

INTERNATIONAL

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2 No. 89

17th Oct. 1922

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

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
The Turkish Victory. By <i>M. N. Roy</i>	671	In the International	
Politics		The Crisis in the French Party. By <i>A. Treint</i>	676
Bulgaria and the Balkans. By <i>C. Kabaktchieff</i>	672	In the R.I.L.U.	
The Labor Movement		The Anarcho-Reformist Front. By <i>A. Lozovsky</i>	677
The Union Congress at Essen. By <i>Fritz Heckert</i>	673	The Cooperative Movement	
The British Trade Union Congress at Southport. By <i>George Hardy</i>	674	The International Conference of Communist Cooperators. By <i>G. Kramaroff</i>	677
		In Soviet Russia	
		The Recovery of Lenin. By <i>G. Zinoviev</i>	678

The Turkish Victory

By *M. N. Roy*.

The dream of a Greater Greece is shattered. King Constantine has again graciously abdicated "according to the wishes of his loyal subjects and for the benefit of Greece which he so dearly loves".

Venizelos has not yet publicly assumed the reins in his hands, but is pulling the strings from behind the scene. He is keeping the Foreign Offices on both sides of the English Channel on the run by his frequent visits, each time with new and mysterious proposals. The astute Cretan will not undertake the task of saving Greece unless he is sure of having the military backing which is indispensable for keeping alive the dreams of a Greater Greece. If he did not return to Athens on the morrow of the second downfall of his arch-enemy Tino, it was because he was not able to bring back with him an unconditional promise of support from Downing Street.

The victory of the Turkish Army was so sweeping that the British Government had to think twice before commissioning Venizelos to head the "great and determined fight of the Greek people" to keep the barbarous Turks out of Europe. It would imply military eventualities of a very serious nature, which British Imperialism could not risk without a certain amount of misgiving. But unlike his royal opponent, Venizelos is fortunate in having friends in both camps. He is the protégé of the Quai d'Orsay and equally in the confidence of the Lloyd George-Churchill clique, through the medium of Sir Basil Zaharoff. So he can play the game from a more advantageous position than Constantine, who suffers under French antipathy.

In order that French support should not be entirely thrown against Greek Imperialism, Constantine had to vacate his throne. A "Greater" Greece under the Royal Colors could count only upon British backing, whereas a Greater Greece under Venizelos could count upon the two rivals across the Channel. Venizelos is playing this game, and the Joint Allied Note of September 23, indicates at least the partial success of his diplomacy. The rivalry between French finance and British finance seems to have grown less bitter, in view of the spectre of Soviet Russia looming behind Turkey. The unseen power behind the Kemalists army appears to have struck terror into the heart of French capital, which desired to monopolize the Near East by assuming the role of the protector of Nationalist Turkey. The vision of Soviet Russia entrenched at Constantinople instead of England is not a very agreeable prospect for France. Hence the latter's hesitating attitude; hence the sudden trip of M. Franklin

Bouillon to Angora, in order to intimate to Kemal just how far the French Government would go with him.

The Greek forces were totally demoralized; British troops on the Asiatic coast of the Bosphorus were entirely inadequate to resist the Turkish advance; the road to Constantinople was practically open before the Angora army. Yet Mustapha Kemal: had to call a general halt and declare his willingness to negotiate with his opponents. He is enough of a general to know that from the military point of view this policy was suicidal because it gave the enemy time to mobilize his forces. What could have been done two weeks ago has become a positive impossibility today. Kemalists forces are no longer in a position to assault the Straits and take Constantinople. Why did the Turkish command permit such a thing to happen? Why did they let the fruits of victory slip through their fingers?

The answer is very simple for those who know that the pawns of this Near Eastern game are being pushed by mysterious hands in London and Paris. In so far as Kemal depended on the revolutionary social force of the Turkish peasantry on the threshold of liberation, he marched on from one victory to the other; but like a military dictator devoid of any revolutionary inspiration or outlook, he hitched himself to the yoke of French Imperialism intriguing against British Imperialism. Thus the victory won with the blood and suffering of the Turkish peasantry, threatens to be practically nullified, and the rivalry of two imperialist groups, upon which rivalry Kemal counted more than upon the revolutionary might of the Turkish peasantry, will be neutralized in order that the position of imperialism as a world factor may be preserved. This is the real meaning of the frequent exchange of notes, the occasional threats which, however, do not exceed the limits of mere threats, the conferences, secret and open, in which the spectacular Turkish victory and no less spectacular Greek collapse have ended.

Whatever may be the final outcome of this conflict in the Near East, the political as well as moral effect in the Oriental countries as far as India has been great. Caught in the meshes of imperialist rivalry, Kemal may still be forced to abandon his dominant position which has already become militarily untenable, unless he has the boldness to cut loose altogether from the moorings of Western European diplomacy, whose friendship and backing are determined by the convenience of bankers and financial magnates.

But the very fact that the Greater Greece created under the benediction of the victorious Entente and unconditionally backed by London has become a thing of the past, that not only entire Asia Minor, but a part of Thrace also, will be Turkish, and that an Oriental nation has vindicated its ability to challenge successfully the right of European Imperialism to condemn it to perpetual slavery, are in themselves a great inspiration to all the subject peoples. For example, it can reasonably be expected that this experience will convince the Indian Moslems of the futility of the way in which they have so far been endeavouring to help the maintenance of the Khilafat. The ability of the Turks to force the Entente to repudiate one section of the Treaty sanctioned by the League of Nations, will undoubtedly encourage the Arabs of Iraq to rebel against the mandatory dictatorship of Sir Percy Cox. British influence in Persia is already a thing of the past. Egypt is in a state of chronic revolt in spite of the betrayal of the upper-class politicians. This revolt, which was somewhat demoralized in consequence of the brutal repression and bankruptcy of bourgeois nationalism, is again showing signs of vigour. Such in general is the moral effect of the Turkish victory. But there are deeper consequences to be expected, consequences which will signify a radical change in the outlook of revolutionary nationalist elements in the Eastern countries, and which may even transform the very social character of the revolt of the oppressed peoples.

It is known that Nationalist Turkey has been backed by Soviet Russia and France, while Britain stood behind Greece. The attitude of France in practically repudiating the Sèvres Treaty in the face of British opposition, created a very favorable impression upon the bourgeoisie in the Eastern countries. Thus the old idea of securing the friendship of democratic nations as against the oppression of arch-imperialist governments, an idea which was very much shaken by the experience of the World War, began to revive. The sinister effects of this idea are well-known. It paves the way for the penetration of a new Imperialism attempting to take the place of the existing one. Turkey has been torn asunder by this imperialist rivalry, fostered by her own diplomats and military cliques who ended by sacrificing the people on the altar of imperialist greed, in the hope of aggrandizing their own position. The effect of these criminal politics was the dismemberment of Turkey as a nation, and the popular revolt against this threatened dismemberment gave rise to the present Nationalist movement.

