

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 71

15th 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.

C O N T E N T S

J. Stalin: Political Report of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. at the XV. Party Congress.

M. Tomsky: Trotzkyism and the Labour Question.

Against Imperialist War.

Hands off Lithuania!

To All Young Workers and Soldiers of Lithuania, Poland, Latvia, Germany and other countries!

Politics.

Luhani: The British Commission on Constitutional Reform in India.

Against Colonial Oppression.

The Brussels Conference of the League against Imperialism.

The Labour Movement.

G. Rosov: First Congress of the Independent Trade Unions of Bulgaria.

For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.

They are at the End of their Lies.

A Declaration by Comrade Pikel.

The Youth Movement.

Youth Conference of Friends of the Soviet Union.

Resolution of the Youth Conference of the Friends of the Soviet Union.

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

H. K.: Discussion Supplement No. 1 of the "Pravda".

Political Report of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. at the XV. Party Congress.

Full Report of Speech of Comrade Stalin.

I. The Growing Crisis of International Capitalism and the International Position of the Soviet Union.

Our country, comrades, lives and develops amid capitalist surroundings. Its international position depends not only on its internal forces but also on the condition of this capitalist environment, on the situation of the capitalist countries that surround us, on the strength, or weakness, of these capitalist countries and on the strength or weakness of the oppressed classes throughout the world, on the strength or weakness of the revolutionary movement of these classes. I need not even add that our revolution is part of the international revolutionary movement of the oppressed classes. Therefore I believe that the report of the Central Committee ought to begin with an outline of the international position of our country, with a sketch of the conditions in the capitalist countries and of the state of the revolutionary movement in all countries.

1. The Economy of World Capitalism and the sharpening of the Fight for Foreign Markets.

a) The first question must be as to the state of production and trade in the great capitalist countries.

It is a fundamental fact in this connection, comrades, that the production of the capitalist countries should during the two years here under review have exceeded the pre-war standard considerably. Some figures in point. The index of the cast iron

output of the world stood in 1925 at 97.6, and in 1926 at 100.5 per cent. of the pre-war level. For the year 1927 we have no complete returns; there are only returns as to the first half year, which speak of a further increase in cast iron output. The index of steel production in the whole world stood in 1925 at 118.5 per cent., and in 1926 at 122.6 per cent. of the pre-war level. The index of the coal output of the world was 97.9 per cent. in 1925 and 96.8 per cent. (a slight regression) in 1926, obviously due to the lock-out in Great Britain.

The world's consumption of cotton figured in 1925/26 at 108.3, and in 1926/27 at 112.5 per cent. of the pre-war figures. The world's crop in the five grain varieties stood in 1925 at 107.2, in 1926 at 110.5, and in 1927 at 112.3 per cent. of the pre-war level. The total index of the world's production is thus slowly advancing and leaving the pre-war level behind it.

On the other hand there are capitalist countries which advance not with small steps but with leaps and bounds, leaving the pre-war level far behind them, e. g. the United States and in part Japan. In the United States the output of the finishing industries figured in 1925 at 148 per cent. and in 1926 at 152 per cent. of the pre-war average, while that of the raw-material industries was 143 per cent. in 1925 and 154 per cent. in 1926.

The growth of world trade. World trade does not develop so fast as output, but it also reaches the pre-war average. The index of the foreign trade turnover of the whole world stood in 1925 at 98.1 per cent. and in 1926 at 97.1 per cent. of the pre-war average. Regarded according to individual countries, the United States showed 134.3 per cent. in 1925 and 143 per cent. in 1926; France 98.2 and 99.2 per cent., respectively; Germany 74.8 per cent. and 73.6 per cent.; Japan 176.9 per cent. and 170.1 per cent.

In general world trade has already reached the pre-war level, which in some cases, as for instance in the United States and Japan, it has surpassed.

Added to this there is another group of facts, such as regard technical progress, the rationalisation of the capitalist industries, the creation of new branches of production, and the increasing amalgamation and trustification in industry on an international scale. These facts, I believe, are all well known. I shall therefore not dwell any longer upon them, only pointing out that capital has succeeded in attaining great results not only along the line of the growth of production and along the line of trade, but also as regards the improvement in production technique and technical progress, as also the rationalisation of production, all this leading to a further strengthening of the great trusts and to the organisation of great new monopoly-cartels.

Those are the facts, comrades, which we must mention and from which we must start.

Does all this mean that the stabilisation of capitalism has become a firm and lasting fact? **Naturally not.** On the occasion of the XIVth Party Congress the report pointed out that capitalism might reach and surpass pre-war averages and that it might rationalise its production, but that this would not mean that the stabilisation of capitalism would thereby become any firmer or that capitalism would regain its predominant pre-war stability. On the contrary, this stabilisation, the very fact of the growth of output and trade, the fact that technical progress and the possibilities of production are increased, while the world market with its limits and with the spheres of influence of the individual imperialist groups remain more or less stable — just these facts entail a very acute far-reaching crisis of international capitalism, pregnant with new wars and endangering the existence of all stabilisation.

Partial stabilisation entails the aggravation of the crisis of capitalism, which in its turn annihilates stabilisation. Such is the course of development of capital at the present historical moment.

b) The most characteristic thing about this growth of the production and trade of international capitalism is the fact that the development proceeds **unequally**. The development does not ensue in the sense of a smooth and uniform advance of the capitalist countries, one after another, without mutual disturbance or collisions but rather in the sense that some of the countries are ousted and ruined while others become prominent and rise, all this in a life-and-death struggle among the different continents and countries for the hegemony on the market. The economic centre is shifted from Europe to America, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Thereby the specific weight of America and Asia increases internationally at the cost of Europe.

Some figures in illustration of the above: Whereas in 1923 the share of Europe in the foreign trade turnover of the world stood at 58.5 per cent., that of America at 21.2 per cent., and that of Asia at 12.3 per cent., the European share had fallen by 1925 to 50 per cent., while that of America had risen to 26.6 per cent. and that of Asia to 16 per cent. Beside the countries of vigorously progressive capitalism (United States and partly also Japan), we see countries undergoing economic decline (Great Britain). Alongside the increasingly powerful capitalism of Germany and the rise of countries which have of late come to the fore, such as Canada, Australia, Argentine, India, and China, we have countries with a stabilising form of capitalism, such as France and Italy. The number of competitors on the selling market increase, the possibilities of production grow, the supply of goods is enhanced, but the absorbing capacity of the markets and the boundaries of the spheres of influence remain more or less stable.

That is the basis of the growing irreconcilable contradictions within the capitalism of to-day.

c) This contradiction between the growth of productive possibilities and the relative stability of the markets forms

the basis of the fact that the market problem has now come to represent the crucial question of capitalism. The aggravation of the market problem in general and that of the foreign markets in particular, quite especially as regards the market for capital exportation, is characteristic of the present state of capitalism. This is really the explanation of the fact that the insufficient degree of occupation in the works and factories has become an every-day phenomenon. The strengthening of the customs-barriers is only oil on the flames. In the limits of its present markets and spheres of influence, capitalism is beginning to feel cramped. The peaceful attempts to solve the market problem have led to no positive result, nor could they lead to any. The well-known declaration of the bankers in 1926 in regard to the freedom of trade ended in failure. The Economic Conference of the League of Nations in the year 1927, which set as its aim the "alliance of economic interests" of the capitalist countries, likewise ended in a fiasco. The peaceful way of solving the market problem is closed to capitalism, which thus has only one way left to choose, viz., a redistribution of the colonies and spheres of influence by force of arms, military collisions, and new imperialist wars.

Stabilisation has engendered an aggravation of the capitalist crisis.

2. The International Policy of Capitalism and the Preparation for New Imperialist Wars.

a) In this connection the question of a redistribution of the world and of the spheres of influence which represent the foundations of the foreign market, is now the crucial question of international capitalist politics. I already pointed out that the present distribution of the colonies and spheres of influence which resulted as an outcome of the last imperialist war, is already obsolete. It contents neither the United States, which are desirous of penetrating into Asia (China in particular) and are no longer satisfied with South America, nor yet Great Britain, which is losing its hold on the Dominions and on a number of very important markets in the Orient, nor yet Japan, which is just now "disturbed" in China by Great Britain and America; no more does it content Italy or France, which have innumerable bones of contention both in the Danubian States and in the Mediterranean; finally, it by no means pleases Germany, which is still without colonies. Hence the general desire for a redistribution of the markets and raw-material sources. It remains to be added that the Asiatic markets and the routes thereto are the main objects of conflict.

This gives rise to a number of knotty points, representing whole foci of new conflicts. One of these points is the so-called Pacific problem, the antagonism between America, Japan, and Great Britain, a source of strife as to the hegemony in Asia and the countries giving access thereto. Another is the Mediterranean problem, the antagonism between Great Britain, France, and Italy, as a source of strife as to the predominance on the shores of the Mediterranean and as to the control of the nearest route to the East. Yet another point is the aggravation of the oil problem between England and America, for without oil there is no possibility of waging war and whoever has the advantage in regard to oil has the best prospects of victory in the coming conflict.

Only recently Chamberlain's latest plan for the settlement of the Mediterranean problem was published in the English press. For the accuracy of this plan I cannot guarantee, but that its publication was symptomatic cannot be doubted. The plan was as follows. The Syrian "mandate" to pass from the hands of France into those of Italy, Tangier to be left to France against a financial compensation of Spain, Germany to get back the Cameroons, Italy to pledge herself to cease all intrigues on the Balkans, etc. All this naturally proceeds under the flag of the fight against the Soviets. No villainy is now committed without the Soviets being dragged in the dirty plan. And what is the actual import of the above arrangement? Its object is the ousting of the French bourgeoisie from Syria, from all times the door to the East, to Mesopotamia, Egypt, and so forth. From Syria, Great Britain can be harmed both in the Suez-Canal region and in Mesopotamia. Now Chamberlain obviously desires to put an end to this disagreeable situation. Without doubt, the publication of this plan cannot be regarded as a mere matter of chance. The value of this fact consists in the circumstance that it is highly characteristic of the quarrels, conflicts,

and military collisions preparing in the present relations among the so-called "great Powers".

As regards the present state of the oil problem and the fight for naphtha, the October issue of the well-known American publication "World's Work" outlines the situation pretty clearly.

"There is a very real danger to peace and mutual understanding between the Anglo-Saxon peoples. The support of American business circles by the Ministry will inevitably be emphasised according to necessity. If the British Government identifies itself with the oil industry of Great Britain, the American Government is bound sooner or later to identify itself with the American oil industry. The struggle, however, cannot pass into the realm of the two Governments without a serious aggravation of the menace of war."

There cannot be any further doubt on the subject. The organisation of new coalitions of power for the preparation of new wars for foreign markets, for raw-material sources, and for the control of traffic-routes is already in progress.

b) Were there in the period under review any attempts at a "peaceful settlement" of the approaching warlike complications? There were indeed several such attempts, but they led to no result. Nay, these very attempts served as a cover for the preparations of the Powers for further wars and as a blind for the purpose of duping the workers and peasants.

Let us take the League of Nations, which the mendacious bourgeois press and the no less mendacious press of the Social Democrats call an instrument of peace. To what end has the twaddle of the League of Nations about peace, disarmament, and the restriction of armaments really led? To no good, at any rate. To nothing but a deceiving of the masses, to rival armaments, to an aggravation of the coming conflict. Can it be looked upon as a mere matter of chance that the League of Nations should talk of peace and disarmament for three years, with the support of the so-called Second International, and that at the same time the "nations" should arm and arm again, aggravating their old quarrels and creating new ones and thereby undermining the cause of peace? What is proved by the failure of the Three-Power Conference for the restriction of armaments (Great Britain, America, and Japan), if not the fact that the Pacific problem is a source of new imperialist wars, and that the Powers will neither disarm nor restrict their armaments? What has the League of Nations done to obviate this danger?

Or let us take the recent attitude of the Soviet delegation at Geneva in favour of a real, as opposed to a merely decorative, disarmament. How can we explain the fact that the frank and honest declaration of Comrade Litvinov on complete disarmament flabbergasted the League of Nations and found it "wholly unprepared"? Does not this speak for the fact that the League of Nations is not an instrument of peace and disarmament flabbergasted the League of Nations and found it preparing new wars? The corruptible bourgeois press of all countries, from England to Japan and from France to America, shouts vociferously about the "insincerity" of the disarmament proposals of the Soviet Union. Why should the sincerity of these suggestions not be tested and serious steps be taken towards disarmament, or at least towards a restriction of armaments? On what does it depend? Or what is, e. g., the present system of "amicable alliances" among the capitalist countries, the Franco-Yugoslav agreement, the Italo-Albanian agreement, the "amicable" agreement prepared by Pilsudski for Poland and Lithuania, the "Locarno system", the "Locarno spirit", etc. — what is all this but a system for the preparation of new wars and the array of forces for the forthcoming military conflicts?

Or let us take the following facts. Between 1913 and 1927, the numeric strength of the armies of France, Great Britain, Italy, the United States, and Japan together increased from 1,888,000 to 2,262,000. In the same period the military budgets of the said countries grew from 2345 to 3948 million gold roubles. The number of fighting airplanes of these five countries rose from 2655 in 1925 to 4340 in 1927. The tonnage of the cruisers of these five Powers rose from 744,000 in 1922 to 864,000 in 1926. The situation of war-chemistry may be illustrated by the following declaration of General Fries, the chief of the chemical war service of the United States.

"An aero-chemical bomb, weighing 450 kilogrammes and filled with lewisite can make ten precincts of New York uninhabitable for at least a week, while a hundred tons lewisite, lung down from fifty airplanes, can have the same effect on the entire city."

What else do these facts prove but that preparations are being made with full steam for renewed warfare?

These are the results of the "peace policy" and the "disarmament policy" of the bourgeois States in general and of the League of Nations and the Social Democratic toadies in particular.

Formerly the growth of armaments was explained by the existence of a Germany armed to the teeth. Now this "justification" has collapsed. Is it not obvious that this growth of armaments is necessitated by the need of new wars among the imperialist Powers and that the war spirit forms the nucleus of the Locarno spirit?

I believe the present "peace relations" may be compared with a worn-out shirt, consisting of rags scantily kept together by thin threads. You need but tug a little at these threads or tear them quite a little, and the entire shirt will fall apart, leaving nothing but rags. You need but scratch the present "peaceful relations" at some spot or other, somewhere in Albania or in Lithuania or in China or America, and the whole construction of peaceful relations will collapse. So it was before the last imperialist war, when the Sarajevo murder led to the outbreak of hostilities. So it is again to-day.

From stabilisation there results the inevitability of new imperialist wars.

3. The Condition of the International Revolutionary Movement and the Signs of a Renewed Revolutionary Advance.

a) The growth of armaments and the organisation of new coalitions do not suffice for the purpose of making war. It is also necessary to secure the hinterland in the capitalist countries. There is not a single capitalist country that could wage war seriously without having first secured the hinterland and gagged "its" workers and "its" colonies. Hence the general development of the policy of the bourgeois Governments in the direction of Fascism. It is no matter of chance that power should now be in the hands of the Right Bloc in France, of the Hicks-Deterding-Urquhart bloc in England, the bourgeois bloc in Germany, the military party in Japan, and the Fascist Governments in Poland and Italy.

Hence the pressure on the working class, hence the Trade disputes and Trades Union law in England, the law of national defence in France, the abolition of the eight-hour day in a number of States, and the combined attack of the bourgeoisie on the proletariat.

