

R. Palme Dutt: Down with the British War on China!

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 10

28th January 1927

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

CONTENTS

N. Bukharin: The International Situation and the Inner Situation in the Soviet Union.

Woroshilov: The Policy of Encircling the Soviet Union and the Red Army.

Hands off China.

R. Palme Dutt: Down with the British War on China!

Politics.

Paul Marion: The Senate Elections in France.

N. N.: Letter from Italy.

J. B.: New Fights in Syria.

The Trial of Rákosi and his Comrades.

The Result of the Rákosi Trial before the Court of Appeal.

The Proceedings of the Rákosi Trial before the Court of Appeal.

Against the Persecution of the Leaders of the Hungarian Working Class.

Union of Soviet Republics.

Prof. Alexandrov: The Construction of the Dniepr Power Works.

For Leninism.

N. Lenin: Our Programme.

The Youth Movement.

Appeal of the Young Communist International against American Imperialism.

The White Terror.

Traces of White Terror in Roumania.

Third Anniversary of Lenin's Death.

The Decisions of the VII. Enlarged Executive of the C. I. from the Leninist Viewpoint.

The International Situation and the Inner Situation in the Soviet Union.

**Report of Comrade N. I. Bukharin
at the XV. Moscow Government Party Conference.**

I. Commercial Interests and the Fear of Revolution. Preparations for an Attack on the Soviet Union.

1. THE PROBLEM OF MARKETS AND PROFITS.

The "Russian problem"

It has long been recognised that the relations of the capitalist states to the Soviet Union are determined by two main factors: In the first place by the necessity, if only a relative necessity, for the capitalist states, of maintaining commercial relations with us, and in the second place by the fear that our Soviet Union may become such a mighty and powerful factor that it will awaken and organise the process of international proletarian revolution, and with this the revolution among the oppressed colonial peoples.

Although the attitude thus inspired has remained the same during the whole period of our existence, and has been adopted from the beginning by the capitalist states surrounding us, at the present time these two factors, and the resultant contradictory position of the capitalist countries, are being rendered more acutely conspicuous by the development of the present epoch than has hitherto been the case. This may be explained by the fact that the main economic problem of the capitalist world at the present time is the ever increasing difficulty in finding markets. Capitalism, in its efforts to maintain that partial stabilisation in the leading capitalist countries, so often the subject of discussion of late, is confronted first of all by the problem of finding markets.

We only need to cast a glance at the situation in many of the capitalist countries, and there is no difficulty in recognising the acute stage now reached by the capitalist world in its endeavours to open up new markets for capitalist production, to obtain fresh sources of raw materials, and to discover new possibilities of investment for superfluous capital.

Let us take the largest imperialist country, the United States of North America. Here we observe a phenomenon which has been accorded the semi-belletristic designation of "gold fatty degeneration", aptly describing a condition of super-accumulation, and the existence of free capital to an extent widely surpassing anything hitherto experienced in previous stages of development of American capitalism. A partial, but extremely characteristic illustration of economic conditions in the United States of North America is given by the enormous and unparalleled fall in the price of cotton, with its attendant hunt for new markets. This over production of cotton represents one of the greatest and most important phenomena arising out of the present economic situation.

In the European countries we observe as a most striking economic factor the extensive "restriction" of the home markets, accompanied by an increased producing capacity in the industrial apparatus, resulting in an enormous degree of enforced short-time work in the industrial undertakings. This situation in the capitalist countries forces the capitalist bourgeoisie to exert their utmost powers to find means to maintain their position.

These efforts are taking the form of a sharper attack on the working class, a rationalisation of the process of production, the centralisation of this process, the amalgamation of the mighty industrial trusts with their closely interwoven interests, the process of organising and centralising industry being accompanied by a certain degree of "planned" distribution of the markets, in so far as any systematic planning is possible within the confines of capitalist economics. The process of trustification, and the attempts at agreements on the distribution of the markets, even drives the capitalists beyond the limits of their own countries. At the present time we are witnessing a number of attempts at forming international cartels and trusts. The first of these is the "steel cartel", participated in by the decisive factors for this branch of industry, the industrial undertakings of France and Germany.

When we approach the so-called "Russian problem", we must take into account the increasing acuteness of the difficulty in finding markets, for this is the key to the estimate made of us by the capitalist bourgeoisie at the present time, and to their intentions towards us.

In order to give an idea of the view taken of the "Russian question" from the capitalist standpoint, I must refer to a speech made by one of the greatest industrialists of Germany, Herr Deutsch, the chairman of the A. E. G. (General Electric Works), at the meeting of the Franco-German "Information Committee" held at the end of October last year. The most influential industrialists of France and Germany are members of the Franco-German Information Committee, and many of the savants and writers of both countries lend it their support. The committee is principally occupied with questions relating to the Franco-German rapprochement, that is, with questions of an economic nature. The passages relating to the Soviet Union in Herr Deutsch's speech are extremely interesting. I have endeavoured to summarise these various passages in the form of theses, and have arrived at the following interesting register of equivalent ideas:

1. "We are doing excellent business with Russia."
2. "Russia pays punctually in all transactions with us."
3. "If we, that is, the French and Germans, do not finance the growing industry of Russia, it will be financed by America."
4. "The raw material resources of Russia are immeasurable, and greatly resemble the raw material resources of America."
5. "These immeasurable resources of raw materials should be exploited, and here possibilities are opened out for a long future, since it is beyond doubt that Russia will reconstruct its industry producing articles of use, whilst 'higher grade goods' (by these Deutsch means the means of production) will continue to be exported from other countries to Russia, as has always been the case."

In other words: According to the plans of the German bourgeoisie, or at least of that section of it represented by the chairman of the A. E. G., the German bourgeoisie is calculating upon finding extensive markets in the Soviet Union, but on the

condition that we do not ourselves manufacture the means of production.

This speech of Herr Deutsch seems to me to be peculiarly characteristic, for it gives a fairly clear formulation of the expectations placed upon us by that section of the bourgeoisie whose interests are most served by international trade and by the firmer establishment of commercial relations with us, and of the attitude which they adopt towards us. It is easily comprehensible that the capitalist world is greatly tempted to look to the Soviet Union as a possible field of investment for superfluous capital, as a market for its goods, and as a source of supply for raw materials, and the burning problem of finding markets, both in Western Europe and America, makes this temptation the greater. And it is further obvious that not merely the emergencies of the moment, in the narrow sense of the term, are the basis of these capitalist calculations, but that their point of departure is rather a certain lengthy historical perspective. And though there are still a few elements existing whose hate and rage against the Soviet Union blinds their eyes to facts, and who cling to their belief that everything is going to ruin in Russia, the leaders of the bourgeois States are none the less fully aware, thanks to the fairly accurate information furnished by their own competent economists, that our affairs are by no means in such a disastrous condition. The bourgeoisie knows very well that we are on the eve of a very considerable economic advance, and that thus we are likely to play a very important rôle in the immediate future, at least in the capacity of buyers of goods from Western Europe, especially of the goods required for industrial equipment.

2. THE SOVIET UNION — THE SEAT OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION.

These prospects of "good business" with us dance before the eyes of the foreign bourgeoisie; but there are other prospects which dance before their eyes with equal persistence — prospects alarming from the bourgeois standpoint, and bound up with the fact that the Soviet Union is a mighty factor for the stirring up of international revolution. It is true that some strata of the bourgeoisie still entertain hopes of our "degenerating", of our being "absorbed by the large peasants" or "kulakised". These hopes rose high in the bourgeois world at the time when our Opposition was so conspicuous, and the action of the Opposition did much to fan the flame of bourgeois expectation. But hard facts have since forced the bourgeoisie to abandon these alluring visions, to recognise after their own manner the "position taken by our Central Committee", and to admit the decisively revolutionary rôle played by the Soviet Union in the midst of the surrounding international world of capitalism.

It is impossible to ignore the tremendous influence exercised by the Soviet Union in the development of the Chinese revolution, and in the development of other emancipation movements in the East. The plain fact cannot be denied or concealed that the working class of our country — precisely because our country is the country of the proletarian dictatorship — sent aid to the British miners as no other working class did. There is no possibility of veiling the fact that those broadest strata of the West European working class which send their delegations to us, arrive at the conviction that the Soviet Union is the headquarters of socialist construction.

All these facts, taken together, exercise a certain retroactive effect upon the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie has formed a double-sided and strangely inconsistent opinion about us. On the one hand it sees in us that great market which is the object of its desire, and at the present juncture the prospect of flooding this market with capitalist goods is more attractive than ever before. But on the other hand another series of facts hammers persistently on the ear drums of the capitalist bourgeoisie; the mighty movement in China, the ever growing sympathy of the international working class for the Soviet Union, the support lent the British miners — in a word, the Soviet Union as the seat of the great international fermentation among the oppressed masses. This inconsistency has existed from the beginning, and will continue to exist so long as the Soviet Union is surrounded by a capitalist world. The vacillation between the two standpoints, too, has existed from the beginning; trade interests and the fear of revolution have always opposed one another in the capitalist estimate of the Soviet Union, and will continue to do so.

3. THE GERMAN VACILLATION AND ENGLAND'S BELLIGERENT POLICY.

Though this vacillation is nothing new, still it must be emphasised that the double-sided attitude towards the Soviet Union is assuming an especially acute form at the present moment. It is precisely the choice between the two standpoints which is separating the various groupings in the bourgeoisie from one another at the present time. You are all well aware that at one time Germany incorporated the most peaceful of tendencies towards us, a circumstance greatly due to the fact that Germany was passing through an ordeal of national oppression, of humiliation, of actual pillage at the hands of the imperialist states. I may here observe that not only our Party, but all other Communist Parties, rightly held it to be possible that the peculiar position in which Germany was placed could have formed sufficient reason for defending even a bourgeois Germany against the tyranny of the imperialist states.

