

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

# - INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 8 No. 7

## PRESS

9<sup>th</sup> February 1928

# CORRESPONDENCE

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

## CONTENTS

The XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. and the Opposition  
(Theses of the Agitprop of the E. C. C. I.)

### Politics.

Haavard Langseth: The Formation of the Social Democratic Government in Norway.

J. R.: The Marching Up of the Parties for the Election Campaign in Poland.

### China.

Tang Shin She: Peasant Revolts and Soviets in China.

### For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.

Letter from Zinoviev and Kamenev to the "Pravda".

Expulsion of the Trotzkyist Opposition Leaders from the C. P. of France.

### Against Imperialist War.

Rudolf Haus: International Gas War Congress in Brussels.

### Against Colonial Oppression.

J. B.: Great Britain's "Little War" in the Sudan.

### Union of Soviet Republics.

J. B.: The Facts Regarding the Results of the Grain Campaign.

### The Peasants' Movement.

Sen Katayama: The Revolts of Poor Peasants in Japan.

### Proletarian Culture.

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

### The White Terror.

Against the Criminal Justice against Stefanov and Comrades!

### In the Camp of Social Democracy.

V. Stern: The Social Democratic "Unity Congress" in Czechoslovakia.

### Ten Years Ago.

Yrjö Sirola: The Revolution in Finland.

### Book Reviews.

W. Ensee: H. N. Brailsford: "How the Soviets Work".

## The XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. and the Opposition.

**The Significance of the XV. Party Congress for the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern.**

**(Theses of the Agitprop of the E. C. C. I.)**

### A Historical Turning Point.

1. It would of course be quite wrong to say that the importance of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. is limited to its decisions regarding the Opposition. The time at which the XV. Party Congress was held was in every respect one of the most important turning points of historical development.

The Soviet Republics have existed for ten years. They have already begun to enter on a period of real socialist reorganisation of the economy, technique and culture inherited from the past. It is no mere chance that on the agenda of the XV. Party Congress there already stood the question of a general plan of development of national economy for a full five years. It is no mere chance that at the XV. Party Congress the extremely difficult task of the socialist transformation of the Soviet village was discussed in a very concrete manner and that the Party Congress concretely debated the real paths to the socialist organisation of millions of peasant undertakings.

On the other hand, when the Party Congress met, the first years of the "stabilisation process" of the capitalist world had passed, years which brought with them new and increased dangers for the Soviet State, but at the same time a new intensification of the capitalist contradictions and the first symptoms of a new rise of the revolutionary wave in the West.

Hence the significance of the Party Congress consists above all in the fact that at this turning point of the inner and international development it drew the balance of the previous period and concretely laid down the tasks of the C. P. S. U. in connection with this transition to development "upon a somewhat higher stage".

### The Oppositional Groupings — a Reflection of the Pressure of the Petty-Bourgeois Right Elements in the Country.

2. At the same time, or more correctly said, thanks to the importance of this Party Congress the decision of the Party Congress on the Opposition is of special historical significance. It could be said that the battle of the C. P. S. U. with the Opposition has been nothing else but the decisive battle in a long struggle which lasted during the whole previous period and only reached its highest point at the present turning point of development. Differences of opinion between the petty bourgeois elements of the Party and the Party as a whole have made their appearance in all the important moments of the post-revolutionary Party history. It suffices to call to mind the chief oppositional groupings since 1917:

a) October Revolution 1917 — Opposition Zinoviev and Kamenev.

b) The Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk — Left Communists (Trotzky, Radek, Preobrazhensky etc.).

c) Transition to the N. E. P. in 1921 — Trotzkyist trade union Opposition and "Worker's Opposition".

d) Economic difficulties in 1923. — Trotzkyist Opposition.

e) Policy of industrialisation and the building up of Socialism in our country in 1925 — Opposition of Zinoviev and Kamenev.

f) Finally, in the years 1926—1927, uniting of all opposition groups under the hegemony of Trotzky.

All oppositional groupings reflected the petty-bourgeois vacillations in our country in connection with this or that turning point in our development. The Party therefore, both under Lenin as without Lenin, always proceeded determinedly against the Opposition and to a greater or lesser extent liquidated the oppositional tendencies. History has, however, shown that the oppositional tendencies have not been completely liquidated. After some time the "liquidated" differences came again to the surface. An accumulation of the oppositional tendencies took place. Of course not because the policy of the Party since 1917 had not been correct or because the country was "constantly" driving to the "verge of ruin", as every Opposition had prophesied. By no means!

It rather resulted from the fact that, in such a petty bourgeois country as Russia, under the dictatorship of the proletariat and in view of the monopoly of the Communist Party, and moreover in a capitalist surrounding, to the same extent as various difficulties of socialist construction become apparent and the capitalist economic elements are growing — although not relatively but with regard to their numerical strength — the political discontent of these petty-bourgeois and capitalist elements was bound to find expression and to grow. It is therefore natural that this political discontent, as there are no other parties besides the Communist Party, had to find expression in the accumulation of oppositional groupings within the Communist Party. This explains, among other things, why the majority of the oppositional groupings were always compelled to come forward in an "ultra-Left", arch-Communist garb, although they obviously reflected the pressure of the petty-bourgeois Right elements in the country and replaced the Menshevist parties which are lacking under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

#### The Latest Oppositional Grouping — a "Sovietised" Tool of International Social Democracy.

3. The characteristic peculiarities of the latest Opposition are: union of all the former groupings, which was not the case with the former Oppositions; such an accumulation of the differences of opinion as opposed to those of the Party, that the former theoretical differences were thereby converted into **programmatical** differences. Application of such fighting methods against the Party as led the Opposition not only beyond the limits of the Party but also beyond those of **Soviet legality**. The Party was therefore confronted by a united front of all the elements discontented with its policy: the Right and also the "Left"; the "lovers" of the village poor as well as the advocates of State capitalism in the Soviet Union; the followers of Left gestures in international politics who deny capitalist stabilisation, as well as those people who boundlessly laud capitalist stabilisation and are dreaming of a "weakening" of the "intervention of the Comintern in Western European affairs; both the super democrats in the Party as well as the administrative bureaucrats who are in love with themselves — they have all united for the single aim: for the fight against the Party and its leaders.

On the eve of the XV. Party Congress the Party was confronted by a form of the political platform of the Opposition which did not leave over a single question on which there were no profound differences between the Opposition and the Party. A platform, a programme of a new Party has been set up, a platform of such a kind that it has objectively become the manifesto for the rallying of all counter-revolutionary sections of the population, an "appalling document" for that world which is fighting against the Soviet Union. The Opposition may make as many "left" phrases as it likes, the fact cannot be denied that the "oppositional platform" has become a counter-revolutionary programme of calumnies against the proletarian dictatorship.

Finally, the Party was not only faced by a programmatical but also by an organisational form of a new party. The Opposition set up its own illegal apparatus, its own illegal press and its own Party discipline. The Opposition proceeded to organise the non-Party elements and to undertake public actions and demonstrations against the Party and the Soviet Power. The objective role of the "October upheaval" of the Opposition on the Tenth Anniversary of the Soviet Power is that of an open action against the regime of the proletarian dictatorship. The Opposition thereby converted itself into a "Sovietised" tool of international social democracy. It is not for nothing that the central question, the "cardinal point" in the fight both of the Opposition and of international social democracy against us is the question of the "regime" of "political liberty".

This whole "qualitative" transformation of the Opposition before the XV. Party Congress, as described above, fully corresponds to that turning point in the development which the Soviet Union is undergoing. With the transition of the Soviet Union, after the first ten years of its existence, to a higher "class" of socialist construction, the proletarian State is confronted by the "oppositional heritage" of the past, accumulated and matured in the course of the whole preceding development. To the proletarian dictatorship which has become ripe for the further socialist construction, there corresponds a Neo-Menshevist Opposition which has been reared on the nourishing sap of the existing petty-bourgeois elements.

#### The Crushing Defeat of the Opposition. — A Result of the Ideological Strengthening of the C. P. S. U.

4. The Opposition suffered such a defeat at the Party Congress as no other Opposition in the history of our Party. Wherin lie the causes of this catastrophe of the Opposition? Firstly in the ideological growth of the C. P. S. U. The Party entered the revolution with a cadre of some thousand members. It has now grown into a Party of millions. The Opposition mainly reckoned upon these new cadres. The great educational work which has been carried on in the nuclei, which discussed the questions in dispute for many years, has steered the Party to no less a degree than the civil war and the revolution have steered the proletariat of the Soviet Union.

It is no mere chance that, at the moment of the decisive battle against the Party, Neo-Menshevism, which came forward in its undisguised anti-Party and anti-Soviet form, had only about 4000 persons in the whole Party behind it and could not obtain a single mandate at the Party Congress. And this in a Party numbering a million members. The decisive defeat of the Opposition can only be explained by the growth of the proletarian dictatorship and of the Party, by the growing influence of the Party among the broad masses and by the absolute Menshevist, openly anti-proletarian "face" which the Opposition assumed in its fight, which developed with inevitable logic. The Opposition, after having completed a whole historical cycle of its development, has thrown off its "Left" "revolutionary" mask and has objectively become an anti-revolutionary force.

It is for this reason that it suffered such a crushing defeat and received a "knock on the head" at the XV. Party Congress. The Party Congress excluded from the Party a group of the most active functionaries of the Opposition, and declared membership of the Trotzkyist Opposition to be incompatible with membership of the Party. There was thereby fulfilled the demand of the Party membership, put forward long ago — once and for all to clear out the Opposition which violates all the principles of a Bolshevist Party.

The decisions of the Party Congress leave only two paths for the Opposition: either complete submission to the Party and ideological disarmament, or conversion into an open counter-revolutionary anti-Soviet Party. Which of these two paths will be chosen by the Opposition? The complete cul de sac at which the Opposition arrived, led to their being deserted wholesale by their simple members. Even a group of their leaders with Zinoviev and Kamenev at the head has deserted them. We do not doubt that the serious proletarian and revolutionary portion of the Opposition will come back to the Party.

On the other hand it must be perfectly clear that the Trotzkyist Opposition — and this is confirmed by the instructions of the Trotzky group, will continue the fight against the Party, as the Neo-Menshevist Opposition represents the result of a long historical accumulation of all oppositional petty-bourgeois sections of the Party which have formed in the course of

the ten years of existence of our revolution and which develop under the difficult conditions of a backward, petty-bourgeois country surrounded by capitalist States. The chief task of the Party consists in rendering quite harmless this small group of renegades from the Party and the revolution which constitute a Neo-Menshevik Party in course of development. We can be convinced that the Party and the proletarian dictatorship will solve this task.

#### All Sections of the Comintern have to Draw the Necessary Conclusions from these Events.

5. The history of the whole struggle with the Opposition and its final episode are of greatest political importance both for the C. P. S. U. and for the whole Comintern. All sections of the Comintern must draw appropriate conclusions from these events. The "episode" with the Opposition is by no means a mere "national", "Russian" episode.

The rise, the development and the catastrophe of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U., that is in the Party which stands at the helm of the first proletarian State in the world, must be studied by the revolutionary proletariat of all countries, as these experiences of the leading party of the proletarian dictatorship are internationally instructive and important.

The formation of the Opposition in the first ten years of painful growth of the proletarian dictatorship and their final abandonment of the revolution at the end of this period are of interest because they show with what difficulties the working class of all countries will have to deal after seizing power, as of course the consolidation of the proletarian power will not proceed in any country without vacillation on the part of various sections of the advance guard carrying out the dictatorship, or without the direct abandonment of various elements who are intimidated by the unexampled difficulties of the revolution from fulfilling the enormous revolutionary tasks. All Communist Parties who are proceeding towards the seizure of power must reckon with this.

The "Russian" experiences with the Opposition are, however, of enormous importance for all Communist Parties also from another standpoint. The history of the Russian Opposition is closely bound up with the Opposition and with the cases of a turning from Communism which made their appearance in the Communist Parties of the various capitalist countries in the period following the first grandiose offensive wave of the international revolution in the period immediately after the war. The fact that there is at present a certain, if of course very relative "standstill" of the revolution, has, in essential, the same effect on the elements both in the C. P. S. U. and in the other Communist Parties which are inclined to petty-bourgeois vacillations. As a counter-part, so to speak, to the Opposition in the C. P. S. U., there formed, sometimes a dying and sometimes a reviving, "Communist" Opposition in Western Europe. This Opposition, in its importance pitiable, in its nature liquidatory, recently experienced, as a consequence of the growth of the stabilisation process, the temporary defeat of the Chinese revolution and the strengthening of the imperialist pressure upon the Soviet Union, a certain revival.

The strongest impulse for the "resurrection" of the West European Opposition was provided, however, by the intensification of the fight of the Russian Opposition against the Party. The hopes which had already been quenched flamed up anew.

The severe defeat of the Opposition of the C. P. S. U. at the XV. Party Congress, the open capitulation of a portion of the Oppositionals, the final transformation of the other portion into a Menshevik-counter-revolutionary group, the indubitable Leftward development which is commencing and the revolutionising of the West-European working class, as well as the sharpened fight between social democracy and Communism connected with it, must give the Opposition a decisive blow. The Communist Parties must exert all their forces in order to expedite this natural process of expiry to which the miserable handful of renegades in all countries are doomed.

In view of the capitulation of the Opposition the Communist Parties of all countries are confronted by the following tasks:

a) All vacillating elements must be shown that after the defection of *Zinoviev* and *Kamenev* from the Opposition, the latter has arrived, on an international scale, at the situation of that *Trotsky* group as we had it in the year 1923. (*Hula* in Czechoslovakia, *Souvarine*, *Rosmer*, *Monatte* in France. *Over-*

*straeten* in Belgium etc.) The "Zinovievist" elements of the type of *Maslov*, *Michalec*, *Neurath*, *Treint* etc. capitulated both ideologically and formally to *Trotskyism*.

b) The breaking away from the Opposition of the *Lenin*-*grad* group, which in the past had some working class elements behind it, transforms the *Trotskyist* Opposition on an international scale into a social-fascist grouping. (See the latest utterances of *Treint* and *Maslow*.) The Opposition according to its social composition, is becoming more and more an organisation of those petty-bourgeois intermediate strata which in all countries supply the cadres for fascism.

c) It is the task of the Communist Parties to facilitate the abandonment of the Opposition by those elements which have seen, as a result of experiences, into what an abyss they were being drawn by the leaders of the Opposition. In addition to work of enlightenment regarding the nature of Neo-Menshevism (a variety of social patriotism) it is necessary to subject to a ruthless criticism all vacillation, every kind of diplomatic excuse, (see the replies of *Neurath* to the questions of the C. C. of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia), all attempts to evade a direct answer and to adopt a centralist position in the fight between Neo-Menshevism and Communism.

#### The Concrescence of the International Opposition with Left Wing Fascism and the International Social Democracy.

6. The "Communist" Opposition in the West-European countries is characterised in recent times by about the same features as those of the latest Russian Opposition. The former, just like the latter, entered on the decisive "phase" of its fight. We see a peculiar international grouping together of all the rotten elements, but already under the open sign of *Trotskyism* (see the instructions of the Opposition in "Inprecorr" No. 3). This collaboration of all renegades can be excellently observed in all countries. In Czechoslovakia the *Right*, with *Hula* and *Skala* who has been expelled from the Party at their head, together with the group consisting of *Michalec* and to a certain extent also *Neurath*, "sympathise" with the *Trotskyists*. In France the *Zinovievists* of yesterday, *Treint* and *Suzanne Girault*, are in the tow of *Souvarine*, *Rosmer*, *Monatte*, *Loriot* and the lawyer *Paz*. In Germany we see *Maslov* and *Ruth Fischer* in touching unity with the social democrats.

