

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 68

1<sup>st</sup> December 1927

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

## CONTENTS

N. I. Bukharin: The Russian Revolution and Social Democracy.

### Politics.

J. B.: The Advance of the United States against the British "Middle East".

### In the International.

Session of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I.

Resolution of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. on the Question of the Opposition.

The XVI. Moscow Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

The Results of the Party Discussion in the C. P. S. U.

### For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.

Wm. Gallacher: The Opposition — the Hope of the British Imperialists.

On the Fractional Work of the Trotzkyist Opposition and its C. C.

J. Jaroslavsky: It is Time to Make an End!

### China.

Asiaticus: The Process of Disintegration in the Camp of the Kuomintang Generals.

### The Labour Movement.

James Shields: Reaction at Work in South African Trade Unionism.

In Defence of the Miners of Colorado!

The R. I. L. U. to the Eighth All-India Congress of Trade Unions.

### The White Terror.

Comrade Weiss (Avigdor) in the Hands of the Roumanian Hangmen.

### Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.

A. Lozovsky: International Congress of Friends of Soviet Union.

### The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

G. Dimitrov: The October Revolution and the Balkans.

### The Discussion before the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

L. B.: The Discussion Supplements No. 4 and 5 of the "Pravda".

How the Legend of the "Fire against the Left" Arose.

# The Russian Revolution and Social Democracy.

## History has Decided.

By N. Bukharin.

### Speech, delivered at the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union.

Comrades! I should like to take this opportunity of dealing with a particular question, namely, the question of our tactics in the revolution and the tactics of the Social-Democratic parties. I have chosen this special question, because in the Soviet Union we now have behind us ten years of successful proletarian revolution and because this jubilee is the suitable moment for overhauling our theory and the theories of the Social Democrats, our political and tactical methods and the methods of Social Democracy. I am also dealing with this question, because — and to this I should like to give special emphasis — recently a number of proposals of "co-operation" have been made to us in overt and covert form on the part of the Social-Democratic leaders. Such proposals were, for instance, made in the statements of the Social Democrat Loebe, in the letters and articles of the representative of the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain, Brockway, in a number of other utterances, and, finally, in the latest speeches of Otto

Bauer and Ellenbogen, made in connection with the jubilee of our proletarian revolution. In my opinion Otto Bauer's latest speech, in which he analysed our policy and made a number of tactical propositions, is worthy of special attention.

What had Otto Bauer to say in the jubilee days of our October Revolution? He spoke of our "mistakes", which, in his opinion, consist of the transplanting of "Russian methods" to other countries and the use of Terror against the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries. He also mentioned that we are now proceeding from Terror against the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries to Terror against our Opposition. As the result of this "analysis" of our mistakes Bauer came to the conclusion that for the co-operation of the West-European Social-Democratic parties with the Soviet Government and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the following pre-conditions are necessary: firstly, internal consolidation and democratisation of the country; secondly, cessation of the various

tactical manoeuvres practised by the Communists in Western Europe. These form the "foundations" for co-operation and the conditions for a change in the attitude of the Social-Democratic Parties towards the Soviet Union. I will now go over these conclusions, or, rather, conditions, submitted to us by the Social-Democratic Parties in Otto Bauer's speech.

Wherein lies the political sense of these conditions? What do Bauer's proposals amount to?

What is the meaning of "internal consolidation" and "democratisation" of the country? I believe that their meaning is clear to everybody. The democratisation of the country means the substitution of the proletarian democracy, i. e. of the proletarian dictatorship by an ordinary bourgeois democracy. Such bourgeois democracy exists at the present time in various countries, beginning with America and ending up with Austria, where, at the time of the insurrection of the Vienna workers, the political content of bourgeois democracy was revealed very clearly. Therefore, the first condition for co-operation is the liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship.

What is the significance of the second "condition" — the cessation of the tactical manoeuvres of the Communist Parties? This means that the Communist Parties must cease completely to fight for the winning over of the masses and give up their existence as independent political organisations of the proletariat. In short, this demand of Otto Bauer means that we should cease to be Communists and liquidate the Communist International. It will now be seen that the two conditions set by Otto Bauer are: firstly, liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship; secondly liquidation of the Communist International.

Comrades! We are of the opinion that these "proposals", made in celebration of the victorious Russian Revolution go a "little" too far (laughter).

Bauer's "Socialist" "demands" are all the more ridiculous because they represent a repetition of the chief demands of the whole of world imperialism. In negotiations of all kinds — be they political negotiations concerning the de jure recognition of our proletarian State, be they economic negotiations regarding credit or the extension of our commercial relations — it is just this kind of demand which the bourgeois world makes.

But that is not all. Just at the present moment the representatives of the bourgeoisie happen to be much more modest than the "left-wing" Social Democrat, Otto Bauer. The representatives of the bourgeoisie demand from us "merely" the liquidation of the Communist International; they have not the nerve to demand the liquidation of the Soviet State. The left-wing Social Democrat, Otto Bauer, is not so cowardly as the bourgeois world. In his courage he ventures still further (laughter). He demands that we should lay still greater sacrifices upon the altar of co-operation with the Social Democrats. I believe you will understand full well why such demands on the part of Otto Bauer appear to us both ridiculous and mean.

If we approach this question, not from the point of view of polemics with the leaders of Social Democracy, but from the standpoint of the destiny of the broad masses, we must form the following opinion of Otto Bauer's speech: It appears that it is high time to understand that the actual course of history is the best test for the various tactical and political methods. Has there recently been, within the last ten years, such an important historical and, partially, even sanguinary test of the theories of the programme, of the strategy and of the tactics of Communism, on the one hand, and of Social-Democracy, on the other hand? There has been such a test. It is demanded of us that we should employ democratic methods, other methods of capturing power, alter our views concerning the character of the State, adopt a different form of State and a different party policy. Let us, however, try to compare the events of our decade with those in other countries, where different methods have been used. If we make the comparison, we undoubtedly arrive at conclusions, which for the estimation of strategy, of tactics and of policy are by no means favourable to the Social Democrats.

Let us consider the question of capturing power. This question, which forms the watershed between us and Social Democracy, is the question of the use of force. Naturally, we are barbarians, because we resort to violence, although Marx decided this question exactly in the sense in which we treat it. Let us for the moment assume that Marx is no longer an authority to the Social Democrats. But our Social-Democratic opponents have sought to capture power by other methods. In

some countries they have already had part in the government in Germany, Austria, Great Britain, Sweden, partially in Belgium, Denmark, etc. In these countries the Social Democrats employed "civilised", "Western-European", "humane", "pacifist", "evolutionary", "organic" (laughter), "peaceable" and "MacDonald" methods. But we must ask ourselves: Where is the Council of People's Deputies of Germany? Where is now the Cabinet of Otto Bauer in Austria? Where is the Social-Democratic Cabinet of Sweden? etc. Where is now the ideological inspirer of the Second International, the perfectly loyal, most affable, absolutely non-recalcitrant MacDonald, the friend of the King of England? Why did he disappear, like all the others, from the arena of State leaders? The bourgeoisie pushed them aside, deposed them, kicked them out. But we, with our "barbarian", with our "non-European", with our "coarse" and "violent" methods, with our "rough" policy of the "use of force", still exist (laughter).

And what is the result of the practical test? The practical test has gone in our favour and against our opponents. But in order to express myself very modestly, I have put the question incorrectly. Did the working class in England actually rule during the Government of MacDonald? We believe this was of the case. Those who thought so laboured under a delusion. The Cabinet of the Labour Party had nothing in common with genuine rule by the working class. What kind of policy did MacDonald pursue? The policy of betrayal of the workers. Was there let drop a single word about the genuine realisation of Socialism, about the expropriation of the expropriators, about a real Labour policy? No. There were various sweet sermons. Those we heard. But earnest words concerning the realisation of Socialism never reached our ears. The so-called "Labour" Government forgot about that, and, even if it had brought the matter up, it would have taken no practical steps towards fulfilment. The MacDonald Cabinet bore the label of a "Labour" government, but in reality it was a creature of English imperialism, composed of "Labour" leaders. The imperialistic face of this "Labour" government was most clearly discernible in the foreign policy, in the policy observed towards the nations oppressed by England, and especially towards India. Every participator in the national-revolutionary movement can tell you of the provoking and dismaying procedure of the MacDonald Government. And in this way vanished from the historic scene a "Socialist" government, which did not take a single step towards the realisation of Socialism, but, on the contrary, executed the policy of its own bourgeoisie.

The most extreme "left-wing" Social-Democrats, namely, the Austrian Social-Democrats, say that "in principle" they would not be opposed to the use of violence. But all that is positively ridiculous! We know of individual cases of violence on the part of the leaders of Austrian Social Democracy. But those were cases of the use of violence against the working class. Violence was used during the Vienna events, but not against Seipel and the Austrian Government but against the working class, who acted against the will of the Social-Democratic leaders. That is a historic fact. When the Social Democrats speak of democracy and dictatorship in regard to our country, they intentionally pass over in silence the circumstance that the dictatorship in our country is a proletarian democracy, which creates for the development of the activity of the workers and peasants a sphere of action more extensive than can or could exist in any so-called democratic country. It is ridiculous to compare an abstract democracy, which never existed and never will exist, with an abstract dictatorship, which never existed and never will exist. There are various democracies and various dictatorships. The dictatorship of the proletariat is at the same time the broadest democracy; namely, the proletarian democracy. And when Otto Bauer now speaks of the "consolidation" and "democratisation" of our country, in reality that means nothing but submission to the enemies of the proletariat and of the peasantry and the destruction of the ruling position of the working class. The dictatorship of the proletariat is its monopolist position. Bourgeois democracy means the destruction of the leading role of the proletariat in the whole of public life.

The Social Democrats have on more than one occasion tried to be exclusively peace-loving towards the bourgeoisie and exclusively treacherous towards the proletariat. The results are particularly clear in the case of Germany. In Germany there were even Soviets, which actually fulfilled the demands now put

forward by Otto Bauer for us: first of all there were Soviets, and then Social Democracy, by fulfilling the demands which are now being made by Otto Bauer, ceded the power to the National Assembly, introduced democracy, etc. And not a hair of a single counter-revolutionary was touched. No force at all was resorted to against the bourgeoisie. They were peace-loving, these humane, pacifist Social Democrats. It is true that some time afterwards violence was employed with the participation of the Social-Democratic leaders, but again that was violence employed against the working class, and this use of violence found expression in the murder of the most prominent leaders of the working class. These facts are known to everybody. But the outstanding historic fact is that the whole policy of the Social Democrats suffered complete bankruptcy. And when, after so many years of crushing experience, they come to us and say: Please repeat in Russia the experiences which we in Germany and in Western Europe have so "brilliantly" gathered, we answer: We are not so stupid now, when we are celebrating the tenth anniversary of the victorious proletarian revolution in our country, to discuss this question which life itself has decided.. (Applause.)

They say to us: But you want to transfer Russian methods to Western Europe. What is the assumption in this accusation? The assumption is that, although such methods were necessary in Russia, in West-European countries methods different in principle are necessary. But excuse me, why do you then demand of us that we in our country should use the West-European "democracy" lauded by you? (laughter). That is the first remark on this question. As you will see, Bauer's logic has gone astray (laughter). All his deliberations are full of inherent contradiction.

But is it true that we employ completely "specific", "Asiatic-Russian" methods, not applicable in West-European countries? Is it true that we have a theory which is not practicable in the West? I dispute and deny this thesis in toto. Our Communist Party and its leaders — since the very commencement of our Party — were, on the contrary, followers of German Communism, disciples of Karl Marx. Is it not true that our theory of State is a Marxian theory, which was and will remain the theory of Marx, and that the Social-Democratic parties revised everything that Marx wrote on this question? Is it no true that the Social-Democratic leaders, including some of those who are now at the head of Social Democracy, formerly advocated dictatorship and the proletarian revolution. We not only accepted the doctrine of Marx in its entirety, we not only carried on propaganda for it in words — we have converted it into reality. And what did the Social Democrats do? They revised this doctrine — the doctrine of dictatorship and of proletarian revolution, the foundation of Marxism. MacDonald — the loyal servant of his king — is now the leader of international Social Democracy. Our leader, however, is Marx, our leader is Lenin, who was a prominent Marxist and enriched Marxism with the experience of the epoch in which we are living.

In the most urgent question of our time — the question of war — we take the view, which we previously defended, that capitalism is inevitably accompanied by wars, that these are intimately connected with the existence of capitalism and belong to its laws of development. That is the Marxist point of view. And what has Social Democracy to say now? It preaches that all this is antiquated, and that everything has been changed by the creation of the League of Nations. For them Marx is obsolete, and Hilferding writes in his paper that the capitalists, the leaders of trusts and combines unconsciously act in accordance with Marx. A splendid Marxism, is it not? In the Social-Democratic parties, revisionism is celebrating a victory along the whole line. We, on the other hand, were and remain true adherents of the Marxist doctrine. How can one say that everything we do in our country is thought out by us and that we want to "export" our "barbarian", "Russian" methods to Western Europe? In the past we imported Marxism into Russia. And this ideologic "commodity" was and remains the most important weapon, which we put to practical use when the former Marxists betrayed Marxism. How can they now accuse us of having recourse to "specific" methods, which are completely foreign to Western Europe? It is an absurd and stupid idea that for Western Europe, Australia, America and, finally, for each country special methods are necessary for the capture of power by the proletariat. There are no methods peculiar to Western Europe, for the fighting methods are

dictated by the relative strength of the classes and of the various strata of the individual classes, as also by the different ideologies in each country. It is quite unmarxian to speak of Western Europe as a single entity: To measure Hilferding and Thaelmann with the same yard-stick is perhaps original but by no means clever. In Western Europe, just as in the Soviet Union, there are no Social-Democratic and Communist methods. Experience in our country shows that the Russian Mensheviks — Social Democrats — have tried to put their methods into practice: They, too, were opposed to the use of force against the bourgeoisie; they consistently supported the bourgeoisie, but they fought, weapon in hand, against the proletarian dictatorship. And it is comprehensible that with us the position is such that there are indeed various parties, but only one party is at the helm, while the others are in prison. This will continue to be the case.

It is absurd to assume that the forms of our State and of our party policy would be as they are at present if we were not surrounded by world imperialism. You must never forget that every force within our country which tries to disorganise our ranks and our affairs immediately receives the support of the whole bourgeois world. And just because up to the present we have stood alone our position is specially difficult. The strong iron fist of the proletarian dictatorship is necessary in the fight against our various difficulties. And when the Social-Democratic leaders with their miserable experience in the use of Social-Democratic methods propose to us as a condition that we liquidate the Communist International and the proletarian dictatorship, we can only answer them with laughter. And you will no doubt excuse us for that. (Laughter, Applause.)

For many years we carried on bloody warfare against our bourgeoisie and their supporters. We have stood extraordinarily severe trials. Our position was more terrible than that of any other country within recent years.

Our energy is now directed towards the building up of Socialism. If you compare our methods with the methods of various parties in other countries, you will see that we ourselves criticise our mistakes most sharply. We do this in every issue of our newspapers, and we correct our mistakes. However, in the matter of the fundamental fighting methods and of the differences of opinion on this question between us and the Social Democrats, among us there exists not the slightest doubt but that we are right. That is the position from the standpoint of internal experience in our country and in other countries.

Compare the role of our country with the role of the Social Democrats, compare the international role of the Social-Democratic parties and the role of the Soviet Union and of the Communist Party. With a certain amount of pride we can maintain that in the whole world there is not an emancipation movement which does not cherish sympathy with us. Can one say anything similar in regard to Social Democracy? This fact, too, shows that our policy is correct. Our enemies may say what they believe to be right. The historic fact remains that our dictatorship has existed for ten years and that we are not occupied in writing books about socialisation and setting up commissions to deal with this question, as did Karl Kautsky & Co., but that we are realising Socialism in our country in deed. (Tremendous applause.) Our role is not to spout about the right of nations to self-determination and to crawl into such organisations as the League of Nations. No. We declare that the League of Nations is a weapon of imperialistic robbery. (Applause.) And at the same time we are putting into practice in our country the great slogan of the liberation of nations. For this reason in particular we are a factor of the greatest significance in the fight for emancipation of all oppressed nations. (Applause.)