When the newborn Nationalist Government at Angora was opposed by all the Entente powers, which threatened to annihilate it, the only helping hand came from Revolutionary Russia. But before long France found in Turkey a means to attack her rival Britain. French evacuation of the mandated territories made a big impression, but the real deal underlying the Angora Agreement signed by Franklin Bouillon remained unknown to the common folk. Die Turkish intellectuals and militarists, until the latter found it more profitable to join hands with their Prussian peers, were all Francophile. The traditional anti-Turk policy of the mercantile interest behind British Liberalism, permitted the entrance of French finance into Turkey. No less than 70 per cent of the Ottoman debt is held by French Banks. A recovery of this enormous amount was not a very unfavorable bargain made by France, in return for the mandated territories, to hold which entailed a heavy drain on the French Budget suffering chronically from a large uncoverable deficit. Then the great railway and mining concessions were a very good beginning for reducing entire Turkey to the dictatorship of French finance capital.

So the Franco-Turkish Agreement sounded the death knell of the Sèvres Treaty, in so far as the other victorious signatories were concerned, but opened the era which would appropriate the whole victory to France. The Angora Government accepted this none too altruistic friendship of Paris, first as a military necessity, then as a diplomatic move to terrorize England, but essentially to find a counterpoise to the Russian rapprochement, the revolutionary consequences of which were dreaded by the Turkish ruling class. The latter was afraid that to lead the peasantry, which constitutes the backbone of the Nationalist revolution, with the help of the Workers' and Peasants' Government, and to cling in home politics to the theory of upper-class domination could not be compatible for any length of time. This dread naturally created a distrust which was seized upon by the French.

But the present crisis has clarified the situation. The shallowness of French friendship has been revealed. The Turkish leaders must be very thick-headed if they have not yet realized the real role their French patrons want them to play. They must be a pawn in the game played by the two imperialist governments situated on both sides of the English Channel. As soon as England gives in to the demands of French militarism in Europe and for a considerable share in the economic exploitation of the whole world, the bitterness of the rivalry between the two imperialist

powers becomes less acute. Consequently the Turks are ordered to halt, thus abandoning the chances of a sure victory. This was exactly the message that Franklin Bouillon carried to Kemal and induced him to deliver to the National Assembly at Angora, which was bullied into declaring in favor of negotiation when military victory was sure. Had this message been ignored, had the Turks been audacious enough to act contrary to the dictates of their friends from Paris, they would have had to face the united opposition of the Entente which in European politics has been dead and buried so many times.

The revolutionary element among the oppressed Eastern people is sure to learn a great lesson from this event. They are going to learn to their great advantage that Imperialism is not limited within the borders of this or that nation, that no one particular nation is instinctively imperialistic and that Imperialism is an economic phenomenon of international magnitude.

The declaration of America that she will stand with the Allies for the defence of the Straits and will take up the holy mission of protecting the Christian minorities from the terrible Turks completes the picture. There is rivalry between the various imperialist powers concerning the division of the plunder, but in the question of plundering they all stand together. Because, for example, an unconditional French support to the Turkish Nationalist cause would be a challenge to the rights of Imperialism, which is the bed-rock of French as much as of British politics. The Eastern peoples will learn from these bitter lessons and disillusionments that their national freedom cannot be looked upon favorably by any particular member of the robber gang. It is only the European working class, whose vanguard has kept the banner of revolution flying in the face of concerted imperialist opposition, that can be a true friend of the freedom of the oppressed peoples, because the welfare of both is dependent upon the destruction of Imperialism.

The upper class-leaders of Nationalism do not challenge Imperialism as such. Their opposition is against one or the other; therefore they inevitably act as the instruments in the hands of one or the other camp of imperialist diplomacy.

The Turkish victory can be completed only when the Turkish people will force their leaders to understand the necessity of giving up dallying with the intriguing imperialist diplomats and of boldly relying on the friendship of Revolutionary Russia.

The same applies to the rest of the Eastern peoples, who will learn much from the Turkish experience.

POLITICS

Bulgaria and the Balkans.

By Christo Kabaktchieff.

We already communicated with regard to the *coup d'état* in Bulgaria by the bloc of the bourgeois parties in alliance with the Wrangel generals and their troops. This *coup d'état* had for its object the overthrow of the present agrarian government and the placing of power in the hands of the old bourgeois parties in order to annihilate the Communist Party.

In order to prop up its domination which was unsettled by the war, the Bulgarian bourgeoisie entrusted power into the hands of the "left" parties, the Socialists, radicals and agrarians. The first two of these parties have long since been discredited and dismissed from power. Today, the Agrarian Party, which represents, the village bourgeoisie grown rich through the war is in the saddle.

This party still drags in its train hundreds of thousands of small and even propertyless peasants. After the city bourgeoisie and its parties had recovered their courage, they began to organize their forces, and today they wish to seize power again and to govern independently. They are discontented with the agrarian government, not only because it represents the interests of the village bourgeoisie, but in particular because it was unable to suppress the growing influence and power of the Communist Party, which in Bulgaria constitutes the actual and immediate danger for the bourgeoisie.

The first attempt of the bourgeois bloc at a *coup d'état* was frustrated by the mass-struggle of the workers and small and propertyless peasants organized by the Communist Party. Notwithstanding this, the agrarian government did not possess the courage to expel the Wrangel generals from the country, nor to disarm the Wrangel and white guardist troops, nor the various officers' and other organizations of the bourgeoisie.

Emboldened by these timorous and half-hearted measures of the agrarian government, the bourgeois bloc undertook a new campaign for the attainment of power,—this time in the form of political demonstrations for the upholding of the "Constitution", which were to have their commencement on the 17th of

September in Tirnovo and were to be repeated in the course of October in Plovdiv and Sofia. The bloc of the old bourgeois parties which had been discredited during the war was unable however, to stir up the masses, and on the 17th of September it led to Tirnovo some thousands of reserve officers, bourgeois youth and other instruments in the pay of the bourgeoisie.

The agrarian government made use of this circumstance, and by the use of the police and various other paid bands, but mainly by taking advantage of the great bitterness of the village masses against the bloc parties, it delivered a severe blow to the bloc.

On the way to Tirnovo (a town in the centre of the country) the followers of the bloc were beaten and thrown out of the railway trains, the staff of the bloc, the former ministers were mishandled and narrowly escaped being lynched.

The agrarian government arranged a meeting (a sort of conference) in Tirnovo on the 17th of September, which decided that all ministers who conducted the wars of 1912-13 and 1918 should be brought up for trial. (It must be explained that the ministers who conducted the war of 1915 and 1918 have already had to stand before a national court of law which has been carrying on its proceedings for six months in Sofia.) The government arrested all these ministers—leaders of the bloc—and submitted a bill to Parliament by which the people will be consulted over the proceedings against these ministers.