Hence the increased pressure on the colonies and dependent States, the reinforcement of the imperialist armies in these countries to a total strength of one million (700,000 thereof stationed in the British possessions and spheres of influence).

b) It is not difficult to comprehend that this inhuman pressure on the part of the Fascist Governments should meet with the resistance of the oppressed nations, the colonies, and the working class at home. Facts like the development of the revolutionary movement in China, Indonesia, and India cannot remain without influence on the fate of international imperialism. Judge for yourselves. Of the 1905 million inhabitants of the entire globe, 1134 millions live in the colonies or semi-colonies, 143 millions in the Soviet Union, 264 millions in the intermediate countries, and only 363 millions in the great imperialist countries which oppress the colonies and semi-colonies.

It is obvious that the revolutionary awakening of the colonial countries marks the beginning of the end of world imperialism. The fact that the Chinese revolution has not yet led to the direct victory over imperialism cannot be of decisive importance for the prospects of the revolution itself. The great popular revolutions never win through at a blow. They grow and extend subject to a certain ebb and flow. This was the case even in Russia, and thus it will also be in China. The most important event of the Chinese revolution was the fact that it put into movement hundreds of millions of exploited persons, unmasked the counter-revolutionary spirit of the clique of generals, tore the mask from the face of the Kuomintang counter-revolutionary lackeys, confirmed the authority of the Communist Party, put the entire movement on a higher level,

that of the Soviet organisation, and awakened new hopes in the breasts of millions in India, Farther India, etc. Only blind men or cowards can doubt that the Chinese peasants and workers will proceed to another revolutionary movement.

As regards the revolutionary movement among the working class in Europe, we can here too observe definite signs of a turn to the Left and a revival of revolutionary activity. Such facts as the British general strike and the struggle of the British miners, the revolutionary action of the workers in Vienna, the revolutionary manifestations in France and Germany in connection with the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti, the electoral successes of the Communists in Germany and Poland, the obvious differentiation in the labour movement in England, in which the leaders proceed to the Right and the workers to the Left, the deterioration of the Second International into a mere appendix of the imperialist League of Nations, the diminishing authority of the Social Democratic Party in the broad masses of the workers, the general growth of the influence of the Comintern and its sections among the workers of all countries, the growing influence of the Soviet Union among the oppressed classes of all the world, the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union — all these facts show unmistakably that Europe is entering upon a new phase of revolutionary activity.

If an event like the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti could arouse such gigantic manifestations of public opinion, it is a proof that there is pent up revolutionary energy among the workers, energy which is only waiting for the opportunity to flare up and attack the capitalist regime. We are on the eve of a new revolutionary advance both in the colonies and in the mother countries.

Stabilisation has engendered a new revolutionary rise.

4. The Capitalist World and the Soviet Union.

a) There are thus all signs of a far-reaching crisis and of a growing instability of international capitalism. Although the temporary post-war crisis of 1920/21 with its internal chaos and a decay of the foreign trade connections among the capitalist countries may be considered to have passed and a period of partial stabilisation has ensued, the main crisis of capitalism, which has become apparent in view of the victory of the October Revolution and the secession of the Soviet Union from the capitalist system of economy, has not only not been overcome but is more and more pronounced and is undermining the foundations of international capitalism. The stabilisation has not only not prevented the development of this main crisis of capitalism, but has also furnished the ground and the source for its further development. The growing fight for markets, the necessity of a redistribution of the world and of the spheres of influence, the breakdown of bourgeois pacifism and the League of Nations, the feverish work of creating new coalitions and setting up of forces for a new war, the insane piling up of armaments, the inhuman pressure on the working class and the colonies, the development of the revolutionary movement in the colonies and in Europe, the growing authority of the Comintern throughout the world, and finally the growing power of the Soviet Union and its increasing authority among the workers of Europe and the colonies, all these are facts which must shake the very foundations of international capitalism.

The stabilisation of capitalism is growing more and more rotten and shaky.

If two years ago there was much talk of the ebb of revolutionary activity in Europe, we have now every reason to assert that Europe is now obviously entering on a new phase of revolutionary uprise. This quite apart from the colonies, where the situation of the imperialists is growing more and more catastrophic.

b) The hopes of the capitalists of a capitalistic degeneration of the Soviet Union and the sinking of its authority among the workers of Europe and the colonies have been doomed to disappointment. The Soviet Union grows and develops as the country of Socialist construction. Its influence with the workers and peasants of all the world increases and deepens. The existence of the Soviet Union as a country engaged in building up Socialism is one of the greatest factors making for the decay of world imperialism and the undermining of its stability both in Europe and in the colonies. The Soviet Union

is obviously becoming the hope of the European workers and the oppressed colonial peoples.

So as to prepare the ground for future imperialist wars and so as to strengthen the capitalist hinterland by yet more thoroughly gagging and fettering the workers at home and the native population in the colonies, the first step is the subjugation of the Soviet Union, that focus and stronghold of revolution, which is at the same time one of the greatest markets for the produce of the capitalist countries. Hence the revival of the intervention policy in capitalist circles. Hence the policy of isolating, of encircling the Soviet Union and that of creating all premises for waging war on the Soviet Union.

The growth of the intervention tendencies in the camp of the imperialists and the danger of war against the Soviet Union are two of the most characteristic facts of the present situation.

It is the British bourgeoisie which is most threatened by the imminent crisis of capitalism, and it is this same bourgeoisie which has seized the initiative with a view to strengthening the tendency of intervention.

It is obvious that the support of the British miners by the workers of the Soviet Union and the sympathies of the Soviet working class with the revolutionary movement in China could but cast oil on the fire. All these facts called forth the rupture between Great Britain and the Soviet Union and the worsening of our relations with a number of other States.

c) In consequence thereof the fight between two tendencies in the relations of the capitalist world and the Soviet Union, the tendency of bellicose aggressiveness, mainly on the part of England, and the tendency towards continuation of pacific relations, urged by a number of other capitalist countries, is the fundamental fact of our foreign relations at the present moment.

The facts characterising the tendency of pacific relations in the period under review are as follows: The treaty of non aggression with Turkey, the guarantee agreement with Germany, the customs agreement with Greece, the credit agreement with Germany, the recognition by Uruguay, the guarantee compact with Afghanistan, the guarantee compact with Lithuania, the draft of the guarantee compact with Latvia, the commercial treaty with Turkey, the settlement of the conflict with Switzerland, the treaty of neutrality with Persia, the improvement in the relations to Japan, and the growth in economic relations with the United States and Italy.

The facts characterising the tendency towards a policy of bellicose aggression in the period under review were the British note in connection with the financial support of the locked out miners, the assaults in Peking, Tientsin and Shanghai, the raid on the Arcos, the rupture of relations by the British Government with the Soviet Union, the murder of Comrade Voykov, the terrorist action of British hirelings in the Soviet Union, and the aggravation of the relations with France in regard to the recall of Rakevsky.

If a year or two ago there was talk of a period of relative equilibrium and of "peaceful co-existence" of the Soviet Union on the one hand and the imperialist countries on the other, we have now every reason to affirm that the period of peaceful co-existence is passed, giving place to a period of imperialist attacks and the preparation of intervention against the Soviets.

The attempts of Great Britain to set up a united front against the Soviet Union have hitherto failed, and that for the following reasons: The contradiction of interests in the camp of the capitalists, the interest of certain countries in economic relations with the Soviet Union, the peace policy of the Soviet Union, the resistance of the working class of Europe, and the fear of the imperialists of an outbreak of revolution at home in the event of a war against the Soviet Union. This does not mean, however, that Great Britain has abandoned its work of organising the united front against the Soviet Union or that it will not succeed in bringing this front about. The danger of war remains in spite of a temporary failure on the part of Great Britain.

Therefore it is our task to keep our eye on the differences in the camp of the imperialists, to delay the war, to ransom ourselves from the capitalists and to take all steps towards maintaining peaceful relations. We must not forget the words of Lenin to the effect that very much in our work of construction depends on whether we succeed in delaying the inevitable war with the capitalist world either until the moment when

the proletarian revolution in Europe has become ripe or else until the revolution in the colonial countries is so far advanced, or else again until the time when the capitalists begin to fight against one another over the distribution of the colonies. Therefore the maintenance of peaceful relations with the capitalist countries is a matter of the utmost necessity for us.

The foundations of our relations with the capitalist countries consist in the sufferance of the co-existence of two antagonistic systems. This has succeeded very well in practice, though the questions of debt and credit are at times a stumbling block. Our policy in this regard is very simple, being expressed by the formula "If you give, I give too". If you give credits to fructify our industry you will get back a certain proportion of the pre-war debts, which we look upon as extra interest on loans. If you give nothing, you get nothing.

These facts show that in regard to the acquisition of industrial credits something has been attained. I am not thinking only of Germany but also of the United States and Great Britain. The secret lies in the fact that our country is the greatest market for the import of industrial accessories and equipments, a form of market of which the capitalist countries are greatly in need.

5. Conclusive Remarks.

In summing up we see:

In the first place the growth of the contradictions within the capitalist world around us; the necessity for capitalism to redistribute the world by means of a new war; intervention tendencies on the part of some capitalist countries, with Great Britain at their head; the reluctance of another section of the capitalist world to take part in any active operations against the Soviet Union and a simultaneous preference of these countries for economic relations with the Soviet Union; the existence of a struggle between these two tendencies and a certain possibility for the Soviet Union to take advantage of the desire for the maintenance of peace.

In the second place we have the decay of stabilisation, the growing revolutionary movements in the colonies, signs of a new revolutionary movement in Europe, the growing authority of the Comintern and its sections throughout the world, an obvious strengthening of the sympathies of the working classes of Europe for the Soviet Union, the growing power of the Soviet Union internally and the growth of the influence of the working class of our country on the oppressed peoples of all the world.

Hence the tasks of the Party are as follows:

Firstly, on the lines of an international revolutionary movement:

a) A fight for the development of the Communist Parties throughout the world.

b) A fight for the consolidation of the revolutionary trade unions and for a united front of the workers against the offensive of the capitalists.

c) A fight for the consolidation of friendship between the working class of the Soviet Union and the working class of the capitalist countries.

d) A fight for the consolidation of the alliance between the working class of the Soviet Union and the emancipatory movements in the colonies.

Secondly, on the lines of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union:

a) A fight against the preparation for fresh imperialist wars.

b) A fight against the intervention tendencies of Great Britain and for the increase of the defensive forces of the Soviet Union.

c) A policy of peace and the maintenance of peaceful relations with the capitalist countries.

d) Expansion of our goods traffic with the outer world on the basis of a confirmation of the foreign trade monopoly.

e) An approach to the so-called "weak" and "not fully qualified" States, which are oppressed and exploited by the ruling imperialist Powers.

(To be continued.)

Trotskyism and the Labour Question.

By M. Tomsky (Moscow).

In its fight against the overwhelming majority of the Party, the Opposition of Trotsky, a hopeless minority, was forced by the logic of fraction struggle to pass over at once to a fight against all Party principles, against all Party authorities, and against all the foundations of the Leninist proletarian Party. The next step of the Opposition logically resulting from the uninterrupted fractional struggle, a step which like all steps taken by the Opposition ended in a wholesale defeat, was that of carrying the struggle beyond the limits of the Party and thus its development into a fight against the whole Party, i. e. into a fight against the proletarian dictatorship effected by our Party. In this fight the Opposition necessarily seeks allies outside the Party, and that in different directions. The main direction was naturally within the working class. To separate the non-party workers from the Party, and to incite them against the Party, was a tempting method of procedure, the only possible method to prove the Opposition to be in the right and the Party to have separated from the working masses. A necessary presumption in this sense however, would be the weakening or total destruction of the mechanism connecting the Party with the great masses of non-party workers and with the trade unions. Therefore, after lengthy preparations in various tones and from various directions, the Opposition is proceeding to a simultaneous and open attack on the Party, the trade unions, and the Soviet authority in the labour question.

The most important strategic moment of this assault is the thesis that the working class, the rôle it plays, and the positions it occupies are on the wane, while other, anti-labour classes are expanding. Naturally this thesis is accompanied by considerations as to the bureaucratisation of the Party, trade unions, and Soviet apparatus, but even this question is put into the shade by the important and significant assertion that the proletariat is shrinking and that its positions are growing weaker. If it were really true that the proletariat is on the

wane after ten years of Soviet authority, that its positions are weaker, its situation worse, and the activity of the hostile classes greater, what sort of proletarian party would our Party be? What would then be the character of the mechanism between the vanguard and the working masses? And what would the proletarian dictatorship then be worth? Even under a proletarian dictatorship, under the leadership of the Communist Party, a certain temporary deterioration of the economic position of the working class is naturally possible, given extraordinary conditions tending to accentuate the internal and external class struggle (war, intervention, civil war, etc.). Given circumstances of economic expansion, however, and of a peaceful development the very deterioration of the economic position of the workers would be a proof of some deviation of the Party from the right way. Let us now regard the position as it actually is.

Wages.

The Opposition asserts:

"The material decrease in wages that set in in 1926, was not overcome until the commencement of 1927. In the first two quarters of the economic year 1926/27, monthly wages averaged in the big industries 30.67 and 30.33 Moscow "index-roubles", as against 29.68 index-roubles in the autumn of 1925. In the third quarter the wages figured according to calculations to hand at 31.62 roubles, so that the real wages at present only very slightly exceed the level of the autumn of 1925."

In reality the average real wages paid in 1925/26 were 14 per cent. above the preceding year and in the following year 12 per cent. higher than in 1925/26 and 27 per cent. above 1924/25. Whence do the Trotskyites derive their figures and how do they calculate? They achieve a statistical conjuring-

trick. The workers' wages oscillate constantly in the course of a single year in consequence of various circumstances. If, therefore, the situation as regards wages is to be clearly expressed, a whole series of figures must be compared with another series, or else the figures for a certain season must be singled out and compared. From the following table on the movement of wages in the course of three economic years it will be easy to see what tricks the Trotskyites play with the figures, so as to confirm a wittingly mendacious statement as to the stability of wages.

Quarterly Development of Real Wages since 1924
(in Budget-Roubles).

	1st Q.	2nd Q.	3rd Q.	4th Q.	Year's Av.	% Increase over 1924/25
1924/25	24.01	23.10	23.95	29.68	25.19	—
1925/26	29.33	27.09	27.56	30.31	28.57	13.4
1926/27	30.67	30.33	32.66	34.90	32.14	27.6

Thus, if we make an honest comparison between these figures, we get for the year 1925/26 a rise of 13.4 per cent. and for the year 1926/27 one of 27.6 per cent. in the wage average as against 1924/25. The Opposition, however, starts from that highest quarter of 1924/25, when the wage curve rose sharply in consequence of the great seasonal price reduction, whereas both in the preceding and in the following quarter wages were far lower. In the quarter in question there was also a great increase in nominal wages, nor were these subsequently reduced. In consequence of an extraordinary price boom, however, the real wages in this quarter were the highest during the entire period down to the end of 1925/26. In the third quarter of 1924/25, nominal wages averaged 49.73 gold roubles, in the first quarter of the following year 52.14, in the second quarter 51.42, and in the third quarter 54.49. During all this time, however, the actual level of real wages was decidedly lower than in the last quarter of 1924/25. But even if we take this quarter and compare it with the corresponding quarter of 1926/27, we may observe a growth of 17.6 per cent. (29.28 budget-roubles in the fourth quarter of 1924/25 and 34.90 budget-roubles in the fourth quarter of 1926/27). The Opposition, however, purposely compares the fourth quarter of 1924/25 with the third quarter of 1926/27, added to which the actual figure of 32.66 roubles is replaced, for the sake of a greater effect, by the smaller figure of 31.62 roubles.

