

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2 No. 46

9th June 1922

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

Who are the Traitors?

by L. Trotzky.

Moscow, May 30th, 1922.

The Social Revolutionary Party at present occupies the centre of attention, but quite differently than at the time of the March Revolution. It often happens in history that some party of other, some man or other, is at first obscured from view, is forgotten for some time and then is again remembered. The Social Revolutionary Party succeeded in a few months, one might say in a few weeks, in getting into power over the whole of Russia—so it seemed at least—and afterwards lost its influence just as quickly and faded into insignificance. The approaching trial affords us the opportunity of reviewing the strange fate of the Social Revolutionary Party. This explains the interest it arouses: it is produced by the necessity for understanding and arriving at certain conclusions.

I will only touch on one side of the question here, which it seems to me has not received sufficient attention in our press and which is nevertheless of great importance: the position which the humbler sections of the party, the rank and file, its minor officials respectively held or now hold in the party.

At the beginning of the present century Plekhanoff called the Social Revolutionaries, "Social Reactionaries". This was appropriate in so far as it described the petty-bourgeois, reactionary components of its world outlook which threatened to convert the party into a tool of bourgeois counter-revolution and did in fact so transform it. As soon as the petty-bourgeoisie separates itself from the proletariat it always inevitably becomes a tool of the bourgeoisie. In the struggle against Czarism and feudalism the party played a revolutionary role. It aroused the peasants, it stirred large groups of young students to political activity, it assembled around its standard considerable groups of workers who were not yet either materially or mentally separated from the village and who considered the revolution not from the proletarian class point of view, but from the shapeless point of view of the "worker". The terrorists entered into the duel and sacrificed their lives for the lives of Czarist dignitaries. We criticized this method, for we were of the opinion that the Sazonovs and the Kaliayeffs would have been more useful to the cause of the revolution if they had combined their energy with the energy of the working masses instead of increasing their individual force by the explosive force of dynamite. But our work among the masses, our criticism and our exposition of terror converted these terrorist acts into external incentives for the revolutionary activity of the masses. It often happened at demonstrations that the most self-sacrificing Marxist workers went hand in hand with the self-sacrificing "Narodniki" workers in order to oppose the Czarist Police and Cossacks by armed force. Later on these met in the prisons of Siberia, on the way to prison and in exile. Among the humbler sections of the party there were always excellent, determined and self-sacrificing elements to be found in spite of the theoretical vagueness of their ideas.

Already at that time a chasm was beginning to separate the young Petrograd textile worker belonging to the Social Revolutionary Party who at any moment was prepared to sacrifice his life for the cause of the working class, from

the intellectuals of the Avksentiev type, from the Heidelberg and other students, philosophers, Kantians, Nietschians who at that time differed in no way from the petty-bourgeois radicals of France, with the exception of their greater illusions and their inferior culture. At that time it was clear to the Marxists how widely these two groups would diverge from the influence of the "Narodniki" ideology; and the future parliamentarians, political place-hunters who for the moment were in no hurry surrender their Socialist phraseology.

In consequence of the war and the revolution the dissolution of the Social Revolutionary Party was enormously accelerated. The complete political and moral decay of the upper sections of the party was accelerated by the fact that the great events compelled clear and exact answers and did not permit of vacillation. Thus we see how Tchernoff at Zimmerwald unexpectedly adhered to the Extreme Left, thus renouncing the idea of the "National Party" and how he later on sat in a bourgeois cabinet and recommended the July offensive hand in hand with the Entente countries. This terribly zig-zag course of the leader of the party already foreshadowed its approaching final eclipse.

A great quantity of trained energy however still existed in the party. The heroic past of the party (its sacrifices, the death sentences, Siberian hard labor, deportations) held, as a result of our backward social relations (the peasant majority!), the honest, subjectively revolutionary parts of the rank and file of the party under the party banner, at the time when the stupefied upper circles of the party had become perfectly ripe for open official flunkeyism to imperialism and counter-revolution. The whole of the play of the Central Committee with the members of the fighting organizations, from the political and moral aspect, took place at the time of the transition period: the rank and file seriously accepted the slogans of the party, proceeded in the old direction and proceeded courageously to the end. They were prepared to kill, to sacrifice their lives against other lives. Their subjective motives were revolutionary. They were only behind the times, they did not see the enormous change that had taken place in the whole world situation. The upper circles saw this. They know all too well that the terrorist campaign against the Soviets was financed from the same monetary sources which but yesterday financed Nicholas against us and against the Social Revolutionaries. The upper circles of the party could not be ignorant of this. They did not act influenced by their traditions and by inertia. They speculated upon gaining advantages; they were conscious of their treachery, of their part as renegades. They therefore conducted this diplomatic play with themselves, with history, with the imperialist Allies and before all with their own party and the rank and file. The Tchernoffs and the Avksentievs profited by the heroism of the Sazonovs and Kaliayeffs and placed the honest and self-sacrificing members of the organization at the disposal of Noulens and Lockhart. When these members of the fighting organization grasped the significance of historical events in the new world situation, when they convinced themselves that they were throwing their bombs at the behest of the French Embassy and the Roumanian Embassy, they shrank back from their own

deeds. The more determined and self-sacrificing they had previously been in their fight against the Bolsheviks with the methods which the Social Revolutionaries learned during the time of suppression, the greater now was their indignation and resentment.

Some of them meditated longer than other, some went abroad, some placed their lives at the disposal of the Workers' Republic and carried out the most dangerous tasks on the front in the civil war. Some are still wavering. With a sort of unflinching instinct however, the bourgeois press of the whole world denounced the stand taken by Semenov and Konopleva with the cry of "Renegades". At the time of the blockade of Soviet Russia it came to the final opinion that the Social Revolutionaries of whom they previously knew nothing were only the Left Wing of the anti-Soviet front or a transmitting fighting mechanism for the terrorist measures ordered from Paris and London. And then one suddenly met with a revolt, a direct stroke of treachery on the part of this Left Wing! A betrayal of the cause which at present unites Tchernoff with Poincaré. The spiritual revolt of Semenov, Konopleva and

others against the Central Committee of the party and against the real masters working behind the scenes of this Central Committee, against the Social Revolutionary Party in its actual attitude, is in reality the immediate consequence of all that the past of the Social Revolutionary Party has to show in revolutionary spirit and in heroism. There is only one clear answer to the great and simple question: which and what cause were all these Social Revolutionaries serving who were killed in terrorist duels and in street battles, or died in Siberian hard labor and exile; the cause which is espoused by the Tchernoffs together with the Noulens, the Poincarés and the Lloyd Georges, or the cause of the Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Russia which, as Genoa demonstrated, is fighting alone against the raging imperialist bloodhounds! Those Social Revolutionaries who have stood up against the corrupt clique which is still attempting to profit by the revolutionary traditions of the party can declare with a calm conscience that they are the trustees of all that the past of the Social Revolutionary party has to show in heroism and greatness during the time of suppression and illegal work.