The Communist Party throughout the whole country, is engaged in a relentless struggle against the bloc. Recently the bloody collisions between the bloc and the party have increased. There were such collisions in Dubnitsa, Gabrovo, Trevna and other places in which there were wounded and even killed on both sides. The party effectively repelled all these assaults. It took no part in the events of the 17th September. The party, however, had mobilized all its forces and was ready to throw itself decidedly against the bloc in the event of greater struggles, and if the supporters of the bloc had not already been defeated before their arrival in Tirnovo.

The Communist Party fights independently against the bloc which constitutes the bourgeois reaction and counter-revolution in Bulgaria. With this it does not cease to expose the timidity and the half-heartedness of the party of small land owners and to fight against the agrarian government which remains a government of the village bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party possesses a powerful influence over the small and propertyless peasant masses, which the agrarian party drags after it; it endeavours on the one hand to draw these masses from the influence of the agrarian party and to enrol them under its own banner, and on the other hand to push over to the left wing these small and propertyless village masses who still continue to follow the agrarian party. These leaders of the agrarian party and their government have been untrue to their promises and are losing the confidence of their adherents. While the Communist Party works in this manner it gathers round itself ever greater masses of the towns and villages and places before the agrarian party and its leaders the alternative: either to go towards the left, to accept the people's judgment upon the leaders of the bloc as demanded by the Communists, to disarm the Wrangel followers and the bourgeois white-guard organizations, restrict profits, and so on, or they, the agrarian party and its leaders, will entirely lose their influence over the village masses, which masses will in their entirety go over to the camp of the Communist Party.

On the 17th of September the bourgeois bloc was defeated. It has abandoned the carrying on of any further political demonstrations for the upholding of the "Constitution". Its officers' leagues and other armed organizations continue to carry on their conspiratory preparations. The situation of the country remains critical. The Communist Party is organizing mass meetings and demonstrations throughout the country in which thousands of workers and peasants take part (such meetings have already been held in Varna, Shumen, Vratza, Gorna-Dechumaya, and so on). At these meetings the demands of the Communist Party are put forward, such as: repudiation of the Peace Treaty and the reparations; higher wages for the workers and the state employees; confiscation of the stores of provisions as a first necessity and their division by the municipality under the control of the workers' and peasants' organizations; disarming of the bourgeoisie and arming of the workers and propertyless peasants; peace and alliance with Soviet Russia.

In this manner the Communist Party prepares itself for the ever more imminent unchaining of civil war.

The defeat of Greece renders the situation in the Balkans more acute. The defeat is a defeat of the Greek national bourgeoisie; it is at the same time, however, a defeat of the policy of national conquest of the whole of the Balkan bourgeoisie.

The Greek government attempted to retain the homecoming troops on the Islands of the Aegean and Mediterranean

seas in order to escape their rage and revenge. The troops, however, deserted the islands, occupied Salonika and Athens, dethroned Constantine, demanded the expulsion of the dynasty and the proclamation of a republic.

The national bourgeoisie again attempted to deceive the masses and the mutinous troops and to place at the head of the revolt the old criminal, the chief culprit in the national catastrophe, Venizelos.

The revolutionary wave is rising in Greece and is giving a powerful impulse to the Communist Party of Greece and is giving a powerful impulse to the Communist Party of Greece, which is the only party not covered with the blood which has been so freely shed in Asia Minor, which has fought the war throughout, and whose leaders have been thrown into prison.

The defeat of bourgeois Greece and of imperialist England in the Near East effected a great change in the whole situation in the Balkans.

The Turkish army is approaching the Balkans. Turkey is becoming our neighboring state. The Entente is losing important positions in the Balkans. Greece, the hired tool of England, is also beaten.

The prospects of the revolutionary movement in the Balkans are bright. It is true that the Entente will make fresh attempts to make use of its vassals in the Balkans—the governments in Belgrade, Sofia and Bucharest—in order to fling them against Turkey. Notwithstanding, there exist the antagonisms between France and England on the one side, between Italy and Greece on the other, and then, the differences between Bulgaria and the Balkan states. All these constitute a hindrance to their warlike intentions.

If, however, the Balkan governments determine to embark upon such an insane adventure, they will not succeed in dragging the Balkan peoples along with them, to shed their blood for the imperialist aims of the European and Balkan bourgeoisie. Such a war will certainly be the beginning of great revolutionary movements in the Balkans, which will be directed towards accomplishment of the great object for which the Communist parties of the Balkans fight—the overthrow of the capitalist regime and the setting up of the Socialist Federative Soviet Republic of the Balkans.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Union Congress at Essen

By Fritz Heckert (Berlin).

The *Union of Hand and Brain Workers of Germany* convened its 2nd congress at Essen from the 1st to 5th October, in order to consider the work accomplished in the past year, and to define its attitude to the tasks which as a revolutionary workers' movement are to be fulfilled by it in the coming months.

The congress was an exceedingly instructive one, for it showed that the workers of this organization have learnt much since their first congress in Halle in the year 1921, and that they are minded to draw the necessary conclusions from these lessons. At the first congress of the R.I.L.U. the representatives of the unions now united in the *Union of Hand and Brain Workers* adopted a position which was sharply in opposition to the principles and the tactics of the R.I.L.U.

The first congress of the R.I.L.U. was thus compelled to submit some questions to the members of the *Union* at their congress in Halle to which clear, unequivocal replies were demanded. The *Union* had to decide whether it would work on the basis of the decisions reached at the first world congress of the R.I.L.U. in Moscow in order thereby to become affiliated to the R.I.L.U., or to reject the principles and decisions of the first world congress and place itself outside this world union of the revolutionary proletariat.

The Halle congress disavowed the attitude of the *Union's* delegates at the Moscow congress and declared in favor of affiliation to the R.I.L.U. The resolution however, in which this declaration was embodied did not signify unconditional acceptance of the conditions, but was in its content a concession to the syndicalist and federalist tendencies prevalent in the *Union*. The ambiguous character of the resolution rendered it possible for a number of members of the *Union*, in the course of the following months to undertake to correct the decisions of the first world congress and to aver again and again that the principles and tactics of the R.I.L.U. did not correspond to the experiences and necessities of the class struggle; that a correction of the decisions of the first world congress in the direction of the opinions represented by the *Union* delegates at this congress, must be undertaken at the 2nd world congress, otherwise the *Union* would have no interest in membership of the R.I.L.U.

This attitude of a number of comrades in the *Union* led to continuous differences with the comrades of the German trade

union opposition, and instead of close cooperation between the Union and the latter there were often lively disputes injurious to their common aims.

The second congress of the Union at Essen, therefore had to test whether the majority of the members would call for a re-examination of the decisions reached in Halle, or whether, from the experiences won in practical struggle, they had drawn the knowledge to set aside the deficiencies of the organization, and to make out of the union a trade union, which, standing entirely on the basis of the R.I.L.U., shall strive firmly and steadfastly side by side with the trade union opposition for the common objective. The congress has made this thing clear and it can be joyfully recorded that the result of the congress means an essential step forward compared with the previous conditions in the Union.

