

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

# - INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 8 No. 8

# PRESS

16<sup>th</sup> February 1928

# 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, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX.  
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

## C O N T E N T S

**G. Luhan:** The Protest Movement against the Simon Commission in India.

### Politics.

**Michel Hollay:** The Policy of the Poincaré Government.

**R. E. Bond:** The London County Council Elections.

### Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

On the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. (Leading article of the "Pravda".)

### League of Nations.

**A. Enderle:** Ten Years of International Deception of the Workers.

### Ten Years of the Red Army.

Decree of the Council of People's Commissaries of 15th January, 1918.

Solemn Oath of the Red Army.

Against Whom has the Red Army Fought?

### The White Terror.

**Daniel Renault:** Eight Years Penal Servitude for Comrade Boris Stevanof.

### In the International.

Resolution of the National Conference of the C.P. of France on the Economic and Political Situation.

### Against Colonial Oppression.

**G. Louis Engdahl:** American Communist Party Develops Defeatist Campaign Against U.S. Imperialism.

**A. I.:** The French Socialists and the Syrian Question.

### Economics.

**E. H.:** The Intensification of the Oil Struggle.

### Documents.

Resolution of the E. C. C. I. on the Polish-Lithuanian Conflict.  
The 15th Party Congress of the C.P.S.U. on the Instructions for the Elaboration of the Five-Year Plan for National Economy.

### The Co-operative Movement.

**Vladimirov:** Preparations for the Expulsion of the Co-operative Societies of the U.S.S.R. from the International Co-operative Alliance.

### Proletarian Culture.

**N. Bukharin:** Leninism and the Problem of Cultural Revolution. II.

### Ten Years Ago.

**Paul Frölich:** The Brest Peace and Germany's War Policy. The Revolt of the Sailors in Cattaro.

## The Protest Movement against the Simon Commission in India.

By G. Luhan.

Some days before the Parliamentary Commission appointed to investigate the question of the Indian Constitution arrived in Bombay, the semi-official Anglo-Indian organ, the "Times of India", appearing in Bombay, wrote regarding this Commission that "it does not inspire that degree of confidence necessary in order that its work shall be fruitful and its decisions acceptable". This confession of the semi-official organ of the British government is very significant.

So far as the majority of the Indian population is concerned, the question does not consist in the "degree of confidence" towards the Commission, but in the strength of the active opposition not only towards the Commission but also towards the great Power which stands behind it, i. e. the British government. The mass protest demonstrations and strikes which took place in Bombay, Madras and Calcutta on the day of the arrival of the Commission compelled the British government to resort to arms. Some demonstrators were killed and wounded and several were arrested. In Calcutta "order" has been restored with the aid of armoured cars which drove up and down all the streets.

These events prove very clearly that the Commission had a very "warm" reception. Even the burning of the effigies of the Chairman of the Commission, Sir John Simon, as well as of Birkenhead, Baldwin and Ramsay MacDonald, do not exhaust with their popular symbolism the entire significance of the events of February 3rd. That which took place in the streets of Bombay, Madras and Calcutta means that the masses have flung their challenge not only to the Commission, but to the Power by which it was created. The demonstrators marched through the streets with the slogan: "Down with British imperialism!" This was to some extent a repetition of that slogan which was to be heard in the streets of the Foreign concession in Shanghai about three years ago, on 30th May, 1925.

At its meeting in December The Indian National Congress recommended "mass demonstrations" as a part of the programme of action for the boycott of the Commission. With reluctance and solely under the pressure of the iron law of development of the national revolutionary struggle, the Congress had inserted in its resolution on the boycott of the Commission, "mass demonstrations" on the day of the arrival of the Com-

mission in India and appropriate demonstrations in the various towns of India which are to be visited by the Commission. In this manner the way was opened for the entry of great social forces into the political arena.

The more the events develop the more open and definite becomes the character of the intervention of the masses. In any event their action will not be confined to mere street demonstrations or to a one day's demonstration strike.

The attitude of the bourgeois nationalists is sufficiently clear. This attitude is determined by their class aspirations in the literal sense of the word. They wish to make use of the mass actions to the extent which will suffice to intimidate British imperialism and compel it to fulfil their most important political demands, which consists in their being accepted as equal partners in the "British Commonwealth". In all stages of their fight against British imperialism, no matter how hard it may be, they will never decide to hazard their future role as the ruling social class which guides the development of the productive forces of India in a capitalist sense. Therefore they do not go beyond the demand for the organisation of street demonstrations and one day's strike. In this they are helped by the leaders of the national trade unions who have entered the Labour movement in order to keep the ever growing masses of the organised workers under the yoke of the bourgeoisie.

The Congress proposed that, in place of the Commission appointed by the British Parliament, a National organ be created to which will be entrusted the drawing up of the Constitution for India. The concrete proposal of the Congress consists in the convocation of a National Assembly, the members of which could be: a) the members of the Committee of the All-Indian Congress; b) the representatives of other political, "workers", commercial, and municipal organisations; and c) elected members of the Central Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Provincial Council. In this way the masses will not be represented in the National Assembly planned by the Congress. This Assembly will be convened mainly in order to betray the cause of the national revolution and in order, at a suitable moment, to conclude a compromise with British imperialism.

One can form a judgment regarding the rate of development of the national struggle and the fundamental shifting of its centre of gravity by the fact that during the present crisis the leadership of the revolutionary actions has passed into the hands of the politically organised advance-guard of the proletariat and of the peasantry. The Communist Party of India is taking steps in order that the broad masses of the entire country shall take part in all phases of the national struggle as an organised and concentrated force, which will convert this fight into a fight against the imperialist power, into a decisive fight by means of revolt throughout the whole country.

An excellent illustration of the approaching events in India is the attitude of the peasants in the Punjab. The peasants of the Punjab have in the last few years taken a very prominent part in the national revolutionary movement. They were the chief target of General Dyer's machine guns in the historical blood bath at Amritsar in the year 1919.

The peasant movement in the Punjab is now so well organised that it possesses its own press organ, "Kirti" (The Toiler). It is written in the local dialect and has a wide circulation among the masses. On the first page appears the sign of a red flag with a sickle and hammer. "Kirti" wrote in its last number, in discussing the question that during the last imperialist war from 1914—1918 advantage was not taken of the opportunity to win freedom:

"The possibility which the Royal Commission now offers must be made use of for our "organisation", and if a war should break out we must make use of it in order to obtain our freedom."

In another number, in replying to numerous inquiries by workers' and peasants' correspondents as to what should be the attitude of the working masses of India "in the event of a war between India and Russia, "Kirti" states:

"If England commences a war against Russia, the workers will fight against this war and say to all their fellow workers that they must not in any case help the English but fight against them with all means. The Russian government is a workers' government and encourages us to fight for own rights. A blow directed at the Russian

government is a blow directed against us. For this reason we must, if a war commences between England and the Bolsheviks, fight against this war, no matter how great the difficulties may be which we thereby encounter."

If one listens to the cry: "Down with British imperialism!" which sounds in the streets of industrial Bombay along with the chorus of peasant voices from the revolutionary Punjab, then one has the key which will reveal how events in India will develop in the near future.

## POLITICS

### The Policy of the Poincaré Government.

Dictatorship of the Big Bourgeoisie — Collapse of Petty Bourgeois Radicalism.

By Michel HOLLAY (Paris).

When, on the 12th January, the Poincaré government submitted the question of confidence in order to enforce the imprisonment of the condemned Communist members of the Chamber of Deputies, and in fact, against a previous decision of the Chamber, obtained a fresh majority of 310 votes against 176, it committed from the standpoint of bourgeois democracy an unconstitutional act and made a brutal attack on parliamentary traditions. That was the tone adopted on the day following the session of the Chamber by the Left bourgeois and social democratic press, which acted as if this insolent violation of their "democracy" had rendered them thoroughly indignant. But all this was only spurious indignation. Their attitude since has shown how inclined they are to permit further violations and to allow "Poincaré's experiment to proceed without disturbance", as the social democrats express it, in order to cloak their benevolent opposition.

In order to make this "Left Chamber" docile Poincaré is playing a cunning game, in which even an honest republican would no longer be able to see any trace of democracy and parliamentary tradition. Poincaré's democracy is the veiled dictatorship of high finance. His government tactics represent the most cynical methods of blackmail. The behaviour of all the bourgeois, petty bourgeois and social democratic deputies constitutes a typical example of decadent parliamentarism, grovelling servility and ideological prostitution. The means of extortion employed by Poincaré are the "question of confidence" and the Franc, which has not been legally stabilised. Poincaré, the man of the big banks and of the Comité de forges, embodies in the eyes of bourgeois France, "confidence". When Poincaré puts the question of confidence there stands behind him high finance. And to govern against this even in words is impossible. The petty-bourgeois Left Bloc has been able to convince itself sufficiently of this. Every time Poincaré submits the question of confidence, or even only threatens to make use of it (the entire budget for 1928 was forced through almost without discussion by this dictatorial means), the radical socialists see the spectre of the Summer 1926, the collapsing Franc, the flight of capital, and they sink on their knees before the "high wall of money", as they designate the omnipotence of the banks. When, for example, on the 12th of January, there existed the possibility, that the old Left bloc would come together again in order to vote against the unconstitutional demands of Poincaré, the latter gave the Radical Socialists an unmistakable hint; he abolished the law forbidding the export of capital. And when he called out in reply to their remonstrances in the Chamber: Gentlemen, you are free even if I submit the question of confidence", they understood and bowed to his will.

Even during the present financial debates this means of extortion is to be plainly seen. The reaction demands in the name of "national unity" that this debate should not be a political but a "purely financial-technical" debate. In the sphere of finance reaction has a very bad conscience. It has not only burdened the country with a fearful load of debts; it did its utmost possible to discredit the Left Bloc government, which inherited the bankruptcy left behind by the reaction, by causing the collapse of the Franc. The Left radicals and social democrats could "wash themselves clean", could denounce the omnipotence of the banks and their defeatist manoeuvres against the

Franc, as Herriot formerly often did in his Sunday speeches. But whilst the right press throughout the country makes a great outcry over the bankruptcy of the 'Left Bloc', none of the radical socialists and social democratic leaders ventures to disturb the peaceful financial debates. On the contrary, they grovel before Poincaré, flatter and praise him and make use of the opportunity, as the social democrat Spinasse did, in order to do honour to capitalism in its highest form, i. e. Fordism and class collaboration. The social democrat Léon Blum, who had promised a surprise, only called out once: "International unity leads to industrial and financial bonapartism", and then withdrew into sham opposition, of which Poincaré says that it is "moderate and honest and without personal hostility". The only thing they demanded was the legal stabilisation of the franc at its present rate (20% of its pre-war gold value) and then, by successive legislative enactments, gradually to revalorise the franc. But Poincaré did not even agree to this demand. "We will speak of that after the elections", replied Poincaré. For were he legally to stabilise the franc now, then the spectre of the collapse of the franc would disappear, and along with it the Poincaré government, and the Radical and Social Democrats would, after showing so many favours to the big bourgeoisie, strive again to wash themselves clean by some of the reforms they promised in 1924: abolition of the exceptional and shameful laws, as well as the military courts, introduction of one year term of military service, social legislation etc. But they cannot wash themselves clean again. For these reforms do not suit the plans of the banks and heavy industry. On the contrary, the legally enacted repressive measures against the working class no longer satisfy the lords of finance and industry. At their command Poincaré exceeds bourgeois legality in order to crush the working class and to influence the elections in favour of "national unity".

Another typical example of how the bourgeoisie abides by its own constitution when it is a question of proceeding against Communism and the revolutionary working class, is the unpunished intervention of high military officers in politics. Every military person, no matter whether he be a simple soldier or a general, is forbidden by the Constitution to take part in politics. The whole of the year 1927 was characterised by monstrous prison penalties imposed upon simple soldiers for having "taken part in politics", that is, fought for their vital interests. But these measures apply only to simple soldiers. There will still be remembered the interview Marshal Foch gave to an English newspaper, in which he called for a campaign of annihilation against Communism and the Soviet Union. Now, when it is a question of winning the favour of the electors, Painlevé, the Minister for war, who approved of all the monstrous sentences imposed on the soldiers for "taking part in politics", is making use of Field Marshal Petain as his election agent. General Weygand thought fit to preside in uniform at a purely fascist election meeting and to inform his audience as to what treatment must be served out to the Communists. One would have thought that this open violation of the Constitution would have aroused the general indignation of the Republican press. But nothing of the sort has happened. Even the central organ of the Socialist Party of France confines itself to making a feeble protest against this open military-fascist propaganda. When it is a question of capitalist stabilisation and of imperialism, when it is a question of proceeding against Communism, then every action is sacred, even though it may tread bourgeois legality under foot a thousand times.

It is becoming clearer every day that Poincaré intends to do away with the freedom of the press, of meetings and of the right of asylum for revolutionary workers. On the 21st January a special number of the "Humanité" which summoned the workers to a protest demonstration for the amnesty, was confiscated by the police. On the 25th of January the police forced their way into Communist nuclei meetings, searched through all the papers and arrested some foreign comrades. Since then hardly a day has passed in which police, in bodies of 15, often with drawn revolvers, have not entered our nuclei meetings in the quest after documents and foreign comrades (In the year 1927 nearly 10,000 "undesirable foreign elements" were expelled). On the 4th of February the police forced their way into the premises of the C. G. T. U. in order to arrest the trade union secretary Roger Gaillard who has been condemned for anti-militarist propaganda.

While the bourgeois class justice is still dealing out senten-

ces of years of imprisonment for anti-militarist propaganda and for leading strikes; while just recently on the 25th of January, ten Morocco soldiers were condemned to death by courts martial for fraternising with the Rif tribes in the Morocco war, this same class justice displays leniency and good-will towards counter-revolutionaries. Thus the document forger Solovsky, who sold his anti-Communist and anti-Soviet forgeries to the capitalist press and Embassies for hard cash, was condemned to only eight months' imprisonment. The real instigator of these forgeries was even acquitted. While the royalist Delest, the business manager of the "Action Française", who has been condemned for a non-political offence was able, with the full knowledge of the police, to take his ease for weeks at a health resort, and, when the police could no longer allow him to remain in freedom, was conveyed to a political prison, the police arrange a regular hunt for our condemned comrades who are continuing their illegal work; and our imprisoned comrades are being more and more deprived of their rights as political prisoners.

Simultaneously with the political persecutions the pressure upon the working class in the factories is being increased. The private factory police (the great Parisian warehouses expend three million annually on their spy apparatus), are being reinforced and are working hand in hand with the State police in order to purge the factories of Communist nuclei. Cases are also increasing in which the employers issue notices to the effect that all workers and employees who are organised in the C. G. T. U. will be discharged if they do not withdraw from the revolutionary trade unions. The government also is opposing the revolutionary trade unions and refusing to negotiate with them. For the government, only the reformist C. G. T. represents the working class.

And in the face of all these facts the Left bourgeois and social democratic press maintains complete silence. But the Communist Party of France is courageously taking up the struggle and more and more winning the sympathies of the French workers. This is proved for instance, by the elections to the "Supreme Railway Council" in which the revolutionary trade unions received 152,000 votes and obtained 131 delegates, while the reformist trade unions received only 97,000 votes and obtained 45 delegates.

Under these conditions of the united front of all bourgeois parties and of the loyal opposition of the S. P. of France, the working masses will soon understand the correctness of the election slogans of the C. P. of France "class against class".

\* \* \*

Since the above lines were written the Radical socialists have once again proved their docility towards Poincaré by voting in their majority for the budget.

## The London County Council Elections.

By R. E. Bond (London).

The London County Council administers for a greater number of people than any other Municipal body in the world. Its area of jurisdiction covers the City of London and the 28 London Boroughs, with a total population of over four and a half million.

The elections to this body are held every three years, and all the political Parties are now engaged in their campaigns for the elections which take place next month.

Labour has never yet secured a majority on the L. C. C. although it is the strongest opposition Party. The present strength of the Parties is as follows:

Conservative . . . . .	84
Labour . . . . .	34
Liberals . . . . .	6

Needless to say the reactionary Conservative majority on the L. C. C. has used its position to bolster up and support vested interests, and has consistently refused to tackle any of the hundred and one social evils affecting the London working class.

It is only necessary to show their record on the question of housing to prove this. The houses in which the majority of the London workers live are a disgrace and an abomination.

There is a shortage of at least 100,000 houses at the present moment, and this number is increasing year by year.

The number of houses required to meet the normal growth of population every year is about 8000. Yet the total number of houses built for the years 1920—1926 inclusive is only 5957!

Absolutely nothing has been done to deal with the terrible overcrowding existing in all the heavily populated industrial areas of the Metropolis, and the work of slum clearances has scarcely been considered, let alone dealt with.

In spite of this there is very strong ground for the belief that within the course of a year or two, the Tories, if still in power, will completely close down their housing schemes (inadequate, as they are) on the pretence that there will then be no shortage.

The reformist London Labour Party will be putting over 100 candidates in the field in the March elections and are making energetic attempts to secure a majority on the L. C. C.

The election programme upon which their candidates will fight is the usual milk-and-water affair, appealing not to the millions of London's industrial workers, but to "all classes" (and of course, particularly to the middle class and Liberal voters).

Their whole policy in relation to the London County Council can be expressed in the formula — "Give us a majority and we will painlessly transform London from a stronghold of Capitalism into a centre of Socialist enterprise".

They carefully conceal from the workers the fact that any real attempt on the part of a determined Labour majority to use the powers of the L. C. C. solely in the interests of the workers would immediately call forth the strongest opposition and sabotage from the Capitalist State.

The most significant feature concerning the Elections is the entry, for the first time, of the **Left Wing disaffiliated Labour Parties**, directly into the contest.

These local Labour Parties have been cut off from the National Labour Party for refusing to expel their Communist members. Although rival local Labour Parties have been artificially set up by the Labour Party bureaucracy, the disaffiliated Parties still maintain themselves in the eyes of the workers as the real, genuine Labour Parties in their districts, which alone have the right to run Labour candidates in all elections.

Between 20 and 25 Left Wing and Communist candidates will be contesting the L. C. C. elections under the auspices of a dozen disaffiliated Labour Parties.