The question of the dictatorship in our country has still another aspect which I should like to deal with in conclusion. That is the question which I call, not with complete accuracy, however, the question of ideologic dictatorship. Not only in political life but also in the sphere of economics we follow our ideal unwaveringly and realise our aims. In the ideologic realm, too, we have in our country a militant dictatorship of the proletariat. But in what sense, in what direction? In our country it is the dictatorship of Marxism. We are not at all

prepared to publish any and every pastoral letter and to feed the working masses ideologically on such things.

We do not go into ecstasies when all kinds of idealistic brochures, idealistic philosophy, books of religious character etc., are distributed. In this respect we are intolerant. But from all the ideologic treasures which mankind has created up to the present, we take the best as our scientific theories: materialism, Marxism. Armed with these instruments and with these noble weapons we fight against foreign influences and ideologies. In our country it is absolutely impossible to start a case against Darwinism, as was done in the country of bourgeois Democracy, the United States. Any judge in our country who came forward against Darwinism would be put into a cage.

We believe that so long as a united leadership is necessary to the proletariat we must nip in the bud everything that disrupts and poisons the working class. We rely upon Marxism, the ideology of the proletariat. We make of Marxism our theory of State, which we teach in all our schools and universities. We are not inclined to feel ashamed when people tell us that we are "one-sided". Our one-sidedness consists in our loyalty to the proletarian fight and in hostility towards bourgeois influence. (Applause.)

Now that we have ten years of development behind us, we can say with pride that we have done much but that we shall do still more. On the day of the tenth anniversary of the victorious proletarian revolution we trust that the next ten years will bring us still greater successes than the past decade. We believe that we shall join forces with the international proletariat and the oppressed nations of the whole earth in our difficult fights, in our fight against the whole of the bourgeois world, in the fight with weapons, when the imperialists attack us, in economic competition with the capitalists, in our theoretic fight against vacillations, against mistakes and against every kind of deceit on the part of our enemies.

In the history of mankind there have never before been such tremendous events as are happening in our epoch. It is an indication of stupidity to assume, as do the Social-Democratic theorists, that a pacifist era was opened with the foundation of the League of Nations. Quite the contrary! The League of Nations is a syndicate of the most powerful robber States of world imperialism, America alone being lacking.

In the year 1914 there broke out a war between two coalitions. The next war will be either the collision of the whole bourgeois world with the Soviet Union and the world proletariat, or a collision between bourgeois coalitions. What will this mean? This will mean a fight without parallel in history. And we can now say that there is in the world only one force which is in a position to save humanity — that is the proletariat and the oppressed nations.

In West-European countries, and especially in Germany, where the effects of the war were most keenly felt, in the first few years following the war there was widely spread among the bourgeoisie an ideology of the following kind: It is possible that civilisation will collapse. It will, therefore, be necessary to seek new paths. But now, in the stage of temporary stabilisation, people are beginning to forget what war means. We in Soviet Russia are naturally greater "barbarians". But we never forget the lessons of the imperialist war.

We do not forget any of the consequences of the world war. We know full well that the next wars will be still more terrible. For this reason we are mobilising in advance all our forces and declare that there is no worthier task than the fight against imperialist war, than the fight for the victory of the working class; for the victory of the working class means the salvation of the whole of humanity from the real barbarity of capitalism. That is certainly not a pretty phrase, not a "noble thought" — for in the victory of the working class lies the only possibility of breaking the backbone of imperialism. We were and remain the standard-bearers of the old slogan: "Long live the international revolution!" (Clamorous and continued applause. The delegates rise from their seats and sing the International.)

## POLITICS

### The Advance of the United States against the British "Middle East".

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The quest for oil wells and cheaper cotton is, apart from the striving for favourable fields for capital investment, the main driving force of imperialism in that extensive area which, in the terminology of British colonial politicians, is described as "the Middle East", and the territories stretching from the Western frontier of India, over Afghanistan, Persia, Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Arabia, Egypt and the Sudan down to Abyssinia. Since the end of the war, British imperialism has maintained the undisputed lead in the great race of the rivals in the "Middle East". Great Britain has not only secured the political rule, or at least the decisive influence in all these countries (if we disregard the very shaky French domination in Syria and the insignificant influence of Italy in Yemen) and in this way built the famous "land bridge" to India — or at least set up its scaffolding — but also British capital is far in advance economically of that of its rivals.

The attempts of the other European competitors, so far as they related immediately to oil wells or securing areas for cotton planting, were everywhere comparatively easily defeated. The French were palmed off with a small percentage of the Mosul oil; the Italian appetite in Abyssinia was sated for the time being by the agreement of 1926, which aroused great excitement at the time, as well as by small slices of territory at the cost of Egypt and in Southern Arabia.

During the past year, however, a new competitor has made its appearance, which is equipped with incomparably greater means than any of the European States, has a correspondingly greater appetite and is therefore by far the greatest danger for British economic imperialism: the capitalists of the United States are stretching out their hands after the Middle East.

It should be pointed out at the same time that this new rival of British imperialism is for the time being proceeding very cautiously, slowly and tentatively. The foreign policy of the United States at present reflects only to a quite unnoticeable extent the activity of the economic combines, hence the greater the activity of these combines themselves.

When a British company obtained the concession for the exploitation of the oil wells on the Farsan islands (in the Red Sea, west of the coast of Asir) participators from the United States were at the same time on the spot. Finally, the exploitation was undertaken by a British and an American company jointly.

United States capital is participating in the oil wells recently discovered on the West coast of the Red Sea, on Egyptian territory, and which are said to be fairly rich.

In the year 1926 a number of engineers from the United States were very busy in Southern Palestine and in Transjordan making borings after oil. In November 1926 capital from the United States was likewise taking part in the borings for oil commenced by the French in the Alaquiten district.

A specially fierce struggle was waged in the course of the last few years between the Turkish Petroleum Company, representing British capital (Shell concern with Deterding at the head), and the Standard Oil Company (American oil capital) for the exploitation of the oil fields in Iraq, particularly in Mosul. It was only in the last few weeks, after all the attempts of the British to keep out the Standard Oil had failed (the declaration of the British Under Secretary of State in Parliament that Mosul oil is only a legend, that there exist no supplies of oil in Iraq worth speaking of, which declaration made the rounds of the European press in the Summer of this year, seems according to this declaration to have been, only an episode in the fight of Deterding against Standard Oil), that an agreement was arrived at, which means in fact a victory for the American claims (the Americans obtained 25%).

In Persia, too, the American companies are constantly pushing their way against the Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

When one considers all these facts one obtains a picture of the advance of the Americans against the British Middle East in the sphere of exploitation of mineral oil. This picture is now supplemented by the American advance in Abyssinia, which in

the last few days has occupied the centre point of interest and throws a bright light on the second sector of the American economic front — the cotton interests.

Only recently there appeared from authoritative sources a report that the American White Corporation had concluded a contract with the Abyssinian government for the erection of a dam on the Blue Nile at the place where this leaves Lake Tsana. This useful engineering undertaking is said to render possible the irrigation of vast areas of land in Abyssinia which are to be given over to the cultivation of cotton.

The excitement which spread in Egyptian political and business circles on account of this news is quite understandable when it is pointed out that the quantity of Nile water necessary for irrigating the cotton areas in Egypt would experience a considerable reduction by the building of a dam on an arm of the Blue Nile. The fact that the English laid claim to 300,000 feddans of land in the so-called Djesirah (island between the Nile tributaries in the Sudan) for cotton planting, already seriously threatened the water supply of Egypt. The double danger of lack of water for the Egyptian cotton plantation and the competition of the cheaper Sudanese cotton (the low prices in Sudan are attained by a terrible exploitation of the plantation workers who have to toil like slaves) is the chief reason why the Egyptians always place the Sudan question in the foreground of all negotiations with Great Britain. The building of a dam at Lake Tsana will increase this danger for Egypt still further.

But this will be a danger not only, and not in the first place for Egypt. More exact investigations of the quantities of water supplied by Lake Tsana show that the chief danger of a dam at Lake Tsana is directed not so much against the Egyptian cotton plantations, which receive only a tenth of their requirements of water from the arm of the Nile in question, but much more against the plantations of the British Cotton Growing Association in Sudan.

This circumstance immediately gave the American dam project an anti-British tendency. It was then remembered that Great Britain possesses a treaty concluded with the Abyssinian government as early as 1902, according to which British firms are to have the preference in the construction of a dam. It was officially (by Chamberlain) and semi-officially asserted that Abyssinia would not grant a concession over the head of Great Britain, that the question still remains open and that Britain must at least be assured a share in the carrying out of this project.

The White Corporation contented itself with simply repeating that the concession is a matter which has already been concluded. The representative of Abyssinia (in Adis Abeba, the capital of this country, a General Consulate of the United States is to be established shortly), on his part, calls attention to the fact that Abyssinia, after Great Britain a year ago concluded an agreement with Italy behind the back of the Abyssinian government (which is still a member of the League of Nations) aiming at the dividing up of Abyssinia, was compelled to look round for better and more reliable "friends" than Great Britain.

For the United States again the penetration of Abyssinia has great importance: it frustrates the British plan of making the textile industry of Manchester independent of United States cotton (as well as that of Egypt) by means of extensive plantations in the Sudan. It renders possible vast prospects for capital investments in Central Africa, which still remains to be opened up. At the same time it enables the United States to exert decisive influence on the further course of politics in the Middle East, for the Lake Tsana concession provides the key not only to Abyssinian but also to Egyptian politics.

The hopes cherished by a great part of the Egyptian nationalist movement in the United States are now receiving definite encouragement. Just at the moment when the negotiations between Sarvat Pasha and Chamberlain were approaching their culmination, a new factor makes its appearance — the United States. The agitation which the Wafd conducted in the United States was one of the most important factors which expedited the formal recognition of the independence of Egypt by Great Britain in the year 1922.

Since then the United States has not let slip any opportunity to express its special position towards the Egyptian nationalist movement and its rejection of the privileged position of Great Britain in Egypt. The Ambassador of the United States, Dr. Martin Howell, emphasised his hostility to "British impe-

rialism" and his sympathy for Zaglul Pasha, his conviction that Egypt is ripe for real self-administration and for independent choice of its advisers (who even now must still be drawn from the circle of British officials) so strongly that he had to be recalled.

But that did not in the least alter the fundamental attitude of the United States to the Egyptian problems. The American imperialists insist that an alliance with the United States is not at all dangerous for Egypt, because the United States is not aiming at territorial expansion: it is more concerned with regulating the cotton market.

The advance of the United States now gives Egyptian policy two possibilities: either to uphold the joint Anglo-Egyptian interests, to create an alliance with Great Britain against the American danger, as is proposed by the organ of the Ittehad party and the Liberal Constitutional Party (Sarvat), or to incline towards the United States, to oust the English from the Sudan and thereby achieve independence, as is advocated by a portion of the Zaglulist and nationalist press.

In any event the affair of the Lake Tsana dam, like the question of Mosul oil, reveals the rivalry between Great Britain and the United States in the Near East which appears to be gradually becoming the centre-point of the political situation in these two countries.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### Session of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I.

Moscow, 24th November 1927.

Yesterday a session of the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. was held. The following questions were on the agenda: 1. the situation in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.; 2. the convening of the VI. World Congress of the C. I.; 3. the coming Congress of the R. I. L. U.; 4. the preparations for the next Enlarged Executive session; 5. Indian questions; and 6. report upon the 9th congress of the C. P. G. B.

In his opening speech comrade Bucharin declared that ideologically the Opposition had sunk to menshevism and that it had expressed differences of a programmatic character, the Opposition's fractional tactic had therefore turned into that of a second Party and its tactic had developed from an anti-Party to an anti-soviet tactic.

Referring to the work of the Opposition in the Comintern, Bucharin quoted a number of examples to show that the Opposition was preparing a new organisation embracing both ultra-left renegades and ultra-right opportunists. The Opposition wanted to go from the weapon of criticism to criticism with weapons, but it received a crushing rebuff both from the masses inside the Party and the whole working class. The C. I. would have to take up a decided attitude in this question, for the so-called Russian question was the most important question for the international proletarian revolution.

In the discussion following upon the speech of comrade Bucharin, Kuusinen declared that he could see no possibility of retaining the Opposition in the Party and considered it necessary to draw organisational conclusions from the attitude of the Opposition and lead an ideological struggle against it with all possible sharpness.

Comrade Smeral pointed out that the Czechoslovakian Party had insisted upon the necessity of organisational action against the Opposition even before its latest action on the 7th November. If the Opposition believed that it could obtain any successes abroad after its defeat in the Soviet Union, it was deceiving itself.

Comrade Losovsky declared that the activity of the Opposition demands energetic action on the part of the Comintern and all its sections in the direction of the political enlightenment of the masses concerning the anti-bolshevist theory and practice of the Opposition, and the taking of organisational measures against the malicious fractionalists and disruptors.

Comrade Braun read a declaration of the German C. P. condemning the Opposition and approving of the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev from the Party. The declaration also points to the necessity of expelling the other leaders of the Oppo-



sition. The speaker then dealt with the situation in Germany and pointed to the bloc which existed in practice between Korsch and Maslov, and declared that the Party must continue the struggle against the Opposition in the future with all possible determination.

Comrade Vaillant-Couturier declared that the activity of the leaders of the Opposition recently had not brought them the expected successes. Even the expulsion of Trotzky had not produced those sentimental feelings upon which the Opposition in France had reckoned. In the last session of the C. C. of the C. P. of France the Opposition was completely defeated and Treint was expelled from the C. C. The Party would continue the struggle against the Opposition with all possible sharpness.

Comrade Bela Kun declared that the C. P. of Hungary was in complete solidarity with the attitude of the C. C. of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. towards the Opposition. The former errors of the C. P. of Hungary were a result of the attitude which is still to a certain degree reminiscent of the standpoint of Trotzky, although the C. P. of Hungary was always a decided opponent of Trotzky. These errors caused the collapse of the proletarian dictatorship in Hungary. He also pointed out that the international social democracy had received new weapons from the Arsenal of the Opposition and this clearly showed that the Opposition wished to liquidate bolshevism.

Comrade Murphy declared that the E. C. C. I. would have to draw all the consequences from the situation which had been created and publish a detailed declaration before the XV Congress of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. The less support the Opposition experienced from the ranks of the workers, the more attention it received from the bourgeois elements. With regard to the C. P. G. B., the Opposition could not reckon upon the least support from the members of the Party.

Comrade Stirner (Mexico) demanded a strengthening of the activity in the trade unions as the experience in Latin-America had shown that the elements sympathising with the Opposition were also opposed to the tactic of the united front.

Comrade Kreibich demanded that the E. C. C. I. react more quickly to the slanderous fabrication of the Opposition abroad as this would considerably facilitate the struggle against the Opposition upon an international scale.

Comrade Katayama pointed out that the Opposition which had already formed itself into a new party, was prepared to commit any crime against the Soviet power. He demanded the sharpest measures against the Opposition as against all fascist and counter-revolutionary elements.

Comrade Badulescu pointed to the necessity of a special campaign against the activity of Rakovsky. The Roumanian communists would have to expose the activity of Rakovsky all the more energetically, because Rakovsky was popular in Roumania.

Comrade Enghdal (United States) declared that the leading organisations of the C. P. of America had approved in numerous decisions of the measures of the C. C. of the U. S. S. R. against the Opposition. However, outside the Party various elements like Lore and Eastman were conducting a campaign in favour of Trotzky. Amongst various other bourgeois papers, one of the most influential defenders of the Opposition was the menshevik organ "Foward", this paper was the most anti-soviet in its tendency in America. It is to be expected that the reactionary American Federation of Labour will soon take over the defence of the Opposition. It was necessary to carry on the broadest ideological campaign against the Opposition.