The Trial of the Social Revolutionaries

by L. Sosnovsky (Moscow).

I.

The Communist: Well, the Commission of Nine is dissolved after all. The leaders have gone home. But what are we to do? We can't go home. We work in the same factory. We suffer under the same enemy, we suffer the same misery. We are forced to pay taxes regardless of party-creed. The traders on the market do not examine our membership cards either; all they are interested in is how to skin us alive. The shareholders oppress us with burdens just as great. What are we to do?

The Social Democrat: The united front is a necessity, for without it we shall be stripped to the bone. But it is you Communists who are responsible for the breaking-up of the united front. I read in the Berlin *Vorwärts* that it was absolutely impossible to organize the united front with you, because the Russian Government prevents such an action through its persecution of the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries. Just now, the Social Revolutionary trial is beginning in Moscow; there must be an end to all this.

Communists: Listen friend, your *Vorwärts* is again lying, as usual. In the republic of your party-comrade Ebert, thousands of Communists and independent workers are languishing in prison for their revolutionary activities. Yet we do not make the liberation of these workers a condition for the united front. *We are working for their freedom in other ways.* But the united front of the working class is by far more important than the fate of a number of workers. The united proletarian front will bring them much nearer to the hour of freedom. But tell me, do you really believe that the fate of the revolutionary workers can be compared with that of the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries in Russia?

Social Democrat: I must admit, I can see no distinction between the two; here and there people are persecuted for their convictions.

Communist: I see that you are not acquainted with the truth. If you will listen I will tell you what I know about the Social Revolutionaries. Shall I?

Social Democrat: Go ahead.

Communist: To begin with, tell me if you approve of the Russian workers' struggle against the capitalists and large landowners; against the Denikins and Wrangels?

Social Democrat: Of course. Do you think for a moment that I sympathize with these monarchistic dogs?

Communist: You recognize therefore the right of the Russian proletariat to defend itself against the counter-revolution and to attack it? You grant them the right to put the counter-revolutionaries into prison and even to shoot the most dangerous among them?

Social Democrat: Of course I recognize this right. But what has that to do with the Social Revolutionaries? Aren't they Socialists and Revolutionists?

Communist: Now listen, friend. The Social Revolutionaries are double faced; one of their faces is turned towards Europe, the other towards Russia. You see the first face, and we see the other face. The capitalists are attempting to overthrow the Russian Soviet Government by force. Do you or don't you consider such an attempt as counter-revolutionary?

Social Democrat: Certainly.

Communist: Well then. The Social Revolutionaries are working for just this aim since the 7th of November, 1917, and they are still at it today; they want to overthrow the Soviet Government by force. Have't you heard, don't you know, that for some time the Social Revolutionaries actually had some success on the Volga, in Siberia, in Archangelsk, and in the Ukraine; that they succeeded in overthrowing the Soviet Government and in substituting another government for it. In Archangelsk, the Tchaikovsky government of the S. R.'s was organized, in Samara and in Siberia, the Constituent Government, in the Ukraine, the Government of the so-called "Rada".

Social Democrat: First of all, this happened a long time ago, and secondly the Social Revolutionaries displaced the Soviet Governments with democratic and Socialist ones. You can't call this a counter-revolution.

Communist: But didn't your *Vorwärts* tell you the whole story up to the end? Aren't you acquainted with the following facts: On the 3rd of May, 1918, the Social Revolutionaries, aided by the Czech-Slovak troops that were paid by France, succeeded in overthrowing the Soviet Power on the Volga. On the 18th of November of the same year, Koltchak very easily drove the Social Revolutionaries out, declaring himself regent and dictator. In Archangelsk, at about the same time, the Social Revolutionary Government of Tchaikovsky, Ivanov and Ignatiev, was arrested by General Miller, and displaced by the dictatorship of this same General. As a matter of fact, it was the Entente Generals that ruled there and that stood behind Miller, the English Generals Ball, Ironside, and others. In the Ukraine, the "Socialist" Rada was driven asunder by German bayonets, and displaced by the dictatorship of the Hetmann Skoropadsky, a dummy of the Hohenzollerns. In Azerbeidjan, the rule of the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries lasted a few weeks after the overthrow of the Soviet Power; then the bourgeois Mohammedan Musavat Party came into power.

Social Democrat: It is too bad that the democratic Socialist power of the Social Revolutionaries could not withstand the onslaught of reaction. But that is not the fault of the Social Revolutionaries.

Communist: No, they consciously aided the bourgeoisie in overthrowing the Soviet Power; they entered into an alliance with the Entente, and received money and weapons from it. In the first period of the revolution, when the reaction was beaten, the Social Revolutionaries helped to organize White Guard armies by secretly transporting monarchist officers from Moscow into the border regions, where the fronts of attack against the Soviet Government were organized. The Russian Bolsheviks always pointed out that the Social Revolutionaries make the preliminary preparations for the counter-revolution. As to the methods of their so-called "Socialist" activities, permit me to ask you a few questions.

Social Democrat: Please.

Communist: Just now, the Social Democrat Ebert is at the head of the German Republic. Tell me then, would you approve of the vicious assassination of Ebert, Scheidemann, Noske, Branting of Sweden, Vandervelde of Belgium, would you approve the organization of such attempts by our Communists?

Social Democrat: Why these questions? Everybody knows that the Social Democrats are against terroristic tactics, even when these are applied against monarchic governments.

Communist: To the great joy of the world bourgeoisie, the Social Revolutionaries made attempts against the lives of Lenin (failed), Volodarsky (killed), Trotsky (they failed to blow up the train in which he was travelling).

Social Democrat: No honest workers would approve of such deeds, if what you say is true.

Communist: We shall come back to this later, and see whether it is true or not. Now tell me: if any Communist or Communist group in Germany had organized an attempt against the life of a Social Democratic Minister, what would have happened to them? Would the guilty one be brought to trial or not?

Social Democrat: What a question! Of course he would have been tried.

Communist: I also think so. And what's more I think that Trotsky and Zinoviev would not have been allowed to appear for the defense of the prisoners before a German court. The Russian Bolsheviks, however, have permitted the appearance of Vandervelde, Rosentfeld, Modigliani and others. Another question: What do you think of the following acts? The Central Committee of the Social Revolutionaries organizes an attempt against Lenin's life, and creates a special terroristic fighting organization for this purpose. After the attempt has been made, the Central Committee shirks all responsibility for the criminal act.

Social Democrat: But why should we not believe that the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party did not participate in the attempt, and that it was only individual persons who acted upon their own initiative.

Communist: The trial of the S. R.'s will clear up this matter. But what is your opinion?

Social Democrat: To send men to kill, to endanger the lives of the perpetrators, and then to wash one's hands of the whole matter is, I think, morally reprehensible.

Communist: You will soon see that was the case. Yet another question: What would the German Social Democrats say if we Communists had organized the plundering of government treasuries, of cooperatives and even private homes for private purposes?

Social Democrat: These would have been common crimes, pure and simple.