The chief differences still alive in the Union were: 1. The attitude towards the individual struggles of trade unions. 2. The question whether the union shall be a universal organization embracing workers of all categories and conducting not only the economic, but also the political struggle. 3. In what relation the Union shall stand to the reformist unions and their actions. 4. The question of the structure of the organization, the nature of the contributions and of the fighting fund of the Union. 5. The relation of the Union to the opposition within the old trade unions.

In order that these questions should not be passed over, the Executive Committee of the R.I.L.U. wrote a letter to the congress of the Union of Hand and Brain Workers, in which it dealt exhaustively with these disputed questions and required from the congress that it should plainly and clearly define its attitude upon these points.

Many an old unionist disliked the idea that it should so formulate its opinions that they could be taken as a clear avowal either for or against the principles of the R.I.L.U. The spirit, however, which dominated the overwhelming majority of the congress delegates was, under all circumstances to create clarity, and under no circumstances to break connections with the R.I.L.U. They desired nothing more eagerly than the consolidation of the organization and the setting up of good relations for united activity with the trade union opposition. It was therefore easy to submit all problems to the congress and to formulate clear answers to these questions. The representative of the Communist Party, whose remarks were followed with the greatest attention, was therefore able to expound to the congress what deficiencies were to be noted in the tactics of the Union and in the structure of the organization, in what way these were to be removed, the Union itself rendered more fit for the struggle, and friendly and comradely relations established with the trade union opposition.

On the first item of the agenda an attitude was adopted towards the trade union situation and to the tasks of the union in the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Upon these questions it was unanimously agreed that every attempt to separate the political from the economic struggle of the worker means a weakening of the working class and is counter revolutionary; that the proletariat must strive to concentrate its fight against the well-organized bourgeoisie, and that only the concentrated class power of the proletariat is capable of overcoming the bourgeoisie.

From this standpoint the Union declared that political neutrality is not permissible for a revolutionary worker, that the union should therefore support every revolutionary action and shall take active part in the struggle for the realization of all demands in the interests of the workers. The Union declared that its immediate and most pressing tasks were: the building up and extension of its organization, based upon workshop organizations according to the branch of industry and economic area; increased struggle against indifference; the publication of clearly written revolutionary trade union literature; the formation of a strong fighting fund; support of the revolutionary opposition in the Amsterdam unions; struggle against the policy of cooperation with the employers; increasing of real wages; defence of the eight hour day; extension of the rights of the workshop councils; struggle against high prices, and for the control of production, etc.

Another resolution determined the relationship between the party and the union, and a sharp distinction was made against the syndicalist and anarchist elements. This resolution declares: that the proletarian class struggle has an international character and that international action can only be carried out provided there is international discipline. Autonomy of individual organizations or countries within an international, means the bankruptcy of every workers' movement; this is proved by the yellow Amsterdam international. In a revolutionary trade union organization the struggle must be conducted without regard to the interests of the capitalists. It can only be carried out successfully in connection with the revolutionary political organization of the proletariat. The conquest of political power, i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat, is the prerequisite for

the final victory of the proletariat in the fight for its emancipation from economic slavery.

The Union recognized that the Communist Party points out the aim in this struggle and that it must take the lead in the whole struggle for the achievement of this aim. It therefore becomes necessary to establish close contact between the revolutionary trade unions and the Communist Party.

The Union expressly declares it to be its duty as a member of the Red International of Labor Unions, 1. to subordinate itself to international discipline, 2. to carry out the congress decisions of the R.I.L.U. and 3. to proceed unitedly in all actions with the revolutionary organizations as well as with the Communist Party.

In order to render possible and to facilitate this common action, the union proposes the formation of Revolutionary Workers' Committees of all revolutionary proletarian organizations throughout the country. The purpose of these revolutionary committees shall be to take a stand on all economic and political questions which interest the proletariat, and to establish close contact between these organizations.

An attempt is made in the newly drawn-up statute to create an organizational basis corresponding to the decisions of the congress relating to principles and tactics which will facilitate the fulfilment of the tasks laid down. In future the Union will organize the workers affiliated to it into industrial groups according to the principle of *one industry, one union*. The industrial groups retain the right of independent management, conducting of wage struggles, conclusion of collective agreements and establishing of international connections.

In order to simplify the managing apparatus, a unified system of contributions will be introduced for industrial groups. In order to conduct struggles unitedly and energetically a central fighting fund will be created.

It must be noted that the overwhelming majority of the congress recognized that the future tasks of the organization can only be fulfilled provided the members make greater financial sacrifices. The minimum weekly contribution was therefore fixed at the amount of half an hour's wages.

At the conclusion of the congress, the chairman summarized the results of the congress and said among other things:

"We recognize the decisions of the R.I.L.U. upon the tactics of revolutionizing the trade unions as binding for us. We shall offer the most determined struggle against all reformist and anarcho-syndicalist tendencies. We will support the revolutionary opposition in the reformist trade unions in their hard struggle with all our power, and shall establish fraternal relationships with them."

All the decisions of the congress were essentially influenced by the intensive work of the representative of the Red International of Labor Unions which was gratefully welcomed by the delegates. Through its assistance in clearing up many questions of the proletarian class struggle and by its assistance in the improvement of the management of the organization the Red International of Labor Unions has shown itself as an organization adequate for the international revolutionary tasks.

In six days of strenuous labor an enormous amount of work was accomplished and it can be recorded with joy that the delegates present at the congress fulfilled the duties entrusted to them with close attention and admirable devotion. This cannot be said of most of the trade union conferences which have taken place this year in Germany.

The results of the congress are a great advance compared with the results of the congress at Halle. The experience of the 12 months which separate the two congresses have shown to the Union that many old views must, in the interest of the revolutionary movement, be thrown overboard, and that it is necessary to root out relentlessly all failings in the organization.

The congress at Essen has rendered the Union capable of carrying out the greater tasks of the coming months.

The British Trade Union Congress at Southport

By George Hardy.

The adjournment of the British Trade Union Congress has brought no new concrete forms in the struggle of the workers against the onslaughts of capital. The 800 delegates representing 5,127,308 members, revealed a drop of 1,289,202 in British trade unions. But probably the drop can be partially attributed to the apathy of workers afflicted with long spells of unemployment. The president, in his opening speech, pictured "darkest England", when he pointed to the misery of 1,500,000 registered, and the large number of unregistered unemployed.

The General Council was instructed to demand the revision of the Treaty of Versailles and immediate resumption of trade with Soviet Russia. Adequate maintenance in "reasonable comfort" is a feature of their demands, which they state should be a national charge. Organizing schemes to give employment was another phase; although all progressives realized that no work can be had unless trade is reopened with Russia on a large scale. The struggle between the old and new unionism, came to the fore, in the debates upon the extension of powers to the General Council, which was created at the last congress as a central advisory body to the trade unions generally. They sought to have the congress sanction the right of the Council to create a defense fund for effective aid during strikes. This fund is to be raised by direct assessments.