Comrade Purman (Poland) declared that the Opposition had practically no influence on the C. P. of Poland. The recent plenary session of the Party had decisively condemned the Opposition, the latter was being exploited in the political life of Poland, especially now, when Pilsudsky was preparing to occupy Lithuania.

Comrade Maggi declared that the C. P. of Italy solidarised itself with all the measures taken by the C. C. of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. against the Opposition and demanded a more decisive struggle against the Opposition upon an international scale.

Comrade Kabaktchiev, in the name of the Bulgarian C. P., Comrade Sillen in the name of the Communist Parties of Scandinavia, and Comrade Sirola in the name of the Finnish C. P. all demanded an intensification of the struggle against the Opposition.

The resolution submitted on the first point on the agenda was unanimously accepted as a basis, and comrades Kuusinen, Zetkin and Gallacher all stressed that the resolution must very definitely point out that the attitude of the leaders of the Opposition was a betrayal of the interests of the international working class movement and the Comintern.

## Resolution of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. on the Question of the Opposition.

Moscow, 27th November, 1927.

The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. adopted the following resolution on the question of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U.:

The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. declares:

1. The ideology of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. is at present the expression of a system of views which are in sharpest contradiction to Bolshevism. This ideology of the Opposition agrees in the most essential points with the views of the social-democrats in general and those of the Russian Mensheviks in particular. The characterisation of the proletarian State, of the Soviet Union as "thermidorian", i. e. counter-revolutionary, as a "degenerating" or "degenerated" State, the corresponding characterisation of the C. P. S. U. and the whole regime of the proletarian dictatorship and its economic organs, the accusation of "Bonapartism" raised against the leading circles of the C. P. S. U. and of the Soviet Power — this ideology, which is copied entirely from Martov, Kautsky and Dan, shows that the Opposition has severed the ideological connections with Bolshevism and, following the example of Katz, Korsch, Maslov, Souvarine and Co., are treading the path of counter-revolutionary Social-Democracy.

2. The Menshevik theory of the Opposition is also accompanied by a corresponding tactic. The Opposition has systematically employed the method of vilest calumniation and discrediting of the leading comrades and the leading organs of the Comintern, the C. P. S. U. and other sections of the Comintern. From fractional grouping it has gone over to the creation of its Trotzkyist Party with a wide network of committees, as well as the formation of a common central committee. From fractional methods of work the Opposition has proceeded to the creation of an illegal technic, to organising systematically illegal meetings, to forceful "capturing" of meeting rooms, to organising of miserable street demonstrations and to other attempts, all of which bear an anti-Party as well as an anti-Soviet character. Simultaneously with this the Opposition has gone over from inner Party discussion to appeals to the petty-bourgeois masses outside of the Party. The Opposition, by stimulating and encouraging the work of all anti-Soviet and counter-revolutionary forces, in this manner prepares the way for a bourgeois "democratic" restoration. Precisely for this reason the Opposition receives the support of the openly counter-revolutionary parties, in the first place the Social-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks.

3. Just as openly as it violates the discipline of the C. P. S. U., the Opposition also breaks the discipline of the Comintern. The Opposition is not content with supporting the fractional work of its agents within the Comintern; it is grouping around it well-known "ultra Left" renegades, as well as openly right elements: (Souvarine, Rosmer, Frey, Loro, Roland-Holst, Hula etc.). It establishes connection with suspicious Italian emigrants in Paris and makes as its central organ abroad the disreputable paper of Maslov, in the columns of which functionaries of the Comintern are denounced to the police etc.

4. This activity of the Opposition is an open betrayal of the revolutionary international movement of the proletariat. It is a crime, especially at a time when the work of socialist construction demands the co-operation of all forces and when the great imperialist States are advancing to attack the Soviet Union. The Opposition, in combating the leading Party of the dictatorship of the proletariat, opposes the first workers' State in the world in a situation when it is necessary to mobilise the broad masses of the proletarians in the capitalist countries and the suppressed peoples of the colonies in defence of the Soviet Union, this citadel of the international revolution. On

the eve of gigantic historical fights between capital and labour, between imperialism and the Soviet Union, the Opposition leaders desert the battle field as some of them deserted already at the time of the October fights in 1917.

5. The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. records with greatest satisfaction that the Trotzkyist Party has experienced a shattering repulse at the hands of the masses of the Party of the C. P. S. U. and the whole of the working class of the Soviet Union. The working class has replied to the contemptible demagoguery and the adventurist provocation of the Opposition with the "October enrolment", i. e. with a new influx into the ranks of the Party.

The Presidium further records that the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union showed the great increase in sympathy for the Soviet Union on the part of non-Party and social-democratic workers who are all rallying to defend the Soviet Union against their own leaders and against the leaders of the Opposition who slander the Soviet Union and the C. P. S. U. The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. further records that the best elements of the anarchist movement have come over to the side of the proletarian dictatorship.

In spite of the ultra-revolutionary phrases with which it masks itself, the Opposition actually stands in the same ranks with the social-democratic leaders against the social-democratic masses who are becoming more revolutionary, in the same ranks with all enemies of the Soviet State and of the proletarian world revolution. This fact proves their disruptive, anti-revolutionary desertist nature, which has revealed itself at a time of war danger.

In view of the above the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. fully supports all measures of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. in the fight against the Trotzkyist Opposition, and imposes on the C. P. S. U. the duty to prevent by the most decisive measures the continuation of the criminal machinations of the Oppositional disrupters. The entire international revolutionary working class will defend the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. For those who attempt to make an attack on this dictatorship, for those who, openly or covertly fight against it, there is no place in the ranks of the Comintern.

The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. expresses its firm conviction that the approaching XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. will preserve the strictest discipline and complete organisatory and ideological unity in the ranks of the C. P. S. U., and this on the basis of the complete and unconditional rejection of the "thermidorian" and other blossoms of the oppositional ideology. It will purge the Party of all those who, like Maslov, Korsch and Co., mask themselves with Left phrases and have gone or are going over to the side of the class enemy of the proletariat.

The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. records with satisfaction that all sections of the Comintern have adopted an attitude against the Opposition, and instructs the leading organs of all sections to carry out a lasting and energetic work of enlightenment regarding the anti-Communist character of the Opposition.

The Presidium of the E. C. C. I.

## The XVI. Moscow Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 21st November 1927.

Today the XVI conference of the Moscow Party district was opened.

Comrade Clara Zetkin was elected honorary member of the Presidium.

In his opening speech comrade Uglanov declared that the 130,000 members of the Moscow Party organisation who represented the millions of Moscow workers, had unanimously condemned the actions of the Opposition. The members of the Moscow organisation are convinced that the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. was on the straight path to the building up of socialism and not towards the strengthening of the Depmen and the Kulaks, as was asserted by a little group of people who had lost their belief in the forces of the working class.

Comrade Bukharin who spoke in the name of the Central Committee of the Party was greeted with great applause and cries of "Long live the Leninist Central Committee!"

He analysed the role of the Opposition and described its policy as Neo-menshevism. The Opposition was using the same methods and tactics as the mensheviks. Its fate is in its own hands, if it likes it can return to the ranks of the Party. The XV. Party congress would raise the question clearly, either the Opposition must liquidate its fraction and abandon those ideas which have nothing in common with bolshevism, or the Party will push the Opposition on one side and continue along its own socialist way. The Party has had enough of the Opposition and will not waste any more time upon it. In conclusion comrade Bukharin stressed the necessity of an increase of the cultural constructive work.

Comrade Lunarcharsky welcomed the statements of comrade Bukharin and pointed out that the Soviet Union was the only country in the world where since the war the number of schools had increased by 30%. The successes of the cultural work were also exemplified by the tremendous diminution of illiteracy brought about by the energetic struggle which had been conducted against it.

Comrade Krupskaya condemned the actions of the Opposition on the 7th November and declared that the deciding factor for the Opposition was not the achievements of the working class but personal bitterness. The counter-theses set up by the Opposition were disjointed and bore no relation to the present situation of the Soviet Union, they might just as well have been written five, six or seven years ago.

Following upon these speeches there was a lively discussion upon the speech of comrade Bukharin, and all the speakers, in particular the representatives of the factory nuclei declared their agreement with the leninist proletarian line of the Central Committee and strongly condemned the Opposition.

Moscow, 23rd November 1927.

The XVI. conference of the Moscow Party organisation received greetings from the non-Party workers to-day. The worker Abankin from the factory "Red Proletarian" declared in his speech that it must not be forgotten that the working class regarded the Communist Party as an inseparable part of the working class and therefore would reject the attacks of the Opposition which did not recognise the achievements which had been attained.

After a speech of Kamenev in which he attempted to defend the policy of the Opposition, the floor was given to the ex-member of the Opposition Sof who exposed the fractional activity of the Opposition hostile to the Party.

Moscow, 24th November 1927.

The 16th conference of the Moscow Party district adopted a resolution upon the speech of comrade Bukharin completely approving of the activity of the C. C. of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

The resolution states that the policy of the delegation of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. in the Comintern was consistent, revolutionary and international. It declares also that the C. C. has properly led the work of the members of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. in the R. I. L. U. and has issued correct directives for the international work of the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions.

The resolution points to the connection between the socialist constructive work in the Soviet Union and the struggle of the workers of all countries and quoted as an example the support accorded to the fight of the miners in Great Britain and to the Chinese revolution by the toilers of the Soviet Union.

The resolution declares that the attempt of the Trotzky Opposition to form an international fraction has been unsuccessful. The Opposition was only able to win renegades like Maslov and Ruth Fischer and could find no support amongst the brother parties, whose overwhelming majority approved decisively of the policy of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. and of the E. C. C. I. in the struggle against the Trotzky opposition.

The resolution points to the successes obtained in the work of socialist construction and approves of the directives of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. to promote the industrialisation of the country and the development of agriculture, and stresses the correctness with which the C. C. has carried on internal Party democracy and approves of the measures of the C. C. against the Trotzky Opposition which had not merely abandoned the Leninist tactic, but also revised the fundamental principles of the Party programme in a menshevist spirit.

The resolution approves of the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev and expresses the conviction that the congress of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. will decide that the support of the Trotzky Opposition is incompatible with membership of the Party.

Moscow, 24th November 1927.

At the Moscow party conference Comrade Stalin delivered a speech which was met with great applause and in which he dealt with the results of the Party discussion which were crushing for the Opposition. He also proved the incorrectness of the theses of the Opposition concerning the relation of the workers to the peasantry.

Comrade Stalin pointed out that all the prophecies of the Opposition concerning the collapse of the revolution had proved incorrect and that not the revolution but the Opposition had suffered bankruptcy.

In conclusion comrade Stalin declared:

"The platform of the Opposition is proof of how far the Opposition has moved from the Party and from the working class, from our revolution. This is a platform of intellectuals who have broken with Leninism and turned away from real life. Can one wonder after this that the Party and the working class have turned away from the opposition? This is the reason why the Opposition has suffered such an unexampled bankruptcy in its fight against the Party.

We are asked: What is to be done now? The Opposition complains that it has handed in a declaration for unity signed by 31 Trotzkiists but that it has received no satisfactory answer. But what answer is actually possible to this hypocritical declaration of the 31 Trotzkiists when the untrue declarations of the Opposition are continually refuted by their own disruptive activities?

The history of our Party knows an analogous case, it was I think in 1907, the declaration of the 31 mensheviki, Lenin called this declaration the 'hypocrisy of the 31. Mensheviki'. I am of the opinion that this hypocrisy of the 31 Mensheviki and the hypocrisy of the 31 Trotzkiists are analogous. The opposition has deceived the Party twice and it intends to deceive the Party a third time, but no, comrades, enough of deception.

And now? It is not possible to go further comrades, for all the boundaries of the permissible in our Party have been overstepped. Two parties cannot continue to exist together, the old Leninist Party which is a united Party and the new Trotzkiist Party. There must be a choice between these two Parties. Either the Opposition itself will destroy this Trotzkiist Party and abandon its anti-Leninist opinions and admit its errors openly before the whole party, or the Opposition will not do this, in that case we will ourselves completely destroy this Trotzkiist party. Either the Oppositionists will take this necessary step or they will not, in which case they will be flung out of the Party (Storms of protracted applause and the singing of the "International".)

\* \* \*

Moscow, 26th November 1927.

In his closing speech at the 16th Party conference, comrade **Bucharin** declared inter alia:

According to all signs, **Poland** is preparing a military action in order to carry out the plan of the militarist clique for the occupation of **Lithuania**. The Polish preparations signify a great danger for peaceful international relations and can only be regarded as a step against the Soviet Union. With the occupation of Lithuania Poland wishes apparently to increase its military basis for possible war against the Soviet Union. These preparations of Poland make the danger of war the most important and topical question in the international situation. The attention of the international proletariat must therefore be concentrated upon this question.

## The Results of the Party Discussion in the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 24th November 1927.

The results of the Party discussion from the 1st to the 23rd November are 572,506 votes for the theses of the Central Committee of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. and 3,416 votes or 0.6% for the Opposition.

## FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

### The Opposition — the Hope of the British Imperialists.

By Wm. Gallacher.

The existence and activities of the Trotzkyist Opposition is a serious matter for the workers of Russia. The objective of the Opposition is clear. It is to destroy the Proletarian Dictatorship, to disrupt the solid front which the Russian workers and peasants present to the robber imperialists and thus to leave a path, wide open, for the counter-revolution to come marching in. This may seem incredible, but consider a moment.

In 1923, **Zinoviev** was energetically striving to drive Trotzky out of the Party. In the course of his campaign he had many talks with me, and other British comrades. He was most anxious to enlist us in the fight against Trotzky. Trotzky was definitely anti-Party and a menace to the progress of the Revolution. There was no doubt at all about this in the mind of Zinoviev and he was very desirous that there should be no doubt in ours. At the same time Trotzky was just as energetically attacking Zinoviev as the man who had deserted in the October crisis and who would fail the Party in the future as he had in the past. Undoubtedly, they each had a correct appreciation of the other, for to-day when Trotzky openly attacks the Party that our Comrade **Lenin** devoted his life to building, Zinoviev weakly follows in his rear and adopts the role of the assassin of Leninism. And we are asked to believe that these two men, who have the most bitter and jealous hatred towards one another, are united on a platform. It is not true. It never can be true. Their only bond of unity is opposition to the Party and the Central Committee of the Party. What applies to them applies to the opposition as a whole. It is composed of the most diverse and unweldable elements in the Soviet Union, disgruntled and disappointed Party members, non-party individuals, anti-party conservative functionaries, anarchists, and counter-revolutionaries. All who oppose the proletarian Dictatorship, all who desire to see the workers power broken and the bourgeoisie once again enthroned, all in short, who are opposed to the Party for whatever reason, are to be found in the ranks of the Opposition.

Supposing for a moment there was the slightest possibility of the Opposition achieving its objective. Suppose it destroyed the power of the Party and the centralisation that is so essential in the fight against the imperialist enemies of the proletariat, what would be the result? Would Trotzky, Zinoviev and the heterogeneous crowd that comprise their following take the place of the Party and maintain the front that can alone guarantee steady progress towards Socialism? The answer is obvious. If the Party could be destroyed the one bond that holds them together would be broken. The Opposition would disintegrate into a series of madly quarrelling factions and the Soviet Union would be shattered by the blows of its enemies from within and without.

And just as we understand this, so also do the imperialists. In **Britain** every rotten reactionary, every reformist trickster, looks with hope to the Opposition. From the deadliest enemies of Russia, Trotzky and Co., receive encouragement and incitement to continue their nefarious work. For several years now the wages and working conditions of the British workers have been steadily depressed. Defeat after defeat has been inflicted on them because of the cowardice and treachery of the leaders. But the employers are not yet satisfied. Wages must go down further still. But here the employers are faced with a serious problem. While the conditions of the British workers are steadily worsening, the conditions of the Russian workers are just as steadily bettering. If this process continues then the contrast will become a real danger for capitalism. The evident fact of working-class progress under a working class dictatorship will arouse a deadly hatred against the capitalist dictatorship which can only give to the masses of the workers poverty and suffering. The Opposition has made much of the Trotzkyist declaration that Socialism cannot be built up in Russia without proletarian aid from other European countries.