What is it that unites these multifarious elements in the *Trotsky* fraction? A typical Menshevik platform in which the Menshevik liquidatory estimate of the driving forces of the world revolution are combined with a nauseating Menshevik counter-revolutionary "criticism" of the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Comintern. Wherein does the estimate of the present situation by the Oppositionals, who see everywhere only hopeless "political" twilight, an "epoch of defeats", a "general swing to the Right, not excepting even the C. P. S. U.", a transformation of the Communist Parties into "Centrist" and "opportunist" parties, "degeneration" and "Thermidor" in the Soviet Union, differ from thorough-going Menshevism. In what way does that campaign of calumny against the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and against the Soviet Union which these gentlemen are conducting under the signboard of a "Communist opposition", differ in reality from the counter-revolutionary incitement of the *Mensheviks*?

It suffices to look at the co-ordinated action of the "Vorwärts" and *Maslov's* "Volkswille" in the campaign and the so-called "banishment of the Russian Oppositionals to Siberia" in order for it to be clear to every, even politically inexperienced, worker that the agency of international capital has two faces but one class content. The same hand wrote at the same time articles for the organ of *Stampfer* and for that of *Maslov*. And the same unity of thought, of methods and interests will become more and more apparent. It is the task of the Communist Parties to expose this concrescence of neo-Menshevism with the Left wing of fascism and of international social democracy.

#### The Importance of the XV. Party Congress for the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern.

7. The international "Communist Opposition" is striving, in one bloc with the whole of European social democracy, to make use of the decisions of the XV. Party Congress regarding the Opposition as an argument against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against the C. P. S. U. and against the Comintern. In order to counter-act this it is the duty of all Communist

Parties not only to point out the correctness of these decisions, but also to conduct a broad agitation and propaganda by means of which the great ideological and educative importance of the lessons drawn by the XV. Party Congress will be made clear to all Communist Parties. The essence of these lessons consists in the following:

a) The dictatorship of the proletariat is incompatible with the existence of two or more parties in the country, as well as with the existence of fractions in the Party of the working class. This fact is being confirmed by the whole history of the fight of the Opposition against the C. P. S. U. The Opposition has already transformed itself into a second, a Menshevik Party within the country and is fighting objectively against the foundations of the proletarian dictatorship. The dictatorship of the proletariat would certainly have perished if it had not dealt the Opposition a deadly blow, had it not destroyed every possibility of the continuation of the counter-revolutionary work of the Opposition outside the Party, just as, in the first years of the revolution, it deprived the Mensheviks and the S. R.'s of such a possibility. The social democrats and the international Trotskyists may make use of this action in order to "prove" whatever they wish. The greatest strength and not the weakness of the proletarian dictatorship consists in the iron discipline of the proletarian class, and in the unity of the proletarian advance-guard which carries out this dictatorship. This has already often been confirmed by the history of our revolution.

b) The greatest danger for every Communist Party, including that which is in power, lies in fractioneering. The Communist Parties, which are conducting a desperate fight against the entire capitalist world, cannot fulfill their tasks without the unshakable unity of their ranks. Without this prerequisite they cannot win the masses, as the fraction struggle, which inwardly rends the Party, constitutes the greatest hindrance to the fulfilment of these tasks. The workers who follow the flag of the Communist Party have to overcome not only the resistance of the social democracy, but also the calumnies of the inner-Party fraction-mongers against the Party.

Only those who hold Trotskyist ideas regarding the Party can tolerate and promote a fraction struggle in the various sections of the Comintern. The Comintern and its sections are therefore confronted with the task of purging from their ranks in the most energetic manner the elements of fraction struggle which is an unhealthy Trotskyist heritage. The tremendous damage which this struggle caused the Yugoslavian Party, the weakening of the fighting capacity with which the struggles of groups in Poland was accompanied, serve as a clear example of the symptoms of sickness of the past period of our Communist movement. The Comintern attaches the greatest importance to the discussion of all political and practical questions of the working class within the Party. It must, however, at the same time put down with a strong hand the fraction anarchy which is corroding some sections of the Comintern.

c) That determination and boldness with which the C. P. S. U., in the name of Party unity — this most important pledge of the victory of the revolution —, subjected its former leaders (Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev) to a severe criticism and with which it carried through a general self-criticism and testing of its own line, in the discussion of which the whole Party took part, and that unity which the membership of the Party displayed, show to all the West-European Communist Parties the real features which the Bolshevik inner-Party democracy possesses in contrast to that false "freedom of thought, speech, and fractioneering", freedom for the individual within the Party which is alleged to exist in the social democratic parties and from the remnants of which some Communist Parties (the Belgian for example) have not yet rid themselves. Hardly any other political party would have decided on such an energetic, all-embracing self-criticism as that which the Communist Parties undertake from time to time.

The result of such a self-criticism, however, is never the victory of "freedom of opinion", the victory of "personalities", of the "leaders" nor the fractional undermining which weakens the Party, but the full triumph of the opinion of the Party as a collective body, of the Party membership and the consolidation of unity of action.

Therein consists the ideological educative importance of the decisions of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. regarding the Opposition.

## POLITICS

### The Formation of the Social Democratic Government in Norway.

By Haavard Langseth (Oslo).

Hardly a year has elapsed since the union between the Centrists and the Social Democrats of Norway into the Norwegian Labour Party took place under the auspices of Friedrich Adler, the General Secretary of the Second International. The Right Social Democrats sacrificed their organisatory connections with the Second International for the sake of unity and put up with the "revolutionary" Austro-Marxist leaders (Tranmael, Bull and consorts) as best they could. Herr Adler did the same. As he considered national (social democratic) unity to be a forerunner of international unity, he emphasised that, if needs be, he himself and the Second International would remain patient even for a few years. Events have developed in such a way that their patience will probably not be tried too severely.

Even last autumn, Friedrich Adler's new friends (Halvard Olsen, Madsen and their partisans) entered on a campaign with the object of bringing about the affiliation of the Norwegian Trade Union Federation to Amsterdam. Thanks to the stir of thousands of revolutionary workers organised in the trade unions however, that campaign was unsuccessful.

And behold! To-day Professor Bull, the theorist of the "Left" and author of the "revolutionary programme" is a member of the Government of His Majesty the King of Norway.

The preliminary history of the first social democratic ministry of Norway is, to put it briefly, as follows:

The Conservative Government with Lükke at its head, which resulted from the election in 1924, has carried on a ruthless policy of stabilisation in agreement with international financial capital. The workers and the trade unions were severely affected by reductions of wages, by the increasing and permanent unemployment whilst at the same time unemployment benefit was restricted, by the introduction of compulsory courts of arbitration, the passing of a paragraph on penal servitude for the protection of strike-breakers, annulment of the rent restrictions act etc. Severe reductions of salaries and wages, affecting broad strata of state-officials and workers, were carried through, and the first steps towards the abolishment of the eight-hour day were made. The small peasants and fishermen suffered from the consequences of an abrupt deflation policy. All the strata of the working people were sadly afflicted by the increase of indirect taxes.

The general election held in October 1927 was a spontaneous reaction of the broad masses against that policy. The result of the election was a completely changed position of the parties in the Storting (Parliament) which was convoked on January 11th. The composition of the latter was as follows:

	1927	1924
Conservatives . . . . .	30	54
Peasant party . . . . .	26	22
Liberals . . . . .	32	36
Social Democrats . . . . .	59	32
Communists . . . . .	3	6

The Conservative Government was compelled to resign, and handed in its resignation on January 20th. In spite of the great majority of the bourgeois parties (88) as against the workers' parties (62), it seemed impossible at first to bring about a bourgeois coalition government. Attempts were made, it is true, to form a front against the working class, a front imbued with a Fascist spirit. With that object in view, Melbye, a landowner and leader of the semi-Fascist Peasant party, was commissioned to form a bourgeois bloc government which was intended to continue the bourgeois policy of financial restoration at the cost of the working class. The initiator of this policy of a bourgeois bloc was Thommesen, the Fascist editor

of the newspaper "Tidens Tegn" and leader of a small group which had detached itself from the Conservatives, the so-called "Independents".

These attempts were wrecked thanks to the resistance of the Liberals under the direction of Movinckel, a ship-owner. The Liberals rejected the government of a bourgeois bloc under the pretext that a policy of that kind was apt to be regarded as a union of one section of the people against another section (i. e. the working class).

The Norwegian bourgeoisie therefore chose the most ready means of escape from the dilemma by entrusting, for the time being, Social Democracy with carrying on the government whilst it waited for better times to come and for better preliminary conditions for fresh combinations.

The Social Democratic Government, however, did not come into the world without causing the Norwegian Labour party acute pains. In the central committee of the N. L. P. there are two opinions with regard to the formation of the government, differing from one another "on principle" in that they are guided by the following, equally opportunist considerations:

The Tranmael-Torp group maintains that the formation of a social democratic government comes into question only after the "capturing" of the parliamentary majority, as a government of the Labour Party would otherwise be entirely "incapable of work" and altogether dependent on the good graces of the Liberals. In that way the Labour Party would be compromised as a "revolutionary" party, thus playing into the hands of those confounded Communists.

The Halvard Olsen Madsen Hornsrud group, on the other hand, maintains that a government of the Labour Party could now, nominating the members of the compulsory courts of arbitration and by carrying through minor reforms to which the Liberals are prepared to agree, ensure the party's popularity among the broad masses and "save" the country from a number of Labour conflicts which may be expected to follow the rationalisation which is being introduced. This is the reason why, in their opinion, the Labour party, being the strongest parliamentary group, although in the minority in comparison to the bourgeois parties as a whole, should take over the government.

Tranmael, the editor of the chief organ and Torp, the president of the Central Committee of the party, suffered a defeat in this "dispute about principles". The problem of the government was solved in a positive way by the Enlarged Central Committee of the party in that it passed the following typically social democratic, double-meaning resolution on January 14th and 15th:

"In connection with the question of a Labour government, the Enlarged Central Committee of the party states that it will not aspire after government power without possessing a majority in the Storting and that, in the present situation, it refuses to take any responsibility for the government unless the accomplishment of urgent and important affairs can be ensured by its doing so."

In the resolution of the enlarged central committee, the following demands are mentioned as being most urgent:

1. Abolition of the law on penal servitude.
2. Disarmament.
3. Reduction of the debts of the poor population and of the municipalities.
4. Remedial measures against unemployment.
5. The passing of the agrarian bill, the promotion of the cultivation of virgin soil and of colonisation.
6. Re-introduction of the corn monopoly and the abolition of the system of corn bounties.
7. Control of the export of fishing products.

In order to mask from the Left inclined workers his capitulation and his cowardly flight and his treachery to the revolutionary workers, large numbers of whom had taken part in the farce of the union with the Right social democrats precisely because of the person of Tranmael, the latter published the following commentary on the above resolution and on the victory of the extreme Right, in the chief organ on January 16th:

"We are not anxious to administer the bourgeois bankrupt's estate. If however a situation presents itself which makes it possible for us — either by applying extra-parliamentary measures or in some other way — to promote matters and tasks which are in the interest of the working class, that alters the case."

Even on January 24th, the case was altered. Alfred Madsen, a tool in the hands of Halvard Olsen a follower of Amsterdam, President of the Trade Union Federation, accepted the King's commission to form a government, in the name of the Norwegian Labour party, which party then proposed that Hornsrud, an old parliamentarian, known for more than ten years as a socialist minister, should be nominated Prime Minister by the King.

The defeat of Norwegian Austro-Marxism is now an open fact. Professor Bull, the "theorist" of that group which wanted to render the Communist Party of Norway superfluous by means of their "revolutionary" policy on paper, has also fallen a victim of the trial and has joined the ranks of the "despicable" socialist ministers as the minister of foreign affairs of the first government of the Labour party.

No one now treats Tranmael's phrases seriously. In the act of introducing the government, he is still making attempts, in the chief organ, to represent it as a fighting government of the working class against bourgeois reaction. The tens of thousands of honest revolutionary workers within the Norwegian Labour party however, who refused Halvard Olsen's Amsterdam policy by the mouths of their representatives at the Congress of the Trade Unions in December last year, will also stand up against a policy of peace within the precincts of parliament and will remain true to the revolutionary class war.

## The Marching Up of the Parties for the Election Campaign in Poland.

By J. R. (Warsaw).

The election which is about to take place for the first time since the Fascist coup d'état, is essentially different from the previous elections in 1919 and 1922. The period of parliamentary illusions is over. Those who are now holding the power in their hands, no longer say: "We lay the fate of the country and the fate of the government in the hands of the masses." On the contrary, the language they are now speaking is essentially different? "Neither the fate of the country nor that of the government depends on the issue of the election." This is what "Elos Pravdy" ("The Voice of Truth"), the favourite organ of Pilsudski, writes.

Why then does Pilsudski's Fascist government issue writs for an election, why does it have a new Sejm elected?

It does so for the reason that it wants to legalise the coup in May by means of an election, to create in this way the appearance as though the dictatorship of Marshal Pilsudski rested on the will of the people, as though it were backed by the masses. The intention is to create a Sejm which will be an obedient executive organ of the government's wishes, a Sejm which will be responsible to the Government.

In order to achieve all these aims, the government is forming a big Fascist camp which, in its outward appearance, is disunited and even disintegrated, but is, in reality, under one control and carries out a uniform programme.

In that camp we find the agrarian capital. Messrs. Radzivil, Lubomirski, Csartoriski, the capitalist successors of the feudal magnates and heirs of their properties are once more conscious of being the ruling class just as in the times of the old feudal republic before the dismemberment of Poland. For those gentlemen, Pilsudski's government is equivalent to their ruling themselves. That government has finally liquidated the agrarian reform, opened credits to the agrarians and ensured high prices of agricultural products. The Government has offered them all the advantages of the American loan, the full burden of which is pressing on the masses of workers. The Government is carrying on a policy which leads towards an attack on the Soviet Union, a policy rousing in the hearts of the Polish landed proprietors the hope that they may, by force of arms, recover their former landed properties which are now part of the Soviet Union or of Soviet White Russia.



The large industrialists and financiers, members of the Polish, Jewish and German bourgeoisie, are supporting the Fascist Government with equal zeal. Why should they not support a government which has fulfilled all their heart's desires, which has suppressed social legislation as a whole with one stroke of the pen and prolonged the working day, which is helping in the carrying out of rationalisation, a government which is promoting war industry, paralysing the struggle of the working class by means of arbitrary awards and ensuring to the organisations of capital a direct share in the power without all the formal ceremony of parliamentarism?

The said gentlemen say so quite openly in their election manifesto of December 19th 1927:

"We have created new, effective forms of collaboration between the economic groups and the government... Economic life is no longer threatened by experiments."

Their rule is now consolidated, they are only sharing it with the landed proprietors.

"In Poland, we are now living in a happy period of harmony between the interests of industry and that of rural property."

In view of these facts, parliamentarism may be consigned to the scrap heap.

"The parliamentary session which has lasted for eighteen months, has not merely been a crisis of this Sejm, but a crisis of the parliamentary system altogether."

In addition to the dictatorial government, the landed aristocracy and capital, the clergy also is entering the arena of the electoral struggle, demanding:

"A change of the Constitution ensuring a stronger government in Poland, a government which would be more independent of party influences than has been the case hitherto."