Communist: And what if we had broken into the safe of a Food Committee?

Social Democrat: That would have capped the climax.

Communist: And what, if under the pretense of being detectives, we had broken into the house of a citizen, and then under the pretext of making a search, we had cleaned out his safe for party-purposes, causing the death of the owner through apoplexy?

Social Democrat: But devil take it, what dirt . . . Why do you tell me all this? Are the Social Revolutionaries guilty of anything like that?

Communist: Yes, indeed. These facts will be examined at the public session of the Moscow Tribunal, in the presence of several thousand citizens and under the participation of the European Right Socialists, with Vandervelde at their head. What will you say when everything is proved true?

Social Democrat: I would say that for such people there is no room in the Workers' International.

Communist: Well then, should such a gang of criminals stand in the way of the united proletarian front, although the menace of the capitalist reaction is immense? What's more, the Russian S. R.'s left the Second International in 1920, and decided to join the 2½ International. But two years have passed and they have not as yet been accepted into the International 2½. It seems that there they know the adventures of these gentleman much better than you, an average worker.

Social Democrat: All this is peculiar. To tell the truth, I am not fully satisfied with your explanations. I am not very clear as to the tactics of the Social Revolutionaries in the past few years, their present tactics, and how the party-members react to the tactics of their leaders.

Communist: We can speak of this another time. At any rate, think over the following. Are your leaders right in sabotaging the united front on account of such a party? Should not we workers begin all together, to build up the united front for the struggle against capitalism, from below?

Social Democrat: This would not be bad at all.

Communist: Well then, good-bye.

II.

Social Democrat: Oh yes, last time I forgot to ask why the Russian Bolsheviks are trying the Social Revolutionaries in 1922 for acts committed in 1918. Are the S. R.'s right after all when

they say that only purpose of this trial is to clear opponents out of the way?

Communist: As to the "clearing out of the way", the naïveté of this presumption is only too apparent. For the last two or three years all the defendants have been in the hands of the Soviet Government. Had the latter only desired to clear them out of the way, it would have had no difficulty whatever in finding a good reason. For have not the S.R.'s committed numerous crimes against the Revolution. Don't you understand that the Social Revolutionaries whose lives had been spared at a time when the Revolution was in the greatest danger, need not be nervous over their lives in 1922. *They are not in danger of death.* They are, however, in danger of a moral death, the pitiless verdict of the world proletariat.

Social Democrat: But why have you instituted this trial only now?

Communist: It was just now that new material was discovered, illuminating the dastardly policy of this party. The Social Revolutionary leaders succeeded in fooling everybody: the Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks, the Independents, the International and their own party. When the leader of the Petrograd workers was assassinated and Lenin was wounded, the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party issued a statement on the day following the attempt, in which it washed its hands of all guilt. And everybody believed that it had actually nothing to do with these criminal acts. Now, however, the direct perpetrators of these acts, Semenov and Konopleva, have issued a statement in which they clearly say that they had acted upon the orders of the Central Committee of their party, and that this Central Committee had created a special organization for the assassination of the leaders of the proletariat. They also point out that besides Lenin and Volodarsky, Trotzky and Zinoviev were also to be killed. Trotzky was to be killed by blowing up the entire train in which he rode. The details have been published in Berlin in Semenov's pamphlet. These will be investigated at the trial.

Social Democrat: Does Semenov claim that the Social Revolutionary leaders commissioned him and other comrades with the assassination of Communists, and then denied all connection with the perpetrators, thus branding the murderers as common criminals?

Communist: Yes. In the struggle against Czarism, when the Social Revolutionary Party applied the terror against the Czar and his servants, it declared soon after the terroristic act had been perpetrated, that it had organized the act in question, and gave the reasons for it. Although if arrested the terrorist faced death, he nevertheless felt proud of his deed, of which the whole world would learn on the next day; he felt proud of his name, which would go down in history. But here it was exactly the contrary that took place. The party disgracefully and cowardly denied any connection with those whom it commissioned to commit the murderous acts, thereby deceiving everybody, including its own membership.

Social Democrat: But are the statements of Semenov true? I heard that he was a renegade, a *Tche-ka* agent, a traitor.

Communist: The main public trial, at which foreign defenders will be present, must show whether Semenov has told the truth, or whether Tchernoff and Co. are guilty of slander. I personally know that all the allegations made by Semenov have already been corroborated by about a dozen of the defendant Social Revolutionaries. The S. R. leaders have simply continued their old lies and this time they fooled their friends, Vandervelde, Rosentfeld, Theodor Liebknecht and others.

Social Democrat: Wherein does the great deception lie?

Communist: Tchernoff and Company have apparently succeeded in convincing Vandervelde and others that the entire Bolshevik prosecution is based solely upon Semenov's pamphlet. Furthermore, that Semenov's allegations deserve no confidence, because he is a deserter, a renegade, a traitor. Should, however, at the main trial, a single person, Semenov, say "yes", and 47 defendants say "no", then the impression would be made that Semenov's allegations are nothing more than a false denunciation, a disgraceful slander. Tchernoff counted upon the old pre-revolutionary tradition, that the defendants would refuse to make any declarations whatever before the tribunal. At the main trial, he hoped that they would sound thundering denunciations against the Bolsheviks. But only three or four members of the Central Committee have refused to give evidence. These were the leaders of the terrorists (Gotz, Donskoi and others). All the terrorists however, those who left the Social Revolutionary Party, and those who remained in it, made detailed declarations, which corroborate those of Semenov in all particulars. Some of these terrorists are old members of the S. R. Party, workers who under the Czarist regime spent a dozen years in Siberia at hard labor, because of their party-membership. I believe one of them has been in the Social Revolutionary movement since 1899.

Social Democrat: But why do those who remained in the S. R. Party make depositions so ruinous to their leaders? Moreover don't they run the danger of being punished by the tribunal on the basis of their deposition? Could they not all, like Gotz, refuse to make any declarations whatever?

Communist: Two sorts of men will appear before the tribunal. On the one hand, brave fighters who attack their enemy with bomb or revolver, but who also boldly sacrifice their own lives for the cause which they think just. On the other hand, there will appear miserable politicians, cowardly hyenas, who send others to death only to renounce their own comrades for fear of consequences. The former were of the opinion that the Bolsheviks were causing the ruin of the country, and that for this reason, the Bolshevik leaders must be killed even at the cost of their own lives. To this group belong: Semenov, Konopleva, Jefimov, Kononov, Ussov and others. When they read in the newspapers of the cowardly repudiation of the S. R. Central Committee, immediately after the terroristic acts had been perpetrated, they asked themselves: *If the assassination of Volodarsky was beneficial to the revolution, why does the Central Committee repudiate this revolutionary act? If the assassination of Volodarsky was no revolutionary act, why did the same Central Committee order the assassination?* But they received no frank or honest answer from the leaders. Their position then became unsafe. And when they saw how great the indignation of the masses was against the attempts on the lives of Lenin and Volodarsky, they understood that the Central Committee had commissioned old revolutionary fighters with a counter-revolutionary deed. For this reason they decided to tell the truth.