That means that the Revolution, and the achievements of the Revolution have got to be given up unless we can get revolutions in the other countries. The mere fact of putting the matter in this way, shows an utter inability to understand the problem. It would be just as true, and quite as plausible, to jump over to exactly the opposite and say, "if we can't get ahead with the building up of Socialism in Russia, then we will never get revolution elsewhere".

For if Russia became a field of exploitation for the capitalists, if the inspiring work of October and of the past ten years were destroyed, the imperialists would gather to themselves new strength and wholesale terror would become the order of the day. The work of Socialist construction is an invaluable contribution to the task of organising the masses of other countries for revolutionary struggle. Yet we must not make the blunder of the Opposition by taking a one-eyed view of this all-important question. Proletarian struggle in the European countries and proletarian progress in the U. S. S. R. are complementary phases of the world-wide struggle against predatory imperialism. Every mass struggle of the workers of any of the European countries, weakens the bourgeoisie and thereby handicaps them in their efforts to prepare war against the Soviet Union. This is a positive gain as it leaves the Soviet Union free to develop its resources in the direction of Socialist economy. Every step forward in the Soviet Union strengthens and encourages the proletariat to maintain the struggle till final victory has been achieved.

But if the British imperialists dread, and hate the Soviet Union because of the difficulty it creates for them in dealing with the British workers, how much more bitter is their hatred, because of the mighty inspiration the great October Revolution has given to the peoples of the East. The British Empire is a slave empire. Millions of Colonial peoples are oppressed, exploited and terrorised with bayonet and bomb, into giving up their sweat and blood to satisfy the British imperialist greed. But the slaves of the East were roused into wakefulness with the shock of the stirring days of October. Awake and active they have watched events since. They have seen the oppressed Russian workers and peasants smash the shackles of imperialist oppression, they have seen them march from conquest to conquest and now they too, begin to move. The very seat of the British Empire begins to shake. When India arises the British Empire is gone forever. The British imperialists talk of Russian propaganda, but this is only a pretext. The very existence of the Soviet Union is an example to all oppressed peoples and it is the example the imperialists want removed. It is to save for themselves their slave Empire and to maintain their domination over the British workers, that they so viciously conspire against the Soviet Union and prepare to let loose all the horrors of war. They will shed rivers of working class blood to keep their brutal rule. Terror and famine they will use as their handmaidens if only the opportunity is given to them. In the Opposition lies this hope.

Every attack on the Party by the Trotzkyists is hailed with delight in the war-mongering press of Britain. In perspective the war-mongers see the Opposition creating discord and confusion throughout the Soviet Union and when this has been effected the opportune moment for a vital blow at working class Russia will have arrived. Many Party comrades who have foolishly followed the Opposition, but who still retain their regard for the mighty work of our great leader Lenin and for the great Party that will carry his work to ultimate completion, must now see the dangerous path they are treading and must now make an immediate and complete submission to the Party. They must break entirely with the Opposition and all its anti-Party work.

For Trotzky and his associates have definitely become "Chamberlain's vanguard", and they must be treated as such.

With imperialist enemies all around, plotting and conspiring against the Soviet Union, with white-guards and Tsarists attending the British Foreign Office to aid in the war preparations, enemies inside the Union should not be tolerated. The Tsarist white guards in London have their agents in Russia. Where will they be found? Surely it is obvious that Trotzky is providing a splendid cover for them. As non-party members of the opposition, every document stolen by Party members, will be open to them. Not only will they be in a position to keep their friends abroad posted with valuable information, but they will be the most energetic advocates of every kind of

illegal anti-Party work, of every kind of sabotage. Conscious of the use that is being made of the Opposition by the Tsarist white-guards in London, conscious of the use that is being made of the Opposition by the British imperialist war-mongers, the members of the Party in Britain will give whole-hearted approval and support to our Comrades of the Soviet Union in whatever action they may take to end the intolerable criminal activity of the Trotzky Opposition.

## On the Fractional Work of the Trotzkyist Opposition and its C. C.

Declaration of the former Member of the Opposition Kusovnikov at the Party Conference of the Sverdlov District.

(From the "Pravda" of November 20th 1927.)

On the 16th November the former member of the Opposition and secretary of the fractional committee of five for the Ural district Kusovnikov delivered a speech at the Party Conference of the Sverdlovsk district, in which he made revelations regarding the illegal work of the "Central Committee" and of the "Committee of Five" of the Trotzkyist fraction for the Ural district.

Comrade Kusovnikov stated, that at the beginning of 1926 the combined C. C. of Trotzky and Zinoviev appointed a "Committee of Five" for the Ural district in order to conduct fractional work. The "Committee of Five" had to appoint similar committees of five in the districts and areas and also functionaries in the towns. The fraction conducted its work under great secrecy and strict discipline. A fraction technic was created of which only one member of each committee of five knew the existence. The meetings of the committee of five and the consultations of the active collaborators were regularly convened for a long period. The estrangement of the Opposition from the Communist workers is also proved by the fact that at the last meetings of the active collaborators of the Opposition, at which 25 persons were present, there was not a single worker. At this meeting some comrades, in spite of the strong objections of Bieloborodov and Mratchkovski, raised the question of changing the tactics of the fight against the Party.

In accordance with the instructions of the Central, the signatures of old Party members only were collected for the "Declaration of the 83". When, however, it was found that the Opposition could not achieve much with these cadres, they decided to collect signatures from all Party members who merely approved of the declaration. But even this did not help. The Opposition failed.

The second campaign was the collection of signatures for the Platform of the Opposition. The work was begun according to the instructions of the Central, and the signatures were sent to Moscow even before the Platform of the Opposition was received in Ural. The Platform was received before, or at any rate not later than the Political Bureau received it. The collection of signatures went very flat; more than 30% of the all the signatories gave their signatures without having read the Platform, and no less than 10% gave their signatures without even seeing it. If one tries to get any member of the Opposition to say what was contained in this Platform, he mixes up all the facts, as in most cases he has not read the Platform himself. In spite of the second failure the fraction work was continued under the slogan: "All means in the fight are permissible!"

With this slogan work was conducted not only in Ural, but also in Moscow. Kusovnikov, who was present in Moscow for the tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, during the demonstration stood on the tribune in the Red Square along with the People's Commissar for Posts, Telegraphs and Telephones, Smirnov. The Opposition group was, "at a given time", to hold a demonstration in some centres against the C. C. The greater the mass of demonstrators that marched past the more excitedly the Opposition members asked: "Where, then, are our supporters?" "Our supporters" did not come at all, because they did not exist.

In Moscow Kusovnikov, on the evening of 7th November, took part in the Enlarged Session of the joint C. C. of the Opposition held in Smilga's house, at which Kamenev was in the chair. Previous to the sitting separate meetings of the Trotzkyites and the followers of Zinoviev had taken place, as

sufficient unity did not prevail between them. In this combined C. C. the roles were divided between the two groups. The followers of Zinoviev conducted the organisatory part, the Trotzkyites the political and technical. According to the information of the district organisers, it was unanimously agreed in the debates that the counter-demonstration had not succeeded, that even its plan had fallen in the hands of the C. C. of the Party. Neither Trotzky nor Kamenev had decided to go into the Centre. The summary of the abortive counter-demonstration was made at the joint C. C. by Trotzky. When he realised the vacillating mood of those present he began to develop a theoretical justification of the present tactics of the Opposition and stated that all is now over with the Party, that one must now seek to influence the class, and by inciting the class against the Party compel the latter to act as the Opposition desires.

Kusovnikov handed over to the Control Commission the entire archives of the Opposition of the Ural district consisting of 2000 sheets, and called upon the members of the Opposition to leave the ranks of the Opposition, the leaders of which have deceived not only the Party but also their own supporters.

## It is Time to Make an End!

(On the Declaration of Comrade Kusovnikov in Sverdlovsk.)

By J. Jaroslavsky (Moscow).

The nearer the 15th Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. approaches, the more the abscess in the body of the Party, the Opposition, opens. Those people who yesterday organised actions against Soviet legality but today turn from the Opposition, speak more and more openly of their illegal action. The XV. Party Congress will have at its disposal completely indisputable data regarding the other Party which the Opposition has been endeavouring to set up since the XIV. Party Congress and the existence of which the leaders of the Opposition have persistently denied, even declaring a few days ago that they "remain and will remain on the basis of the united Leninist Party"; that they "categorically" and "emphatically" repudiate the accusation of forming another Party.

The declaration published above of the member of the Opposition Kusovnikov, in Sverdlovsk on the illegal fraction work of the Opposition, in which Kusovnikov has taken part since 1926, deserves extraordinary attention, not because it contains any entirely new facts but because it confirms that which the Party already knew. At the same time, however, this declaration completely sweeps away the hypocritical asseverations of the leaders of the Opposition, that they "honestly" prepared for the Party Congress and they were "honestly" ready to cease their anti-Party work. What does Kusovnikov prove?

1. The Opposition, already, at the beginning of 1926, formed a fractional C. C. Now we know from another document, from a letter from Antonov-Ovsjenkov, that this was achieved at the price of the silence of Trotzky at the XIV. Party Congress. According to the words of Antonov-Ovsjenko, Trotzky had intended to come forward at the XIV. Party Congress against Zinoviev and Kamenev, but his Trotzkyist friends persuaded him to keep silent, and he remained silent in order to have the possibility, in return for his silence, to come to an agreement with Zinoviev and Kamenev on the setting up of their own Central Committee, their own fraction organisations and their own Trotzkyist Party.

2. This illegal Trotzkyist "C. C. of Trotzky and Zinoviev" appointed in the Ural an illegal Committee of Five to conduct fractional work, which committee had to appoint similar committees of five in the districts and areas and also functionaries in the towns. This declaration of Kusovnikov is corroborated from other sources. Thus Reno, who was recently expelled from the Party by the Moscow Control Commission on account of fractional work, states:

"There exists a centre of the Opposition from which the Moscow Committee receives directions and conveys them in turn to the district organisers. Periodical meetings of nuclei organisers are held in this or that district, or of all the active members of the district."

Nobody can assert after these declarations that we have unjustly accused the Trotzkyists of forming another party. There

exists a complete and definite organisation of another party, with a C. C., with district centres, with Moscow and other "Committees" of this Trotzkyist Party. This other party arranges its own conferences for working out its programme, its platform, for deciding on its tactics etc. The members of the C. C. of this new party are, when necessary, even summoned by telegraph to meetings (the Central Control Commission is in possession of documents proving this). On the 7th of November there took place in Comrade Smilga's house an Enlarged session of the Joint C. C. at which Comrade Kamenev occupied the chair.

3. The Opposition has no support in the working class and its advanced organised elements. After long work in the Ural, in a working class centre, in spite of the journeys there of Mratchovsky, Bjeloborodov, Vorobjev and others, there is not a single worker among their active collaborators! (25 persons in such a working class centre as Sverdlovsk!). If these people would not themselves insist that they are the "Left proletarian Leninist wing", if they did not wish to deceive themselves and others, then they would now be bound immediately to capitulate completely and acknowledge all their errors. Have they not seen this in the last weeks and months in hundreds of meetings! If Sorin, Voronsky and other members of the Opposition possess in Ivano-Vosnessensk not a single supporter among the active workers, if in Leningrad and Moscow the Opposition failed miserably, on what can they reckon? Does not this defeat bear witness to the complete ideological defeat of the Trotzkyites?

4. Under the influence of the complete ideological defeat of the Opposition in face of the working class, under the influence of the unanimous and decisive defensive action of the whole Party and the whole working class, the Opposition is endeavouring to "change its tactics", is making a new attempt "to manoeuvre". At the meeting of the active collaborators of the Opposition in Ural "some comrades, in spite of the strong objections of Bjeloborodov and Mratchovsky, raised the question of changing the tactics of the fight against the Party".

Be it noted: It is not a question of ceasing the fight against the Party, but of changing the tactics of the fight.

And in Moscow, on the 7th November, in Comrade Smilga's house, the "Joint C. C. of the Opposition" decides the question only under the impression of defeat. The "district organisers" of the Opposition declare "unanimously" that the counter-demonstration did not succeed, that even its plan had fallen into the hands of the C. C. of the Party. Neither Trotzky nor Kamenev had decided to go to the Centre. (Why not, if, as the Opposition assert, the masses are for them? J. J.) In drawing the conclusion regarding the abortive counter-demonstration, Trotzky at the Joint C. C. (of the Opposition), "when he realised the vacillating mood of those present, began to develop a theoretical justification of the present tactics of the Opposition and stated that all is now over with the Party, that one must now seek to influence the class, and by inciting the class against the Party compel the latter to act as the Opposition desires".

5. Even now, after the defeat, the roles at the meeting of the "Joint C. C. of the Opposition" were so divided that the leading political role remained with the Trotzkyites. The technic is also in the hands of the Trotzkyites. To the followers of Zinoviev there remains the organisatory detail work. This only serves to confirm the correctness of our assertions that Zinoviev and Kamenev have gone to Trotzky, have become Trotzkyites.

6. Kusovnikov confirms that neither the "declaration of the 83" nor the Trotzkyist "Platform" of the 13 found sympathy in the Party. They began to collect signatures "of old Party members only". But the old Party members will not go into another Party and wish to remain in the Leninist Party. "When, however, it was found that the Opposition could not achieve much with these cadres, they decided to collect signatures from all party members who merely approved of the declaration, but even this did not help. The Opposition failed".

The Opposition decided to cast a new bait, the Platform in which every possible good thing is promised to everybody, but the Party is spit upon as being Unleninist, Thermidorian, kulakish and so forth. More than 12,000 copies of this platform were printed (in one single printing office Fischelev illegally printed 12,000 copies). Consequently, even assuming that each copy was read by only ten people, more than one hundred thousand people have become acquainted with the Platform. And the results? Practical nil.

There remains only one and a half weeks to the Party Congress. Will the Opposition be capable of drawing the necessary conclusions before the Party Congress? Will the members of the Opposition be able to free themselves from the hypnotism of the Left phrases of the Opposition leaders who are enticing them more and more along the path of hostility to the Party and of hostility to the Soviet?

The Party at any rate will draw the conclusions. They will create guarantees so that nobody will venture to "incite the class against the Party"; so that nobody will venture to set up another Party in our country.

It is time to put an end to this!

## CHINA

### The Process of Disintegration in the Camp of the Kuomintang Generals.

By Asiaticus.

A fresh change has taken place in the Chinese kaleidoscope: Chiang Kai Shek has returned from Japan to Shanghai, whilst Tang Sen Chi has again fled from Wuhan to Japan, and in the South, in Canton, General Li Tchai Sun has been ousted by General Chang Fat Kui. The troops of the Nanking government are now in Wuhan and, outwardly regarded, the district of the Yangtse along the Shanghai-Nanking-Wuhan line is in the hands of the Nanking government. Only in Canton, where Li Chai Sun had already made himself completely independent of Nanking, has a fundamental dividing line been drawn by the revolt of Chang Fat Kui. But even here there can be no talk of a consolidation of the power of the Kuomintang, not even in the Yangtse valley, but on the contrary, of a progressive process of disintegration.

Considered from the military point of view we see at present in the Yangtse valley the following situation: The army of Tang Sen Chi in the province of Hunan and Hupe, hated by the national revolutionary mass of the people as a result of the betrayal of the revolution and the bloody suppression of the workers' and peasants' movement, was attacked simultaneously at three fronts: from the South West by the troops from the province of Kweichow; from the West by the troops from the province of Szechwan and from the East by the "punitive expedition" from Nanking. Tang's troops attempted to defend themselves on the South West and Western front, while they abandoned all resistance towards Nanking and surrendered without a struggle the way to Wuhan. Thus the Nanking troops have been "victorious" and occupied Wuhan, whilst in the interior of the provinces of Hupe and Hunan the fight is still proceeding between the Szechwan and Kweichow troops and the troops of Tang.