The vital issue was: the Councils' powers were to be extended, to make it an instrument in negotiations where direct settlements failed and to enable it to call other unions to action. The fight for *centralized action* was led by Harry Pollitt of the Red International group. Frank Hodges of the Miners' Federation, was in the category of Samuel Gompers, when he argued that each union must maintain its autonomy. And he shot an arrow of distrust into British trade unionism by stating that the miners would not tell the members of the General Council that a strike was contemplated. Hodges revealed the very elements of weakness in the trade unions, when he said, "Each of the 32 members of the Council would say: I will do my best to prevent a stoppage not because of the principles of the dispute, but of the fear for the consequences to my own members".

*

Comrade Pollitt pointed out that labor is in retreat because there is no centralized disciplined movement. During the engineers' lockout he said: "There were 47 different unions with 47 different views, and this brought their defeat". He showed the necessity for industrial unionism. Those who thought he was arguing for more power for the reactionary officials were disillusioned when he pointed to the Council and remarked: "They will not always be there; Communists will fill those positions someday." In reference to Hodges he said: "It is disgusting to listen to this from men who are looked up to as leaders". The elements of progress shown in this desire for more centralized power can be attributed to the work and influence of the R.I.L.U.

Herbert Smith, President of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, and a delegate to the American Federation of Labor Convention, suffered a severe interrogation for the lack of international responsibility to the American striking miners. It was pointed out by Pollitt that enormous shipments of coal had gone to North America. The *London Times* of Sept. 9th also reports that 900,000 tons of Welsh coal arrived in U.S.A. and Canada, and 500,000 tons more contracted for.

To cover up the methods of the Amsterdammers, Smith blamed the American miners, because some workers remained at work. This is no excuse for international scabbing, remarked the delegates. Nor is the fact that Amsterdam officials allowed its affiliated bodies to blackleg the British miners an excuse for further scabbery. Yea, not even Smith's plea of poverty of the miners can justify aiding the coal barons against the 650,000 who stood out solidly for five months.

*

News of the Whitehaven Colliery disaster, where the miners once more were buried alive, never to be rescued from the masters' mines, was received during this serious session. It brought out the fact that 4 deaths and 517 wounded was the daily toll of the mining industry. A sad need for united protection of the miners is emphasized in these figures, which only a united front of the labor unions can give.

The fight between the National Sailors' and Firemen's Union, and the newly formed Amalgamated Marine Workers Union revealed the treachery of Havelock Wilson, President of the N.S.F.U. He was charged with *blackmailing the sailors* with his pernicious agreement with the Shipping Federation—the employers' union—known as P.C.5. The seamen must procure this from the officials of the N.S.F.U. and have it duly stamped by the employers. Then they must join *Havelock's Union* at a cost of £2. The President of the A.M.W.U. charged the N.S.F.U. with supplying scabs during strikes.

The revelations bore out the above. No more evidence is needed to emphasize the dire need of a real International of marine workers. To this end, the International Propaganda Committee of Transport Workers of the R.I.L.U. is working. The Red International seeks to link together the Marine Workers ashore and afloat. The transport workers of all branches must be in one solid International that will enable them to put into practice the decision of the Amsterdammers at the Rome Congress, where they declared for "no more war". We must establish the universal 8 hour day upon the sea!

The Congress declared against war, with a timidity and ambiguity that brought forth rebukes from all sides. Conscientious objectors demanded general strikes in the name of pacifism, forgetting that a *real general strike against war must lead inevitably to the class-war*. The Communists saw the ironical side; with battleships of all nations while they were debating, flying like vultures of the desert to guard their capitalists' interests in the Near East. Only the Communists understood the real situation of conflicting national interests and the remedy—the revolutionary overthrow of the system.

*

The bright spot of the congress was a protest against judicially murdering our Comrades in South Africa. Robert Smillie, the ex-president of the M.F. of G.B. and member of the General Council of the T.U.C., was a keen supporter of progressive measures. He was one of the movers of this resolution.

Although the congress did not reveal its official anti-revolutionary stand by passing a motion similar to those of the Labor Party and the Second International at Edinburgh and London respectively—by protesting against the sentences imposed upon the S.R.'s convicted of murder and of aiding the bourgeoisie in counter-revolutionary plots—nevertheless, when this resolution for our African comrades was given notice of, Will Thorne, the supporter of the recent European slaughter, and *Social Democracy*, cried out for his murderous friends and exclaimed, "what about those about to be hanged in Moscow".

The reaction against such a resolution would have brought a keen fight from the revolutionaries, which the T.U.C. officials thought best to avoid.

What about Ireland, and the massacres in India? We do not hear a voice raised against this, or against the continued imprisonment of class-war prisoners in America. Not even a question asked the American delegates in favor of the suffering hundreds in the dungeons of U.S.A.

Instead, the congress listened to a spasm from the A.F. of L. delegate in favor of the "return of light beer and wines". Much to the amusement of the congress, in true American style, this was urged as "necessary to the maintenance of *law and order*".

The report of the General Council upon its international relations showed that their attitude had not changed, and a fight to the finish is imminent in their attitude towards the Communist and the Red Internationals. Their report is the "middle of the road" policy: purely reformistic, and tempered with a subtle attack upon revolutionary principles.

Throughout, they protest against "cell" organization, although the Labor Party was built up by similar methods of penetration.

All the reports of delegates to the various political and economic gatherings bristle with attacks against those who are destined to become, by their constant agitation of revolutionary class-consciousness, the inspirers of organized mass-action, which even the president of the congress admitted was necessary. This may or may not have been an indication that the Council sought endorsement of its request for more power?

The report upon the Second International congress held in London declared for a "united proletarian *democratic* front, to defend liberty against the restoration of the Monarchy from the Right in the new Republics of Central Europe, and against the encroachment of *dictatorship from the Left*". They evidently do not see that President Ebert has become the wearer of the Kaiser's crown when he declared for the singing of *Deutschland über Alles*; and that the struggle for bread in Germany is met with a ruthless dictatorship by the *democracy* they are pledged to aid.

*

The League of Nations came in for support, but doubt is in their ranks, for the chairman said it was "not a real league". The Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions further declare that *no real league of nations can exist under capitalism*.

We call the proletariat to action against the League of Nations,—the League of Robbers. Evidence that the capitalists do not obey decisions, not when they arise out of the instruments of their own making, came forth in the resolution asking that the British Government write into the statutes of Britain the decisions of the Washington Congress.

The Labor Party's report upon the white terror in Hungary was a truthful declaration of horror practiced upon the workers. A second inquisition; the hanging, stretching and dismembering of the bodies of revolutionary workers; Communist women outraged! And the proletariat gazed in sad dismay. Many months have passed since the report was issued and now this same group of officials are opposing the Dictatorship of Labor. How do they expect us to overcome the white terror? Are not the same methods used everywhere against the workers in a greater or lesser degree?