The so-called **Opposition** is also serving the policy of Fascism. The former **Right (National Democracy)**, whose entire programme is being put into effect by the present government, does not engage in a fight for power, it denies having any intention of doing so and avows in its appeal that:

"We are not engaging in the fight because of the question as to who shall be victorious, but only as to how shall the country be managed and how should it be ruled."

That "how" does not in the least differ from the programme of the Government. Behind its apparent opposition, the national democracy is concealing its capitulation to the Government, its endeavours to be admitted to the general Fascist bloc.

The sham opposition of the **Right** is indeed very advantageous to the Government. In the eyes of the working masses and of the national minorities it creates the impression that it is carrying on a fight against some reaction or other, against clerical and nationalist reaction — ostensibly in the name of progress and of democracy.

On the other side of the partisans of the Government, the **second Opposition**, also a fictitious one, is taking up its stand. That fictitious Left opposition is formed by the P. P. S., the "Wizwolenie" ("Liberation") and by other Reformist Labour and peasant parties. All these parties are sleeping partners of the Government, they enjoy its protection and profit by the reprisals directed against the revolutionary parties.

Mr. Niedzialkowski, one of the leaders of the P. P. S., recently wrote in his book as follows:

"The insincere policy carried on by the socialists in that they do not join the Government majority formally, although they are actually supporting the Cabinet, may be necessary; in any case, it is useful. The large masses, especially the unenlightened strata, believe it to be an actual opposition based on principles."

These are the "insincere tactics", this is "an opposition for the unenlightened masses", this is the silent support of the government, carried on by the present "Opposition" of the P. P. S. and by the other parties allied with it, against the Government, of which Moraczewski, by the bye, a member of the P. P. S. who has only been formally, excluded from the party, is a member.

In the domain of the national minorities, the petty bourgeois Ukrainian, White Russian and Jewish parties play a

similar rôle. They also are staging an opposition and a struggle and are, in reality, selling the interest of the Ukrainian, White Russian and Jewish masses.

That absolutely disparate and apparently divided crowd is united in its common offensive against the masses of workers in the towns and villages.

The camp of the workers and peasants alone represents a genuine opposition to Fascism. The **Communist Party of Poland** is the vanguard of that camp. In Poland, our Party is illegal, it only exists as an underground organisation and is exposed to constant persecution. Our comrades have been sentenced to penal servitude of from three to eight years for their membership of the party. Election to the autonomous administrative bodies have proved that any list which is suspected of being theoretically connected with Communism, is pronounced null and void. The Communist Party, however, has shown that it is the party of the proletarian masses by collecting 70,000 votes in Warsaw and 50,000 votes in Lodz on those invalid lists.

When speaking of the camp of workers and peasants, we do not refer to the Communist Party only. The **P. P. S. Left**, a party which has come into being as the result of its secession from the P. P. S., has existed in Poland for the past eighteen months and is developing in the direction of a consistent class war against the bourgeoisie and the Fascist dictatorship. On the occasion of the election to the autonomous administrative bodies it became evident that the said party exercises a marked influence on the working centres, especially in the Western and Southern districts. The existence and development of the P. P. S. Left are evidence of the fact that the masses of workers in Poland are tending towards the Left.

We must also mention a number of radical peasant groups, some of which have persisted as remnants of the **Independent Peasant Party** which was dissolved by the Government because of its "Bolshevist" leanings, whilst some have sprung up independently or have split off from the opportunist peasant parties.

The radical peasant movement is even stronger in the countries annexed by Poland than in Poland itself. The revolutionary peasantry of Western White Russia is entering the election under difficult circumstances. Its legal organisation ("**Hromada**") has been dissolved by the Government a year ago and been shattered by hundreds of arrests. The struggle of the White Russian peasants is nevertheless being continued and will be given expression at the election. In Western Ukraine, the peasant movement and, to a certain extent, the Labour movement also, is represented by the "**Selrob**" ("**Worker and Peasant League**").

All these elements, however, are not linked by any electoral bloc, but by common, direct slogans. The camp of the workers and peasants as a whole is carrying on a fight against Fascism, against imperialism, against war on the Soviet Union. It is carrying on a fight for the eight-hour day, for an improvement of the conditions of living of the working masses, for freedom for the workers and peasants, for land to the peasants, for the self-determination of the suppressed nationalities, for a workers' and peasants' government.

The light of the electoral campaign reveals to us a process of polarisation of the classes in Poland. Whilst the old traditional parties are crumbling down, Fascism on the one hand, the anti-Fascist workers' and peasants' movement on the other hand, are crystallising into definite shape.

## CHINA

### Peasant Revolts and Soviets in China.

By Tang Shin She.

The Canton Soviet power set up after the December insurrection has been crushed, but there still exist in the country numerous Soviets formed before and after the revolt. The population regards the Soviet system with the greatest enthusiasm. In the east of the province of Kwangtung, between Canton and Swatow, the districts of Haifunghs, Lufung, Puling, Hoyüan and Tsedien are under a Soviet regime. As was recently reported, the island of Hainan lying south of Kwangtung has been

captured by peasants and a Soviet government has also been set up there. In addition there are Soviets in several districts in the east of the province of Hunan, for example, Shaline, Kweitunghs, Leinyingsien; and in the West of the province of Kiangsi, as Tsuichuan and Hailing, that is, in the neighbourhood of the celebrated Ngyan-yuan mining works (province of Kiangsi). The Soviet system has even spread to the province of Hupeh; the district of Huang-Mei in the east of this province is under Soviet rule.

At the time of the setting up of the Soviets, after the revolt, meetings of workers, peasants and soldiers' deputies were continually held with the agenda: settlement of the distribution of the land, introduction of the eight-hour working day, control of factories by the workers, election of members of Soviets, measures against the counter-revolutionaries. In conclusion there was formed in every district in question a Red Army of workers and peasants. The old feudal bourgeois social order was abolished and a new one set up in its place.

Under the banner of "Seizure of political power by the workers and peasants", a gigantic wave of peasants revolts has again spread over the whole of China. Peasant revolts are continually taking place, not only in the provinces of Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hunan, Hupeh, Kiangsi, Honan, Chili and Shantung, where peasant movements, led by the formerly revolutionary Kuomintang or by secret organisations, had long existed, but also in the provinces of Kiangsu, Chekiang and in Manchuria which have long been oppressed by the counter-revolutionaries. Since last Autumn, in Chekiang and Kiangsu, in the broad environs of Shanghai, large towns have often been occupied for days by the insurgents. Already since the middle of January last the district of Tonghua in Manchuria has been in the occupation of the so-called "Da-Dau-Hai" (Big Knife League). If the latter movement does not bear the revolutionary character of that of the movement led by the Communist Party in South China, it is nevertheless, for the commencement, an important action against Chang Tso Lin.

In the immediate future the peasant revolts will increase. In the first place there will commence in Spring a general increase of prices in China, and secondly the formerly important military cliques are disintegrating. Many of such disintegrating troops will be disarmed by the peasants; others will come over to the revolutionary peasants themselves. Thus Chang Fa Kui's troops in eastern Kwangtung and Tan Seng Di's troops in South and Eastern Hunan are already in flight. In Hupeh and Honan numerous small bodies of troops are threatened by the Hankow generals and by Feng Yu Hsiang. All this tends to favour the revolution.

South of the Yangtse the peasant movement is under the leadership of the Communist Party. North of the Yangtse the movement, which is under the leadership of big peasants and landowners, bears for the greater part a religious character and is directed only against the present military rulers. The most urgent demand recently is: abolition of the extra taxes, and not, as the peasants from the South demand, distribution of the land. Nevertheless, in addition to the peasant leagues organised by the Communists, a portion of the Red Spears" and a large section of the "Gate of Heaven League" are in connection with the Communists.

The revolutionary peasant movement of South China commenced in the year 1921 but has always followed a reformist course. Its demands were: reduction of rent of land, participation in the municipal administration. The distribution of the land in Hunan last year was a spontaneous action of the peasants. When the Yeh-Ting troops marched from Nanking to Swatow there still existed a dispute in the revolutionary leadership whether the owners of more than 200 mow of land should be expropriated or those already possessing more than 50 mow. Measures were adopted even against those peasants who themselves undertook punitive measures against the counter-revolutionary landowners and gentry. In the province of Kwangtung it was decided to expropriate all those possessing over 50 mow of land and to reduce land rents by 30%. The whole peasant movement was very opportunist. The two Plenary sessions of the Communist Party of China held in August and November last year completely did away with the opportunist tactics. The Minister for Agriculture Tang Pin San, who, ever since his appointment as Minister, pursued an opportunist course,

was excluded from the C. P. of China in November. Many provincial committees of the Communist Party were reorganised and instructed that they must base the peasant movement directly on the peasant masses. The leaders of the peasant organisations must for the greater part consist of poor peasants. The peasants unions and committees must be so organised that, in the event of a revolt they can be immediately converted into peasants Soviets.

Thanks to the change of course in the peasant movement it has been possible in the period from November to the present time to form numerous Soviets and to spread a gigantic wave of revolt over the country. This proves that the peasants can be helped only by revolutionary means.

## FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

### Letter from Zinoviev and Kamenev to the "Pravda".

(Full Text.)

A telegraphic summary of the following letter was published in our last week's number. Ed.

**Editorial Note of the "Pravda":** The "Pravda" No. 13 of 15th January last published the instructions of the Trotskyists") which, on the one hand, are directed against the Party and the Comintern and, on the other hand, attack Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev as "traitors". We have received from the latter a letter addressed to the redaction, the publication of which in the Central organ we consider necessary. The redaction notes with satisfaction that with this letter Kamenev and Zinoviev take a decisive step which will facilitate the return to the Party of all those who adopt the same standpoint.

Redaction of the "Pravda".

\* \* \*

The two documents published in the "Pravda" of 15th January, 1928, are in the first place, as regards the character of the views contained therein, so incorrect, secondly they submit proposals to the oppositional elements within the Comintern to adopt a course which is so fundamentally wrong, thirdly are therefore calculated to cause such serious injury to Bolshevism, and fourthly are so full of distorted "representations" of our standpoint that we consider it to be our duty to reply to them at once. This is all the more necessary as a whole campaign has commenced abroad regarding these questions, of which the world bourgeoisie and the social democracy are making the greatest possible use for their own purposes.

The interests of our cause demand that all other considerations be set aside.

I.

We separated from the L. D. Trotsky group immediately on the question of the complete and actual submission to the XV. Party Congress. Either submission to all demands of the XV. Party Congress, with the firm intention to come into collaboration again with the majority of the Party, or entry on the path of a second Party — that is how the question stands. It is impossible to evade this question. He who does not perceive today, after the XV. Party Congress, that the question stands thus and not otherwise, is condemned to fall into ever greater errors.

If our categorical abandonment of the course leading to two parties had been unexpected by our former bloc allies and were not the result of our profound conviction which has been formed on the basis of the whole of the experiences of the two years of struggle, then such words as "centrist capitulation" and similar terms could still lay claim to a certain political meaning. In reality, however, they are devoid of any sense.

\*) Published in the "Inprecorr" No. 3, 19th January 1928.

That is proved, for example, by our letter addressed in August 1927 (everybody who has followed the history of inner-party relations will recognise the importance of this point of time) to L. D. Trotsky. This letter had the task of creating clarity as to whether in the circles of the Opposition leaders, in the question of the decisive rejection of all tendencies leading to a second party, which was already at that time to be noticed here and there on the periphery of the Opposition, there exists complete solidarity.

This letter contained the following:

"Only people for whom 1) the question of a second party has been decided in the depth of their consciousness in the affirmative, and who after this decision worked with more or less patience than others also would 'work their way' to this conclusion, without at the same time renouncing the pleasure, to 'provoke' — by a sharpening of the situation — the desired conclusion in any given stage of the struggle, or whom 2) the collapse of their hopes on a bloc with the ruling group brought to despair and who are capable of extending their fury directed against this group to the whole party, can exclude the question of the expulsion of our group from the Party or "abstract" from it in deciding the tactical questions of the given moment.

The overwhelming majority of the Opposition — above all and in particular the Opposition workers — are safe from any such frivolous and adventurous tactics. The guarantee therefor lies in the fact that 1. the kernel of the Opposition has entered on the path of struggle solely as a result of a principal difference of opinion with the majority and conducted its fight solely in order to convince the majority of the Party, and that 2. this kernel of the Opposition is aware that there is nobody except the workers organised in the C. P. S. U. who could carry on the cause of the October Revolution, and also that 3. this kernel understands that the exclusion of the Opposition from the Party\*) means in fact the formation of a second party and the inevitable declaration of failure, collapse and conclusion of the October Revolution...

Outside of the C. P. S. U. there is only one thing threatening our Leninist ideas — degeneration and decline. If these ideas are victorious at all, they will only be so within the C. P. S. U. as it historically arose and exists, and in no other way. Who does not understand or forgets this or adopts a frivolous attitude to it, cannot lead our cause — the defence of Leninism in the Soviet Union and in the labour movement of the whole world — to victory but to ruin."

That is what we wrote L. D. Trotsky on the 5th of August 1927, immediately after the July-August Plenum and some months before the Party Congress, that is at a time regarding which nobody can say that it was the moment of the strongest pressure upon the Opposition (On the contrary the Plenum, as is known, allowed Trotsky and Zinoviev to remain members of the C. C.). In December when the whole situation demanded a clear decision, we drew from the above cited analysis the only possible conclusion: We proposed to all our Opposition comrades to submit actually and consistently to all demands of the Party Congress, no matter how hard they might be.

To this analysis of the question of a second Party as is contained in this letter written in August, there is still to be added what must now be already clear to everybody: The whole experiences of the two years' fraction struggle irrefutably prove that not only the way of a second party is immediately disastrous, but also the existence of a firmly organised opposition directed for a long time against the Party in the most important questions, contradicts the laws of the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship, and that the abandonment of such a fight is unconditionally dictated by the vital interests of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The authors of the instructions not only do not display any understanding of this important conclusion from the history of the two years' struggle, but in the well-known declaration of the 121 declare the abandonment of the fraction work to be only "a concession to Zinoviev and Kamenev". In addition both of the two new documents published are based wholly and entirely on the idea of the continuation of the fraction struggle. One must be blind in order not to see that after two years of

obstinate fraction struggles, and after this fight has already been carried into the street, which led to the decision of the XV. Party Congress regarding the expulsion of the entire Opposition from the Party, the maintenance of the fraction and the continuation of the fractional struggle are tantamount politically to a second Party.

In December, 1927, during the Party Congress, the question stood as follows: either capitulation to the C. P. S. U. or to the idea of a second party. We capitulated to the C. P. S. U. and consider that to be the only correct way out of the severe and long struggle; for under the dictatorship of the proletariat a second party cannot be anything but a plaything in the hands of the petty bourgeois elements, and is bound to become a weapon for undermining the dictatorship as well as an obstacle in the way of socialist construction.

## II.

There is only one case in which steps for the formation of a second party could be justified from the historical standpoint of the proletarian revolution and would even be absolutely necessary for a Bolshevik: namely in the event of his arriving at the conviction that "thermidorian" tendencies undoubtedly exist in the country, are more and more gaining the upper hand in the Party and in the Soviet Power; that the working class have lost the leadership of the Revolution, the October Revolution has exhausted itself and the Soviet Union has ceased to be any longer the driving force of the world revolution. Never at any time, even in the sharpest moments of the fraction struggle, have we adopted such a standpoint. But such views are an ideological pitfall into which every group which opposes itself to the C. P. S. U. inevitably stumbles.