In spite of the "victory" over Wuhan, the position of the Nanking army is at present very similar to the military position of Tang before his defeat. A few miles from Nanking there stands the army of Sun Chuan Fang which is repeatedly attempting to advance against Nanking and which has already inflicted serious reverses on the Nanking troops and the advance of which is now held up only by the approach of the troops of Feng Yu Hsiang, which are already in the North of the province of Honan. But the attitude of Feng towards Nanking is itself a great riddle. Formally he is at peace with Nanking. In fact he has (it is true, some months ago) proclaimed his loyalty to Nanking, and he will probably now make it his aim to work his way still further forwards against the territory of Chang Tso Lin and his ally Chang Tsun Chang, at the cost of struggles and losses of others without allowing himself to be involved to any great extent in the fighting. Thus we see that especially in the Yangtse valley the military dismemberment, the rivalry of the generals among themselves and their civil wars were never so chaotic, so estranged from any sympathy of the people and so hated as they are at present.

So much for the generals and the crowd of bankrupts behind them who bear the once so proud and significant name of Kuomintang! But where are now the masses of the Chinese revolution, the workers, peasants and radical petty bourgeois

for whom the national revolutionary movement against imperialism and militarism is a fight for existence?

In the first place we can record the fact, which events are rendering more and more plain, that the masses are not with the Kuomintang generals; they are just as little with those of Nanking as they were with Tang Sen Chi and Li Chai Sun. The fall of Tang Sen Chi, of Li Chai Sun and the advancing process of decay among the Nanking generals, which now, after the defection of Canton, is expressed more and more in the disintegration in the districts North of Shanghai and South of Shanghai up to Fukien, — all this bears witness to the complete undermining of their former positions of power and shows how they are more and more losing the ground from under their feet. The basis of their successes were only outwardly their former military victories. The essentially new factor of their military successes compared with those of the former guerilla war of the generals, was that a stormy revolutionary movement brought them to the North, a movement determined above all by the tremendous hatred against reactionary militarism and the determination of the revolutionary masses to exterminate it root and branch.

The generals of the Kuomintang have succeeded in forcing the revolutionary movement underground; but upon this revolutionary volcano the power of the generals can no longer reassume its old form. It is becoming more and more disintegrated, more rotten at its foundation, ever more brutal in its effect; it collapses over night and then rises again in another form. And below the surface of this power the peasants' revolts are spreading like wild-fire in the South and in the North; the proletariat of Shanghai is overcoming the first and most difficult phase following the defeat and is uniting its forces in the rising strike-wave, in the more and more successful movement for winning back legality for the revolutionary trade unions. What is seen on the surface is still very little in face of the powers of imperialism and of the reactionary generals, but one must not overlook the fact that it is precisely the tremendous pressure and the terror of the combined counter-revolution that force all the signs of the growing revolutionary will to struggle, the rallying of the masses for fresh fights to remain below the surface. That this process is progressing, however, is shown ever more clearly by the process of decay in the camp of the Kuomintang leaders and its militarism.

In Canton and in the province of Kwantung this process against reactionary militarism is now going on at a much more rapid rate than in the Yangtse valley. It is true the army of Jeh Ting in the North of Kwantung was defeated after having held out for a long time in alliance with the partisan divisions of the peasants. According to the latest reports, the remnants of the army of Jeh Ting have again gathered together on the basis of a bigger peasants' revolt in the North of Kwantung and are combining together into an army with the revolutionary peasants divisions.

Meanwhile in Canton itself Li Chai Sun has been defeated by Chang Fat Kui. The city was captured by street fights and then, in the neighbourhood of Canton, Wampoa with its military academy was captured and victorious troops were further able to advance far along the Canton-Shanghai railway line. According to British reports, Chang Fat Kui has achieved victory "with the aid of the Labour Party". The British news agencies describe his troops as the "Reds", and the whole tone of the reports show that British sympathies are on the side of the defeated Li Chai Sun.

How far Chang Fat Kui along with his army can be described as "Red" it is difficult at present to say. It is, however, specially significant for Canton and Kwantung that the peasants revolts have been continually breaking out afresh in connection with the military movements in the last few months against Li Chai Sun, that his regiment in Canton was hated more and more, and that as a result General Chang Fat Kui, who in the revolutionary period of the Wuhan government belonged to the Left wing of the Kuomintang, was able to capture more and more positions in Kwantung and also in Canton itself. The fight of Chang Fat Kui for Canton will thus certainly be viewed sympathetically by the revolutionary masses and perhaps even directly supported by them.

While Tang Sen Chi has collapsed as a result of the military advance of his opponents from other provinces, we see that in Canton the power of Li Chai Sun has collapsed under

the blows of the numerous revolts and also as a result of the people's movement against him in his own province. Just as Canton some years ago signalled in its somewhat hazy movements, which were strongly influenced by the petty-bourgeois population, the powerful and great movement of the Yangtze valley, in the industrial district and in the revolutionary peasant centres, so the present movements in Canton are signals of the approaching great revolutionary wave which will once again attempt to sweep away the semi-feudal militarism, the most important ally of the imperialists in China.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### Reaction at Work in South African Trade Unionism.

By James Shields (Johannesburg).

The year 1927 has proved in many respects to be a year of shattered hopes for South African workers. Hopes placed by the white workers in sympathetic treatment from the Nationalist Labour Pact Government have everywhere been subjected to ever-growing disillusionment. Hopes of the native workers in the ability of their organisations to put up a fight for their demands have been doomed to bitter disappointment. Throughout the course of the year the forces of reaction have grown and consolidated themselves whilst working class organisations have had to suffer not a few damaging blows from the hands of both internal and external enemies.

Following in the footsteps of the Smuts' regime, the Pact Government has expended a great deal of energy along the lines of rendering the organisations of the workers impotent. On all sides the machinery of class peace and conciliation has been tightened up until practically the whole of white trade unionism has been dragged into its clutches. The industrial organisations of the white workers have been reduced to the position of weapons without a sting, with their leading officials in the majority of cases quite content to confine their efforts to having an amicable talk on affairs with the masters across the top of a table.

Even with this state of affairs predominating however, the apostles of class peace remain dissatisfied. There is a fly in their ointment of class harmony. As is well known the trade unions of the white workers in S. Africa are organisations of a labour aristocracy which refuse to have any truck with the native workers. Despite this fact a number of known communists hold position on the Trade Union Congress national executive where they do not hesitate to propagate a militant class outlook. Their presence on this important body has long proved a thorn in the side of the jingoes but one for which time and again they could find no remedy. This year the reactionaries resorted to an attempt to get the militants (particularly the Secretary, the communist Andrews) ousted from a position of importance in the trade union world. This attempt took the form of an underhand and dastardly attack on the very existence, the T. U. C. itself.

Strings were pulled here and there, and soon a number of reactionary intrigues made their appearance in various unions. These culminated in demands being pushed forward for a ballot on the question of continuance of affiliation to the T. U. C. Great play was made with the fact that the congress had passed resolutions of sympathy with the Chinese revolution condemning imperialist intervention, etc., and had also sent greetings to the native workers' organisation at its last congress. A ballot was taken in the A. S. W., the Boilermakers Union, and the Ironmoulders Union, but much to the discomfiture of its promoters resulted in a decision on the part of these bodies to still remain affiliated. In one instance however, success crowned the efforts of the wreckers and they were able to get the A. E. U. to vote in favour of discontinuing its affiliation fees, thus pulling out from T. U. C. membership. The loss of the A. E. U. which is one of the biggest unions in the country has dealt a blow to the stability of the T. U. C.'s position financially and otherwise, and to a certain extent has jeopardised its capacity to carry on active work in the future. Affiliation of other unions in many respects sympathetic to the Trade Union Congress to fill the gap created by the A. E. U.'s withdrawal

continue to hang fire through one cause or another. As things stand at the most it is just possible that the T. U. C. may be compelled in the near future to run the risk of suspension of activities, an outcome that would be greatly welcome to the hearts of the employers and their tools.

Unfortunately it is not only in white trade union ranks that things are in a bad way. The position is not too bright in the camp of non-European trade unionism. The I. C. U. (Industrial and Commercial Union) leaders still claim to have a large membership in their organisation but ever since their base desertion of the class struggle outlook a year ago stagnation has set in in many quarters. No longer is it possible for I. C. U. leaders to boast of a continual influx of new members, rather is there every reason to believe that a big falling away has resulted in the different provinces.

This is not surprising in view of the fact that the present I. C. U. leadership, having once turned its back on the policy of class struggle, has seen fit during the past year to assume the role of strikebreakers. In various native strikes which occurred the I. C. U.'s officials washed their hands of the strikers because they dared to have recourse to strike action as a means of rectifying grievances. For instance there was the example of the Durban Dock strike on June 16th when some fifteen hundred native workers downed tools and went on strike because twenty of their mates were arrested for non-payment of the poll tax. The I. C. U. leaders disclaimed to support these strikers and they were ultimately bulldozed back to work by the authorities. It was the same story in the case of a couple of strikes of native workers on the Natal coal mines, the reason for I. C. U. lack of interest in these latter occasions being the excuse that the men in alliance with the colliery management had "engineered" the business.

In the most typical case of all, the Railway strike at Kazerne, Johannesburg, involving four hundred native workers the facts of the I. C. U. leaders betrayal were most clearly demonstrated. These native workers had struck work for higher wages and better rations many of them being I. C. U. members. The scene of the strike was little more than a stonethrow from the Union headquarters and with little delay an I. C. U. organiser was on the scene to have a talk with the employer. After an hour's confab in the employer's office this organiser advised the men to go back unconditionally to work as the whole strike was illegal. The strikers greeted him with a howl of fury and he quickly made himself scarce and left them to their own devices. The business being left in the lurch in this fashion it was not surprising to find that twenty four hours later a stream of recruited native labourers bound for the gold mines had been diverted by the Chamber of Mines recruiting organ, the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association to work in the strikers' places, and every striker was paid off and sent back to his home. A few days later the I. C. U. official organ "The Workers Herald" came out with a leading article in which inter alia was stated, "The reasonable attitude of I. C. U. officials at the recent Kazerne strike should prove to the Government that they are not dealing with a lot of hotheads but that they are dealing with men who are anxious to assist both employer and employed. Had the Kazerne natives listened to the advice of I. C. U. officials... no doubt the whole case might have been amicably settled."

An instance of the above description shews clearly the depths to which the I. C. U. leaders have now sunk. Inside the I. C. U. itself opportunism is flourishing and already in the course of the year two small splits have occurred in branches in Natal and the Orange Free State. In both cases the split resulted in consequence of disgruntlement of certain reactionary elements who apparently were after more plums for themselves. It is now reported that there is much manoeuvring going on in the I. C. U. aiming at a reshuffling of official positions and that this is one of the reasons behind Kadalie's abrupt recall from his European and American tour before it has been completed.

The native workers, it is clear, are thus faced with a very serious and responsible task. They have to find ways and means of rescuing their industrial organisation from the hands of the opportunist elements that have got control, kick these gentlemen out of the way of doing further harm, and get down to the task of a sincere waging of the class struggle.

Earlier in the present year it was thought that the African National Congress was getting ready to take up the issue from the point at which the I. C. U. leaders had left off. Any such



hope, however, was soon shewn to be unjustified. One of the E. C. members, J. G. Gumede, returned from the Brussels Conference of the League Against Colonial Oppression with a radical programme of struggle embodying the organisation of native labour, and for a while he outlined this at native meetings. At the A. N. C. convention held in Bloemfontein in July last he was elected President of the Congress but its new Executive was once more found to be dominated by men who are in many respects closely allied to the Chamber of Mines. The issues and points raised by the Brussels Conference were quickly allowed to drift into oblivion. The A. N. C. proved itself incapable of giving a lead and soon found itself dragging along in pretty much the same old rut. It is very questionable now whether the A. N. C. will ever cut much of a figure for it has woefully let slip a fine opportunity to base itself on the broad basis of the masses, and of course there is practically no native bourgeoisie as such from which it could develop an anti-imperialist support.

Sunk in stagnation as the organisations of the workers are, yet the picture is not without its hints of brightness. The gap between the white workers and the bourgeoisie is broadening and economic issues are beginning to sweep to the front. The irksomeness of the Conciliation machinery has already led to a number of strike outbreaks during the past few months and discontent on the Rand gold mines is daily becoming more intensified. The sporadic strike outbursts amongst the native workers who groan under the most intolerable conditions are steadily educating the latter in the school of experience, a school that is bound sooner or later to throw up that native working class leadership which is still greatly lacking. Not yet have the native toilers produced genuine fighting class leaders who won't betray them; not yet has the feeling of class struggle permeated sufficiently the white producers to overcome their racial outlook. As time goes on however, the factors making for this end are gradually developing and with the growth of industrialisation in South Africa the labour movement will grow and expand also.

## In Defence of the Miners of Colorado!

Against the Capitalist Assassins and their Servants!  
To the workers of the whole world!

Rifles and machine guns have again shattered the illusion of class harmony between American workers and employers.

Coal miners of Colorado are striking for wage increases, enforcement of mine safety laws and against the company unions, since October 18th.

Parading unarmed with their wives and children, they have been brutally shot down by State police whose real employer is Rockefeller, the richest man in the world, direct operator of Colorado mines and at the same time head of great religious and philanthropic movements. Five miners were killed outright, and twenty persons, among them many of the miners' wives, wounded, several fatally.

It is not the first time Rockefeller's hirelings have murdered workers en masse. In the very same mines, in 1913, nineteen men, women and children were shot and burned to death at Ludlow, Colorado.

But not all the responsibility for these murders lies at the door of Rockefeller, or his tool, Governor Adams of Colorado who has, despite his claim as a "liberal" and "friend of labour" mobilised tanks, bombing planes, machine guns and every weapon of war to crush the strike.

The chief blame for the Colorado massacre of workers and their wives and children lies upon the despicably corrupt reactionary leaders of the American Federation of Labour, and in the first place, upon Lewis, head of the miners' Union. Lewis' agents and the whole A. F. of L. machine, united with the "black hundreds" of the American Legion and Ku Klux Klan, with Rockefeller and his governmental lackeys, to crush the strike.

Even while rifles were speaking, Green and Company, whose hands are wet with the blood of the workers, pretending to defend the interests of the miners they have betrayed, paid a bootlicking visit to Coolidge.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions expresses its profound indignation at the massacre of the Colorado miners to whom it sends its warmest greetings as heroic fighters for the interests of the American proletariat. The R. I. L. U. calls upon the workers of all the world to raise their energetic protest at this bloodbath which puts American bourgeois democracy on the same level as European Fascism and Chinese counter-revolution.

Down with the Capitalist Assassins!

Down with the Corrupt Bureaucracy of the A. F. of L.

Long live the brave miners of Colorado!

E. B. Red International Labour Unions.

## The R. I. L. U. to the Eighth All-India Congress of Trade Unions.

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. on behalf of the revolutionary trade union movement of all countries sends cordial and fraternal greetings to the Eighth Trade Union Congress and the whole working class of India, and wishes for success in the struggle against the alien and native oppressors.

The Trade Union Movement in India is rapidly developing, the class consciousness of the wide proletarian masses is growing, as well as the proletarian solidarity in the economic and political struggle against the oppressors. There are tremendous tasks confronting the working class of India. The struggle against imperialism and colonial oppression, begun by the workers and peasants in the U. S. S. R., China, Indonesia, can be successfully accomplished only by the efforts of the working class throughout the world, and particularly of the proletariat in the colonial countries. The role of the Indian proletariat in this struggle must be particularly great.

In this struggle against the alien oppressors and the national exploiters, the working class of India and its trade unions may always count on the aid of the Red International of Labour Unions and of all its sections. This constitutes the very distinction between the R. I. L. U. and the reformist Amsterdam International which is permeated with the imperialist spirit, whilst the former has at all times supported the struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples for independence.