I shall not dwell on the learned economic reflections of the Trotskyites, according to which the calculation of average wages assumes the existence of two sorts of workers, one in receipt of more and the other in receipt of less than the average wage. Nor will I dwell on the sentimental complaint of the Opposition that the unskilled worker should be in any way worse paid than the trained worker. It is a characteristic fact, however, that in spite of their obvious desire to gain the friendship of the backward workers, they do not venture to assert that the position of the lowest group does not improve. (The figures referring to the distribution of wages may be seen in the article by Comrade Kravaly on "The Policy of the Party in the Labour Question and the Demagogy of the Opposition". (Imprecorr No. 70.)

Let us still examine a statement of the Trotsky group in regard to wages, a subject on which so much can be learnt from figures. The Trotsky group proclaims our own old slogan, "Equal pay for equal work", on which we base our entire wage policy in relation to female workers and from which they would like to make out that we have deviated.

In the first place we must not compare the average wages of all women, seeing that the average here depends on the difference in qualification, the difficulty and development of the work, the absence of women in the best-paid professions, etc. A real comparison is only possible if the wages of the men are compared with those of the women in the same professions.

Women's Wages in Percentage Proportion to those of Men in the same Professions in the Year 1926.

Textile Industry.

Weavers	97—97.2 per cent.
Flax-Combers	94.0 per cent.

Clothing Industry.

Unskilled Working women	94.2 per cent.
-----------------------------------	----------------

Tobacco Industry.

Fillers	83.8 per cent.
-------------------	----------------

Graphic Industry.

Compositors	81.9 per cent.
-----------------------	----------------

The difference is here only due to the better training, greater perseverance and intensity of the male workers and to the physiological peculiarities of the women.

* * *

The proportion of wages to the alimentation of the workers is shown by the following figures:

In the starvation years two thirds of all expenses were incurred for foodstuffs, a proof of the primitive level of the workers' budget.

Before the war, the share of foodstuffs stood at 47—48.7 per cent and in 1926 at 45.6 per cent.

The improvement in the quality of the food appears from the following table:

Bread & Meat Consumption.
(In Kilogrammes)

Year	Rye Bread	Wheat Bread	Meat
1922	31.08	3.50	1.33
1924	16.40	13.23	5.76
1926	11.44	15.55	6.15

The expenditure for such commodities as are generally not purchased save in the case of a certain level of prosperity, has increased in the worker's budget.

Characteristic as all this may be, and however much these indications may speak of an uninterrupted improvement in the economic position of the working class, it will yet be necessary to investigate whether the position of the working class has not deteriorated in other directions, which may be of influence on the cultural and economic level of the workers.

The Working Day.

Another question of great importance is that of the working day; the counter-theses of the Trotsky group containing the following clause:

"1. Any tendency towards prolongation of the working day must be nipped in the bud."

How long is really the average working day in the factories? In 1913 the average working day figured at 9 hours and 42 minutes; in 1917, when the workers introduced the eight-hour day by force, it was 8 hours and 45 minutes; in 1924 it was 7 hours and 37 minutes; in the following year 7 hours and 25 minutes; in 1926 7 hours and 20 minutes; and in the current year, according to returns to hand, 7 hours and 18 minutes. This average has been reckoned on the basis of the six or seven-hour day in the unhealthy works and in those works where a very hot temperature prevails and of the normal eight-hour day. Furthermore the overtime, which was so cried down by the Trotskyites and by the Menshevik "Socialist Messenger", averaged, in 1923, 16.8 minutes per working day and worker, the corresponding figures for the following years being 11.4 minutes for 1924, 10.8 minutes for 1925, and 10.2 minutes for 1926.

It appears from the above that wages are increasing and that the actual working day and over-time are on the decline. The Trotsky group calumniates the Party, the trade unions, and the Soviet authority in the question of the working day and of wages.

Social Insurance.

Though in composing their platform the Trotskyites forgot the question of social insurance and their platform therefore makes no mention of social insurance in so far as it deals at all with labour politics, a fact which is doubtless due to the

great amount of attention they have paid to this subject, they have nevertheless not failed to express their opinion to the effect that everything in this connection is in a deplorably bad state in our country and is steadily regressing. Is this a fact? Let us look at the annual budgets of the social insurance. I begin with the year 1924/25, earlier than which we have no accurate or comparable budget in social insurance. In that year the sum total of the revenue in the social insurance budget figured at 461,480,000 roubles, in 1925/26 at 682,462,000 roubles, and in 1926/27 (provisional returns) at 859,363,000 roubles. For the year 1927/28, the control figures, which we believe to be correct, provide for a revenue of 946,860,000 roubles.

These are the figures, and their meaning is obvious. The rates of insurance contributions show a decline from 14.43 per cent. in 1924/25 to 13.40 in 1925/26, 13.12 in 1926/27, and 13.10 in 1927/28, in percentage proportion to the wage total. At the same time the revenue increased, a proof of the growth of the working class and the wage total.

The gross revenue returns may very well rise, but the question arises as to how this revenue is spent. Is there an increase in the rates of benefit or is there not?

The amounts paid to insured parties temporarily incapacitated figured as follows in 1924/25: To men 1.91 roubles average relief per day, as against 2.43 roubles in 1925/26 and 2.79 roubles in 1926/27; to women 1.30 in 1924/25, 1.59 in 1925/26, and 1.83 in 1926/27.

The difference must be attributed to the smaller qualifications of the women. The extent of the pensions for invalided workers is certainly very small, save in the case of accidents, when the victims receive their full wage rate, but in this respect, too, an improvement has been recorded. Group 1 of the invalids received 15.53 roubles in 1924/25, 23.04 in 1925/26, and 30.19 in 1926/27. In the same proportion there was a growth of the invalidity pensions in the 2nd and 3rd group.

Unemployment.

Our greatest source of concern is the question of unemployment. In this connection the Trotzkyites have the best occasion for their malicious criticism, though even here they are not justified in their remarks.

The elation of the Trotzkyites is diminished by the fact that in the course of the last year the number of unemployed has not increased but rather decreased.

The number of unemployed registered at the labour exchanges figured as follows:

On April 1st, 1927	1,478,000
On July 1st, 1927	1,217,000
On September 1st, 1927	1,025,000

The number of unemployed trade union members was as follows**):

January 1st, 1927	1,667,524
July 1st, 1927	1,501,800

Contrary to the assumption of the State Planning Commission, therefore the number of unemployed showed a diminution instead of an increase. This is naturally not the merit of the Trotzky group. But on what does the Opposition base the following malicious description?

"Two millions of unemployed in the towns and a thousand million poods of provisions, etc." (Compare the counter-theses of Trotzky's Opposition on the five-years' plan of economy. "Inprecorr", No. 70.)

How can there be two millions of unemployed in the towns? In spite of a certain recession, the position of unemployment is very serious. But why exaggerate so shamelessly?

*) The value of a budget-rouble is at present slightly more than two gold roubles.

***) These figures include those organised unemployed who are registered in the trade unions but have not reported to the labour exchanges.

Unemployment among Trade Union Members on January 1st, 1927.

Trade Union	No. of Members	Unemployed	Percentage of Unemployment
Agricultural Group:			
Agr. & Forest Workers	1,109,367	300,184	27.1
Industrial Group:			
Paper Industry	43,201	3,617	8.4
Mining	428,169	28,688	6.7
Timber Trade	173,185	37,178	21.5
Leather Industry	122,220	26,010	21.2
Metal Industries	843,862	79,360	9.4
Printing	110,433	19,987	18.1
Foodstuffs Industries	442,452	113,724	25.7
Sugar Industry	106,237	34,393	32.4
Textile Industries	813,958	46,463	5.7
Chemical Industry	236,566	24,686	10.4
Tailoring	73,249	18,535	25.3
Total of Industries	3,393,532	432,641	12.7
Building Workers	599,346	227,090	37.9
Transport, Post, Telegraph, & Telephone Group:			
Water-Transport	157,333	71,399	45.4
Railways	1,087,235	99,602	9.2
Communal Transport	177,660	36,067	20.3
Post, Telegr., Telephone	114,354	15,565	13.6
Total of Transport etc.	1,536,582	222,633	14.5
Group of Employees & Intellectuals:			
Art Workers	88,562	17,764	20.1
Sanitary Workers	488,581	71,228	14.6
Educational Workers	746,816	81,283	10.9
Soviet & Commercial Workers	1,173,679	197,309	16.9
Total of this Groups	2,497,638	367,584	14.7
Other Communal Work	241,156	35,650	14.8
Alimentation	248,224	81,742	32.9
Total of all Groups	9,625,845	1,667,524	17.3

From the above table it will appear that unemployment mainly hits the unions of seasonal workers, i. e. the agricultural workers and such industrial workers as are employed in the open country. The statistics of unemployment among trade union members affects a great percentage of the unemployed mainly because it penetrates farther into the rural districts than the apparatus of the People's Commissariat of Labour. It suffices to glance at the number of unemployed in the purely rural trade union of the sugar industry (32.4 per cent.), at the building workers (37.9 per cent.), and the agricultural and forest workers (27.1 per cent, the absolute total in this one union alone being 300,184). So as to aggravate the situation and to misrepresent the true character of our unemployment, all the unemployed are represented as living in the towns. Why must that be?

That the unemployed are insufficiently supported is by no means a proven fact. They can naturally not be supported to the full extent of their wages. That is obvious, and it is just as obvious that unemployment is a great misfortune for every proletarian, mitigated slightly by social insurance and the trade unions. The platform of the Trotzkyists says:

"The average extent of the relief is about five pre-war roubles. And this relief is enjoyed by no more than about twenty per cent. of the unemployed trade union members.

Now is this an improvement or an aggravation? Was the position any better at the time when Trotzky and his present apostles Zinoviev and Kamenev held prominent offices?

The expenditure of the State and local organisations for the purpose of fighting unemployment figured in 1925 at 14 million roubles, in the following year at the same level, and in 1927 at 17 millions. The control-figures provide 23 million roubles for the year 1927/28. In 1925, the social insurance funds employed 30 million roubles in this connection, in 1926 they spent 46 millions, in 1927 68 millions; for the year 1928 provision has been made for an expenditure of 123 millions. As a whole these sums amount to 44 Millions in 1925, to

60 millions in 1926, to 85 millions in 1927 and probably to 146 millions in 1928.

The average earnings of an unemployed worker temporarily used for public work is 45 roubles a month.

The number of unemployed supported by means of social insurance grew from 330,000 in 1925/26 to 463,000 in 1926/27.

The following were the relief amounts actually paid:

	In the 1st Category. roubles	In the 2nd Category. roubles
1925	8.69	5.79
1925/26	13.44	8.79
1926/27	17.00	11.36

The relief rates are on the increase, so much is shown by the social insurance returns.

Just as little foundation can be found for the assertion that the relief benefits no more than 20 per cent. of the trade union members.

The average extent of the relief rates in 1917/28 must figure at $\frac{123,000,000}{725,000 \times 12}$. That means an average of 14.14 roubles per beneficiary.

We must add to this the trade union relief, which stood in 1924 at a total of 5,991,000 roubles, in 1925 at 7,560,000 roubles, and in 1926 at 15,069,000 roubles.

So as fully to explain the economic position of the workers, we shall now investigate the rôle played by social insurance in the workers' standard of living.

The Significance of Social Insurance in the standard of living of the Proletariat.

Does the relief extended by social insurance fall short of the general material level of the workers and their ordinary standard of living? The data furnished by the Moscow Department of the Institute of Labour Statistics furnish the following reply to this question: The share of social insurance in the worker's budget stood in 1924 at 4 per cent., in November 1925 at 7.2 per cent., and in November 1926 at 7.7 per cent. The total average for 1926 was 9.2 per cent. Here again we remark an increase.

In 1924/25, 315,966 insured parties were provided with accommodation in sanatoria, convalescent-homes, and health-resorts, the corresponding figures for the next two years being 351,045 and 513,219 respectively, and the presumable figure for 1927 599,825.

The Opposition of Trotzky libels the Party and the trade unions in asserting that the social insurance of the workers has deteriorated.

The statistics of labour productivity are not yet so well developed in this country as to allow of any degree of accuracy in speaking of this subject. For this reason I personally do not share the opinion of Comrade Kravaly that the growth of labour productivity has fallen short of the growth of wages. Naturally I do not, on the other hand, agree in the least with the hypocritical assertions of the Trotzkyites in this connection. If we have established quite uniform methods of calculation in regard to the computation of wages for a number of years past and in various branches of industry, this does not apply at all to the computation of the productivity of labour. In this connection the calculation is very indefinite. According to these returns we can merely calculate the general tendency of productivity, while the figures that result are not always reliable. On the basis of an objective treatment of the problem of the growth of productivity in the past year, it may be said that the productivity of labour rose in general at the same rate as wages, of which it was sometimes a little in advance and at others slightly in the rear. What is devoid of evidence and altogether wrong is the statement of the Trotzky group that the growth of wages fell short of that of the productivity of labour. This assertion may be understood in the sense that productivity is growing quicker than wages. If that is so, however, how can it be made to agree with the assertion of the same Opposition to the following effect?

"The increase in negligence, the careless work, the greater amount of scrap material, the wear and tear of machinery, the growth in the number of accidents, con-

flagrations, rows, etc., are factors representing a loss of hundreds of millions of roubles annually."

(italics mine M. T.)

Either this account is wrong, or else the statement as to wages remaining behind is false. For the state of affairs here depicted excludes all possibility of a growth in productivity, since it is a state of decay and decomposition but not of progress. Fortunately such a state exists only in the imagination of the panicstricken Trotzkyites. It is a libel against our workers. The actual state of affairs is quite different. The productivity of labour is in general increasing at a normal rate, just about in conformity with that of wages. Does this mean that the growth of productivity is not to surpass that of wages? Nothing of the sort. Only irresponsible demagogues can affirm anything of the sort under the circumstances of a proletarian dictatorship and the rationalisation of production. The outcome of our endeavours in the direction of rationalisation must be an unparalleled growth of labour productivity, which in certain cases far exceeds the growth of wages, creating the presumption for a Socialist accumulation and for the more rapid improvement in the material and cultural level of the proletariat. In the question of labour productivity, therefore, the Trotzkyites assume a demagogic and irresponsible attitude.

Nor is the case any better with the Opposition as regards the other claims advanced, part of which are nothing but a repetition of old hackneyed truisms of the Party in its labour policy, a repetition of what has long been effected by the Party and the trade unions as part of their daily work. Wherever the Opposition desires to reproduce certain resolutions of the Party and the trade unions "in its own manner", complete illiteracy is revealed as regards economy and production. This is the case, e. g., in regard to the question of standards.

"The constant changes in the standards and tariffs must come to an end."

Energetic, but stupid. What does it mean? May the standards and tariffs be changed at all or may they not? And if not, for how long not? For one year or two or three years, or until the authority passes into the hands of the Trotzky group? If it is impossible what is to be done in place of a lathe made in 1894 an automatic machine of the type of 1926 is installed, increasing the output capacity to the twentyfold? Are the tariffs to be revised in such a case? If not, is it fair that the workers at the old lathe should earn one tenth of what they have been earning hitherto? Must the tariffs be revised when the demand decreases and the earnings of the worker sink, if, e. g., the textile workers are given American cotton with "fleas" in it in the place of Egyptian? In both cases the tariffs ought to be revised. Finally it is necessary to revise the tariffs and standards upon the introduction of the seven-hours' day in the place of the eight-hours day, so as to ensure the workers their existing earnings. It is necessary, to revise the standards unconditionally and immediately in all the quoted cases.

