

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2 No. 91

24th Oct. 1922

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

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
The Dardanelles Question in Terms of Naphtha. By <i>Karl Radek</i>	691	The Communist University of Omsk. By <i>N. Ch.</i>	696
Politics		The United Front	
The End of the Austrian Democracy. By <i>Victor Stern</i>	693	The United Proletarian Front By <i>A. Treint</i>	696
The Kato Government and its Policy towards Soviet Russia. By <i>Sen Katayama</i>	694	Pages of History	
In Soviet Russia		Russia's Revolutionary Past. By <i>M. Prokovsky</i>	697
Extract from Comrade Trotzky's Speech at the 5th All-Russian Textile Workers' Congress	695	In the Camp of Our Enemies	
		A Menshevik Opinion on the S.R.'s. By <i>J. Shaffir</i>	698

The Dardanelles Question in Terms of Naphtha

By *Karl Radek*.

The *London Nation*, the leading organ of English liberalism, lights up in the clearest possible manner the idea of the fight for the Straits, when it writes that the meaning of the fetish of the opening of the Straits, which threatened the life and peace of millions, was nothing else than the right to be able to send warships, and in the first place English warships, to the Black Sea, and that there were only two motives for this demand: first the fear of a war with Soviet Russia, and secondly, the anxiety on account of naphtha.

With regard to the first of these motives we need not waste many words. The English government knows that Soviet Russia does not desire any war with England, that on the contrary, she is striving for peace and the strengthening of economic relations with England who is economically the strongest European power. If England therefore regards it as necessary to keep the Straits under her control (under the flag of the League of Nations), it means that the English government has not decided to live in peace with Soviet Russia and that she wishes to reserve to herself the possibility of despatching her warships to the Black Sea in the event of war? With regard to the second motive, the anxiety on account of naphtha, — this side of the question is no less important, and perhaps plays at the present moment a much more important role than the possibility of a war with Soviet Russia. Notwithstanding, very little attention has been devoted to this question. Naphtha shuns the light of open discussion.

Kemal Pasha was the first to touch this question in his interview with the correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune*.

This correspondent said to His Excellency, that every one who knew the part that naphtha played in international politics must understand that Great Britain must secure to herself the entrance to the great naphtha wells, for otherwise she would cease to exist as Great Britain. He then suggested that the question of the naphtha wells in Mesopotamia had a much greater importance than that of Constantinople, perhaps even a much greater importance than the question of the Straits. He therefore asked Kemal's opinion upon the attitude of the Turkish national government towards the endeavours of the British to secure the approach to the Mesopotamian naphtha wells. Journalists are often in the habit of asking questions upon which the person interviewed desires to speak, and Kemal Pasha therefore replied that the

district in question was in the province of Mozul, which lies within the territory mentioned in the national pact, (that is to say, that the Angora government does not recognize the English mandate in Mozul, but regards Mozul as Turkish territory); that the majority of the population of this district consists of Turks; that he did not think the occupation of this district was necessary to the exploitation of the naphtha wells. Nobody had anything against the exploitation of Turkish naphtha by America, who has no political aims in Turkey. If England were to adopt the same standpoint, it would, in his view, be much more reasonable.

In reply to the correspondent's question whether if Great Britain were to decide on the evacuation of Turkish territory in Mesopotamia it could still have the possibility of exploiting the naphtha wells there, Kemal Pasha replied that it would have the same rights there as other people.

General Morris, the Constantinople correspondent of the *Daily News* points out in regard to this, what Kemal Pasha was silent over. He reports that in the treaty concluded with the Angora government, by Franklin-Bouillon in the name of the French government, Turkey promised France naphtha concessions in return for her support against England in Mozul, and that the negotiations were under way. The American newspapers report that the American Chester Corporation which, already before the war, had endeavoured to develop its economic activities in Turkey, was now negotiating with Angora with regard to naphtha.

Naphtha is now beginning to light up the Dardanelles question, and much that was hitherto concealed from the public eye now comes to the surface. It is quite probable that the naphtha lamp revealed its full light to the pacifist Lloyd George when he rattled his sabre on the 16th of September.

II.

The question of the naphtha wells of Mozul have a very long history; we can here refer only to the most important facts which are necessary for an understanding of the further development of the Near Eastern question.

In 1916, England concluded a treaty with France, which secured the predominating influence of France in Mozul. And after the conclusion of the armistice, Mr. Detering, the head of the *Royal Dutch Shell* which stands in close relationship with

the English government, turned to Clemenceau with the declaration, that he was ready to offer assistance to the French government in the naphtha undertakings which the peace treaty allotted to France. These negotiations lasted very long, until finally, on April 15th, 1920, France concluded the San Remo agreement with England which defined the naphtha relations of both countries in the British colonies of North Africa, in Roumania and Mesopotamia.

In this treaty the British government pledges itself to make good to France 25% of the English exploitation of naphtha in Mesopotamia on the basis of the current prices. If, however, a private company should undertake the exploitation of the Mesopotamian naphtha industry, the British government is pledged to grant the French government 25% of the shares of this company. The price of these shares must not be reckoned higher than the price paid by other shareholders in the company. Such a Company shall be under constant British management.

The English government upholds the agreement on the basis of which the French government is to receive from the Anglo-Persian company 25 per cent of the naphtha conveyed from Persia by means of the naphtha pipes to the Black Sea. These pipes can be laid in any district over which France has a mandate. France will render assistance in the construction of naphtha pipes. A special treaty will be concluded between the French government and the Anglo-Persian Company regarding the price of naphtha.

In consideration of which, the French government permits, so far as it appears desirable, the erection of two special naphtha pipes and railways which are necessary for the working of the wells and for the transportation of naphtha from Mesopotamia and Persia through the French spheres of influence to the harbor or harbors of the Mediterranean Sea. The harbor or harbors shall be determined by the agreement between the two governments.

If such a naphtha pipe or railway should pass through French spheres of influence, France agrees to impose no customs or imposts upon the naphtha conveyed over her territory. Only the ground owners shall be compensated.

On the other hand, France agrees to make possible the procuring of the site at the end harbor, necessary for the erection of magazines, railways, etc. The naphtha conveyed in this manner is free from all export and transit customs. The materials for the setting up of the naphtha wells shall likewise be subject to no import duties.

If the naphtha company referred to wishes to lay a naphtha pipe and railway to the Persian Gulf, the English government offers its services in order to procure similar conditions to those above mentioned.

How did it come about that France renounced her rights in Mozul and only receives 25% of the proceeds, not in kind, but only on the basis of the market price? The English government based its claim upon the fact that in 1914, before the war, it concluded an agreement with German capitalists and with the Turkish government on the basis of which England was to obtain 50%, the Turkish Government 25% and the German capitalists 25% of the naphtha exploitation. As England now has the Mesopotamia mandate, she possesses besides the 50% of the old English share, the right to the Turkish share, and allows France the 25% of the German share.