The report upon the Rome Conference says: "By constant reference to Russia and America, it was evident that no Labor International will be complete without them." But why are the Amsterdamers declaring in one breath in favor of admitting the Russian proletariat, and for splitting the unions by expelling those who adhere to the principles fought for by the Russian workers? Why do they refuse admittance to the Russian unions by enforcing the policy of Amsterdam, which is too reactionary for acceptance.

Ever since the failure of the Triple Alliance, the workers of Great Britain have been on the retreat. Nothing was done at Southport to arrest this retreat. All action will come from the rank and file and minorities who support the Red International of Labor Unions. These minorities are holding a series of industrial conferences in all the chief industrial centers, and will prepare for the United Revolutionary Front of British Unionism to the detriment of the Clynes, Thomas, Hodges and the Goslings of the Transport Workers, who refused international solidarity to the American miners.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Crisis in the French Party

By Albert Treint.

The Agreement between the Center and the Left.

At the session of the Enlarged Executive Committee in May, the representatives of the Center of our party had agreed to solve the crisis in the French party in accordance with the views of the International.

Frossard and Cartier had undertaken to defend before the party the union of the Center and the Left against the anti-Communist tendencies and for the pursuance of an active Communist policy in harmony with the decisions of the International.

A beginning had already been made.

Frossard succeeded in reuniting the Communist fraction at the Congress of the C.G.T.U. at St. Etienne.

At the Congress of the Seine he flatly declared himself in favor of centrism.

Under most difficult conditions Frossard has made efforts that we appreciate all the more as we know how much they cost him. These efforts ended in a series of joint motions, called the Frossard-Souvarine motions which symbolize the agreement of the Center and the Left in the Communist movement.

In previous articles I have called attention to the fact that the Center, both in the Party and in the Federation, has sometimes led the battle feebly, while the Left, always more resolute and consistent, was thoroughly engaged in the struggle.

I have none the less greeted the first steps of the Center taken upon the path traced by the International, and I have always expressed the hope that these first steps, still hesitant, would be followed by others much firmer, and that the Center and the Left would finally unite to make the journey together.

The Ambiguous Declaration of the Center.

The motions Frossard-Souvarine had already sealed the agreement between the Center and the Left, when the Center issued a separate declaration on its own behalf.

The mere formulation of this declaration showed the preponderance in the Center of elements which, under cover of a formal agreement with the Left made before the Congress, wished in reality to follow separate activity in accordance with its own plan.

The contents of this declaration were even made significant. Beneath the false splendour of bombastic, but empty phrases, was discernable the faint gleam of poisonous allusions.

The motions Frossard-Souvarine were there represented as a basis for discussion at the Congress.

As shown in the press of the Center, it was a question of the personal ambition, of those who, instead of serving the Party, make use of it for their own advantage.

It is very evident that the signers of the declaration tried to place themselves above all suspicion, and said to the Party in a clever and insinuating manner: "Mark this. We are taking our stand with the Left. But it might well be that every movement of the Left serves merely as a pretext for some ambitious careerist to get a soft job."

This vague manner of discrediting the fighting comrades of the Left, this presentation of the motions proposed jointly as not at all final and definite, gives the declaration of the Center an ambiguous character that can deceive none.

The Betrayal of the Agreement Between the Center and the Left.

Paul Louis, one of the signers of the Frossard-Souvarine motions has attacked the Left on the trade union question. He declares the first project drawn up by Rosmer to be something monstrous. The efforts of the Left to reach an understanding with the Center is, according to him, a retreat of the Left, terrified at its own work.

This is the Paul Louis who, at the Congress of the Somme, had voted for the Frossard-Souvarine motions with reservations.

Similar attitudes have been taken in other Federations. And furthermore, the equivocal declaration of the Center has been approved as a motion on the general policy, while the Frossard-Souvarine motion has been discarded.

Cachin wrote an article in the *Bulletin de Presse Communiste* attacking the motions which he himself has signed, giving his arguments in favor of the Renault motion. The *Bulletin de Presse Communiste* supplies our provincial press with unpublished articles. It is sent to the editors of our newspapers and to the secretaries of the federations. Cachin's article was not reproduced in the provincial press. But it is incontestable that it has already pointed the way for the Centrist groups of the Party in the provinces.

All this increases the boldness of the Renault faction. In a statement which appeared in *Humanité* on October 5th, this group tries to persuade the entire Center, and Frossard in particular, to follow the path of Cachin and Paul Louis.

In its "Reply to the Declaration", the Left has denounced these acts. In vain will the attempt be made to say: The reply of the Left is a declaration of war against the Center.

Let me put this question.

A pact is signed. Some of the signers betray it. Who, then, declares war? Those who betray or those who denounce the betrayers?

And then, if you wish—yes, the reply of the Left is indeed a declaration of war. Not of the Left against the Center as such, but of the Left against those in the Center who, by their acts, broke the agreement between the Center and the Left.

Against those, the Left prefers to declare war openly, rather than make war in an underhand manner.

The Future.

In the light of facts, the Center appears to us to be without cohesion. It is composed of dissimilar elements.

Some of them sincerely desire to work with the Left and the International. The Left is wholly with them.

Some reunite through political expediency, but respect agreements made. The Left watches their acts.

Some in the Center are under the influence of the Renault faction. The Left will fight these energetically no matter who they are.

An agreement on the basis of equality cannot be considered with the present Center as a whole.

Such an agreement can be made only with those elements in the Center who did not betray their pact with the Left and the International.

To act otherwise in view of the new facts disclosed since the most recent deliberations of the Executive Committee, would result in establishing a party in which the struggle between different policies, far from disappearing, would be renewed more sharply than ever.

This would mean the stagnation of Communism in France for many years.

We stand at a decisive point. We are about to witness the birth of our Communist Party. Let us take care that this new-born French child of the International should be strong enough to live.

This can be realized only by the collaboration of the Left with a Center cleansed of traitors.

This view of the Left in France which I am now expressing, at a time when the situation is grave, I shall maintain before our other parties, and before the Executive Committee of the Third International.

IN THE R. I. L. U.

The Anarcho-Reformist Front.

By A. Lozovsky.

The *Union Syndicale* of Italy has adopted a resolution against the R.I.L.U. which resembles more a declaration of war. The Anarcho-Syndicalists of Italy have finally decided to leave us. In their manifesto they claim that the International which they will establish in Berlin (no one knows when), will be the only real International. In the name of this future ideal International they seek to destroy beforehand the existing Red International of Labor Unions and they bring against us in their decision the old accusations which have bored the world for a long time. They reproach us with the fact that we will not convene the congress in Western Europe, that we are permeated with the Communist spirit, that we will not adopt the Anarcho-Syndicalist outlook, etc. Nevertheless, they promise "to unite the trade union movement of the East with that of Western Europe", while they admit the Russian unions into their International. The manifesto concludes with the declaration that they will not go to Moscow to the Second Congress, and that those syndicalists who will attend the congress have nothing in common with their organization.