There was particularly clearly revealed the distinction between the imperialist policy of the Amsterdam International and the revolutionary policy of the R. I. L. U. in the course of the bitter struggle of the Chinese proletariat against imperialism and the internal counter-revolution. Whilst the R. I. L. U. did all in its power to help the Chinese Revolution, the Amsterdam International did not lift a finger to help the Chinese proletariat in its hard struggle. The denial of aid to the Chinese workers and peasants was tantamount to helping the world imperialists and the Chinese counter-revolution.

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. is profoundly convinced that the trade unions of India will be able to determine who are the enemies and who are the friends of the exploited classes and oppressed peoples and that the working class of India will march shoulder to shoulder with those who have placed upon their banner the unity of the world trade union movement. The overthrow of the imperialist domination, and the independence of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

Long live the working class of India!

Long live the Unity of the World Trade Union Movement!

Executive Bureau, Red International of Labour Unions.

Moscow, 24th November, 1927.



## THE WHITE TERROR

### Comrade Weiss (Avigdor) in the Hands of the Roumanian Hangmen.

On the 14th October, comrade Weiss (Avigdor), a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Egypt who was sentenced in the communist trial of 1925 to three years imprisonment, has been released together with two other comrades. The two other comrades were brought with force aboard a soviet steamer — although they had lived for decades in Egypt, this did not prevent the Anglo-Egyptian authorities from regarding them as "Russians" — but comrade Weiss has been handed over to the Roumanian Siguranza, which "identified" him with a bandit and murder called Weiss who was sought for in 1919/20 in Roumania and who is to be hanged.

Comrade Weiss has never been in Roumania in his life, and in the years in question he was in Syria and Palestine (where he was founder and secretary of the Railwaymen's Union). The whole affair is nothing but a diabolic plan to get rid of a dangerous communist quickly and without too much trouble.

Having regard to the well-known methods of the Roumanian Siguranza, there is no doubt, despite the numerous proofs of comrade Weiss' innocence, that his life is in the very greatest danger. Only the immediate intervention of international working class solidarity and the unanimous demand for his release can save comrade Weiss from the claws of the Roumanian hangmen.

Save comrade Weiss!

## TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

### International Congress of Friends of the Soviet Union.

By A. Losovsky.

The Celebrations of the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution have turned into a grand and mighty demonstration of international proletarian solidarity. Workers throughout the world demonstrated their solidarity with the working class of Soviet Russia. In spite of the vilification and slander showered down upon the October Revolution by the bourgeois and social-democratic press during the last ten years, although misrepresentations about the Land of the Proletarian Dictatorship have been broadest — this Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution has been celebrated by workers the world over. There is not a country in which the workers failed to mark this Great Anniversary with meetings and demonstrations and the publication of special numbers devoted wholly to the Tenth Anniversary of the Proletarian Revolution.

Celebrations of the Tenth Anniversary were prohibited in many countries. Indeed, Turek, a young worker in Poland, was murdered because he had written "Long Live the October Revolution" on the wall of a house. It is characteristic that articles summarising the situation were not only published in the revolutionary press; the bourgeois and social-democratic papers likewise "celebrated" this Anniversary.

\* \* \*

While the social-democrats throughout the world were deriding and hurling mud at the proletarian celebrations, the wide masses of the workers were frankly, gladly and wholeheartedly celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution. Representatives from all the continents and colonies and semi-colonial peoples met in Moscow on that great day of international rejoicing. All were represented: England, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Esthonia, Latvia, Austria, France, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Finland, the Balkan countries, United States, Columbia, Ecuador, Argentina, Uruguay, Chili, Mongolia, China, Japan, Indonesia, Philippines, India, Tibet, Korea, Turkey, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia — such is the incon-

plete list of countries where the workers fraternised with the working class of the U. S. S. R. on this Great Anniversary. It is especially noteworthy that besides the workers of various shades of opinion, the representatives of national-revolutionary parties in the oppressed countries and even representatives of the Progressive-bourgeois intelligenzia came to the U. S. S. R., if only to get away for a short period from the moral and spiritual reaction rampant in capitalist countries to-day.

\* \* \*

Even a superficial study of the Soviet Republics was sufficient to convince every unprejudiced person that the U. S. S. R. were nothing like their bourgeois and social-democratic prototypes. And as everybody having a more or less intelligent understanding of affairs, knows that an imperialist conspiracy is being hatched against the Proletarian State, it was no difficult matter to come to the conclusion that organised action would be necessary to defend Soviet Russia. That was why the idea of convening a World Congress of Friends of Soviet Russia was hailed with widespread sympathy. The Congress was duly opened in Moscow on November 10. The mood of the Congress which embraced about a thousand persons from the four corners of the earth, was extremely interesting. The overwhelming majority of the representatives that attended were social-democratic workers and non-party workers. The seriousness with which they deliberated on the ten years of activities of the Soviet State and ways and means to defend the U. S. S. R. from the onslaught of the imperialists was indeed very marked. Extremely characteristic was the fact that all the representatives of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples received a hearty welcome at the Congress. The representative from Revolutionary China was greeted with prolonged applause. The representatives from India, the Negroes from South Africa, Sierra Leone and representatives from other colonial and semi-colonial countries were likewise given a hearty welcome. This alone distinguished the Friends of U. S. S. R. Congress from all the Congresses of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, where down to the present time coloured workers are treated as representatives of "inferior" races. No less characteristic was the exceptional ovation given by the Congress to the official representatives of the State (Rykov, Voroshilov and other members of the Government). In a word, the temperature of the Congress was so high that a certain section of the bourgeois intelligenzia simply melted away.

\* \* \*

The Friends of U. S. S. R. Congress deliberated on two reports: The position of the U. S. S. R. and the New Danger. Indeed the first report raised the question of defending Soviet Russia before the members of the Congress. It was raised because all the representatives at the Congress recognised the gains achieved by the October Revolution. And once the workers realised that in the U. S. S. R. much was being done for the Socialist Cause, the conclusion was plain: all means and resources would have to be used to defend the only Workers' State in the world. In short, the second point of the Agenda was the logic outcome of the first. Social-democrats the world over contest, first of all, the socialist character of the October Revolution; secondly, they deny that war is being prepared against the U. S. S. R. Some of the reformists (Members of the General Council), do not believe that war preparations are being made against the U. S. S. R., others assert that the strained atmosphere in Europe has been caused by the "Red Imperialism" of the U. S. S. R. and in view of their greatness and momentum of international reformism that were destroyed at the Congress, — a Congress where the majority of the representatives were social-democratic and non-party workers.

The resolution adopted unanimously stressed especially that socialist construction was making some big strides forward, that Soviet Russia was a Land of Proletarian Democracy where everything is done by the workers for the workers. The resolution, furthermore, enumerated in detail all the achievements of the U. S. S. R. and in view of their greatness and monotonous importance undertook: to defend in the countries represented the first Workers' Republic in the World; to struggle against the capitalist threat of war on the U. S. S. R.; to divulge the intrigues of international diplomacy which is preparing war; to condemn everywhere the rupture of diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R.; to get the respective governments to recognise the U. S. S. R.; to give widespread support to the initiative of the U. S. S. R. to achieve disarmament (although

the U. S. S. R. knows in advance that the imperialist war-mongers will not permit disarmament); to struggle jointly with the proletariat to counter all imperialist wars in general; to defend the cause of the oppressed colonial peoples against their enslavers, and first of all to shield the revolutionary movement of the Chinese working masses and to struggle for trade union unity in the various countries and throughout the whole world".

This declaration needs no comment. It makes very clear indeed that the U. S. S. R. is the Motherland of all exploited classes and oppressed peoples, furthermore, such language is used only about something that is dear to every toiler, about something that is worth defending.

No less definite and clear was the second resolution adopted against imperialist war, in defence of Soviet Russia and in support of the Chinese Revolution. The resolution refuted the social-democratic legend about "Red Imperialism" and condemned and branded war against Soviet Russia as counter-revolution. The peaceful character of the international policy of the U. S. S. R. was especially stressed by the Congress. The predatory plans of imperialism were revealed, while the League of Nations was condemned as a "bloc of capitalist brigands". This resolution was all the more interesting as it showed that such slogans like "Defence of the Fatherland", "The last war", etc., were simply inspired by imperialism. It should not be forgotten that this is the most sensitive point for the social-democrats, and if workers affiliated to the Second and Amsterdam Internationals could have raised this question it shows indeed how far our ideas on the imperialist character of the bourgeois Fatherland have penetrated the workers at large.

\* \* \*

With its resolution the Friends of the U. S. S. R. Congress confirmed: 1) That the victory of the social revolution and the building up of socialism was possible in one country; 2) that throughout the world the U. S. S. R. has real, and by no means platonic friends; 3) that the "Red Imperialism" of the U. S. S. R. is simply a baseless lie of the social-democrats; 4) that the exploited classes and oppressed peoples throughout the world consider the U. S. S. R. their Motherland; 5) that the U. S. S. R. has honest friends and ardent supporters behind the enemies lines; 6) that every honest worker prefers proletarian democracy under the form of a Dictatorship to Bourgeois Dictatorship — under the form of Democracy; 7) that war against the U. S. S. R. will raise throughout the world such strata of the people and such forces that it may well end in catastrophic results for the war-mongers themselves; 8) that the united front is no invention, no bolshevik ruse, but a reality which looms up large every time the working class desires to defend and retain the positions it has won in the past.

This character of the Congress will be especially distasteful to international reformism. In point of fact, these individuals for ten years past have been proclaiming that there is no social revolution, that in the U. S. S. R. there is no workers' democracy — all that exists there they allege is bolshevik demagogy. And suddenly a Congress is held, where the majority attending are social-democratic and non-party workers, which adopts decisions that in effect deals the Second and Amsterdam Internationals smashing blows. It is not surprising therefore that this Congress has met with the hostility of the social-democrats. Neither will it be a matter for surprise if after this Congress international social-democracy increases its campaign of slander against the U. S. S. R. tenfold.

But no matter what international reformism may do it will be unable to smother the voice of those honest social-democratic and non-party workers who have announced to the world:

"Hand and brain workers! Fight with every means in your power to defend and preserve Soviet Russia — the Motherland of toilers everywhere, the stronghold of peace, the hearth of freedom, the citadel of Socialism!"

Moscow, November 15, 1927.

## THE EFFECT OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION ABROAD

### The October Revolution and the Balkans.

By G. Dimitrov.

The effect of the October revolution on the Balkans was tremendously powerful. Like a searchlight it dispersed the gloomy darkness of the war on the Balkan fronts. Like a guiding star it showed the peoples of the Balkans and the masses of workers and peasants, numbering millions, the path to peace and freedom. The proximity of Soviet Russia, the agrarian character of the Balkans and its similarity to Russia in its economic and social construction brought the October Revolution particularly near to the hearts of the masses on the Balkans and made it easier for them to understand, it thoroughly. The victory of the Russian proletariat and the setting up of the first Workers' and Peasant Soviet State was greeted with unbounded enthusiasm.

A powerful movement against war and in favour of an immediate peace without annexations and indemnities developed both among the population of the Balkan States and among the masses of soldiers at the Balkan fronts. The slogans of the October Revolution attracted day by day fresh masses of workers and peasants at the front, in the towns and the villages. Demonstrations of women followed one another, the workers in the factories protested with increased boldness against war being continued. At the Dobrudja front, fraternisation between the Russian, German and Bulgarian soldiers became a constantly recurring phenomenon in spite of the most relentless suppressive measures on the part of the military power. At the Salonika front (the centre of the Balkan front) a mighty movement for the termination of war, a lively peace propaganda developed among the Bulgarian soldiers; revolutionary leaflets were distributed and secret soldiers' committees and nuclei were called into being. In spite of wholesale arrests, in spite of thousands of soldiers being shot, this movement gained more and more ground and was given the most telling expression in the soldiers' riots in Dobro Polie and at the gates of Sofia in September 1918.

Just these soldiers' riots have been one of the factors which hastened the termination of war at the Balkan fronts.

The October Revolution encouraged the masses of workers and peasants of the Balkans in their struggle against monarchism, against the bourgeoisie and against the originators of the disastrous bloody war.

The workers' and peasants' movement in the Balkans received a tremendous, and unprecedented impetus.

Under the impression made on them by the October Revolution, which bestowed full national freedom on the numerous oppressed nations of Tsarist Russia, the oppressed peoples (Macedonians, Thracians, Albanians, inhabitants of the Dobrudja) entered on the right path of the national revolutionary fight. Bolshevism gained a powerful influence over the workers, peasants and petty bourgeoisie and over the nationally suppressed population.

The organisation of the workers in the trade union organisations, of the Left inclined peasant parties, proceeded at a rapid pace. The workers' and peasants' co-operative movement developed to an extent which was never witnessed before the war. The revolutionary Social Democratic Parties of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Roumania and Greece proclaimed their faith in Bolshevism, transformed themselves into Communist parties and developed into mass parties. The Bulgarian Communist Party won over the fourth part of the total number of voters and captured the administrative posts in almost all the towns and villages. The Yugoslavian Communist Party polled 200,000 votes at the election. All this was achieved by means of the revolutionary Bolshevik slogans. The Communist Parties of Roumania and Greece also made great progress. Mass strikes and

demonstrations swept the Balkans. The masses of workers and peasants engaged in a decisive advance against the bourgeois monarchist system.

Thanks to the profound social and political concussions resulting from the war and under the powerful influence of the October Revolution, the positions of monarchism and of the bourgeoisie were seriously shaken. In Bulgaria, the old King Ferdinand was compelled to abdicate the throne. Constantine, King of Greece, was removed. In spite of the "victory" in the war, the dynasties of Belgrade and Bucharest were shaken and began to totter. The rising world revolutionary wave weakened the influence and the pressure of imperialism on the Balkans. At that moment, the bourgeoisie and monarchism in the Balkans were no longer in a position to rely on the help of those who had been their support from without (Tsarist Russia and the old Austro-Hungarian Monarchy had disappeared and the victorious imperialist States themselves were threatened with the danger of revolution).

The bourgeoisie of the Balkans which was terrified and impotent, made various concessions to the masses in order to maintain its class predominance. The eight-hour day was almost universally proclaimed. Labour legislation was solemnly promised. Roumania and Yugoslavia set about working out an agrarian reform. The position of the peasant masses rose to such a level that, in Bulgaria, it even culminated in a three years' Peasant Government.

An immediate revolutionary situation existed. The Balkans were on the eve of a labour and peasant revolution, and this revolution would certainly have broken out and been victorious had not international Social Democracy committed its second betrayal (the first took place on August 4th), had it not prevented the revolution in Germany and Austria from developing into a real proletarian revolution, had it not let down the labour insurrection in Italy and the occupation of the factories and facilitated the overthrow of the Soviet Republics in Bavaria and Hungary. In view of the situation at that time, a victorious revolution in the Balkans would not only have led to the formation of the Soviet Balkan Federation, but would also have facilitated the proletarian revolution in Central Europe, would have ensured to Soviet Russia an important and reliable cover in the rear and promoted the revolution in the Near East.

In the same way as their brothers in Western Europe, the Social Democrats in the Balkans were on the side of the bourgeoisie and opposed to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, the peasantry and the oppressed nations, to the workers' and peasants' revolution in the Balkans.

Owing to this treachery of the Social-Democrats, the international bourgeoisie could rally-together, could strengthen its self-confidence, consolidate its position to a certain degree, find the way to a relative stabilisation of capitalism and finally proceed to a systematic attack on the revolutionary proletariat and the peasantry.