"The treaty is sacred". Why the treaty of 1914 is to be sacred and not that of 1916, is not mentioned in the official documents, but this follows from the events that occurred after the conclusion of the treaty. In the first case, the English governor in Syria, *Emir Fayzal*, caused the French great difficulties. England gave up the Fayzal policy, and promised France her support in the reparations question. France therefore made concessions in the naphtha question. How French public opinion behaved towards this treaty we are informed in that excellent book of Delaisy as well as in the book by Peter Lespagnole, *World Struggle for Naphtha*. We only quote here the heart-outpourings of a French politician in the August number of *Revue de Paris*:

"French public opinion is thoroughly aware that the treaty of Sevres was only concluded in order to introduce British control over Turkish naphtha, which formerly belonged to Germany and then passed into the possession of France. French public opinion is aware that the French government, when it signed the secret and wonderful treaty of San Remo, thereby resigned its political independence and conceded to England not only all the wells of Mesopotamia, but also all those which we could have acquired in the colonies and in other countries Up to the time of the war France consumed yearly 400,000 tons of naphtha which

were supplied by the Standard Oil Company. Today France needs a million tons. We waste two billion francs annually through the importation of dear oil, the demand for which is continually increasing due to the development of aviation and motorino and of civil and military automobile transport.

. . . . If we assert the point of view that political independence is the result of free access to naphtha, we come involuntarily to the conclusion that the treaty of San Remo is for France precisely similar to the treaty of Metuen (The treaty of Metuen in reality converted Portugal into an English colony). Let us assume that in the future France is compelled against her will to conduct a war independently against those great powers that have control of naphtha. Of what use will her mighty army be to her, richly equipped with aeroplanes, tanks and armored trains? A silent naphtha blockade will suffice in a week or even less to cripple the aeroplanes and the tanks and to bring to a halt the infantry which will be without means of transport."

"Can this lamentable and faulty past not be corrected", asks the French politician.

In August the French patriot bemoaned the lack of Naphtha; today France is attempting to correct the past with the bayonets and lives of the Turkish people's army.

III.

The question is whether France does this in agreement with the American Standard Oil Trust or at least, if the question can be so put, what attitude will Standard Oil take to the French attempt at solving the Mozul question.

The treaty of San Remo was concluded at the time when, after Wilson's downfall, America withdrew from European politics. As soon as the treaty of San Remo became known to the American government it immediately began to fight it.

On the 17th of May, three weeks after the signing of the treaty of San Remo, the State Department sent a communication to the American Senate in which the sharpest protest is raised against the policy of England and against the mandate of the League of Nations. It demands the policy of the "open door" in all countries possessing naphtha.

There began a diplomatic exchange of notes between the English and American governments, of which only an unimportant portion was made public.

England appealed to the sacredness of the treaty of 1914 and pointed out that the Americans had concluded a similar treaty which confers on them the right to exploit naphtha in Palestine and that England does not contest this treaty. America answered with the 21 demands one of which is, that America should be permitted to exploit half the amount which the holders of mandates have in any country, but in no case less than that which "third parties" obtain. Translated into Mesopotamian speech this means that America proposes the following division of the naphtha of mesopotamia: 50% to England, 25% to America, and 25% to France.

At the time of the conferences of Washington, Genoa and the Hague, uninterrupted negotiations were conducted over this question between the Standard Oil Company on the one side and the Royal Dutch Shell on the other, as well as between the governments which were pulled by the wires of the naphtha trusts. England made concessions. John Cadman, the representative of England in the international naphtha council, wrote in his article in the 4th number of Keynes' *Reconstruction of Europe* with the air of an innocent young lamb, to the effect that he told the Americans that the treaty of San Remo was concluded for the purpose of avoiding possible conflicts with France by reason of the naphtha interests of Germany and Roumania, and for the purpose of facilitating the cooperation of French and English naphtha groups in Russia and Mesopotamia and in the English colonies; that this treaty was not directed against America, Italy or any other country, and interfered with neither the actual or potential rights of America. He further added that if the Americans did not receive any concessions in Mesopotamia it was because no one else received such concessions, as it was decided to retain all of the naphtha enterprises, regardless of their ownership, until the Arabian State is set up and until the development of the resources of the country are firmly established.

John Cadman sings like a nightingale, but the wolf of the Standard Oil Trust probably asks him: Why then have you divided up the Mesopotamia naphtha? Since that time constant negotiations were in progress. During the negotiations at the Hague, the French, together with the Belgians, created a special naphtha trust in order to be able to turn the balance between the Standard Oil and the Royal Dutch.

Kemal Pasha now throws his sword into the scale. That, of course, throws the scales out of balance, and behind the curtain of the naphtha trusts there is in all probability a new conflict smouldering. Every one will grab as much as he can. The question remains,—what connector has all this with the fight for the Straits.

IV.

In the same number of *Reconstruction* an anonymous author in his article. "On the political aspect of the naphtha question", after relating the history of the attempt of the English and American naphtha trusts to come to an agreement, writes to the effect that the naphtha peace is concluded and that the San Remo treaty is buried, but that unfortunately, this non-official treaty had not received the form of an official treaty between America and the Allies, but that it was possible to effect such a treaty; that France and Great Britain must perceive the fallacy of the doctrine that commercial supremacy over naphtha constituted the deciding factor in preparedness for war; France would reap no advantages even from the possession of the Roumanian naphtha wells, for in the event of war she would not have the necessary naval and military control over Roumania and the Bosphorus. England could also draw no advantages from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, if she did not retain the Persian Gulf in her possession. It was not naphtha that assured military and naval supremacy but the reverse.

This is a paradox, for military and naval domination require naphtha for the engines of the fleet, for the automobiles and for the aeroplanes. This paradox however, contains the profound truth, that after the seizure of the Roumanian and Mesopotamian naphtha wells, England and France need possession of the Straits. With regard to Roumanian naphtha it is obvious that this will be conveyed through the Straits. And as regards the naphtha in Mesopotamia, the pipes will have to be laid through Syria.

In this way the control of the Straits is of constant interest to English and French imperialism, and if England will appease the Americans, America will also support the demand that the Straits shall be in the hands of the Allies. This answers the question why England, immediately after the sharpening of the Near Eastern conflict, turned to the United States, and why Mr. Hughes declared after his conversation with the English ambassador, that the control over the Straits must be a *real* control.

If France and America wish to steal the English naphtha wells, the occupation of Mozul by Turkish troops and the prolongation of the crisis of the Straits which keeps England in danger of war is advantageous to them. If they come to an understanding however, they will then turn the whole front against Turkey.

Turkey acts rightly when she takes advantage of the conflicts among the naphtha trusts, but she must not forget that the sole guarantee that she will not be sacrificed to the oil kings, lies in her own strength and in the strength of the peoples who constitute the bone of contention of the naphtha magnates. The naphtha of the Caucasus plays an important part in the struggle of the Allies with the Soviet Power. The naphtha front of international capital must be opposed with the united front of those peoples for whom naphtha is the only means of defence against the international capitalist yoke.