Social Democrat: But who is this Semenov? Why is he so slandered?

Communist: Semenov is a young man yet. He played no important part in the party until the Revolution came. But in his 14th year he joined a revolutionary organization. At 15 he already sat in a Czarist prison. After this arrest he dedicated himself wholly to revolutionary work. He worked chiefly in the fighting-division (not literary or agitational). So, for example, he organized the escape from the Riga prison, etc. The October Revolution roused his indignation. The dispersion of the Constituent Assembly made him an irreconcilable enemy of the Bolsheviks. Thereafter he organized the illegal organizations using armed force against the Bolsheviks. Being very energetic, brave and trustworthy, he enjoyed the unlimited confidence of the party. The party appointed him leader of the central fighting organization. Such posts were filled by the S. R. Party with absolutely trustworthy men. In 1918, after the repudiation by the Central Committee of the terror organized by itself, Semenov decided to quit the party. At that time a whole group, *Narod (People)*, quit the S. R. Party. In 1919, he, together with a group of comrades, proposed to the Soviet staff to send them to the Southern front against General Denkin. At that time they demanded in the most energetic manner that they be assigned the most dangerous tasks; for example, to get behind the enemies' lines, to organize explosions, attack higher commands, etc. After the liquidation of the Denkin front, Semenov went to the Polish front. Here too he reached the enemies' lines. There he was arrested. He gained the confidence of Soviet Russia's worst enemy, the White Guard Savinkov, learnt his plans, and returned to Russia with important information. In 1920 he decided to join the Communist Party. As an honest and brave man he first related his counter-revolutionary past, at the same time revealing the past of his party: Only after he had staked his life several times for the cause of the Bolsheviks, did he feel that he had acquired the right to membership in the Communist Party. Judge for yourself whether Semenov is a man to be bought or bribed, or who can be forced to make a false affidavit.

Social Democrat: Indeed, he is a very interesting person. A marvelous fate. First he organizes an attempt on Lenin's life, then he joins the ranks of the Leninists.

Communist: It is a fact that the great majority of those who have shown that they fight and die for their ideas, have left the S. R. Party. All that the S. R. Party can boast of now are miserable scoundrels and petty triguers who receive their pay from the Paris and Prague Exchanges.

Social Democrat: Are there other men like Semenov on trial?

Communist: A very interesting case is that of *Gregory Ratner*. He was a high official in the S. R. Party (Secretary of the Moscow Committee and member of the Party Central Bureau). His sister, Eugenie Ratner, member of the Central Committee of the S. R. Party, is one of the chief defendants. Like Semenov, Ratner was a bitter enemy of the Soviet Power. Later, he realized his mistakes, and volunteered as a Red Guard for the front. There he turned Communist. Being a man of rare modesty, he refused to accept any office in the Soviet Government, and in spite of

his high education, he now works as an ordinary railroad worker. just now, Ratner has made depositions not only against the members of the Central Committee of the S. R. Party, but also against his sister, revealing the participation of the Central Committee in the assassination of Volodarsky.

Social Democrat: Will Semenov and others also have to defend their past activities, or will they be spared because of their Communist membership?

Communist: Semenov, Konopleva and Ratner are also among the defendants. Ratner even declared that only upon this condition would he make any depositions. This group, however, will not be defended by Vandervelde and Co., but by the leading Communists, Bucharin, Pokrovsky and, if I am not mistaken, also by Clara Zetkin. Besides these, there is another category of defendants; for example, one of the persons mentioned in Semenov's pamphlet was arrested because he had participated in a military conspiracy against the Soviet power; at present this person is a non-partizan and serves faithfully in the Red Army. He declared that everything that Semenov alleges against him in his pamphlet is true, and that he is ready to suffer the consequences for his past activities. He refused, however, to say anything against other persons. But when he was confronted with the Berlin organ of the S. R., *Golos Rossi* (the "Voice of Russia"), this man was filled with indignation against this downright lie of Tchernoff's, and declared himself ready to furnish evidence and to tell the truth about the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party.

Social Democrat: It seems therefore that the position of the foreign attorneys for the defense is not one to be envied. They had simply been deceived and persuaded to take over the defence. They think that the Moscow trial is an ungrounded bluff, and that they can beat the Bolsheviks with ease.

Communist: Neither do I envy the attorneys. Thousands of working Red Guards of Moscow will be present in the courtroom. Their glances of contempt alone will make the lawyers nervous. Just think this over: You are a Social Democratic worker, and I'm a Communist worker; I ask you how many Social Democrats are to be found in the prisons of the bourgeois countries of Europe?

Social Democrat: I must admit that I have not heard of any such cases.

Communist: But have you heard that thousands of Communist workers in every "democratic" country are languishing in prison?

Social Democrat: Yes, I have heard of this.

Communist: Now, listen. The workers of Moscow will ask Vandervelde and Co. why they do not appear for the defense of the true revolutionary workers of Western Europe, and why they raise no finger to free them from the bourgeois prisons. Why did they come to Russia to defend the counter-revolutionaries, the enemies of the Soviet power, the enemies of the Proletarian Revolution, the murderers of Volodarsky? Why?

Social Democrat: Indeed, I do not envy Vandervelde. But perhaps the policy of the S. R. Party has become more revolutionary than it used to be in 1918.

Communist: No! The form has perhaps changed, but the counter-revolutionary spirit has remained the same. But of that we shall speak another time.

Radio

The following radio relating to the defenders of the Social Revolutionaries has been received from Moscow:

In the trial of the S. R.'s, Zetkin, Muna and Bokanyi will represent the E. C. of the Comintern; Sadoul and Kohn will represent those former S. R.'s now supporting the Soviet Power; Frossard, Smeral, Sadoul, Bell and Jordanoff will act as experts. Moscow, June 7th. Radek, Kohn.

Telegram from the E. C. of the Comintern to Anatole France.

Anatole France,
c/o Humanité, Paris.

On the eve of the opening of the trial of the Social Revolutionaries, the Soviet Government, with which you interceded on behalf of the accused on the ground of one-sided information whose purpose was to take advantage of your good faith, invites you to attend the proceedings. The Soviet Government would be pleased to be able to welcome you here and the representatives of the French Communist Party in Moscow join in this request of the Russian proletarian government.

Moscow, June 5th.

Zinoviev, Frossard.

POLITICS

The Position of Bulgaria and the Ultimatum of the Entente

by Chr. Kabaktchieff (Sofia).