The idea of a second party is under our conditions injurious also because, in the quest after an ideological justification, the absolute hostility to the C. P. S. U. must now inevitably lead those groups which follow this course to distort every estimation of all driving forces of the revolution, of the relations of forces of the classes and the importance of the Soviet Union for the international Labour movement. The recognition of this fundamental political danger played a not unimportant role in our political breach with the L. D. Trotsky group, and we can straightaway say that, unfortunately, the confirmation of our apprehensions came earlier than could have been expected: The published documents entirely confirm these apprehensions.

The authors of the "instructions" recommend the communists in the capitalist countries everywhere to emphasise that the Soviet government, "even under opportunist leadership gives to the workers and peasants incomparably more than a bourgeois State would with the same level of productive forces".

That means to ignore the fundamental and principal difference between the "Soviet State" and the "bourgeois States". The strength and importance of the Soviet Union for the international Labour movement lies in that it realises the dictatorship of the proletariat, is building up Socialism and is the driving force of the world revolution. When one passes over that in the "instructions" to the Communists in the capitalist countries and confines oneself to pointing out that the "Soviet government gives more to the workers and peasants than a bourgeois State would give", that means in the best case to sink from the standpoint of Bolshevism to the standpoint of a cheap "Left" trade unionist; for only Purcell and similar people are capable of applying this "simple" criterion to the Soviet Union ("Who gives more?"), which he likewise applies in comparing the position of the workers in Great Britain and in the United States, and the complete inadequacy of which (of the criterion) becomes obvious when one attempts to apply it to the situation of the workers of the Soviet Union, for instance, during the period from 1918 to 1921.

The European Communists to whom this advice is given, were they to accept it, would resemble the ordinary well-meaning "guests" of some social-democratic or co-operative delegation as those visiting the Soviet Union. What is there "Left" in this standpoint?

That means no longer only to spring over the line drawn by the logic of the fraction struggle with us; that is a new, false and injurious line.

Equally incorrect and harmful is the second novelty invented by the authors of the "instructions"; the characterisation of the power in the Soviet Union. It is maintained in the "instructions" that "petty bourgeois elements in the Party and in

\*) Here is meant the exclusion of the entire Opposition as a complete tendency.



the State" are leading the Soviet Union, "but they are compelled (?) to base themselves on the working class". To what does this characterisation apply? To the MacDonald government? to the social democratic government of Ebert? or to the government of the Soviet Union? For the authors of the instructions have here obviously sunk to the idea that a dictatorship of the proletariat already no longer exists in the Soviet Union.

If one considers this formulation seriously and treats it as a carefully thought out and considered political assertion, and not dictated by anger at defeat in the inner-Party struggle, then it is finally nothing else but the **comprehensive formulation of accomplished Thermidor**, i. e., a historical and political untruth with which the authors of the document allegedly want to have nothing to do; but they are driven to it by the inevitable logic of their standpoint. That is a glaring example of how a false attitude to the Party inevitably involves a completely false and ruinous estimation of all the chief questions confronting our Party and our State.

The logic of this situation compels the authors of these instructions to say a "new" word to the questions of the Comintern. The work of the Opposition in the Communist Parties is considered by them as analogous to the work of the Communists in the reformist trade unions, for which purpose an, at least ambiguous, analogy is drawn between the Communist Parties of Germany and France and the former Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany and the French petty bourgeois Socialist Party. On whom do the authors of this document place their hopes in such a case?

They openly admit that the "only group of their real followers" in the Comintern is the French group "Against the Stream" and eagerly whitewash Souvarine.

As regards the group "Against the Stream", nobody ever doubted that this group of Loriot, Paz and others is an out and out Right wing and exclusively intellectual group. With regard to Souvarine, the article by Zinoviev "The 21 Conditions of the Leninist Comintern" states:

"Souvarine is not one of our followers. We do not accept the slightest responsibility for his views and his periodical. If one takes Souvarine's 'line' as it appears today, in 1927, that is not Bolshevism. His criticism of the Soviet Union has already long gone beyond the bounds of what is permissible."

It is worth while to go into the article in the periodical "Against the Stream" to which the authors of the instructions refer, for here there is an example of how a false attitude leads directly to the fight against the proletarian dictatorship.

The members of the French delegation which visited the Soviet Union (among them being socialist workers), after their return to France, reported at workers' meetings and in the press regarding their journey in a tone very favourable to the Soviet Union. And what now? The periodical "Against the Stream" cannot do anything better than to pour cheap ridicule on the delegation. One example suffices: The members of the delegation speak enthusiastically of the emancipation of the women by the October Revolution. To this there is replied in "Against the Stream":

"If there were great 'women victors' in this revolution, these are perhaps the wives of the N. E. P. people, the wives of the bureaucrats and those women who have themselves found a place in the enormous bureaucratic machine, the wives of rich peasants, but in any case not working women and peasant women." ("Against the Stream", No. 4, page 9.)

Is that not already a tone of direct calumny against the Soviet Union? Is that not a calumny of the October Revolution?

The same tone is adopted by the most embittered elements of the Maslov group, on account of which we sharply admonished this group even at a time when we had a certain alliance with it. The fate of Korsch, Katz and Co., who commenced by being "ultra-Left" and ended by serving the social democratic leaders as weapons against the Comintern and the Soviet Union, must plainly suffice as a warning example.

Our relations with the Ruth Fischer, Maslov group convinced us (convinced absolutely all Russian Comrades who came into contact with them recently) that Maslov and Ruth Fischer

are personally heading with full determination for a second party in Germany, and are not stopping short at anything. Maslov and Ruth Fischer are to be condemned most emphatically. We know at the same time that the best elements which are most closely connected with the workers within the Maslov group, are strongly opposed to the "idea" of a second party and are seeking their way back to the C. P. G. and the Comintern.

In our opinion it is one of the tasks of the Comintern, and before all of the approaching VI. Congress of the Communist International, to help these comrades to find their way back to the C. P. G. and to the Comintern. Then it will be possible to eliminate the split in Germany better and more quickly. The authors of the "instructions" were so clever as not to notice anything of this and to close their eyes to it, and at the same time abused those comrades in the Czechoslovakian, French and Belgian Communist Parties who — although they are not of the same opinion as the majority — wish to correct the errors within the Party and do not permit any fight against the Soviet Union. The authors of the "instructions" went so far as to declare when reviewing all the oppositional groups in the Comintern, that precisely the right group which is further removed from Bolshevism are its closest followers.

Either capitulation to the C. P. S. U. or to Paz and Souvarine. The authors of the document choose the second course. What is there "Left" in this?

If our Party gives back to us and to our comrades the right to membership in the Party (which we hope it will), we shall naturally, as Bolsheviki, hold it to be our right and our duty, within the limits of the decisions of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern, to express our opinion on those things which we consider to be faulty in the policy or tactics of any section of the Comintern, and will always endeavour to straighten back the line where it is distorted. But to correct the line of the C. P. S. U. by means of Souvarine is ridiculous.

The essential thing is that the political grouping which has arrived at such conclusions, must in the given concrete situation after the XV. Party Congress, necessarily become a weapon of the petty-bourgeois forces against the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern.

### III.

We were in the same bloc with the group of L. D. Trotzky. We therefore bear full and equal responsibility with them and their present day supporters for all the actions of the Opposition during the years 1926 and 1927. As every politician knows, a bloc presupposes mutual concessions but does not exclude inner struggles. There were struggles within our bloc. That is well known to the authors of the "instructions". Therefore it is at least not wise on their part to speak of a "masquerade with Trotzkyism", of an "invention of Trotzkyism" etc. Did not the group of L. D. Trotzky, already on the 30th of August (on the 30th of August and not on the 30th December, 1927), reproach us in written form that we "did not wish to disarm along the line of fight against alleged Trotzkyism"? Is it not clear from this fact that we did not regard the errors of L. D. Trotzky as "alleged" errors, and that even in the moment of closest collaboration we considered it to be impossible not to conduct a fight against the errors of Trotzkyism.

The meaning of our breach becomes perfectly clear if one simply compares what we propose on one side and what the authors of the "instructions" propose on the other side. Our conclusions are: back into the Party and the Comintern; one must get back to work with the Party; back into the ranks of the Bolshevik Party; abandonment of contrary attitude to the Party; defence of one's own views within the Party, without transforming this right of every member of the Party into a fractional struggle. It is clear that these slogans proceed from the standpoint that the C. P. S. U. is the lever of the proletarian revolution; that the Soviet Union constitutes the country in which the building up of Socialism is proceeding; that one cannot help the cause of Lenin but only injure it by opposing the C. P. S. U.

What do the authors of the "instructions" set up against it? "For the given period not a second Party but such a strongly organised fraction as would guarantee the possibility of a systematic influence on the Party". "to proceed against the leadership of the C. P. S. U.", hopes that a "decisive swing to the Left" will come about in the Party as a result of a "stronger pressure of the bourgeoisie". This policy, these in-

structions can be based only upon the conviction that the Party is developing more and more to a Thermidor. The false characterisation of the Party, over which we disputed above, undoubtedly proceeds from this conviction. But that is quite false. One must not underestimate such important facts as the Party policy, as the revision of the land laws in an openly collectivist direction, the shortening of the term for leases, the withdrawal of the right of kulaks to membership of the land societies as a means in the fight against the kulak (decision of the XV. Party Congress), and lastly the acceptance of a fresh 100,000 workers into the Party.

The character and the direction of these measures are clear. These facts show with sufficient power of conviction how false it was when the Opposition often characterised certain manoeuvres of the Party policy simply as a gliding over into the policy of another class. The logic of a fraction struggle led to obviously false assertions as the conclusion of the "Platform", that, in the circles of the leading majority, under the influence of the breach between Great Britain and the Soviet Union and other international and inner difficulties, the following plan is contemplated: 1. Recognition of debts. 2. More or less to liquidate the foreign trade monopoly. 3. To abandon China, i. e. for the time being to refrain from giving support to the Chinese Revolution and to the national revolutionary movements in general. 4. A Right manoeuvre within the country, i. e. a further extension of the N. E. P. These conclusions do not and did not in any way correspond to reality; this is to some extent due to the circumstances that the platform was drawn up as a document directed against the policy of the C. C. of the Party along the whole line\*).

We predicted during the XV. Party Congress that a refusal to submit to the decisions of the Party Congress would lead inevitably to a distortion of all the fundamental ideas of Leninism, to a distortion of the whole perspectives, of the whole estimation of the Party and of the State. It is now our duty to say to all those who still follow the "instructions" of L. D. Trotzky: do not increase this error, perceive the incorrectness of this course which obviously leads you away from the Party, and do everything that is necessary in order to return to the ranks of the Party and to work along with it.

We repeat to every member of the Opposition that which we said several times during the XV. Party Congress in the circle of the former Opposition: Political courage and political consistency do not consist in obstinately pursuing a course which leads farther and farther away from the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern. One must decide to turn about. One must not doubt that the Party, according to the example of Lenin, will adopt from the views of the minority everything that life will confirm and which proves correct from the viewpoint of the proletarian revolution.

To capitulate to the Party of the October Revolution is not only not shameful, but, after all that has occurred, is the direct duty of each of us. What is shameful and unworthy of any serious proletarian revolutionary is to close the eyes before the political blind alley into which a further opposition to the Party inevitably leads.

There is no middle course, no "two and a half" way for the proletarian dictatorship. One has to choose. Those who did not understand this yesterday must understand it today, after they have become acquainted with the "instructions". We are certain that a large portion of the former Opposition, that all followers of the Opposition in Leningrad and all workers in the Opposition, will choose this way, the way of reconciliation with and approach to the Party.

We are convinced that the doors of the Party and of the Comintern will open to all excluded comrades who really submit to the Party.

Our task as soldiers of the proletarian revolution consists in helping by all means the Party in its difficult work in helping it in overcoming all difficulties which lie in its path.

\* In this connection we must say we cannot now defend this document dating from the period of the most acute fraction struggle, quite apart from how various questions were dealt with therein. It goes without saying that we shall be guided in our work by the decisions of the XV. Party Congress.

in contributing towards the solution of the new, urgent questions in a Leninist sense and to carry on Lenin's cause to the end.

\* \* \*

The inner and international difficulties of the Soviet Union are known. The mobilisation of the public opinion of the capitalist countries against the Soviet Union is proceeding at full speed. Particularly great is the role of the social democratic and democratic press in these sinister designs. In this campaign there are merged in the strangest manner the ranks of the bourgeois journalists and some "ultra-Left" members of the German Reichstag; leaders of the social democracy and such alleged "Lefts" as the group "Against the Stream". The main obstacle to all the plans of the imperialists against the Soviet Union is the resistance of the working masses. It is easy to understand that to weaken this resistance and to weaken the sympathies of the workers towards the Soviet Union at the moment is the most important strategical task of those who are cherishing plans of attack on the Soviet Union. We consider it our duty at such a moment to warn the Communist workers most decidedly against this campaign, the fruits of which will be garnered only by the bourgeoisie.

The international and inner situation of the Soviet country demands complete and unreserved gathering together of all the forces of the Party. Only in this way will the Party overcome all difficulties and hindrances connected with the building up of Socialism in an agrarian country and advance to final victory.

G. Zinoviev

L. Kamenev.

## Expulsion of the Trotzkyist Opposition Leaders from the C. P. of France.

On the 30th, 31st January and 1st February there was held in Paris the National Conference of the Communist Party of France.

The question of the Opposition was discussed for nearly two days at this National Conference, at which the chief speakers of the Opposition were granted unlimited time for speaking.

Comrade Bouthonnier, who delivered the report on the question of the Opposition, at the conclusion of his report submitted to the Opposition the decisive question, on the reply to which depended whether the Opposition could remain in the Party. The question was:

"Will you preserve perfect Party discipline or continue to remain undisciplined? Will you cease your publications and dissolve your fraction?"

Thereupon a discussion took place in which the Opposition leaders were able to explain their standpoint at large and in which numerous delegates of the National Conference took part. Finally the Opposition group, in a declaration, submitted to the Party the following conditions, upon the fulfilment of which it wished to make dependent the abandonment of its fractional activity:

1. "Immediate annulment of the expulsion of all the Oppositionals in the whole Communist International (Russia, Germany etc.) and reinstatement of the expelled Oppositionals into their former rights.

2. Immediate opening of a discussion on all questions in dispute and simultaneous publication of all the documents of the Opposition which have not yet been published.

3. Opening of a discussion sheet in the 'Cahiers du Bolshévisme' and convening of information meetings, to which all members of the Opposition are to be admitted."

This provocative declaration was the subject of a further discussion. Finally the National Conference of the C. P. of France adopted the decision, by 174 votes against one vote and four abstentions, to exclude Treint, Suzanne Girault, Marguerite Faussecave and Barré from the Party.

## AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

### International Gas War Congress in Brussels.

The Red Cross and the Gas War.

By Rudolf Haus (Berlin).

From January 16th to 19th an International Gas War Conference was held at Brussels, in which the States belonging to the League of Nations participated.

This conference was kept mysteriously secret. The names of the participants were not revealed, nor was anything published as to the contents of the agenda. The outcome of the conference was not made known, a very vague declaration being all that was made public.

Nevertheless, the International Gas War Conference undoubtedly discussed important problems. It is certain that both the Governments of the imperialist countries and also the representatives of the most important chemical trusts were present at Brussels, whither the most eminent experts on gas warfare were also summoned, certainly not as a mere matter of form. Thus the well-known German expert and gas "scientist" Hanslian had been invited to the Conference.

Not only Germany, but also the other imperialist powers must undoubtedly have sent experts to Brussels. And yet, according to the declaration of the International Gas War Conference, these gas war experts, who have devoted all their energies to the perfection of the gas weapon, are alleged suddenly to have turned into the meekest of lambs.