The idea of this long resolution is that they will not allow themselves to be lured by any bait to Moscow.

But how do they assume at all that we wish to entice them to us? We have nothing whatever against it that they string their empty phrases outside of the R.I.L.U., for in the R.I.L.U., revolutionary phrases are rated at very little.

Only try, dear sirs, to form your Anarcho-Syndicalist International; we will then, if your attempt succeed, have a word to say to you.

II.

The Czecho-Slavonian Amsterdamers have, just as the Italian Anarcho-Syndicalists, entered the lists against Moscow. In order to obliterate from the mind of the simple worker, even the thought of the R.I.L.U., the Union of Czecho-Slavonian Textile Workers has drawn up a declaration which every member of the union is obliged to sign. It is stated in this declaration that the members of the union pledge themselves to work in the spirit of the Amsterdam International, to renounce all propaganda of the ideas of the R.I.L.U., to conduct themselves becomingly and to cause no vexation to the reformist leaders. This declaration reminds us of those documents in which the workers under the compulsion of the employer, declare that they will withdraw from their union and never belong to it again. Experience teaches that such declarations constitute no guarantee for the employers, that in the heads of their workers "injurious ideas" find a place. One may still doubt whether the Czecho-Slavonian reformists will be more fortunate in this respect. They cannot terrify us with such papers.

III.

At the end of August two congresses were held in Switzerland: the congress of the reformist trade unions (300,000 members) and the congress of the syndicalist unions (35,000 members). At the head of the reformist organizations there stand virulent Amsterdamers, at the head of the syndicalist organizations, — ideal Anarcho-Syndicalists of the type of Borghi & Co. Both congresses began their work by passing with considerable majorities a protest against "the persecution of the Socialists in Russia".

Thus a united front of the reformists and Anarcho-Syndicalists was formed against Moscow, i. e., against the Russian Revolution and also against the R.I.L.U. After this vote it was clear that the Anarcho-Syndicalists are well suited for this ideal International which is being brewed by some international muddleheads in Berlin. It is doubtful whether this new International will ever see the light, but there is not the least doubt that the Anarcho-Syndicalists are now proceeding hand in hand with the Amsterdam International. They do not want the united front with the Communists and form it with the reformists instead.

Only carry on in the same spirit and after a twelvemonth we will see how many workers remain in your organizations!

IV.

While the Anarcho-Reformist front is being formed in Europe against the R.I.L.U., the front in America is widening still more. Some weeks ago comrade William Foster was arrested, the head of the Trade Union Educational League, who carried on energetic agitation in the reformist unions for the ideas of the R.I.L.U. The activities of the T.U.E.L. met with such success that they disturbed the everlasting chairman of the American Federation of Labor, Gompers, as a result of which he began a furious struggle against it. A short

time ago, comrade Foster was seized by private detectives, from whose hands he only freed himself after three days. After he succeeded in escaping from the clutches of the private detectives he was arrested by the detectives of the official forces. The newspapers report that he was arrested on the ground of the charge brought against him by Gompers, that he is an agent of the Soviet Government from whom he received funds in order to destroy the labor movement of America and American democracy. Thus we see how Gompers makes his accusations. Private spies make the arrest and the official representatives of the law affix their seal.

At the same time the Anarcho-Syndicalist leaders of the I.W.W. declare themselves against the sending of relief to the starving in Soviet Russia, and attack the R.I.L.U. because it does not promulgate the Anarcho-Syndicalist ideal.

We could content ourselves with the above mentioned facts, if there were not similar happenings in the other countries. In Germany, in Italy, in France — everywhere, there is being formed an anti-Communist, Anarcho-Reformist front, which is supported by the governments and the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie which has well brought up the reformist leaders, knows that this will surely retard the development of revolutionary events.

And as regards the Anarchists, the anti-Moscow, anarchist propaganda — although the Anarchist ideal is by no means agreeable to the bourgeoisie — meets with the sympathy of the "representatives of culture and civilization", for the bourgeoisie knows that the Anarchists constitute no danger for the bourgeois order, that *Communism alone is the real danger which already threatens the rule of the exploiter*. Anarchism is today a commodity to be employed against Moscow, which, like the other anti-Moscow wares is quoted very high on the exchanges of international reaction.

The R.I.L.U. has again and again suggested to all Anarcho-Syndicalist organizations, that they affiliate to it, and in the frame of one united organization, fight for the realization of their ideas. Some groups have preferred to remain outside the R.I.L.U. and to conduct an open struggle against it, against the Communist International and against the Russian Revolution. They thereby place themselves along with the bourgeoisie and the reformists on the other side of the barricade. But neither the international bourgeoisie nor reformism has been able up to now to defeat the Russian Revolution and we are certain, that their new ally, Anarchism, will help them but very little.

THE COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT

The International Conference of Communist Cooperators.

By G. Kramaroff.

On the 1st of November, representatives of Communist and Cooperative organizations of all countries will meet in Moscow to decide questions of practical and theoretical character. The importance of this conference is very great. The fact that the Communist Parties of the various countries have not yet worked out a definite point of view with regard to cooperation and have not yet defined their attitude in principle to this movement, which embraces millions of toilers in all countries, compels us to seek means to make good this omission.

The vanguard of the working class, as represented by the Communists, cannot regard with indifference such an important movement as the cooperative movement, the more so, that the bourgeoisie and the compromising parties have long employed this movement as an instrument in their policies and as a means for distracting the attention of the working class from its struggle against capitalism.

The Russian Communist Party repeatedly discussed the question of cooperation at its conferences and congresses and adopted a number of practical measures directed towards making the cooperative societies an important factor in reestablishing national economy and in the cause of the struggle of the workers for Socialism.

Unfortunately, we have not yet defined with sufficient clearness our attitude towards the cooperative movement and a complete analysis of this movement from the revolutionary Marxist point of view, has not yet been made.

Our German comrades who have recently devoted considerable attention to the cooperative movement have been in a large measure engaged in seeking methods by which the Communists could influence the cooperative movement and use it in the interests of the working class; but they have avoided the question of the theoretical significance of cooperation.

In France we observe on the one hand a tendency to a peculiar syndicalism in cooperation (cooperation as a form which should take the place of the existing capitalist system), and on the other hand a tendency towards conciliation with the position of the old cooperative leaders who, accustomed to the principles of the Rochdale pioneers, actively support the bourgeois system.

The example of the *Belgian Socialist Party*, which based itself on the workers' cooperative societies, increases the antagonism of some of our French comrades towards capturing the cooperative movement even by our Party. They are inclined towards that unfortunate political neutrality which has served as an excellent instrument in the hands of the present cooperative leaders for obscuring the class-consciousness of the working class members in the Cooperatives.