Noske's blood bath in Germany, Horthy's victory in Hungary, the victory of Fascism in Italy — this was the beginning of the steady growth of international bourgeois reaction and its constant spread. The victory of counter-revolution in Europe made it possible for the imperialist Powers to gain once more a firm hold on the Balkans. By the sacrifice of the economic and political independence of the Balkans, the Balkan bourgeoisie and monarchism gained for themselves the powerful support of the English, French and Italian imperialism and embarked on a brutal, fierce offensive against the revolutionary movement on the Balkans. It began with the sanguinary suppression of the general strike in Roumania in December 1920. The second important step in this direction was the exceptional law against the revolutionary movement in Yugoslavia in 1921 (the so-called "Obznana"). The military Fascist coup in Bulgaria in June 1923 was the third historical action carried out by the Balkan reaction which has ever since that time been raging and advancing in the Balkans, efficiently supported by foreign imperialism. A further important step of Balkan reaction was the overthrow of Fan Noli's People's Government in Albania by Achmed Zogu in 1924 with the direct help of Italy and Yugoslavia and the powerful support of England.

The September insurrection in 1923 in Bulgaria against the military Fascist dictatorship and for the Labour and Peasant Government was, in that period, the last heroic attempt of the proletariat to overcome the reaction, to maintain the proletarian positions which had been conquered and to keep the way open for the victory of the Balkan revolution. The September revolt of the Bulgarian workers and peasants was permeated with a Bolshevik spirit and was carried on under the banner of the October Revolution. In spite of the defeat, the insurrection will remain, in the eyes of the Bulgarian proletariat and of the proletariat of all the Balkan States, a bright ray thrown on the path of the revolutionary fight which will lead to a final victory.

For years the most terrible White Terror has been raging in the Balkan countries, and Fascism is making further progress. Its victims are innumerable. The bourgeoisie succeeded in shattering the organisations of the proletariat and the peasantry and in prohibiting and persecuting most severely the Communist Parties in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Roumania as legal parties. It succeeded in murdering or throwing into prison the most active proletarian cadres, in robbing the masses of workers and peasants completely of their political rights, and in exploiting the workers and peasants to the utmost. The revolutionary movement has for some time been driven back by the bourgeoisie, and the proletariat, as an important political factor, been pushed on one side.

The bourgeoisie of the Balkans could not, however, exterminate the ideas of the October Revolution, could not uproot the spirit of Bolshevism, nor destroy the unbounded love of the Balkan masses towards Soviet Russia.

On the contrary, the process of the Bolshevisation of the masses is steadily advancing, at the cost of colossal sacrifices and indescribable suffering. The proletarian masses and important sections of the poor peasantry have remained loyal to Communism.

In spite of everything, no proletarian groups have gone over to Social Democracy (this political agency of the bourgeoisie and of counter-revolution).

The Communist Parties of the Balkans, which have been so terribly persecuted, have been re-established as illegal organisations (with the exception of Greece, where the Party is still legal) and are, slowly but surely, beginning to gain strength and to consolidate.

On their way to Bolshevisation, the Communist Parties eliminated from their midst the liquidatory, petty bourgeois intelligentsia and the Social Democratic remnants (the group Sakarov-Manov in Bulgaria, the group Miloikovitch in Yugoslavia, Cristescu in Roumania and Puliopolus in Greece). The progressive Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties in the Balkans is further proved by a fact which should not be under-estimated that they all stand firmly on the side of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union against the Trotskyist Opposition, against the Menshevist position and against the activity of the group of Trotsky and Zinoviev which is aiming at a split, and by the fact that this group has no adherents among the Parties in the Balkans.

As a federation of all the peoples of the former Tsarist Russia, the Soviet Union is a shining example before the eyes of the Balkan peoples. In the Balkans, just as in Russia, the very complicated national question can only be solved, the territorial feuds only be settled, the imperialist pressure overcome and real peace among the Balkan peoples be ensured by the creation of a federation of the Balkan peoples after their liberation from capitalism. That is the reason why the Balkan proletariat, in common with the peasants and with the oppressed nations, is carrying on its fight for the Balkan Federation, for the Federation of the Balkan Workers' and Peasants' Republics. As this Balkan federation is only possible by the removal of the bourgeois monarchist Fascist regime which prevails in the Balkans and by a decisive fight against imperialism, the only right way towards this end is the way of Bolshevism, the way of the October Revolution, a revolution of the workers and peasants under the lead of the proletariat.

## THE DISCUSSION BEFORE THE XV. PARTY CONGRESS OF THE C. P. S. U.

### The Discussion Supplements No. 4 and 5 of the "Pravda".

By L. B.

No. 4 of the discussion supplements, which appeared in the "Pravda" of November 15th. contains the continuation of Comrade Kuusinen's article "The Present 'Historical Untruth' of Comrade Zinoviev", and four articles dealing with the counter-theses of the Opposition on the subject of work in the village. They are: "The Demagoguery of the Opposition in the Question of the Soviets" by K. Baumann, "The phantasies of the Opposition about the Peasants' Storage" by P. Kershenzev, "Nationalisation of the Land", by W. K. and "Taxation of the Village and the Opposition" by M. Liefshitz.

The discussion supplement No. 5 ("Pravda" of November 17th) contains the counter-theses of the Trotskyist Opposition with regard to the five years' plan of national economy and the following replies: "The Strike-breakers of the present Day and their 'Counter-theses'" by Marezky, "The Starting Point" by E. Goldenberg, "The Party's Policy in the Labour Question and Oppositional Demagoguery" by D. Kraval and "From where are we to obtain the Means?" by W. Meshlauk. The content of these contributions may be briefly summarised as follows:

#### The "Counter-theses".

1. After some complaints about "the bureaucratic preparation of the Party Congress", "the belated opening of the discussion" etc., the counter-theses of the Opposition with regard to the five years' plan of national economy begin with the assertion that the theses of the C. C. give no answer to the questions as to the direction in which unemployment, the increased demand for goods, the housing shortage will develop in the next few years; they give no answer to the question of "the rise of grain prices which has undeniably set in, the difficulties in the obtaining of grain, the restriction of exports, the danger of a decrease of the purchasing power of the rouble etc.". The theses of the C. C. speak of the necessity of combating drunkenness in a general way but without making concrete suggestions; the economic plans proposed, are, on the contrary, built up on the basis of an increased consumption of alcoholic liquors. The theses of the C. C. are nothing more nor less than a collection of undefined wishes which are absolutely contradictory to the draft plans made up to the present; it would therefore not be surprising if the new drafts would "suddenly assume a super-industrial character and turn out to be as little real as some other 'anniversary surprises' (!). The "haziness" of the theses is intended to mask the growing yieldingness to the pressure of the non-proletarian classes which is being practised.

2. The writers of the theses forgot that, in the present phase of development, every important economic question is a question of class war. The carrying out of the manifesto with regard to the slogan of exerting pressure on the Kulaks and the Nepmen — "issued after two years delay" — took for granted that the Party would change its policy fundamentally. "The fact that the Kulaks, the private capitalists and the bourgeois intellectuals are growing together with numerous members not only of the State bureaucracy but also of the Party bureaucracy" has already created the germs of a double power (!), which is a danger to the dictatorship of the proletariat. In order to abolish this danger it is necessary "to bring to light the Kulak and his constantly increasing income, to organise seriously the class war of the village poor against the Kulak. The pressure which is to be exerted on the NEP-man demands that the activity of the workers be roused, that all the organisations of Soviets, trade unions and of the Party should be made really responsible. There is no question of all this in the theses of the C. C. The slogan: "Fire to the left", issued by Stalin necessarily resulted in facilitating the union of the Right elements within the Party with the "Ustrjalov elements" outside the Party. It is "the prospering Kulak and NEP-man who are driving, the

party leaders to settle accounts with the Opposition". "The bourgeois capitalist elements" — maintains the Opposition — "are waiting with impatience until the Opposition will be annihilated, in order that the carrying out of their economic programme, the letting loose of both the Kulak and the NEP-man, the union with foreign capital by abolishing the foreign trade monopoly will be easier.

3. The declaration of the theses of the C. C., "the period entered upon is characterised by the growing class power of the proletariat, by the consolidation of its alliance with the masses of the poor and middle peasants, by the relative reduction — even though an absolute growth is still possible — of the private capitalist elements in the town and in the country" is said to be wrong; to be an "anniversary estimate". For, firstly, capitalism in the village is on the increase not only absolutely but also relatively, secondly, the growing pressure of the bourgeois elements does not coincide exactly with the economic statistics, thirdly, the forces of the capitalist encirclement should be taken into consideration.

The "wrong analysis of the proportion of forces" by the C. C. is lulling the activity and vigilance of the proletariat to sleep. "Under the present regime" the assault of the class enemies on the proletariat is beginning to rouse into activity the advanced strata of the latter. The fact that the Leningrad proletariat (?) took up an attitude of sympathy with the Opposition during the demonstration of October 17th, is evidence of this.

4. The theses fail to throw light on the present situation as the point of issue for the five years' plan. It is not true that the shortage of goods has been reduced. The apparent improvement in the first six months of 1926/27 is to be attributed to an artificial restriction of the demand for goods. In the second half of the economic year 1926/27 the shortage of goods, however, made itself felt with full intensity. The situation on the grain market is becoming worse in spite of three good harvests. The result is the destruction of the plan of exports (and with it of the plan of imports). The decisive causes of the difficulties are: the lack of goods (the backwardness of industry), the accumulation of stocks by the Kulaks (differentiation of the village), the improvident policy regarding the circulation of the currency (excessive issue of paper currency in connection with an insufficient carrying out of the revenue estimate).

5. In the five years before us, the "colossal deficit in industrial goods" will inevitably bring with it an increase of the stores of corn of the agricultural upper strata, the differentiation of the village, difficulties in the food supply and in exports and — as a consequence of all these factors — an increased pressure on the foreign trade monopoly. The State Planning Commission wants to abolish the shortage of goods by raising the rent of workers' dwellings, by increasing direct taxation, above all the tax on spirits. It is high time to replace indirect by direct taxation.

6. The investment of capital in industry, according to the original five years' plan of the State Planning Commission (which has not been confirmed by the C. C. — L. B.) remains almost stable during the next five years (1,142 millions in 1927/28 and 1,205 millions in 1930/31). As a matter of fact, the new figures make provisions for a much greater growth (from 1250 million to 1,588 millions), but on the one hand the Party is not informed of the real foundations of this higher calculation, on the other hand extremely small sums are assigned to industry from outside, even according to this plan.

The different variants of the five years' plan consider a 26% to 33 per cent increase of nominal wages and an increase of real wages by 40 to 50 per cent. The present policy of the "shortage of goods", however, makes an increase of real wages very doubtful. Real wages are to-day only a little higher than in the autumn of 1925. The increase of wages is behind the increase of the productivity of labour. The position of the working class is inevitably rendered worse by rationalisation, because it is not accompanied by a development of industry etc. which could absorb the workers who are dismissed. The area for workers' dwellings is below that of the members of other classes and will be further reduced according to the variant of the State Planning Commission until 1931 with an investment of capital of 700 million roubles; according to the variant of the Supreme Economic Council, it will remain unchanged for the next five years with an investment of capital amounting to a milliard. With regard to this question, the theses of the C. C. restrict themselves to mere wishes that the housing area for the workers should



be increased, without mentioning how this can be brought about in view of the present rate of industrialisation.

Even in order to prevent unemployment from increasing beyond the present level, a much more rapid rate of industrialisation is required than has been provided in all the plans; two millions of unemployed on the one hand, a milliard pood of unused stores of grain on the other hand, which is chiefly in the hands of the wealthy elements — this is a clear sign of the incapability of the leaders of the C. C. 150 million poods taken from the said stores could provide sufficient means for alleviating unemployment and the shortage of goods and give a powerful impulse to economic development as a whole.

In discussing the manifesto issued on the occasion of the anniversary, the Opposition suggested, among other things, the following demands of the workers: protection of the eight hours' day against any prolongation, an increase of wages, a combination of rationalisation with an adequate development of industry, measures for alleviating the consequences of unemployment, a systematic improvement of the workers' housing conditions, equal pay for men and women doing equal work, a declaration to the effect that the introduction of apprenticeship without pay is inadmissible, measures against improving the regime of economising, for an improvement of medical help in the factories, an increased number of schools for workers' children etc., to which the Opposition added that, when these demands had been fulfilled, a reduction of the hours of work to seven hours should be put on the agenda.

In its "counter-theses" the Opposition explains its attitude of opposition to the proclamation of the introduction of the seven-hour working day with the reason that the question was not raised "seriously and practically" in the manifesto. The carrying out of the seven-hour day without a reduction of wages involves a yearly expenditure of 500 million roubles. If this sum is available, the workers ought first to have been asked whether they would rather have it used for the introduction of the seven hour day or for the building of houses of for an increase of wages. The C. C. has not asked the workers.

8. The cause of the difficulties is that industry has developed too slowly during the past few years. The wrong taxation policy facilitates the accumulation of big stores of grain and other provisions in the hands of the Kulaks. In agriculture, in consequence of the rapid development of capitalist elements on the basis of the production of goods on a small scale, the dependence of State industry on the capitalist Kulak elements is also steadily increasing, the latter exercising a detrimental influence on exports and with it on the rate of socialist construction. The slow development of industry further acts as a brake on agriculture. The "fact" that an important section of the most important posts of supreme command, of exports, is passing into the hands of the class enemy, is one of the most fatal consequences of the policy of the C. C. There are two ways out of this situation: the first is to withdraw 150 to 200 million poods of cereals from the wealthiest tenth of the farms in the form of a compulsory loan for the purposes of export, the other, if the C. C. cannot make up its mind to resort to the first, would be to give up the foreign trade monopoly. The Opposition has never maintained (?) that the C. C. intended to abolish the foreign trade monopoly. The general trend of the policy of the C. C., however is objectively leading to the latter path.

The reduction of the cost price of industrial products only resulted in reducing the accumulation in industry, the cheaper prices of the goods did not, however, reach as far as to benefit the consumer. An essential preliminary condition of lowering the cost price is the reequipment of the existing factories or building of new ones. For this purpose however — this is what the C. C. has forgotten — it would be necessary to divert a large part of the national income from the capitalist to the socialist section. The C. C. is, on the contrary, laying the whole burden of this task on the shoulders of the working class and is trying to procure the necessary means by increasing the intensity of labour, by reducing the share of workers' wages in the cost of production and by cutting down the contributions of social insurance. The theses of the C. C. omit to mention the fact that the policy of lowering the prices not only results in the extension of the turnover of goods in the village but also in adding to the possibilities of accumulation on the part of the Kulak.

The systematic reduction of the cost price and of prices in industry, necessary in itself, under the condition that the prices for agricultural products remain unchanged, does not suffice to overcome the disproportion. It is necessary at the same time

to increase systematically the withdrawal of hundreds of million roubles from the accumulated means of the prosperous and wealthy farms and especially of the Kulak farms for the purposes of industrialisation.

9. The question as to from what sources the means for a "revolutionary" solution of industrialisation should be taken is answered by the Opposition as follows: The chief source is the exploitation of the Budget, further credits and a price policy aiming at a diversion of the national income; another source is the exploitation of our connections with foreign countries. "Concrete suggestions": the pure assignments for industrialisation taken from the Budget may reach 500 to 1000 million roubles yearly in the course of the next five years. Taxes on excess profits should be increased from 5 to 150—200 million roubles. A compulsory loan to the amount of 150 million poods of grain should be taken from the rich peasants; an elastic handling of the policy of reducing prices is necessary; further, really effective economical measures under the pressure of the masses from the point of view of class policy; the foreign trade monopoly should be turned to account. The question of the selection of the functionaries is, in the last resort, also a financial question. The mobilisation of private accumulation; reduction of the cost of circulation; abolishment of the sale of spirits by the State within two or three years, as its consequences do more harm to industrialisation than its profits yield benefit. The five years' plans of the State Planning Commission for Systematic Economy and of the Supreme Council of National Economy should be rejected categorically. The Opposition, on its part, demands that the distribution of the burden of taxation should be changed in favour of the workers and village poor at the expense of the Kulak and the NEP-man; ensurance of an absolute stability of the currency; a Budget without deficit; an increase of the means assigned for defence, for industrial purposes, electrification, for transport and for the building of houses and measures aiming at the introduction of the collective system in agriculture in the Budget of 1927/28; an energetic warding off of all attacks on the foreign trade monopoly.