The fact that a gas war conference had met could no longer be kept secret, so that the Conference was forced to make some declaration or other. It reported as follows:

"The International Gas War Conference will submit various projects to the International Red Cross. It has passed a declaration to the effect that the gas weapon is inadmissible, since it affects combatants and non-combatants alike, and that it must be abolished by the League of Nations."

This declaration is not to be taken at its face value. True, the stress is laid on the abolition of gas warfare; in reality, however, it ought to be laid on the "various projects" to be submitted to the Red Cross for further treatment.

What is the significance of gas warfare and what are its prospects? The entire development of armaments aims at covering the objective, whether man or object, as completely as possible. A straight line leads from the rifle to the machine-gun, from the hurling of a metal ball to shrapnel and grenades, a line which has now found its continuation in the gas weapon. Gas covers the objective most completely. Between the bullets of the machine-gun there is still an uncovered space, through which a man may pass unharmed. In a gas cloud there are no such spaces. The gas weapon is therefore nothing but the logical outcome and perfection of the war machinery of the last few centuries.

It is ridiculous that this weapon should suddenly be found to be more "immoral" than a machine-gun or modern gun fire. Naturally gas is not the "humanest" of means, as a British gas expert was pleased to put it, since its victims may be guaranteed to die and not to spend the rest of their lives as cripples.

The war experts are naturally in no way affected by the moral scruples of our pacifists. In all the imperialist countries they are preparing for gas wars, and aggressive gas wars at that.

In the first place we have the United States of America, which has more than once declared that it does not contemplate for a moment discarding gas warfare. This has been affirmed both by gas experts and by prominent statesmen. The capitalists of the United States do not consider it necessary to conceal their warlike intentions; they therefore boast quite openly of their armaments in general and their gas armaments in particular.

From year to year the expenditure of the American Government for gas experiments has been on the increase. Again and again we can read in the American papers of members of the American forces who have been killed as a result of gas experiments.

The United States merely express openly and brutally what all imperialist States not only think but also practise. The fact that such a powerful State as the United States openly champions the employment of the gas weapon causes all other States likewise to declare in favour of gas warfare. But there are plenty of other reasons sufficing to induce the imperialists of all countries to prepare for a gas war. The subventions afforded by all imperialist States to their chemical industries are significant enough. The gas experiments at Warsaw and other capitals are proof of the eager experimenting of the imperialists. Since the end of the war, no fewer than 1000 new war gases have been discovered.

Thus all political and military facts may be said to speak a language very different from that of the hypocritical "declaration" of the International Gas War Conference.

According to all that has transpired, the programme of the Brussels Conference included the comprehension of the Red Cross in gas warfare. It aimed at establishing the rôle and tasks of the Red Cross in this connection (that same Red Cross which in all countries has proved such a radically reactionary, and in Germany even a monarchist, body).

The question of anti-gas methods absorbed the main attention of the Conference. There are at present very considerable collective anti-gas methods, for it is only the collective methods that are efficacious. The Brussels Conference was probably occupied in considering methods of protecting the bourgeoisie against gas attacks; protection of the broad masses would hardly have been a matter of interest. It is thoroughly in keeping with the character of capitalism to seek to ward off the dangers of war from the bourgeoisie.

This programme and the treatment of this particular question again clearly show up the war preparations of the imperialists. If we insert these facts into the general political line of international (and particularly British) imperialism, we shall recognise that the Brussels Conference also plays a part in the war preparations against the Soviet Union.

Where anything is undertaken against the Soviet Union, the Social Democrats must naturally take part in it. De Brouckère, a Belgian Social Democratic leader, also took part in the Brussels Conference. Thus the entire Social Democratic International cannot fail to be well informed as to what is on foot. Nevertheless, they do their utmost to represent this conference for "war preparedness" as having been merely an anti-gas conference. In this connection the "Vorwärts" is particularly eloquent, writing as follows on January 20th (copied from the "Social Democratic Press Service"):

"Comrade Brouckère has been confirmed by the Brussels negotiations in his opinion that the only possible solution lies in the concentration of all efforts on a total abolition of gas warfare."

This declaration of Brouckère's finds enthusiastic approval on the part of the "Vorwärts", which thus fully adheres to the general policy of the Social Democrats of representing all the imperialist war preparations as steps taken in the interest of peace. It is the object of the Social Democrats to deceive the workers as to the true state of affairs and as to the threatening danger of a new war.

## AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

### Great Britain's "Little War" in the Sudan.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

"We have swallowed a juicy morsel; now we must see about digesting it", said Sir John Maffey-Loader, the newly appointed Governor-General of the Sudan, at a farewell banquet in London before entering upon his position. Ever since the final liquidation of the "co-dominion" between Egypt and Great Britain in the Sudan, the latter has indeed been actively engaged in turning the country into a British colony. Here British capital has carte blanche for investments; there is plenty of good soil, natural resources, natives who, driven by hunger and misery, furnish cheap "working-cattle" for capitalist employers (throughout the Near East the Sudan negro is looked upon as a worker that can be exploited to the utmost and is therefore often transported by contract to Egypt or even to Syria and Mesopotamia); it is therefore only a question of establishing British rule securely

enough for the economic exploitation of the country to be carried on without difficulty.

The dominion of the Sudan has proved particularly profitable for British capitalists since Great Britain has been ruling there alone. This year cotton was already exported from the Sudan to Great Britain to a total value of three million pounds, thus enabling Great Britain to bring considerable pressure to bear on the Egyptian cotton prices; in the coming year the area under cotton cultivation is to be enlarged by a further 30 per cent. to a total of 135,000 feddans (one feddan approximately equalling one acre). Rubber exports from the Sudan already exceed half a million pounds in value. The value of the British goods imported into the Sudan is almost two million pounds.

And all this is only the beginning. New roads are being made with a view to opening up further regions of the Sudan to traffic and capitalist exploitation; dams are being built, electric plants set up, bridges constructed (e. g. the new bridge from Khartoum to Omdurman, which was recently inaugurated with much ceremony) and the Sudan is being developed into a favourable strategic basis for British troops, lest any complications should arise in Egypt.

And the requisite means? These are also being provided in part by the native population. The system of the British Governor is based on the taxation of certain regions and districts and the coercion of certain tribes and villages to labour, the result being that in the last two years the British administration has attained a tremendous budget surplus.

There merely remains the question as to how the native population likes colonial domination. Schuster, Financial Adviser to the Sudan Government, has attempted to answer this query. Though misery and starvation reigns in the towns and entire tribes roam the countryside in the hope of finding food, he is of opinion that the Sudan population has a better life than the people in Egypt and even a better life than the British working class.

If this is not intended as a facetious hint to the effect that the Baldwin Government has brought the British worker to a level below that of a Sudan coolie, it cannot well be in keeping with facts. For the population of the Sudan (whether in the towns or in the mountains) is in a state of continual fermentation. The imperialist ideal of a "pacification" of the Sudan has not been attained by any means.

Just recently, this silent fermentation has given rise to an open anti-British eruption. In the "happy Sudan", Great Britain has a "little war", which is naturally carried on with all the cruelty of colonial wars.

It started with the assassination of Captain Ferguson, who was commissioned to collect the cattle tax of one of the mountain tribes, that of the Nuer. This was the signal for a rising which embraced all the kindred tribes of "spearmen", starting in a distant part of the Sudan. Military expeditions were immediately equipped for the "punishment" of the rebellious tribes. Aeroplanes of the Royal Air Force prepared the way for this punitive expedition by a bombardment of the villages, which in many cases were so completely destroyed that nothing was left for the troops to do.

In a wild panic at the approach of "civilisation", the Nuer tribes with their families fled into the interior of the country, into a region of swamps which could defy the attacks of the airmen. From this position they were able to inflict considerable losses on the British troops, so that reinforcements had to be sent from Khartoum. The unknown territory delayed the military operations, just as it had done in the eighties, when the British suffered one defeat after another and were finally obliged to call in the aid of Egyptian troops. Now again, auxiliary forces had to be raised, and that even among the Sudanese population itself.

These troops, however, are unreliable. The Cairo paper "Ahram" reports of friction between the British and auxiliary forces of a nature highly characteristic of colonial warfare. The British commanders are said to have ordered the Sudanese mercenaries into the foremost ranks. The natives, however, refused, agreeing only to fight under equal circumstances with the British. In the ensuing fray a British officer and several soldiers were killed; nor was peace restored until the Sudanese demands had been fulfilled.

Since such "incidents" are by no means rare, the war in the Sudan will presumably be of long duration. One British paper has satisfaction in stating that such colonial wars afford a welcome opportunity to test the qualities of Great Britain's arms and war munitions for greater wars in the future.

## UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS

### The Facts Regarding the Results of the Grain Campaign.

By J. B.

Thanks to the united efforts of the bourgeois, Social Democratic, and "ultra Left" press, a new campaign of calumny and agitation is on foot against the Soviet Union.

Thus, only a few days ago, the bourgeois "Börsenzeitung" of Berlin published on its front page a contribution from Charkov under the heading "A Struggle for Bread in Russia". Naturally the inventions of the bourgeois "Börsenzeitung" were taken up by the whole chorus of Social Democratic and Trotskyist-Maslovist publications. The "Socialist Messenger", the organ of the Russian Mensheviks, which is always in the "vanguard" on such occasions, hastened to tell its readers in the very first number of the year 1928 that Bolshevism was approaching its end, since the problem of the peasantry was sticking in its throat and would, it was to be hoped, soon cause it to choke itself to death.

Elaborate though they may be, however, the announcements of the "Börsenzeitung" in regard to a "struggle for bread" were nothing but a barefaced lie. From the beginning of the grain-purchasing campaign down to January 15th, i. e. in the first four months of the agricultural year, the State and Co-operative organs of the Soviet Union bought up more than 366 million poods of grain (i. e. more than 6.1 million tons — "Ekonomitcheskaya Shisni" of January 20th, 1928). If it is borne in mind that the total town population of the Soviet Union amounts to 26 millions, it will be obvious that the spectre of a "struggle for bread" in that country could only have originated in the hate-distorted brain of a bourgeois writer. All along, the supply of grain to the towns of the Soviet Union has proceeded without the least interruption and, as appears from data to hand, it can be considered guaranteed for the whole twelvemonth.

It is obvious that the task of the grain-purchasing campaign is not exhausted by the creation of a grain-stock sufficient to cover home requirements. The Soviet Union exports grain; indeed, grain exports are one of the main constituents of the total export trade of the country. The measure of such exports greatly contributes to determine the possibility of importing industrial apparatus and those industrial raw materials the production of which within the Soviet Union is at present still insufficient, as, e. g., cotton. The growth of the grain-export fund is one of the main presumptions for industrialisation and one of the chief tasks of the economic policy of the Soviet power. In this connection there certainly have been difficulties to overcome, and it is these difficulties which obviously served as the basis of the forgeries of the "Börsenzeitung".

A whole number of circumstances both of an "objective" and of a "subjective" nature have until quite recently hindered and impeded the rate of development of grain exports. In the first place we must here make mention of a factor which, at the present stage of development of an agrarian country like the Soviet Union, is very hard to eliminate. The growth in the purchasing power of the village is distributed most unequally throughout the year. In the autumn months, i. e. at the time of the realisation of the harvest, it registers a sudden leap upwards, with which the industrial production and the supply of industrial products cannot keep pace. A certain divergence between the demand of the rural districts and the supply of industry is therefore more or less inevitable in the early winter months. It can only be reduced by the accumulation of adequate stocks of goods.

But in spite of the very considerable growth in industrial production (by 20 per cent.) the extent of supplies was smaller than usual. The reason lies in the fact that the danger of war, which was particularly great in the summer of 1927, after the rupture of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union and after the murder of Comrade Voykov, called forth a special demand, such as is usual immediately before a war, a demand which contributed not a little to the depletion of the stocks of the Soviet Union commercial organs.



In the current economic year, therefore, the grain-purchasing campaign in the Soviet Union started with greatly depleted stocks. The ordinary seasonal disparity between the rural demand and the industrial supply was thus more acutely felt. The insufficient provision of the village with industrial goods in the autumn months entailed a rate of purchases which was inadequate from the standpoint of the export programme. But together with the further development of the industrial production and with the further satiation of the market, the influence of this factor will decrease, and there is reason to assume that it will be completely eliminated by the spring.

In this connection mention must be made of one further circumstance working in the same direction. The summer of the year 1927 yielded an extraordinary crop of plants required for technical purposes. The yield of these technical cultures enabled the peasants in many districts slightly to defer the time of realising their grain. Thus it was not in the autumn, but in the winter months that the grain-purchasing activity was most intense, as was indeed already the case in the year 1925/26. There was a certain temporal shifting of activity, which was not dangerous in itself but which is likely to entail some friction and delay in exportation.

The influence of these retarding and impeding factors, which are of a purely temporal and seasonal nature, was enhanced very greatly by the fact that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, engaged in discussions and kept away from its constructive tasks by the opposition of Trozky, was until quite recently not in a position to devote itself to the management of the grain-purchasing campaign with the requisite degree of energy. The result was to be seen in a whole series of organisational errors and shortcomings.

What gigantic importance attached to this "subjective" factor may be seen from the fact that in the few weeks that have elapsed since the 15th Party Congress, the liquidation of the Opposition and the liberation of all forces of the Party for the every-day work of Socialist construction, there has already been a complete and conspicuous change in the process of the grain-purchases, which figured at 382,000 tons in the first half of January as against 305,000 tons in the second half of December. The latest reports show that after January 15th the rate of purchases neither declined nor remained level, but continued to rise vigorously. From January 16th to 20th, the "Grain Product" centre bought up 70 per cent. more grain than between January 11th and 15th, the Centrosoyus 38 per cent. more, and so on. The uninterrupted rise has also been confirmed by reports from various districts.

If therefore the "reports" as to a "struggle for bread" are merely stupid and malicious inventions, the malignant joy evinced at certain disturbances in the grain exportation are likewise premature to say the least of it. Certain small interruptions, local friction, and difficulties occasioned by the season naturally occur and will long continue to occur. At the present level of development it is impossible to eliminate them. But he must be a hopeless fool or a man completely blinded by class hatred who would believe that such local friction or such seasonal difficulties could possibly destroy, or even seriously or for any length of time harm, the work of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

## THE PEASANTS' MOVEMENT

### The Revolts of Poor Peasants in Japan.

By Sen Katayama.

During the night of June 1st a party of some 300 peasants in the Kagawa Prefecture made a combined attack on the houses of their landlords. Some of them were brought to trial and in December, 1927, seven were condemned to imprisonment with hard labour and ten were given periods of probation. The police authorities, who protect the interests of the landowners, are supported by the various Fascist organisations employed by the latter. The Fascists are generally armed with modern weapons and drive round in automobiles.

But the peasants are rapidly revolutionising against their oppressors. When the verdicts of the case in the Kagawa Prefecture, were announced the condemned peasants made a revolutionary demonstration, all standing up, throwing their hats in the air and singing a revolutionary May Day song!

Some 6000 peasants of Uzura Mura, in the Gifu Prefecture, attacked the police office, throwing stones. They demanded the release of their arrested colleagues. The cause of the event was that a landlord attached the rice crop and announced the auction day as November 10th, so the peasants planned to get the attached rice crop at a cheap price, but the landlord cunningly schemed with the court concerned and postponed the date, the result being that the peasants were infuriated at the arbitrary change of the auction day. The peasants of that village, numbering 6000, attacked the court house and three hundred policemen came out in an attempt to disperse the peasants. A great collision took place; many were wounded and over twenty were arrested. All through the night the peasants demonstrated, and at last all but three of the arrested were released and the court declared that the auction would be postponed indefinitely. The crowd then dispersed.