This is so simple, one would think, so clear and undeniable, not only for every trade unionist, from the factory council downwards, but also for every worker in a factory or workshop and for any one occupied in any way with production. What then is the sense of the programmatic declaration of the Trotzky group that "an end must be put to the constant changes in the standards and tariffs"? It has no sense at all from the standpoint of production and reality, being merely an idiotic phrase in the mouth of a narrow-minded and irresponsible demagogic agitator.

The Party and the trade unions have pointed more than once to the impossibility of frequent thoughtless revisions of standards and tariffs not called forth by technical changes in the conditions of production. Day by day the Party and the trade unions wage a fight against the bullying of workers who are the victims of certain isolated economists and careless trade unionists, and the attempt of the Opposition to cry louder than all others in this question, which every day and every hour requires knowledge, consideration, and attention, shows most drastically their hopeless lack of understanding for the questions of labour and production.

The attitude of the Trotzky group to the seven-hour day may not be passed over in silence. It finds expression in the following demands.

In the first place their own demands must be fulfilled, then the eight-hour day must be safeguarded, and subsequently the seven-hour day introduced. The counter-theses of the Trotzkyites say as follows:

"Any tendency towards prolonging the working-day beyond eight hours must be nipped in the bud."

Very sonorous and purposeful indeed. Here we have "tendencies and nipped in the bud; all that is wanting is the 'foot-steps of history'. First, therefore, the eight-hour day must be safeguarded.

And now another quotation on the same subject.

"In these circumstances the most urgent task of the workers' policy in regard to the regulation of working hours ought to have been the safeguarding of a rigid adherence to present legislation in relation to the eight-hour day, and only when this task was accomplished would it have been time to attack the question of the seven-hour day."

This quotation originates from another "Opposition", the Mensheviks, as a friend of the Trotsky group revealed to the "Socialist Messenger"). Kindred souls have met, have recognised each other and have begun to coo in unison.

The Trotskyites consider the obligation undertaken by the Party and the trade unions to effect the seven-hour day as an act of demagoguery, an election manoeuvre, a "Easter egg" in preparation for the Party Congress.

The "Socialist Messenger" fully and wholly agrees with this.

"We must therefore not be surprised that the promise of the jubilee manifesto in regard to securing the transition to the seven-hour day made on the broad classes of society the impression of a hypocritical gesture, obviously calculated to make a demagogic 'squeeze' of the Opposition. Naturally it is a fact that there is here no lack of hypocrisy and a demagoguery, nor is there any want of strategy in the fight against the Opposition."

Listen to this touching unanimity.

Naturally both the one and the others declare that they would not object, were it not for . . . and so on. They differ but little in their estimate of the political consequences; but in general both the one and the others miscalculate most lamentably in their estimates. The "Socialist Messenger" is of opinion that this will be of use to the economist but a disadvantage to the workers, though it may somewhat mitigate the unemployment. The Trotskyites are of opinion that the expense incurred will amount to 500 million roubles per annum and that economy will therefore be harmed. They will be seen at once to be people of a wide horizon and with liberal aims. The total is no less than five hundred or even a thousand million**).

As a matter of fact the effectuation of the eight-hour day has shown that the total production only receded at first, and then not even in keeping with the shorter working hours but considerably less, but that in some years, even under the conditions of unchanged equipment or bad repair, it surpasses the former production standard.

The forthcoming reduction of the working day by one hour will ensue under circumstances which differ completely from the circumstances governing the introduction of the eight-hour day. The introduction of the seven-hour day will ensue under the conditions of a radical reconstruction of our industry, the technical adaptation of the factories and works, the most rational organisation of work in the face of a tremendous cultural growth of the working masses, accompanied by an increase in the active participation of broad masses of workers in the work of constructing the Socialist industry.

That this is more than a mere phrase, however, and corresponds to actual facts, is proved by the most fleeting consideration of the work done at the production-conferences, which, despite the croaking of the Trotskyites, continue to meet, consolidate, and develop. True our consideration of this work is still insignificant, but a fairly good idea of the spirit prompting it can be gained from the indications made in regard to the investigation of 480 enterprises with 862,895 workers covered by nine trade unions. These workers submitted to their managements 31,319 suggestions, which means roughly 36 suggestions per 1000 workers. This is a very real active participation of the masses in

*) "Socialist Messenger" No. 21/22 article by S. Schwarz on the Eight and Seven Hour Day.

**) It is not known from where the Trotsky group derived this total. Possibly from the region of countless fractional secrets or by simply halving the well-known thousand million of Zinoviev.

the work of construction of Socialist industry. Of these suggestions, 80.2 per cent. were accepted by the administrations. This is a proof of the active, conscious, and useful participation of the masses. Of the accepted suggestions 67 per cent. were carried out. The execution of the suggestions is greatly delayed, but in this regard, too, great progress has been made.

This is a small fraction of the work of the trade unions in the realm of the participation of the masses of workers in the work of Socialist construction. These figures show on the one hand that on this front, too, the proletariat is anything but regressing; on the other hand they characterise the atmosphere which will accompany the introduction of the seven-hour day. The circumstances in which we shall have to realise the seven-hour day, are pronouncedly different from those circumstances in which the eight-hour day had to achieve the output of the ten-hour and nine-hour days. It cannot be doubted that in the beginning of the realisation of the seven-hour day the cost of production will rise somewhat, though by nothing like 500 millions, but it is just as certain that this will serve as a powerful incentive for the increase of productivity and will very soon overtake and excel the productivity of the preceding era.

The attempts of the Opposition to create their own platform in the labour question have ended in failure as have all other attempts of Trotsky's ideological front. The development of their own line in the labour problem has led the Trotsky group to the "Socialist Messenger". It is no wonder that their attempt to incite the non-party workers against the Party in this connection ended just as did the similar attempts of the Mensheviks. The history of the Mensheviks must be highly instructive for Trotsky and his disciples! In spite of the Menshevik promises of a high wage, of the independence of the trade unions, and the like, points also fully conceded by the Trotsky group, the non-party workers drove them from their midst after hearing them for a long while.

Of late years the proletariat of the Soviet Union has greatly increased and it continues to grow from day to day, a fact which remains unknown to the Trotskyite super-men in their deviation from the working masses and their Socialist work. The non-party workers know that their Party, their Soviet Power, and their trade unions do not promise the workers more than can be realised and that they co-operate with all workers to realise, by their aid and in spite of all obstacles, whatever they think possible and believe to be absolutely necessary. The introduction of the seven-hour day is no easy matter, but this task has been set by us and will be successfully solved by us together with the working-class, for the seven-hour day strengthens the position of the working class and will be indisputably our greatest victory on the front of Socialist construction.

Therefore the non-party workers have so energetically withstood the Trotskyites when the latter tried to lead them against the Party and against the trade unions. The non-party workers recognised in them old acquaintances, thinly veiled Mensheviks. The rôle of the Trotskyites is undoubtedly shrinking. Just as undoubtedly, the 15th Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. will put an end for ever to the propaganda of Trotskyism in our Party and to the Trotsky-Menshevik Party itself, which has collapsed before it could attain any degree of development. The broad masses of non-party workers will welcome any step of the 15th Party Congress in this direction.

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

Hands off Lithuania!

Against the Fascist Dictators!

To the Workers, Peasants, Soldiers, and all the Toilers of Lithuania, Poland, Germany, of Western White Russia, Western Ukraine and Latvia!

Note: The following appeal was agreed upon by the Communist Parties issuing the same several weeks before the Geneva Conference. The proceedings at Geneva prove once again that the Polish bourgeoisie regards the "understanding" arrived at by it only as the first step towards the complete liquidation of the State independence of Lithuania, and the fascist government of Lithu-

ania is prepared to take its place in the front against the Soviet Union being prepared by the imperialist Western powers, even at the cost of surrendering the State independence of Lithuania. The watchfulness and the revolutionary activity of the Communist Parties must therefore be increased.

Comrades!

A great danger is threatening the Lithuania people. The fascist government of Pilsudski has commenced to carry out its long-cherished plan of conquering Lithuania. The subjugation of Lithuania by the Polish capitalists and landowners will render it easy for Pilsudski to carry out the attack on the Soviet Union which is being prepared by the English bankers. The occupation of Lithuania by Pilsudski would be a further step to the blockade of the Soviet Union which England, with the help of its vassals, intends to cut off from Western Europe.

We are convinced that Pilsudski has decided in this or that manner, to put an end to independence of Lithuania in the very near future. His feverish preparations are the clearest proof of this. The Polish army is concentrated in the Vilna district. The divisions of Pilsudski's fascist guard — "arrow" — are being armed in all haste. Special bodies of troops consisting of alleged natives of Lithuania are being gathered together, and, according to the plan of the Polish general staff, are to play the role of an insurgent army. Active behind the scenes there stands Zeligovski, the "hero" of the conquest of Lithuania in the year 1920, who precisely in the last few days received his discharge in order the better to mask the criminal plans of Pilsudski.

The masses of the people of Lithuania are confronted by a great task: to defend the independence of their native country with the all-round support of the workers of Poland, of Western White Russia, of Western Ukraine, of Germany and Latvia.

Workers and peasants of Lithuania!

Bear in mind that the occupation of Lithuania by Pilsudski, no matter whether it be carried out openly or is concealed by the signboard of federalism, means double oppression and double exploitation by the Polish-Lithuanian bourgeoisie. Bear in mind that behind the bayonets of Pilsudski there are hidden the Polish landowners, who have but one thought: to restore their estates at your cost. Do not forget for a moment that Pilsudski, either tomorrow or the day after, will convert you into cannon fodder for the war against the Soviet Union.

Come forward in a firm united front for the fight against the Polish occupation and its Lithuanian helpers. Organise meetings, demonstrations and strikes. Arm yourselves in order to beat back the Polish imperialists. Take up the fight against the fascist government. Only a workers' and peasants' government representing the real interests of the overwhelming majority of the working masses in town and country is really capable of defending the independence of the country.

Soldiers of the Lithuanian army!

Rise in defence of the independence of Lithuania, unite with the mass of the people and turn your rifles against the Polish-Lithuanian bourgeoisie and the united fascists of Poland and Lithuania!

Workers and peasants of Poland, of Western White Russia and Western Ukraine!

Bear in mind that the conquest of Lithuania by Pilsudski means the intensification of the fascist reaction in the whole of Poland and the direct danger of war against the Soviet Union, the commencement of the military campaign against Soviet White Russia and Soviet Ukraine. It is your duty to exert all your forces and means in order to prevent this new adventure of Pilsudski before it is too late. Go into the streets and raise aloud your voices in protest against the predatory policy of Pilsudski.

Soldiers of the Polish army!

Remember that Pilsudski wants to make you into instruments of subjugation and the hangmen of the Lithuanian people. Your fighting slogan must be: **Not a single shot at the Lithuanian soldiers, workers and peasants who are defending the independence of their country!**

Workers of Germany!

While the government of the German bourgeoisie is prepared, under the pressure of English imperialism, to close its eyes to the actions of Pilsudski in Lithuania, you are in duty bound to come forward in defence of the independence of this country. Remember that the conquest of Lithuania by Pilsudski would mean an intensification of reaction and is a preparatory step to the war against the Soviet Union; remember that the road to Moscow runs through Kovno, that the path the Polish imperialists are pursuing leads to the kindling of a world-conflagration. In all the towns of Germany there must resound the powerful battle-cry, "Hands off Lithuania!"

Workers of Latvia!

The conquest of Lithuania by Pilsudski means a direct threat to the independence of your country. The Polish imperialists have long been viewing with greedy eyes the ports of Libau, Dünaberg and the six provincial districts in the neighbourhood of Dünaburg. In addition they are demanding the handing back of the land that has been confiscated from the Polish landowners in Latgalya. Raise your voices against the crime of Polish imperialism and in defence of the independence of Lithuania!

Only a powerful counter-action of the working and peasant masses, only the determined protest of all workers can curb the predatory intentions of the Polish bourgeoisie. Only an unwearied fight against the kindling of war can save millions of workers and peasants from the horrors and miseries of a new fratricidal war.

Down with the war machinations of Pilsudski!

Down with any form of conquest of Lithuania by Polish imperialism!

Down with the Polish occupation of Western White Russia and in Western Ukraine!

Down with the fascist governments of Poland and Lithuania!

Long live the fraternisation of the peoples of Lithuania, Poland, Germany and Latvia!

Long live the workers' and peasants' government!

December 1927.

The Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Lithuania, Poland, Germany, Western White Russia, Western Ukraine and Latvia!

To All Young Workers and Soldiers of Lithuania, Poland, Latvia, Germany and other Countries!

Appeal of the Exekutive Committee of the Young Communist International.

Young workers and peasants!

The Polish imperialists are preparing, with the open and undoubted support of the British Conservatives and with the silent approval of Germany, the annexation of Lithuania.

Polish troops are being concentrated on the Lithuanian frontier under all possible pretexts; the Polish government is arranging various provocative demonstrations and supports in every way within Lithuania all kinds of rascally elements who are ready to betray and sell Lithuania cheaply.

The fascist government of Lithuania itself stands in direct connection with the Polish fascists and does everything in order to subject the toilers of Lithuania to the double yoke of the Lithuanian and Polish bourgeoisie.

The British bankers who are pushing Poland against Lithuania by supporting and inciting the annexationist plans of the Polish imperialists, are again provoking an armed conflict.

The annexation of Lithuania is a general rehearsal of the new war against the Soviet Union, is a direct step towards the preparation of a new "campaign against Moscow".

Young workers, peasants and soldiers of Poland!

Do not forget your sacred duty to fight against the exploiters and the fascists, against the Polish landowners and the bourgeoisie, against the fascist militia! Do not let yourselves be deceived by Pilsudsky! He would do everything in order to deceive you and to lead you against Lithuania to realise his imperialist designs. Force, calumny, slander and deceit, all are put into motion in order to convert you into devoted servants and cannon-fodder in the interest of the Polish bourgeoisie and landowners. Do not let yourselves be deceived! Do not help Pilsudsky to enslave Lithuania! This enslavement involves for the toilers of Lithuania the double yoke of the Lithuanian and Polish bourgeoisie, and for you all the horrors of war, thousands of killed and wounded, thousands of maimed and unemployed.

Protest along with the whole working class against the provocative action of Pilsudski! Organise protest demonstrations, strikes — in this manner you can prevent the war. Young railwaymen, do not transport any weapons and soldiers who are destined to crush and subjugate the Lithuanian toilers! Soldiers of the Polish army, do not take part in the cause of the imperialists, turn your weapons against your own government, against your own oppressors!

Young Workers and Soldiers of Lithuania!

The independence of Lithuania is in danger. You, who have already to bear the burden and weight of the fascist yoke of the Lithuanian bourgeoisie, are threatened by a new danger, the danger that to this yoke there be added the yoke of the Polish landowners.

Neither the fascists nor the social-democrats are capable of organising the fight for the independence of Lithuania. The Lithuanian bourgeoisie is prepared to share its power and the suppression of the Lithuanian toilers with the Polish imperialists. The social-democrats and the emigrants have openly gone over to Pilsudski.

Only under the lead of the working class and only the toilers themselves, the young workers and peasants themselves and the Lithuanian soldiers can defend their independence and offer resistance to the Pilsudski people and the Lithuanian fascists.

Arm yourselves, provide yourselves with weapons everywhere, prepare for the fight for your independence, release the imprisoned revolutionaries from the prisons; they will join you in the fight against the attacking Pilsudski people, against the treacherous Lithuanian government which is doing nothing in order to organise the defence of the country.

For the united front of all the toilers of Lithuania! For the workers' and peasants' government! For the emancipation from the double yoke and from exploitation! For the alliance of the toilers of Lithuania and Poland!

Young Workers of Latvia!