The entry of these Parties into the election is of the utmost political importance. The election manifesto of the Left Wing and Communist candidates immediately challenges the whole policy of the reformist Labour leaders by declaring that they do not intend to delude the workers with the belief that by obtaining control of the London County Council all the problems facing the workers of London will be solved.

"Any real attempt to use the L. C. C. in the interests of the workers" declares the manifesto; "will meet with fierce resistance from the Capitalist State who will not hesitate to use similar methods to those they used against Labour Boards of Guardians in different parts of the country."

"We shall fight on the L. C. C. for the most elementary demands of the working class, convinced that in doing so they will learn the need for, and be inspired to fight for the ending of Capitalism and the building of Socialism by their own power as a class."

The candidates of the disaffiliated Labour Parties will fight the election round the demands for the extension and development of model, up-to-date housing schemes for the workers; the requisition of all large empty houses of the wealthy; slum clearances without compensation to slum property owners; the removal of all Imperialist and militarist teachings from the schools; continued education and vocational training for all young workers up to the age of 16, during working hours and paid at Trade Union rates; the direct taking over and centralisation of the whole of London's passenger Transport system without compensation; the repeal of all Capitalist legislation attacking the rights of Local Government; the right of local self-determination in the payment of wages, etc. etc.

In the Left Wing and Communist candidates the workers of London have representatives who will expose the sham and hypocrisy of so-called Capitalist "democracy", and who will raise the banner of militant Socialism in the Council Chambers of the wealthiest City in the world.

## PLENUM OF THE E. C. C. I.

### On the Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

Leading Article of the "Pravda" of February 7th, 1928.

The approaching Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International will have to deal with a number of questions which are of fundamental importance for the whole international Labour movement.

We are now entering a new era of international development. Its main features consist in the great intensification of the capitalist antagonisms, before all in the antagonism between the working class and the bourgeoisie. We are already now witnessing the approach of great economic conflicts. The bourgeoisie is increasing its attack upon the working day and on wages, but the working class is showing a great class resistance, which can be explained by the fact that the working class has recovered from the defeat of the the past years.

The turn to the Left of the working class, the growth of the revolutionary mood in its ranks are the second extraordinarily important fundamental feature of the present era of development. And finally, the abrupt swing to the Right of the leaders of international social democracy Social democracy is the most consistent ideological defender of capitalist stabilisation. The British reformists are openly advocating a programme of betrayal of the proletarian class interests (agreement with the capitalists with regard to "peace in industry", terror against the revolutionary wing of the Labour movement and against the Communist Party of Great Britain). The German social democracy is manoeuvring more cautiously, by masking its anti-proletarian policy with Left phrases; but in fact it is conducting the same policy of surrendering the class positions. The same phenomenon is to be seen in France, where the socialists and the reformists of the C. G. T. are splitting the ranks of the workers and hampering their united resistance against the capitalist offensive.

International social democracy is aware of the fact that the growth of the revolutionary mood and the turning to the Left of the working class represent a danger for it. It is attempting to get control of this process. One of its chief methods to this end is to hold out the prospect of the possibility of setting up labour governments. It is, however, perfectly clear that the leaders of social democracy in fact are aiming at **coalition with the bourgeoisie**.

The Communist International must now direct its whole front towards the most possible **strengthening of the struggle against international social democracy**, which constitutes the chief hindrance to the winning of the broad masses of the working class for Communism. In connection therewith there stands on the agenda of the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. the French and the British question.

The whole course of development of the **British Labour movement** in the last three years proves that the Comintern must put the question of a change in the relations of the Communist Party of Great Britain to the Labour Party. The British Labour movement has passed through such great historical events that a **qualitative change** has been brought about in it: We perceive the **open going over** of the leaders of the Labour Party and of the trade unions to the side of the bourgeoisie. The heads of the British Labour movement have betrayed the working class in the question of the Trade Union Act and the Anglo-Russian Committee; they have adopted an openly imperialist attitude on the question of the Chinese Revolution and the national emancipation movement of India. This leadership, following the footsteps of Spencer, has taken the path of "peace in industry", i. e. of complete capitulation to the British bourgeoisie.

At the same time a profound process of differentiation is taking place within the British Labour movement; a rather strong revolutionary kernel has been formed which responds extremely actively to the appeals of the Communist Party. In view of the extraordinary reprisals of the trade union bureaucracy and of the leaders of the Labour Party, the Communist Party of Great Britain finds itself in a very difficult situation. The Communist Party is now faced with the question whether it can further allow itself to be bound by formal discipline to the Labour Party, support the candidates of the latter at electi-

ons etc. at a time when its attitude towards the Labour Party does not bring it any rights whatever and hampers it in the organisation of the revolutionary forces of the British Labour Movement.

In an Open Letter which the C. C. of the Communist Party of Great Britain addressed to all its members, it recognises the mistakes which the Communist International has pointed out and the necessity of raising the question of a change of our tactics. This change will have to find expression at the next elections, in which the Communist Party of Great Britain, supported by the workers sympathising with it, will have to take up an independent position.

The Communist Party of France is likewise confronted with the question of a change of its policy in the approaching elections. The Comintern has instructed the Communist Party of France (and the latter has adopted these instructions) that it will have to enter the next elections with the rejection of all election agreements with the socialists. The Communist Party of France has proved during the last years that it is capable of conducting an active struggle against the danger of war; it was capable of organising great mass movements of the working class. But the basis of the Communist Party of France among the industrial proletariat is still very small. The Party must learn to combine various forms of the class struggle and at the same time devote great attention to the daily struggles of the working class and create the necessary active cadres for this struggle, which alone will ensure success to the Communists in the approaching elections.

The turn to the Left of the working class, the intensification of the class struggle, the sharpening of the contradictions of stabilisation are creating for the Communist Parties, not only in France and Great Britain but also in Germany and in other countries, extremely favourable preconditions for the decisive fight against reformism, for the successful carrying out of the tactics of the united front from below, for the complete exposure and annihilation of social democracy.

In this fight the Communists must come before the masses as the only true Party of the working class by openly submitting their programme of the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Plenum of the E. C. C. I. will have to draw the balance and to indicate the further line of the Communist Party of China. The Chinese Revolution has, in the last few years, pursued a great and heroic path. The campaign against Swatow, the uninterrupted peasants' revolts, the insurrection of the proletariat of Canton — all this proves that the Chinese Revolution lives and is rising to the highest forms of the revolutionary struggle. With the assistance and under the leadership of the Comintern, the Communist Party of China has freed itself from the opportunist errors of its former leadership, has renewed this leadership and set up a clear programme of the workers and peasants' revolution.

The Communist Party of China is heading towards the armed revolt. The whole situation of China is a proof that this course is correct: the Chinese bourgeoisie, which has gone over to the camp of counter-revolution, has not solved a single task of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and was not able, in spite of the consolidation of the reactionary forces, in spite of the most cruel white terror and in spite of the active assistance of the imperialists, to strangle the workers' and peasants' movement. The experiences go to show that the Communist Party has to concentrate all its efforts upon the task of the daily, careful preparation of the armed revolt, in all localities; before all upon dominating the organisation of a mass movement of the workers and peasants. Only such a systematic preparation — from the leadership of the economic daily struggles of the working class up to the creation of volunteer detachments — can secure the victory of the Chinese Revolution.

The experiences of the Canton insurrection prove that the Communist Party of China is the true bearer and leader of the Chinese Revolution; that it is a fighting advance-guard which is capable of the greatest heroism and sacrifice; that the Chinese working class has really grown into a powerful revolutionary force. But the same experiences prove that a still closer connection of the Communists with the broad masses of workers and peasants is necessary; that we have to learn to bring the fight of the working class into unison with the peasants' movement.

One of the most important tasks of the Communist Party of China is the consolidation of the Party, the enlargement of its working class cadres and the restoration of its forces as well as the fight against those tendencies that lead away from the chief task of preparing the forces for the armed revolt to liquidatory moods, to the renouncement of the leading role in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, but also against those moods which find expression in the lack of understanding of the task of a long-lasting, persistent, difficult daily work among the masses and of the necessity of creating conditions for immediate actions against the counter-revolution.

On the agenda of the Plenum there also stands the question of the international activity of the Trotskyist Opposition. It would be a great mistake not to realise the danger which the activity of the Trotskyist Opposition in Western Europe constitutes. For in every capitalist country the Trotskyist Opposition is sure of the support of the bourgeoisie and of the social democracy, which will offer them every possibility to propagate their views. The documents which have been published in the Communist Press, prove that the Trotskyist Opposition now set their hopes on the work in other countries. These documents are a brilliant illustration of the fact that we have to deal with an opportunist, liquidatory group which, along with the Mensheviks, are speculating upon the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in all fundamental international questions have gone over to the position of Hilferding.

The Plenum of the E. C. C. I. must give the impulse so that the Communist Parties of the other countries increase their work to expose Trotskyism, as the struggle against the Trotskyist Opposition is a fight against the main sources of lies and calumnies against the Comintern. Decisive fight against that organisation which has set out to disintegrate the Communist ranks from within is necessary.

## LEAGUE OF NATIONS

### Ten Years of International Deception of the Workers.

The End of the Washington Agreement.

By A. Enderle.

The representative of the British Government declared at the meeting of the Administrative Council of the International Labour Office on February 2nd, that his government would never be able to ratify the Washington agreement with regard to the eight-hour day in its present form. He therefore brought forward a motion to the effect that a revision of the Washington agreement should be put on the agenda at the next international Labour Conference in 1929.

The Administrative Council accepted the motion by 13 votes against 7, 4 abstaining from voting, i. e. with the votes of the employers and of the representatives of the Government against the votes of the representatives of the trade unions, thus backing the British Government and asked it to put a formal motion at the next Labour Conference.

No one doubts that this is the finishing stroke dealt at the Washington agreement. The pompous international deception with which the Reformists have fooled the international proletariat for the past nine years, has finally burst.

In connection with the revolutionary storm of the proletariat which began with the Russian revolution in 1917 and spread throughout Europe after the imperialist world war had collapsed in 1918, the working class turned the old proletarian demand for the eight-hour day into a fact at one blow, not only in the states of the Central Powers who had been defeated, but also in the so-called victorious states of the Entente. International capitalism worked hand in hand with international Reformism in order to arrest the further revolutionary advance of the international proletariat.

The International Labour Office in Geneva was set up as a department of the League of Nations, with Albert Thomas, the French leader of the "socialists" at its head as director. Immediately after the dictatorial conclusion of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the first conference of the International Labour Office was convoked in Washington at which, among other

things, the famous Washington Agreement with regard to the eight-hour day was concluded. That agreement provides for a maximum working day of eight hours for workers, employees and officials in all the countries and — with a great number of exceptions, it is true — with regard to traffic, agriculture etc. That agreement is, however, only to be legally valid in the separate countries if it is solemnly ratified by the governments of the individual countries in the course of ten years.

This Washington agreement was proclaimed by the Reformists with a great fanfare as "the commencement of the social epoch", all the capitalist governments solemnly promised an early ratification of the said agreement in order to pacify the workers who were in a revolutionary mood. In order that the masses of workers should seriously believe in that fraud, a number of minor states represented at the League of Nations, such as Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Poland, Peru, Chile, were persuaded formally to sign the ratification. International Reformism, under the lead of Albert Thomas and of the freshly founded Amsterdam Trade Union International, trumpeted forth the "great results" of the ratification throughout the world, even though there was not the slightest change in the situation of the exploited proletariat of those countries who were compelled to work by shifts of ten and twelve hours as they had done before.

The governments of the capitalist Great Powers took good care not to ratify the Washington agreement, but they missed no opportunity for many a long day, to announce repeatedly that the ratification was near at hand. Each of the governments, however, did so with the reservation that it was prepared to ratify — under the condition that the other large capitalist States should take the lead in ratification.

In consequence of the change of the revolutionary wave in 1917 into an offensive of capital in 1920, it was possible for capital to do away with the eight-hour day bit by bit. As early as in 1923 it was abolished in Germany, and nine to twelve hours of work were resumed. Poland, Switzerland, France and other States followed suit. The proletariat of Great Britain offered the most violent resistance, until its power of resistance also was broken by the treachery of the Reformist leaders, in spite of the heroic struggle of a million miners in 1926. The capitalist group of leaders in the League of Nations, i. e. the British bourgeoisie, has now made up its mind to put an end to its hypocrisy which has become superfluous and to declare openly that there will be no ratification of the Washington agreement.

As the Washington agreement has merely had an effect against the eight-hour day, the procedure of the British Government and of international capital as a whole can only be explained by the supposition that, the eight-hour day having actually been abolished, the government considered that it would be more to the detriment than to the benefit of its prestige were it further to keep up its pompous hypocrisy. To this must be added that the ten years' term provided for the ratification will run out next year and that the governments want even now to avoid a campaign for a prolongation of the agreement.

Matters are different with regard to the Reformists. A splendid means of deceiving the masses has been taken out of its hands, and the leaders are now exposed to the eyes of the proletariat as rogues and swindlers. Hence on the occasion of the declaration of the representative of the British Government at the meeting of the Administrative Council in Geneva, Albert Thomas, greatly upset, stammered: "It is a tragic hour for the Labour Office". And Hermann Müller, his faithful friend, the representative of the A. D. G. B. in Geneva, talked about "a question concerning the fate of the Labour Office altogether".

In order to cover up their gigantic deceit from the eyes of the workers and to prepare for a fresh manoeuvre of deception, all the leaders and organs of the Second International and of the Amsterdam International are scolding at the British Baldwin Government which is "false to its word". In this way, however, they only surpass their former fraud by a fresh one. During the first years after the revolution, the social democrats have, in a number of capitalist States, ruled the governments or exercised a powerful influence over them but, when they were in power, these traitors to the cause of the workers, did not think, even for a moment, of ratifying the Washington agreement, neither in Germany nor in France, in Belgium, or in Great Britain. MacDonald's government was nearly a year at

the helm of the capitalist state which was paramount in the League of Nations. It prattled in the same hypocritical way about ratification but, like the governments of Lloyd George and Baldwin, did not accomplish it. Facts are now being made known in the British Press, proving that it was the moderate leaders of the workers in Great Britain who, at the time of MacDonald's government, made every effort to prevent the ratification of the Washington agreement with the use of the most shallow pretexts. It is due to their insistence that the government of MacDonald, instead of ratifying, "engaged in negotiations with regard to the introduction of a uniform interpretation of the Washington agreement on the basis of industrial legislation."

That preparatory work of MacDonald's government is now being used by Baldwin's government for the purpose of justifying the revision — more correctly the abolition — of the Washington agreement, with the argument that the Washington agreement admitted of too diverse interpretations. In this way, the leaders of the Second and of the Amsterdam Internationals are actually not only the initiators of that repulsive hypocrisy but — although unwittingly — those who prepared the way for the final abolition of the Washington agreement by capital.

Apart from the lame abusive language which the Reformist leaders in all the countries are using against the Government which is "false to its word", they have assumed a very modest attitude towards the proceedings of the governments. Mac Donald's organ wrote with regard to the sudden advance of the representative of the British Government in Geneva, that "the true reason why the Government refused to ratify was to be looked for in the attitude of the employers' federation..." But in what way are the British Reformists fighting against it? The "Daily Herald" answers this question when it states that, the General Council of the Trades Union Congress has accepted the invitation of the ministry of Labour with the object of discussing with the employers the alleged difficulties.

This is then a fresh fraud in collaboration with the capitalists for the purpose of carrying out an even more insolently deceitful manoeuvre against the workers.

According to the announcement of the "I. F. T. U. Press reports", the "fight" of the International Trade Union League of Amsterdam is as follows:

"This campaign, which should reach its culminating point in the demonstrations of the workers of all countries in May 1928, must begin with the Labour Press in all countries contributing towards exposing the tacit international understanding between the dilatory governments and the narrow-minded employers, and towards showing that the workers are firmly determined to maintain their strongest position, i. e. the eight-hour day. When this will have penetrated into the slow-working brains of the rulers (!), their own interests will teach them that it is preferable for the hours of work to be the same in all countries."

Even in 1919 and during these nine years, the class-conscious proletariat has been quite clear as to the object of the Washington fraud and as to the role played by the treacherous leaders. The large mass of the proletariat, however, in the capitalist countries which is following in the train of the Reformists, was, to the end, deceived by that swindle and was thus held back from lining up in the revolutionary front and engaging in the true revolutionary fight for conquering and ensuring the eight-hour day.

The urgent thing to do is now to turn the Washington fraud to account in order to show up to the broad masses of the workers the bankruptcy of Reformism, the unprecedented betrayal of the workers carried on by the Reformist leaders. In 1918, the eight-hour day was actually achieved by means of the revolutionary struggle. In the nine years of the Washington agreement, the eight-hour day and with it all the revolutionary achievements of the proletariat have been lost as the result of the Reformist policy of collaboration with capital.

It is no mere coincidence that the British bourgeoisie is just at the present moment feeling strong enough to throw aside the last mask of hypocrisy, at the very moment when the Reformist leaders of the British trade unions are crowning their betrayal of the workers by arranging peace conferences with the leaders of capital for the "security of British industry" and for "bridging over class antagonisms". That Reformist policy of

collaboration which not only holds sway in Great Britain but also in France, where Jouhaux offered to enlist the trade unions in the capitalist State apparatus, in Germany by means of strengthening the policy of co-operation, in Switzerland and in all the other countries by the destruction of trade union unity and by the persecution of the Communists, is the strongest support of international capitalism. The lesson which the working class in every country should learn from the collapse of the deceitful Washington manoeuvre is that it must destroy that collaboration and replace it by the revolutionary fight of the proletariat.

## TEN YEARS OF THE RED ARMY

### Decree

of the Council of People's Commissaries of 15th January, 1918,  
Petrograd.

The old army was an instrument of class suppression of the toilers by the bourgeoisie. With the transference of power into the hands of the working and exploited classes, there arose the necessity of creating a new army, which shall be a wall

### ДЕКРЕТ

#### Совета Народных Комиссаров

15 января 1918 г.

г. Петроград.

Старая армия служила орудием классового угнетения трудящихся буржуазией. С переходом власти к трудящимся и эксплуатируемым классам возникла необходимость создания новой армии, которая явится оплотом Советской власти в настоящем, фундаментом для замены постоянной армии всеардным вооружением в ближайшем будущем и послужит поддержкой для грядущей социалистической революции в Европе.