The great imperialist war was still raging when Lenin spoke of the possibility that the war might end in such a complete defeat of one of the flourishing state organisations of imperialism that this nation, even though maintaining a bourgeois regime, might fall into a position radically and fundamentally different from that held by it during the imperialist war. In such a case comrade Lenin held a national emancipation war against the rule of imperialism to be possible. In my opinion Germany was actually in this position at the close of the imperialist war, so that the Soviet State was perfectly right in expressing its sympathy with oppressed Germany, and all Communist Parties were fully justified in aiding Germany, despite its bourgeois regime, in its struggle against the imperialist States. This could be done, and had to be done, for Germany was at that time a country completely isolated, and its struggle was not based on any imperialist interests or imperialist tendencies whatever. At the present time there are bourgeois politicians in Germany, supported by their social democratic spokesmen and by the ultra-Left apostates from Communism, who are doing their best to represent our attitude in this question as a fall from virtue, an iniquity. To these we declare once more from this tribune, that the Communist Party of our country, and the Soviet State led by the Communist Party, will always be found on the side of all oppressed and enslaved states, even when these are national bourgeois states, if they are attacked on all sides by imperialist robbers. This is the line which we have laid down, this is the line which we have followed, and we shall continue to follow it when similar emergencies arise in the future.

At the present time matters are very different. The Germany of today has been successful in pulling itself together again; it has struggled its way out of the abyss into which it had fallen. The Germany of to-day has been caught up again in the whirl of general imperialist policy; and this time not merely as an object of this policy, but to a considerable extent as its subject, that is, as one of the actively effective powers working in the imperialist political arena. And though it is true that Germany's penultimate stage of development isolated it among the powers of Western Europe, and caused it to incline naturally towards us, the position has now radically changed. Germany has turned fairly decisively towards the West, and the economic superstructure rendering this change of front possible has been the revival in German economics, promoted to a great extent by American capital. Germany now reenters the concert of imperialist States possessing full and equal rights, it "turns away" from the East and steers a course towards the West.

This does not by any means signify that it breaks off every connection with us. Germany, though once more an imperialist State, differs from the other imperialist States in the special acuteness of the necessity of finding markets. Germany is bound hand and foot by the heavy fetters imposed by its benevolent conquerors. The problem of the market knocks loudly at the doors of German capitalist economics, bending beneath the load of a hitherto unheard of burden of chronic unemployment, and compelled year after year to restrict the working time in the industrial undertakings. All these symptoms of unsound economics have become permanent in Germany, and are felt the more severely by German capitalism which has excellent industrial equipment at its disposal, undertakings in which the rationalisation of production has been successfully furthered, factories which have probably no parallel in any other country of Europe, combining every imaginable achievement of science and technics with the immediate process of production.

And since Germany is suffering with extraordinary severity from the unsound economic conditions of the present epoch, and is still fast in the thumbscrews of the Versailles treaty, it is only natural that for the immediate future it is condemned to a policy of vacillation, and that the conciliating tendencies of a considerable part of the bourgeoisie with respect to the Soviet Union are inevitably bound to find expression.

Thus Germany is still though in a much less degree than before, one of that type of bourgeois states pursuing a comparatively conciliatory policy towards us.

The antipodes of Germany's attitude to the Soviet Union may be found in that adopted by England. England has received severe blows of late from two different quarters: from the mighty Chinese revolution and from its own working class. These blows will be repeated again and again. They undermine more and more the traditionally conservative regime of the British empire.

This circumstance, combined with the mighty influence of our Soviet Union, has forced England into the position of champion of the bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union. Of late, since the revolutionary tendencies in the East have become more clearly defined, since the Chinese revolution has begun to exercise a gigantic and unparalleled influence in all the countries of the East, and since the victorious advance of the armies of national revolution is being clearly sensed in all the cities of the world, and not merely in the capital cities — since all this, England's hostile attitude towards us has become more and evident every day.

We have seen of late that attempts are being made to encircle us on all sides: by diplomacy, by military tactics, and by a system of every imaginable description of conspiracy, proceeding from the English government. With the intermediation of the English government, under its leadership, with its instruction and aid, a large number of diplomatic and military conventions have been agreed upon: The Franco-Roumanian agreement, the Polish-Roumanian convention, the Polish-Yugoslavian treaty, and the conference of the diplomatists and general staff officers of the Baltic border states. England's activity against us in Persia is a part of these tactics; England's action in Afghanistan is directed against us, and the aggressively bloody work of the English government in China is a blow dealt at us, a fact which the English press does not trouble to conceal. All this shows that the attempt to encircle the Soviet Union is being carried on with greatly increased energy. The instigator, initiator, and financial supporter of this policy of encirclement is the English bourgeoisie, the government headed by the king of England. It is under England's leadership that military operations are being prepared against us; in Poland especially these preparations are being made with feverish energy. Only recently Roumania raised a loan of several 100 million lire in Italy (Italy is one of England's closest allies), enabling the ammunition orders to be funded and a naval base to be constructed in Constanza with the aid of English experts. It is England who is financing the followers of Wrangel, who continue to maintain their military organisation, and hold themselves in readiness.

This is the aggressive and actively hostile policy pursued against us by England at the present time.

The policy of our government, of the government of the proletarian dictatorship, has been and always will be a policy of peace. Last year we concluded a large number of guarantee treaties. Treaties bearing a demonstratively peaceful character. One agreement of this description was that concluded with Turkey, another the agreement made with Lithuania, and the same character is borne by every agreement proposed by us to the border states. The latest reply which we have received to our policy of peace has been the Fascist coup d'état in Lithuania, which destroys every one of the model treaties concluded between our government and the so-called Baltic "border states."

It need not be said that the import of the Lithuanian coup d'état is by no means exhausted in those executions, arousing at the present moment the rapidly rising tide of proletarian protest, the indignation and abhorrence of the people, against the brutal Lithuanian butchers. The import of the Lithuanian coup lies much deeper than this. Behind the scenes of this supposed nationalist coup d'état we may see the Poland of Marshall Piłsudski, ready at any moment to devour this new Fascist Lithuania. Poland has been waiting for this morsel long enough, and Poland's participation in the coup becomes obvious when we learn that the most prominent leaders of the coup

d'état have been naturalised Poles, elements who have been most zealous of late in altering their surnames to the Lithuanian form, that they may play the part of resident Lithuanian patriots, and combine the rôles of "Lithuanian" landowners and bearers of the Polish influence into Lithuania.

Behind Poland we again find England, to whom belongs the doubtful honour of being the leading wirepuller in the events in Lithuania. But what is particularly astonishing is — and I fancy that this has not yet been published in our newspapers — that various reports show that the Germans, too, have taken part in the Lithuanian coup d'état, and even participated actively in the events. "Democratic" Germany obviously fears an increase of Polish influence, and its anxiety to furnish a counterweight against this increased influence, and to gain at the same time a concrete strategic position influencing Lithuania, have induced it to participate in the Lithuanian coup d'état. Germany thus shares with the Polish and English governments the responsibility for all the Fascist misdeeds committed by the new Lithuanian government. With respect to this last, that is, to the Fascist régime in Lithuania, we can only wish, figuratively speaking, that it may broil in that "Smetano" sauce (a Russian play upon words: "Smetana", a cream sauce, and Smetano, the Lithuanian prime minister) which has been prepared by the present leader of the government in Kovno (Laughier, applause). Such coups d'état as these may take place in other border states. We are in receipt of reports showing that a similar coup is being prepared in Latvia; we hear the same from Finland; and we hear again that work is being carried on feverishly on all sides to draw a cordon of despicable Fascist scoundrels all round the Soviet Union, in order to enable our work of constructive socialism in our country to be most effectively hampered and delayed. I must draw special attention to the fact that at the present time Pilsudski does not even deem it necessary to conceal the smallest part of his notorious scheme "towards the East", to be accomplished mainly at our expense.

4. FROM THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS TO THE MONARCHISTS.

I am further obliged to draw attention to the fact that all over Europe open and semi-legal "ideological and moral" preparations for war against the Soviet Union are being made. These preparations are going on on a large scale, and the whole of the gigantic machinery of ideological influence upon the masses is now being set energetically in action against us.

This "moral" mobilisation of the masses against the Soviet Union has found perhaps its most patent and despicable expression in the tale of the so-called "Soviet shells". These "Soviet shells" made their appearance for the first time in the columns of an English Liberal paper, the "Manchester Guardian", and the German papers took up the story. The whole matter is based on an agreement which we had had, and still have, with the firm of Junkers. This firm, as the "Pravda" correctly observed a few days ago, does not manufacture sausages, but aeroplanes. We do not conceal, nor have we ever attempted to conceal, the fact that we have made an agreement with the firm of Junkers, or that aeroplanes have been constructed and will be constructed in the future, and we can declare quite openly that we shall not fail to profit by the advantage offered us when any capitalist state sends us instructors, pays us suitably for the permission to construct aeroplanes on our territory, and manufactures other weapons required for national defence. Although our armaments are lower in proportion than those of any of the great Powers, we are not by any means such donkeys as to permit ourselves to be disarmed at a time when all other countries are arming, or to permit other people to seize us by the throat and deal our constructive socialism a blow from which it would not easily recover. We have no intention of permitting anything of the sort, nor are we going to let ourselves to be led by the nose. We are thoroughly aware that our enemies are showing their teeth, and we are prepared to utilise every available possibility — of this we give notice to all concerned — for the most efficient defence of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. (Applause.)

The bourgeois states are preparing for a fresh imperialist war; they are exerting every effort towards completing the task of surrounding us by foes, and are making ready for opening the actual campaign against us. At the same time they are aware that we are no longer in 1914, and are fully conscious of the fact that the broad masses of workers and peasants are crying out for

peace at the present time. Therefore the whole strategy of the capitalist class is directed towards maintaining the assertion that it is we, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, who are striving to disturb the peace. This is the course they are following. They say: "See, we have created a League of Nations, and are prepared to smooth out every conflict. But who is stirring up the peoples to revolution in the East? The Bolsheviki. Who blows the trumpet of international revolution in every quarter of the globe? The Bolsheviki! Who disturbs the bourgeois "law and order", etc? The Soviet Union! This must be swept away, for it is a threat against peace.

This is the leading motif, and it is taken up untiringly by the II. International, by the social democrats and the leaders of the Amsterdam International, and by the apostates from the Communist Movement expelled from the Comintern. All these are lending their fullest support to the bourgeois slanders against the Soviet Union, and to the treacherous manoeuvres employed by the bourgeoisie in its preparations against the Soviet Union.