All this applies almost exclusively to the consumers' societies which mainly comprise urban proletarian elements.

If we turn to the attitude of the Communists towards the producers' cooperatives (agricultural, home-workers' etc.) and the credit organizations affiliated with them which comprise almost exclusively small peasant proprietors, we see again that only in Russia we have attempts of the Communist Party to define its policy towards these petty bourgeois organizations.

Neither in Germany, where the Raiffeisen and Schultze Delitch organizations combined a large number of members and have considerable capital, nor in France, where the Vine-growers' Cooperatives represent a considerable force, nor in Hungary where the agricultural societies are mighty cooperative organizations, do the Communists make even an attempt to define their attitude towards the cooperatives as definite forms. For them they represent just a mass of reaction against which it is necessary to fight as against the bourgeoisie.

Only in Italy where part of the agricultural cooperatives together with the consumers' societies belong to the National Cooperative League, is the gradual recognition of the cooperative movement observed and methods are being adopted to use it in the interest of the growing revolutionary proletarian movement.

And yet the problem of the attitude of Communists towards cooperative societies combining small proprietors is the same problem as that of the attitude of the proletariat towards the peasantry which in the immediate future is the basis of development (or the collapse) of capitalist society.

If the forthcoming International Conference of Communist Cooperators will define our attitude towards cooperative societies of all forms, it will be a great advance for our Party.

In addition to the above however, it is proposed at the Conference to define the tactics and also to draw up a plan of work for Communists in the cooperative movement. We hope that as a result of its work the Communist Parties of all countries will have fashioned for them the new weapon in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and the compromising parties.

IN SOVIET RUSSIA

The Recovery of Lenin.

Lenin knows how to rest. — Lenin as pedestrian and tourist. — He takes up work again. — A deluge of false reports.

G. Zinoviev.

At each mass meeting of the workers we are unfailingly overwhelmed with questions concerning the state of health of comrade Lenin, and the progress of the recovery of the man in whom the popular masses of the greatest country in the world have boundless confidence.

Everyone knows that Lenin can work as do few men. But he understands also how to rest. His work is in general methodical and ordered even in times of highest tension. His rest is simple. Lenin, like most strong characters, loves nature. He spends almost all his periods of rest outdoors.

The comrades who have lived with Vladimir Illitch in the vast solitudes of Siberia, have discovered in him an enthusiastic tourist. The most assiduous daily labor did not prevent him an enthusiastic tourist. The most assiduous daily labor did not prevent him from making excursions dozens of *verst*s from his residence in Siberia.

In Switzerland, where Vladimir Illitch lived for a long time, there are few places which he did not visit either on foot or by bicycle. He is more familiar with the vicinity of Geneva than many a Swiss. Before the historical schism in the Russian Social-Democratic Party which divided it into menshevik and bolshevik factions, Lenin journeyed into the mountains to prepare his plan of work and action amid peaceful surroundings.

After the defeat of the Revolution of 1905, Vladimir Illitch spent several weeks in Kuokalla, a small Finnish railway station not far from Petrograd, where a number of the militant leaders of our party gathered around him. There, too, he took advantage of all his moments of leisure to enjoy the sea and Finnish landscapes.

Following that, he returned to Geneva, then went to Paris, and from there to Cracow. At Paris, he invited us more than once to pleasant outings in the vicinity.

In Galicia, Vladimir Illitch passed four months in the little village of Tatra. There his custom was to take frequent walks to the neighboring mountains. He often lured us to take long bicycle trips as far as Hungary, more than 100 km. distant. From there we would bring back as a prize, a bottle of good wine. Lenin loved to take young comrades along with him on his trips. His greatest pleasure was to do a little mountain climbing. Thanks to him, daily baths taken in the cold mountain streams were enforced until the beginning of winter upon all members of that colony of Russian exiles. Kamenev, who often tried to avoid them, drew upon himself the worst rebukes... In winter we would go skating in Cracow. After reading through the newspapers from Petrograd we would debate questions of vital importance to our party while skating.

Upon his return to Russia after the Revolution of 1917, Vladimir Illitch availed himself of all opportunities to make excursions into the neighboring country of Petrograd. He was there at the time of the uprising of July, 1917. The Central Committee, realizing the importance of the events, went to fetch him in all haste.

Some time after the July days we spent almost three weeks with Vladimir Illitch in a small hay-shed not far from Sestroretsk. . . Lenin was being tracked. Kerenski, Tseretelli, the entire provisional government ordered a search for the dangerous "agent of Germany". Lenin will affirm that we are not at all exaggerating. Well! his desire to go for a walk, or to get together a fishing party sometimes proved stronger than all considerations of prudence.

From Sestroretsk Lenin, by order of the Central Committee, returned to Finland under great risks, where he remained in absolute retirement.

During the five years of the existence of the Soviet regime, and particularly during the first four, Vladimir Illitch had no opportunity to take the least rest. Last summer serious illness forced him to give up his daily work. When I saw him recently, however, I was surprised at the fact that Vladimir Illitch, "who reads almost no newspapers", was remarkably well-posted on events of any importance, and held opinions "of a man badly informed" so suited to the present need that the directing departments of our party soon agreed to them.

Vladimir Illitch is returning to activity after a long convalescence. The world will see how much the "first-hand" reports on the illness of Lenin spread broadcast by all our opponents, from the monarchists to the mensheviks and S.R.'s were worth. During the two weeks of 1918, when, seriously wounded, he struggled against death, Vladimir Illitch won more popularity than at any other time in his life. Whoever attends our mass meetings to-day, whoever has seen how the Russian working people, even non-partizans, follow the illness and recovery of Lenin, will be deeply convinced that this crisis in health, and the invidious counter-revolutionary activities of which it has been the outcome, has only strengthened, more than was expected in 1918, the affection which the masses of Russia bear to Vladimir Illitch.

How pitiable appear to-day all the sordid, petty intrigues of Milioukov, of Tchernov, of Dan, whose newspapers published on "the hopeless condition" of Lenin, so many articles expressing malicious joy in each line! How ridiculous these people appear again in publishing information on the "crisis in our party" and the "struggle for power" amongst us! Milioukov has printed numerous articles in his Paris daily on the health of Lenin written as if they were medical diagnoses. Such chosen morsels from this collection deserve to be preserved in the literature of humor. In its entirety, the campaign of false news and lies conducted by the bourgeois press at the time of the illness of Lenin summarizes all the campaigns of this kind directed against the power of the Soviets.

His convalescence over, the captain returns to his post of command. The entire crew of the great ship from the first to the last man will retake courage. I do not exaggerate. Our entire party, and with it the best elements of the Russian workers and peasants, will heartily cheer the return of Vladimir Illitch to his daily tasks. The class-conscious workers of all countries will rejoice with us at this new defeat of our enemies.