#### I.

Ввиду этого Совет Народных Комиссаров постановляет: организовать новую армию под названием „Рабоче-Крестьянская Красная армия“, на следующих основаниях:

1. Рабоче-Крестьянская Красная армия создается из наиболее сознательных и организованных элементов трудящихся классов.
2. Доступ в ее ряды открыт для всех граждан Российской Республики не моложе 18 лет. В Красную армию вступает каждый, кто готов отдать свои силы, свою жизнь для защиты завоеваний Октябрьской Революции, власти Советов и социализма. Для вступления в ряды Красной армии необходима рекомендация: войсковых комитетов или общественных демократических организаций, стоящих на платформе Советской власти, партийных или профессиональных организаций или, по крайней мере, двух членов этих организаций. При вступлении целыми частями требуется круговая порука всех и поименное голосование.

#### II.

1. Воины Рабоче-Крестьянской Красной армии состоят на полном государственном довольствии и, сверх всего, получают 50 рублей в месяц.
2. Нетрудоспособные члены семей солдат Красной армии, находившиеся ранее на их иждивении, обеспечиваются всем необходимым по местным потребностям, согласно постановлений местных органов Советской власти.

#### III.

Верховным руководящим органом Рабоче-Крестьянской Красной армии является Совет Народных Комиссаров. Непосредственное руководство и управление армией сосредоточено в Комиссариате по военным делам, в составленном при нем Особой Всероссийской Коллегии.

Председатель Совета Народных Комиссаров *В. Ульянов-Ленин*.  
Верхонный Главнокомандующий *Н. Крыленко*  
Народные комиссары по военным и морским делам *Дыбенко, Подвойский*.  
Народные комиссары: *Прошьян, Затонский, Штейнберг*  
Управляющая делами СНК *Влад. Бонч-Бруевич*.

of protection for the Soviet Power at the present time, but in future has to form the basis for replacing the permanent army by the arming of the people and shall offer a support for the approaching socialist revolution in Europe.

#### I.

In view of the above the Council of People's Commissaries

resolves to set up a new army under the name of "Red Workers' and Peasants' Army" upon the following basis:

1. The "Red Workers' and Peasants' Army is formed out of the most class-conscious and best organised elements of the working classes.

2. Its ranks are open to all citizens of the Soviet Republic from the age of 18 upwards. Everybody who is prepared to give his life and his strength in defence of the achievements of the October Revolution, and for the Soviet Power and for Socialism, can enter the Red Army. Applicants for entry into the Red Army must have recommendations from the soldiers' committees or public democratic organisations which stand on the platform of the Soviet Power, from Party or trade union organisations, or at least from two members of the same. For the entry of whole bodies troops into the Red Army it is required that a vote be taken and mutual guarantees given.

#### II.

1. Soldiers of the "Red Workers' and Peasants' Army" receive full maintenance and 50 Roubles monthly from the State.

2. The relatives of the soldiers of the Red Army who are incapacitated for work and who have up to now been sustained by them, are to be maintained according to the local standard of consumption fixed by the local organisations of the Soviet Power.

#### III.

The supreme commanding organ of the "Red Workers' and Peasants' Army" is the Council of People's Commissaries. The immediate command and administration of the army lies in the hands of the War Commissariat and of the Special All-Russian Collegium affiliated to it.

President of the Council of People's Commissaries:

W. Uljanov Lenin.

Chief Commander:

N. Krylenko.

People's Commissary for the Army and Navy:

Dybenko.

Podvoisky.

Peoples Commissaries:

Prochian

Satonsky,

Steinberg.

Business Manager of the Council of Peoples Commissaries:

W. Bontch-Bruyevitch.

### Solemn Oath of the Red Army.

1. I, son of the working people and citizen of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, hereby receive the proud name of a soldier of the Worker and Peasant Army.

2. In face of the working classes of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and of the whole world I pledge myself to hold this name in honour, conscientiously to learn the profession of a soldier and also to preserve from plunder and damage, as the most precious thing, the property of the people and of the military.

3. I undertake most strictly to observe military discipline and to carry out without demur all orders of the commanders appointed by the power of the Worker and Peasant Government.

4. I pledge myself to abstain from all actions lowering to the dignity of a citizen of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and also to restrain my comrades from such actions and to direct all my acts and thoughts to the great aim of the emancipation of all workers.

5. I promise to obey the first call of the Worker and Peasant Government and to devote myself to defending the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics against all dangers and attacks on the part of its enemies, and in the fight for the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, for the cause of Socialism and for the fraternity of the peoples to spare neither my whole strength nor life itself.

6. Should I intentionally break this my solemn oath, may I be punished with universal contempt and be struck by the hard fist of revolutionary law.

## Against Whom has the Red Army Fought?

The October Revolution converted the imperialist war into civil war, into class war. On the one side stood the landowners and the bourgeoisie; all those to whom the war was advantageous, who derived benefit from it in the shape of enormous profits; on the other side there stood the workers, a great portion of the peasants who had been impoverished by the war, and the toiling masses of the national minorities oppressed by tsarism.

The forces of the counter-revolution were at first organised at the expense of the landed proprietors, of the factory owners and the big business people. During this time the counter-revolution was based exclusively on the officers and junkers and a portion of the well-to-do cossacks. The cossacks who served at the front did not support the counter-revolution. Thus, for instance, the majority of the cossacks in Petrograd in the October days who were ordered by Kerensky to proceed against Petrograd and overthrow the Soviet power, refused to fight against the workers. When the cossacks returned to their homes (where they constituted the wealthiest and most privileged portion of the peasantry) they took up arms against the Soviets as a result of the agitation of their leaders, generals and officers. In other districts the counter-revolutionaries made use of the kulaks and rich peasants in the fight.

To what a great extent the kulaks and rich peasants acted unconsciously in supporting the counter-revolution can be judged by a number of examples. The mobilisations achieved result only so long as the fighting took place in the immediate locality; as soon as waverings occurred on the front the mobilised forces immediately dispersed and the retreating white-guardist hordes gradually melted away. This is what happened on the occasion of the retreat of Koltchak's army in Siberia, of the retreat of Denikin in North Caucasus and in the Crimea at the beginning of 1920, and the shattering of Wrangel's forces at the end of 1920 and the beginning of 1921.

With the Red Army we see precisely the opposite picture. With the formation of the fronts in the civil war the Red Army grew uninterruptedly, and in 1920 reached a total of five and a half million. The main mass of the workers and the poor and middle peasants were drawn into the defence of the Soviet power. The Committees of poor peasants formed troops for the fight at the front. Whenever the Red Army was compelled to retreat, its ranks were reinforced by a great number of volunteers; intensive recruiting work was conducted in the towns among the members of the trade unions. In the rear of the white-guardists red partisan troops were organised, which rendered the Red Army particularly great service in the liquidation of Koltchak's and Denikin's forces.

The civil war lasted for three years. If the greater portion of the workers were on the side of the Soviet Power and the Red Army, then there arises the question with what means were the counter-revolutionary governments of the North, of the North West of Siberia and of the South able to conduct such a prolonged fight.

The answer to this question is clear. They were helped by the imperialists of all countries, who had made it their task to liquidate the power of the workers and peasants in the country of the Soviets.

Already in November, 1918, France and Great Britain worked out a plan for the economic blockade and annihilation of the Bolsheviks. The carrying out of this plan commenced with the occupation of South Russia; on the 23rd November, 1918, an Entente naval squadron took possession of Novorossisk; in December troops were landed in Odessa, Sebastopol and Batum, Cherson and Nikolayev were taken, and in March, 1919, there were in South Russia 20,000 British and French troops with tanks and aeroplanes.

On the 23rd December, 1918, France and Great Britain came to an agreement regarding the division of the frontiers of Russia according to spheres of influence: France's influence extended over the Ukraine, the Crimea, the Southern portion of the Don district and Poland; Great Britain's influence extended over the North, the Baltic countries, Transcaucasia and North Caucasus and the Eastern portion of the Don area.

Under the pretext of defending Azerbaijan against the Turks, the British and the white-guardist troops, supported with British money, took possession of Baku and other towns on the coast of the Caspian Sea.

In July, 1918, a counter-revolutionary revolt occurred in Transcaucasia, when the British supplied the insurgents with weapons and munitions and sent occupation troops.

On the 20th September, 1918, 26 commissars from Baku were shot on the orders of the British military commander. The British government in this way adopted the role of hangmen for the counter-revolution.

The work of the agents of the British government and of the occupation troops in Caucasus and Central Asia had as its object to rob Soviet Russia of oil, cotton and manganese and to hamper the action of the Red Army.

In addition, Great Britain and France afforded the white-guardist troops great material help. On the 19th February, 1919, there arrived in Novo-Rossisk a transport of arms (about 100,000 rifles, 1000 machine guns, 350 guns, 106 aeroplanes and 7 tanks) and clothing for Denikin's army, for all of which the counter-revolutionary government paid with wheat.

In June, 1918, the Murmansk district was occupied by the combined Franco-British-Serbian-American corps with over 40,000 men and 15 aeroplanes; the coast of Murmansk was blockaded by 4 British cruisers.

On the 2nd of August, 1918, there was set up in Archangel, with the immediate participation of Great Britain, the government of Chaikovsky, and 12,000 men of the allied occupation troops were concentrated in this area.

A campaign for recruiting white-guardists for the purpose of blockading Soviet Russia was organised in the North by the imperialist governments. The imperialists likewise took a hand in the fight against the power of the workers and peasants in the North West.

In December, 1918, there appeared in Libau and Riga a British squadron with a consignment of rifles, machine guns and military clothing. With the help of Great Britain a white Estonian army was equipped with 17,800 bayonets, 700 sabres, 57 guns, 4 armoured trains, 6 tanks and two armoured motor cars. In October, 1918, this army formed the main body in Yudenitch's attack on Petrograd.

In December, 1918, a British squadron seized the torpedo boats "Spantak" and "Avstroil" belonging to the Red Baltic Fleet.

In May, 1919, British torpedo boats frequently fired on Soviet forces. On July 18th the cruiser "Oleg" belonging to the Baltic fleet was destroyed by a British motor boat. On the 18th August motor boats and aeroplanes in the Baltic attacked Kronstadt, where they sank the vessel "Pamjatny Asova" and destroyed the armoured train "Andrey Pervosvanny".

Such facts could be cited without end; and all go to prove that the imperialists of the whole world proceeded against the Red Army. If the white-guardists had not received such material and moral help the fight against them would not have lasted so long and the economy of the country of the workers and peasants would not have been destroyed to the extent it was.

The Red Army, which stood alone in its fight, which had to fight against the inner counter-revolution and defend itself against the intervention of the West European imperialists, recognised who are the chief enemies of the power of the workers and peasants. The knowledge that socialist construction could not be commenced until the final victory over the white forces, acted as a powerful stimulus, so that the workers' and peasants' regiments, in spite of poor food and clothing, weak technic, isolation from the outer world and from all outside help, defeated their class enemies.

Now, when the Soviet Power and the Red Army have already existed for ten years, the workers of the other countries know what the Soviet Union is and will not be a blind tool in the hands of their bourgeois governments.



A combined British and French squadron, consisting of three dreadnoughts, eight cruisers and twelve torpedo boats blockaded the coast of the Black Sea. Odessa was occupied by the 56th French division, and in the Crimea there were two battalions of the French 175th cavalry, a battalion of Greek troops with two batteries, and over 4000 Algerians and Senegalese.

At the time of the offensive of the Red Army (March-April, 1919), the French troops hastily evacuated the occupied area, taking with them almost the whole of the mercantile fleet as well as a portion of the warships with everything that was on board of them.

Great Britain, which felt a great longing for the oil riches, supported the counter-revolutionary forces in Transcaucasia and in Central Asia. On the 23rd November, 1918, a British division landed in Batum and occupied the chief centres of Grusia.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### Eight Years Penal Servitude for Comrade Boris Stevanof.

By Daniel Renault (Paris).

Eight years penal servitude for Boris Stefanov, the like sentence for his "accomplice" Zuckermann and ten years penal servitude for Lisa Dijour (who has fled to Turkey), because she translated the instructions of the Communist International into Roumanian — that is the sentence of the Bukarest military court on Boris Stefanov and Comrades.

Already some years ago, before the Roumanian Siguranza had succeeded in arresting Stefanov — he was to have the same fate as Pavel Tkatchenko, who was foully murdered —, he was condemned in his absence to ten years penal servitude. He has already spent two years in prison "on remand", so the present sentence means nothing but the confirmation of the one pronounced previously.

With this sentence on Boris Stefanov, who was a Roumanian deputy and against whom, in spite of all the efforts of the police, no "conspiracy" could be proved, the oligarchy of the boyars have given a provocative answer to the great international demonstrations of solidarity for Boris Stefanov. They have been encouraged thereto by the "democratic" powers, England and France. These are the Powers which are preparing the way for fascism in Roumania. This is proved not only by the sentence on Stefanov and Comrades, but by the circumstances under which it was imposed.

The French lawyer, M. Junker, whom Stefanov's family had sent to Bucharest, was simply expelled from the country. M. Junker, by the way, is by no means a Communist. He wished to do nothing more than fulfil his duty as legal defender of the accused. In spite of this he was arrested on his arrival in Roumania, thrown into one of the dungeons of the Siguranza and finally conducted over the frontier as a criminal. This action was only possible as a result of the support of the French government.

When the great peasants' trial took place in Kishinev, Henri Barbusse and several others were able to be present for days at the proceedings. In the years which have passed since the reaction has made further progress. The French government is openly supporting the regime of white terror in Roumania. The Siguranza, the bloody police instrument of the bourgeoisie, which represents a State within the State, has an official representative in Paris, in the person of the notorious pseudo consul Radoi. When the Roumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs comes to Paris, he has consultations not only with Briand but also with the Minister for Justice Sarraut, in order to settle between the two States the question of the persecution of "undesirable" elements.

The sentence of penal servitude pronounced on the brave representative of the peasants of Dobrudsha calls to mind the whole social and national drama of the suppressed working masses which has been proceeding in Roumania since 1918.

Because Boris Stefanov, both by word and in writing, stood up for the down-trodden peasants of Bessarabia, because he wholeheartedly championed the demands of the Bulgarian and Turkish minorities in the Dobrudsha, because he defended all national minorities oppressed by imperialist Roumania, because he is a Communist, a spokesman of the poor peasants, an indefatigable propagandist of a real land reform — for these reasons he was persecuted with deadly hate by the boyars.

He succeeded in escaping abroad. But, like Comrades Rakosi and Szanto, he returned to his own country in spite of the white terror in order to work there for the right of the legal organisation of the workers and peasants. He was arrested, and for two years submitted to terrible tortures; for fifteen months, he was confined in the horrible dungeons of Jilava. Half a dozen times the trial against him was commenced, only to be adjourned again. The indignation of international public opinion finally compelled the government to carry out the trial to an end, but did not prevent it from imposing a terrible sentence.

The sentence on Stefanov and Zuckermann are in fact death sentences. For ten years in Roumanian prisons means systematic murder. Stefanov and Zuckermann would not be the first who have perished in the Roumanian prison hells.

For this reason it is up to the international proletariat and all those who still have within them the least spark of honour, not to abate their solidarity with the victims of the white terror in Roumania and in the whole of the Balkans. The fight must be continued with increased energy. Stefanov, Zuckermann and the thousand others who are pining there in prison must be freed.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### Resolution of the National Conference of the C. P. of France on the Economic and Political Situation.

At the National Conference of the C. P. of France, which took place from 30th January to 3rd February in Paris, a detailed resolution on the economic and political situation was unanimously adopted, the first part of which sets forth how the capitalist class in France is endeavouring to overcome the protracted economic crisis following the stabilisation of the French valuta at the cost of the working class. Wage cuts, lengthened working time, progressive unemployment and short time work — this is the effect of capitalist rationalisation upon the working class. In order to realise its aims, the bourgeoisie is concentrating in the "National Unity" all forces, including those of the national bloc as well those of the former bloc of the Left, against the workers. The Party of the petty bourgeois, the Radical Party, has allowed itself to be taken in tow by the big bourgeoisie. The reformist trade unions and the Socialist Party assist the government (military laws, colonial policy etc.) and play the game of reaction. At the same time French imperialism is attempting to advance, to maintain and extend its positions on the world market. The dangers of a new world war are growing, above all of a war of the capitalist States against the Soviet Union.

Proceeding from this situation, the resolution characterises the Labour movement, the tasks of the C. P. F. and especially its tactics in the approaching election struggle as follows:

#### The Revolutionising of the Masses.

In the whole world the attempts of capitalism to stabilise itself are accompanied by a number of new methods for corrupting the working class and paralysing the labour movement, in that the bourgeoisie is striving, with the help of the reformist leaders, to cause the Labour movement to become a part of the State apparatus. (Industrial peace in England, fascist trade unions in Italy, compulsory arbitration courts in Germany, National Economic Council in France.)

But at the same time the events that have taken place in the last few years on an international scale show us that a revolutionising of the proletarian masses and of the suppressed

population in the colonies is proceeding. All the events, from the Vienna revolt and the Sacco-Vanzetti campaign up to the Canton Revolt, are symptoms of a new revolutionary wave.

We are undoubtedly approaching a general intensification of the class struggle and of the war dangers in the whole world. In this situation French imperialism will play a leading role. That is the perspective which must dominate every action of our Party and determine its tactics.

We have not yet learned to estimate correctly the character of the offensive of the employers and of the government. Our Party has not understood, in its daily work, to draw the practical conclusions from the correct perspectives which the National Conference of Saint Denis has already laid down.

1. We have not correctly estimated the character of the offensive of the employers and of the government. This wrong estimation was the cause of the great weakness in our leadership of the Labour movement, the cause of a lack of impetus in our trade union work for the organisation of the labour struggles. This is the reason why we did not take into account the circumstance that, especially since the Spring of 1927, there has been a noticeable awakening among the workers.

2. We were inclined to treat the political questions exclusively from the parliamentary point of view (question of labour legislation, unemployment etc.). Our Parliamentary action did not sufficiently reflect the mass action and the immediate struggle of the workers.