In the same Prefecture in Gifu and Yamazoe, the villages next to Uzura, a terrible fight between the landlords and the poor peasants took place. The causes of the peasant riot in Yamazoe are as follows: 1. some 29 peasants leased some 60 acres of paddy fields belonging to nine landowners. On account of a dispute in regard to the rent, the peasants did not pay rent for three years, with the result that the case is now in the courts. Now the landlords have united and placed a lien on the land against the peasants. The landlords attached the whole rice crop thus depriving the peasants of the means of life; they got the court's permission to dispose of the rice crop at their free will, (the customary way is to set up the attached crop for auction at which the peasants can buy cheaply). The landowners quietly sold the crop to eight other landowners at a very cheap price so that the peasants got nothing out of their whole year's toil and efforts.

When the landlords who bought the crop began to harvest it, the indignant peasants appealed to the C. E. C. of the Peasants' Union which in turn appealed to two other Peasant Unions. The harvesting began on the 24th of November 1927. On that day the peasants began to call their colleagues by striking church bells and blowing horns. Soon over 5000 peasants were parading the village; and they kept on until late in the night. Someone set fire to the houses of the prominent landowners with the result that three were burned down. Many landowners were attacked; some were thrown into ditches or ponds after a hard drubbing by the angry peasants. Over 150 policemen came out to defend the landowners, with the result that there were many collisions and many arrests were made. The Peasants' Unions, forming a united front, supported the peasants by sending substantial aid and speakers to organise protest meetings against the brutality of the police forces. The fight is now going on in the courts and in the press.

The peasant movement has been taking on a more and more violent form everywhere. The unarmed peasants courageously fight against their oppressors. There occurred 1155 peasant disputes involving 1245 landowners and 43,294 peasants during the first eight months of 1927. There are many village, local and national conferences of peasants being held to discuss and decide their urgent problems. On the 29th of October, 1927, there was held the National Peasants' Council of Tokyo at which the government authorities arrested all the delegates and put them into prison. But the delegates held their meeting in the prison, electing a chairman and deciding the questions on the agenda.

At the recent Army Manoeuvres a soldier who came from the Suiheisha, the Etta Class (pariah) made a direct appeal to the Mikado who was reviewing the army. This rendered the ruling class terror stricken. This event shows that the soldiers are awakening against the army officers. The Suiheisha is a joint proletarian and peasant organisation of the most militant people which joined the Ronoto, the left wing proletarian party.

All these are signs of progress of the revolutionary movement in the country. The general parliamentary election will take place in May. It will be contested by the proletarian:



parties which are trying to conclude an election agreement. It will be the first general election under the new Manhood Suffrage Law; the number of electors is estimated at 13,000,000. For the first time the workers and peasants, who hitherto had no vote, will take part in the general election. Ten million new electors in the arena of politics will give a supreme chance for the peasants as well as the proletarian movement to advance the revolutionary cause.

## PROLETARIAN CULTURE

### Leninism and the Problem of Cultural Revolution

By N. Bukharin.

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

Comrades, on this solemn occasion I should like to choose as a fit matter for expatiation the subject of Leninism and the Problem of Cultural Revolution.

This subject is at present one of the most vital matters with which the Soviet Union and our Party are faced. It will be the greatest honour we can render our great master if, on this day of remembrance, we return again and again to him, to derive new strength from the teaching he has left us. For our task is the "new formation of the world", as theoretically formulated by Marx the great founder of scientific Communism. It is up to us to overcome quite extraordinary difficulties and to live and fight amidst capitalist encirclement. Capitalism is an enemy that has declared war to the knife on us.

Our opponents are strong, armed to the teeth, and continually increasing their armaments. Bourgeois-capitalist science and technics and the organisation of capitalist work are at present on the increase. Standardised and serial production, electrification, and a whole number of the latest technical innovations, the liquefaction of coal, the improved production and distribution of gas, the production of artificial fibres, which occupies an ever greater place in capitalist production and can at a moment's notice be turned into the production of explosives; finally, the important military inventions, such as the dirigible motors on the land, on and under the water, and in the air — all these things represent an elaborate technical preparation on the part of capitalism, with the help of which capitalism intends to maintain its position. The war and post-war crises have inflicted serious wounds on capitalism. The post-war crisis has not yet been overcome; on the horizon we see the indications of further catastrophes.

But in the meantime our opponents, undeterred by the fact that the crisis is not yet over, are fortifying the chief vantage-points of their position. We must deliberately face the fact that we are approaching a period of competition with these still powerful imperialist opponents. Of that fact we must not lose sight for a single minute, not for a single second. We are still destined to live for a long time under the shadow of the imperialist swords drawn against us. We have still the prospect of a long struggle with the "Holy Alliance" of the bourgeois counter-revolution, which will not and cannot leave us in peace, seeing that our peace and our growth, our work and our development all disturb the "peace" of the imperialist States. It is for this reason that our development and the tasks we have to solve within the country are so closely and indissolubly connected with the questions of international politics.

Our opponents fight us with all imaginable means. They also fight us on the ideologic front, where one of their chief weapons is that of speculation in regard to our technical and economic backwardness, our lack of culture, and the penury we have not yet succeeded in overcoming. The imperialist leaders and their adherents, all the enemies of a rising Socialism, all those that hate the iron dictatorship of the proletariat, all the Social Democratic cynics, all the petty-bourgeois sceptics, gnawed by doubts and prophesying destruction — all of these are speculating on our backwardness.

On the one wing there are the powerful leaders of international capitalism, on the other their adherents — all our manifold "friends" who have not infrequently derived their weapons from the arsenal of the open opponents of Socialism. It may often be observed how some cunning business-man and ideologist declares with assumed pathos that Bolshevism is the "great plague", the terrible Asiatic illness threatening to invade Europe. With failing voices these whiners complain that Bolshevism represents the "destruction of all culture and civilisation". Some of the particularly obstinate, refractory, and hypocritical imperialist spokesmen, especially such as once governed "public opinion" in imperial Russia, surpass all limits of bestial rage and even go so far as to designate the Soviet Union as the embodiment of Anti-Christ, as a "Satanocracy", as Berdayev, the bard of the aristocrats, is pleased to call it in his counter-revolutionary rage.

Our Social Democratic opponents, again, show a zeal worthy of a better cause in spreading abroad malignant inventions, describing Russia as a semi-Asiatic country, at all times accustomed to an Eastern form of despotism, a country in which a dictatorship has been established which as closely resembles that of Horthy or Mussolini as one egg resembles another. (To this I may remark in parentheses that if the adherents of Trotzky designate us as Fascists, they have obviously borrowed this poisoned weapon from their Social Democratic friends.) All Social Democrats declare that we Communists have undertaken the realisation of a Utopian fancy, the construction of Socialism, a task calling for a higher cultural standard, for which reason our "enterprise" is doomed in advance and irrevocably to failure, however much we may preen ourselves and whatever excellent slogans we may invent. In the great Book of Destiny our failure, they affirm, is already registered, seeing that we are proceeding contrary to the iron laws of history. And the oppositional fragments which broke away from our Party, are following this same path in affirming that, if we are not saved by an immediate outbreak of the world revolution, our destruction is practically settled. All these people, therefore, produce much the same melody, whatever chords they strike.

It is highly characteristic that the argument of backwardness and lack of culture is not only directed against us Bolsheviks of the Soviet Union now that our revolution records one success after the other. It is highly characteristic that the same argument was raised a very long time ago by the opponents of the Communist labour movement in general, who criticised the purpose of Communism by "proving" that the class of the uncultured, the oppressed, the pariahs, who are only capable of destroying, of initiating a wild anarchy, and of throwing back society to the level almost of pre-historic times, could not be productive of any good. It is characteristic, too, that even the half-friends of the Communist movement have several times since the inception of Communism drawn back half afraid from those whom they themselves had often called upon as saviours from the sins of the present capitalist civilisation. Such a prominent man as the great poet Heine, whom Marx called his friend and who really was in the friendliest of personal relations with the founder of scientific Communism, wrote shortly before his death of the Communists and of Communism:

"Nay, I am rather a prey to the secret fear of the artist and scholar, who sees our entire modern civilisation, the dearly bought achievements of so many centuries, the fruits of the very noblest efforts, imperilled by a victory of Communism."

In the following year, 1855, this friend of Marx', the revolutionary poet of Germany and one of the most radical figures of German public life, wrote as follows on the same subject:

"With fear and horror I think of the epoch when these sinister iconoclasts come into power. With their gnarled hands they will shatter all the marble statues of the goddess of beauty."

It is interesting to note that such a prominent member of our public life as Valeri Briussov, who subsequently became a member of our Party, was engaged in 1904 and 1905 in writing an undeniably beautiful poem, which he called "The Approaching Huns", and for which he chose as an epigram the words "Stamp out their Paradise, Attila", Attila here personi-

ifying Communism and the Paradise being that of the bourgeoisie.

At that time Valeri Briussov greeted our Party in song, calling us the "approaching Huns".

Such an attitude was characteristic not only of the petty-bourgeois Philistines, but also of the best thinkers of the bourgeois-capitalist world and even of those who thanks to their unusual personal gifts endeavoured to liberate themselves from the net of the bourgeois-capitalist ideology. Even those who had a premonition of something new and historically important in the Communist movement, which was destined with a "wave of flaming blood" to revive the "worn-out body" of bourgeois culture and civilisation, saw in the workers new "Huns" who would shatter everything to atoms and allow all the glorious creations of human genius to rot while sowing new fields with their "elementary" rye when once they had wiped all traces of the old pre-capitalist and capitalist culture from the face of the earth.

Since these lines were written much time has elapsed. Much water has flowed and not a little blood. But the iron tongue of history has told us many things, which are now doubted by no one, however little he may think.

We have seen that it is not the sinister Communist iconoclasts nor the Hunnish leaders of the Communist labour movement, but rather the very elegantly dressed and "brilliant" lieutenants and generals of the imperialist armies who, armed with all the achievements of this civilisation, are threatening and destroying civilisation and culture and all their achievements, accumulated in the course of centuries. The same thing applies to the yet better dressed and perfumed diplomats of the most Christian States with their lispings talk, their kid gloves, and their "noble" anxiety for God and culture, with their "honourable" considerations as to the best way of throttling Communism; the kings of banks and stock-exchanges with all their tender male and female lilies in Solomon-like simplicity; the scholars who exert their brains, their knowledge, and their talents in efforts to provide capitalism with the maddest weapons for the destruction of the material and spiritual assets of present-day civilisation; the servants of God, the artists, the writers, and the singers who in all tongues and by all possible means serve the cause of the destructive policy of imperialism.

Among splinters of steel, in poisonous gases, in vermin, human excrements, and blood, the "noble" culture of capitalism threatens to expire. Capitalism, indeed, is ready to devour its own culture. It is not we, the "sinister iconoclasts" (how this name suits us!) that are the bearers of this destruction, for we save all that is valuable in our culture. It is our capitalist opponents who **menace everything**. It is **against them** that every honest man who is capable of considering the great problems of the day, must arm himself.

Something else has also become apparent. Our era has disclosed a further truth. It shows that after a period of temporary decay the "sinister Communist iconoclasts" are not only saving all that is worth saving from former times but are also outdoing all others in extending culture to an enormous mass of people, creating a tremendous cultural movement of the masses, tilling a vast area with the tractor of civilisation, and opening up not individual veins of culture whose brilliance disappears in the masses but rather a mighty stream of civilisation and cultural construction. And finally, a third truth has also been disclosed in the course of time. Enormous perspectives are now opened up to us for creative and constructive work, perspectives such as the capitalist world never knew and never could know. Economically, in our work among the masses, in our scientific and creative activity, and in regard to culture in general, we have already reached the threshold of tremendous tasks; we have left the narrow limits of a "chamber" culture and walk on the highroads and through the cities, sending our messengers of culture into the villages and into the remotest nooks and corners.

Our science is beginning to turn the propeller of practice faster and faster. It is now no longer a subject of occupation for individual "cabinet scholars"; it is already in immediate touch with the great tasks of economic construction, from which, directly or indirectly, it derives its theoretic programme. With febrile haste the working class is enlarging the scope of its work. It raises the oppressed and tormented nationalities to the level of historic life, aids them with a brotherly hand in developing their civilisation, and thus provides science with new tasks. It comprehends economic construction in a single tremendous

organised system, uniting in a constantly increasing measure national economy in the State scheme and in the uniformity of systematic schemes. These tasks also confront science with very interesting problems, such as are fully unknown to the science of the bourgeois world. Finally, the working class pays the minutest attention to the problem of man himself, his work and his health, thus opening up new realms of science with new tasks and bringing theory and practice, science and life into closer contact along new lines.

Thus the mechanics of the workers' dictatorship include culture more and more in the general circle of life of the masses, subjecting an increasingly ample science to the new requirements of life and adapting its development to the advance of the entire tremendous historical process. All this is very different from the sinister prophecies in which even the best thinkers of the bourgeois and capitalist world indulged, very different from the miserable lamentations, interspersed with malicious sallies, to be heard from the Social Democratic "critics" who bark themselves hoarse at the proletarian dictatorship. True, during the period of revolutionary warfare many "lilies" were broken. But during the imperialist wars yet far more "lilies" were mowed down and far more nightingales were silenced by the roar of cannon. The important point is that if we compare the destruction caused by capitalism itself with the destructive side of the revolutionary process, we can declare without any pricks of conscience that it has cost us less to achieve a state of affairs which will definitely eliminate the destructive efforts of the perfumed and manicured barbarians of capitalist civilisation.

From the standpoint of cultural activity, the working class and its Party has placed the masses in the foreground. No more single prodigies, no more exotic hot-house creations; in the focus of our cultural work are the masses themselves. And it is with them that the point of gravity lies.

How ridiculously petty and contemptible are the accusations directed against victorious Communism. No other than Lenin, that passionate revolutionary, the great destroyer, the leader of the working class, who led the attack on the capitalist castles, fortresses, and estates, most emphatically and in his very last articles placed the cultural problem in the very centre of our Party and Soviet work. Very aptly Lenin declared that after the conquest and consolidation of the workers' dictatorship our attitude towards Socialism had fundamentally changed. He wrote:

"This fundamental change consists in the fact that we formerly attached the main importance to the political fight, the revolution, the conquest of power. Now the main interest must centre on the peaceful and organisational "cultural" work. I may say that the point of gravitation has shifted to the side of cultural work, naturally apart from international relations in which regard the main importance attaches to defending our international position. But apart from this and considering only our internal economic conditions, our work must centre in cultural activity."

This idea must be comprehensible to every member of our Party and to every worker who is desirous of becoming thoroughly conversant with the aims of his class and its historical development. In sketching the fundamental outlines, Marx also recorded this idea. The period of the workers' dictatorship, the transition from the capitalist to the Socialist, and thence to the Communist, order of society, can be regarded from a particular standpoint, viz. that of a **transformation in the entire predominant class, the working class**. In fact, we can regard the process of proletarian dictatorship from the standpoint of a strengthening of proletarian authority; we can regard it from the standpoint of the development of the economic basis of Socialism, i. e. from the standpoint of the growth of our Socialist industry and transport, from the point of view of what we call the proletarian "key positions" or "heights of command", or else we can consider it as the "socialised section" of our economy.