10. In conclusion, the Opposition demands that the slogan: "Fire to the Left!" be condemned; the fact should be realised that the danger is threatening from the Right, "from the growing bourgeois classes in the town and country and from the Ustrialov and semi-Ustrialov elements within the party and outside it who support them"; no concealing of the difficulties; the "agitation against the Opposition" should be discontinued and its programme made public.

#### The Methods of Oppositional "Criticism".

Comrade Maretzki, in his article "The Strikebreakers of the Present Day and their Counter-theses" gives a general characterisation of these "counter-theses". The annihilating defeat of the Opposition in the party organisations (in the votings which took place up to November 16th, it only received 2423 out of 364,000 votes) compelled it to embark on its ambiguous tactics. In view of this defeat it does not dare to maintain its most biting and impudent Menshevist accusations against the Party in the counter-theses which are intended for the public. Not a word about the "Thermidor", not a word about the C. P. S. U. being "stifled", not a word about "the C. P. S. U. being a prison" etc. This heavy artillery of Menshevist accusations which the Opposition did not dare to fire in front of the Bolshevik workers, was employed all the more in the streets and before the non-party public.

In spite of this moderated language, it is obvious that the counter-theses are the economic foundation of the strike-breaker's policy of the present Trotzkyites. In all important questions regarding the economic plan (the rate of development, the relation to the world market, the relation between the town and the country, industrialisation, the systematic development of light and heavy industry, the investment of capital and its effect, prices, credits, the Budget policy, the overcoming of difficulties, unemployment, the housing problem, the policy of the class struggle against private capital and against the Kulak, the role of mass organisations in the solution of the tasks of socialist rationalisation etc.), the theses of the C. C. give definite, precisely outlined instructions. The Opposition, however, does not enter into the nature of these problems at all, but distracts the general attention from them by its "criticism" of a plan which does not exist. The political meaning of all expressions of opinion uttered by the Opposition is that they are trying to justify that ideology of strike-breaking, that "loud-crying pessimism" which



Lenin in 1917 characterised as follows: "With the bourgeoisie . . . everything is excellent, with us everything is bad. With the capitalists everything has been wonderfully prepared, with us everything is bad."

So-and-so much more electrical energy is being produced in the United States than in the Soviet Union. The Kulak is growing. The NEP-man is attacking us; the workers are beating a retreat; the pressure of the nonproletarian elements is on the increase; the leaders of the proletarian dictatorship are carrying on a policy of "great catastrophes": the dependence of national economy on the Kulaks is steadily growing etc. — this is the estimate which leads the Opposition to desert.

The tune is very similar when the Opposition states that "in the last few years more than the fifth part of the turnover has been in the hands of private capital", without mentioning that from year to year private capital is being more effectively ousted from the circulation of goods, a fact which even Miljukov is obliged to acknowledge. The Opposition reveals the same attitude of mind when, in comparing the pre-war figures with those of the present day, it belittles the latter and represents the former in an exaggerated manner.

The counter-theses offer a remarkable supplement with regard to the question of the attitude taken up by the Opposition towards the manifesto and the seven-hour day. In the C. C., the Opposition voted against the manifesto on the grounds that it contained nothing about the Chinese question (Jevdokimov), because it was inadequate (Zinoviev), because it was merely a manoeuvre (Trotzky). The counter-theses now explain that the Opposition was against the point dealing with the seven-hour day because it did not contain anything "clear, categorical, exact". The Opposition omits to say that a transition to the seven-hour day in a year at the latest is demanded in the manifesto, whereas we are not yet informed as to whether the Opposition thinks of the transition to the seven-hour day being perfected in a year, in two years or ten years or never.

The Opposition denies that the proletarian dictatorship has gained in strength during the last few years. It thinks it can prove this by referring to the fact that the C. C. is just now calling for reinforced pressure on the capitalists and Kulaks. Is not that a sign of weakness? As a matter of fact, the contrary is true. Just because we have grown stronger we may undertake such a step with every prospect of success.

In order to refute the accusation of calumny raised against it, the Opposition declares that it has never maintained that the C. C. was intending to abolish the foreign trade monopoly etc. Comrade Maretzki, however, quotes the platform of the Opposition which runs exactly as follows: "In the circles of the leading majority, the following "plan" is being hatched: recognition of the debts; 2. liquidation of the foreign trade monopoly to a greater or lesser extent . . ." Such calumnies and such a juggling with assertions are a direct scorning of the Bolshevik workers.

The Opposition describes the five years' plan of the State Planning Commission — which, by the bye, neither the C. C. nor the Party Conference has confirmed — right away as "a plan of the greatest catastrophes and concussions". We are fairly accustomed to such "prophecies". Zinoviev and Kamenev described Lenin's policy in October 1917 as a "catastrophe". In 1923, Trotzky stated that the country was approaching its "ruin". When the new Opposition came into being, it also cried out about "catastrophe" and "disaster". At the present moment the Opposition is again covering its shameful flight from the revolution by hysterical screams about a "catastrophe".

Another fact is characteristic of the anti-Party attitude of the Opposition. The Opposition "criticises" various projects concerning the five years' plan. If, in their opinion, a figure is put down too low in one draft, they cry out: you are working against Socialism! If, in the other draft, the corresponding figure is put down higher, they call that "bureaucratic oppo-mism! Demagogy!" It is quite natural that such "critics" can never be satisfied, as they only want one thing: to bring the party and its leaders into discredit at any price.

The Opposition wants to create the impression that the "Third Force" (the bourgeois and Menshevik counter-revolution) is afraid of it. The following questions suffice to refute this assertion: Who is pleased at the Opposition's attempt at organising a demonstration in the streets on November 7th and who is annoyed at the failure of this attempt? Whom do the "Vor-

wärts" and the "Sozialistische Bote" praise? Whose speeches are now being published by Miljukov's organ? Who is urging the Opposition on to the path of illegal action? Whose judgment of the manifesto agrees with that of the Opposition?

### The Panic Manoeuvres of the Opposition and the Present Economic Situation.

In his article: "The Point of Issue", Comrade Goldenberg characterises the method by which the Opposition is estimating the present situation as the point of issue of the five years' plan. The pessimistic estimate of the Opposition is based on the following "fundamental facts". "Standing in a queue in front of shops" as a sign of "steadily increasing shortage of goods"; "difficulties in the raising of corn" and "an increased issue of paper money". In reality things are as follows:

A few weeks ago, people really stood in queues, as the autumn (realisation of the harvest) always brings with it a tremendous seasonal increase in the demand for goods. These "queues have long ceased to exist. According to the preliminary calculations of the State Planning Commission the demand for industrial products in the whole of the economic year 1927/28 will increase by 5.1 per cent, whereas the supply will rise by 7.7%. This is no intensification but a decrease of the shortage of goods. With regard to the two other questions — it is a case of difficulties which only last a few weeks (in the raising of corn for instance, where there are difficulties of transport due to bad weather) concerning similar temporary difficulties, i. e. difficulties connected with the season; the Opposition — which is moreover operating with quotations of wrong figures — sees in such incidents "catastrophes". When the Opposition maintains that the sources of the credit system have diminished in 1925 — and that by a third as compared with the previous year — and that a further diminution is taking place in 1926/27, it is simply lying as the Opposition is wont to do. In 1924, the balance of our credit system amounted to 2412 million roubles, on October 1st 1925 to 5343 millions, on October 1st 1926 to 6412 millions and on July 1st 1927 to 8175 million roubles. Any other conclusion may be drawn from this, but not that of a decline.

The counter-theses of the Opposition once more raise Trotzky's old theory about good harvests being a danger to industrialisation, and founded it — on what? On the "queues" which do not exist, on an invented increase of a demand for goods and on a fictitious failure of the campaign for the raising of corn. Trotzky's "theory" and its "confirmation" are worthy of one another.

"In our country, industry is lagging behind the development of national economy as a whole." This is what the Opposition says. What then say the figures? In the four years from 1924/25 to 1927/28, the share of industry in the total production of the country amounts to 32.4%, 35.9%, 38.0%, 40.2%, its share in the total production of goods to: 53.2%, 58.5%, 59.6% and 60.7%.

Comrade Goldenberg describes the "reproach" made by the Opposition to the effect that the rate of the saturation of the market with articles of general use remains behind the general rate of industrialisation, as petty bourgeois, Menshevik demagogy. Another development is actually impossible as the policy of industrialisation just consists in the fact that at the present moment the production of means of production must increase more rapidly than that of articles of general use. The increased production of means of production is, in the last resort, also a prerequisite for the rise of consumption.

The Opposition proposes to take 150 million poods from the stores of corn by means of a forced loan. It talks of stores of 800 to 900 million poods. In reality however the amount of the stores in question amounts to 700 million poods at most. The 150 million poods which, the Opposition suggests to be taken from the stores, thus disappear by simply correcting the figure. On the other hand, the geographical distribution of the said stores clearly shows in whose possession they are. In the central Volga district in the autumn of the current year, the stores amounted to 12 poods per head, in the lower Volga district to 13.3 pood, in the Northern Caucasus to 14 pood, in the Crimea to 13.9 pood, in the Ukraine to 7.5 poods, in Siberia to 6.9 and in the central black soil district to 4.5 poods. The specific preponderance of the Kulaks is greatest in the Ukraine; with regard to stores however the Ukraine ranges in the

last place but one. In the central black soil district also the differentiation of the village is comparatively strong, and there are nevertheless the smallest stores in that district. This proves how "fair" and "concrete" are the suggestions made by the Opposition.

### The Demagogy of the Opposition and the Situation of the Working Class.

Comrade Krawal makes use of a rich material of figures in refuting the demagogic assertions of the counter-theses in the question of the labour policy of the Party. In its platform, the Opposition raises the accusation that the numerical increase of the working class and the improvement of its living conditions have almost come to a standstill since 1925. The figures however demonstrate the contrary. In the last two economic years the number of workers employed in large industry increased from 1,529,900 to 2,021,000, i. e. by 32 per cent. In the time from the last Party Congress to the quarter July to September 1927, the actual wages of the workers increased by 18.5 per cent, nominal wages by 22.8 per cent. At the present moment, actual wages amount to 111.3% of the wages in 1913 with a reduction of the hours of work amounting to 23 per cent. This is the case, if wages in cash alone are taken into consideration. If other privileges are included, actual wages amount to 134 per cent of the pre-war wages. (Demonstrated in Comrade Krawal's article by an extensive statistical table embracing the various branches of industry. L. B.). As a matter of fact, the Opposition has not dared to maintain its accusations in the counter-theses, having been found guilty in the workers' meetings of simply copying the assertions contained in its "platform" from the Menshevist "Socialist Messenger".

The assertion made by the Opposition that an insufficient increase of wages is being provided for, is refuted by the fact that an increase of actual wages by 46 per cent is provided for in the next five years.

The Opposition meets the introduction of the seven hour day with the demand that "any inclination to prolong the eight hour day should be nipped in the bud". In reality, we record a constant reduction of the hours of work (including over-time) from an average 7.8 hours in 1923 to 7.4 hours in the current year. At the same time, over-time is being cut down.

The manner in which the Opposition deals with the difficulties which actually exist, lack of housing accommodation, unemployment etc. shows that it does not concern itself seriously with the problem of overcoming these difficulties but only with bringing the C. C. into discredit. It exaggerates the difficulties with the use of forged statistical data, passes over in silence the successful efforts made by the Party in order to overcome them and finally represents measures which have been carried out by the C. C. a long time ago (increase of the unemployment benefit) as demands made by the Opposition.

The "counter-theses" demand an increase of wages at least in correspondence with the increase of the productivity of labour, whereas, in reality, the productivity of labour has increased by 23% during the last two years, actual wages by 29%, nominal wages by 40%. The demand made by the Opposition is therefore actually equivalent to a reduction of wages.

### Where are the Means to be Found?

Comrade Meshlauk's article "Where are the Means to be Found?" concludes the discussion supplement No. 5. This question reveals perhaps most clearly the demagogical, purely destructive character of the demands made by the Opposition. The Opposition demands "nothing more nor less" from the Budget for 1927/28 than "a considerable increase of the assignments (as compared to the original draft. L. B.) for defence (chiefly for war industry), for industry in general, for electrification, for transports, for the building of houses, for measures aiming at the introduction of collective farming". It demands that the net investment in industry alone at the cost of the National Budget should amount to 500—1000 millions yearly in the next few years. This is of course only a shifting of the question as to the means, because the Opposition forgets to say where the Budget is to find these sums.

As regards the increased taxation of private capital, even Comrade Piatakow, a leading member of the Opposition, showed in 1925 that the burden of taxation of private capitalists amounts

to 62 to 90 per cent of their income and that this is "the limit which the taxation of the biggest incomes should reach". Since that time, the burden of taxation on private capital was increased by 40 per cent of the taxes in force before that time. In consequence of this burden of taxation, the number of industrial businesses carried on by private capitalists has suffered a decrease, in 1926/27 it fell even in absolute figures by 19 per cent. The fact alone that, in the taxation of private capital, we have gone beyond the highest limit recognised by the Opposition, sufficiently exposes their "concrete proposals".

The number of Kulak farms in the Soviet Union amounts to 3 to 4 per cent. If the Opposition then demands a forced loan at the cost of the stores of 10 per cent of the peasant farms, this means that about 1½ million farms in the hands of the middle peasants would have to suffer from this measure apart from the Kulaks; this means steering towards a shaking of our relations with the middle peasants. The Party will not agree to this; it will however continue on the path of restrictions with a view to suppressing the tendency to exploitation shown by the Kulaks, by an increase of taxation etc.

It is characteristic of the whole attitude of the Opposition that, in its disbelief in the socialist methods of development, it regards the transference of the means of the capitalistic strata by means of the budget as the chief source of industrialisation. The Party is indeed doing everything in its power to procure as much as possible for the requirements of socialist construction from the said means. After the nationalisation of large industry, after the abolition of private ownership of land, after the economic power of the steadily growing co-operative sections of industry, trade and transport exceeding many times the share of capital in these branches of industry, thus leaving but little room for the capitalist elements in accumulation and in the Budget — the development of socialist industry and agriculture which are being directed on to socialist paths by the co-operatives and by electrification, remains the chief source of industrialisation.

## How the Legend of the "Fire against the Left" Arose.

The Russian Opposition and its supporters in other countries declare continually that the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. directs its "fire against the Left". The following passage from the closing speech of comrade Stalin at the VII. Enlarged Executive session of the E. C. C. I. (7th December 1926) reveals the source of this legend. Ed.

Comrade Kamenev declared that the XIV. Congress of our Party made a mistake when it "directed its fire against the Left", that is to say, against the Opposition. From this it would follow that the Party is conducting a fight against the revolutionary kernel in the Party and is continuing this struggle. From this it would follow that our Opposition is not a right-wing, but a left wing Opposition.

Comrades, that is nonsense, that is only the talk of the members of the Opposition. The XIV. congress did not dream of opening its fire against the revolutionary majority, and could not do this. In reality the XIV. congress opened fire against the Right wingers, against the members of the Opposition, which is a Right-wing opposition although it cloaks itself in a "Left-wing" garb. Certainly, the opposition tends to regard itself as a "revolutionary Left-wing", but our XIV. Party congress declared on the contrary, that the Opposition only masks itself with "Left-wing" phrases and in reality is an opportunist opposition. We know how often it happens that a right-wing opposition cloaks itself with a "left-wing" garb, in order to deceive the workers. The "Worker-opposition" also considered itself to be more revolutionary than any one else, but it turned out in the end that it was more to the Right than any one else. The present opposition also considers itself to be more Left than all the others, but the whole activity of the opposition shows that it is the rallying point and the lever for all Right-wing opportunist tendencies, commencing with the "Worker-opposition" and Trotzkyism and ending with the "new opposition" and all possible sorts of Souvarines.

Comrade Kamenev has merely confused the two words "left" and "right".