3. We had the tendency to keep too much within the limits of bourgeois legality and not sufficiently to stir up the working class to fight and resistance against the persecutions.

4. We have not sufficiently explained the character of the war danger and the decisive role of French imperialism in the preparation of the imperialist war, and we have not sufficiently exposed the pacifist illusions and the role of the League of Nations. As a result we have not been able to mobilise the broad masses against these dangers.

5. In applying the tactics of the united front the Party has not made sufficient use of the proposals submitted by the lower organisations in order to develop a movement and mass organisations.

The Open Letter of November 10th already pointed out all these weaknesses and showed the Party the correct path. In spite of this the great majority of the Party has not paid sufficient attention to testing and applying the practical suggestions contained in the Open Letter.

#### The Mistakes and the Tasks of the Party.

The correct path which the Party has to pursue indicated by the Open Letter, must be pursued with all force and absolute conviction by the lowest to the highest organisations. This is an indispensable condition for a serious organisation of the active resistance and of the class struggle of the workers.

The Party must therefore, after a severe self-criticism, as was contained in the Open Letter, continue the discussion up to the last nuclei and determinedly proceed to carry out the following tasks:

1. Concentration of our agitation and our propaganda on the following slogans:

Against the national unity and the consequences of its policy for the working class!

Against the socialist and reformist leaders, who are playing the game of reaction by supporting the National Unity!

Against the lie of bourgeois democracy!

Against the danger of an imperialist war and the pacifist illusions!

For the defence of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Revolution!

For the workers' and peasants' government!

2. Against the front of the bourgeois forces which are supported by the reformist leaders we must set up the united front of the working class, on the basis of the immediate demands and in connection with the final aim.

3. We must fight against the dangers of an imperialist war, against the intervention of the imperialist Powers against the Soviet Union, against war in the colonial countries.

4. We must increase the resistance to the persecutions and intensify the fight for the amnesty.

5. We must organise the foreign workers and the workers in the colonies.

6. We must make use of the discontent among the peasants and support the demands of the peasants' Council in order to rouse the peasants against the government of National Unity.

#### Class Against Class!

The Party will on this basis take part in the election campaign, which is to be regarded as a phase of the broad battle which the working class has to fight under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Our election tactics will be based on the following principles:

1. For the first ballot the Party will come forward with its own Communist programme.

2. For the second ballot the Party will maintain its candidates against all bourgeois candidates, and in general also against those socialist candidates who have rejected our proposals for a workers' and peasants' bloc.

3. Our attitude towards the Socialists cannot be made dependent upon their attitude towards the "reactionary candidates", because the government of "National unity" has abolished the formal dividing line which existed between reactionaries and "Lefts".

4. Should the Central Committee of the Party consider it necessary to make exceptions in some cases, it will submit to the Comintern a concrete proposal which is to be jointly examined by the Executive Committee of the Comintern and the C. C. of the C. P. of France.

The election campaign must not be separated from our general activity. In the course of the campaign we shall have to change the traditional methods of agitation and to emphasise with all sharpness the Communist character of our campaign.

During the whole campaign our chief agitation and propaganda must be conducted in the factories. (Proposal and putting forward of candidates in factory meetings, campaign in the factory papers, collections in the factories, intensification of trade union work.) Our campaign must be directed towards organising the working class in the united front committees, in the trade unions and in our Party.

Our proposals for the united front shall not only be submitted to the socialist candidates and their sections, but before all to the masses, and shall find expression in the organisation of factory committees. The offers and the efforts for the united front must be systematically repeated.

Thus the Communist Party will prove itself to be the only revolutionary leader of the working class. In opposing the rallying of the bourgeois forces and also those who support these forces and by offering resistance to the persecutions, our Party will promote the organisation of the proletariat and lead it in the approaching revolutionary struggles.

## AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

### American Communist Party Develops Defeatist Campaign Against U. S. Imperialism.

By J. Louis Engdahl.

The American Communist Party is successfully developing a broad defeatist campaign against the war being waged by the imperialist United States government against the revolutionary forces in Nicaragua.

Defeat of the armed forces of Wall Street is demanded in numerous demonstrations, featured by clashes with the police, marking a new development in the American Communist Party's anti-war activities.

In similar struggles in the past the Party has contented itself with declarations for the withdrawal of troops, demanding "Hands Off China!" or "Hands Off Nicaragua!" or "Hands Off Mexico!"

Today, however, the Party openly and militantly declares for the defeat of Wall Street imperialism, for the desertion of the American marines to the ranks of the Nicaraguan revolutionists, for the stoppage of arms and munitions production and shipment by workers in the United States, calling upon American workers to emulate the Nicaraguan stevedores at Corinto, who went on strike, refusing to handle American munitions.

Two of the chief demonstrations held by the Party, in conjunction with the Young Communist League, were staged before the two largest navy yards of American imperialism, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, at Brooklyn, New York and the Philadelphia Navy Yard, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Another was held before the state department building in Washington.

The severest clash with the police took place at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Here the demonstration was held under the direction of the New York District of the Party, that was simultaneously holding mass meetings addressed by Socrates Sandino, brother of the Nicaraguan revolutionist, who is a Brooklyn carpenter.

Some of the banners carried successfully in the Brooklyn demonstration in spite of the efforts of the police to destroy them, presented these slogans: "Ex-Servicemen Greet the Marines who joined Sandino in His Fight Against Wall Street's Forces", "American Workers, Sailors, Marines! Defeat the War to Make Nicaragua Safe for Wall Street!" "No Supplies to Enslave Nicaragua to Wall Street!" "Support Nicaragua's Struggle Against Wall Street!" "Defeat American Intervention in Nicaragua!" Leaflets distributed at the demonstrations linked up the war against Nicaragua with the war being waged against the Chinese revolution.

The statement issued by the American Communist Party incidental to these demonstrations declared:

"We urge all American workers, soldiers and sailors to organise for struggle against American Imperialism, the common enemy of all the exploited and oppressed within and without the borders of America."

"Civil war against imperialist war!" was a slogan raised in literature distributed by the Party!

No arrests were made at Philadelphia although the demonstrators were forced to remain a definite distance from the entrance to the navy yard.

In a special proclamation on the occasion of President Coolidge's departure for the Sixth Pan-American Conference at Havana, Cuba, the American Communist Party declared:

"We must follow the example of our American brothers, those marines who refused to shoot down the fighters for liberty and who dedicated their lives to give battle to American imperialism. We must do what the Nicaraguan workers did at Corinto. We must not scab against our brothers. We American workers cannot and will not be strikebreakers.

"No worker should raise a finger to make or move munitions for shooting down the heroic Nicaraguans led by Sandino.

"All together for a powerful united front of the workers and farmers to paralyze the strangling hand of the American imperialist clique, the capitalist rulers in Nicaragua, in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, in Colorado, in Cuba and wherever Wall Street undermines the welfare of the working masses."

Wall Street presses forward in an effort to rapidly conclude the bloody Nicaraguan chapter in the growing history of its violent rule over the Latin American peoples. While the massacre, especially from airplanes, of Sandino's revolutionists, continued; while Lindbergh was continuing his imperialist "good will" flight over Latin American countries; while the Pan-American Conference at Havana was veneering with dollar hypocrisy the brutal oppression of tens of millions of people; we find Dr. William P. Cumberland, formerly dollar dictator of terrorised Hayti, imported to establish Wall Street's financial tyranny over Nicaragua. Wall Street is to provide a loan of \$ 22,000,000 to its puppet government, most of which, in keeping with past practices, will be used to cover funds already advanced by the international bankers to finance the counter-revolution — the "loyal government" of Diaz.

Throughout the two Americas the forces opposed to imperialism rally under the leadership of the Pan-American Communist movement. The Nicaraguan campaign of the Communist Party in the United States marks an advance step in this struggle. It is a rehearsal for wider and more successful struggles in the future. It is a rehearsal for the successful war that must be waged against the new war planned against the Soviet Union, in which American imperialism will take a leading role.

## The French Socialists and the Syrian Question.

By A. I. (Beirut).

Telegraphic reports from Paris state that the French Socialist Party has included in its programme the demand for the evacuation of Syria by the French troops, and that the Socialist leader Jean Longuet has addressed a letter to Riad Bey Solh, the delegate of the Syrian national parties in Europe, in which he expresses the sympathies of the French Socialists for the unity and independence of Syria.

Though it is undoubtedly welcome to the workers of Syria that under the pressure of the working masses even the French Socialists are obliged openly to declare themselves opposed to colonial adventures of the French in Syria, it must not be forgotten that this step has been taken for too late.

There was a time when the Socialist leaders could really have protested effectively against French intervention in Syria. That was at the commencement of the Syrian rebellion. Then, in 1925, the Left Bloc was still in power and enjoyed the direct support of the French Socialists. It was that Government, supported by Blum, Renaudel, and Longuet, that was responsible for the sending of a great expeditionary force to Syria, for the bombardment of the Drusian and Hauranian villages, for the barbarous bombardment of Damascus in October 1925, and for all the atrocities committed by French generals (such as Gamelin).

At that time, however, the French section of the Second International was silent, just as silent as the said International was in general in regard to the French activity in Syria. At that time the 26 Communist deputies in the Chamber were the only ones to oppose all credits for Syria. The Communist Party alone supported the Syrian fight for freedom, instituted mass meetings, led demonstrations through the streets, and even proclaimed the general strike against the war in Syria and Morocco, a strike which was, however, as the imperialist papers had particular satisfaction in reporting, not supported, or in truth basely betrayed, by the C. G. T.

It was only when the generals acting under the orders of the Left Bloc had crushed the heroic Syrian fighters for liberty by weight of numbers, and when an unparalleled rule of terror had dealt with all and any that were so much as suspected of revolutionary sentiments, only then the Socialists remembered their duty and voted against further credits. True, in the meantime something had occurred in France, for Herriot and Painlevé, the friends of the Socialists, had joined Poincaré and there was therefore no need of the Socialist votes for the accordance of the military credits.

But here again the Socialists were far from practising any actual proletarian solidarity. No Socialist vote was raised against the practice of the French authorities to effect the execution of rebels in Syria in public. No Socialist vote was raised against the wholesale arrest and deportation of Syrians. No Socialist thought it incumbent upon him to so much as protest against the persecution of the labour movement in Syria, the dissolution of trade unions, the maltreatment of trade union leaders and striking workers in Syria and the Lebanon. The restoration of the most elementary freedom of the Press, which is constantly being trampled under the feet of the French generals in Syria, interested none of the "defenders of democratic liberties", as the Socialists like to call themselves. In Syria every national revolutionary, every trade unionist, and every worker knew that he had no aid to expect of the Socialists, for they had done nothing, all appeals to their "Socialist" conscience remaining in vain.

But on the eve of the French elections this conscience appears to be disturbed and Jean Longuet has discovered his sympathies for the Syrian people.

However, there still remain serious doubts as to the sincerity of this tardily discovered love of Syrian independence, as to which both the working population of Syria and probably also the French proletariat (which had to pay with its own blood for the colonial adventure of the French imperialists in Syria) must demand a speedy and satisfactory explanation.

Important as it may be that after three years of sanguinary warfare in Syria the French Socialist Party should for the first time express itself in favour of evacuation, it yet remains uncertain whether the Socialists merely assume this attitude in dealing with a Poincaré Government or whether they would also maintain it towards a Left Bloc regime. Whether they are ready to support this demand outside Parliament, hand in hand with the Communists, by force of mass actions.

Whether the resolutions of the Party are binding on all its members, i. e. also on Paul Boncour, who, as a French delegate with the League of Nations, could very effectively advocate the abolition of the French mandate for Syria, or on Leon Blum, who as an enthusiastic Zionist hitherto supported the Balfour declaration separating Palestine from Syria (which is in contradiction to the principle of Syrian unity, as supported by all national-revolutionary Syrians and now recognised by the French Socialists).

Whether the French Socialists are also willing energetically to support the many more immediate claims of the Syrian people for general amnesty, freedom of the press, workers' protection laws, and the like.

So long as all these questions have not been answered satisfactorily by deeds, it must unfortunately be assumed that it is merely a question of electioneering manoeuvres on the part of the French Socialist leaders. Therefore the French workers, who are really interested in the liquidation of imperialist wars, in the independence of Syria, and the free development of its working population, must support the one and only Party that has hitherto fought undauntedly and consequentially against imperialism, viz. the Communist Party of France.

## ECONOMICS

### The Intensification of the Oil Struggle.

By E. H.

The serious differences which ensued last summer between the American Standard Oil Company and the Anglo-Dutch Royal Shell group in connection with the purchase of Soviet oil by the New York Standard Oil Company have of late revived. The Standard Oil Company of New York has published a communication from which it appears in what part of the world the struggle between the two giant companies is now raging. The new scene of action is India.

In India the Standard Oil could formerly not succeed in marketing American oil in competition with the Royal Dutch Shell and Burmah Oil companies, seeing that the Anglo-Dutch group possessed an area of production in Roumania at a far shorter distance. In 1927, therefore, the Standard Oil Company of New York started shipping Soviet oil, procured on very favourable terms by an agreement with the All-Russian Naphta Syndicate, to the Indian market. According to an assertion contained in the communication of the Standard Oil, the English group retaliated by reducing the price of oil every time an oil-tank steamer with Russian oil arrived in India. Throughout the country a system of under-cutting and of a grant of secret discount was practised to the detriment of the Standard Oil group, so the latter maintains.

"The Royal Dutch introduced destructive and desperate methods into the oil business. If continued in its present dimensions, the Indian price competition must needs lead to an annual loss to the Royal Dutch and Burmah group of 12,750,000 dollars, and to the Standard Oil to one of four millions."

This statement as to the extent of the losses incurred does not appear to be exaggerated. A sharp drop in various Bri-

tish oil values on the stock exchanges confirms this development. The rate of the Burmah Oil shares has receded since the beginning of the competitive struggle in India from 96 to 58 rupees.

At the same time the serious differences in India appear to be only the beginning of a far more portentous struggle. True, there have recently been rumours of a coming agreement between the British and the American oil interests; but such reports have been denied whenever they have appeared. The correspondent of the "Berliner Tageblatt" makes the following statement in the evening issue of February 8th:

"The various rumours circulating here as to an allegedly impending agreement between the British and American oil interests in their struggle for Russian oil, are said in well-informed circles to be without foundation. As I am informed, the American group is by no means inclined to come to an arrangement with Sir Henry Deterding, the leader of the Anglo-Dutch oil interests."

The struggle on the oil market is being continued all the same. Similarly, the expectation of the Royal Dutch Shell that the struggle would be localised to the Indian market, has been proved false by subsequent events. Even on the British markets themselves the American oil companies have taken steps which are bound to lead very shortly to a competitive fight. The Vacuum Oil Company, affiliated to the Standard Oil of New York, is determined to reply to the action of the Royal Dutch, which is attempting to fight the Standard Oil on its own ground (in America), by taking up the fight most energetically on the British market.

Deterding now threatens to use all means, including possible recourse to British law, against the sale of Russian oil, which he designates as "stolen oil". These threats, however, seem by no means to intimidate the American oil concerns, while the "Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung" of January 25th, 1928, expresses itself as follows as to the effect of the measures Deterding threatens to carry out:

"That the Anglo-Dutch group plans suing the Standard on account of the 'stolen' oil, as it is now quite generally called in England, is considered even by well-informed Dutch circles to be a threat, the realisation of which is doubtful, to say the least of it. The same may be said as regards the plan for the introduction of import prohibitions for Russian products into territories under British rule or control. In practice such prohibitions are of a very doubtful efficacy."

This opinion appears to be confirmed by the development (up to the present) in the import trade in Russian oil into Great Britain. To prevent this, the British Government has complied with the wish of men like Deterding and commenced a commercial warfare against the Soviet Union. Since May 1927 (the month of the Arcos raid), the imports of Russian oil are shown by the official British import figures to have figured as follows:

In Gallons	1927	1926
May . . . . .	67,444	3,825,576
June . . . . .	2,603,822	1,940,145
July . . . . .	4,234,647	7,861,325
August . . . . .	7,386,117	3,450,328
September . . . . .	3,071,803	2,184,600
October . . . . .	4,486,332	14,328,722
Total	21,850,165	33,590,696
Value in Pounds Sterling	728,927	1,274,555

Here we have thus a recession by quite 11.5 million gallons. If these figures are more minutely examined, however, it will be seen that this recession is due to the deficiencies in May and October, when it amounted (for both months together) to 13.5 million gallons. The smaller imports in May are also attributable to the Arcos raid. The great deficiency in October 1927 in comparison with the preceding year may be explained by the fact that the miners' strike caused October 1926 to record extraordinarily large oil imports, whereas in 1927 the imports were no more than normal. If therefore the ob-

viously abnormal months of May and October are eliminated, the other monthly figures for the importation of Soviet oil into Great Britain show a favourable aspect.

That Great Britain is likely to be a loser, for the time being, in the oil struggle, may be seen by the progress which Russian oil is making on markets until recently, only supplied by British oil interests. Here it may be pointed out that the supplies furnished to the Spanish oil monopoly consisted mainly of Soviet oil, which was formerly very little sold in Spain. Similarly, Soviet oil has gained a footing on the French market.

From all these facts it follows that the oil struggle between the American and British imperialists is being waged with great vehemence and that it is the American imperialists that are gaining ground. It cannot be doubted, however, that these struggles will sooner or later lead to a new constellation in the form of at least a temporary combined action on the part of American and British oil capital against the Soviet Union.

## DOCUMENTS

### Resolution of the E. C. C. I. on the Polish-Lithuanian Conflict.

(27th January 1928.)

1. The Polish-Lithuanian conflict has by no means lost its sharpness. On the contrary, the danger of an annexation of Lithuania by Poland has even become greater as a result of the hypocritical decision of the League of Nations and the efforts of the Second International to lull the vigilance of the masses. The resolution of the League of Nations' Council has not solved the Lithuanian question but only postponed the realisation of Pilsudski's plans with regard to the annexation of Lithuania; it does not deal with the kernel of the question and in fact allows the danger for the independence of Lithuania to continue to exist. Lithuania only receives a respite; it is called upon to come to an understanding with Poland by peaceful means, that means, it shall "voluntarily" submit to Poland and convert itself into a semi-colony of the latter. If Lithuania does not do this "voluntarily", then it will be compelled to it.