But it is also possible to regard this process from the standpoint of the changes entailed in the nature of the working class. In other words, this enormous historical process may be considered from the standpoint of a remodelling of the masses, the reformation of their nature, and in particular the re-forming of the proletariat. As is well known, Marx once wrote that in the great civil wars and in the struggles among the nations which occupied the stormy period separating capitalist

society from Communism, the working class changed its own nature. Lenin, who never departed one jot from the Marxian teaching but only developed and intensified it, regarded this problem of a "remodelling of the masses" as the most significant, most difficult, and most essential problem confronting our Party.

And how did Lenin divide up this question when he set about analysing the conception of "cultural revolution?"

"We are faced with two great tasks. The first is the task to re-form our apparatus, which is worth practically nothing and which we have taken over wholesale from former times, for during the years of struggle we did not and could not succeed in creating any serious innovations in this direction. The second task consists in cultural work among the peasants, which forms the actual object of co-operation. If we had already realised perfect co-operation, we should now be standing with both feet on the basis of Socialism. But the presumption of such co-operation embodies such a high cultural level on the part of the peasantry (considering the peasantry as a mass), that it appears to be quite impossible without the aid of a cultural revolution."

If we read these lines again and again, we are involuntarily prompted to ask "And how about the working class?" Throughout an entire epoch, for this in the word Lenin employs, two tasks are to occupy our attention, the re-formation of the State apparatus and the hundred per cent. co-operation of the peasantry. To a superficial critic desirous of finding signs of "national limitations" and a "deviation in the direction of the peasantry", it would be easy to designate these tasks, set up as the main objects of an entire epoch, as expressive of some sort of "deviation".

In reality, however, the matter is altogether different. If Comrade Lenin speaks of the re-formation of our State apparatus, he naturally understands this to be in close alliance with the cultural rise of the working class. For what is meant by the "State apparatus" in the Soviet Union? The framework of State authority. And in what does State authority consist in our country? In the words of Marx, it is the working class which is "constituted as the State authority". Our State is the most comprehensive organisation of the working class. Consequently the remodelling of the State apparatus, which Comrade Lenin set up as one of our two primary tasks, constitutes the most essential portion of our work among the working class. But in what direction must we remodel our State apparatus? Along the lines of a struggle against bureaucracy, the education of the working masses, the instruction of the working masses in the art of administration. The remodelling of the State apparatus is in the first line a cultural problem. In discussing the Party programme on the occasion of the VIII. Party Congress, Comrade Lenin spoke as follows:

"We know very well how this lack of culture weighs upon the Soviet authority and aids the rebirth of bureaucracy. According to the letter of the law, the Soviet authority is accessible to every worker; in reality, however, it is far from being at the command of all. And here it is not because the law intervenes, as was the case with bourgeois authority; on the contrary, our laws help to make authority accessible to all workers. But the laws alone can effect little. What we need is a mass of educational work, a thing that cannot be obtained quickly by means of a law, requiring rather a tremendous amount of work."

In a cultural sense, the working class "matures" very slowly; it does not mature spasmodically nor yet uniformly in all its branches; it matures only, partially. Not all workers pass through the various workers' faculties and high-schools; not all workers become "red managers" or Soviet officials; not all are equally connected with the organs of Soviet authority. But though it advances "particularly", the working class does advance from one grade to another. When the predominant mass of the working class is firmly established at the tilers of the administration, bureaucracy and bureaucratism will die a natural death. The improvement of the cultural level of the workers is therefore a presumption for the actual improvement of our State apparatus.

And thus the entire gigantic programme of Lenin, as outlined in the said article in rapid but emphatic strokes, is divided into two tremendous tasks, firstly the co-operation of the

peasants, to effect which an entire cultural revolution is necessary, and secondly the re-formation of our State apparatus and the penetration and replenishment of all its pores with culturally improved workers. This alliance between a peasantry, co-operating to one hundred per cent., and a State apparatus purged of all bureaucratic evils, really constitutes the great organisational and cultural task of our epoch.

I repeat that for Lenin it was the mass that stood in the centre of the entire system. Many years ago there was, both within and around the Party, a great discussion in regard to the cultural tasks. Lenin then pitted all his energy, all his revolutionary passion, and the heavy artillery of his overwhelming logic against the errors apparent in our ranks. After the events of October, there were many who desired to storm the very heavens; they excited themselves unduly in debating the questions of proletarian culture and in preparing the immediate revolution of all spheres of science and technics; there were some who thought that proletarian culture was a thing to be manufactured in experimental laboratories.

Lenin attacked such a conception with all the arguments at his disposal, and why he did so is quite obvious at present. He acted most strategically. He was right in fearing that these enthusiasts would probably get entangled in artificially cultivated theories and would thus turn away from the immeasurably more numerous and more elementary, but also more essential, cultural requirements of the masses. He therefore attacked the "twaddle" and "bombast" in regard to proletarian culture with bold references to such phenomena as corruption, Communist vainglory, and illiteracy. There lies the enemy, he said, that is what we must fight against with all our might; like that we shall attain results. But if we shut ourselves off, if we separate the working class from the masses or segregate part of the working class from the rest, or remove any small group of the proletariat from its social foundations, we shall be committing a tremendous and unforgivable error. It is not a question of upsetting all science at a blow, but rather of singling out the fundamental enemies of culture and education and destroying them as speedily as possible. These tasks must be given precedence, on them we must concentrate the entire attention of our Party, and against these evils we must fight most inexorably.

In connection with this Lenin set up a further task, that of taking from capitalism as much as was possible. It was impossible, he said, to transfer the focus of the revolution to the realm of mathematics, biology, and physics, without first solving at least a certain small percentage of the elementary and preliminary task which cried to the heavens for settlement and which, if neglected, would trip us up and be our ultimate ruin. It was therefore that Lenin so persistently advised us to take from capitalism all that could possibly be taken from it. At a meeting at Petrograd in March 1919, Lenin said:

"The masses have destroyed capitalism, but a mere destruction of capitalism will not help them. They must seize the culture that capitalism has left over for the purpose of building up Socialism; they must take all the science, technics, knowledge, and art, without which it is impossible to construct our Socialist life and society. But this science, this knowledge, and this art are in the hands and the heads of the specialists."

I may here remind you of the fact that at that time a great portion of the workers, among them numerous members of our Party, failed to understand this necessity, and it was only the iron will and the logic of Lenin that could prevent the proper revolutionary policy from being consumed by "Left phrases" and could ultimately lead forth the proletariat from the complicated labyrinth of dangers onto the only right straight path of historical evolution. (To be continued.)

## THE WHITE TERROR

### Against the Criminal Justice against Stefanov and Comrades!

Workers, Intellectuals! Protest!

A terrible judicial crime must be prevented! The unheard of proceedings against the working class leader and ex-member of parliament Boris Stefanov and his five comrades has caused indignation and disgust in the whole world.

Immediately after his arrest, one of the men who are now on trial, **Tkatchenko** was "shot dead whilst attempting to escape".

The same fate was prepared for **Stefanov**, but the international protest movement which set in caused the Roumanian government to decide to settle with **Stefanov** in another way.

**Stefanov** and his companions have been imprisoned since August 1926. They are accused of a "conspiracy against the State".

The process has already been postponed nine times because important witnesses were missing allegedly, but in reality because the police had no material whatever against the accused upon which they could base an indictment to hold water. **Stefanov** is to be sentenced upon the basis of his legal political activity.

He is being held in prison in order to ruin his health and so render him harmless.

If there were ever any doubt about this, then it has been abolished. **Stefanov** is to be tried in camera so that public opinion can exercise no control on the proceedings.

The new proceedings began on the 30th January before a court martial in Bucharest. Two French lawyers, Messrs. **Junker** and **Delbert**, journeyed from Paris in order to defend **Stefanov** and his fellow-accused. They also went to Bucharest in the name of 60 Parisian lawyers to present a memorandum to the Minister of the Interior **Duca**.

The representatives of the most prominent advocates in France were simply turned away from the Ministerium! And shortly afterwards they were expelled from the country! This proves clearly that the Roumanian authorities fear the light of publicity. For judicial crimes, darkness is desirable.

The toilers of all countries must protest against the planned crime.

All those who still have ears for the voice of justice and humanity must join in the protests.

Oppose the crimes of Roumanian "justice" with the solidarity of all the toilers!

Send resolutions of protest to the Roumanian government and to the Roumanian Embassies!

Protest against the expulsion of the French advocates!

Send protest delegations to the diplomatic representatives of Roumania abroad!

No meetings should be held without adopting resolutions of protest!

Fight against the judicial crime against **Stefanov** and his comrades!

Fight for the immediate release of all the accused!

The Executive Committee of the  
International Red Aid.

## IN THE CAMP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

### The Social Democratic "Unity Congress" in Czechoslovakia.

By V. Stern (Prague).

#### Prelude.

On the 28th and 29th January last there took place in Prague the joint Congress of the social democratic parties of the various nationalities of Czechoslovakia. The Congress was announced some weeks before with a great set-out as a "tremendous historical event" of enormous importance. But in the weeks immediately preceding the Congress the social democratic press became almost silent regarding this approaching "world-moving" event.

Immediately before the Congress we witnessed the significant spectacle of the German and Czech social democrats, whose "unity was to be established for ever at the Congress, voting one against the other in Parliament. Correctly stated that means that the Czech social democrats voted with the Czech national socialists for the government to which they are supposed to be sharply opposed, whilst the German social democrats ran away from the vote in order not to vote either for or against the government (In the Czech Parliament votes which are not given for a motion are counted as being against).

The voting took place on the occasion of the government's declaration regarding the smuggling of arms into Hungary.

It therefore possessed the importance of an announcement regarding the future attitude in the event of a war between Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The Czech social democrats now showed quite openly that in the event of such a war they will be reliable defenders of their native country. The German social democrats did not venture to betray their intentions at present. This proves that in a serious situation they will act in precisely the same way as the Czech social democrats. In any event this parliamentary prelude to the Congress showed very plainly the value of all the phrases regarding the "indissoluble unity" which the Congress was to realise.

#### A Parade Congress of Phrases.

The Congress was in reality a German-Czech Congress. There are no serious and growing social democratic parties in the other nationalities of Czechoslovakia. The undisputed leader of the working population of these nationalities is the Communist Party. 240 delegates, among them four Hungarians, represented the Czech social democratic party while the German social democracy was represented by 194 delegates. In addition there were only eight representatives of the Polish and five of the Ukrainian social democracy. The II. International was represented by **Friedrich Adler** and **De Brouckère**. Of foreign social democratic parties there were represented only bankrupt parties of various nations of the Soviet Union. The composition of the delegations themselves did not offer any picture of the sentiment of the social democratic working class. The Congress consisted for the greater part of party bureaucrats.

The Congress has brought literally nothing but empty, and not even fine-sounding phrases. At least three quarters of all the words spoken at the Congress and written in the innumerable congratulatory articles in the social democratic press served but to express astonishment that, after ten years of common existence in one State, the social democratic representatives of the various nations had succeeded in gathering together at one congress. It never occurred to any of the speakers or article writers how much they mocked their own party when they praised as an unheard of event a fact which for Communists is a matter of course.

The Congress had two tasks: It had to bring about a united fighting front of all social democratic workers against the threat to cut down the social insurance and against the reaction, and establish at least a temporary understanding in the national sphere. The Congress did not make even the slightest beginning with the realisation of these tasks. In the political reports and decisions it was only declared in general phrases that the workers of the various nations must act together against the attacks of the bourgeoisie. One can seek in vain, however, for any recommendation of concrete fighting measures, still less for a concrete decision to take up the fight in any form.

The slogan with which the chief political reporter of the German social democrats, **Dr. Czech**, concluded his utterances, was the pathetic summons to "rally in love and faith round the old banner of social democracy", and "to show that they fully grasp the importance of the moment and are up to the great tasks" etc. The Czech political reporter, **Bechyne**, came to the conclusion that there "must be set up against the false united front of the Communist revolution the democratic united front of the social democratic party in this State."

The reports on the social insurance were delivered by the Czech social democrat **Dr. Winter** and the German social democrat **Schäfer**. **Dr. Winter** came to the conclusion that it was the task of the Congress to declare that the social democratic workers must exert all their forces, so that the working class in the Republic and all those who cherish good-will towards the Republic may know that the reform of the social insurance carried out by the Czech and German bourgeois coalition is a crime not only against the working class of this State, but also against the State itself. The loudly proclaimed "tremendous struggle" for which the Congress was to unite the workers internationally, consists therefore in making the "public announcement" that the government has committed a crime.

The conclusion of the German reporter **Schäfer** that the workers of Czechoslovakia "must gather together in strong social democratic organisations" was in no way better.



### Complete Fiasco of the National Understanding.

None of the organisers of the Congress seriously thought of organising a real fight against the bourgeoisie. But it would probably not have been unwelcome to them if they had been able to point to at least a small apparent success in the question of the national understanding. In this respect the judgment on the Congress is generally unanimous. The "national question" was referred to a Commission, which has "to investigate the prerequisites for the promotion of its solution", and will in any event end just as did the Commission elected at the Hamburg Congress of the Second International which had to investigate the dispute between the Czech and German social democratic parties; and, after long and futile birth-pangs, died with a confession of bankruptcy and without having achieved anything.

### The Real Object of the Congress.

The social democratic leaders made great efforts to conceal the true object of the Congress, but their utterances only served to betray them. In an article which appeared in the "Social Democrat" soon after the convocation of the Congress there were given the reasons why the Congress had to take place precisely at the present time. It was pointed out that the common action of the capitalists of all nations, the formation of an international capitalist government strengthens the desire of the workers likewise to act unitedly. This drove the workers into the arms of the Communists, because they believe that this international unity is to be found in the ranks of the Communists. The same paper published articles by Czech social democratic leaders in which it was declared that the unity must be permanent and not only for the period of joint opposition, but also for the period of joint participation in a coalition government.

The sharpening of the class antagonisms is causing the social democratic leaders to guess rightly that the bourgeoisie will soon be needing them again. On the other hand the Czech social democrats, who have never disguised their longing for the lost ministerial posts, want the increased strength given them by the German social democrats in order to be able the more easily to enter the government. All this was very plainly expressed at the Congress itself, when Bechyně declared, "I should like that from now on, for all time, whether things go well with the State or bad, that all nations should be constantly represented in the government". Dr. Czech declared in turn that the German social democrats, already in the year 1919 and still more plainly in the year 1923, at the Aussig Party Congress, had accepted the basis of this State.

The positive attitude to the State is expressed in the resolution calling for a fight for social insurance. This resolution declares that "the Republic has carried out social legislation comparatively rapidly", "especially social insurance, this greatest social-political work". This sycophantic praise of this miserable piece of legislation by which the workers are defrauded in the most monstrous manner, characterises very plainly the capitulation of the German social democrats, whose sham opposition up to now had rendered possible a somewhat sharper criticism of the government policy, to the open social patriotism of the Czech social democrats.

One cannot therefore deny that in regard to the preparation for the participation of the German social democrats in the capitalist government, of a State which suppresses their class and their nation, the Congress nevertheless achieved a certain result. The Congress, it is true, had also another object, regarding which it has not been so successful. The contemplated worsening of the social insurance and the general offensive of the bourgeoisie has called forth a fighting movement in the working masses, in which there is being formed a united fighting front from below. In order to entice the social democratic workers who are taking part in this fight away from the front, and in order to keep the other workers away from it, the Congress sought to create the impression that the social democratic leaders wish to establish a better united front. Therefore everything was done at the Congress in order to prove that it is impossible to set up a united front with the Communists, who only wish to "expose" the socialist leaders, and that therefore there remains no other alternative than the united front under purely social democratic leadership.