According to the Peace Treaty Bulgaria had to pay as war reparations 2,250,000,000 gold francs which, according to the present quotation of Bulgarian exchange is about 67,500,000,000 leva. In addition to this Bulgaria had to hand over a huge quantity of cattle, coal, and other materials to Jugoslavia, Roumania and Greece and to maintain the occupation troops and the Entente Commissions, which these also amounted to several billions. Among its principal obligations, Bulgaria would have had to pay in the year 1920 45,000,000 and in every succeeding year 140,000,000 gold francs. In the financial crisis, however, which Bulgaria has been in since the war she has not been in a position to make any kind of payments. Since 1920 Bulgaria has been in arrears to the extent of 325,000,000 gold francs (9,750,000,000 leva). The government therefore requested a moratorium from the Entente. The Entente Reparations Commission at Sofia thereupon handed a note to the Bulgarian Government in which the Commission gave its consent to a postponement of payment. But the Entente made use of the helpless position of Bulgaria to impose very hard conditions on the Bulgarian Government. Four-fifths of the State taxes and revenues must be yielded to the Reparations Commission which today exercise control over this and which perhaps tomorrow will take in hand the administrative and technical direction of the collection. All mines, concessions and monopolies are under the superintendence of the Commission. The Commission prepares laws on the Budget and State revenues which the Bulgarian Parliament is bound to accept. To put it briefly, Bulgaria is placed under supervision, and transformed into a colony of the Entente.

The termination of the period in which the Reparations Commission ultimately required an answer to their note was originally the 1st of May. Subsequently, upon the insistence of the Bulgarian Government, a respite was granted until May 2nd when the Bulgarian Government yet again requested a further extension of time. It is doubtful whether the Entente will accede to this demand.

The economic and financial situation of Bulgaria is most desperate. The weak industry of Bulgaria which has been ruined by the war, cannot be set up again, as Bulgarian industry, in consequence of the low value of her currency, is not in a position to import new machines, machine parts, raw materials, etc. Bulgarian industry has therefore lost the sole foreign markets which were of any importance to her, i. e., Macedonia, Constantinople and Asia Minor. The balance of foreign trade is against her. The imports for 1921 exceeded the exports by about 924,000,000 leva. At the same time prices steadily increased. On the average, prices are thirty times higher than pre-war prices. The financial crisis of the state is extending and becoming graver. Including her pre-war indebtedness, Bulgaria's national debt amounts now to 100,000,000 leva, i. e., 20,000 leva per head of the population. (reckoning 5,000,000 inhabitants, in round figures.) The national budget which at present is 4,000,000,000 leva is about 20 times greater than that of the year before the Balkan War (1912). To raise this amount taxes have been increased, among which of course those indirect taxes which are loaded upon the broad masses play a prominent role. With a gold and silver reserve of 60,000,000 leva there is in circulation 3,500,000,000 leva in banknotes. The Bulgarian budgets presented since the war years showed a deficit even before the State had made any attempt to meet the liabilities imposed by the Peace Treaty. The attempt of the Government to extricate itself from this most desperate financial situation by means of an interior "patriotic" loan has been entirely without result. In this critical position Bulgaria received the ultimatum of the Entente. The present "Farmers' Government" which has disappointed the peasants is losing their support to an increasing extent from day to day. Even among the bourgeoisie of Bulgaria the Government is becoming increasingly discredited in consequence of its characteristic policy in the interests of the middle and large landowners who have become rich. Thus the Bulgarian Government is facing extremely chaotic conditions. The bourgeois parties, compromised and politically bankrupt, make renewed attempts to capture the power of the state, but not having sufficient power for this, they have united into a bloc. In spite of this the 4 Bloc parties at the last election obtained hardly 150,000 votes out of 780,000. The bourgeois parties therefore are not hesitating to play the part of tools

and agents of the Entente, in order with its assistance to obtain power. The Wrangel troops who have a counter-revolutionary shelter in Bulgaria are welcomed and supported by these bloc parties, as the Entente Commission is of course interested that the continuous menacing of Soviet Russia develop undisturbed. Typical of the connection which obtains between the bourgeois parties of Bulgaria and Wrangel's Army were the recent sensational discoveries in Sofia, which revealed how the whole country was covered by a widespread network of spies, including hundreds of those employed under the old Czarist regime and how the bourgeoisie has its secret deliberations with the staff of Wrangel's army, in order to prepare by these means a coup d'état in Bulgaria. As soon as this clique succeeds in seizing the power of the State, the Communist Party would be outlawed. The oppression of the Communist Parties over the whole of the Balkans by the various governments is too well known. The Entente sees its policy of ruthless conquest in the Balkans threatened by the propaganda of the Communist Parties. Therefore it would view with approval the Communists of Bulgaria being persecuted and thrown into prison as in all other Balkan countries. Entente imperialism which succeeded in indirectly getting the Communist parties in Jugoslavia outlawed, and is attempting to obtain a firm foothold in Bulgaria against Soviet Russia, is now directing its chief attack against the Communist Party of Bulgaria. The Communist Party of Bulgaria, however, will the more surely resist the attacks directed against it the more it obtains the political support of its brother parties, particularly those of France, Italy and England.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Communists and the French C. G. T. U.

The following article is taken from *La Lutte des Classes*, the new bulletin of the Red Trade Union International issued at Paris and conducted by Comrades Rosmer, Godonèche, Tommasi and Tourette. It gives a picture of the present situation which we believe will be of interest to our readers.

The situation that confronts us on the 1st of May, 1922, is quite different from that three years ago. The bourgeoisie has advanced all along the front. It has regained the self-assurance which it had lost; it is retaking everything that it yielded at the time when the revolutionary menace hovered it over, and it is taking a great deal that it did not yield. It is preparing for new struggles. The entire government machine—the police, the courts and the army, that is now being used very freely—are insufficient. These are being reinforced with military formations, and the bourgeoisie does not hesitate to break its own laws only to organize itself under the name of *Unions Civique*, a White Guard that today serve the purpose of breaking strikes, but which may kill workers tomorrow. Its audacity is limitless.

In France we are faced with several problems of a special nature. What characterizes the labor movement, in the unions as well as in the Communist Party, is *confusion*.

The revolutionary minority which was so weak on the second of August 1914, underwent a steady development, and in spite of the successive mistakes committed by the men that guided it in its hard struggle, it succeeded last year in becoming a great power. But just at the moment when its triumph was at hand, certain men thought it wise to commence within it a battle between the various tendencies that composed it, instead of seeking to determine the common basis upon which these various elements might have cooperated.

The split followed, brutally cleaving the trade union organizations into two sections. It is a great pleasure to be able to state today that the regroupment proceeded under very favorable conditions about the *Confédération Générale du Travail Unitaire* (C. G. T. U.), and that the heads of the Rue Lafayette, whose mischief was thereby limited, retained control over a very small number of workers.

How is the present confusion to be cleared up? We believe that the best way is to have each one of the various tendencies define its position in a clear and concise manner. It is of no use whatever to say that there is unity or agreement, when there is none, and it is more honest and beneficial to state what the differences of opinion are and why they exist.

The various tendencies may be classed into two large groups: that of the Syndicalists who claim that the war and the Russian Revolution have taught us lessons which Syndicalism

should profit by and that it should therefore be modified accordingly; the other main group claims that pre-war Syndicalism should be resumed purely and simply, and that no change whatever is necessary.