It must be emphasised, comrades, that the campaign based on the so-called "Soviet shells" has already assumed truly gigantic dimensions. Grumbach — a French socialist — has had this "shell" question brought before the II. International for discussion. The Russian Mensheviki, the German social democratic press, and the French Social Democratic Party, seize the opportunity of exploiting a slander for the purpose of arousing a gigantic international campaign against us. These are the people who are themselves preparing to open war upon us, but they prefer the strategy of distracting attention from themselves by cries of "Stop thief". They themselves are the guilty ones, but they cry out and run away, and point with their fingers at others. They declare the existence of the Soviet Union to be a threat to peace, but the sole basis of this assertion is their anxiety to find a pretext for the preparation of a war against the Soviet Union on the part of their lords and masters.

I feel it incumbent upon me to state the problem of war danger very clearly before the Moscow Party conference. Our Party organisation, and especially our Moscow Party organisation, must remember that we possess no guarantees against an invasion of our country. It is of course not a question of to-day or tomorrow, or even of next month, but we have no guarantee whatever that it may not come in the spring or the autumn.

One of the indirect indications of preparations for military operations is the intensity of the revival in the activity of the White emigrés, of every description of social revolutionists, and of the constitutionally democratic, Menshevist, and other organisations. It is not merely that these people, having been set aside, like to console themselves by drivelling about Boishevist terror — what the deuce does that matter — let them drivel as long as they wish. But here it is a very different matter. The present revival among the White elements living outside of our boundaries is doubtless connected with the plan which I have already mentioned, that of encircling the Soviet Union by a cordon of enemies.

The monarchists are making energetic preparations under the leadership of a certain elderly gentleman — Nicolai Nicolayevitch (laughter). The monarchists have their connections, and at the present time they are endeavouring to bolster up their organisation again with the aid of English subsidies. Agitation is being carried on among the Cossacks. Energetic work is being carried on in Poland, where the groups of national bourgeois and landowners from some of our national republics and countries, the national White Guards from the Ukraine and White Russia, the bourgeois, Menshevist, and federal elements of Georgia, etc., meet and confer together. Matters have gone so far — and our Party ought to know this — that the Georgian Mensheviki have once more raised the question of a rising in Georgia, and deem the right moment to have come for this. A "Committee for the emancipation of the Caucasus" has been formed in Paris, headed both ideologically and financially by a certain French Colonel of the name of Chevalier, the commissary of the occupation troops in the Caucasus during the Entente occupation. Colonel Chevalier is the leader of this clique, and he finances its periodical: "Prometheus" (truly an imposing title!), the leading organ of the "Committee for the emancipation of the Caucasus". These gentlemen have a programme which, in their own eyes at least, is very definitely laid down. We have reliable information that this insurrection is to take place on the day when either Poland or Roumania advances to the attack.

under certain circumstances it may take place earlier. Our Georgian comrades must accord special attention to this.

Thus we see alarming symptoms arising on all sides in the international situation: from Roumania, from Poland, from the refugees supported by various foreign states, and especially by England. To be sure there is no great call for us to be particularly alarmed at all this, for our enemies are perfectly aware that war against us is a very risky business (laughter, applause), and that the issue is not so certain for them as they would like. But none the less we must look the growing danger of war clearly in the face. Our enemies shrink from nothing. Only today we have received a telegram informing us that a number of foreign papers have published provocative reports on a concentration of Soviet Union troops on our Western frontier. Our bourgeois adversaries grasp at every means, and resort first of all to lies and provocation.

5. FOR A PEACE POLICY. FOR PROLETARIAN DEFENCE.

We must continue to pursue, openly and demonstratively, that policy which we have hitherto pursued, the policy of peace. We have amply proved our peaceful attitude in the treaties mentioned above, the guarantee agreements with various countries. We have demonstrated our policy of peace in our peaceful attitude in the conflict with Tschang Tso-Lin, on the East Chinese railway. We may openly declare that Tschang Tso-Lin, who has had the impudence to plunge into a villainous adventure against Soviet Russia, could have been settled by us at once, with the greatest ease, had we cared to do this. But we did not care to do so and have not done so, though we have had to put the greatest restraint on ourselves. Here again our attitude has furnished renewed and ample proof that we pursue, and shall continue to pursue, a policy of peace. It need not be said that this policy of ours does not prevent our sympathising with every emancipation movement, indeed this sympathy is the first premise of our policy. We must repeat again and again that we take sides, and shall always take sides, with the oppressed in every part of the world. We believe in the mighty revolutionary powers of the working class. We believe in the revolutionary and creative powers of the tremendous movement going on in China at the present time.

It may be said that the struggle of international forces, the struggle among the main participants and the main partners in the great historical conflict, has now entered a higher stage of development.

Remember, comrades, that at the time when the greatest heroism was demanded of us, at the time when civil war and intervention were at their worst, we stood almost alone in the battle. It is true that the West European proletariat supported us, and a number of revolutions broke out, though only to stop halfway. In the present situation the main characteristic is, however, the fact that two mighty historical factors are arising simultaneously and acting mutually upon one another, and this in spite of the partial stabilisation of capitalism in some of the largest countries of Western Europe, and in America. One of these factors is the advance of socialist construction in the Soviet Union into a higher phase, into a period of reconstruction in which we lay the foundation of a new technical basis for our work. This fact is one of the greatest factors urging the international proletariat to go forward in its struggle.

The new phase in our revolutionary development thus being realised coincides with an event of colossal historical importance for the whole world — with the great Chinese revolution, the reports of which are filling our newspapers, and whose swelling onward course every one of us is following with strained attention and anxiety for the issue. The English imperialists have sent armoured cruisers to China, they are sending out their sailors, they have despatched armed forces, and they are doing their best to ingratiate themselves with the Canton government, and to win this over to their side. But it is becoming perfectly plain to the whole of Europe, and to the whole world, that the masses of the Chinese people are determined to drive the English imperialists out of China, and even out of the territory of the "sacred" concessions, and that the Chinese workers are going to sweep away the band of imperialist despots who are now attempting to crush the rising Chinese revolution. We are fully confident in our hope that the 400 millions of the people of China will sweep away the old regime, and with it all robbery and imperialism (applause).

The forces of revolution are thus enabled at the present time to contend against the forces of capitalism with the advantage of a somewhat higher stage of development, despite the partial capitalist stabilisation achieved in a number of countries. Under these circumstances we must ask ourselves the question: Is it still possible for a war or an intervention to be entered on against us? To this question we reply: preparations are being made for this war; we do not know whether these preparations will end in actual war in the near future or not, but we know very definitely that the preparations are being carried on. As a counter-action against these preparations our first endeavours must be directed to increasing our propaganda for peace. We are fully aware that any great struggle which may take place between us and the capitalist world will not be decided so much by military technics as by the trend of feeling among the broad masses of the people. This will be the decisive factor. This does not, however, by any means signify that we are to approach military questions with indifference. On the contrary, we must occupy ourselves seriously with the questions involved by the necessity of furnishing competent defences.

We shall pursue a demonstrative peace policy; but should anyone attempt to attack us, then he must remember that we are no longer in 1905, nor in 1914.

In all the articles written shortly before his death, Comrade Lenin pointed out that we are just passing the Rubicon between the decaying capitalism of the West and the enormous masses of the peoples of the East, that these masses will be caught into the whirlpool, will emerge on the side of revolution out of the midst of the general crisis in the capitalist world, and will advance along the road to revolution. At the time when Comrade Lenin wrote of this, it was still a question of the future. His scientifically Marxist prediction has been completely fulfilled today. The thunderbolts of the Chinese revolution are the best proof of the correctness of Lenin's prophecy. And these thunderbolts show not only this, but they show at the same time that capitalism, in venturing on a war against us today, will have to contend with much greater difficulties than ever before.

The fear of revolution which possesses the imperialist bourgeoisie, its frantic desire to accomplish certain "preventive" measures against us, its fear of our growth and rapid development, its fear of its own workers — all this drives the bourgeoisie to force an issue, or will presently drive it to this point. It is very probable that the first move will be to send out some of the invaluable scouting dogs to be found in our immediate geographical neighbourhood, to have us thoroughly reconnoitred and sniffed out. It is possible that these elements may first be financed and driven forward against us, before other action is resorted to. This is not impossible. We may state plainly that we are not afraid. No one can know so well as ourselves how dear every day of peace is to us; our passionate longing for peace is our first and our last word, and we shall strive to the last to maintain this peace. Our whole policy, every single diplomatic step taken by us, and every single diplomatic note despatched abroad by us, must be permeated and borne by this striving for peace. We cannot repeat often enough that we lose nothing by maintaining peace, but gain on the contrary a great deal by it. Nevertheless, we can assure all our enemies that the long breathing space which we have enjoyed, whilst we have been working at our economic development, has not by any means reduced us to a condition of simple-minded harmlessness, nor has it caused us to cease to be the fighting party of the communist proletariat. At the slightest threat of danger to the proletarian dictatorship, the working class of our country and its Communist Party will reply by closing their ranks with unexampled determination, and will present such a front that each and every foe and adversary of ours will break his teeth on the steel of our bayonets. (Enthusiastic applause.)

Comrades, we are often told that we made a miscalculation in our hopes of international revolution, that we have been preaching international revolution all the time, but that our hopes were disappointed at the decisive moment. The international revolution has "not come about", and we must resign ourselves to the bitter necessity of ceasing to be what we have hitherto been. In my opinion our first reply to this must be: The international revolution need be waited for no longer, for it is already an accomplished fact. It is an extremely wrong, naive, and nonsensical idea to imagine the international revolution as one single event, in which all countries begin, at a certain concerted signal, to take part at one and the same moment in the "world conflagration".

gration". It is absurd to suppose there is one certain "hour", mystically determined beforehand, in which "His Majesty" the proletariat comes into power.

The international revolution is a gigantic process, involving decades. This process commenced during the imperialist war in a number of countries, leading in our country to a more and more firmly established dictatorship of the working class, and rolling various kingly crowns in the dust in central Europe. During the course of its development it has suffered various reverses, and has often been brought to a standstill, but only to begin again at some other point. If we look to the East, and penetrate into the import of the great events in China, we cannot but realise that the Chinese revolution is a constituent part of the international revolution, of that international revolution which has already arrived, and which does not first need to "come about" somehow and somewhere.