### The Bourgeoisie is very Satisfied.

That we Communists made plain to the workers the true meaning of this Congress was of course very vexing to the social democratic leaders. They attempted at the Congress to represent our Communist criticism as "a united front of the Communists with the bourgeoisie". Dr. Czech, as well as many other speakers at the Congress, declared that the discontent of the capitalists and of the Communists is a proof that the Congress was following the right course. With this incautious assertion, however, Herr Dr. Czech burnt his own fingers. It is in fact downright astonishing to note how well disposed the entire capitalist press is towards the attempt of the social democratic leaders, to arrive at understanding. Its criticism is confined to declaring that the Congress achieved very few positive results, which would have been very desirable. But the bourgeoisie is in entire agreement with the object of the Congress and the intentions of the social democratic leaders. The government organ "Die Prager Presse" published a leading article written by the Czech social democratic leader Hampl, on the significance of the Congress. The "Venkov", the organ of the Czech agrarians, that is the organ of that Party which bears the greatest responsibility for the policy of the government and against which the social democrats are supposed to be conducting a fierce fight, welcomes with the greatest satisfaction the fact that the Czech social democrats have succeeded in winning 17 new active colleagues in the German social democratic members of Parliament, who can be taken into account for future government combinations. The press of the German government parties also adopts a similar standpoint. Its statements acquire a somewhat polemical character solely because it boasts that the German bourgeois parties were the first to adopt the path which the German social democrats are now pursuing and because it calls to mind that they were for this reason attacked by the German social democrats. To the reproach of the social democrats that the bourgeoisie did not succeed in establishing a real national understanding, the German government press replies by pointing to the difficulties of such an understanding, which requires much patience and in which the social democrats, unfortunately, will not succeed any more quickly than the bourgeoisie.

But the bourgeoisie and the social democratic leaders are rejoicing too soon. This attempt at stabilisation, like all others, has another and, for the bourgeoisie and social democracy, less pleasant side. The masses will very quickly see what is really being offered them in place of the promised understanding and of the promised common struggle. The result must be an even more decided turn on the part of the masses from the social democratic leaders, a more determined and speedy rallying to the camp of struggle to which the whole development is more and more tending.

## TEN YEARS AGO

### The Revolution in Finland.

On the Occasion of its Tenth Anniversary.

By Yrjö Sirola.

On the evening of January 26th 1918, the red light was lit on the tower of the Workers' Club premises in Helsingfors, which was the signal for the Red Guard of the workers. At the same time, the Whites began to stir in Oesterbotten, the extreme North of Finland. This is how the class war began, the war for power between the capitalists and the workers. The struggle continued for three months and ended with the defeat of the revolutionaries in the first days of May.

The Civil war in Finland in 1918 was not a "fight for freedom" against a foreign oppressor, as the Finnish Whites tried to make out, for the Russian Soviet Power had recognised Finland's national independence even in the first days of January, so that a war of deliverance was no longer necessary. Civil war came into being as the result of the international conditions and contradictions in Finland. The mass of workers in Finland realised that, in connection with the Russian revolution, the moment had come to improve their position. The capitalists, on the other hand, who had been compelled to make a few minor concessions, wanted to withdraw them and to establish a police and military rule, nay, even a monarchy.



Other, international, factors also had a strong, even a decisive influence on the civil war, on its beginning and termination. It was a great mistake on the part of the Finnish Labour movement and a severe sin of omission of its leading party that they did not follow the international happenings at that time with sufficient attention, although the effect of the great war was making itself strongly felt. The Finnish Labour movement did not think itself capable of exercising any influence on the solution of international questions.

As early as in the Spring and summer of 1917, the situation in Finland began to assume a constantly more revolutionary character. After the March revolution in Russia, a Right socialist government, the "Tokois Senat" was formed in Finland, and in "Manuers Landtag", i. e. in the Finnish Parliament, the Social Democratic Party had 103 seats out of 200. The statutes of the "Landtag" allow the minority far-reaching possibilities of obstruction. The bourgeois parties made ample use of that possibility. Slight reforms, such as the general municipal franchise and the eight-hour day were only achieved with the help of extra-parliamentary pressure in the form of a demonstration, in which the revolutionary Russian soldiers took part side by side with the workers of Helsingfors. The Government concerned itself chiefly with "appeasing" the excited people and with obtaining an extension of Finland's autonomy, to which the Provisional Russian Government refused to consent. On July 18th, 1917, the so-called power bill was carried in the Landtag, which laid down that the supreme power, with the exception of foreign policy and of military questions, should be in the hands of the Landtag of Finland. Although that law coincided almost to the letter with the resolution passed at the first Russian Soviet Congress, the Landtag was dissolved by Kerensky, who enjoyed the support of the Mensheviks. When the Landtag tried to meet in defiance of that measure, Kerensky prevented it by military force. Thereupon the Social Democrats seceded from the Government and the reformatory activity came to a complete standstill. Both within the Government and outside it, the bourgeoisie began to prepare for counter-revolution.

In connection with unemployment and with the food shortage, these circumstances led to an ever growing discontent of the people, and the revolutionary wave reached its culminating point in Finland at the time when the November revolution in Russia overthrew the oppressors of Finland. A general strike broke out, and the power passed into the hands of the workers in the most important centres and even in the provinces. The Social Democratic Party however was not prepared to take over the power, and a Bolshevik party did not exist. The general strike was called off as soon as the bourgeoisie had been forced to abandon their planned coup d'état — to enthroned "three regents" with full monarchical power —, at the moment when the Landtag proclaimed itself to be the instrument of the supreme power and confirmed the eight-hour day and the municipal by-laws.

It was a great mistake to let the revolutionary situation pass without turning it to account, and Comrade Kuusinen, who was the leader of the Finnish Social Democracy at that time and has later become a Communist, criticised that omission very severely. (O. W. Kuusinen: "Revolution in Finland, a Piece of Self-Criticism".) Matters then developed rapidly, approaching an armed conflict with rapid strides. The bourgeois Government — the majority of the Landtag having changed in the meantime — used all the means of the power of the State for the purpose of organising the White Guard under the lead of Svinhufvuds. The majority of the Landtag supported the Government. Local conflicts occurred. A ruthless chauvinist propaganda was started. The aid of foreign countries was called in.

The social democratic leaders in Finland failed to display sufficient activity, especially with regard to the supply of the workers with arms. In the middle of January 1918, it is true, a revolutionary executive committee was set up, but the mistakes made were irreparable. On January 25th, the party leaders resolved to proceed to take over the power. On January 27th, the conflict between the two labour organisations, the Guard of Peace and Order and the Red Guard, was settled and they were both mobilised. The revolutionary government of the people's deputies was formed on the same day. In Vasa, a few members of Svinhufvud's government formed the White Government, whose military Commander-in-Chief, Count Mannerheim, a tsarist general, on the same day issued the order to attack. Civil war broke out.

The conduct of the war by the Red forces proved very faulty. The workers of Finland had no military training of any kind and were almost without officers. Russian volunteers were recruited, but it was impossible to form an army all of a sudden. In spite of all that, the Red Guard fought heroically against the advancing White troops who were under the command of Finnish, Swedish, German and Russian officers. The Red troops could even record local successes. As they failed, however, to make a direct and vigorous advance from the North, their only line of communication fell into the hands of the Whites. The White troops, on the other hand, soon got into a desperate situation that they were compelled to appeal to foreign countries for help. Sweden dispatched the Black Brigade, as the Swedish soldiers called it. In Berlin, Svinhufvud succeeded in persuading Wilhelm's Government to dispatch an expedition to Finland, but under conditions which were so humiliating for Finland that even a section of the Finnish bourgeoisie refused to accept them.

The revolutionary troops were forced to beat a retreat before the well-equipped German troops. The fact that the organisation and discipline of the army also came to nought at that time, resulted in a disorderly retreat. The Whites succeeded in cutting off the communications between the Red troops and Russia, and the remainders of the Red Guard capitulated near Lahtki, Kotka and in other places, in the first days of May.

That was the end of the civil war. The Finnish bourgeoisie then wreaked vengeance by a bloodthirsty terror against the workers who had dared to rise against oppression and exploitation. Its object was to exterminate the Labour movement root and branch. That attempt, however, was unsuccessful. The workers of Finland soon raised their heads again, with a stronger class-consciousness than ever. The Communist Party of Finland was founded, the lack of which had been the chief and deepest cause of the defeat.

But the lessons taught by the revolution in Finland are not merely of a negative character. They show that the proletariat does not allow itself to be enslaved without offering resistance, but that, if occasion favours, it is prepared to rise against oppression. The fight of the workers of Finland was at the same time helpful to the Russian revolution. Their action was one of the reasons why the offensive of the Whites against Petrograd and against the Murman railway was called off.

After the revolution, the bourgeoisie of Finland was compelled to proceed with something like a "small-holders' enfranchisement". The land question was of course not solved by that measure, but the situation was cleared up. The peasants who are still "not freed", no longer expect their enfranchisement from the bourgeois landowners by means of heavy burdens of taxation and purchase-money, but from the revolutionary fight carried on in common with the industrial proletariat against the capitalist system as a whole. Their slogan is no longer that of democracy but that of the power in their own hands, in the hands of the working people — the slogan of the proletarian dictatorship.

The sacrifices which the revolution demanded, have not been made in vain. The struggle which was carried on by the workers of Finland in 1918, has not been forgotten. It was an honourable skirmish on the part of the outposts of the proletarian world revolution.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### H. N. Brailsford: "How the Soviets Work" (\*).

By W. Ensee (London).

As its title suggests, this little work sets out to give an account of the structure and organisation of the Soviet System, the respective powers and functions of the Soviets, from the smallest units (the village and town Soviets) up to the higher and supreme legislative and administrative bodies, as well as a description of the practical working of the Soviet system. But the book does more than this. The reader is able to derive from its pages some idea of the profound and vast changes that the October Revolution and the setting up of the Soviet power

\*) "How the Soviets Work", by H. N. Brailsford, Vanguard Press, New York.

has brought about not only in the material conditions, but in the entire mentality and outlook of the great masses of peoples, representing the most divergent races and cultures, spread over the enormous territory comprising the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

The book is for the most part based on the author's personal observations and studies made in Soviet Russia last year, when he was able to satisfy himself as to the enormous progress made in all spheres of life by comparing present conditions with what he witnessed on the occasion of a visit in 1920.

Mr. Brailsford is at his best when recording conversations he has had with workers, peasants, members of the Red Army, Soviet officials etc. or describing various scenes and incidents he has witnessed, when he gives us some very vivid pen pictures. Thus we get a description of a Soviet election meeting held in one of the big engineering works in Moscow. Practically all the two thousand workers in the factors are present, and listen attentively to an orator in a simple uniform, indistinguishable from a private soldier or sergeant. The orator is Voroshilof, the Commissar of the Red Army, the equivalent to the Minister for War in Western countries, and he is replying to the "Note" from Chamberlain just received in Moscow. There follows the business of bringing in amendments to the election manifesto:

"Two rather handsome young girls of the Pioneer organisation, resplendent in red ties, then came forward with two amendments. They insisted that more should be done for the homeless children of Moscow, and — could one conceive such a thing outside Russia? — they wanted more teaching of foreign languages in all schools. That, they maintained, was essential if they were to be good internationalists. We voted again and the proposals of the Pioneer girls were adopted. As they voted, they held out their hands above their heads with their five fingers spread out — a naive symbol which means in the ritual: 'The five Continents of the earth are more to me even than my own land.'"

The election over,

"One read a glow of content and good fellowship on every face, and, as the proceedings closed, a private of the Red Air Force came to the platform and declared that if a rupture should come with Great Britain, he and his fellows would do their duty. I could not imagine a parallel proceeding at home. With us, privates do not speak as the equals of the Minister of War from the same platform."

The Chapter on "The Nationalities and the Union" contains generous acknowledgment of the great efforts being made by the Soviet government to foster and promote the culture of the former subject nationalities and to raise these backward peoples, held in ignorance by the Tsarist government, to the highest possible cultural level. The author describes the impression he received as he stood before a class of Tartar and Bashkir students, their straight black hair, high cheek-bones, closely set eyes and wide nostrils proclaiming their Mongolian descent:

"But through what mental adventures must they be passing! Conceive the bewilderment of these girls in their early twenties, if anyone had told them, ten years ago, that their destiny is not the veil and subjection in a Tartar labourer's hut, but a share in the learned work of the new rulers of Russia... Within these walls they will make the pilgrimage from Mecca to Moscow, and pass from the world of Mahomet to the world of Marx."

Brailsford rightly emphasises the tremendously important rôle played by the Bolshevik Party not only in the October Revolution, but in the maintenance of the whole structure of the Soviet Union. He states that, "when Moscow faced the problem of reuniting the territories of the former Empire which it had reconquered in the civil war, only one thing can have saved it from despair — the faith of the Communist Party in itself." Elsewhere he declares that "If the present Russian constitution as it stands on paper were taken over by any other people, without a disciplined Communist Party to work it, it would break down, amid a hopeless clash of competing authorities, within the first year. The Party is the cement which holds the loose structure together". But in his estimate of the

Party Brailsford adopts the conventional bourgeois and social-democratic view that it is something existing above and imposing its will on the masses, although in the interest of the latter. There therefore naturally arises for Brailsford the question, "To what extent is this average Russian citizen irked (!) or depressed (!) by the dictatorship?", and hence the surprise he expresses at "the natural and spontaneous way in which a worker would say, when summing up the gains of the Revolution, 'Besides, we are free.'" "He would say it", says Brailsford, "without emphasis, as if it were a thing which everyone knew, and no one could possibly doubt." "In trying to think oneself into this state of mind", continues Brailsford, "one has to cross many countries." As a matter of fact here it is not a question of different countries; the barrier preventing our English intellectual from appreciating the point of view of the Russian worker was not one of frontiers but of class. With his Liberal outlook Brailsford is unable to comprehend that which would be readily grasped by any class-conscious worker. The workers straight from the bench and factory, for instance, who have taken part in the numerous delegations to Russia do not see anything paradoxical in the proud claim of the Russian workers that they are free and masters of the country, for they recognise on the basis of comparison with their own condition that the Russian workers are actually the ruling class.

As in his former book on Russia, "The Russian Workers' Republic", the author does not show any adequate appreciation or comprehension of the character and genius of Lenin. One of his statements in fact calls for refutation. Only a person strangely unfamiliar with Lenin's writings would venture the assertion that, "When Lenin, with his comrades, returned to Russia from exile in Switzerland after the revolution of March, 1917, he does not seem to have perceived at once how valuable the Soviets would be for his purpose — or if he did he did not instantly declare it." As a matter of fact, Lenin in his "Letters from Afar", written while still in exile in Switzerland, already stated,

"If the power were in the hands of the Soviets of the workers, soldiers, and peasants' deputies, these Soviets and the All-Russian Soviet elected by them could put into effect... the peace programme laid down by our Party."

And again, in the famous "April Theses", written on the 17th April, 1917, the very day after his arrival in Petrograd from exile, Lenin declared: "As long as we are in the minority, we effect the work of criticism and enlightenment by preaching the necessity of the transference of the whole power of the State into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, so that the masses can rid themselves of their mistakes by their own experience."

Recording as it does so much of the author's own observations, the book is to be recommended as conveying an idea of how the Soviet rule is affecting the every day life of the workers and peasants and how under it the country is advancing on the road to Socialism. Without the author intending it, his book, in spite of its Liberal outlook, certainly goes a long way to confirm Lenin's assertion that "the Soviet power is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic."

#### TO OUR READERS!

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

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

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

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