The conquest of Lithuania also threatens the independence of Latvia. The Polish imperialists are doing everything in order afterwards to get Latvia into their hands also. Do not be passive, support the workers of Lithuania who are fighting for their independence and their emancipation.

Young Workers of the whole World!

The attempts at annexation of the Polish imperialists, who are acting with the direct support of Great Britain and other imperialist powers, are fraught with the danger of a new world war. Do not tolerate the enslavement of Lithuania! Do not permit a strengthening of Polish imperialism! Do not tolerate any fresh provocations and threats against the Soviet Union — offer united resistance against imperialism which is again shaking the world.

Young workers of Great Britain and Germany, protest together with the adult workers against the provocative attitude of your governments, offer due resistance to the attempts to provoke the conquest of Lithuania!

Organise together with the adult workers, public meetings and protest demonstrations against the enslavement of Lithuania, against the new danger of an attack on the Soviet Union!

Organise in the factories joint actions of the young workers in a united front!

Everywhere the cry must be heard: Down with the provokers of the new war, down with the Polish, British and German imperialists!

POLITICS

The British Commission on Constitutional Reform in India.

By G. K. Luhan.

The British Government has appointed a Commission "to enquire into the working of the Indian Constitution". The Commission has been charged eventually to put before the "Imperial Parliament" tentative proposals of legislation "establishing, extending, modifying or restricting the degree of responsible government (in existence in India now)".

The "Indian Constitution" in question was itself introduced by the Government of India Act of 1919. The Act also provided for a definite time limit within which the Constitution was to be revised by some such Commission as has been set up now. The appointment of the present Commission is thus an integral part of a settled policy.

But the precise moment chosen to bring the Commission into life is highly significant.

The British Government was under no "Constitutional" obligation to give effect in 1927 to that part of the Government of India Act of 1919 which provides for the setting up of the apparatus of revision. Under the terms of the Act, it could have postponed the appointment of the Commission for another 2 years, that is, till the end of 1929. As a matter of fact the repeated demand of the Right wing of the Indian nationalists for the appointment of the Commission earlier than the date fixed in the Act of 1919 had up till now met with a flat refusal.

In arriving at this decision, the British Government was certainly influenced by "various reasons" arising out of inter-Party politics in England as well as the internal situation of India. It must have been anxious to forestall the possible verdict of the approaching general election which may take place within the next 2 years, oust the Conservative Party from Office and thus throw the burden of "deciding the whole future of India" entirely on the less worthy shoulders of the Labour Party or a Liberal-Labour Coalition. It also must have had in mind the steady revolutionisation of the masses in India and the importance of the present phase in the evolution of the political relations between the Indian bourgeoisie and British imperialism.

But there is still another consideration which must have weighed more than any other. It is the necessity of securing the flank in India in the coming war against the U. S. S. R. with the political preparation of which the present Government of England practically confounds its *raison d'être*. It is on account of the necessities of its policy of aggression against the U. S. S. R., that the Conservative Cabinet has chosen the present moment to dangle before the eyes of the Indian bourgeoisie the promise of political concessions in the shape of "this most important Royal Commission".

It is interesting to recall that a similar consideration of strategy weighed heavily with a former British Cabinet when it decided in 1917 to make a "solemn" promise to the people of India to grant "responsible government" — the promise out of which grew the present "Indian Constitution". By that promise, imperialist England secured, during a critical phase of the last world war, the neutrality of the Indian bourgeoisie and even its help in the recruitment of the man-power of India to carry the fight against Germany to a victorious conclusion.

But the situation in India in 1927 is quite different from that in 1917. For one thing, the contradiction of interests of the growing Indian bourgeoisie and British imperialism has become more acute and irreconcilable. The political concessions which British imperialism is in a position to make are not of a nature to satisfy the Indian bourgeoisie; while it cannot make other concessions without virtually abdicating its position as the paramount power in India.

The Commission which has just been appointed accentuates this dilemma.

The Left wing of the nationalist movement of India has been as a matter of principle denying the competence of the "Imperial Parliament" in England to determine the constitution of India. It has been asserting "the inherent and inalienable rights" of Indian people to determine the character and tempo of their political advance without reference to the

convenience of the Imperialist government. It is opposed to the idea of a British Commission on constitutional reform for India. But the revolutionary implications of such a position have not up till now been embodied in a programme of action.

The **Right wing** of the nationalist movement is willing to "co-operate" with the imperialist authorities in framing the Constitution of India. It is, however, opposed to a Constitution which may be concocted by the imperialist authorities without the responsible participation of Right Wing leaders.

The actual Commission consists only of members of **British Parliament** chosen from the Conservative, Liberal and Labour Parties. There are no Indians on the Commission, and none of the nationalist parties in India are in any way represented in it. Anticipating the opposition of the whole nationalist movement to such a Commission, the Viceroy of India has proposed a cumbersome scheme to associate in a subordinate capacity delegations of India, legislative bodies with the labour of the Commission. It is, however, a testimony to the real crisis through which British imperialism in India is passing that the Viceroy has supplemented his declaration of policy with an appeal to the Indian bourgeoisie for co-operation in the name of "the rich prize of achievement of the common purpose which we may assuredly win together, but can hardly win in separation".

All the parties comprising the nationalist movement have reacted to the appointment of the Commission with a practically unanimous opposition. The Bengal section of the Swaraj Party has proclaimed in its manifesto that "it is for the people of India to frame India's Constitution". The **Bombay Chronicle**, organ of the National Congress characterises the Commission as "a machiavellian device of arrogant imperialists who are determined to exploit the divisions of India to humiliate and drag her into accepting a dictated and fraudulent Constitution". The Right wing leaders who have been waiting in an expectant mood have now been disillusioned and have come forward with proclamations to the rank and file "not to co-operate with the Commission".

Finally, at a conference of all the Nationalist Parties, the policy of boycott has been adopted as a reply to the "insolent challenge" of British imperialism. It however, remains for the Indian National Congress which is meeting in its annual session in December to give a more official character to the campaign of boycott and realise it organisationally.

The situation created in India now is certainly rich with revolutionary possibilities. The only safeguard against their degeneration into reformist compromise is an energetic and concerted action by the **Nationalist Left wing** and the **Workers' and Peasants' Party** to orientate the whole anti-imperialist movement towards the vast exploited masses and find in their revolutionary organisation the sure "sanction" for coercing British imperialism into submission to the fundamental demands of the National revolutionary movement.

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

The Brussels Conference of the League against Imperialism.

(The following has been already communicated to the Press.)

Brussels, 10th December, 1927.

The session of the General Council of the International League against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism was opened on the 9th December in the afternoon by **Marteaux**, a social democratic member of the Belgian Chamber. The session is very well attended.

Edo Fimmen delivered the political report on behalf of the Executive Committee of the League. He declared inter alia: Without a doubt, the Brussels conference met with a strong response in all countries. The Brussels decisions were accepted with enthusiasm in Latin-America, India, Syria, Arabia etc. On the other hand, the bourgeois press and governments undertook furious attacks upon the League. Several members of the Executive were arrested. The representative of the Negro organisation in the executive of the League, **Senghor** died a few days ago in a French prison. The arrest of **Hatta**, who is also a member of the executive, by the Dutch police found the sup-

port of the Second International, as did also the bourgeois attacks upon the League.

The first half year of the existence of the League is a lesson that the anti-imperialist movement can only exist in the sharpest contradiction to the bourgeois and reformist groups. We are now faced with the necessity of proceeding from the first stage of our work, the phase of pure agitation, to the second phase, the formation of strong mass organisations in all countries and the concentration of our forces. The good results of our work in Great Britain, America, France, Holland and Japan justify the hope that we shall be able to book very considerable successes if we go on with our work.

The discussion was then opened upon the speech of **Fimmen**.

Mirza, the leader of the Social Democratic Party of Persia, attacked the policy of Great Britain in Persia very sharply.

Scott Nearing stressed the necessity of forming firm organisations with their roots in the working class and the peasantry.

Schmidt (Amsterdam), a member of the Social Democratic Party, polemised sharply against the Second International and proposed a resolution of protest against its attitude towards the League.

Arslan, the representative of Egypt and Syria, condemned the colonial policy of MacDonald and the social democracy.

Katayama, **Doriot** and **Saklatvala** also spoke. Following upon the election of an editorial commission the session was then closed.

Brussels, 10th December, 1927.

In the session which took place on Saturday morning the following resolution against the attitude of the Second International was adopted upon the motion of **Schmidt** (Holland):

"Following upon a discussion of the document of the 7th October, 1927, published by the Second International, in which the League against Imperialism etc., is represented as being nothing but a communist manoeuvre, the General Council of the League protests solemnly against the publication of this misleading unjust and false document, which it regards as a direct attack upon the numerous national organisations which are affiliated to the League and upon all revolutionary workers who participate in the work of the League. The General Council of the League declares that by this action the Second International has violated the principles of Socialism and rendered good service to the capitalist and imperialist governments which everywhere explain and damn all nationalist activity as 'communist activity', as the result of 'relations with Moscow' etc.

The General Council appeals to all worker socialist members of the parties affiliated to the Second International to remember their socialist principles and to support with all the means at their disposal the struggle of their comrades in the oppressed countries for emancipation, to oppose with determination the attitude of the leaders of the Second International and to affiliate themselves individually and in groups to the sections of the League in their respective countries."

The resolution was unanimously adopted amidst great applause. The numerous members of parties affiliated to the Second International who were present also voted for the resolution, as for instance the British member of parliament **Ellen Wilkinson**, the secretary of the British section of the League, **Bridgeman**, **Schmidt** (Holland) etc.

In the morning session the financial situation of the League was discussed. A considerable section of the delegates and organisations represented undertook to contribute larger or smaller sums monthly or annually to the finances of the League. The Socialist Party of Persia promised 300 Gulden annually, the Dutch group 150 Gulden annually and the South African section 300 Gulden regularly. The conference accepted these offers with great applause.

Brussels, 10th December 1927.

In this afternoon's session of the League the leader of the Indian National Congress **Lal Nehru** presented a report upon the struggle of India for emancipation from British imperialism. The executive committee of the Indian National Congress wel-

comed the Brussels conference with joy. The congress of the I. N. C. which would take place in the next few weeks would undoubtedly decide to affiliate to the League against Imperialism. The speaker then described the great disappointment of the Indians at the attitude of the British Labour Party and of MacDonald. The appointment of the Royal Commission upon India had caused great bitterness in India, and this was especially true of the approval of this Commission expressed by the British Labour Party. In India the forces making for complete national independence were growing ever stronger. (Storms of applause.)

Fimmen then declared that the League would use all the forces at its disposal to obtain the emancipation of India.

The member of the British parliament Ellen Wilkinson declared that she regretted deeply the attitude of the Labour Party and that she and her friends had done their utmost to prevent it.

Amidst considerable applause the communist member of the British parliament Saklatvala described the struggle of the communists for the emancipation of the colonial countries.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

First Congress of the Independent Trade Unions of Bulgaria.

By G. Rosov.

On the 6th to the 8th of November the Congress of independent trade unions was held in Sofia — the first congress of class trade union organisations in Bulgaria after the military fascist coup d'état of 1923.

During these years the fascists have done everything possible to destroy with fire and blood the revolutionary labour movement, to exterminate all real leaders of the working masses. The reformists, in their turn, attempted by base betrayals to subjugate to themselves the decapitated working class of Bulgaria. But neither the one nor the other have been able to carry out their aim. The irrefutable proof of this is the present November Congress of the independent trade unions.

The congress was opened in one of the largest halls of Sofia, 140 delegates being present and 9 members of the Central Committee of the Independent Association of Workers' Trade Unions. The hall was packed with an audience of workers.

A delegate from the French Unitary General Confederation of Labour, Comrade Simonen, had also arrived for the opening of the Congress. For the first time in five years did the Bulgarian workers see amongst themselves a representative of the international proletariat. The appearance of Comrade Simonen was greeted by the audience and the delegates with exclamations of "Long live the unity of the international trade union movement!" "Long live the French proletariat and their struggle!"

After Comrade Simonen's most enthusiastic speech, telegrams of greetings from the Yugoslavian independent unions, from the Soviet C. C. T. U. and the R. I. L. U. were read. At this point all present rose unanimously and sang the "Internationale".

On the second day of the Congress Comrade Hais, representative of the One Big Union of Czechoslovakia, dwelt in detail on the celebration of the Tenth anniversary of the U. S. S. R., on the achievements of the Russian workers, and on the transition to the seven-hour working day. More than once the speaker was interrupted by the Congress' calls of "Long Live the U. S. S. R.", and it was unanimously decided to send the Soviet C. C. T. U. a telegram of greetings.

In general the Congress was an imposing demonstration in honour of the October Revolution, reflecting the mass campaign which has been unfolded in Bulgaria for the sending of a workers' delegation to the U. S. S. R. At the last moment the reactionary Government refused to give passports to the delegation, many of the delegates were arrested, and in some places even the funds collected by the workers for sending the delegation were confiscated. All this did not in the slightest degree lessen the political significance of this campaign. Through this campaign, as also through the calling of the Congress, the Bulgarian workers and peasants expressed their loyalty to the great cause of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R.

The Congress heard the following reports:

1. Report on activities of Central Committee of I. A. W. T. U. during 1926-1927.
2. Report on position of working class (question of unity, struggle against Fascism and war danger).
3. Report on unemployment.
4. Report on labour legislation.

In its report the Central Committee described its stubborn struggle for the right of existence of the Independent Association of Workers' Trade Unions. On the 31st December 1926 the membership of the Independent unions was 5,018, and by 30th September 1927, they had already 6,928 members. It is, however, impossible to reckon the forces of the I. A. W. T. U. by its membership. The organisation was set up and works under conditions of exceptional and unintermittent terror by the Fascist Government. Only the more active workers join its ranks — the fighting vanguard of the Bulgarian working class. At any rate it is the only trade union centre under whose leadership the economic struggle of the Bulgarian proletariat is being waged.

From January to September 1927, the I. A. W. T. U. carried on 32 strikes, 3,162 workers participating in them. 96,910 working days were lost, and 375,000 lei were spent in aid for the strikers.

In spite of the exceptionally difficult conditions under which it had to work the I. A. W. T. U. was able to carry on quite considerable educational activities. During the period (January to September 1927) there were held: 526 meetings of trade union sections, 268 conferences at the enterprises, 69 general meetings, 49 lectures, 22 socials and 22 appeals were published in 60,000 copies. The central organ of the I. A. W. T. U. "Unity" is published once a week, during the last two years, and has a circulation of 5,000. Besides this the Needle Workers' and Commercial Employees' Unions publish their own organs. Recently a left teachers' monthly journal has begun to be published; "People's Education". There were also published 4 pamphlets on various trade union questions, with a total circulation of 16,000 copies.

Besides the I. A. W. T. U. there is a reformist trade union centre in existence, but this is nothing more than a sign-board. According to its own figures, it had 3,324 members in 1919. Since then it has called no congresses and published no report. In 1920 the basic part of the reformist trade unions affiliated to the then existing revolutionary unions. The reformist attempts to increase their influence during the fascist onslaughts on the revolutionary movement suffered a complete defeat. The I. A. W. T. U. states in its report that the reformist trade union centre counts a bare 100 to 200 members amongst the workers of small enterprises. There are no industrial workers at all in its ranks. It is plain that the question of unification with such a trade union centre that exists only on paper is completely wiped off the slate.

An important and vital question is the unification with the unions of State employees, which are not affiliated to any trade union centre. The total membership of the unions of State employees is approximately 30,000. At the present moment the I. A. W. T. U. is broadcasting the slogan of setting up a general federation of brain and manual workers as a preliminary step to complete unity of the trade union movement. This slogan has met with a great response amongst the masses.