The world revolution will complete its course when it triumphs in all countries. Then it will have completed its orbit. But we must not talk as if it had not even begun its course, and as if we should pray to the communist God and the communist Holy Virgin to take pity on us and send down international revolution upon the sinful earth. (Laughter, applause.) The work of building up socialism being accomplished by us in our country is a constituent of international revolution; the defeat of the English imperialists in China by the national revolutionary armies is a constituent of international revolution; the position of the miners, almost compelled to face the problem of seizing power, is a constituent of international revolution. The international revolution takes many forms, is expressed in many ways, suffers many temporary reverses and defeats, but none the less we are in the midst of international events, and surely it can only be born idiots or perfectly blind individuals who can turn about uncertainly in this vortex of happenings, and ask: But where is our intangible international revolution? (Enthusiastic applause.) As witnesses of all the events and tremendous struggles going on all around us, we cannot but become more and more firmly convinced that there is no description of capitalist revival in any country — and that a certain degree of revival exists is beyond doubt — which can ever erase the fact that the source of international revolution is sending forth mighty springs in quite other parts of the capitalist organism. Our realisation of this fact gives us an ever growing confidence in our own powers, and imparts to us that discipline and cool headedness so needful to us in face of the open and concealed preparations for war all around us. We repeat once more that we feel no fear of coming events, whatever these may be, for we are intensely conscious of having right on our side from the standpoint of the history of the world, and never doubt for the fraction of a second that our cause will triumph in the end.

It need not be emphasised, comrades, that in the matter of war danger, and intervention danger, we possess no absolute guarantee against these dangers.

An absolute guarantee for our final victory could be supplied by the seizure of power by the working class in several countries. The question is, however, frequently put in a wholly false form: either the international revolution must be victorious, or we receive no aid whatever from outside. The question was stated approximately in this manner by the Opposition during the famous

discussions on "socialism in one country", a debate of which we are all pretty well tired. The comrades of the Opposition have alleged the following dilemma to exist: Either state help on the part of the proletariat of other countries, or our downfall. But when we approach the question of intervention, and of armed interference on the part of the imperialists in our affairs, we find that between these two poles — state aid from the victorious proletariat of other countries, or our downfall — there are a great many intermediate stages, and that these are of the utmost practical importance both for our continued existence and for our possibilities of realising socialism.

During the civil war on our territory, the working class of Western Europe did not seize power. But did it thereby fail to help us at all? It helped us indeed. In China there is no dictatorship of the proletariat as yet, the whole of China is not even united under the national revolutionary government; but is the great struggle of the Chinese people of no help to us for this reason? The English working class has not seized power, but it has many glorious class conflicts behind it, and it has astonished the world by its last magnificent strike, in which it was aided by our workers in the trade unions. Is not this struggle in the British working class, the growth of the fighting and the revolutionary spirit among the British working people, one of the most powerful weapons in our hands? Is not the help of the proletariat pouring in upon us from all sides, now from this direction, now from that, from every section of our fighting front? This help varies in degree, and also in nature. But it is there, and the international bourgeoisie is afraid to venture into war against us, chiefly for the reason that it cannot feel sure that its own proletariat will not attack it from behind. It cannot guarantee its own proletariat. We receive visits from many delegations, even delegations of Christian workers. There is a deep-seated ferment going on among the non-communist workers in Germany. Is it easy, under these circumstances, to drive the German workers into a war against us? Is it easy to induce the English working man to take up arms against us, and to force the English miner to shoot down the workers of the Soviet Union? I hardly think so. The bourgeoisie sees this very well, and hesitates to declare direct war against us.

Further, we must remember that a certain amount of support is given us by the international working class.

It may be that many different shades and degrees are to be distinguished in this support: one shade is given by a certain state of discontent and fermentation; a further shade is that of a certain fighting spirit; another the active proletarian insurrection, and the final shade is the victory of the working class. There is thus a complete scale of differing shades, of various degrees of support lent to us. The state aid of the working class is not by any means absolutely indispensable to us. Had we state support, we should simply sweep aside the whole of our opponents. Then we should have an absolute guarantee for our victory. But if we have not this security, still we can speak of a certain relative guarantee of success in the coming struggle. It is difficult for us to name a fixed denominator for our chances, but still we can say to our workers: Our chances are good, for the workers of the other countries are with us, and the bourgeoisie will find it difficult indeed to induce their armies, consisting mainly of proletarians, to enter the field against us.

II. Work of Construction in the Midst of Hostile Surroundings.

I. SOCIALISM AND CAPITALISM IN THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ARENA.

Before we pass on to a consideration of the inner situation, we must first accord attention to the question of the relations between our economics and international economics, and must throw light upon the question of the pressure being exercised upon us by international economics.

I am of the opinion that a clear grasp of this question will point out the way towards forming a correct judgment of our whole economic work. I have quoted from the speech made by Deutsch, chairman of the A. E. G. You will have observed, comrades, that Herr Deutsch is not a very enthusiastic adherent of the slogan of the "industrialisation of our country". He is kind enough to permit us to restore and develop our light industries, but is prepared to place a definite veto, and to issue a categorical prohibition, against the increasing importance of the rôle played

by heavy industry in our economics. It need not be said that we reply to this conception of the dawesation of our country by proclaiming our slogan of industrialisation, despite Deutsch and his followers. Here fresh arguments are brought against us, and have been laid down in detail by our Opposition at the last Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. I refer to the thesis of our growing dependence on the capitalist countries. You will all remember Comrade Trotsky's declaration that: We are a country becoming more and more dependent on capitalist economics, we are falling more and more under the control of international capitalist economics.

This formulation is one-sided, and obviously wrong. I have already pointed out its main error in the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. Our comrades of the Opposition do not comprehend that our growing dependence on capitalist economics signifies at the same time our growing independence. If we export more grain and import more machinery, this appears at a first glance to involve

a greater degree of dependence. And yet it leads at the same time to a lessening of our dependence, for if we import machinery serving for the manufacture of the means of production, and if we develop our metallurgic and metal industry with the aid of this machinery, and systematically improve and consolidate our heavy industry, we are surely laying the foundation of our independence from the capitalist world. Those who see the dependent aspect only, fail to observe the reverse side of the medal, and the failure to observe this other dialectic factor of the inconsistent situation bears witness to an entire lack of comprehension for the essential character of our foreign trade policy.

The attitude of the Opposition in this question implies something more, to which I must further draw your attention. Every statement made by the comrades of the Opposition has for a background a distinct accusation against us on the score of "national limitedness". Socialism — they say — consists of adaptation to the whole world, to the international development of socialist economics, to a systematic organisation of the international division of labour. Cotton must be grown where cotton grows best; America must produce this, Germany that, a third and a fourth country something else. Socialist economics can only be built up on the basis of the international division of labour. Those who hold a different opinion are — in the eyes of the Opposition — slipping down the path to "national limitedness". Those who wish to build up self-sufficing economics — an "autarchy" — on their own territory, an economic entity independent of the international basis; those who defend and work for economic independence; these are the backsliders, these have no conception of the fundamentals of Marxism and Leninism, and the flood of Opposition eloquence descends upon them.

This must receive its answer. When we ask ourselves what our essential economic ideal really is, naturally we reply that this is the systematic organisation of the world's economics. It is obvious that work must be properly allotted in these international economics. Regarded in the light of such an international division of labour, every "Russian" or other territorial "self-sufficiency" is of course a retrogression. But the question before us is entirely different. To build up socialism in our country whilst it is surrounded by capitalist countries, is something quite different from pointing out what course we should take after the proletarian dictatorship has been established in all the leading countries of the world. When this last has been accomplished, it need not be said that we shall not insist upon this or that industry being carried on in just our country. In such situation it will be our task to concentrate the various industries in such areas as offer the most suitable geographical and climatic conditions, the most suitable position with respect to railways, technical and other possibilities, etc. A complete theory has already been worked out on the localities and territorial distribution of the various industries. We have time enough to discuss this.

At the present junction the matter is otherwise. Today the world's economics are unfortunately not yet under the dictatorship of the proletariat, but are in the hands of the capitalist bourgeoisie. It is our constant endeavour, and must continue to be our constant endeavour, to attain an ever greater independence from these capitalist international economics. When this is designated as "national limitedness", the accusation is simply ridiculous. The independence which we seek is expressly a class independence, an independence from the capitalist States. If we are to be condemned today, under present conditions, to a slavish adherence to the great dogma of the international division of labour and to renounce our struggle for economic independence, in exchange for peaceful cooperation with the international bourgeoisie, then this is an "internationalism" in which we cannot participate.

If the proletarian dictatorship had been realised in all capitalist countries, and we then maintained that our country must be independent of international economics, then indeed we should be Chauvinists and national reformists. But today, surrounded as we are by capitalist foes, our endeavours towards the increased independence of our socialist "national" entity, and towards the increased independence of the country of the proletarian dictatorship, are our plain duty as international proletarian revolutionists. Those who reproach us with "national limitedness" cannot see how plainly this duty lies before us, for they do not grasp the fact that their international "unlimitedness" is in reality perhaps nothing more than a not very limited connection with the capitalist world.

In the discussion of the burning questions of the relations between our economic policy and that of the rest of the world,

we must not by any means underestimate the immense importance of our **foreign trade monopoly**. The history of economics shows us other instances in which young countries (in these cases young capitalist countries), dependent on the international economics then developing on capitalist lines, have raised a similar tariff wall between themselves and their competitors, thus resisting the pressure of the more powerful capitalist countries.

Those countries having rich natural resources at their disposal, and possessing a social structure favourable to economic development (such as America), first erected these tariff barriers, caught up with the other countries, and finally passed them. In how far is this paralleled in the Soviet Union? In the Soviet Union we observe not only a form of socialist tariff protection, but something much greater — the foreign trade monopoly. The foreign trade monopoly is a much more effective weapon than the protective duty. If we possess the foreign trade monopoly, we are free to import or not to import, as we please; we can buy goods much more systematically and advantageously, we can manoeuvre as an economic entity. No bourgeois State has ever possessed such a means of defence in economic struggle as we have in our foreign trade monopoly, and it can by no means be stated unreservedly, and without due consideration of the special economic aspects of our particular case, that we are "under the control" of the world markets. It is obvious that to a certain extent we are influenced by the laws governing the international markets. Nobody has ever thought of denying this. But the special qualitative aspect of the question must be taken into account, it must be remembered that we have means at our disposal such as no bourgeois State has ever had, enabling us to offer resistance to the pressure of the world markets.

Within our country itself our natural resources are so great that we have no cause to fear the pressure of the international markets. All that is required is an improvement in our work, and we shall emerge victorious from the great competition between capitalism and our developing Socialism. The pressure of the world markets is merely the spur stimulating us to greater efforts, it will never be the cause of our downfall.