POLITICS

The End of the Austrian Democracy

By Victor Stern (Vienna).

The Geneva Convention.

The Austrian proletariat is again under the necessity of reaching a decision of serious consequence. The acceptance or refusal of the conditions imposed at Geneva by the League of Nations — conditions upon which depends the granting of credits to Austria — will be decided by them.

The bourgeoisie of Vienna will sacrifice without any hesitation its ideal of national independence. Dignity, honor? — old fables! Profit alone counts. They hope better to be able to exploit labor in an Austria colonized by the Entente. What more do they need?

The proletariat stands therefore alone in the defense of the last vestiges of Austrian independence, — and above all of its own liberty. The Geneva convention can not set itself up against its will. At this moment it is the determining force of its own destinies.

The Geneva convention is the reply to chancellor Seipel, who went about offering the Austrian Republic to Prague, to Berlin, to Rome, seeking to evade by this venal action the greed and competition of the neighboring states. But none of these

states were disposed to run the risk of war, for the sake of a right of sovereignty over suffering Austria. Thus has it been decided that Austria become a "common colony" of British and French imperialism, and Austria is asked to accede with all its good will.

The Slip-Knot.

The Geneva agreement consists of three sections signed by M. Seipel, and which are now to be ratified by the Austrian Parliament. The first gives away the independence of Austria. The second defines the engagements assumed by England, France, Italy, Czecho-Slovakia, etc. The third treats of the conditions upon which aid will be accorded to Austria.

The states which grant this help, begin by declaring that they do not intend to contribute in any way to the promised credits. On the contrary, they demand the repayment of their advances, from the credits Austria may get. They concede to Austria only the right to resort to private credit, up to the limit of 650,000,000 gold crowns; the parliaments of the benefactor states will be invited to guarantee these loans. Austria, however, before knowing whether she will be granted credits, or whether these loans will be really guaranteed, must submit to the conditions imposed upon her.

They are hard. We do not believe that any like conditions have ever been imposed upon a civilized people. They mean for Austria the renunciation of all external political independence. All hope of again being united with Germany must be abandoned. The menace of suicide, lavishly put forth by M. Seipel, is rudely outlawed.

Austria engages herself not to concede to any state any economic advantage. The All-Mighty engage themselves to demand nothing of her *individually*. That means that Austria is to become a *collective* colony.

But it is the third section which proves the truth of the mockery of "political independence" granted to unhappy Austria.

The principal clause of this document is the obligation imposed upon the Austrian government to present on demand (and this is binding upon any government liable to succeed the present one) the right for two years to take without consent of parliament, all measures necessary to stabilize and balance the budget. Which means the re-establishment of absolutism for two years. Besides which, the Austrian government agrees to increase the taxes for the services of the State, and the prices of monopolies, especially of that of tobacco. Finally it agrees to work out a program of fiscal reforms. These three conditions must first be acceded to before the promised credits are even guaranteed . . .

The first crushes without discussion the last vestiges of democracy in Austria. Even reactionary Hungary does not accord such powers to her dictator. The second and third conditions indicate with all clearness who will henceforth be the real governors of Austria. These will consist of a Commission of Control in which each of the four contracting states will have twenty votes, twenty other votes being reserved to the states which will eventually accede to the agreement (Switzerland, Poland). This commission will regulate the details of the grant of credits to Austria and their repayment. But it will have for its principal task the surveillance of the new absolute ruler of the country, the Commissioner-General, to be appointed by the League of Nations.

As for the Austrian government, it will not be able to spend a single cent without supervision. The new *Bank of Emission* will be completely independent of it. Money received, destined to cover the loans, will be deposited in a special account kept by the Commissioner General. The government renounces the right to issue notes and to contract loans. If the securities which the Austrian government furnishes (regulation of tobacco, import duties, etc.) should appear insufficient, the Commission of Control will take others. To crown it all, the Commissioner General "will cooperate" in the working out and the execution of the program of fiscal reform . . .

Are we exaggerating when we say that never has a country been so stifled?

The Parties for the Strangulation of Austria.

The bourgeois press of Vienna displays the most active enthusiasm. The *Social-Christians*, in the majority in parliament, are celebrating the huge success of their chief of State, M. Seipel. The *Pan-Germans*, grieved by the check on their hopes, "do not wish", they say, "to oppose the salvation of their Fatherland" . . . The bourgeoisie, in a word, looks with favor upon the opportunity of getting rid of a democracy which has become importunate, and to erect in its place a solid and profitable dictatorship.

The *Social-Democracy* is silent. The *Arbeiterzeitung*, says that "the Geneva Convention deserves serious examination". The

Entente, as you see, was wrong to abandon brutally its methods of persuasion. The Central Committee of the Party cannot take upon itself the choice between serfdom and death, and calls therefore, a convention for the 14th of October. What a mean personage is this Mr. Seipel! And that is all the action that the *Social-Democracy* takes.

One thing is certain: the Social-Democracy will not be the one to give the signal for a struggle against our enslavement. The greatest audacity which we may expect from it will be a fictitious opposition. It is more probable that it intends to enter the coalition government to disguise the coming dictatorship. But the preliminary overthrow of Mr. Seipel would be necessary; and the *Social-Christians* are not the kind of people to let themselves be taken in.

Our Program.

The Communist Party of Austria remains then the only one to combat the odious Geneva Convention. It is not difficult to prove that our choice does not lie between acceptance and perdition; for the *Austrian proletariat, acceptance would mean both perdition and enslavement*. The fulfillment of the guarantee clauses, even in case of the grant of credits, would inevitably bring about an unemployment crisis. Is there no other solution? Our party affirms the contrary. There are in Austria private fortunes whose magnitude by far surpasses the 650,000,000 gold crowns for which the present government is willing to sell out our democracy, our national independence, and what is more, the future of the proletariat. The alternative, says the Communist Party of Germany, is this: Enslavement and hunger, or imposition of sacrifices upon the possessing classes. The capitalist regime of Austria is in full decomposition; credit or no credit, it is condemned to death. A Communist regime is the only real solution; but until the day when the victory of the proletariat will bring this about, the working class must defend in daily struggle its last liberties and its last piece of bread. How? By imposing the necessary burdens upon the rich.

The Duty of the International.

In this situation, a definite duty falls upon the international proletariat. French, English, Italian, Czecho-Slovakian workers must make themselves heard. Their governments have engaged upon an underground war of conquest against the Austrian proletariat, with the support of the Austrian bourgeoisie. International Communism must come to the help of the workers of this country. The impression upon the Social-Democratic workers, if they are supported by the much abused International Revolutionary Party, will be great.