These Neo-Syndicalists who think themselves orthodox, because they invoke the Charter of Amiens completely disregard the spirit of pre-war revolutionary Syndicalism. This document contains neither theory nor text. It was in its time an important document. But when the Congress of Havre, that took place in 1912, thought it advisable to readopt it, it simply meant that it had nothing to say, and that Syndicalism was stagnant, conscious of its weakness.

Syndicalism had laid down several great principles: a method—direct action; a means—the general strike; an end—the revolution and the liberation of the working class. And it was the application and realization of these principles alone that mattered. If our comrades had paid attention to what was going on in this world, they would have seen that *direct action* as a method had always been the rule of all Communist Parties and that the general strike (once condemned and rejected by the Social Democrats and Reformists), is everywhere frequently applied, except in France, where the labor movement has lacked initiative as well as courage since 1914. Hence it would not be paradoxical to say that there is actually more real Syndicalism in the action of the European Communist movement of today than in the program of the French Neo-Syndicalists.

Besides this Neo-Syndicalist group, there is yet the Anarchist group, which also invokes the Amiens document, and uses it as a weapon against the Communists, absolutely forgetting that the Amiens document was directed against them as well as against the Socialist Party, and that Syndicalism never has and never had anything in common with Anarchism.

But if we think it desirable and useful first to define the position of each group, we also believe that that is not all that must be done. This would be only a very small part of the work to be accomplished. Most of all, it is necessary to organize action proletarian defense; and the greatest strength of pre-war Syndicalism lies in the fact that it was able to find a common basis of cooperation in the trade unions for all revolutionary groups.

Members of the Communist Party, we believe that Party has its place and role to play in the labor movement. The Party has its task and the trade union its task. Does the one include the other? We believe that the question is not rightly put. Here as in many other questions, the lessons of the Russian Revolution are very useful, and it is inconceivable that we should never think of profiting by these lessons. For when the revolution comes we shall be faced with the same problems that confronted our Russian comrades, and it would be naive to think that the revolution can be brought about by an old text, useful in its time, but insufficient for the requirements of today.

It is clear that it is always a minority that leads the struggle of the working class. The C. G. T. of pre-war times represented but a small part of the entire working class, and even within it, it was yet but a very small minority that decided between Congresses. This courageous minority, energetic, far-sighted, and enjoying the confidence of the working-class, is for us, the Party. For a long time before the war, a revolutionary party was able to exist even within the core of a trade union organization, and be part of it. Today, however, we are in the midst of a new situation; the split and the existence of a Communist Party. Besides, the experience of the Russian Revolution has shown that it is preferable that the revolutionary workers' party and the trade unions, retain their distinct and separate organizations. Some of our Syndicalist comrades who understand this, and who admit that Syndicalism cannot possibly limit itself to the mechanical repetition of the pre-war Syndicalist formulae, but who differentiate themselves from us in that they retain all their distrust of political parties, Communist Parties included, will defend adhesion to the Red Trade Union International on condition that the Syndicalist movement be given guarantees for its complete autonomy and independence. We believe that these comrades see ghosts where there are none; and if their point of view should triumph at the Congress of Saint-Etienne, we shall bow to their will. But we will combat with all our might all those who, under the pretext of wishing to create an orthodox Syndicalist International, would only succeed in isolating the French labor movement from the rest of the world, at a moment when the entire labor question is very quickly becoming an international problem. To attempt to create a third Trade Union International would be pure idioey, that would end with the same success that marked the insane attempt of the K.A.P.D. (Communist Labor Party of Germany) to build a Fourth International about its insignificant movement.

The tasks which we set before us are—to bring clearness into the French labor movement, to facilitate the common work of all revolutionaries within the trade unions and to incorporate the French labor movement into the international movements. There is plenty of work. We appeal to all those who find the ideas which we have briefly exposed here correct.

The End of the South German Metal Workers' Strike

by A. Enderle (Berlin).

During the week of May 21st-28th there came to an end in South Germany a struggle of about 150,000 metal workers which can be described as the greatest trade-union struggle since the origin of the German labor movement. The struggle lasted in different districts 8, 10 and 13 weeks and was carried on with stubbornness, determination and solidarity by all who took part whether organized in the Socialist, Christian or Hirsch-Duncker trade unions. But in spite of all these efforts the battle has been lost.

The cause of the gigantic conflict was the demand of the employers that the working hours be lengthened. Up to that time the metal workers had, according to an agreement worked on the average 46 hours a week. The employers first demanded the introduction of a 48 hour week on the occasion of a new agreement in Bavaria. After some weeks similar demands were presented to the workers in Württemberg and Baden. The prolongation of the hours of labor was refused by the metal workers on a membership ballot by almost 95 % of the votes cast and the fight was decided on. This unanimous intention of the workers to defend themselves was based not merely upon the principle of refusing every extension of working hours, but above all on the recognition that to yield on this point would mean the abolition of the eight-hour day. It was thus that even the leaders of the great Metal Workers' Union, comprising about 1,600,000 members viewed the attack of the employers and the fight was taken up with surprising energy.

It was perfectly clear to everyone who had a knowledge of conditions that a struggle restricted to the metal industry of South Germany could not possibly end in victory for the workers, because the metal industry is not of such absolutely vital importance to the economic life of Germany that it would not be able to endure a prolonged strike. On the other hand control over strikebreaker work in other districts of Germany was not altogether practicable. For this reason the Communists and with them the great majority of the strikers at the very beginning of the struggle demanded the widening of the battle-front and the extension of the strike to the whole of the working class of South Germany. This demand which was presented to the trade union leaders was the more justifiable as even those latter continually reiterated that the metal workers were fighting in the front trenches for the whole German working class. Yet the trade union leaders persistently declined to extend the conflict beyond its original limits, because they feared in the same way as did the English railwaymen's leaders in the strike of the miners last year, that the strike would develop into a fight for political power on a great scale. This latter, however, was by no means desired by the trade union leaders, and above all by the German General Trade Union Federation (A.D.G.B.) for, as is well known, this is so closely and officially allied with the present capitalist Federal Government that it anxiously endeavors to avert every political conflict between capital and labor.

In repeated ballots the workers persistently refused to accept the extension of the hours of labor and the trade union leaders had to do something in order not to allow the fight to collapse through lack of necessary funds. The Metal Workers' Union doubled membership dues throughout the whole country and all other trade unions affiliated to the German General Trade Union Federation (A.D.G.B.) raised three or five marks strike assessments from every member. The Amsterdam trade union leaders who refused, in view of the political alliance between the Right Socialists and German capital, to accept responsibility for the consequences of this struggle sought to persuade the workers that the strikers would gain the victory by means of financial assistance in the contest between the cash resources of the combatants. By this the inner power of the strike was crushed and when the employers threatened to lock out a further fifty thousand workers in the Frankfurt district whereby the financial burden of the trade unions would be rendered unbearable in view of the protracted struggle, the trade union leaders gave up resistance and only endeavored to end the struggle as speedily as possible. For this purpose they did not conduct the negotiations centrally for the whole strike area, but in separate districts, first in Bavaria, then in Baden, Frank-

furt and at last in Württemberg where the greatest resistance on the part of the workers was to be expected.