This is demanded by the interests of imperialist Great Britain and France, which are attempting to set up a united front from the Baltic to the Black Sea against the Soviet Union. This is also demanded by the interests of imperialist Poland: it wants to gain access to the seacoast across Lithuania, to extend the market for the Polish bourgeoisie by means of the American loan and the annexation of Lithuania, and finally, the Polish landlords wish to wrest from the Lithuanian peasants the soil which formerly belonged to them. In one word, Poland's efforts are directed towards the re-establishment of a Great-Poland of 1772, and the "voluntary" or enforced union of Lithuania with Poland is only a part of the realisation of this plan.

2. The fascist government of Lithuania, which represents the interests of the Lithuanian kulaks, landowners, and of the city bourgeoisie and which sees in the proletarian revolution, in the Soviet Union its most dangerous enemy, is inclined, under the pressure of the imperialist robbers, to come to terms with Pilsudski. In order to deceive the watchfulness of the masses, it welcomes the decision of the League of Nations as a great victory for Lithuania.

The broad working masses of the country are, however, aware that this pact, that an alliance or a union of Lithuania with Poland will inevitably lead to the annexation of Lithuania by Poland; to the loss of Lithuania's independence; to her conversion into a Polish semi-colony; to the strengthening of the Polish landowners in Lithuania; to the seizure of former estate lands from the small peasants; to increased suppression and exploitation etc. Therefore the working masses of Lithuania have repeatedly thwarted the attempts of the ruling classes to conclude a pact with Poland. The prospects of a successful frustration of the Lithuanian-Polish agreement by the Lithuanian working masses are less favourable this time, as the pressure of the imperialists of Great Britain, France and Poland upon

Lithuania, which has consolidated herself after the coup d'état in May, will undoubtedly be much stronger this time.

In the Lithuanian question all bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties in Poland are grouping round Pilsudski. The union between Lithuania and Poland is a very popular slogan among the bourgeois and even petty-bourgeois masses of Poland. This enhances the annexationist greed of Pilsudski still more. If up to now he has not realised his plans, it is only due to the fact that the Soviet Union, which always takes its stand against all annexations and against the enslavement of small nations, and Germany, whose interests lie in the maintenance of Lithuania's independence, have energetically opposed them.

3. It must be specially pointed out that the leaders of the social democratic parties of all countries, which have long become the most contemptible agents of imperialism, are eagerly supporting the annexationist plans of Pilsudski. When Pilsudski was feverishly preparing to attack Lithuania, and for this purpose bought the support of Lithuanian social democratic emigrants, organised them into "insurgent" detachments etc. in order to capture Lithuania under this banner, the social democratic press, not only the press of the P. P. S. but the press of other countries, especially that of Germany and France, praised the love of peace of Pilsudski, and even wrote that little Lithuania is threatening the peace.

4. After the meeting of the League of Nations' Council the Second International convened a Conference of the social democratic parties of north-east Europe for the 18th and 19th December in Berlin. The aim of this Conference was: to lull the vigilance of the broad working masses, which were greatly disquieted as a result of the sharpening of the Polish-Lithuanian conflict and quite correctly perceived behind it the acute danger of a war against the Soviet Union; further, to cripple the fighting power of the masses and to support the imperialists in the annexation of Lithuania by Poland.

This Conference, which was participated in by the rabid Mensheviks Zeretelli, Abramovitch, the Pilsudski-follower Nedzialovski, the notorious Lithuanian social democratic emigrant Pletchkaitis etc. as well as by the "Left" secretary of the Second International Fritz Adler, further Hilferding, Crispin, Stauning etc., neither condemned the policy of the French and British imperialists towards Lithuania and the Soviet Union nor the annexation plans of Pilsudski and his lackeys in the P. P. S. It did not even condemn the corrupt Pletchkaitis and Co.

As the social democracy of every country represents before all the interests of "its" bourgeoisie, which do not always coincide with the interests of the bourgeoisie of the other countries, the Conference could not adopt any general resolution. It contented itself with empty phrases on democracy and with the adoption of a "minimum programme" which does not differ in any way from the "minimum programme" of Pilsudski and of the League of Nations. The programme demands: opening of the Polish-Lithuanian frontier, re-establishment of normal economic and political relations between Lithuania and Poland etc.

And if before the Berlin Conference some so-called "Left" social democratic parties (Latvia, Austria), under the pressure of the masses, had to recognise the seriousness of the annexation plans of Pilsudski and his making use of Lithuanian social democratic emigrants for this purpose, they have today, after the Conference, apparently arrived at complete unanimity with regard to doping the masses and to a practical support of the annexation policy of Pilsudski towards Lithuania.

5. The E. C. C. I. calls upon all sections of the C. I. and all those who not only in words but by deeds are opponents of war and of imperialism, to develop the greatest energy and initiative in exposing the plans of the imperialist robbers, the annexation efforts of Pilsudski as well as the shameful role of the social democratic leaders. The E. C. C. I. considers the struggle of the masses against these plans to be necessary and is of the opinion that the danger of the annexation of Lithuania by Pilsudski is not yet removed. One must be prepared for any form of this annexation (by a "voluntary" capitulation of the fascist Lithuanian government or by a staged "insurrection" from within, as well as by the organisation of Lithuanian bands from without etc.).

It, must not be forgotten that peace is not only threatened on the territory of little Lithuania. The annexation of Lithuania is only the first step to the aggressive action of the imperialist robbers against the Soviet Union. Therefore all the sections of the Comintern must devote serious attention to the Polish-Lithuanian conflict, expose the role of French and British imperialism as well as the annexation plans of Pilsudski, but at the same time expose also the abominable role of the imperialist agents, i. e. of the social democratic leaders, who lull the vigilance of the working masses.

The broad working and peasant masses, not only of Lithuania and Poland but also of the other countries, before all of Germany, Great Britain and France, must be mobilised for resistance against the imperialist robbers. The Communist Parties of Lithuania and Poland must develop special activity. They must organise meetings, demonstrations and strikes and be always in readiness in order not to be taken by surprise by unexpected events and must always be effectively prepared for determined defence and for fight.

6. The struggle against the annexation plans of Pilsudski must be conducted under the following slogans: **Down with the imperialist robbers and their lackeys, the social democratic leaders! Defence of the independence of Lithuania against the Polish imperialists! Down with the fascist dictatorship in Lithuania and Poland! Fight for a workers' and peasants' government in Lithuania and Poland!**

## **The 15th Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. on the Instructions for the Elaboration of the Five-Year Plan for National Economy.**

Theses of the Agitation and Propaganda Department of the E. C. C. I.

### **The Rate and Programme of Socialist Construction.**

1. The main characteristic of the new sector of Socialist construction is the transition from a period of reconstruction in which progress ensued mainly on the old material and technical basis, to one of new construction, in which all progress calls for new investments. Hence there arises the necessity to start planning from a standpoint envisaging a fairly considerable number of years, since without such a perspective it is impossible to effect a construction entailing a complete remodelling of national economy. The presumption for the establishment of such plans lies in the results attained by the planned work of the last few years, while the decisive guarantee for the execution of the plans is to be found in the leading rôle played by the key positions or commanding positions of the proletarian State in the economic life of the country.

The conditions of the new constructional period show up the fundamental difficulties of Socialist construction, difficulties which may be summed up under the following heads:

a) The tremendous specific gravity of the small goods trade in the economy of the country and the consequent cultural and technical backwardness.

b) The isolation of the Soviet Union as a social and economic system, not only as the first but also as the only proletarian dictatorship, surrounded by a compact capitalist ring.

In consideration of these difficulties, the XV. Party Congress started from the fundamental Leninist thesis that our country undoubtedly contains all that is necessary to overcome such obstacles and to build up Socialism, in which connection the assertions of the Opposition that the cultural and technical backwardness of the Soviet Union defies all efforts at improvement and that it is impossible to establish Socialism in a capitalist environment, were denounced as Menshevism.

2. In summing up the achievements of Socialist construction work during the period of reconstruction, the XV. Party Congress, in full agreement with the former resolutions of the Party and with the general fundamental principles of Leninism, laid down the chief tasks and methods of Socialist construction

during the next few years. These central items of the constructional programme, on which the attention of the Party must be concentrated, in the solution of which the widest possible masses of the working population must be called upon to aid and which must be taken as starting points for the determination of concrete questions of constructional work, are in the main as follows:

a) Elimination of the technical backwardness of the country by the establishment of a far more rapid rate of development of the productive forces than in pre-war Russia or in the capitalist countries.

b) Transformation of the country from an agrarian-industrial into an industrial one with highly developed production of means of production.

c) Guarantee of a more rapid growth of the Socialist section of economy as compared with the private sections.

d) Further consolidation of the alliance between workers and peasants.

e) Improvement in the standard of living of the broad masses.

f) Participation of the widest possible masses of the working population in the creative work of Socialist construction.

g) Elimination of the cultural backwardness of the country.

These reciprocally supplementary and indissolubly interconnected tasks are merely a concrete expression of the individual elements of Socialist construction. It is just for this reason that the XV. Party Congress established them as decisive directives for the elaboration of the five-year plan. They must therefore form the basis of any control of the results achieved and a criterion for the correctness of the economic policy of the Party and of the Leninist Central Committee.

3. The question whether the Soviet Union can attain such a rapidity in the development of the forces of production, as will enable it not only to attain but also to surpass the technical level of the most advanced countries of present-day economy, will be ultimately decisive for the issue of the competitive struggle between capitalism and Socialism. The experience gained in the period of reconstruction and the preliminary indications of the five-year plan answer this question in the affirmative.

In 1921, when the civil war came to an end, the total output of agriculture stood at 58.3 per cent., and that of the big industries at no more than 20 per cent. of the pre-war returns. In the year 1927 agriculture registered 108 per cent. and industry 101 per cent. of the output of 1913. Hence it follows that the rate of reconstruction has been unparalleled throughout the world. This is quite particularly astounding if we take into consideration that

a) no country in the world issued so late and so exhausted from the war period as did the Soviet Union;

b) reconstruction ensued without any influx of means from without, whereas all the powerful European countries had more or less outside sources of this kind to rely on.

It is obvious that the period of reconstruction was connected with great difficulties, and that particularly because it entailed the necessity of great investments. The preliminary calculations of the five year plan, however, show that even these difficulties can be overcome. According to these indications, the average yearly accretion, expressed in percentage proportion, will amount in the next five years to 14 per cent. in the case of industry and to 4.8 per cent. in that of agriculture. The latter branch of economy, being split up and devoid of the advantages of wholesale management and also being less easily accessible to a systematic organisation, shows a far slower rate of development than industry.

Such rapidity of development naturally leaves the growth in the Russia of pre-war times far behind. Between 1895 and 1905 industry advanced yearly by 10.7 per cent., and between 1905 and 1913 by 8.1 per cent., while agriculture extended by anything between 3.2 and 3.5 per cent. per annum in the period from 1900 till 1911. Even the rate of development of industry and agriculture in the United States falls far short of the above, for there industry developed between 1895 and 1900 by 8.2 per cent. per annum and between 1900 and 1913 only by 3.5 per cent., while agriculture increased its output in the period from

1900 to 1910 by an average of 3.1 per cent. and between 1911 and 1920 by only 1.4 per cent.

If despite a considerable rise in comparison with pre-war times, the rate of development of our agriculture falls slightly short of such countries as Canada, the rate of development of industry is an absolute record which not a single big capitalist country of the world can equal. This is all the more characteristic, seeing that the Soviet Union cannot count on any great influx of foreign capital, such as enabled Russia's pre-war industry and the industry of the United States to flourish.

The possibility of such a rate of development is guaranteed

a) by the advantages of planned economy, which renders possible the most practical employment of the internal resources of the country,

b) by the expropriation of the landowners and capitalists, which made it possible to employ for purposes of construction that part of the national income which was formerly spent unproductively by the ruling class.

c) by the enormous specific preponderance of the key positions held by the proletarian State in national economy,

d) by the inexhaustible creative forces of the broad masses, placed by the revolution in a position to participate in active and creative work.

The capitalist world, which is hampered by very narrow market limits and possesses an apparatus far in excess of the absorbing capacity of the markets, cannot hope to dream of any such rate of development.

If the rapid growth of the productive forces represents an enlargement of the technical basis of Socialism and an elimination of the technical backwardness which forms the main obstacle in the way of its attainment, special importance attaches from the standpoint of Socialist construction to the growth of the big industries, and that for the following reasons.

a) In the Soviet Union such a growth is tantamount to the growth of the Socialist element in economy, for, in the hands of the proletarian State and under the administration of the working class, this industry remains "consequentially Socialist" in character (Lenin), however much this fact may be denied by the international Social Democrats and the Trotskyist adherents.

b) Together with the co-operatives, the big Socialist industries are the most important means of guiding the development of the rural districts in the direction of Socialism.

c) The growth of the big industries and particularly the creation of a strong and well-developed engineering industry cannot but strengthen the economic independence of the Soviet Union and weaken the efficacy of all attempts on the part of the international bourgeoisie to strangle the growth of Socialism by economic means. It is just for this reason that the XV. Party Congress resolved to "instruct the Central Committee to continue without slackening the policy of Socialist industrialisation, which has already begun to show positive results".

These achievements of industrialisation are characterised in particular by the following indications.

For the last two years the rate of development in industry figured at 56 per cent. and will amount, according to the indications of the five year plan, to 14 or 15 per cent. in the year 1927/28. During the coming five years this development will, as already pointed out, constitute a record in the history of economic development.

The specific weight of industry in the total economy of the country is constantly increasing. During the last two years the quota of industry in the entire output of the country advanced from 32.4 to 38 per cent., while the quota in the entire output of goods rose from 43.1 to 60 per cent.

The number of operatives employed in industry rose during this period by 33 per cent.

The qualitative changes in industry found their expression in an increased proportional importance of such branches of industry as manufacture means of production, the quota of which in the total industrial output advanced in the course of two years from 34.1 to 37.6 per cent., as also in the creation of new industrial branches of production, such as the con-

struction of machines, turbines, and motors, or the chemical industry, of finally in the results of electrification.

According to indications furnished by the Supreme Economic Council it will be possible in five years' time to cover 80 per cent. of the country's requirements of machinery by home production. The success of electrification is apparent in the completion of a whole series of large stations (Volkov, Kashira) and in the construction of new super-stations (Dnyeprostroy). Altogether, from 1400 to 1600 million roubles are to be expended in the next five years for electrification, while the output capacity of the works is to be increased to 2.4 times its present extent and the current output raised to 10,000 or 12,000 million kilowatt-hours. Thus the plan of electrification envisaged by Lenin, who considered it the most important step on the way to Socialism, will practically have been realised. These facts are the best possible refutation of all that is said by the Oppositional critics in regard to the "poor" results of industrialisation and of the accusations they are wont to direct in this connection against the C. P. S. U.

These facts demonstrate that the process of industrialisation not only strengthens the specific importance of industry in economic life by ensuring it the leading position in all economy, but also entails far-reaching technical alterations both in industry itself and also in economy in general. The Socialist rationalisation of production and administration is described by the resolutions of the XV. Party Congress as a factor materially accelerating these processes of the technical reconstruction of economy. In contradistinction to the methods of capitalist rationalisation, which entail a deterioration in the position of the working class, the XV. Party Congress emphasised the indissoluble connection between Socialist rationalisation on the one hand and the improvement in the standard of living of the proletariat in general and the introduction of the seven-hour day in particular upon the other.

#### The Growth of the Socialist Elements.

5. Besides the achievements of industrialisation, the last few years of constructional economic work have brought about a general change of course in the direction of a strengthening of the Socialist elements in economy. If we take upon the one hand the entire socialised section of economy (State and co-operative, transports, electricity) and on the other hand the altogether private section (the small trade in commodities in the rural districts and the output of private industries and crafts), we shall see that the rate of development is far greater in the former than in the latter groups. Thus, in the economic year 1924/25, 43.8 per cent. (1132 million roubles) out of the total sum of all new investments in economy fell to the share of this section, while in 1927/28 the respective quota was already 65.3 per cent. At the same time the quota of the non-socialised section rapidly decreased.

In industrial production the proportional participation of the private economic section dropped from 19 per cent. in 1924/25 to 14 per cent. in 1926/27, the number of larger capitalist concerns, of greater dimensions than mere workshops, decreasing not only relatively but even absolutely. The value of their output fell from 169 to 165 million pre-war roubles and their proportional participation from 3.9 to 2.4 per cent.

In commerce the share of private capital dropped, between 1924/25 and 1926/27, from 9.4 to 5.1 per cent. as regards wholesale, and from 42.2 to 32.6 per cent. as regards retail, trade, the total turnover proportion sinking from 27.4 to 18.1 per cent.

All this, and primarily the tremendous growth of the socialised industry, fully justified the XV. Party Congress in establishing that, whereas at the commencement of the New Economic Policy the State industry was practically at a standstill, so that in the circulation of commodities the State and co-operative organs were obliged to make use of private dealers as middlemen, while thanks to a rapid turnover private capital still played a fairly important rôle, the Socialist sections in industry and in other key positions are now, on the threshold between the reconstructional and new constructional periods, decidedly predominant.

In recording these achievements of the socialised section of economy, the XV. Party Congress arrived at the conclusion that

the presumption thus obtained for a "yet more pronounced economic ousting of the private capitalist section of economy". The realisation of these directives of the Party Congress cannot but accelerate the above-mentioned process of a speedy dwindling of the relative importance of the private capitalist section in economy.

#### How the Difficulties can be Overcome.

6. In establishing the essential points of orientation for the Socialist programme of construction, the XV. Party Congress started from the Leninist thesis that all achievements of Socialist construction must in the first place depend on the consolidation of the alliance between the workers and peasants and that the "main difficulties and most important problems of the proletariat" lie in this direction. The principal difficulty lies in the fact that despite all its achievements industry is not in a position to overcome the rapidly growing demands of the peasants and to get the better of the "hunger" for commodities. Hence follows the disproportion between the prices of industrial products and those of agricultural produce.