Let not the International working class lose sight of its vital interest in Central Europe. The reaction is on the point of conquering a strong position of the first order. In its struggle against the insolent encroachments of the Entente high finance, the Austrian working class counts upon the help of the International.

The Kato Government and its Policy towards Soviet Russia

By Sen Katayama.

In order to explain the present Kato Government, it is necessary to give the Japanese financial and industrial aspect under which the previous Takahashi government struggled to keep its head up. Many things caused the fall of the Takahashi government. Takahashi only became Premier because of the assassination of Premier Hara, the real head of the government and long-standing leader of the majority party, *Seiukai*. Hara's government, subsequently Takahashi's was a party government and commanded the absolute majority of the Lower House. Hara's cabinet was formed on September 29, 1918,—the memorable year of great uprisings in the shape of rice riots.

The policy of the Takahashi government was always *expansion in every field*. It sought to keep up industrial, commercial and export trade along the lines pursued by Japan during the war. Its national finance policy was to keep the prices of commodities high, thus artificially stimulating industry. The export of gold is still prohibited.

Takahashi's government found itself in a financial and industrial deadlock. For the last 2 years export trade was steadily falling off, unemployment increasing and industry shrinking. As export trade fell, import trade proportionally increased, so that industries received a hard blow.

The Takahashi government kept up the expansion policy in armament and, moreover, kept a big army in Siberia and along the border territories of Korea, Manchuria, and even in the mainland of China. As the government expenditures increased,

industry went down. The only way open was to increase taxation and with the funds thus raised to meet the increasing expenditures. But, under the circumstances, to do this was absolutely impossible.

At that time the Washington Conference was called, and as a result, Japan began to reduce her navy, and thereby gained a short breathing spell. But, after all, this navy reduction will not save the country. Japan must either face financial bankruptcy or adopt a stringent retrenchment policy.

The people became tired of the Takahashi ministry. It had concealed many acts of mischief, and, as I said before, found itself financially entangled. But the Takahashi ministry commanded the absolute majority in the Lower House, and tried to push its own bad policy in spite of all.

Takahashi wanted 3 of his ministers to resign, to enable him to reorganize his cabinet and to continue his Premiership. But the 3 ministers he tried to induce to resign were stubborn and insisted on the resignation of the whole cabinet. This was the cause of the failure of Takahashi's ministry.

Takahashi resigned on June 6, 1922.

The next, present government was formed by Admiral Kato, who has been Secretary of the Navy since 1915. He assumed this post under the Okuma government and kept it during Terauchi's, Hara's, and Takahashi's ministries. He was called upon to form a new cabinet and to assume the premiership because of his success at the Washington Conference, but chiefly because, due to the Siberian invasion by the Japanese army, the army clique became rather unpopular. Kato represents the great capitalist interests of Japan and is supported by the capitalists of the country. He formed a cabinet in three days after he was called to take the premiership.

Individually, the members of Kato's ministry are able and progressive men. The majority of them come from the Upper House of the national legislature, and they are men belonging to parties in the Upper House. But they have no backing among the people; they represent the monied class in the Upper House.

Of course, the *Seiukai*, which is the present majority party of the Lower House, will tacitly support the Kato government, because the *Seiukai* rather selfishly gave the government to Kato instead of constitutionally giving it to the opposition party, the *Kenseikai*. The *Kenseikai* is the minority party in the Lower House, but *Seiukai* claims in principle to be the first party government. Premier Takahashi advised the Mikado to call in Admiral Kato instead of Viscount Kato, the head of *Kenseikai*. This act made the *Seiukai* unpopular, and Kato was attacked together with Genro who had helped him to become Premier.

Quite a strong movement has been organized by the opposition party against Kato's government, but Kato's government is supported by the money class. As Kato has been the Minister of Navy, his ministry represents the Navy clique,—the Satsuma group. As soon as he entered the government the stock exchange experienced a boom.

The main reason why Kato's ministry came into power is the fact it had a tacit agreement with the *Seiukai*, with which it must compromise in order to conduct its national policy.

In order to escape Takahashi's fate, and to meet the present situation there is only one way out for Kato's ministry, and that is the reduction of national expenditures. These policies were proposed which, if adopted, would save Kato's ministry and the country.

1. Extensive reduction of armaments and immediate evacuation of Siberia and other parts of Asia,—Manchuria and China. The readjustment of administration so as to cut down the national budget.
2. To raise the embargo on gold.
3. Declaration of the government of its intention not to borrow any more money for government expenses.

If Kato's government is able to do these 3 things, it may continue to exist in spite of the opposition parties. The next point on the agenda is the evacuation of Siberia. To be sure, the Army clique does not like the idea, but the last parliament did not make any appropriation for the extension of the Siberian invasion, and besides, sentiment is against continued occupation. The cry for immediate evacuation of Siberia and China is raised not only by the people at large, but more especially by the workers. A strong demand comes from the capitalist class, especially those connected with commerce and industry in the Far East.

Whether the present government will be able to accomplish this is rather doubtful. One thing is certain however; it will favor the capitalist class and work for capitalist interests at the expense of the workers.

Evacuation of Siberia was urged by all classes except the army clique, but for the time being, the army clique is powerless

before the demands of big capital and the people. So now, the evacuation, so many times pledged, promised, and announced, but never executed, will be finally carried out. The government announced however, that it will retain a small force in northern Sakhalin, but this act is opposed by the people also.

The government strove to make a big issue of the Nikolai-evsk episode, but the Japanese public knew that the Japanese army authorities were the ones responsible for the Nikolaievsk affair.

Furthermore, Japan wants to negotiate, not only with the Far Eastern Republic, but also with Soviet Russia, because, in the first place, Japan must cut down her national expenses, and secondly she wants trade with Soviet Russia. The commercial interests of Japan which carried on a lively trade with Russians before and during the war, and whose activities were interrupted on account of the Siberian invasion by Japan, are all clamoring for resumption of trading relations with Soviet Russia.

As to the inner policy of the Kato ministry:

The reactionary character of the Kato government is revealed by its refusal to introduce the universal suffrage bill.

Its main support within the country, the Seiukai Party, is also losing favor. In the recent city election in Tokio, the Seukai only won 23 out of 88 members for the city council; the other 55 were elected from the Kenseikai and Kiekaminkai. With the failing influence of the Seiukai, the present government will not live very long.

IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Extract from Comrade Trotsky's Speech at the 5th All-Russian Congress of the Textile Workers

Comrades! I am fortunate, as I only returned to Moscow yesterday, to be able to greet your 5th All-Russian Congress which met on the eve of the fifth anniversary of our revolution and of the Soviet Republic.

We can in no way claim that the greatest dangers, still less, that the greatest economic difficulties are overcome.

During these five years we have experienced much, attempted much; failed in much, but also learned much. We have renounced none of our revolutionary tasks, during these five years we have lost none of our conviction and of our readiness for struggle; but we have grown maturer; we consider circumstances more profoundly, and we hope that in the next five years we shall commit less errors.