In its resolution, the Congress unanimously approved of the Central Committee's Report, called attention to some of the weaknesses in previous work and pointed out the policy for future struggles. The greatest attempts of the independent trade unions must be made to organise first of all the industrial proletariat — the tobacco workers, textile workers, miners, as well as the 200,000 agricultural workers. The struggle for the immediate demands of the workers and employees must be connected with the struggles for unity, against fascism, against the attack of capital, and for the right of combination. Besides this the Congress pointed out the necessity of intensifying cultural-educational work for the preparation of trade union workers.

The resolution on the second question — the position of the working class — pointed out that the struggle for national and international trade union unity is the most important task, and proposed the calling of an international unity congress.

The Congress discussed in detail the question of the struggle with unemployment, which has taken on a mass cha-

acter in Bulgaria during the last three years. According to official data there were at the end of 1926 130,000 unemployed, or one-third of the whole of the working class. At the end of July this year there were 75,000 unemployed. But with the coming of autumn and winter the ranks of the unemployed swell quickly, and by now it has most probably passed last year's figures.

The Congress noted that the existing labour legislation is not being carried out. In the resolution taken on this question Congress brought forward several concrete measures for the carrying out and widening of such legislation.

Besides, the following resolutions were also passed by the Congress: 1. On the amnesty of political prisoners and against exceptional and special legislation for the safety of the State; 2. against the attacks of imperialism in China; 3. against the persecution of the unitary unions in Roumania, as well as the working class in Greece; 4. against the war being prepared on the U.S.S.R.; 5. against the prohibition of the Russian and Yugoslavian delegates to be present at the Congress, etc.

Such is in brief the work of the Congress. It proved that the greatest danger which threatened the working class in connection with the Fascist attack was already behind and the revolutionary trade union movement in Bulgaria, despite the innumerable sacrifices of the last 4 years, decisively moves forward. The Congress, through the decisions taken, will still further promote the strengthening and development of the Independent revolutionary trade unions.

FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

They are at the End of their Lies

Leading Article of the "Pravda" of December 8th, 1927.

The representatives of the Opposition, Kamenev, Rakovsky and other members of the Opposition who had been admitted to the XV. Party Congress with advisory votes, spoke in the discussion on the report of the C. C. What was the result of their coming forward?

Should anyone still have cherished the hope that the Opposition would ensure for itself the possibility of remaining in the Party by going down on their knees before the supreme Party organ, the Party Congress and by a complete ideological and organisatory capitulation to the Party, these hopes have not been fulfilled. Instead of honestly admitting their mistakes, instead of honestly condemning their behaviour in the past, the speakers of the Opposition continued to weave their tiresome, despicable network of lies on the platform of the XV. Party Congress. The Opposition has learned nothing by experience. The lesson which the Opposition was taught by the Party and the working class passed by it without leaving a trace.

Comrade Kamenev, the chief speaker of the Opposition, acknowledged that the Opposition

"was faced by the problem of choosing between two paths. One of these two paths is the second party... This is the path of a political and class degeneration — he said — but we cannot lead those who share our views on to that avenue, and we do not wish to do so."

The Opposition, said Kamenev, wants to remain in the Party. Both Kamenev's whole speech, however, and the speeches of the other members of the Opposition were in violent contrast to these words.

The Opposition does not wish for a "second party", but it has nevertheless created a second party and is maintaining it even to-day. This is a fact which is contradictory to Kamenev's "peaceable" asseverations. In whose name did he appear before the Party Congress unless he did so in the name of the second party which he professes "not to want"?

Persons whose honest desire it is to remain in the Party, ought first really to have liquidated the second party, in order to say afterwards that they did "not wish" its existence. The fact that the Opposition did not proceed in this way, proves once again that it continues to maintain its standpoint of a second party and that it is carrying on its old policy of betrayal towards the Leninist party.

The Opposition does not "want" a second party? Did Kamenev and the other speakers of the Opposition at the Party

Congress condemn the methods and views hostile to the Party to which the Trotzkyist "second party" resorted, which it applied and is applying even to-day? Did they condemn the activity of the Opposition in the streets of Moscow and Leningrad, in Charkov etc. which was hostile to the October Revolution? Did they condemn the appearance of the Opposition in alliance with non-party bourgeois intellectualists in the fight against the Bolshevik party? Have they abandoned the tactics of an "overthrow à la Clemenceau" in case of war? **Nothing of the kind** can be gathered from the speeches made by the representatives of the Opposition at the Party Congress. They passed over all these questions in silence. After all that, only an idiot can believe the Opposition when it asserts that it is against a second party.

Not only did the speakers of the Opposition not condemn the views and methods of a second party which is actually in the process of formation, but they even had the incredible impudence to "demand" that the Party Congress should again admit to the Party those "functionaries" of the second party, including Fischelev and his companions, who have been thrown in prison because of their anti-Soviet activity. Only persons who are completely sunk in the slough of lies can pretend to have an "olive branch" in their hands whilst, at the same time, they lay such declarations before the Party Congress. These tactics of the Opposition could not but meet with a fierce rejection on the part of all the delegates to the Party Congress.

At the Party Congress, the Opposition repeated (nay, even in a worse form) those two declarations which it made on October 16th last year and on August 8th of the current year: the speakers "promised" (!) in the name of the Opposition completely to liquidate the fractional scandal, but they "promised" at the same time... "to defend their views within the framework of the party statutes!" Indeed, after all that has happened, only persons who have lost all sense of reality can reckon on these "conditions" being accepted.

As a matter of fact, it is necessary really to play the part of "professional forgers", as the Opposition has been called at the Party Congress, in order to appear before the Party Congress — after the experience made with the two previous declarations — and only to make empty "promises" with regard to the "discontinuation of the fractional fight".

To-day it no longer suffices when the Opposition talks about ceasing the fractional fight. In the course of its development, the Opposition has slid down to Menshevik views of such a character that there must absolutely be no room for their propagation in our Party.

At Lenin's suggestion, the X. Party Congress declared, in the resolution condemning the anarcho-syndicalist deviation of the "Labour Opposition", the propaganda of views of that Opposition to be "incompatible with membership of the C. P. S. U."

The views the present Opposition holds with regard to our Party, according to which the latter is an "anti-proletarian", "Thermidorian" party etc. are, by their nature, Menshevik views which ought also to be incompatible with membership of the C. P. S. U., as this propaganda serves the purposes of the open class enemies of the proletariat, and as the adherents of the views of the Opposition are inevitably driving towards disrupting the framework not only of the Party, but also of Soviet legality, and towards a fight against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Opposition is at the end of its lies. The political lie has become one of the chief tactical norms of the Opposition, and this mendacity of the Opposition is no mere coincidence. It is not simply rooted in the personal qualities of the partisans of the Opposition but is explained by those contradictions in which the Opposition has entangled itself. It has drifted into a hopeless blind alley.

The views of the Opposition drive them towards an activity which is hostile to the Soviets, towards a fight against the Bolshevik Party and against the proletarian dictatorship which is under the lead of the Bolshevik Party. But the forces of the Opposition do not allow it to conduct this fight openly. This contradiction is the source of the constant, permanent lying of the Opposition in the face of the Party, of the working class, of the international proletarian movement. This is one of the causes of the degeneration of the Opposition which has burnt down behind it all the bridges to the masses of the workers, as the working masses do not tolerate or pardon lies, and finally always succeed in exposing them.

Kamenev was right when he acknowledged that the Opposition has now to choose between two paths — although, in contrast to his words, the Opposition is evidently making up its mind and choosing the “road of political degeneration”, the road of the second party. The Party is prepared to assist any comrades of the Opposition who earnestly wish to extricate themselves from the blind alley of political degeneration. The issue from the blind alley of degeneration and lies is open to them if, in view of the undeniable facts, in view of the clearly expressed will of the Party numbering millions and of the working class, they honestly confess to have been in the wrong and turn away from the petty bourgeois views which inevitably drive the adherents of the Opposition into a fight against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Only in this way will it be possible for them to disentangle themselves from the web of undignified lies to the Party, and to the working class, only in this way is it possible for them to return into the Bolshevik ranks, the ranks of the Party which is working indefatigably at the building up of socialist society, at the preparation of the international victory of Socialism.

A Declaration by Comrade Pikel.

A Declaration by Comrade Pikel, Formerly Member of the Opposition, on his abandonment of the Trotzky Opposition.

To the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

On November 16th last, I took occasion, at the general meeting of the nucleus of the People's Commissariat for Enlightenment, to declare my defection from the Opposition in a whole series of tactical and programmatic points. This action was essentially tantamount to an attitude of reserve in the fight raging between the overwhelming majority of the Party on the one hand and the Opposition on the other. To-day this is no longer sufficient. The Party is altogether right if it confronts us of the Opposition with the direct question as to whom we are siding with.

To-day two paths are open to each and every of us. Either to co-operate, to the utmost of his powers and in a spirit of comradeship, with the Party for the solution of the tremendous problems with which it is faced, or to remain in the ranks of the Opposition, to turn against the Party, and thereby to shake the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union all the more thoroughly and completely. I most decidedly and unconditionally choose the former path, and that for the following reasons:

The discussion is approaching its end. The appeal issued within the Party throughout the Soviet Union is causing the number of votes in favour of the Opposition to dwindle from day to day. The outcome of the struggle is apparent, viz. that the Party and the working class unanimously express their fullest confidence in the Central Committee. Fifty thousand proletarians join the Party in the place of the five hundred excluded Opposition members. We are isolated within the Party and jeered and laughed at from outside by the working class.

No Opposition in the entire history of the Party has experienced such a collapse of its ideas and its organisation. Naturally this is in no way the fault of the “omnipotent apparatus”. The masses have grown so greatly in a political and cultural sense as very well to recognise the class contents of the quarrel now in progress. Of this fact Comrade Kamenev was able to convince himself in the “Kossa” (“sickle”) factory. The nucleus of this factory was considered by us to be Oppositional, and it was assumed that Kamenev would be elected by this nucleus to the district conference of the Party; that was why he held a speech there. The very contrary of what we expected occurred. Kamenev's speech made the former Oppositionists fervent adherents of the Central Committee, and he was unable to find more than a very few followers there.

Such a unanimous and decided condemnation of the Opposition by the masses of the Party is naturally not the product of any pressure on the part of the apparatus. This is an argument of demagogy. The reasons of our defeat do not lie where the bankrupt leaders would fain seek them. The entire false, anti-Leninist political and tactical line taken by the Opposition in the fight against the Party led to our catastrophe.

I may start with the fundamental questions, which are contained in the so-called platform of the Opposition. What is

their standpoint? Leaving aside the entire revolutionary phraseology and all the oaths of fidelity to the heritage of Lenin and the world revolution, this document at bottom questions the possibility of proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and thus arrives at the conclusion that as an epoch of proletarian revolution and of the break-down of imperialism our own epoch has necessarily been overestimated.

If the class fight proceeding in the Soviet Union is looked upon as a Thermidorian contortion of the Party and the Soviet Government; if the absolute growth of the capitalist elements in town and country leads the Opposition to the assertion that the antagonisms between the peasantry and the proletariat and within the peasantry itself are hardly to be bridged over in view of the delay in the advent of the world revolution; if above all the proper policy of the Comintern is regarded in this platform as an “approach to Amsterdam” and “coquetting with the thoroughly anti-revolutionary Social-Democratic leaders”, while the adventurous group surrounding Maslov and Ruth Fischer is looked upon as a pearl of orthodox Leninism; if the entire economic section of the platform, both in its theoretical and in its practical divisions, in repetition of the old tenets of Trotzky, completely passes over the peasantry (thus, e. g., the chapter on “State Industry and the Development of Socialism”, preposterous as it may seem, makes no mention at all of agriculture and its importance for the industrialisation of the country) and leads in its suggestions not to strengthening the alliance between the working class and the bulk of the peasantry but rather to weakening the economic and therefore also the political connection between town and country — how should such a platform be considered anything but liquidatory and revisionist in regard to all Lenin taught us? That is the reason why at one time I refused to put my name to this document and this, too, was the beginning of my gradual defection from the Opposition.

The platform represented a complete victory of the Trotzky faction in the Opposition and had a depressing effect on many comrades of the Leningrad group. A number of signatures were obtained under pressure by what is known as “fractional discipline”, so that no quarrel should ensue in our ranks. This document convinced me of the ideological impotency of our leaders (Zinoviev and Kamenev), who capitulated almost all along the line to the un-Leninist ideas of Trotzky.

The counter-theses in regard to work in the villages and in industry have changed nothing in these relations and most logically follow up the liquidatory principle of the platform.

That was the reason why our faction had to own itself politically defeated, not by the apparatus but by the entire masses of the Party and the working class.

The same capitulation to Trotzky likewise ensued in regard to the tactics of the Opposition. The fractional struggle began immediately after the 14th Party Congress. Waged at first in simpler and milder forms, this fight assumed a pronounced organisational shape as soon as the bloc with Trotzky and his adherents had been created. In August 1926 we had a fairly good apparatus with its own committees, secretaries, travelling agents, illegal meetings, etc. There was no need at the time of illegal printing-works, seeing that the secretariats of Trotzky, Zinoviev, and Kamenev were technically fairly well equipped. The attempt to initiate a discussion in the Summer of 1926 over the heads of the Party, ended in a declaration of penitence on the part of the Opposition leaders in the Central Committee on October 16th. The “lower” adherents of the Opposition accused the heads of treachery, but the latter explained their attitude with the necessity of manoeuvre tactics.

The fractional work did not stop, however; it was merely diverted. In 1927 it grew beyond the measure attained prior to October 1926. The new declaration of the Opposition on August 8th by no means weakened this fractional activity. The acceptance of the declaration by the Central Committee was taken by our leaders as a sign of weakness and confusion on the part of the Central Committee, for which reason the fractional game of hazard increased yet more its illegal activity.

I acknowledge openly and frankly to the Party that while a member of the Opposition I clearly recognised all the elements for the formation of a second party. There was a separate Central Committee even a political bureau, a committee for Leningrad, another for Moscow, special territorial committees, government committees and district organisers, special propaganda groups, special circulars, members' contributions, and a special discipline. All this existed, continues to exist, and

cannot be refuted by any asseverations of the leaders of the Opposition as to the unity of the Party or a decisive fight against two parties.

The further occurrences and especially those of November 7th (the absence of my signature to the platform preventing me during the last few months from being employed on illegal work) led to the logical result that a second party was created after having been long in preparation among us. The counter-manifestations on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the October revolution were nothing but an open attempt to legalise the Opposition as the second party in the country. Such a "consistent" anti-Leninist line of tactics gained the upper hand in the Opposition thanks to the hegemony of the Trotzky group.

Both Zinoviev and Kamenev capitulated again. The theory of the pressure exercised by the apparatus and of the necessity of opposing it by all ways and means, a theory which only two years ago was condemned most emphatically and in a Leninist sense by Zinoviev and Kamenev, a theory which has nothing to do with the differences of opinion that arose on the 14th Party Congress, has now become gospel truth to the two new apostles of Trotzkyism. It was not for nothing that in the compilation of various programmatic documents the task of elucidating and analysing the question of party regime was entrusted to Trotzky by the leaders of the Opposition.

In regard to tactics, too, we were thus defeated most pronouncedly by the masses of the Party and the working class, by the very masses that had been taught for years by Zinoviev and Kamenev what the existence of two parties would mean to the fate of the proletarian revolution and dictatorship.