The best way to overcome these difficulties lies in the direction of a further intensive development of industry. Before all the Party considers it advisable to promote the development of the crafts and of workshop industries most emphatically, so as to contribute to the mitigation of the excessive demand for commodities. The Party Congress is of opinion that the "price scissors" must again be closed by means of a reduction of the prices of industrial products, an object to be attained by rationalisation.

Seen from the economic standpoint of the capitalists, this price reduction policy in the face of a yet existing "hunger" for commodities would be altogether incomprehensible, for in all capitalist countries an excessive demand for goods would merely entail a tremendous price appreciation. The Opposition attempted to direct the Party into such a private-capitalist policy, but in its desire to safeguard the interests of the alliance between the peasantry and the working class, the Party naturally rejected all such suggestions.

If the only way to get the better of the dearth of commodities consists in industrialisation, the interests of such an industrialisation and the necessity of eliminating a number of other disproportionate relations in Soviet economy call in their turn for a certain rate of agricultural development. In spite of all the important achievements of agriculture, its growth does not correspond to the requirements of the country. Even now the rapid development of industry meets with a dearth of raw materials (e. g. cotton, leather, wool), which cannot be satisfied merely by an intensification of agriculture. The export difficulties merely by an intensification of agriculture. The export difficulties which hamper the import of industrial accessories can also only be met by an improvement in the technical level of agriculture. Finally, the practically stable status of unemployment in the face of constant new openings in industry, is also to be explained by the backwardness of agriculture, which causes the natural accretion of labour to find no employment in the country and therefore to resort to the towns.

The only way to get over these difficulties lies in the direction of a policy of an improvement of agriculture, such as the Party has hitherto pursued and which was confirmed by the resolutions of the XV. Party Congress. The necessity of such a co-ordination between the policy of industrialisation and that of improvement of agriculture was beyond the comprehension of the Opposition, which made suggestions of a "maximum" transfer of the means invested in agriculture to industrial purposes in the interest of a more intensive industrialisation. In reality this would mean a weakening of the alliance with the peasants and an undermining of serious industrialisation.

The Party turned down the suggestion of a "maximum transfer", though at the same time remarking that it would be wrong altogether to eschew an employment of funds of rural origin for industrial construction, since this would entail "a slowing-down in the rate of development and a disturbance of equilibrium, which would have an adverse influence on the industrialisation of the country". Thus the Party Congress also severed itself from the other extreme, also suggested by members of the disjointed oppositional bloc, which embraced persons with opposite views on the same subject.

#### The Enhanced Prosperity of the Masses.

7. Besides the question of the relations between town and country, the problem of the relationship between production and consumption is of great significance. The improvement in the standard of living of the broad masses is one of the most important and decisive tasks of Socialist construction. It is just this that is one of the most essential characteristics distinguishing Socialist from capitalist economy. Therefore Soviet economy is not faced with the main difficulty impeding the development of productive forces of present day capitalism, viz. the contradiction between the level of productive forces and the volume of mass consumption, or in other words the contradiction between the capacity of production and the possibilities of consumption.

By its policy of a systematic augmentation of wages and an improvement in the standard of living of the peasant masses, the Soviet Union secures for itself such tremendous possibilities in regard to the extension of its markets as were never dreamt of in capitalist economy. Thus the actual wages of the working class increased, on an average for all industry, from 25.18 pre-war roubles in 1924/25 to 28.50 roubles in 1925/26 and 30.67 roubles in 1926/27. This average has already surpassed the pre-war level, for at the commencement of 1927 the average wages stood at 100.6 per cent. of the corresponding figure for 1913, without inclusion of the additional improvements (social insurance, better standard of living, etc.), together with which the actual wages amount to 121 per cent. of the 1913 level.

In certain branches of production the wage level of pre-war times has been considerably surpassed. The monthly average wages in the first quarter of the economic year 1926/27, compared with the corresponding figure for 1913, stood at 126 per cent. in the chemical, 130 per cent. in the leather, and 153 per cent. in the foodstuffs industry. The five-year plan provides for actual wages in 1931, which will exceed the corresponding French and German wages by 20 or 30 per cent.

This uninterrupted growth of wages in the Soviet Union is of all the more importance, seeing that in the capitalist countries the wage level in general remains stable and in some cases is even on the decline. In this connection it should be added that in the last few years the Government spent 644.7 million roubles for the construction of workers' dwellings and that for this purpose alone 391 million roubles were provided in the budget of 1927/28. The funds for social insurance purposes increased in the course of two years by 85 per cent. and attained a total of 852 million roubles, which made it possible for the unemployed invalids to be insured, the sick to receive their full wages, and 513,000 persons to be sent to sanatoria or recuperation homes. All this had its effect on the standard of living of the proletariat, especially considering the fact that during the last two years almost two million additional wage workers found employment.

If, however, the improvement in the standard of living of the broad masses in the towns promotes the development of industry and the rise of wages, the general progress of agriculture, the diminution of the tax onus in comparison with pre-war taxation, and the emancipation of the peasantry from the payment of tremendous ground-rents to the landlords had the same effect. In the last two years alone, the revenue of the peasantry rose from 3500 to 4800 million roubles, or by 35 per cent.

This improvement in the standard of living among the masses is the basis of a very far-reaching demand, which satisfactorily settles the market problem but at the same time creates a fresh difficulty in the undue demand for commodities, the impossibility of satisfying the increased demand, and the insufficiency of agricultural exports, also largely a result of the increase of the rural consumption beyond the pre-war level. The solution naturally lies in the development of industry. But the new investments do not immediately entail the creation of new values for consumption, while in view of the limitation of the general resources, the increase of these investments sets no definite restrictions to the growth of consumption. Hence there follows the necessity (referred to at the XV. Party Congress) of establishing such an "optimal co-ordination of the two moments" as will ensure an adequate growth of mass consumption, given a sufficient rate of accumulation.



As early as 1923, Trotzky failed to comprehend the necessity of any such co-ordination, when he set up the maxim of a strict concentration of production, the realisation of which would at that time greatly have aggravated the position of the working class. Nor yet did he understand it in 1927, when he resorted to the other extreme and demanded at the same time a "maximum" accumulation and a "maximum" increase in consumption, which is incompatible therewith. The hypocritical character moreover, of this slogan of the "maximum" improvement in the standard of living of the proletariat, as set up by the Opposition, was clearly apparent when the Opposition resisted the introduction of the seven-hour day. When a thoroughly serious and essential measure was suggested for improving the situation of the working class, it was seen that the Opposition opposed it, and that after having prepared, with the help of all sorts of renegades of Communism calumnies all over Europe as to a systematic infringement of the eight-hour day in the Soviet Union, though they knew perfectly well that, as confirmed by official statistics, the average working day in the Soviet Union, including overtime, figured at 7 hours 48 minutes in 1924, at 7 hours 36 minutes in 1925, and at 7 hours and a half in 1926.

### The Soviet Union and World Economy.

8. One of the most important problems of Socialist construction, both in principle and in practice, is the question as to the relations between the Soviet Union and world economy. The question of foreign trade, of concessions, foreign credits, and the like, is very closely connected with the question of industrialisation and the general advance of economy. Foreign trade is the weakest point in the economic front, since in spite of the achievements of the last few years the level of the foreign trade turnovers still remains extremely low. During the last two years the total turnover of foreign trade rose from 1282 to 1483 million roubles, there being last year an excess of exports to the extent of 57 million roubles. That is not even 50 per cent. of the pre-war turnover, a fact entailed on the one hand by the resistance of the world bourgeoisie against an extension of Soviet exports and on the other hand by the growth of home consumption beyond the limits of the pre-war consumption.

The XV. Party Congress, which furnished the directives for an increase of foreign trade on the basis of a rise of agriculture and industry, also prescribed the general lines the Party was to follow in regard to its international economic relations.

The Opposition of Trotzky started by spreading libellous reports in which it was asserted that the Party was aiming at a complete isolation of Soviet economy from world economy; thence they proceeded to make accusations of the opposite nature in affirming that the Central Committee showed tendencies of desiring to liquidate the foreign trade monopoly and to make other concessions to the capitalist world. The Opposition finally outdid itself in establishing a principle advocating a maximum development of international relations, which, as the XV. Party Congress pointed out, would, if consequentially carried out, "mean the abolition of the foreign trade monopoly and an economic and military capitulation to the international bourgeoisie."

While recognising the necessity of an extension of economic relations with the world's economy, the Party Congress pointed out in contradiction to the Opposition that such an extension was only so far permissible as it tended "to increase the economic power of the Soviet Union, to make it more independent of the capitalist world, and to extend the Socialist basis for the further industrial development of the Soviet Union".

### The Participation of the Masses in Socialist Construction.

9. While setting up elaborate tasks of Socialist construction, the solution of which will be a matter connected with great difficulties, the XV. Party Congress at the same time started from the Leninist standpoint that the success of the constructional work depends mainly on the participation of the broad working masses. This task, which throughout the years of revolution has enjoyed the greatest possible attention on the part of the Party, will gain special importance when the new constructional period entails a number of fresh difficulties. The stage already behind us shows a whole series of signal successes in this connection.

This is best proved by certain facts and figures. Thus the measure of organisation in the working class has greatly increased. The number of those organised in the trade unions increased in the last two years by a full third and has already attained a total of ten millions, of which more than a million are already included in the active work of the trade unions. By means of production conferences, by commissions and conferences, hundreds of thousands of workers have been enabled to take part in the solution of practical questions of industrialisation. In Leningrad alone about 70,000 men take part in the production conferences. In the course of half a year no fewer than 11,000 practical suggestions were accepted at these conferences, more than 80 per cent. of this total being put into execution by the works managements. The most important means by which the workers and peasants are enabled to take practical part in the work of construction, are provided by the Soviets. At Moscow alone some 18,000 workers take part in the work of the different sections in the Soviets. The number of female delegates has reached 90,000 in the urban, and 380,000 in the rural, districts. In the village Soviets alone, 109,000 peasant women are at work.

The most important experiences gained by the working class during the years of revolution in the sphere of construction now enables this class to take a firm hold of the economic apparatus and to conduct it. Thus four fifths of the working managers of the State industries and about half the members of the trust administrations are workers. That shows that tremendous masses have been recruited for the active construction of Socialism. But still greater demands must be made. Bureaucracy in the Soviet apparatus, the negligence practised in the work of the economic organisations, and the lack of active workers in the rural districts prove that there is still much to be done in the direction of mobilising the masses and making them active. The main obstacle in this connection is the yet inadequate cultural level of the rural districts. True, in the realm of cultural work very much has been done since 1917, as will be seen by the following comparative statistics:

The circulation of the newspapers increased from 2½ million copies in 1913 to 7½ million copies in 1927. The number of books published was double that of pre-war times. The number of pupils in the elementary schools in 1926/27 surpassed that of 1914/15 by 36 per cent., while the corresponding increase figured in the secondary schools at 39, in the technical schools at 120, and in the high-schools at 28 per cent. In the Universities, 50 per cent. of the students are now workers or the children of workers and another 25 per cent. peasants or peasant children. In the revolution years a number of "workers' faculties" have been created, their object being that of preparing adult workers for the universities. These unprecedented institutions prepare about 45,000 adult workers for university studies.

A very important factor of cultural growth, which is also unique of its kind in all the world, is the Red Army, which for the peasants in particular is not only a military but also a cultural school, the result being that the ex-army men subsequently become the most active participants in the constructional work in the villages. They furnish 34 per cent. of the members and 49 per cent. of the chairmen of the village Soviets, 50.5 per cent. of the members and 67 per cent. of the chairmen of district executive committees, etc.

A tremendous amount of work has also been done towards raising the cultural level of the backward nationalities.

Finally, progress has also been made in the realm of scientific work. Since 1918 the number of scientific institutions and societies has increased by 300 per cent. But all these great achievements in a cultural direction are insufficient in comparison with the requirements of Socialist construction. Cultural backwardness has, in the main, not yet been overcome because its basis, the small production of commodities, has not been surpassed.

Therefore the XV. Party Congress designated as one of its chief slogans a redoubling of all efforts towards raising the cultural level of the working class and the working sections of the peasantry, towards a far-reaching reformation of the manner of living, against drunkenness, towards an elimination of illiteracy, and towards a proletarian consciousness and a proletarian discipline among the peasant and working masses.

## THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

### Preparations for the Exclusion of the Co-operative Societies of the U. S. S. R. from the International Co-operative Alliance.

By Vladimirov (Moscow).

Personally, I should be very sorry if the Russians could no longer take part in our Congresses. Without them, discussions would be dull.

Charles Gide.

The Twelfth International Co-operative Society Congress, which took place at Stockholm in August, 1927, was prepared by a broad campaign of the Conservative wing of the International Co-operative Alliance designed to exclude the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union from the Co-operative International. The German and the Swedish co-operative press opened against the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union a regular crusade. But the congress did not fulfil the exportations which were entertained. The majority of the Alliance did not desire a rupture.

After the Stockholm Congress the attacks upon the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union increased. Up to that time, Mr. May, the general secretary of the Alliance, had abstained from attacking us in the press, and the official organ of the Alliance was not used for the purpose of printing discussion articles directed against us. But in the December number of the "International Co-operative Bulletin" there appeared an article from the pen of Mr. May, entitled "The co-operative Movement of the Soviet Union and the International Co-operative Alliance". The object of this article was to convey into the international co-operative movement the atmosphere of a split.

The immediate occasion of Mr. May's attacks was furnished by the articles of the manager of the foreign department of the co-operative central of the Soviet Union, Comrade Varjas, which appeared before the Stockholm Congress in "Kooperativnaja Shisnj" (Co-operative Life), under the general title: "The Questions at Issue in the International Co-operative Movement", and which were devoted to the questions appearing on the agenda of the Congress.

Mr. May is, as appears from his article, greatly perturbed by the attempts of the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union to impose their extreme point of view and their demands upon the Alliance.

"The question of political neutrality and the question of those bounds which this principle prescribes for us is continually brought up, and the attempt is made to attribute to this question the greatest possible significance."

If one casts a glance through the history of the Alliance, one sees immediately that no other single question has given rise to so much differences of opinion, so many quarrels and discussions, as the question of political neutrality. The attacks upon the political neutrality of the Alliance began with its inauguration. They were made at a number of congresses and they led to acrimonious discussions; they have not yet ceased.

The differences of opinion in the question of the role played by the co-operative societies as a means for reorganising and transforming the present capitalist economic structure into a socialistic one, upon which point of view the socialists insisted and which was opposed by the representatives of the Schultze-Delitzsch artisans' and agricultural co-operative societies, who saw in the co-operative societies merely a component part of the capitalist economy, led to the rupture at the Budapest Congress in 1904.

Mr. May accused the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union of encumbering by their incessant demands the work of the officials of the Alliance. The concluding words of Victor Servis' speech at the Geneva International Co-operative Congress in 1924 will still be remembered:

"Differences of opinion should not upset us, I remember that twelve years ago the Belgian, Italian and the French delegates took the point of view which is now held by our Russian comrades."

The work of the Alliance has always been impeded by its political neutrality and these impediments existed before the inauguration of the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union, and they will continue to exist until the cause is removed.

Mr. May's accusation to the effect that the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union obstruct the work of the Alliance is childishly naive. It is an attempt to justify the inactivity of the Alliance.

It is possible that Mr. May has in mind the fact that the co-operative movement of Great Britain, which has its own co-operative party, was obliged to join the Labour Party. Is it just an accident that all the efforts of the Alliance, and especially those of Mr. May, to get into the organisation of the League of Nations and to participate in its work have been deliberately ignored by the League of Nations? No, that is no mere accident. The co-operative party of Great Britain was compelled to join forces with the Labour Party, for a party such as this, which allows itself to be operated on such principles as these, could not successfully protect the powerful co-operative movement of Great Britain, whose interests brought it daily into sharper conflict with the existing capitalist system. Furthermore, this party, which outwardly appeared to be an independent one, in reality sailed in the wake of the Labour Party and therefore had to join forces with it in the political fight.

The only reason why the League of Nations, which is so eager to draw workers' organisations into its sphere of influence, deliberately ignores the Alliance, even though it has 50 million members, and does not even consider it necessary to invite it into an organisation like the advisory committee, whose duty it is, to see to the execution of the decisions of the World Economic Conference, is as follows:

"The Alliance may count upon general recognition only if it works actively in defending the interests of the masses which it unites."

Mr. May reiterates that the task of the Alliance is confined to purely economic questions. But we would ask Mr. May whether he can name any economic questions connected with the interests of the co-operative masses, which have been solved by the Alliance. For many years the Alliance has been trying to elaborate an economic programme, but in spite of the fact that this question does not vanish from the agenda of its sessions, the Alliance cannot complete it. This is comprehensible. Its leaders are not sufficiently "genuine" to make out a programme embracing the fight against the trusts, trading concerns, taxation, duties, the fight for peace, the fight against Fascism, for concerning all these questions there are fruitless discussions, which, however, evade the political weapons of the fight. No discussion is allowed as to the execution of the statutes of the Alliance concerning the substitution of another, namely co-operative order of society, for the present one, which is built up on private capitalist competition.

In order to lend greater weight to his words, Mr. May resorted to phrases, such as "they have declared war on the statutes", the purpose of which is to provoke hostile feeling against the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union. The political neutrality, which is supposed to be established, relates merely to the Alliance itself but not to the individual organisations belonging to it. This is comprehensible. If these organisations were requested to observe political neutrality, the co-operative societies of a number of countries — Belgium, Austria, Czechoslovakia, etc. — could not belong to the Alliance. The co-operative societies of the Soviet Union, too, which advocate the dictatorship of the proletariat, could also not be members of the Alliance.

The co-operative societies of the Soviet Union do not act in the underhand manner, which Mr. May attributes to them in his article. Even at the first congress attended by the representatives of the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union (Ghent) Comrade Kissin declared briefly and clearly that the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union were against political neutrality. He said: "We are not disposed... to renounce our right to defend our standpoint in our press or at the international congresses and sessions." The Congress did not dispute this our right.

Every national organisation is allowed the right to choose its own political platform. As far as the statutes of the Alliance are concerned, the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union have always respected them, even though they tried, within

the bounds of the right granted to them, to have introduced into them the adjustments, which, in their opinion, were necessary.