Of course, during this period we committed the greatest mistakes in the field of elementary military self-defence.

At Genoa we proposed: "Let us disarm!"

As you know, however, at Genoa they refused even to place this proposal upon the agenda, and even those governments refused which have unceasingly reproached us with our "militarism". From this we had to draw the logical conclusions: we maintained our army; we have 800,000 soliders under arms. That is a very great number for a hungry, cold and wasted country which is just beginning to recover. But for the time being we cannot abandon this policy.

In the Ukraine and in the Crimea the 1922 class of recruits has just been called. I was in the Crimea and travelled through the Ukraine, and all facts and documents testified that the full number of the 1922 group have responded to the summons. There are no desertions. The morale is excellent. There is no force or repression whatever. We still recollect how the first mobilization was carried out and we know what it means when the recruited workers and peasants in the Ukraine and the Crimea, which districts responded much later to the call of the October Revolution than did Moscow, Petrograd and the Central districts, are now responding voluntarily and eagerly. This means in the first place a very great advance in the political level of the peoples of our federation. They learn along with their power and know what our policy is and for what purpose we need our army. In the second place, this voluntary, even joyful enlisting of the youth proves that the relations between the working class and the masses of the peasants are also improving in these districts where the Soviet order is much more backward than it is with us in the centre, although in the centre it is very far from being perfect.

There is no doubt that the new economic policy is facilitating, nay, is making possible the mutual understanding of the working class and the peasant masses. In this new economic policy which we often describe as the bond between the workers

and the peasant, the textile worker is the link that binds the worker to the peasant. In fact, this bond begins with that mass of articles of necessity required by the peasants. And the whole question of our future destiny depends upon whether we shall succeed—and I do not doubt that we shall succeed—in supplying the peasant with what he needs, and in ever better quality and at ever cheaper prices.

If but yesterday and the day before, the fate of Soviet Russia depended entirely upon our munition stores and upon our infantry and cavalry barracks, today the fate of Soviet Russia will be determined before all at the congresses of our industrial organizations and our economic organs. I might say that the existence or nonexistence of the Russian Socialist Soviet Republic depends upon these trifles

The question is whether we can deliver to the peasants this or that article in greater quantities and at cheaper prices, and whether we can prove to him that Socialism gives him these things, that the proletarian state is capable of giving him all these things.

If we prove that, we shall have succeeded all along the line.

Although the centre of gravity is passing over to the economic sphere, and although the textile workers form at the present moment the connecting link between the proletariat and the peasantry, we must not neglect the work and care for the army and navy.

We can point to great successes on the military field. We have for the first time carried out manoeuvres by which we are able to test our army and our business management. This test shows that there are still great faults and failings, but notwithstanding, the success is enormous.

I witnessed the rebirth of our Red Navy. Our Navy was crippled; but since foreign ships came to Odessa and Kronstadt with impunity, and were able to threaten with ultimatums and to bombard Odessa (the same thing happened in Novorossisk during the evacuation of the whites), we came to the conclusion that in any case we needed a minimum fleet, not of course for the purpose of any kind of colonial robbery. We are not England; we never for a moment think of capturing colonies, of dominating other peoples; we are only concerned with the protection of our coasts. So long as our enemies threaten us, we are compelled to maintain our armed forces and the Red Navy.

In the Baltic our Red fleet has recently carried out manoeuvres, and in the Black Sea I saw the training of our Black Sea fleet. The whole of the European press spoke of the rebirth of our navy under these difficult circumstances as of a wonder, and now they naturally cry out about our militarism. Only the other day, at Genoa, we proposed disarmament. Did we perhaps hope that they would disarm? No! We have had sufficient experience in this respect. We proposed to the robbers that they lay aside the knife, and we said to them in the politest manner: Begin and we shall follow! . . . course the robbers refused. We began to partially demobilize our army, but to raise its quality and at the same time to rebuild our Red Navy.

Five minutes before I came here, I had a conversation with M. Herriot, a French radical bourgeois. Herriot was at one time a minister and he will again be a French minister, perhaps president. We spoke over politics, over the possibility of an economic rapprochement and over many other things, while beneath our windows, the soldiers marched by, singing "For our Soviet Power" . . . The window panes shook. *I must tell you that these sounds made a much deeper impression upon my visitor than all the explanations I gave him.* Therefore I call upon you comrades not to reduce your kindly interest in the Red Army and the Red Navy.

The greatest question of international development has not yet been solved. The breaking up of the old imperialist groups and the inner decomposition of the capitalist countries continues without interruption. Perhaps slower than we wished, but every wish demands patience. The general line of development is proceeding as we predicted and as we expected; it cannot be otherwise. And this question is of the highest importance for the trade unionists.

The Russian Mensheviks with Martov at the head take up clearly and unambiguously the following position: "Return to capitalism, give back the factories and workshops"—and what then? Then the Mensheviks promise to defend the eight hour day and the interests of the working class in capitalist Russia. In order to give them the opportunity of proving their virtues as a labor party the factories, the workshops and mines, even the land is to be given back to the exploiters.

We are passing through difficult times. We have to overcome difficulties; perhaps we must also reckon with the discontent of the workers, as we frequently saw with regard to finance and raw materials; all this will often occur. And the

Mensheviks often take advantage of these difficulties. They set up the program: we are for the Soviet State, for Socialism, but against the Eolshevik errors and we advise you, the masses, to demand this and that and to exert pressure in this or that matter. With this program they could, in former days, convince a part of the working class; but now, for the fifth anniversary of the Soviet Republic, the Mensheviks bring us a precious gift: the program of "Back to Capitalism". This makes it possible for you to take up with the greatest clearness the fight in the labor movement against any attempt of the Mensheviks to get a firm foothold in the trade unions.

But we also make concessions to capitalism. They say to us: "you are making concessions to capital; now make concessions to us Mensheviks, since we are the accomplices of capitalism. Yes we are making concessions to capitalism because it is still strong, but our task is to weaken it. Our end is Socialism, and in order to be able to strangle capital we must first strangle the Mensheviks and that,—in the shortest time.

I conclude with what I began. We have now become much more cautious; we weigh everything much more carefully, although many a Soviet scale is deceptive. But if we compare our present situation with that of the year 1918, we will see that we have added, besides the grey hairs some of us have on our heads also something in our heads: we have learned much and we have become much more prudent.

There are still many difficulties, and the best way to overcome these difficulties is: *to maintain, by means of the trade unions, the closest contact with the broadest masses of the people.* And in this respect the textile workers form the advance guard. Your union is not only the link, but also the barometer of the relations between the workers and the peasants of the advanced section of the proletariat and the backward masses of the people.

I do not doubt that the forthcoming 6th year of our existence, will, if no war intervene, be marked by the rebirth of industry; not a feverish, rapid development, but gradually, step by step. The trade unions will grow larger and stronger, and will lead all energetic, all vital, active, self-sacrificing elements of the working masses.