The best proof of the efficiency of a correct policy in gradually improving the relations between us and the world markets is furnished by our foreign trade statistics.

Our trade balance, after being adverse for a time, is now favourable. We have succeeded in achieving a balance in our favour, a success due to our properly conducted economics, to the increased correctness and accuracy of our planning calculations. According to our plan, our exports in 1926/27 will amount to the value of 763 million roubles, as compared with 668 million last year. The annual exports will increase by 14 per cent, whilst imports decrease by 9.9 per cent. This is one of the not inconsiderable successes showing the possibilities opening out before us in the future.

2. THE RATE OF OUR DEVELOPMENT.

I shall now pass on to the inner questions, and shall deal in the first place with those questions connected with our general work of economic construction, above all with the question of industrialisation. First I must refer to the problem of the rate of our development, for which purpose I must express the processes concerned in figures.

First a few words on the increase of raw production in comparison with 1923/24. These statistics have been divided into two main divisions — industry and agriculture. For 1925/26 the agricultural percentage was 27.6, the industrial 120.7. If we refer to the control figures issued by the Gosplan for 1926/27, we see an increase for agriculture of 34.4 per cent as compared with 1923/24, and for industry of 152.8 per cent. We therefore observe that our industry is developing at a much greater speed than our agriculture; in other words, the specific weight of industry is increasing in our country.

These Gosplan figures are not so optimistic, with respect to industry, as the actual conditions would justify. The first issue of Gosplan control figures calculated the raw output of large industry at 15.6 per cent for 1926/27, whilst the People's Supreme Economic Council insisted on a somewhat higher figure, 18.6 per cent. The People's Supreme Economic Council thus formed a considerably more favourable estimate of the prospects of our economics.

The estimate finally adopted raises the figure even higher, fixing it at 20.6 per cent. To-day we can already look back over several months of work according to this plan. A reference to

the reports for October and November shows us that the actual execution of the plan has yielded a figure exceeding even the maximum estimated. Over 21 per cent is the actual figure. If we compare these months with the corresponding months of last year, we see an increase of over 30 per cent. The practical execution of our plan of industrial production, and the actual amount of the raw production of our industry, thus exceed the estimates finally agreed upon during the elaboration of our industrial plan.

Let us now enter somewhat further into the details of the work of industrialisation. The figures given above on the comparative developments of industry and agriculture show definitely that the influence of industry upon the general economics of the country is increasing. Considerable light is thrown on this question by a comparison between the development of heavy and light industry. The specific weight of heavy industry in 1924/25, from the standpoint of the growth of this industry and the expression of this growth in figures, may be seen from the following figures: Heavy industry 1924/25 41,3 per cent, 1925/26 44,6 per cent, 1926/27 45,6 per cent (an increase of 24,9 per cent for heavy industry, and of only 17,3 per cent in light industry). We see from this that within the confines of industry itself, the speed of development of heavy industry, that is, of the production of the means of production, is more rapid than that of light industry.

The question of industrialisation must further be regarded from a third standpoint, from the standpoint of the changed importance of State industry as compared with private capitalist industry and with small trade. The dynamics of the united forces of private capitalist industry and small trade may be seen from the following figures:

In 1923/24 27,7 per cent of the raw production of our total industry fell to the private capitalist and small industries, in 1925/26 16,9 per cent, and in 1926/27 the figure will probably be 15,3 per cent. In other words, we observe a steady decrease of the participation of private capitalist industry and small trade in our general industrial economics, and in consequence a steady increase of the specific weight of State industry and of the general industry of the country. Even from this social class standpoint, State socialist industry is developing much more rapidly than private capitalist and small industry.

3. THE GROWTH OF THE TECHNICAL BASIS OF SOCIALISM.

Many further illustrations of the industrialisation of our country might be cited. For instance, our agricultural machine construction has already surpassed its pre-war standard (123% of pre-war output). This is a clear proof that our industry is beginning to adapt itself to agriculture. In relation to the peasantry, the industrialisation of our country means something very different from the industrialisation of capitalist countries. Our industry must strive to enter into the closest possible relations to agriculture, it must take peasant economics in tow, and draw them forward with its own advance, in order that our industry may be the medium bringing the peasantry over into Socialism. Further. The production of steam turbines in 1926/27 is 75 per cent greater than last year. That of steam boilers 66 per cent. Our electrical industry has passed far beyond the pre-war level. The generation of electric energy has made enormous progress.

All these separate examples show us how the fundamental economic dissections given at the last Party Conference have been followed.

Indissolubly bound up with the general question of industrialisation we find the question of the expenditure for the basic capital of the industries. Under normal condition, the speed of industrial development can be best judged by the raw production, but this standard cannot altogether be applied to our conditions. During the course of the last few years of industrial reconstruction our raw production has increased enormously, owing to the fact that we have reopened idle factories and works.

After this "restoration work" was completed, we were faced by the task of erecting new new factories and works, new streets and railways, etc. All this requires great sums of money. Therefore, even our best endeavours cannot achieve such a rapid increase of raw production as would be possible were we working with existing basic capital. Under normal conditions the development of production runs parallel with the development of basic capital, and certain definite relations exist. In our case these relations are not maintained. Our factories and works were lying

idle at first, and we set large numbers of them to work again, so that in our case there has been no parallel development. Hence it is of the utmost importance for us, when discussing the development of our large industry, to ascertain the state of affairs with respect to basic capital, with respect to the development of capital. The figures referring to this point are as follows: In 1923/24 expenditure for industrial capital amounted to 225 million roubles. In 1924/25 to 385 million roubles, in 1925/26 780 million roubles and in 1926/27, that is, in the current economic year, 947 million roubles, or including outlay for the process of electrification, a sum total, in round numbers, of 1 milliard 100 million roubles. This sum expresses the development of capital in the current economic year.

374 new production units have been formed, representing a total value (completed) of 1 milliard 55 million roubles.

It should also be mentioned that the expenditure for house building amounted to 248 million roubles in 1925/26 (housing 282,000 workers), whilst an expenditure of 315,5 million roubles is proposed for 1926/27 (housing 361,000 workers).

It is often difficult to form an idea of the actual significance of the achievements thus expressed in statistics. If we speak, for instance, of all that has been accomplished during the last few years (the first years, the years of the civil war, do not count from the economic standpoint, since nothing was accomplished or built during that time), we see that our achievements have been very considerable. Only recently ten large and efficient long distance stations have been built, the Schatur Works for instance, the works at Kaschira, and the Volohovstroy Works. Six works have been enlarged, four similar works built, and further about 25 municipal electric works erected. During the last few years seven large and efficient works have been built for the metal industry. Some of these will cost 80 million roubles and more. For the electro-technical industry six new works have been built. In the coal mining industry 76 collieries have been erected, and work has been commenced on further 19 large and 97 small mines. In the petroleum industry five new petroleum refining works have been built. In the textile industry 11 new factories are working already, and 17 others are in course of erection. A huge textile factory, equipped with new American machines, will begin work within the next few days in the vicinity of Moscow. The chemical industry has been enlarged by 12 new works, and 12 more are being built. Fifteen hundred kilometers of new railways have been laid, five cities have been furnished with electric tramways, etc. Such smaller achievements as 62 new factories for agricultural purposes, 47 grain elevators, etc. are also worthy of mention.

I have pointed out these very concrete facts in order to show you where our work of development finds concrete expression. It need not be said that all these fresh achievements are merely a first step. But when we remember that our constructive work has only been going on for a few years (for though we have been in existence for ten years, our constructive work did not begin until much later), and when we remember that we are now approaching the solution of the problem of basic capital for the first time, then it must be admitted that the greatness of our achievements must be plain to all who are not completely blind.

4. FALSE PROPHECIES ON THE "CONTROL" OF THE WORKERS BY THE KULAKS.

I should now like to touch upon some of the main questions of our economic policy, in their connection with the differences of opinion in our Party.

For us the central problem — both economically and politically — is the question of the relations between town and country. Here I must lay special emphasis on the fact that industrialisation cannot be identified in the least with industrialisation in capitalist countries. The distinguishing characteristic of our industrialisation is that it does not form a lever for the ruin of the rural districts, but for their uplift, that it is not a means for the elimination and disappearance of the middle peasant, but for the uplift of peasant farming. Our industrialisation does not in the least exploit the home markets after the manner of the capitalist, it does not ruin and proletarianise the middle peasantry. Our industrialisation is directed towards serving the interests of our agrarian and peasant substructure, the interests of agriculture, with the ultimate object of winning over the peasant farmers to us.

The Leninist standpoint with regard to the relations between town and country is that we must produce for the peasant more cheaply than the capitalist has produced for him; this is to be

the basis of the alliance between town and country. The standpoint of the Opposition, defined by Comrade Preobrashensky, is however as follows: We must not charge the peasant lower prices, but rather higher ones, in order that the speed of our industrial development may be intensified. Our comrades of the Opposition have substantiated these ideas by a number of theoretical considerations and a greater number of prophecies. They have proclaimed that unless we follow their advice with regard to the peasantry, the goods famine will become more acute than before, for our industry will be unable to develop at the required speed, and will thus fail to cope with the growing demands. And the inevitable consequence of an increased goods famine is every imaginable political and other complication.

The second prophecy of the Opposition was the following: They maintained that since we underestimate and fail to comprehend the process of differentiation among the peasantry, since we do not grasp the fact that the kulaks play a much more important rôle than we have supposed, there is bound to ensue a renewed aggravation of that economic misfortune which happened to us during the time of the so-called "false economic calculation". Comrade Kamenev coined a winged word to the effect that the kulak has "controlled" us. Comrade Kamenev stated that we had drawn up a certain economic plan, but the kulak got the "control" of this plan, hoarded up his grain, did not put it on the market, forcing us to restrict our export plans, to cut down our import plan, and to revise our programme of production. At this time the Opposition reproached us with having failed to notice the rise of the kulak, who was enabled to organise an actual "grain strike" against the proletariat, and to wreck our projects.

A year has passed since this time, and we can now form a clear idea of the actual facts of the goods famine and of the course taken by the grain buying campaign. We are now in a position to subject our economic tactics to the test of facts.

