in the creation of a State of a special type. A State of this kind is already born in Russia, it is represented by the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets.

Comrade Kamenev has not got a proper grasp of the fact, of the significance of the existing Soviets in their identity with the type, with the social political character and the State of the Commune; instead of investigating the fact, he began to talk about my "calculating" on an "immediate" future. The result was, unfortunately, a repetition of the methods of many bourgeois when faced by the question what are the Soviets of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies; do they represent a higher type than the parliamentary republic, are they more useful for the people, more democratic, are they more suitable for the fight, for instance against the lack of bread etc. — attention is distracted from these urgent, momentous questions raised by life to the empty, so-called scientific, but in reality hollow, academically lifeless question of "calculating on an immediate change".

An empty question put in the wrong way. I "calculate" merely and exclusively that the workers, soldiers and peasants can deal more satisfactorily than the officials, better than the police, with the practical difficult question of the increase of

the production of bread, its better distribution, the better provisioning of the soldiers etc.

I am firmly convinced that the Soviets will make a reality of the independence of the mass of the people more quickly and better than the parliamentary republic (I will compare the two types of State in greater detail in another letter). They will decide better, more practically and more wisely what can be done, and especially what steps can be taken towards socialism. The control of the banks, the amalgamation of all banks into one — this is not yet socialism, but it is a step towards socialism. Such steps are being taken to-day in Germany by the Junkers and the bourgeoisie against the people. The Soviet of the Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies will be able to take them much more efficiently and to the advantage of the people tomorrow, when the whole power of the State will be in its hands.

What will render it inevitable that these steps be taken?

The famine. The destruction of economics. The threatened breakdown. The distress of war. The horror of the wounds which the war is inflicting on mankind.

Comrade Kamenev concludes his article with the remark that, "in the wide discussion he hopes to carry his point of view as the only possible one for revolutionary social democracy in so far as it wishes to and must be the one and only party of the revolutionary masses of the proletariat and does not want to turn into a group of Communist propagandists."

It seems to me that these words betray a completely erroneous estimate of the situation. Comrade Kamenev sets up the "mass party" against the "propagandist group". But it is just the "masses", who have yielded to the frenzy of the "revolutionary" defence of the country. Would it not be more worthy of an internationalist at this moment to resist the frenzy of the masses than to "want to stick to the masses", i. e. to yield, to the general mood? Have we not seen how in all the belligerent countries of Europe, the chauvinists justify themselves by their wish to "stick to the masses"? Ought we not to know how to remain in the minority against the frenzy of the masses for a certain time? Is not the work of the propagandists at the present moment just the cardinal point for the liberation of the proletarian line of action from the petty bourgeois and patriotic frenzy of the "masses"? It was just the blind confidence of the masses, both proletarian and non-proletarian, without distinction of class differences, which formed one of the preliminary conditions for the plague of defence of the country. Finally, it is not particularly dignified for the proletarian party to speak with contempt of the "propagandist group".

NB. A second "Letter on Tactics" did not appear. Ed.

Chronicle of Events.

April 14th.

The National Conference of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets, at the proposal of Nogin, passes the following resolution: "The Conference is filled with indignation that the English and French Governments hold back Russian political emigrants, among them Comrades Lenin, Martov and Tchernov, and refuse them permits of transit. The Conference demands that the Provisional Government take immediate and energetic measures to ensure the return of the pioneers in the cause of liberation."

The English Government addresses an enquiry to the Provisional Government as to whether, now that America has declared war against Germany, it still requires financial support from England. The Provisional Government states that it regards further financial support as absolutely necessary.

April 15th.

The 5th day of the National Conference of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets. The delegates of the Entente Social Democrats address words of greeting to the Conference. Plechanov replies in a social patriotic speech. The Conference then deals with the question of the Constituent Assembly. The speaker proposes that the suffrage for the Constituent Assembly should be regulated according to the following principles: General, secret, equal and direct franchise; equal rights for men and women; the franchise from the age of twenty; franchise for the army also, but the members of the standing army shall vote separately.