The role of the trade unions in the near future will be very great, and we hope that in the event of our needing the Red Army and Navy we shall have a youth that shall have previously passed the school of the labor organizations, of the trade unions. That the trade unions are parts of the army is only a symbol of the fact that our working class will in the future take over the lead of the Workers' and Peasants' state in all spheres in an ever greater measure than was the case during the past five years. In token of these tasks and of these prospects I extend to you my greetings.

The Communist University of Omsk.

By N. Ch. (Omsk).

The Communist University of Omsk was founded in 1919, a short while after the defeat of Koltchak. At the beginning of its activity, the studies lasted only nine months; from this year on they will last two years. From 1919 up to today, the University of Omsk has given Siberia almost 2,000 militants prepared to work for the Party and the Soviets.

Situated in the center of the city, in a modern building, it is provided with a rich library. A zoological institution and a social science section will be annexed this year. The University published a revue, *l'Oeuvre prolétarienne*, edited principally by the students. The latter, while pursuing their studies, work also outside the University, as a rule in the various sections of the Party. Since last year their material condition has improved. The boarding-school is quite comfortable. The University has its shoe and clothing shops, its laundry, its bakery. In a general way it is self-sufficient, and the young people attending it are initiated by actual practice into all varieties of manual labor.

THE UNITED FRONT

The United Proletarian Front

Working class strategy and tactics. — Let us not be frightened by words. — The formation of the French Party. — The Advance Guard and the Masses. — What our Party should be.

By Albert Treint (Paris).

The united proletarian front is a strategy and tactic of the working class for the purpose of achieving a decisive victory against the bourgeois power. In certain sections of the French

Party, contaminated by social-humanitarian pacifism, one shrinks from every expression of the military. The seizure of power by the working class, preliminary condition to the establishment of a Communist regime, cannot be realized except by the proletarian victory in an armed clash with the enemy classes. For those who are conscious of the necessity of revolutionary violence, military comparison will hold no shock. The International and the associated parties engaged in the struggle, frequently use military terms: proletarian front, advance-guard, alliance, objective to achieve, capitalist offensive, proletarian defensive and counter-offensive. In order to make the misled workers behind Renouid understand the tactics of the International, Zinoviev, in a recent article, compared the bourgeoisie to a citadel, besieged by revolutionary troops. Even in our own working class movement, each time that there is an allusion to the use of violence in the struggle between the classes, military terms rise quite naturally to the lips of the militants. Did not Quesnel, militant syndicalist, just say to the strikers of Havre, when the decision to return to work was taken, "War in the open is finished, war in the trenches is about to begin."

Whatever may be the character of human struggles, they are governed by general principles of strategy and tactics, upon the observance of which depends victory.

Many workers have taken part in the World War. They have had experience of these things. Proletarian strategy and tactics are rendered more intelligible to a great number of workers, by comparisons of military order. It is good pedagogy to review these comparisons.

Theoretically, the Communist Party should be a selected formation of the working class, with a view to the creation for the revolutionary struggle, of an advance-guard, officers and generals. The French Communist Party is not such an organization. Like many other parties, it has evolved historically from the sources of old Socialist organizations. It has conserved many of their defects. It has not as yet succeeded in assimilating all the best elements of the revolutionary unions. Historically, the French Communist Party tends by repeated evolutionary approaches, to lead to the ideal Communist Party. That is the essential.

To simplify, I shall take up the tactics of a concerted front in the case of a perfect Communist Party. I shall thus succeed in outlining a clear tactical and strategic plan. This plan naturally, will have to be reshaped in order to apply to whatever circumstances, more or less complex, exist in different countries. But the essential fundamentals of the plan exist in all cases. The theory of the united front may be considered as a system formed of flexible lines. This system can be transplanted without fundamental alterations from the theoretical plan to the surface, more or less agitated, of national lands, and can be adapted to them exactly.

The workers' army has its advance-guard in the Communist Party. The main body of this army is formed by the workers' organizations and by the unorganized proletariat. The role of an advance-guard is to determine the boundaries of the enemy, to watch him, to determine his powers of resistance. That can only be done by having contact with the enemy in battle. But an advance-guard should never battle alone. It would only subject itself uselessly to annihilation, and would betray the remainder of the army, demoralized by terror, to the hands of the enemy. Such is the history of the March action in Germany. The advance-guard should not engage in battle until the bulk of the army rejoins it on the battle front.

The Communist Party, however, should not only play the role of advance-guard. It should also organize its connections with the entire working class, instil the workers with confidence by the practical propositions for the struggle which it makes to other working class organizations. When the troops of these formations have to compel their chiefs to lead them to the battle front, the Communist Party should not only denounce these leaders as traitors, but also be ready to replace them by Communist officers. These officers should not impose themselves mechanically by any arrogant discipline. They can only draw their authority from the warm-hearted confidence of workers determined to give battle.

Finally the Communist Party should show itself capable of directing the course of the proletarian struggle. It should appear capable of furnishing the generalship of the victory. The word generalship does not here imply any haughty superiority for some, and humiliating subordination for others. The general struggle of the proletariat on all the battle front can only be carried on with a minimum of losses and a maximum of efficiency if it is coordinated. It can only be coordinated by the existence of a coordinating organism. This is therefore only division of labor which is the necessary condition for the workers' victory. The proletarian front is not established by the arbitrary will of the working class, or the Communist Party. The proletarian front is the geometrical plane where the struggle for the eight hour day and the maintenance of existing wages

takes place. This fighting may take place at any point along the workers' battle field: the mills, the mines, the North, Havre, etc. The Communist Party should seek to utilize all these struggles to lead the entire working class to the united proletarian front of the combat. But it should only precipitate the decisive battle with all forces combined.

In the fight on the front, the most humble soldier realizes that back of the wrestle, there is in the background an entire enemy organization of which the center of command is called the bourgeois power. The experience of the struggle on the united workers' battle line, will cause to be born in the souls of even the most backward workers, the will to break this power of the bourgeoisie and to organize the land conquered from the bourgeoisie, by the creation of a Soviet exercising the ruthless dictatorship of the proletariat against the scattered enemy. As soon as these detachments will be reduced to powerlessness, the proletarian army occupying the territory of the capitalist regime, will build step by step, by passing through the various phases of state capitalism and Socialism, a Communist system.

With the establishment in the entire world of a society without classes, will disappear the imperial rivalries and the wars of revolutionary defense. Then only shall we sing of peace. At this point, I shall leave quite willingly certain comrades to cope with the troubles of the "unrepentant captains".

Renoult one day accused the Communist International of carrying on the moral disarmament of the proletariat for the strange reason that it was calling the workers to battle on the united front of their class. He was offering at the same time the hospitality of the columns of our Parisian paper, *L'Internationale*, to humanitarian pacifism. It is he who by such means, was contributing to the real work of morally disarming the proletariat.