In the first place, we must place on record indisputable success in the matter of satisfying the goods famine. There has been no aggravation of this famine, but an alleviation. This has been brought about by a number of circumstances, but chiefly by the increase in our industrial production. We have harvested more cotton at home than we had anticipated — ten million poods in place of the 9,3 million estimated (our native cotton supplies about 54 per cent of the raw material for our textile industry). Besides this, the cotton crisis in America has enabled us to buy cotton in much larger quantities, and on much more favourable terms than we had originally expected. This year we throw 200 million metres more cotton cloth on the market than was originally intended. Our peasant buyers are above all buyers of textile goods.

The development of our industry, and the expansion of our foreign trade transactions, enable us to overcome the difficulties of our situation. The prophecies of the Opposition as to impending goods famine have been completely confuted by actual facts.

Our work with respect to the buying of grain has also been subjected to the test of subsequent facts. The whole economic philosophy of the Opposition was based on the supposition that the chief danger threatening us was the grain-buying que-

stion. To the Opposition this grain-buying problem was simply a pseudonym for the kulak question. Every other question — Soviet elections, co-operative policy, taxation, etc. — was for the Opposition a medium for confirming the — alleged — fact that the kulak had swollen up to such a size that he already had the "control" of us, not we of him.

A supplementary thesis to this philosophy of the Opposition holds that we have offered no opposition to the growth of the kulak, and that we are still offering none. But if this were the case then the kulak should surely have continued to extend his power during the past year. This is the actual "historical test" for the correctness of the Opposition theory on the kulaks. If the comrades of the Opposition were right, then this year's grain campaign should have cost us much more trouble than last year's for the kulak would be better able to thwart our plans this year than last.

But what are the actual facts? We are now in a position to test our work by facts, and not merely by approximate calculations for the future.

Let us examine into the actual course taken by the grain campaign. I have at my disposal material dealing with the period between the beginning of the campaign and the 25th December. In 1925/26 318,5 million poods of grain were bought up during this period (up to 25th December), whilst this year the amount is 435 million poods. Calculated in percentages, this means an increase of 36,5 per cent as compared with last year — an increase by no means to be despised. We see that facts take but little heed of the Opposition.

The rate at which our grain-buying plan has been carried out has again been favourable. In September the plan was, for instance, more than carried out, 125,4 per cent of the expected amount being attained. In October 127 per cent, in November 139,2 per cent. This means that our anticipations have been more than realised. What are the conclusions to be drawn from this?

The first conclusion is that the thesis of our being under the "control" of the kulaks is refuted. It is not true that the kulak governs us. The truth is that we "control" him, that is, we hold him skillfully back, keep him in the required position. This is the truth!

Secondly: It is not true that we are helpless in the grain market. The actual fact is that, on the contrary, we have been able to get the grain market into our hands, one of the most important events of our economic life, and one of the most important achievements and conquests of our economic policy.

The third conclusion to be drawn from the results of the grain campaign is that we now possess a guarantee against the seasonal rises in price of agricultural products, and therewith a guarantee against all the secondary phenomena arising out of these increased prices — reaction upon wages, upon the rate of exchange of the chervonetz, etc. Our grain campaign is run on systematic lines; the prices did not rise in the autumn, and we have every reason to assume that they will not rise in the spring.

The general political conclusion to be drawn is that the results of the grain campaign signifies the collapse of the economic philosophy of our comrades of the Opposition.

III. Difficulties of Growth

So far I have dealt with our achievements, and with the positive results of our economic life. I should now like to add a few words on the difficulties of our present period of development, and on the tasks arising out of these difficulties.

I should like to begin with the problem of unemployment. The number of unemployed in the Soviet Union is very great. When we examine into the social strata from which the army of unemployed is recruited, and ascertain what proportion are peasants who have drifted into the towns, we find that the increase in the number of our unemployed is due to a very great extent to this movement from the country into the cities. The difference in the standard of living in town and country is acutely felt. The poorer strata of the peasantry (but not these alone), the superfluous population of the villages, or the so-called agrarian overpopulation of the country — this is the source of the great army of the unemployed. If the number of unemployed continue to increase at the present rate, then our industry, rapidly developing, as it is, will not be able to absorb and employ all the unemployed looking for work in the immediate future.

There are two paths which must be pursued simultaneously

for the solution of the unemployed problem. One of these is the adoption of measures enabling the superfluous population of the villages to find occupation at home, in their own villages. This involves the whole difficult question of the raising of our agriculture, a question to be approached from the standpoint of an efficient division of labour among the various branches of agriculture. The first task is the differentiation between extensive grain growing projects, intensive tillage, intensive cattle rearing, etc. The problem of inducing our human material to remain on the soil must be attacked vigorously and determinedly. Above all we must attack the question of the support to be given to the intensive farming undertakings, and to the forms of cultivation requiring a large amount of labour. When these forms of cultivation are adopted to a greater extent, a larger number of workers can be given productive occupation. Certain prerequisites are naturally the first premise for the success of such undertakings — working up of agricultural products, factories for canning vegetables and fruit must be erected, etc. Agriculture must be industrialised with the aid of the co-operatives.

At the same time we must accord due attention to deve-

loping the cultivation of special plants: cotton for instance. But here we must recollect that a very important question is that of the expenditure required for irrigation plant, a leading factor for the rationalisation of our agriculture. We must not forget that an irrigation system in the hands of the State will greatly contribute to the collectivisation of agricultural processes.

The next difficulty to which I should like to refer is the raw material question. Native raw materials are being produced and worked up to an increasing extent. In 1925/26 the area under cotton cultivation had increased by 30 per cent. In comparison with the previous year, an increase of 98 per cent. in comparison with pre-war time. The area under cultivation for flax increased by 20 per cent. during the same period, an increase of 88 per cent. in comparison with before the war. For hemp the area under cultivation has increased by 27 per cent, exceeding the pre-war figure by 127 per cent.

Our industry is growing even more rapidly. We are greatly feeling the lack of raw materials, especially of wool, leather, and cotton.

At this point, comrades, I should like to draw your attention to a small but interesting feature of our difference of opinion with the Opposition.

At the present time the Opposition is of the opinion that we need not concern ourselves particularly about agriculture: all we have to do is to go ahead with industry, and constant pressure on this lever is the royal road to Socialism. And yet the fundamental solution of the riddle is the fact that Socialism, and our socialised industry, are in need of an agricultural basis. How can the textile industry be developed without raw materials, without cotton? How can wool spinning mills be set going if there is no wool? We cannot ignore agricultural production, for it supplies the raw materials for our industries. The question of prices, taxation, etc. have to be solved in such a manner that the peasant does not cease cultivating flax, hemp, oil-bearing plants, etc., because he finds the cultivation of wheat comparatively more profitable. What we require is correct proportions between the prices of industrial and agricultural products.

Comrades, the raw material problem is one of the most important of the tasks before us; it is closely bound up with the question of the relations between town and country, and forces us along paths going in very different directions to those proposed by the Opposition.

I now pass on to the question forming in my opinion the central and most important question of our economic policy — the question of price policy. This question is of great importance for us from more than one standpoint — both from the standpoint of the general development of our economics and from the standpoint of our industry. The rate of our development depends upon the reply we give to the price question. It is again of paramount importance from the standpoint of the improvement of the level of culture among the masses, especially among the masses of the industrial workers. The possibilities of a slow or rapid general cultural uplift of the country depend on our price policy. In short, from whatever standpoint we regard it, the price question is a leading one for the whole of our policy.

Although our Party has issued the slogan of reduction of prices, a reference to the common retail trade index figures for industrial and agricultural products shows a recent rise in the retail figures, despite a certain drop in the wholesale index figures. This means that the disparity in the prices of industrial and agricultural products is growing, if in a slighter degree than during the famous crisis in the autumn of 1923. We must look this fact squarely in the face, for it involves certain economic and political dangers. A remarkable situation: Our industry is growing much more rapidly than our agriculture, and yet the disparity between the prices for industrial and agricultural products is increasing. Industry is developing rapidly, the wholesale prices are falling, but the retail prices, that is, the prices which the broad working masses have to pay for products, are rising. The wholesale prices of State industry have fallen by 36 per cent. during the last 3 years, but the retail prices have only fallen by a miserable 3 per cent. The problem of wholesale and retail prices must be raised energetically, and in its full extent.

There is do doubt whatever that we have been successful in concentrating in our own hands not only the whole of large industry but at the same time a great part of the markets,

that is, wholesale and retail trade. Wholesale trade is entirely ours, retail trade is ours to a lesser extent, but sufficiently to give us the greater part of the markets. Speaking generally, we may assert that we hold a dominant position with respect to the trade in goods. Both in industry and in commerce we are practically monopolists. When we combine this fact with the fact that industry is developing more rapidly than agriculture, and with the circumstance that whilst the wholesale prices are falling, the retail prices fail to do so in spite of a special campaign for the purpose, then the question arises: Why do the retail prices not fall, what becomes of the difference between the wholesale and the retail prices? What are the causes of this inconsistency? And we can ask further: Have we reduced the wholesale prices sufficiently, have we done everything possible, can we not take further steps for the attainment of better results?

If we examine all these questions in their totality, the present situation remains inexplicable if we do not draw the conclusion that both in State industry, and even more in our State trade and in the co-operatives; there must be some concealed profit, some net proceeds which our state knows nothing of, but which is absorbed somewhere in the economic organisation. This does not by any means imply that this net profit is consumed or wasted in the apparatus. A certain amount is expended for extensions outside of our plans, without the knowledge of the leading organs of our economics, State, and Party.

How can anything of this kind come about in our industry? The net profits can, for instance, be entered as "amortisation" in the annual balance, can be employed for the erection of new buildings or works, etc., even when such an extension of the industry has not been contemplated in our original plan.

In State trade and in the co-operatives, extensions of this kind, not provided for in the original plan, occur even more frequently. Both in the sphere of industry, and in the sphere of traffic in goods, there are concealed profits, not entered as such by our economic organs, but employed under various classifications for the extension of the apparatus, for the extension of business. We may console ourselves by remembering that this evil has its advantageous aspects. Even if the development of our industry takes this "illegal" form, still it is a positive development. The negative aspect of this matter is however greater than the positive.

Monopolist Self-Satisfaction or Systematic Progress?