The working masses must categorically repudiate the repeated slanderous accusations against the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union to the effect that they interfere in the internal affairs of the co-operative organisations of other countries. The executive and the central committee of the Alliance have been investigating these accusations for years and on no single occasion has it been proved that the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union have interfered with the internal affairs of other organisations.

Mr. May merely repeats the calumnies made by the enemies of the Soviet Union co-operative societies without advancing a fact in confirmation of them, a circumstance which can only lead to dissatisfaction within the Alliance.

In all probability Mr. May's nerves have recently been so overstrung that he can no longer refrain from giving public expression to his annoyance. I shall pass over his rough attacks on Comrade Varjas. Mr. May "stigmatises" us as "Soviet agitation writers". Perhaps he is right. As will be seen from his articles, we are still "young", we have "still to learn". The fault is in some measure Mr. May's. The general secretary of the Alliance, which has existed for fifteen years, has, apart from short agitation brochures and articles, done nothing to enlighten us concerning "the real aims of the co-operative movement".

Another thing: Mr. May writes that the mere fact that the Alliance accepted the organisations of the Russian revolutionaries "should suffice to induce them to observe a loyal attitude, if not to make them grateful, towards the Alliance".

It is necessary to read this sentence of Mr. May's in order to understand the declarations of the former secretary of the Alliance, Prof. Müller, on the congresses of the Alliance. In his last work, "History of the International Co-operative Alliance", he writes:

"Past congresses of the Alliance were excellent opportunities for leaders of the Alliance to meet together and spend an agreeable time."

Mr. May is evidently dreaming of such an Alliance.

In the above-mentioned article May says: "If the members of the Alliance cannot remain loyal to the statutes, there is only one expedient", and again: "In our opinion, the time is past when the Alliance and its leading officials had to give strictly business consideration to the Russian or Soviet co-operative societies."

Mr. May has gone too far in his capacity of secretary of the Alliance. The gravest danger to a movement is that the machinery should desire to take over the function of the movement itself. It would have been much better if Mr. May had withheld his judgement and left decision on such matters to the organisations themselves, which are responsible for these decisions to the masses of members of their organisations.

Mr. May's request to exclude the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union from the Alliance only compels the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union to make still greater efforts to preserve the unity of the Alliance.

## PROLETARIAN CULTURE

### Leninism and the Problem of the Cultural Revolution.

Speech Delivered at the Celebration of the Anniversary of Lenin's Death.

By N. BUKHARIN.

(Continued from last week's issue.)

It would, however, be altogether wrong to represent the matter as though Lenin had merely considered it necessary to take over the culture of the bourgeoisie in its entirety and without restrictions. That was by no means what he intended. He repeatedly told us that we must take over all such things as are useful to the proletariat, while energetically rejecting all that is harmful. His attitude towards religion, towards a philosophical idealism, towards the bourgeois sociology, and towards many other subjects is sufficiently well known. He more than once attacked those whose thoughts were completely

dominated by bourgeois traditions. In particular I may call to mind his remarks to the effect that in the realm of art we harbour many renegades from the bourgeois world, who offer us works without rhyme or reason under the pretence of proletarian art. But as a born strategist, Lenin knew how to distribute the forces at his disposal according to the importance of this or that sector of the cultural front.

And it is just this which is one of the most important presumptions for a correct policy in general and a proper cultural policy in particular. For, as Lenin put it, our peaceful, organisational, and cultural work is by no means in itself a "peaceful" activity, but only another form of the class struggle of the proletariat, of the fight for Socialism. Even when Lenin told us that we must "build up Socialism with the hands of our enemies" or maintained that "a good bourgeois specialist is better than ten bad Communists", he was speaking of nothing else than this very class struggle, to be carried on by special methods.

It is now a long time since Lenin wrote his last article. Year by year we see more and more clearly that for each case that arises there are ever fewer "cut and dry" recipes to be found in Lenin. But then Leninism does not consist of "cut and dry" recipes. Lenin told us to study that which is, in its entire concreteness and with all its peculiarities. Lenin was far from desiring to apply to any given time measures and solutions employed three or four years before. And if we wish to proceed in the spirit of Lenin, we must render ourselves an account of all changes that have occurred since that time and take into consideration what tasks have already been fulfilled and what tasks are yet before us, how these tasks have been influenced by recent events, what completely new problems have arisen, and so on. It is only thus that Lenin's disciples should consider questions.

In the article from which I have already quoted, Lenin writes as follows in regard to the co-operatives:

"This cultural revolution is all we now need to become a fully socialist country. But such a cultural revolution requires tremendous efforts both of a purely cultural nature (in view of our illiteracy) and in a material direction, since our development into a country of culture necessitates a certain material basis, an improvement of the material means of production."

Do these principles still apply? Naturally they do. But nevertheless there have been some quantitative changes since that time. We are not now suffering starvation, and in spite of great material difficulties we have succeeded in raising our economy and our State budget to an appreciably higher level. What was at that time no more than a pious wish (viz., the increase of material means for cultural purpose), has not only become a necessity but in a certain sense it has become such a vital necessity, that it absolutely has to be satisfied, even at the cost of sacrifices on other fronts. If in one of his speeches Lenin maintained that we should not stint in cultural work, this must now be repeated with far stronger emphasis, seeing that a great many questions of economic development stand and fall with the problem of culture. Thus you will certainly all be aware that in our great constructional work there are a number of serious shortcomings, such as mathematical mistakes, negligence, faulty projects, and the like. This is ultimately a question of culture, and even the quantity of our output is adversely influenced by the fact that we do not always make sufficient use of West-European and American experiences. How often we set out to discover things that have been discovered long ago. We have not even learnt to reckon properly, although we really need to know that even better than the capitalists, seeing that our economy is on a much larger scale. We spend too much on our constructions, both because our materials are too expensive and because we employ antiquated and expensive technical methods when there is no objective reason why we should not be using more up-to-date systems.

But this is only one out of many aspects of this question. Does not rationalisation absolutely depend on the question of a higher cultural standard of our workers, our employees, our engineers, and our administrative officials? Is the bad working of our apparatus in the rural districts not an outcome of such shortcomings? Could we not have increased the rate of our

savings if the broad masses had stood on a higher cultural level? Should we not be able to cope more successfully with bureaucracy, which is not only a social evil but also an impediment for the development of the productive powers of our economy? In a word, our production suffers by reason of our lack of culture. But, be this as it may, certain means are now at our disposal, which is a very great achievement. Just remember the time when Lenin considered it a great success for us to have accumulated a sum of 20 millions. We have now a budget of 6000 millions. This shows the tremendous progress we have made with our Soviet economy.

Secondly, we have aroused and enhanced the activity of the people in the greatest degree, and that both of the proletariat and of the peasantry. We have also enhanced the cultural requirements of the masses. Our peasants and workers are no longer the peasants and workers of pre-revolutionary times. During the last four years we have observed a tremendous advance of culture in our peasantry and our working class. One of our comrades who works among the peasants and the village school teachers (Comrade Shatzky, now a member of the Party) told me that even in such a backward gubernia as Kaluga certain peasants possess libraries of 400 or 500 volumes. Moujiks may sometimes be heard discussing Tolstoy, Tourgeniev, etc. Was there ever anything of the kind prior to the coming of the Communist "Huns"?

We have so aroused the cultural requirements of the masses, that we now find it hard to pay the bill we have accepted. Thus it is fully comprehensible that our Party, the most active portion of the working class, and the more progressive among the peasants must make a great effort to satisfy the growing demands of the broad masses.

The culture of the masses has also been enhanced in regard to the most elementary things, such as the art of reading and writing. The level of the masses has risen because the horizon of the masses has expanded tremendously. In the direction of political enlightenment, the culture of the masses has attained an unprecedented level.

If we speak of our achievements, it seems to me that, without exaggeration, we can maintain that, as regards **political consciousness** and class consciousness, there is no proletariat in all the world to be compared with ours. We can also maintain that, as regards his political horizon, i. e. in regard to his conversance with the great questions of international politics, our peasant is practically the equal of the culturally and economically far more advanced peasant of Western Europe.

In regard to this realm of culture, we may well affirm that the great re-formation of the masses which ensued during the revolution, partly as an elementary phenomenon and partly as the result of the activity of the Red Army, our political work of enlightenment, and the entire mechanism of the proletarian dictatorship, has placed these masses politically at the head of the workers of the whole world.

A tremendous amount of work has been done among the working class and the peasantry. Very much has also been done among those nationalities which were formerly considered as foreign-born. This side of the problem must also by no means be neglected; it is of far greater importance than we generally suppose. We have also done much good educational work among the most backward sections of the working population, especially among the women. Without a dictatorship of the working class all this could never have been achieved. The stern language spoken by the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of the civil war was the necessary presumption for this success.

We can therefore claim to have achieved great success in our work among the masses. But we have also to record some satisfactory results as regards the formation of our working cadres. We have acquired a great degree of organisational skill, we have learnt much that is new; we have enlarged our experience. Have we not established a considerable number of military cadres of our own? Yes, indeed we have. The commanding positions in the Red Army are to a great extent occupied not only by tried specialists, but also by qualified men risen from the "lower orders". The framework keeping together the whole army already consists of our social material, of elements that have passed through the gigantic political mill,

representatives of the proletarian dictatorship. We are already beginning to form special cadres of our own technicians. Such cadres we must establish all over the country. Throughout the country we have cadres of our fairly experienced administrators, men of the working class who have passed through the severe school of the civil war and the fight against starvation and misery. They are very tough fighters, men who in the fire of our revolution have not only steeled their "shoulders, heads, and hands", but who have also acquired tremendous experience and a certain theoretic schooling. It is these men who hold the large and small levers of our tremendous mechanism, political and economic, Party and Soviet positions. With their administrative culture, their experience, their knowledge, their training, and their cultural requirements, they are now far above the very revolutionary but only slightly experienced men they were when they entered the period of civil war. Such more or less, is the present state of affairs in our cadres.

Of late we have commenced to deal with (and to solve) such problems as Lenin postponed indefinitely and as we were formerly really not in a position to approach. These are tasks which we may sum up under the head of the "scientific revolution", in the sense of a revolution in the methods and system of science. A few years ago no such thing existed or could possibly exist, but now we are not only dealing with this task but are even partly solving it.

In a whole number of sciences, and that not only in the Social sciences in which Marxism has already for many years occupied a commanding position, but also in the natural sciences, a far-reaching re-formation is taking place. Marxism is carefully feeling its way. This is an extremely interesting phenomenon, which is unfortunately not accorded nearly enough attention in the press. We have already various prominent biologists who enthusiastically discuss Marxian dialectics and their application to biology. Physics, chemistry, and physiology are included in the same current, as are also reflexology, psychology, and pedagogics. There is even a society of mathematicians dealing with the problems of Marxism in relation to mathematics. All this shows that our cultural growth penetrates to the very highest realms of culture, and that Marxism, which fought originally with arms and with political propaganda, is now extending its work to the entire cultural front and is penetrating into every apartment of the cultural edifice, even into the "holy of holies" of former cultures, with a view to remodelling everything according to its own example.

The same process is also noticeable in art. I cannot devote myself here to enumerating all the new achievements recorded in this connection, but every unprejudiced hearer will admit that a "new direction", with which we are associated has already made its appearance in literature. All of you will be aware that within the last twelvemonth there has been a decided transformation in our dramatic art. Such pieces as "The Revolt", "The Armoured Train", or "Lyubov Yarovaya" are by no means merely accidental.

It is obvious that all this is not without a tremendous practical significance. If art begins to speak more or less in our language without stuttering, lisping, or ogling to one side, it means that a number of people have been "infected" and have come to feel revolutionary. If the natural sciences — not to speak of the social sciences — are beginning to experience their revolution, it means that they are the more speedily becoming weapons of the cultural and economic revolution itself. When extensive circles of pedagogues have come to do more than mere lip-service to our standpoint and champion it out of conviction, not formally but in reality, it means that the new generation succeeding us will advance more boldly and ripen to Socialism more rapidly.

Such are our achievements and successes

in regard to the **remodelling of the masses,**  
in regard to the **remodelling and training of the cadres,**

and

in regard to the **revolution in science and art.**

Have we thereby fulfilled our "historical" mission? Naturally not. We have merely the first steps behind us. We are still up to our ears in a sea of shortcomings and deficiencies. We have before us whole mountain ranges of the hardest and most passionate work. True, some of our "cultural" enemies,

blessed with all the benefits of the old world, predict our speedy decline by reason of what they call our "historical superfluity". Thus, e. g., the famous professor Ustryalov is of opinion that we owe our victory to the fact of our far greater energy in comparison with the "Whites". Nevertheless, the horoscope set us by Ustryalov envisages our certain decline. He writes as follows about us:

"Iron monsters, with metal hearts, machine-made souls, and cables in the place of nerves.

"What can our armed fronts do against them, against their terrible reflectors burning with condensed energy?

"They destroy the culture of decay, drench the earth with new energy, and, having fulfilled their mission, perish as the victims of complete self-absorption."

Ustryalov probably foresaw how certain "grouzers" were beginning to suffer from internal exhaustion and were thus even to be induced to attack our entire system. But such "microbes" have been removed to a more northern clime.

As regards our "self-absorption" and the "exhaustion" of our party, Ustryalov has indeed proved a very poor prophet. The party has "absorbed itself" so far that the working class reacted to the attempt of the "microbes" to penetrate into the pores of the party organism, by equipping an army of a hundred thousand fighters, who went straight from their workshops into the Communist ranks. And these "iron monsters" seem anything but inclined to succumb to the ravages of microbes, preferring to build and to fight with increased energy, in a full consciousness of their creative mission, leading the masses from victory to victory and overcoming, with really "animal" obstinacy the most discouraging difficulties they find in their path.

(To be continued.)

## TEN YEARS AGO

### The Brest Peace and Germany's War Policy.

By Paul Fröhlich.

#### 1. Peace without Annexations and Indemnities.

The German Government, true to Bismarck's traditions, had greeted the outbreak of the revolution in the country of an enemy with applause and had done everything in its power to promote that revolution in Russia. It cherished the hope that one of their opponents would thus be given the check-mate and, in its self-conceit, it did not think that the revolutionary movement might spread to its own country and sweep it away. This is the reason why it had permitted the Bolsheviki, the most dangerous enemies of imperialist war, to proceed to Russia and had in this way provided the revolution with leaders. This is also the reason why its sympathies with the Russian revolution awoke at the very moment when it became evident that the revolution was not likely to bring about a direct strengthening of the war machinery.

Under the influence of the peace propaganda made by the Petrograd Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet, the German Government hypocritically professed a preparedness for peace which did not exist. It promised reforms with the object of soothing the workers who had shown their revolutionary readiness for the fight and their fighting force in the April strikes in 1917. It consented to a peace resolution being adopted by the Reichstag which ostensibly demanded peace without annexations and war-indemnities and furthered the farce of an international socialist peace conference in Stockholm. That Liberal Spring which shone bright on Germany in 1917, had its origin in the critical military situation, in the revolutionary fermentation among the masses and in the wish to make a clean sweep of the Eastern front without great difficulties, in order to ensure a final victory in the West.

The October revolution involving the victory of the Bolsheviki who had triumphed with their peace slogan, doubtlessly encouraged the hopes of the German rulers. When the Soviet Government had sent its offer of peace into the world, Count

Hertling who had just been appointed Imperial Chancellor, declared in his programme speech on November 30th 1917:

"I do not hesitate to admit that the proposals made by the Russian Government, as far as they are known hitherto, may be regarded as a discussable basis for entering into negotiations, and that I am prepared to do so as soon as the Russian Government will send representatives authorised to negotiate with us. I should like to express my hope and desire that these endeavours will soon assume solid shape and will lead to peace."

The first arrangements concerning an armistice were made on the next day, followed by the conclusion of an agreement with regard to an armistice on the 16th of December, the express purpose of which was to create peace. On December 25th 1917, the Central Powers published the following solemn declaration:

"The delegations of the Quadruple Alliance agree upon an immediate general peace without forcible acquisitions of land and without war-indemnities. In so far as the Russian delegation condemns the continuation of war, merely for purposes of conquest, the delegations of the allied Powers hold the same view. The statesmen of the allied Governments have repeatedly pointed out in their programmes that the allied Powers would certainly not prolong war even for a day, for the sake of conquests. The allied Powers have always kept unswervingly to that standpoint. They solemnly declare that they are resolved to sign, without delay, a peace which will put an end to the present war on the basis of the conditions mentioned above, which are equally just to all the belligerent Powers. The allied Powers have no intention forcibly to appropriate to themselves territories which have been occupied in the course of the war."

This is an unreserved approval of the Russian suggestion with regard to peace without annexations and war-indemnities, an apparent confirmation that the naive interpretation of the peace resolution passed by the Reichstag was correct and that it had actually been resolved upon by the Government in that meaning. Two days later however, on December 27th 1917, the draft of a peace treaty made by the Central Powers appeared, article 2 of which contained an absolutely different stipulation, i. e.:

"Article 2. The Russian Government having proclaimed, in correspondence with its principles, the right of self-determination of all the peoples living within the union of the Russian country, without exception, a right of self-determination including even their complete separation, it takes cognisance of the resolutions which express the will of the people to raise a claim of the complete national independence of Poland, Lithuania, Courland and of some sections of Esthonia and Latvia which want to secede from the Russian national union.

The Russian Government acknowledges that, in view of the present circumstances, these declarations must be regarded as an expression of the will of the peoples, and is prepared to draw the conclusions resulting from it."

How did that monstrous discrepancy come about? An annexation programme had been resolved upon by the Government, by the Supreme Command and by the Emperor on November 8th 1916, containing the following points with regard to the East:

1. Recognition of the Kingdom of Poland.
2. Annexation of Lithuania and Courland territory to the effect that, including the Kingdom of Poland, a favourable frontier against Russia, running from the North to the South, is established.
3. A commercial agreement with Russia, i. e. economic advantages.