The negotiations carried on with the employers resulted in the extension of the hours of labor to 48 hours. The terms of the agreement were so adroitly drawn up that a great part of the workers at first believed it to be a success, especially as the employers were ready to go more than half-way with regard to wages. As the leaders of the unions did all they could urged acceptance of the terms and openly threatened to sabotage the continuance of the struggle, the strikers gave up hope and by a great majority voted in favor of the agreement. The struggle is therefore at an end and the employers can record a complete success.

The length and unexampled bitterness of the fight showed that in reality more was at stake than the prolongation of the hours of labor by one or two hours. The offensive of the employers was rightly regarded by the whole of the working class as the first serious thrust of the employers' general offensive against the eight-hour day and for the further reduction of real wages. From this point of view, the struggle and even more the victory of the capitalists is of international importance. By means of wage reductions and the prolongation of the working day, the English, American and French capitalists have to a certain degree succeeded in competing against German prices in the world market. To this intensified competition German capital must answer by a reduction of prices. The cheapening of production can however only be reached by a lengthening of the hours of labor and the reduction of wages. The victory of the South German metal industry will certainly be followed up by further attacks, the more so as at the Employers' Conventions reduction of wages and abolition of the eight-hour day are quite openly demanded. For this reason, the workers of Germany will during the next month be faced with the alternative, either of certain defeat or of carrying on the struggle between capital and labor on political lines. The proletariat will lose yet more if it continues to follow its trade union leaders who cling to the policy of class coalition; it will come out of this struggle victoriously if it restores the national and international united front by the ruthless application of the class struggle. That the German workers are ready for this is the only gratifying circumstance revealed by this struggle.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Decennial Jubilee of the "Pravda"

by N. Lenin.

Ten years have elapsed since the founding of the legal *Pravda*, the Bolshevik daily, that is, legal in the sense of the Czarist laws. And before this about another decade passed; nine years (1903—1912) if we reckon from the time of the origin of Bolshevism; thirteen years (1900—1912) if we reckon from the time of the founding of the old *Iskra* (the Spark) which was completely Bolshevik in tendency.

The tenth anniversary of the Bolshevik daily paper published in Russia! Only ten years have elapsed since its establishment! But from the point of view of the content of the struggle and the movement these years are as a century. The rapidity of social development in the last five years is absolutely supernatural if one measures according to old standards, according to the standard of European Philistines, of the tribe of the heroes of the Second and 2½ Internationals, these civilized Philistines who consider it "natural" that hundreds of millions of people (to speak more correctly more than a billion) in the colonies and dependencies and in the very poor countries should be treated as animals, that they should be compelled to suffer enormous exploitation and literal pillage, hunger, famine and degradation, that they should have to suffer all this in order that "civilized" people can decide in a "free", "democratic" and "parliamentary" manner the question whether the spoils should be peacefully divided or whether ten to twenty millions of people should be massacred over the question of the imperialist spoils — today in the war between Germany and England, tomorrow in the war between Japan and America (in which France and England would participate in some way or other).

The fundamental reason for this enormous acceleration of the world's development lies in the fact that fresh hundreds of millions of people have been drawn into it. The old bourgeois imperialist Europe, which used to consider itself as the central point of the earth, festered and broke out like a stinking abscess in the first imperialist butchery. May the Spenglers and all the educated petty bourgeois who are able to admire it (or at all

occupy themselves with it) weep as they will. The decay of old Europe was not a mere episode in the history of the downfall of the world bourgeoisie which had overgorged itself with imperialist plunder and the suppression of the majority of the earth's population.

This majority has now awakened and has commenced a movement which not even the strongest and mightiest can stay. How should they do it? The actual "victors" in the first imperialist massacre are not even capable of vanquishing tiny little Ireland, are not even able to deal with the muddle prevailing in their mutual relations with regard to finance and currency questions. China and India are in a ferment. These represent over 700 million people. Together with the population of the adjoining Asiatic countries which are entirely similar to them, they represent the majority of the earth's population. Thus the year 1905 approaches inevitably and ever more rapidly, with the essential and enormous difference that the revolution in Russia in the year 1905 (at least at the beginning) was isolated, that is to say, no other countries were drawn into the revolution and it could be stranded, whilst the revolution developing in India and China is already an integral part of the revolutionary struggle, the revolutionary movement of the international revolution.

The decennial jubilee of the legal Bolshevik daily, the *Pravda*, stands out as a milestone on the road of the great acceleration of the greatest world revolution. In 1906—1907, Czarism had apparently crushed the revolution. Some years after, the Bolshevik party was able to gain entrance into the fortress of the enemy by other ways and means and daily undermined the damnable Czarism and landlord absolutism from within. Some years passed and the proletariat revolution organized by the Bolsheviks was victorious.

In the foundation of the old *Iskra* in 1900 about ten revolutionaries took part, in the birth of Bolshevism at the illegal congresses in Brussels and London in 1903 about 40 revolutionaries took part. When in 1912—1913 the legal Bolshevik paper, the *Pravda*, appeared it had a hundred thousand workers behind it, who with their penny collections vanquished the oppression of Czarism and the competition of the petty-bourgeois traitors to socialism, the Mensheviks.

At the elections to the Constituent Assembly in November 1917 9,000,000 out of a total of 36,000,000 voted for the Bolsheviks. In reality however it was not at the elections but in battle with the Bolsheviks, at the end of October and November 1917, obtained the majority of the proletariat and the active peasantry, represented by the majority of the delegates of the Second All-Russian Soviet Congress, by the majority of the most active and most progressive portion of the working people, that is of the Army, at that time 12,000,000 strong.

This is a brief account in figures of the "acceleration" of the world revolutionary movement of the last twenty years; a very small, a very incomplete account, which shows roughly the history of 150 million people, although in these years the revolution has begun in countries with a total population of one billion and more and has become an irresistible force. (The whole of Asia and South Africa whose populations recently called attention to their determination to be men and not slaves in a perfectly "unparliamentary" way).

And should some "Spenglerists" conclude from this (there is no stupidity of which the "overclever" leaders of the Second and 2½ Internationals are not capable) that the proletariat of Europe and America do not consider these movements as revolutionary forces, we must answer, "The above-mentioned" "overclever" leaders always think in this way as if the fact that a birth takes place nine months after conception enables them to foretell the exact hour and minute of birth, the condition of the child at birth, the condition of the mother and the exact degree of pain and danger which the child and the mother will have to suffer.

The "overclever" people! They understand that the transition from the Chartists to the bourgeois flunkies such as Henderson, from Varlène to Renaudel, from Wilhelm Liebknecht and Bebel to Südekum, Scheidemann and Noske, etc., is the standpoint of the development of the international revolution analogous to the "transition" of a motor car from a journey over a smooth road hundreds of miles in length to the passage over a small dirty stinking puddle on the same track, a puddle but a few feet wide.