I must show you how the negative aspect outweighs the positive. We have been struggling with the problem of our prices for several years, and as early as 1923, during the first discussions with the Trotskyists, some of us pointed out that a danger exists in the sphere of economic policy, a danger arising out of the circumstance that we hold the monopoly in a number of branches of economics. In itself it is an excellent thing for the workers' State to be in possession of the positions of power, since this places in its hands the opportunity of realising the socialist state of society. It is an excellent thing when the working class holds the positions of power. The monopoly held by the working class in national economics, in the market, and especially in the sphere of large industry, is a tremendous plus, and one of the most important pre-requisites for the work of building up Socialism. This is beyond all shadow of doubt. It is a perfectly elementary truth. But it must not be forgotten that disadvantages may arise out of an advantage, and that many difficulties threaten.

As you are well aware, a capitalist monopoly is an institution for pillage. A capitalist monopoly signifies that a small handful of big capitalists rule over the whole of economic life. The monopolist capitalists have no reason to strive for a steady increase of production at cheaper prices. Once they have got the power into their hands they can demand as high prices as they like, and squeeze the last penny out of the population.

It must be admitted, comrades, that even a non-capitalist and proletarian monopoly may easily succumb to the temptation to rest upon its laurels. Cannot this or that economic organ fix some profitably high price, and realise this in the market by the exploitation of its monopolist position? It is even possible to justify such a trick theoretically. Industry must be developed as rapidly as possible, for it is our socialist basis; we can develop it more quickly if our net profits are great, and these are great in proportion to our prices. High prices secure for us high net profits, which we can utilise for new industrial plant, for the development of industry, for the building

up of socialism at top speed, etc. Here we have a wonderful ideology, and viewed from the outside it appears to be "purely proletarian".

One of the greatest errors of the Opposition is its adoption of this viewpoint. We find this standpoint clearly expressed in a work by Comrade Preobrashensky: "The New Economics", in which we read that we must not disregard the fact that we are the heirs of monopolist capitalism. Monopolist capitalism has always exploited its power of extracting super-profits out of everything and everybody, and Comrade Preobrashensky concludes that we must not fall behind capitalism. As heirs we must squeeze out at least as much profit as our forebears, if not more. The sole difference between our hunt for profits and that of the capitalists consists of the fact that we do not employ our profits for the benefit of capitalist society, but for socialist society, not for the capitalist class, but for the firmer establishment of proletarian rule. This is the philosophy of the opposition on this point.

But it is a false philosophy. We cannot, must not, and shall not pursue such a policy, unless we are determined to rush to our own destruction. In the first place, even from the purely economic standpoint it is nonsense to assert that the speed of accumulation will be quicker in proportion to the amounts we can squeeze out of our consumers by means of high prices. This thesis is fundamentally wrong, and is doubly wrong. Wrong in the first place because industry develops in reality with much greater rapidity when the traffic in goods between town and country is accelerated. The more rapid this turnover, the greater the sum of profit, even though the prices remain the same, or are even reduced. A cheaper price may be fixed for some one article, but if we improve the quality of this article, and if we contrive to gain more rapid returns, then the total profits on the year will increase, even though the price of the article has been reduced.

This is the difference between the two methods. From our standpoint our main task is to fix a cheaper price, to produce better qualities, to realise in this manner greater profits, to obtain quicker returns, to develop industry at an intensified speed, and to accelerate our speed of development without at the same time ruining the peasantry, and without robbing industry of the needful agricultural raw materials, by means of a policy maintaining the right relations between industry and agriculture, strengthening the alliance between workers and peasants, and cementing more firmly the leadership of the proletarian industry and of the proletariat itself.

The price question has still another side, and one no less important. The mechanism of development in our state of society differs in principle from that of the capitalist state. Let us consider the conditions under the capitalist order, in industrial capitalism, in the classic age. Under capitalist conditions the main incentive to rapid growth and increased production is competition. Competition is the whip, the spur. But the "golden age" of free competition is over, and the capitalist monopoly has taken place. The capitalist monopoly brought great advantages in its train, reduced expenses for administrative

and other purposes. But on the other hand it brought with it many elements of decay. After the capitalists have monopolised everything, the spur and stimulant to improved production vanishes at the same time. Hence the decay of capitalism.

For the Working Consumers.

How does this apply to our proletarian monopoly? Free competition is swept away by it. What are then our motives for production? I am of the opinion that it is the mass of the workers and peasants themselves which forces us to improve our production. If we had come to a standstill with our achievements, if we had become negligent, if we were to fix any prices we cared to, and no voice had been raised in protest, then certainly we might have fallen into decay. But the mechanism of our development is different altogether. Our motives for production are different. The workers say: No, what we want is lower prices and better goods. The peasants say the same. The Party listens to the voice of the masses, and asks: What is the matter; what is the cause of the discontent? Shall we not put pressure on our economic front? Shall we not say to our comrades at work in the sphere of economics: Good friends, kindly improve production, etc. The motive power behind us is not competition, but something else.

The driving power impelling us forward is in the last resort growth of the needs of the masses. The masses do not fail to let us know at once if anything is lacking in the performance of our economic duties towards them. Those who attempt to rest on their laurels for a while will very soon be made conscious of this.

But on the other hand: In so far as all economists do not adapt their measures adequately to the demands of the masses, and in so far as our position is monopolist, the danger exists that we do not strive energetically enough for the simplification, improvement, and rationalisation of our apparatus, and that we incline to follow the line of least resistance, that is, the direction of the maximum rise in prices. This danger exists and has found its ideological expression in the economic conceptions of the Opposition. In spite of the opinion of the Opposition, I maintain that this method is fatal for us; that this is a line of policy which must be combatted by our Party — and not only by our Party. The Party must at the same time mobilise the more advanced strata of the workers and peasants in order to bring an immediate influence on the part of the masses upon the economic and co-operative organs. Our economics exist for the consumers, not the consumers for the economics. This is a point which must never be forgotten. The "New Economics" differ from the old in taking as their standard the needs of the masses, and not the profits which they may pocket on Monday or Tuesday, without a thought of what may happen on Thursday or Friday.

The question of the reduction of prices, the cautious reduction of wholesale prices, and an obstinate struggle for the reduction of the retail prices — these are factors of great political importance today.

IV. On the Heels of the Class Enemy.

The Proletariat and its Allies versus the N. E. P. man and the Kulak.

When we inquire into the prospects of our inner development, we can look forward to the future with every confidence, for the natural wealth of our country is enormous, and the planning system is developing rapidly in our economics. We have already been successful in solving many huge economic problems: for instance Volchovstroy, we approach the practical solution of such problems, as that presented by the construction of the Dnyeprostroy, the Volga Don canal, the Grossny Tuapse petroleum conduit, several great railways, etc. This is great evidence of progress. Besides this, we have made great advances towards enriching our national economics by the utilisation of scientific and technical possibilities, a point of the utmost importance for the future. When we now pass from these economic aspects of the question to the questions of the class struggle in our country, we find that our analysis up to now has already fairly well answered every question which can be raised on this subject. In the struggle between the working class and private capital in industry we see a decline

in the specific weight of private capital from 5.6 to 4 per cent between 1923/24 and 1925/26. In wholesale trade the decline is from 21.8 to 9.4 per cent, in the retail trade from 41 to 24 per cent. This is the balance of the class struggle, these are the most important victories of the class struggle.

Our main weapons in the struggle against private capital are: The firmer establishment of the co-operatives and for state trade, and our system of planned economics. We are, however, ready to employ other means as well. During the past year we have increased the taxation of private capital, and have introduced special railway tariffs and other administrative measures against private capital. It is true that private capital can record an absolute growth, but the conditions are such that private capital is being rapidly surrounded on all sides by us. Our greatest enemy in the rural districts is the Kulak, but here, too, we can record a considerable economic victory — we have captured the grain market. The Opposition has greatly exaggerated the part played by the Kulak, but still it is an undeniable fact that the kulak could have done us considerable damage by an alliance with private capital. But we have suc-

Some firms, as for instance the Tramway Company of Naples, which contributed 200,000 lire, presumed, without any authorisation, to take enormous sums from the emergency fund of their staff and from the relief fund.

The masses of workers in almost every case protested against these frauds, as far as local circumstances permitted. In the "Pomilio" factory a large placard "Down with the loan!" caused the dismissal of four workers and the temporary suspension of forty others; one of the dismissed workers had his ears boxed in the manager's office. The poster was removed by the Fascists, but appeared again the next day crowned with a large drawing representing the crossed sickle and hammer.

The Communists distributed in almost all factories pamphlets and small papers which had been secretly printed, decrying the loan, the plutocratic financial policy of the Government and the reduction of wages; the distribution of these pamphlets met everywhere with the sympathy of the workers. In the factories in which the directors did not themselves deduct money from the wages, but asked the workers what each of them would subscribe, only a small minority replied by buying a share, whilst the other workers declared that their wages did not even suffice to feed their children and that they had absolutely no reserve funds with which to buy shares.

The economic position of the working class has become perceptibly worse in recent times. The recovery of the lira has not brought about any reduction of retail prices; the stores in the factories are not used by the workers because they have specialised in the sale of old stock and damaged goods. The intensified supervision concerns itself almost exclusively with small traders, who are loaded with new taxes.

On the other hand, unemployment in the towns and distress in the country are rapidly increasing. The Fiat works in Turin, which alone employ about 32,000 workers, were closed for a fortnight on the pretext of the transition from collective agreements as to wages to individual agreements (the abolition of collective agreements means the abolition of the last achievement of the class trade unions which was left to the workers), but in reality chiefly to re-arrange the works for the production of new war material. There are at present altogether 5000 unemployed in Turin, to whom must now be added workers returning from France. Workers have been dismissed from almost all the factories in Milan. As a sign of the distress in the country, we would point out the re-appearance of the disease known as pellagra and the increased mortality from pellagra in 1926.

It is difficult to give data as to the deterioration of the economic position in South Italy, because the great mass of the working population there consists of peasants and artisans; after a stop had been put to emigration and in view of the misery which prevails in the towns, these inhabitants are forced to live in the villages on the verge of starvation.

Since similar conditions of distress prevail in the home markets, and since exports have been considerably restricted, it is easy to foresee that even the recovery of the lira will be endangered by the industrial crisis.