These plans of conquest were followed by the peace resolution of the Reichstag and by Michaelis' approval "as I understand it". Less than a month after that, however, on August 9th 1917, a Privy Council sat in Kreuznach, extending the old programme of conquest at least over Belgium! After another month had elapsed, i. e. on September 11th 1917, the Privy Council in Bellevue beat a retreat with regard to Belgium. It has not been made known whether or not the Russian question was also discussed, but when Ludendorff, in his "reminiscences", refers to the plans made at that time, he

mentions the affiliation of Courland and Lithuania involving a personal union with the Hohenzollern, and to an economic affiliation of Poland to Germany. The Russian offer of peace once more caused the lust of conquest to flare up. On December 11th 1917, Hindenburg wrote to Hertling, the Imperial Chancellor, that the agreement of September 11th had been made under the condition that peace was to be concluded in the current year:

"The preliminary condition on which that decision of the Privy Council was based, has ceased to exist. As our military position has moreover become extremely favourable, I cannot any longer see any need of yielding up our military demands, but I am compelled to raise a renewed claim with regard to them, and that to the full extent to which they have been laid down at the Kreuznach Conference on April 23rd and August 9th with general approval."

In view of the fact that the demands of the Supreme Command were received by the Government as orders, the programme of conquest of Brest-Litovsk was thus determined beforehand. This was further quite evident from the circumstance that co-operation in the Brest peace negotiations was conceded to the Supreme Command on December 18th. How then is it possible that the said declaration of peace without annexations was made on December 25th? The cause was actually an entanglement of considerations and diplomatic devices. In Austria, distress and war weariness had reached such a point that she wished for peace under any circumstances, and the Austrian Government was prepared to make great concessions to the Soviet Power. As Ludendorff says in his book "War and Politics", Count Czernin, the Austrian Foreign Minister, had adopted the "Jewish Bolshevik demand" for peace without annexations. It was, in the first instance, necessary to show him a good will in order to make him toe the line.

Furthermore, a deceitful manoeuvre was necessary in order to pacify Germany's own population. In addition to this, v. Kühlmann, the Foreign Secretary of Germany, cherished the silent hope that he would be able to trick the Supreme Command and deduct something from the schemes of conquest directed against the Russians, in order to hasten the conclusion of peace.

Finally — and that was the decisive factor — they thought it would be possible to carry out a little trickery in common with the Soviet Government. Was not the latter compelled to conclude peace? Could it hope in earnest that it would really be able to carry out its programme in view of the situation it found itself by the war? Did it not risk a good deal should it return from Brest with a manifestly unfavourable peace, with a peace which had obviously been come to by violence? "Political commonsense" altogether favoured the supposition that the Soviet Government would not be over-particular, that it would deceive its own people and give its consent to a peace which would be declared to be a peace without annexations by the contracting parties, although, in reality, it was something quite different.

The pretext for a manoeuvre of that kind was near at hand. In the Baltic provinces, so-called representative bodies of the country had been formed, meetings of diets which were completely in the hands of the German feudal lords and had passed a resolution with regard to the affiliation of the provinces to Germany. The intention was to have these resolutions recognised as being the substantiation of the right of self-determination of the peoples. Kühlmann and Czernin thus entered on peace negotiations "in good faith" — indeed the good faith of traitors to Soviet Russia which was to play the accessory after the fact.

The bourgeois parties, without exception, naturally anticipated an important success to result from those peace negotiations. There were nevertheless great differences in their lust for more land. Representatives of the so-called "Eastern orientation" were inclined to try to come to fair terms with Russia, amongst them especially the agrarians who feared that an extension of territory in the East might lead to intensified competition, and heavy industry which altogether regarded the conquest in the East only as a compensation for the anticipated conquest in the West. Just those two influential strata however, carried on a policy of annexations with great eagerness and, in view of their apparently favourable chance of war,

an appeal to common sense was certainly not to be expected from them.

For all that, Professor Hoetzsch, the foreign politician of the Conservatives, in the course of the first negotiations in Brest, expressed his opinion, in the "Kreuzzeitung", that the practical use made by Germany in Brest of the right of self-determination of the peoples, would take away from Russia more than Germany required and had more the appearance of annexations than that which should be demanded for military and strategical reasons in the East. The opinion of the great majority of the German bourgeoisie, however, was expressed in the following words published in the "Deutsche Zeitung" after the Russian peace-proposal:

"There is no conceivable reason why we should yield up any bit of what we have won. Provided that the Russians believe in our strength, they will conclude peace with us on any condition. ... Nothing but an icy coolness in waiting, combined with purposeful and firm words, may restore peace."

Social democracy displayed all the variety of colours of a rainbow in the question of peace. The main troop of the party executive whose opinion was expressed in the "Vorwärts", hypocritically advocated a peace of annexations in order to make it possible for the government to continue its double-dealing. Schippel, Quessel, Cohen, Kranold and others, stood up for an Eastern orientation, in the "Sozialistische Monatshefte". They maintained that it was necessary to observe moderation in the East and to conclude a peace of mutual understanding in order to defeat England. The extreme imperialist wing with its chief representatives Lensch, Cunow, Haenisch, Winnig, was in favour of conquests in the East also. They had openly said so before the revolution. Eduard David for instance had worked out "Guiding Principles with Regard to Peace" for the social democratic fraction of the Reichstag and for the party leaders in 1915, in which a considerable degree of yieldingness to the pressure of the masses from below may already be noticed. They contain the following point:

"The union of the conquered Russian and Polish territories into an independent State allied with Germany and Austro-Hungary."

After the Russian revolution, schemes of annexation could no longer be ventured openly in such an insolent form. In order to make up for that restriction, they expressed their will in formulae such as: "War is determined by the sword", or:

"As war is not decided either by the diplomats or by the journalists, but by the soldiers, it is always more correct to stake everything on Hindenburg's card." (Jansson, a leader of the trade unions, in the "Glocke" of November 24th 1917.)

The plans of conquest of the majority of the social democratic leaders were clearly expressed when it was a case of taking up an attitude with regard to the results of Brest-Litovsk.

The Supreme Command thus had but a single serious opponent in its schemes of conquest, i. e. the working class which had been betrayed by its official leaders, greatly weakened by the loss of their old-established organisations and which was being kept down by the military dictatorship. As the workers, one to other hand, still lacked the courage to rise, the military met with no actual resistance. It was therefore easy for them to achieve their end in the Brest negotiations. At first, these negotiations, it is true, took place in a form which made it seem likely that peace would be brought about without friction. For the time being, Kühlmann and Czernin played the role of persons full of moderation. When they then came to the fore with their real intentions, the first thing they achieved was to disperse the assembly. On the side of Germany, the pause in the negotiations was filled with a fresh contest about the political leadership. Its immediate cause was the Polish question.

The German Government had already abandoned its original plan which had been to divide the Russian territory of Poland between Germany and Austria, and had adopted the so-called Austro-Polish solution, according to which Russian Poland should be united with Galicia and form an autonomous State within the Habsburg monarchy. Germany was to get merely a strip in order ostensibly to improve its frontier from the strategical point of view. At a conference in the castle

of Bellevue on January 2nd 1918, the Foreign Office, with General Hoffmann's support, persuaded the Emperor to narrow that strip even more, against the wishes of the Supreme Command. When the political leaders heard of that victory over Ludendorff, their hearts sank into their boots. When Ludendorff thereupon sent in his resignation, Hertling, the Chancellor hastened to write that matters were not yet definitely settled. The question concerning the border-line had in the meantime developed into the general question as to whether the Supreme Command should have an important influence on political decisions, i. e. whether it should, in practice, predominate in the administration of the State. In this question also, the government carried off the victory, but merely on paper because it shrank from turning its victory to account.

In practice, it became evident that the Supreme Command, i. e. Ludendorff had made their will prevail. The further course of negotiations in Brest testified to that. General Hoffmann actually seized the reins. When the attempt to persuade the Russian representatives to depict German annexations as a result of the right of self-determination of the peoples had failed, Kühlmann's tactics were directed towards making territorial concessions to Russia. He still believed that the conclusion of peace meant nothing more than the usual bargaining of diplomats.

In such circumstances, negotiations could of course not advance at all. At that moment, General Hoffmann declared with military brutality that it was no question of phrases about a peace of mutual understanding nor of a peace without annexations and contributions, but simply a question of power. Germany had won, Germany was ready to fight, Germany was backing the meetings of the Junkers in the Baltic provinces, which had resolved upon an affiliation to Germany, briefly: Take it or leave it! At the same time, General Hoffmann entered into negotiations with a delegation of the Ukranian Rada which had arrived in the meantime, granted it considerable concessions at Poland's expense, and did so although he admitted that Trotzky was right when he said that the only territory which that delegation was entitled to dispose of was that of their rooms in Brest-Litovsk. Agreements with the delegation of the Rada were in themselves indicative of the determination of the military to interfere with the civil war in Russia. Trotzky broke off negotiations in Brest on February 10th with the well-known declaration that war had come to an end without a peace treaty.

The diplomats in Brest, especially Kühlmann and Czernin quickly agreed to accept Trotzky's declaration. In any case it meant practically that the territories under occupation remained in the hands of the Central Powers, although that annexation was not approved of by the Russian revolution. The Supreme Command however sided with Hoffmann's point of view that Trotzky's declaration was a termination of the armistice, as the latter had clearly been resolved upon for the purpose of concluding peace. As peace had not been achieved, the time allowed for the termination of the armistice elapsed at the end of eight days, i. e. on February 20th. The fresh conflict between the Foreign Office and the Supreme Command was "settled" on February 13th. Payer, the Vice-Chancellor, entreated them not to rob him of the means to make social democracy keep to war in the East. Social Democracy would fail to understand that war in the East should be continued for military reasons\*).

\*) Payer's concern was quite superfluous. Social Democracy was fettered to the German chariot with iron chains. The "Vorwärts" wrote the following answer to Trotzky's declaration:

"German Social Democracy is firmly convinced that it is best serving the interest of the German people by its peace policy. It is therefore prepared to use every influence it possesses in order to put that peace policy into effect. The idea, however, that the German working class is able to seize the power by force in order to come to the assistance of Russia, is a delusion. An undertaking of that kind would not only be hopeless, but would also clash with the democratic principle (!) and be dangerous in view of the fact that the state of war in the West still existed." The "Freie Presse" in Leipzig wrote on February 17th 1918: "The Bolsheviki ought to conclude peace and not to instigate revolution in Germany."

The worst things Mr. Payer could expect from those quarters was a few superfluous phrases, but no deeds.

Hertling, the Chancellor, also did not wish to take upon himself the bad repute that Germany was changing its policy at that moment and proceeding with annexations. Yet, there was no help for it and a fresh advance was resolved upon.

The Soviet Government was then compelled to sign an even more unfavourable peace which dismembered Russia and violated the peoples of the Baltic provinces.

A radiogramme communicated to the Soviet Government on February 21st why it had been obliged to give way:

"In view of the fact that the German working class, at this hour of danger, has proved too irresolute and not strong enough to arrest the criminal hand of its own militarism, we had no other alternative than to accept the conditions of German imperialism until the time when the European revolution will alter them."

Even more was true of the German working class than had been expressed in the above words. German workers continued to transport weapons further into revolutionary Russia even at that time, fulfilling with them the hangman's work of their masters. The brand of that indignity will remain on the revolutionary proletariat until it will wipe it off by its own liberation.

Nevertheless it became evident that the October revolution had increased the fighting force of the German working class. In spite of the censorship, the public negotiations in Brest-Litovsk opened the eyes of the working class to the lust of conquest of the ruling classes and to the fact that they were expected to shed their blood for the subjugation and plundering of the peoples. In Vienna, which, in the most terrible meaning of the word, was at that time faced by famine\*), a general strike broke out on January 14th, spreading throughout Austria with elementary force. Only the tactics of Adler & Co. which were as skillful as they were artful, succeeded in driving the workers again into the factories on January 22nd, after vague promises on the part of the Government. On January 28th, a strike broke out among the munition workers of Berlin, and that strike also spread at once to the other towns of the country, to Leipzig, Nuremberg, Munich, Hamburg, Cologne, Braunschweig, Danzig and others. In Berlin alone 500,000 workers were out in the streets.

The movement showed, from its very beginning, a political character. Workers' councils were formed. The following demands were made: abolition of the state of siege and of the censorship, restoration of the right of strike and assembly, the release of political prisoners, peace and republic. The Government at once took up the gauntlet with full energy. The factories were occupied by the military, court martials were established. Attempts were made to demoralise the workers by violent measures. In Berlin alone, 50,000 workers on strike were called up by the military authorities.

All these measures however would have been of no avail, had not the social democrats taken it into their hands to demoralise the workers on strike. Whilst the trade unions, from the beginning, refused to have anything to do with the fighters, Ebert, Scheidemann and Otto Braun surreptitiously sneaked into the strike management. The Spartakus League tried to fan the flames of the strike into armed insurrection, but the workers of Berlin still supported the revolutionary leading functionaries of the Independent Social Democratic Party who were opposed to an insurrection. The strike therefore had to be called off on February 3rd, without result.

In spite of all that, the fight had had the result that the workers were indignant at that betrayal and that large numbers of them broke with the social chauvinists. The influence of the social democratic leaders on the workers in the factories of the big towns was broken from that time onwards, and those thousands who were sent to the trenches, carried there the germs of revolt.

(To be continued.)

\*) The German army administration dispatched a transport of corn to Vienna, in spite of the lack of food in their own country, thus preventing Czernin from concluding a separate peace with Russia.

## The Revolt of the Sailors in Cattaro.

Ten years ago, a short time after the end of the January strike in Austria, the crews of the Austrian fleet in Cattaro mutinied; 6000 sailors hoisted the red flag on the masts of forty warships, overpowered the officers and elected sailors' councils. They demanded that peace be made immediately. The mutiny lasted three days. At the end of that time, the sailors surrendered, having remained isolated and being weakened by internal dissensions and by the machinations of the officers, in face of the threat of the fleet of battleships from Pola which had been called in by the commandant of the fortress to come to its rescue. Court-martials began their activity. Four sailors were shot by sentence of court-martial, 800 were thrown into prison, 40 of whom were also condemned to be shot. The sailors were detained in prison until the end of the war; a large number of them died from the consequences of the horrible treatment and of starvation.

We publish below some reminiscences of one of the sailors who took part in the mutiny at Cattaro. Ed.

I was arrested on February 3rd and taken to Igalla together with six other members of the naval air force. On February 6th we were taken, together with all the other sailors to the Gardicia barracks in Cattaro; 40 of us were selected and brought before a court-martial. Four of these were shot, the rest returned to us.

On March 1st we were transported to the forts of S. Giovanni, Vermac, Kavac, San Marco and Trinita. When we tried to take a photograph of the tombs of our comrades who had been shot, our camera was confiscated.

We — 80 men — were taken to the fort of Trinita, in which we remained confined until September 14th.

The diet at Trinita was "excellent" (for breakfast black coffee of roasted chicory, for dinner a small tin of preserved food divided among four men and with it "barbed wire"). Quarters were of a corresponding quality. Two blankets for every three men lying on the icy cold concrete. We got just as much light as could come in through a loop-hole. Sickness incurred by the internees was not recognised by the authorities. Any sick person was a "malingerer". The doctor who visited us every three months, sent those who were suffering to hospital, but it was then too late.

Comrade Neubauer from Vienna, 18 years old, was taken to hospital in the morning (he was already unable to walk) and died on the same day (June 10th, 1918).

Comrade Horak from Pardubitz was admitted in hospital together with Neubauer. He succeeded in escaping.

When I was taken to hospital together with some others on July 20th, we had a specially strict escort which excluded any possibility of flight. After a short time in hospital, I came back into our fort, where those arrested on the "Katharina" had also been confined in the meantime. The charge was now brought against us of treason, mutiny and riot.

Finally when the Austrian monarchy collapsed, we were released (with the exception of 32 who remained in prison) and were conveyed to Pola. From there we were ordered to the stone-pits of Val Maggiore as "unreliable elements".

\* \* \*

Otto Bauer, who when writing on the estimation of the insurrection in Cattaro stated that "Cattaro is not Kronstadt", tries by means of that estimation to conceal the fact that he himself may claim the credit for throttling the Kronstadt insurrection. Otto Bauer realised that the sailors' revolt was supported by the solidarity between the sailors and those who had taken part in the January strike, and that the revolt had arisen

from the distress of the working class as a whole. With the help of the social democrats however, the January strike was throttled and the sailors of Cattaro were isolated. This is the reason why Cattaro could not be Kronstadt!

And here the question arises: Why did Otto Bauer not hasten to come to Cattaro, regarding which he had such excellent informations at his disposal? Where were the social democratic leaders for whom the sailors were longing?

Was Dr. Bauer not content with the fact that, for a short time, the red flag was waving over the half of the Austrian naval force? That the sailors were armed down to the last man? That the officers and admirals had been taken prisoners and were kept in custody? That only a spark was needed to make the fight flare up? Did the sailors capitulate to the brutal ultimatum of the commander of the naval port? It was not until they were defeated and taken prisoners that they resigned themselves to their fate.

I recall the last speech of Comrade Rasche at the naval aerodrome on the evening of February 2nd. He said:

"It is better to fall in the coming fight than to surrender. We know what fate has in store for us."

That is the course of events in Cattaro. In exactly the same way as in the January strike, the sailors' movement in Cattaro was suppressed and the leaders were murdered or imprisoned.

On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of Cattaro, Julius Braunthal, who vacillated ten times to and fro as to whether or not he should fire at the red battle-ship "Monarch", is now trying with smooth words to book to the credit of social democrats that which they betrayed, ten times over.

Not a single line referring to those events appeared in the "Arbeiter Zeitung", nothing was done all the time the sailors were waiting, to inform the working class of those facts.

This is the reason why Cattaro is a "bloody, serious, episode which has partly been forgotten, partly never been known". The social-democratic journalists now wish to wear laurels for deeds done by the red sailors!

That question will not be decided by those phrase-mongers who now, ten years after, from the safety and ease of their editorial chairs profess their adherence to the movement from which ten years they prudently held aloof, but by the workers, who have learnt the lesson taught by the facts and experience of those ten years and know very well that it is not the workers who are to blame for the defeat at Cattaro but the leaders in whom they placed their confidence at that time.

---



---

### TO OUR READERS!

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

England . . . . .	2 sh.
America . . . . .	50 cents
Germany . . . . .	1.50 marks
Austria . . . . .	2 schillings
Norway . . . . .	1.50 crowns
Sweden . . . . .	1.50 crowns
Denmark . . . . .	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R. . . . .	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.