Herein, therefore, lie the reasons of our great defeat. It requires courage and steadfastness to speak openly on the subject to the Party. In the ranks of the Opposition there are hundreds of comrades who are aware of it but who cannot make up their minds to draw the necessary conclusions. At the best they separate themselves unobtrusively from the Opposition. This is a cowardly form of retreat, it is not the way Bolsheviks act. It is not easy for me to make this statement. All my best friends are among the Opposition, including such as for many years have politically trained me and thanks to whom I have learnt to have a deeper insight into many of Lenin's teachings. But near and dear as they may be to me, I do not hesitate to break with them completely, since the Party is worth more to me than all else.

Who will believe that the Party, which has most zealously and seriously set about solving the problem of the seven hours' working day in the Soviet Union and which is now engaged in settling in a Socialist sense one of the most important of all questions, that of soil regulation and exploitation on the basis of a technical reconstruction of agriculture — who will believe that this Party could ever be "Thermidorian" or "Kulak-Fascist?"

Who can believe that our Party should sink into a petty-bourgeois bog, now that tens of thousands of proletarians are joining its ranks? No, it is high time we liberated ourselves from the Oppositional hocuspocus, it is high time for us to form a sober judgement of the situation and to admit errors and mistakes without reserve.

We are in the midst of a period of turbulent Socialist construction. There are, however, still great gaps to be filled and we are still faced with great difficulties. The international situation is replete with dangers and complications. A tremendous amount of work is still in store for us. We therefore require the greatest degree of unity, concord, uniformity of aims, and fraternal collaboration. In the present differences, of course, a great number of questions are not yet solved so far as I am concerned. Within the Party, however, I will try to overcome these vacillations and to solve these problems. And now, an end to the differences of opinion! Work, work, and work again, with the Party and for the Party.

Long live the united, homogenous, perfectly disciplined Communist Party and its Leninist leaders.

Pikel

Member of the C. P. S. U. (since March 1917).

November 25th, 1927.

Editorial note. Comrade Pikel was for the last three years actively engaged in the Opposition; during this time he conducted Zinoviev's secretariat and was thus in the centre of the organisatory bodies of the "New" and subsequently of the "United" (Trotzky) Opposition.

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

Youth Conference of Friends of the Soviet Union.

On November 14th and 15th, the Conference of the Young worker delegations and the junior members of the worker delegations of the various countries, took place in the Experimental Theatre and in the Trade-Union House in Moscow.

The chairman of the conference, Comrade Franz Doll (Y. S. W.-Germany) welcomed the delegates and greeted the young Moscow workers in the name of the committee, which convoked the conference. The Conference was convoked through the initiative of the young workers' delegation of Germany. The presence of the non-Communists, who constituted the major portion of the delegates, proved the intense interest which the young workers of the world take in the Soviet Union. The delegates were able to see with their own eyes the progress which has been made in the Soviet Union: a six-hour working day, four weeks' holiday with pay, every possibility of education in the Soviet Union in contrast to increasing misery in the capitalist countries.

The capitalists are augmenting ever more eagerly armaments to be employed in depriving the revolutionary proletariat of its head, the Soviet Union. In this connection the young workers have two tasks: 1. to defend the Soviet Union on all occasions and to tear up the tissue of lies spread about it, to fight ruthlessly against the reformist leaders, the diluters of Marxism, and to create the united front of the young proletariat for the successful fight against capitalism; 2. to take up a clear position in relation to war. The young workers will not allow themselves to be used as cannon-fodder during the next imperialist war.

The first item on the agenda of the Congress was: "The Economic, Political and Cultural Achievements of the Young Workers of the Soviet Union", in relation to which a report was given by Comrade Chaplin, General Secretary of the L. Y. C. L. of the Soviet Union.

He compared the situation in former Tsarist Russia, where youth was spiritually and economically subjugated and constituted the cheapest form of Labour, with the situation of the young workers after the October Revolution. In the Soviet Union the work of juveniles is subordinate to the interests of training and education. To this end there exists a law forbidding the employment of boys and girls under fourteen years of age and prescribing a four-hour working day for those between the ages of 14 and 16, a six-hour working day for those between 16 and 18 and a four weeks' holiday with pay for all juvenile workers. For the four hours per day which they put in the young workers are paid as for a full day of eight hours. It must also be pointed out that there is a law forbidding the employment of young workers on night work and in trades which are injurious to health. Rest houses, sanatoria, night sanatoria and cure resorts are open to all young people in needy circumstances. For the purpose of training a well schooled and qualified supply of workers a certain percentage of juveniles are taken on each year in the factories.

At the moment there are two million young workers, of whom 500,000 are between the ages of 14 and 18. Unfortunately, there are various darker phenomena to be faced, including about 160,000 juvenile unemployed, a large number of whom have never done any work at all.

The best way to get rid of unemployment is to industrialise the country.

The Soviet Government has begun the colossal work of reforming public education. The difference between brain workers and manual workers is to be done away with. The first steps in this direction are the factory schools. Other possibilities of education open to young workers are: evening technical schools, labour colleges and universities. Special attention is given to the education of the young peasantry in peasant schools.

From 18 years of age all subjects of the Soviet Union have the active and passive right to vote.

One of the greatest achievements of the October Revolution is the powerful political organisation of the young workers and peasants, the L. Y. C. L., which now has more than two million members and a children's organisation, "the Young Pioneers", with a membership roll of over two millions. This association is one of the strongest pillars of the proletarian dictatorship. Tremendous work is also being done in the emancipation of working women and girls. Female members constitute 21% of the Communist League and 40% of the pioneer association.

Such success on the part of the association was possible only under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Comrade Chaplin called upon the delegates, who had witnessed with their own eyes the truth about the Soviet Union, in the name of the young workers of the Soviet Union to align themselves with the working youth of the whole world in the front for the defence of the Soviet Union.

Hereupon Comrade Birjov greeted the Congress in the name of the Young Pioneers of Moscow.

The following took part in the discussion: Comrade Hasper (Germany, Christian Socialist), Ruffy (France), Sha (China) in the name of the young workers and peasants of China, Newlands (England), Chamara (Czechoslovakia), Shurskaja (Poland), Heikundi (Mongolia), Brunelli (Italy), Elgert (The Argentine), Altmaer (Belgium).

In relation to the second item on the agenda, "the Danger of War and the Tasks of the Young Workers", reports were submitted by Comrades Clancy (Youth Guilds of the I. L. P.), Doll (Y. S. W. of Germany) and Girard (France).

Comrade Clancy stated inter alia: The young workers of many countries have congregated for the purpose of discussing a policy for the fight of the young workers of the whole world. The delegates from the heart of British imperialism understand the true significance of British imperialism, which is stretching forth its robber hand not only towards China but also towards the Soviet Union, whose mineral wealth and agricultural lands are highly tempting. The dark designs of England date back to 1917 and the ten years since that time have been spent in eager preparation for war. The playing off against the Soviet Union of the small border States, financed by British imperialism and the breaking off of relations are a part of the net woven around the Soviet Union. Everywhere armies are being built up and great masses of unemployed young workers are being driven through hunger into these armies.

The delegates must, therefore, recognise that it is their task upon their return to take the matter in hand and to agitate among the soldiers in the capitalist countries and to make them understand that they must not permit themselves to be used as cannon-fodder. In spite of all the difficulties, the young workers will not allow themselves to be kept back from this work nor will they forget the example of Karl Liebknecht. His example will urge on the young workers to stand shoulder to shoulder and to base no hopes upon the oily misleading tongues of the Labour Party and of the democratic movement, who will again betray them as they did in 1914. The young workers must also disintegrate the military youth organisations of the bourgeoisie: the boy scouts, cadets, territorial armies, etc., the diversion organisations of the bourgeoisie, and enlist in the united mass front for the defence of the Soviet Union all the young workers in their ranks.

Comrade Doll: The front of those desirous of making war on the Soviet Union is becoming denser and denser. The German bourgeoisie has, as is proved by Geneva and the entry of Germany into the League of Nations, taken up its position in this front. It is true that the League of Nations makes peace resolutions, but its members send out troops to suppress the workers and peasants of China. The arming of the German bourgeoisie is in full swing.

A further means of preparing for war is the works' sports clubs of the employers managed by ex-officers. In addition to these ideological and military preparations, the bourgeoisie resorts to open Fascism. By means of religious education, which is again being introduced into German universities and technical schools, it is desired to train young workers to be willing instruments of war.

There are, furthermore, a number of reactionary laws, for instance, that concerning compulsory labour service, which aim at keeping youth from anti-military enlightenment, influencing them in a reactionary sense and enabling the censorship laws to suppress all writing of a revolutionary nature. The law for the protection of youth from amusement is employed to prevent revolutionary entertainments for young people. The Social Democrats sanction these laws, to some extent openly and also by withholding their votes. They also support the League of Nations, which is nothing more than a united front against the Soviet Union. The Social Democratic press agitates rabidly against the Soviet Union, with which the Y. S. W. associate themselves.

The opposition in the ranks of the Young Socialist Workers is constantly growing and expulsion will not put a stop to the fight against the adulteration of Marxism.

A war against the Soviet Union is a class war and to convert this class war into a world civil war must be our most sacred duty.

Comrade Girard: While the Soviet Republics are constantly becoming stronger, the strength of the capitalist States is waning. England is taking the lead in preparation for war. The breaking off of relations, the murder of Voykoff, the attempts to assassinate Russian labour leaders are its work. We must carry on anti-militarist propaganda. Commencing with the children, whom we organise and bring up to oppose militarism, we must win over for our proletarian sports organisations the young members of the bourgeois sports associations. We must disintegrate the army of the bourgeoisie, fight for the economic and political interests of soldiers and explain the position of the workers in the Red Army. We must also form a united front of workers of the West and of the colonies, in order to get these reserves of the bourgeoisie onto our side. Anti-military work is difficult, but if we neglect it Fascism will thrive and the workers will pay doubly for their cowardice. Upon our return we must convert into reality our slogan: Turn your guns upon those who put them into your hands and ignite the proletarian revolution throughout the world.

The following took part in the discussion: Comrade Shatzkin (Soviet Union), Sawirusa (Poland), Heidrich (Czechoslovakia), Richtarykova (Czechoslovakia, National Socialist), Sha (China), Lissov ("Hammer and Sythe", Factory, non-party), Fevrier (France, Young Socialist), Negrin (Italy), Lima (Brazil), Lün (Skandinavia).

In his part of the discussion Comrade Shatzkin said: The approaching war against the Soviet Union will be a war not only against the power of the working class in general, against their economical and political position, but thereby also a war for the destruction of the achievements of the young workers and peasants arising out of the October Revolution. In a large measure the Soviet Union has begun to convert into reality the demands made after the first international congress of proletarian youth, held in Stuttgart in 1907. None of the Social-Democratic governments, which we have seen, have tried to materialise in the sphere of work and education the Stuttgart programme of the Youth International. In the Soviet Union alone is that the case. The defence of the Soviet Union is, therefore, the defence of the future of the whole of the young proletariat. An attack of the capitalists upon the Soviet Union is an attack upon the political rights of young workers, upon the six-hour day, upon the month's holiday, upon the abolition of night work and child labour, etc. We must impress this upon every young worker in the capitalist countries.

In order to be able to fight successfully against war, we must be clear in regard to our attitude towards war. Only a portion of the young workers can be influenced by chauvinistic slogans. In order to win over the other workers and peasants, both young and grown up, the bourgeoisie have recourse to pacifism. Between chauvinism and pacifism there is objective distribution of labour. Those who are not caught by chauvinism are deceived and distracted by pacifist talk.

Pacifism is propaganda for the disarmament of the proletariat. In the youth movement, especially in England, there are still many young workers who believe that by carrying on general propaganda against the use violence they are fighting for the Soviet Union. That is a fatal mistake.

In order to fight against war we must not only get rid of all vestiges of pacifism but also spread amongst the masses of young workers the greatest distrust of the leaders of Social Democracy and of the Young Socialist movement.

The most important thing is to organise the masses against war. And for this purpose a united front of young workers and of labour in general is absolutely necessary. The Young Communist International, of which I am a member, has ever since the foundation of the Young Socialist International made repeatedly and systematically proposals for a common fight against war and against the danger of war, during the occupation of the Ruhr and whenever war has been imminent either against the Soviet Union or any other country. In spite of the fact that we have declared our willingness, without imposing any conditions, to meet at a conference in order to discuss a plan for a common fight, we have not been able to get consent of the leaders of the Young Socialist International. If the leaders do not desire a united front, this must be created by the masses, despite and against the will of their leaders. The united front of all honest young proletarians in the factories and towns in the fight for the defence of the Soviet Union is one of the most important tasks awaiting the delegates on their return home.

On the basis of pacifist views, here and there the opinion is held that in case of mobilisation one should desert from the army, and there are some who cannot see blood and believe that it is best to throw away the guns and run away from the army. And there are some who believe that in so doing they fulfil their sacred revolutionary duty. What do they understand by deserting from the army? That means getting out of the war themselves and leaving the great masses of workers in the war. This means withdrawing all the revolutionaries from the army and leaving the masses to the influence of the bourgeois officers.

Our task is to remain in the army, to create revolutionary organisations there, to disintegrate the bourgeois discipline, to organise the workers against bourgeois command and to tell the workers what Lenin said: Learn to use a rifle, this may become very useful to the working class. We must not throw away our rifles but turn them against our enemies. In war time the army is the decisive place, the most important political institution, upon whose attitude very much depends. And it is here that we must exert our strength and prepare the ground for the revolution. Without this work a man may a thousand times say that he is against war and is ready to defend the Soviet Union, failing this work there is no real defence of the Soviet Union.

In order to fulfil this task much self-sacrifice is necessary. One must be ready to pay for this work with many years' imprisonment and, if necessary, with one's life. But just for this reason the young workers must occupy themselves with this revolutionary work in particular. One of the main ideas of Karl Liebknecht in the matter of the antimilitary fight was that care should be taken to choose from among the young workers the right people for this difficult and dangerous work, because the young workers are not so burdened with old-time conceptions as are the adult workers and because the young workers are filled with great enthusiasm, which is an important factor in the revolution.

Up to now this work has been done almost exclusively by the Communist section of the young proletariat, for instance, in the Ruhr district, in Shanghai, in the Baltic Ports, in England during the despatch of troops to China, etc. Many comrades fell in this fight or languished in bourgeois prisons. We should, therefore, try to gain for this revolutionary task not only young Communists but all honest young proletarians who desire to defend the Soviet Union. We hope that the comrades gathered here will do all they can to carry on the fight for the Soviet Union in practice. (Applause.)

The resolutions on these two items of the agenda were passed unanimously.

Resolution of the Youth Conference of the Friends of the Soviet Union*

The Conference of the representatives of the Working Youth of the capitalist States, of the oppressed Youth of the East, of the young brain workers who have gathered together in Moscow for the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution, in the full consciousness of its responsibility towards the working youth of the whole world, fully and entirely endorses the appeal of the friends of the Soviet Union against the threatening imperialist attack. All the delegates, no matter what their political tendency, whether Communists, non-party, social-democrats or anarchists, will do everything in their power to realise the decisions adopted by the Congress.

The toiling youth of the West and of the East is called upon to play a prominent role in the question of war. It is from their ranks that the imperialists attempt to recruit followers of imperialism and chauvinism. Men for the army and navy are drawn from their ranks. The imperialist war of 1914—1918 has shown that war plunges the working youth into fresh misery; it destroys the flower of youth on the battlefield; it brings with it the abolition of even the insufficient restrictions on the exploitation of the working youth, martial law and an intensification of political oppression. The working youth is the first victim of militarism and of imperialist war. It must be the first in the ranks of the fighters against the new attack upon the Soviet Union.