In France we know that our party is still not perfectly communistic, that many communist forces are outside of it in the unions. We take into account this situation. And at the same time, we shall work to create a Communist Party which will suffice for the syndicalist communists, not without telling them however, dear comrade Monatte, that their entrance into the Communist Party, even as it is to-day, would help it to strive to become a real party, and would hasten the achievement of its tasks.

PAGES OF HISTORY

The Revolutionary Movement of the Past

By M. Prokovski.

The Czarist government and its historians maintained the legend that Russia being the most backward country of the world, revolution originated only in the most recent time under the influence of Western ideas. In reality, however, Russia since the 16th century was the most restless, the most revolutionary country Europe. From the middle of the 16th to the beginning of the 19th century every Russian government lived as if upon a volcano.

Only with the beginning of the 19th century had absolutism gained a tolerably firm foothold, precisely at the time when it is stated the revolutionary movement had begun. The revolutionary outbreaks of the first three quarters of the 19th century constituted no serious danger to Czarism. Only on the 1st of March, 1881, when Alexander II. was assassinated, was the possibility of a new outbreak recalled, and only in the 20th century there broke forth the new catastrophe which has swept into the glowing abyss not only the last absolute government, but also the bourgeois pseudo-democracy which arose on its ruins.

One fact will suffice to portray the relatively strong revolutionary nature of old Russia. During the period of the disintegration of absolutism and the rise of early capitalism every European country had its peasant revolution,—France the Jacquerie, England the rebellion of Wat Taylor, Bohemia the Hussite War, Germany the Great Peasants' War of the 16th century. Every country had such a revolution.

Russia, however in the corresponding period of her economic development (which with us occurred during the 17th to 18th centuries) passed through four revolutions, three in Greater Russia—the so-called "insurrectorial period", at the beginning of the 17th century, the revolt of Stepan Razin, 1670—1671, and the Pugatchev Insurrection 1773—1774. The first overthrew a number of governments one after the other, the last came near to doing so. Katharine had no more dangerous rival than Pugatchev. Thereupon came the fourth violent and successful revolution in South-Western Russia (in Ukraine 1648 to 1654),—

the revolt of Bogdan Chmelnitzki who put an end to the Polish rule in this province. This marked the beginning of the disintegration of old Poland.

What is the explanation of this exceedingly strong revolutionary excitability of the Russian people? Certainly not the national character of the Russians. The "national character" explains nothing, but itself needs explaining.

The revolutionary character of the Russian people is to be explained by the peculiarities of their economic development. In the 14th century, when in Western Europe mercantile capital was already springing into existence, crafts and industries were flourishing and the national state with its bureaucracy, money taxes and standing army arose, Russia remained fast in the midst of feudalism. This was the so-called *fief epoch* of Russian history.

Under the assaults of European mercantile capital, which had forced its way into this wild country,—at first through Novgorod in the shape of the Hensa merchants, then to Moscow in the shape of the Italians who at the end of the 15th century built the Kremlin at Moscow, and finally in the shape of the English who in 1553 discovered the great sea route to Russia via Archangel.

In the 17th century the English were succeeded by the Dutch, the teachers of Peter the Great.

Under the burning rays of this rising sun of capitalism, Russian feudalism melted like snow in the spring. That which in England was the consequence of a slow, continued and persistent struggle in different places, in Russia, rapidly purged by its native capitalism, arose at one stroke throughout the whole country. The open country had no time in which to adapt itself to the new economic regime. The landowner who in Russia more than anywhere else was an instrument of original accumulation, intoxicated with a greed for profits entirely unknown to his grandfather, at times plundered the peasants in the literal sense of the word. Moscow wallowed in luxury whilst the villages became acquainted with hunger. The peasants turned from one landowner to another and experienced everywhere the same fate. The more passive majority sold themselves as slaves for a piece of bread; the active minority foresook the frontiers of the country and formed free Cossack settlements which were equally dangerous to the neighbors and to the Moscow State.

The collisions between the State and the Cossacks of Eastern Russia were the signal for the first peasant revolution. The newly established state of merchant capitalists was weak and the victory went easily to the Cossacks. The peasants' revolt grew like wildfire and easily destroyed serfdom which was in its beginnings. The revolt had for its slogan: "*Abolish the masters and seize their land*". So ran the proclamations of the peasants' leader, *Bolotnikov*.

The mass of large landowners were abolished. But in Great Russia the peasants and Cossacks could not build up anything on the ruins of the feudal state. They had themselves no political ideal besides Czarism. In 1614, the Cossack army won the throne for the old feudal family of the Romanovs who immediately betrayed those who had obtained the throne for them. Under the first Romanovs the peasants were finally enslaved.

The Western Cossacks stood nearer to Europe and were more intelligent. The Moscow Czar had to be content for several decades with the role of superior feudal lord of the Ukraine. Gradually however, he acquired possession of it, and the Ukrainian peasants were dominated by the Senior Council of the Cossacks, who turned from leaders of the revolt into a real landowning class.

Razin's revolt occupied for several months the most important line of commercial communication of the Moscow State,—the Volga River. Razin's movement led to the first conscious peasant revolution. Razin was inspired with a certain tendency to replace the bureaucratic state by a peasants' republic with a Czar at the head. But the real Czar had an army at his disposal which was well armed and organized according to the best European methods. The Cossack troops had to capitulate before this army. On the 6th of June, 1671, Razin was executed in Moscow. Most of his comrades had been shot down before that time. With the conquest of Astrakhan some months later, the chief commercial routes were again in the hands of the state of commercial capitalists.

The following Cossack and Peasant revolution almost exactly 100 years after Razin's death, had a still more military bureaucratic character. It is characteristic that the Cossacks did not play the leading role in this revolution. The rebellion was dangerous to absolutism through the participation of the semi-proletarian workers in the Ural mines. The mines formed the industrial basis of Pugatchev who obtained ammunitions from there; but Pugatchev did not succeed in reaching Moscow. An

army was mobilized against the rebels which, according to the admission of Catherine had only been used against the strongest foreign enemy. Pugatchev's troops were defeated and on the 8th of January, 1775, he experienced in Moscow the fate of Razin.

The Pugatchev episode was the last Cossack and peasant revolution and the last great mass action in Russia before 1905. After that, serfdom consolidated itself and was only abolished in 1861 under the attack of a new wave of capitalism, coming from the West,—industrial capitalism. The expropriations that followed were answered by the peasants in a number of revolts (at least 2000 in the whole of Russia) but it did not come to a general revolution. These revolts however, were more dangerous for absolutism than the revolt of the bourgeois-liberal Decabrists (December 14th, 1825). The conspiracy of the Decabrists was of great importance for the development of the revolutionary ideology of the Russian intellectuals; in the history of the mass movements of Russia, however, it only occupies a minor position.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

A Menshevik Opinion on the S. R. Party

By J. Schaffir.