History is made by man. The Chartists, the Varlènes and the Liebknechts make history with their heads and their hearts. The leaders of the Second and 2½ Internationals use a quite different portion of their anatomy; they serve as manure for the soil for the new Chartists, the new Varlènes and the new Liebknechts.

For the revolutionaries self-deception would during the present very difficult period be most dangerous. Although Bolshe-

vism has become an international force, although new Chartists, new Varlènes new Liebknechts that is to say, legal Communist Parties (as legal as our *Pravda* was legal for ten years under Czarism) have arisen in all civilized and progressive countries, none the less the international bourgeoisie is still incomparably stronger than its class opponents. None the less, this bourgeoisie, which did its utmost to make the birth difficult, to increase tenfold the dangers and the birth pangs of the proletarian power in Russia, is still in a position to sentence millions of people to torture and death by White Guards and imperialist wars. We must never lose sight of that. We must skilfully adapt our tactics to the peculiarities of the present situation. The bourgeoisie can still torment, maltreat and kill! But it is incapable of stopping the complete victory of the proletariat, which from the point of view of world history must rapidly be drawing near.

Two Manifestoes

The Communist Party of Mexico to the Workers and Peasants of Guatemala.

Comrades!

You have overthrown the Cabrera Government whose tyranny was limitless. Power fell into the hands of the petty bourgeoisie, whose head, Herrera, sought to convince you of the victory of the "principles of liberty". But what was the aim of the petty bourgeoisie and how did it realize the principles of liberty? It was the extension of the capitalistic freedom to industrialize your country and to transform the land-slaves of yesterday into the wage-slaves of today. Or did the Herrera Government perchance bring you any other liberties? Did perhaps the slave-whip fall less cruelly upon the wounded backs of your wage-slaves? Did perhaps the persecution of those of you who openly announced their revolutionary ideas, become less intense? No, Comrades!

But in spite of all this, the petty bourgeoisie could not hold its positions. The counter-revolution came and Herrera fell, just as Cabrera did.

The generals, the worst element in our Central American republics, hirelings of the economic and political lust for grab of American imperialism, began a new bloody comedy and helped their friend Orellana to the presidency.

Orellana claims to possess the absolute and "upright" sympathy of the United States. We of the Latin-American countries know only too well what this "upright sympathy" means. It signifies victory for those who most unscrupulously betray the interests of their own country to North American capital. Orellana is victorious and numerous American industrialists are already paying your country a visit.

But what does your overthrown petty bourgeoisie do in the meantime? It seeks friends and "upright sympathy" for itself.

Comrades! The present Mexican Government conducted by Obregon is ready to give it this assistance. The new Mexican bourgeoisie has learned from the Wall Street model. Why should not the growing high finance of Mexico possess a policy of conquest of its own? If the United States can acquire an economic and political guardianship over Mexico, why should not Mexico do likewise in Guatemala?

Ammunition, weapons and generals are being sent to your borders. A new revolution is to be enacted. Your petty bourgeoisie once more begins to talk of its "principles of liberty". They seek to provoke you into a new civil war, for the purpose of increasing the profits of individual financial groups.

Comrades, do not permit yourselves to be deceived by "Democratic", "Liberal" and "Socialist" promises. We, your Mexican brothers, who have been convinced by decades of bitter experiences that the liberation of the proletariat can be accomplished solely through the power of the workers and peasants themselves, warn you of the impending event.

Take the arms that are offered you, but take them to fight for our own interests. Take them to overthrow the generals; take them to liberate yourselves from the rule of the landowners; reserve your bullets for this work!

The Mexican proletariat will fraternally support you in this. Our workers and peasants will rise against the imperialistic attempts of the "Socialist" Government of Obregon.

Brothers of Guatemala! Workers and peasants of Latin America! We call you to the mobilization of the revolutionary masses of all American countries!

Long live the united front of the American proletariat!
Long live the Communist International!
Long live the World Revolution!

Mexico, March 1922.

The Communists of Guatemala to the Communist Party of Mexico

Comrades,

We and the whole revolutionary proletariat of Guatemala thank you for your brotherly words.

You have pointed out the aims and intentions of our exploiting classes with great clearness. We are again called upon to shed our blood for the avaricious interests of individual cliques. The revolutionary cloak used by these men is to serve the purpose of deceiving the workers and peasants.

The Cabrera Government brought us nothing but clubbings, ruthless exploitation, barracks in which all of us were treated like beasts, and prisons in which our comrades were eaten up by vermin.

And what did the bourgeois Government of Herrera bring us? The deception of all our hopes; the bloody scorn of a party for which we had died on the fields and in the streets of Guatemala.

And then after the victory of this party, when the proletariat made its just demands, it was answered with machine-guns. When we protested against the extradition of Mexican fugitives who sought asylum in our country, our leaders were thrown into prison. We then organized, and the peasants and workers of Guatemala united to fight for the Communist ideals. Our organizations were persecuted; our wives and children were killed in the streets of the capital, and many workers were shot down. Comrades, we have suffered bitter defeats, but our enemies have not succeeded in crippling us. Herrera was overthrown.

Today Orellana tells us that his Government is a "liberal administration", and his program contains many beautiful and good promises for the working people. But what is actually taking place? Revolutionary workers are continually persecuted. In the country, the government troops are shooting the rebellious peasants like dogs. Our leaders have not yet been freed from prison. Nothing has changed.

Comrades!

As long as the unfortunate agrarian worker of Central and South America is subjected by a double yoke,—by a national, cynical bourgeoisie on the one side, and by the unscrupulous foreign exploiters on the other,—we must unite more closely and fight together in order to throw off our leeches with our united strength! Only then will we be able to build up the land of freedom, the land of the workers.

Long live the united front of the American proletariat!

Long live the Communist Party of Mexico!

Long live the Communist International!

Guatemala, April 1922.

Session of the Enlarged Executive on June 7th.

(by Radio.)

The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Comintern has decided to convoke a session of the Enlarged Executive including the delegations recently arrived from France, Italy, Czecho-Slovakia, Germany and other countries and various new delegates. The agenda is as follows:—

- 1.— The Conferences in Genoa and Berlin.
- 2.— The French Communist Party.
- 3.— The Italian Communist Party.
- 4.— The Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party.
- 5.— The German Communist Party.
- 6.— The Norwegian Communist Party.
- 7.— Our relations to the Syndicalists.
- 8.— The convocation of the Fourth World Congress.

The first session of the Enlarged Executive takes place on June 7th in the Kremlin.

Secretariat of the E. C. of the C. I.

To the Recipients of the Inprekorr.

We request all recipients of the "International Press Correspondence" immediately to inform us of all changes of address, in order that the Inprekorr not be sent to non-existent addresses. In view of the great expense involved in the publication of the Inprekorr we must economize where ever possible. We ask our readers to assist us in this connection by complying with the above request.

The Managing Editor.

Printed by Friedrichstadt-Druckerei G. m. b. H., Berlin SW. 48