The working youth regards the Soviet Union as its fatherland. A victory of the world bourgeoisie over the proletarian State means not only the restoration of the Tsar, of the landowners and capitalists, but also the annihilation of all the achievements of the youth of the Soviet Union, which serves as an example to the young workers and peasants of the whole world. By defending the Soviet Union, the working youth of the other countries defends its own class cause against its class enemies — the bourgeoisie of its own country; it defends the beacon which shows the path of the future to the young proletarians and peasants of the whole world; it defends the State which was the first to lead the toiling youth from the darkness of imperialist slavery to the free path of transforming its life on the new socialist basis.

The delegates to the Conference pledge themselves to enlighten the working youth of their countries regarding the criminal, counter-revolutionary character of the threatening war against the Soviet Union, to expose all the anti-Soviet machinations of the imperialists and their lackeys, no matter what they may call themselves, and with what phrases on peace and democracy they may mask their manoeuvres. We shall dispel the lies of the imperialists regarding the Red Army and declare that the Red Army is the true defender of the proletarian State.

It is necessary to mobilise the broad masses of the young workers and peasants for the defence of the Soviet Union, and for this purpose to set up a united front of all the young toilers, in spite of the sabotage of those leaders who by their deeds support the imperialists in their preparations to attack the Soviet Union. The calumnies of the imperialists regarding the Red Army must be exposed. Mass protests and mass demonstrations against every aggressive step against the Soviet Union will render it more difficult for the world bourgeoisie to carry out its counter-revolutionary handiwork. Of special importance is mass agitation among the working youth in the war industries and the transport service, by which they are to be prepared for active fight against the war on Soviet Russia.

The most important task of the working youth is the propaganda against the war on the Soviet Union in the ranks of the soldiers and sailors, who are to be misused by the imperialists as cannon fodder, as blind tools of bloody war. The workers and peasants clad in the uniforms of the bourgeois armies are to be enlightened and informed that the Soviet Union is their fatherland, that a war against the Soviet Union constitutes a crime, that the Red Army is also defending their interests when it protects the peaceful socialist work of construction. Without such a revolutionary activity in the army all talk regarding the fight against war remains idle chatter. This difficult, dangerous but most important work must be performed by the young workers, who are the most sincere friends of the Soviet Union, the greatest opponents of imperialist war.

Not by pacifist phrases as to peace being good and war being bad, not by hopes upon the League of Nations, upon the International Arbitration Court and the other organisations of the great capitalist Powers can the working class avert the war and, if it breaks out, convert it into the victory of the proletarian dictatorship, but only by mass actions, by demonstrations, strikes and by revolutionary work in the army.

The representatives of the toiling youth at the Congress remind all young workers and peasants of the glorious traditions of the proletarian youth and the trust bequeathed by Karl Liebknecht. They call to mind the example of the French sailors

in the Black Sea who refused to fight against the Soviet Republic, and they pledge themselves to carry out their work in the spirit of these heroic examples. The working youth will, along with its adult brothers, form a firm bulwark of the workers' State; it will be the enemy of all its enemies.

Down with the imperialist war against the Soviet Union!

Long live the Soviet Union, the fatherland of the toilers of all countries!

Young workers and peasants, take your place in the front ranks of the defenders of the Soviet Union!

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

Discussion Supplement No. 11 of the "Pravda".

By H. K.

The Discussion Supplement No. 11 of the "Pravda" contains an article by Comrade Troshin: "How shall we mobilise the free Means of the Peasantry?" in which the writer makes proposals with regard to a reformation of the system for getting hold of the free means of the peasantry. Comrade Burov, in his article: "Create experimental rural Districts!" advocates the development of model rural districts. Comrade Remejko's article "On Peasant Relief Committees" moots the question of a fundamental reform of these organisations. Comrade Lebedj, in his article "The 'Suggestions' with Regard to the Soviet Construction made by the Opposition" deals with the demagogical accusations which the Opposition raised with regard to this question. Comrade Chalotov, in his article "The Labour Question in the Theses of the C. C. on the Five Years' Plan of National Economy" discusses the calumnious assertions of the Opposition in regard to the situation of the workers.

The Discussion Supplement is concluded with a brief survey on the articles received by the editor, referring to the "Theses on Work in the Village", which it was not possible to publish in the supplement.

In the introduction to his article "How shall we mobilise the free Means of the Peasantry?" Comrade Troshin states that the deposits made by the peasantry (in savings banks, agricultural and co-operative companies etc.) which amounted to 775 million roubles in 1914, amounted altogether to only 13,318,600 roubles on 1st April 1927, whereas agriculture had, at the same time, already reached the level of 1913; the section of production offered for sale also amounted to as much as 80 per cent. of the corresponding figure in 1913. In the economic year 1926/27, more than 1,300,000 poods of various agricultural products (cereals, linen, oil-seeds) remained in the hands of the peasantry, the greatest section thus being withheld from the circulation of goods in the country; to a certain extent these products were even used for private speculation, especially on the part of the Kulaks. In the future we are faced by the problem of how to put these stores on the market by the intermediary of the socialised sector of trade.

After giving an extensive analysis of the causes of this inadequate raising of the products — above all the lack of elasticity and the backward methods of work of the storing apparatus — Comrade Troshin proposes a fundamental change of the mode of getting hold of the products i. e. to accept deposits in kind. It would thus be the task of the agricultural and credit companies to receive these stores and to pay out to those who deposited them the corresponding sums of money, but only in cash. This would make it possible to get hold of and control the whole production of agriculture by co-operative and State trading. With the help of an exhaustive exposition of experience made up to the present, Comrade Troshin silences all possible apprehensions that the State trade or the co-operatives, which would have to pay the reimbursement at the market price of the day, might suffer a loss. A reform of that kind would at the same time tremendously facilitate the regulation of prices of agricultural goods, add to the possibilities of exports and altogether promote the development of the systematic factor in agriculture.

In his article "Create experimental rural Districts!", Comrade Burov proposes that, under the lead of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., the whole R. S. F. S. R. should be covered by a network of model agricultural districts which, according to his personal experience, must be regarded as the most appropriate means of promoting the socialist elements of agriculture in general and of collective farming in particular. The chief tasks of such model agricultural districts would be, on the one hand to create model germ-cells by a fundamental transformation of the whole economy of these districts, on the other hand they would offer an opportunity of testing practically the directions of the Party with regard to work in the village, which would make it possible to work out directives in the future with special accuracy. The said model agricultural districts, the financing of which should be provided for in the Five Years' Plan, should finally be developed into one great collective farming system.

In his article "On Peasant Relief Committees", Comrade Remeiko proposes a fundamental transformation of the Peasant Relief Committees as have hitherto been working. As a sufficiently strong system of credit companies has developed in the last few years, the supply of credits, which even now is one of the chief functions of those committees, no longer comes into consideration for them. It is further urgent that the field of activity which is next to that of the greatest importance — the work of small industrial undertakings — should be yielded up to the Soviet organs. Comrade Remeiko proposed, as a new field of work of the peasant committees that they should take into their hands the development of "mutual relief funds" (in the nature of the "Raiffeisen" banks), a function which would strengthen the authority of these committees. It is further necessary to liquidate the different organs for the districts, provinces etc., with the exception of the central apparatus of the R. S. F. S. R., as the first cause excessive expenditure.

Comrade Chalotov, in his article "The Labour Question in the Theses of the C. C. on the Five Years' Plan of National Economy" goes into all the detail questions and proves with the help of an extensive supplementary material of figures referring to the section of the theses of the C. C. on the Five Years' Plan of National Economy, which deals with the development of the situation of the workers in that period, that the calumnious assertions of the Opposition with regard to the situation of the working class and the pessimistic prospects of a further rise of its well-being resulting from that pessimistic attitude of mind are absolutely unfounded. Above all, he discusses the assertion of the Opposition maintaining that there was a stagnation in the wages of the workers for the past two years and even that the wages have fallen as compared to the purchasing power.

In order to save at least the appearance that such demagogical assertions are justified, the Opposition proceeds for instance as follows: it compares the average wages of the fourth quarter of the economic year 1924/25 with the corresponding figure of the second quarter of 1926/27. Note that the first figure exceeds the average of the whole economic year 1924/25 by about 23 per cent, whereas the corresponding figure for the economic year 1926/27 is the lowest which occurred in

the course of the whole year (99 per cent of the average for the first quarter, whilst the corresponding figure for the fourth quarter as compared with January, amounts to 114 per cent).

The fact that these assertions of the Opposition are absolutely unfounded and that, among other things, a decisive increase of the average actual wages took place in the course of the past two years, reinforce the certainty that, in spite of the prophesy of the Opposition, the material position of the workers will improve in the course of the five years before us in the measure provided for in the theses of the C. C. on the Five Years' Plan.

In his article "The 'Proposals' of the Opposition with Regard to the Soviet Construction", Comrade Lebedj enters into the theoretical analysis of the Soviet construction, made by the Opposition. The Opposition applies the preliminary conditions to which bureaucratism owes its expansion under the State apparatus of the capitalist countries, to the Soviet Union and fails to recognise that the proletarian State alone is able to combat and is combating bureaucratism effectually, that the preliminary conditions of the proletarian State alone offer the historical possibility of overcoming bureaucratism, which is a legacy bequeathed us by Tsarism.

With the use of extensive statistics, he expounds that the assertions of the Opposition to the effect that the activity of the broad masses of the population — in the village especially that of the agricultural labourers and of the poor peasantry, in the towns that of the industrial workers — is relaxing in consequence of the growing influence of the Kufaks and of the NEP-bourgeoisie on the lower organs of the apparatus of State, are pure inventions. The results of the last Soviet elections and the share taken by the broad masses of the population in the activity of the Soviet (in Moscow for instance there are 40,000 active participants in the work of the Moscow Soviets, chiefly from among the factory workers, in Leningrad 16,000), gives evidence of the lack of foundation of the assertions made by the Opposition with regard to this question.

The leaders of the Party succeeded in bringing about an increase of the class rôle of the proletariat throughout the whole apparatus of State from top to bottom and in isolating the NEP. and petty bourgeois groups. The Opposition is well aware of the fact that the data given by itself do not give a correct picture; it only resorted to those calumnious assertions for the purpose of promoting its fractional aims.

In an article: "On the Conclusion and the Results of the Discussion before the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.", Comrade Roshol demonstrated that the Party members expressed their full confidence in the C. C. with a degree of unanimity such as was rarely reached at one of the discussions in former times. The following figures give evidence of this:

Up to December 2nd 1927, 724,066 Party members out of a total number of 730,862 Party members voted for the C. C., 4120 (0.5 per cent.) against the C. C., 2676 (0.3 per cent.) abstaining from voting).

The Trotskyist Opposition maintained that no actual discussion took place in the Party. Here also figures show that the Opposition is telling lies. The meetings, at which the voting took place, were attended by, on an average, 68 per cent. of the Party members, (in some places by 89 per cent., as for instance in the Stalingrad organisation); they were therefore attended by an unusually high number of members; the same applies to the discussion in which an average of 12 per cent. of those attending it took part. The Opposition took a specially active part in these meetings. The percentage of the oppositional speakers in the discussion far exceeds the specific weight of their actual strength. About 9 per cent. of those taking part in the discussion were members of the Opposition, whereas, in Charkov, only 3 per cent. of those taking part in the discussion stood up for the line of action taken by the Opposition. The behaviour of the Opposition at the meetings was obviously calculated to frustrate the discussion before the Party Congress and to bring the central bodies of the Party, above all the XV Party Congress, into discredit. Both the contents of the resolutions moved by members of the Opposition at the meetings and a great number of its concrete suggestions were taken from the "platform" of the Trotskyites. These resolutions were worked out by the local leading organs of the Opposition.

The most annihilating criticism with which the Trotskyites met was pronounced by the simple workers who spoke at the meetings.

The Opposition made every possible effort, especially in the big factory nuclei and in the nuclei of the high training schools. There also it suffered a disgraceful defeat. In the factory nuclei, 1350, i. e. 0.6 per cent. of 227,000 party members in round figures, voted against the line followed by the Party; 998, i. e. 0.4 per cent. abstained from voting. In the village nuclei, about 48, i. e. 0.1 per cent. of about 54,000 workers voted against the line followed by the Party; 129, i. e. 0.4 per cent. refrained from voting. In the employees' nuclei, 643, i. e. 0.7 per cent. of about 88,000 persons attending the meeting voted against the line followed by the Party, 476, i. e. 0.5 per cent. abstaining from voting. Of the members of the nuclei of higher educational institutions (28,220) who attended the meeting, 676, i. e. 2.4 per cent., voted against the Party line whilst 150, i. e. 0.6 per cent. abstained from voting. Of the 30,677 members of the army nuclei who attended the meetings, 28, i. e. 0.1 per cent. voted against the Party line whilst 68, i. e. 0.2 per cent. abstained from voting.

In the large factories, the workers inflicted the severest defeat upon the Opposition. Thus, to cite an example, only a single person among the 1109 Party members of the Sormovo Works voted against the line followed by the Party and only two abstained from voting. In the Party meeting of the Putilov Works, 97.8 per cent. of the 1280 members attending the meeting voted in favour of the Party line without any abstention from voting. In a great number of big factories, the Opposition did not receive a single vote, in many cases only an insignificant percentage voted against the Party line.

A survey of the composition of the delegations at 20 Party conferences which took place in the current year, shows that the factory workers were represented in the first instance, both as regards their social extraction and their present occupation. The various organs, from the C. C. to the provincial and district committees made their reports at those conferences. The latter could also record an unusually lively activity. On an average, there were 20 to 25 speakers who discussed the reports made by the committee. About half of the province and district conferences took place after the publication of the theses of the C. C., a fact which refutes the assertion of the Opposition alleging that those who attended the above conferences were not familiar with the problems under discussion. With the exception of a few individual cases, all the delegates voted for the C. C. at those conferences. The elections of the leading Party functionaries at those conferences show a strengthening and a further increase of the proletarian influence in the leading bodies of the Party. At the election of the Party Committees (province and district committees) the percentage of newly elected members of the committees who belong to the working class by their social extraction, rose to 57.8 per cent. of the total number, consequently by 3.5 per cent. as compared with the corresponding figures at the XIV. Party Congress. In respect of their occupation up to the present, the percentage of factory workers in the committees increased from 10.9 per cent. before the XIV. Party Congress to 19.7 per cent. before the XV. Party Congress.

The fact that in the time up to the Party Congress more than 70,000 workers applied for admission to the Party, this being, in the most industrial districts, an average of 2 per cent. of the factory workers (in the industrial provinces of the R. S. F. S. R. as much as 2.5 per cent., in the Ural 2.1 per cent., in the Ukraine 2.9 per cent., in Baku even 6.6 per cent.), and an even higher percentage in districts where agriculture prevails — this fact gives the strongest evidence of the confidence of the workers.

The Trotskyist Opposition has more and more dwindled down with every discussion; at the discussion in 1923, about the third part of the Moscow organisation still voted in favour of the line followed by the Opposition. From something above 30 per cent. in 1923 it dwindled away to 0.5 per cent. in 1927. The Party has overcome Trotskyism ideologically, the process of a rapid disintegration of Trotskyism is already in full swing. In the last period, 819 Party members in Leningrad, Moscow, in the Ural, in Charkov, in Georgia, severed themselves from the Opposition. The small number of workers who have remained in the Opposition up to the present, are detaching themselves from it.

By devoting special attention to ex-members of the Opposition and approaching them in a friendly way, the Party organisations, above all the nuclei, should help them to overcome ideologically the last remnants of Trotskyist views and bring the said comrades back into the fold of the Party.