During the last trial against the S.R.'s, the Mensheviks united with Tchernov and other friends of Gotz, who had luckily escaped being brought to trial, to protest against the Bolshevik "justice burlesque", which was directed against all Socialists. Messrs. Abramovitch and Martov worked under full steam to publish appeals and declarations to the world proletariat against this unheard-of mockery of right and justice . . .

The trial has now come to an end. The sentences have been passed. Naturally, the Mensheviks do not at once stop their loud wails. We witnessed a few more hysterical attacks against Soviet Russia, for the protection of persecuted innocence represented by the S. R. Party. Still the Mensheviks are trying to set clearly the difference between themselves and their protégés; they withdraw from them, and even, who would have believed it, reveal the machinations of the S. R.'s.

There can of course be no talk of disclosures, since the Mensheviks are merely repeating what has already appeared at the Moscow Trial; but they do it in their own characteristic way.

In a leader of the *Socialist Herald* (Nr. 17, September 8th) the Mensheviks substantiate the truth of a series of the main charges against the accused. Messrs. Martov and Company throw special light upon the class character of the S. R. Party as it already appeared during the years 1917—1920. It appears that already in 1917 a right movement crystallized in the S. R. Party which represented the interests of the landowners. Further, that the policy of the leading groups in the Party was primarily determined by the pressure of the right wing.

The large landed peasantry was not the only social support of the S. R.'s. The Party of Tchernov and Gotz also found support in the urban democracy which after the October Revolution displayed a distinct bourgeois tendency.

To leave no doubt as to the bourgeois tendencies and their true class significance, the Mensheviks in the same article, characterize the class character of the October Revolution. They write as follows: "The October Revolution took place, and only could take place, because the majority of the active elements of the proletariat adopted the slogan of Bolshevism".

This characterization perhaps lacks clearness. But it leaves no doubt as to whether one can speak at all of a Socialist tendency in the S. R. Party. According to this article the S. R. P. is a purely petty bourgeois party which after the October Revolution took the side of the bourgeoisie and the Entente.

I think I hear already the indignant cries of the Mensheviks: What has the Entente to do with this? Why do you drag in the Entente? I will answer this question. In the above mentioned article, on the activity of the S. R.'s in 1918 to reestablish the Eastern front of the world war, we read: "Thereby (i. e., by the restoration of the Eastern front), the S. R. P. placed itself in a situation where the imperialist governments of the Entente and their natural allies, the Russian generals and the Russian bourgeois parties would necessarily be masters of the situation." We may express this somewhat more clearly; we are accustomed to call things by their right names, and we say: The S. R.'s are the lackeys of the Entente and of Czarist generals. The Mensheviks expressed the same thought in somewhat more complicated fashion. They say, the S. R.'s chose to conduct their struggle in a field where the Entente and the Czarist

generals would inevitably be masters of the situation. We see here no essential difference from what we said. Here is still another confession about the results of the Court's investigation:

"All the facts which appeared before the Moscow Tribunal, when cleared of the Bolshevik calumnious tendencies, must be recognized as a mistake of the defendants in the appreciation of the true forces at play, as a result of the unscrupulousness and selfishness of the bourgeois allies of the S. R. Party as well as of the inner weakness of that Party; that is, as a misfortune, not as a crime of the party. The military helplessness of the Constituent Committee, the emergency which necessitated compromises with the Cossack Durov, with the industrialists and with the Siberian reaction; the passage of the leadership of the S. R. Party Central Executive to the *Union for Rebirth*, in which Avksentiev and Argurov betrayed the Party and conspired with the Cadets against the S. R.'s; the pitiful intermezzo of the Ufa directorship which ended ingloriously with the Omsk downfall; the surrender of democratic, revolutionary principles by the directing organs of the Party in Kuban, the Ukraine, etc.,—all these facts had their foundation in the basic error of the hope for a general popular uprising against the Bolsheviks, with the help of the foreign Czecho-Slovakian power."

This very long and entangled sentence seems to be purposely so constructed as to hide from the ordinary reader the facts which the Mensheviks are now compelled to acknowledge publicly. We therefore recommend to our readers that they read this sentence carefully. The Mensheviks recognized that the opposition of the S. R.'s to the Soviet Power in 1918 is not an accidental crime, but the logical result of the attitude towards the October Revolution.

If we add that the letters of Tchernov published in the same number of the *Socialist Herald* acknowledge that the S. R. Party still stands upon the same basis, we then see clearly how true the judgment of the Mensheviks upon the activity of the S. R.'s in 1918 remains for their present position. But perhaps, this is only theoretically true; perhaps the S. R.'s have changed their tactics since 1918. The Mensheviks give a sufficiently clear answer to this question also, on the basis of the published documents of the Administrative Center. We wish to remark that Mr. Martov answered the recent question of the Mensheviks as to the position of the S. R.'s on the recently published documents, with a violent diatribe against Comrade Radek, adding that these documents had nothing to do with the S. R. Trial.

Untill recently the Menshevik leaders maintained the same attitude. But recently the organ of the Mensheviks comments as follows upon these documents: "These documents prove that in 1921, representative leaders of the Party in foreign countries conducted an active movement in the spirit of the *Union for Rebirth*, prepared intervention in masked form, adventurous Cossack revolts, and directed their whole activity not in the sense of the international workers' movement, but in that of the large and small states under control of the Russian capitalists."

These words prove that Messrs. Abramovitch, Martov and Company, in spite of their mad campaign of calumny which they developed around the S. R. Trial, are now forced to acknowledge the truth of a whole series of charges which the Revolutionary Tribunal brought against the Party of Tchernov and Gotz.

And now the question: Why were these gentlemen so excited during the proceedings? Why do they fall into such rage at the mention of the verdict of the Revolutionary Tribunal? Is it purely out of humanitarian grounds? We believe that we have here something more serious than a mere emotional expression of petty-bourgeois sentimental ideology.

The defense of the S. R.'s by the Mensheviks is primarily explained by the fact that the Mensheviks see in the S. R.'s allies in the fight against the Soviet Power. The Mensheviks, in spite of their Marxian phraseology, are forced, like the S. R.'s to seek their support among the large landed peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie. The conviction expressed in this same article that a certain portion of the S. R. Party will be acceptable to the Mensheviks for the coming fight for the "rights of people", is not without basis. The political ties of Mensheviks and S. R.'s are long known, and it is useless to insist upon it. It is merely of interest to point out that Messrs. Tchernov and Gotz, the defenders of the S. R. Party are now forced to acknowledge the truth of our main charges against the S. R.'s.

One must wonder that Martov and Co., in spite of their realization that the S. R.'s have played and are still playing the role of agents of the Entente, are still filling the world with their loud demands: "Save the innocent S. R.'s, these worthy knights of democracy and Socialists!" . . .