In spite of the low standard of living of the workers and in spite of unemployment, the industrialists want to reduce wages still more and to force the workers who are still at work, to work over-time. In some places, such as Novara and Milan (the firm of Radaelli), the Fascist corporations themselves are compelled to resist the employers' organisations, which does not prevent the employers, who are supported by the authorities, from carrying through the measures resolved on by their organisations in spite of the platonic protests of the Fascist trade unions.

The only factories which are not in a state of crisis and are not obliged to dismiss workers, are those which are adapted for war industry. Many metal works (including the Itala, Michelin, Pomilio, Fiat etc.) have been militarised; in communicating this news to the workers, the industrialists took care to explain that workers who, in the future, are guilty of subversive propaganda, instigation to strikes etc., will be tried by the exceptional Court Martial and sentenced according to the new law for the protection of the State.

The metal works of Brescia and its surroundings have received large orders for shells and machine guns; in Milan they have begun to manufacture large-calibre shells and in the district of Biella, the textile factories have resumed the manu-

facture of war material. Although the *Confederazione Generale del Lavoro* has not been dissolved, the Reformist leaders calmly remain perfectly passive. As is well known, the Communists entrusted with trade union work have almost all been arrested and deported; in spite of this, the Communist trade unions have re-established their cadres and have urgently demanded that the Reformist leaders call a conference of the C. G. d. L., before which they shall lay the measures which are necessary to restore to the class trade unions their capability of fighting against the Fascist dictatorship.

The deportations from all the provinces of Italy are continuing. Already 29 persons have been deported from Bologna, amongst them ten peasants from Molinella, who have been sent to Rhodos, one of the Aegean Islands and ten workers from the town of Bologna, who are destined for the Tramiti Islands.

From Trieste, 15 workers have been deported, amongst them Juraga, the correspondent of the "Unita", two anarchists and workers who are in sympathy with us. From numerous places also, many deportations have been reported. Communist demonstrations have taken place at the stations of Livorno, Padua and Trieste.

Apart from the deportations, "plots" are being constantly discovered, which are to come before the exceptional Court of the Fascist militia in the near future.

New Fights in Syria.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

For many weeks there was a pause in the fighting in Syria. At the beginning of the winter, the French generals had finally abandoned the hope of settling the revolt and the insurgents on their part, gathered together after the serious fights in the summer. It should be emphasised that the chief cadres of the insurrection had still remained intact, both the Druses of the Sultan el Atrash and the majority of the volunteers from the districts of Damascus and Ruta remained loyal to the insurrection in spite of severe privations. Only a few of the unimportant leaders, such as Hamsat el Dervish, the priest of the Hedjri, gave themselves up to the French who, of course, tried to exaggerate and make a great deal out of this surrender. The insurgents, it is true, had been deprived of their most important centres by the occupation of part of the Djebel Drus and of the Ruta. They were, however, quickly able to re-establish themselves by transferring their headquarters to the district of El Arak (on the frontier between the English and French mandatory territory), and on the other hand by building up a basis for operations on the plateau of El Safa (between Damascus and the Djebel Drus).

In the meantime Ponsot, the new French High Commissioner, travelled about the whole country, studying the situation. In spite of the military "successes", it had become clear even to the reactionary French Government of Poincaré, that the roots of the insurrection reached much deeper than the French propaganda Press, which repeatedly talked of a "handful of bandits", "uninfluential fanatics" etc., would have us believe; that the demands of the Syrian Nationalists for self-determination and self-administration were justified; and that, in any case, the pacification of Syria was not to be thought of unless these demands were conceded.

Mr. Ponsot proceeded to carry out his task with the greatest caution; whereas his predecessor de Jouvenel had, by empty and bombastic speeches, brought the French into greater discredit than they already enjoyed thanks to the deeds of cruelty of the generals, Ponsot wrapped himself in impenetrable silence. He accepted petitions, wishes, deputations, to which he listened patiently without expressing his opinion in a single word. He only made it understood that he was "studying" the Syrian question. In the meantime of course, the executions, wholesale arrests and deeds of violence of the generals went on on the same scale as before without the taciturn Ponsot finding it necessary to interfere.

It was indeed interesting that all the deputations which appeared before Ponsot, whether from Aleppo or Damascus, from Hama or from Hons, from Baalbek or from Tripoli, although they represented various parties and various groups of the population, always made the same stereotyped demands for independence, for the unity of Syria, Parliament, an army of

to the plans passed by the Ministry, it will have a tonnage of 420,000. Japan, which in 1922 had 88,000 tons, will have 203,000 in 1930; in 1926 it already had 145,000.

As we see, the imperialists are regularly arming on sea and on land and also in the air in a predatory way, and of course not for their amusement, not to soothe one another with pacifist conversations, but in order to attack one another at the moment when it becomes necessary, in order once more to involve the working masses in the fight, in the horrible slaughter.

The same applies to the increase of technical equipment of the land and sea forces. In the last war there were 2½ heavy machine guns to every 1000 combatants in France, and now there are 11, i. e. almost five times as much. Light machine guns did not exist at all, now there are 49 to every 1000 combatants. In 1918, the air-fleet dropped 22,000 kilos of bombs on Paris from 480 flying machines. Reckoned according to our old Russian weight, this means 1375 poods, but now the same number of air-craft, the carrying capacity of which has considerably increased, could drop almost ten times as much — instead of 1000 pood, 9,375! When we add to this the increase in the number of air-craft, we can say with conviction that of the towns which came under the fire of modern squadrons, nothing but a heap of ashes would remain. We are obviously living in an epoch of which we can say without hesitation that we are approaching new bloodshed and war, if not with the rapidity of a perfected flying machine, at least with the rapidity of an express train.

Only one circumstance can console us, the working class of the Soviet Union; if the workers prove incapable of preventing the slaughter and if the bourgeoisie once more, with the help of social traitors, involves them in a war, the result will inevitably be that a new Soviet Republic, perhaps even several new Soviet Republics will place themselves side by side with our Soviet Union. Of this we have absolutely no doubt (applause).

Needless to say, we, and with us the whole Communist International, i. e. the advanced section of the whole world proletariat, will take all possible measures to prevent, to avoid war. We cannot, unfortunately, guarantee peace however, because there are far too many circumstances and causes which at present we are not able to overcome.

Side by side with the preparations for inevitable wars between the various National Bourgeois groups, preparations are being made for war against us. This war against us is not being organised by those who live in our neighbourhood, not by Poland, not by Roumania, Esthonia, Latvia and Finland, not by the present Lithuania. They would never make up their minds to such an adventure if they did not feel behind them the powerful support of the Great Powers. Behind the small States, which encircle us, are the great capitalist sharks who know what they want. Amongst them, Great Britain is the chief instigator; she is organising both the public opinion of the whole world and all the small States which lie on our Western borders and is stirring them up against us.

In 1923, the military Budgets of Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Poland and Roumania amounted altogether to 370 million roubles, in 1926 to 430 million, i. e. by 16% more. The peace strength of the armies of these States amounted in 1923 to 479,000 and in 1926 to 533,000, i. e., 11,3% more. Apart from these regular armies, there are in all these States Fascist organisations which are no less well organised and which are undoubtedly more united from the political point of view and more suitable for special purposes. The Fascist organisations are our bitterest class enemies; the bourgeoisie maintains them exclusively for the purpose of class war. In 1923, these organisations had altogether, without reckoning Roumania, 295,000 as against 479,000 regulars, by 1926 they had 651,000 as against 533,000 regulars.

Thus our neighbours on our Western border have about 1,200,000 men under arms in the army and in the voluntary organisations, to which we can only oppose our Red Army with less than 600,000 men, i. e. we have against us an army which is numerically twice as strong and, further, half of it consists of our class enemies. The number of air-craft of these five neighbouring States amounted in 1923 to 280, but by 1926 to 510, without counting the enormous number of reserve flying machines. The possibilities of producing air-craft in these States is very small, but Great Britain, and especially France and Italy, supply them with flying machines

in almost unlimited numbers and under extremely favourable conditions.

These small States are increasing their armaments for war against the Soviet Union. In recent times they have proceeded in increasing measure to organise their own war industry. In 1923, they had altogether only seven factories for the production of war materials, now they already possess 22. These factories have been built chiefly in Poland and Roumania. Their possibilities of producing war material are of course still very weak; nevertheless there has been in this respect an increase of supply from 8% of the annual demand in 1923 to 25 — 30% of the demand in 1926.

I repeat that if Poland, Roumania, Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia and Finland were to receive no support from outside, they could not attack us without running the risk of breaking their necks. Unfortunately however they are backed by the technique and the industry of France, Italy, Great Britain and the United States.

In addition to these preparations by way of military organisation, public opinion is being furiously worked upon in order to turn the petty bourgeoisie and the backward strata of the workers against us. The bourgeoisie is best helped in this work by its faithful servants, the Social Democratic pensioners. The Press of Great Britain, the United States, France, Italy and our "dear" neighbours is literally suffocating under its calumnies against the Soviet Union.

There is literally no event that is in any way remarkable, or that is even not remarkable, which is not attributed to Moscow. What is it this all about? What is it? Is it that the consciousness of the bourgeoisie is obscured or that it is inspired by the arch-fiend, or has all this simple and perfectly concrete causes and aims?

The bourgeoisie of course knows perfectly well that the masses enslaved by it see the path to emancipation from their slavery in the methods of Moscow. This is why the peoples of China, Indonesia and other countries are instinctively drawn to Moscow. The bourgeoisie feels and must feel that the ground is slipping from under its feet and that it must take some extraordinary measures in order to maintain its position. It knows just as well as we do, that two worlds built up on quite different lines and which exclude one another, with different prospects of development, with a different ideology and economic basis, cannot exist side by side, that one of them, as Lenin repeatedly told us, must sooner or later perish.

The bourgeoisie now believes that the moment has come for it to improve its position in an open fight. The whole misfortune for it is that the bourgeois States, as Comrade Bukharin pointed out yesterday, cannot come, to an understanding and cannot agree to take decisive action against us in a united front. They have far too many causes for disputes and rivalries among themselves. This circumstance gives us the possibility of postponing an immediate collision with the bourgeoisie of Western Europe.

We are striving for peace, we have repeatedly spoken and do speak of it, and we say that we have repeatedly published official declarations as to our wish to live in peace etc. If, in spite of this, we are not believed, if nevertheless the bourgeoisie is increasing its armaments for war, we should all of us, to put it mildly, hardly be in our senses were we not to make regular preparations for defence, did we not properly arm ourselves to parry the blow which threatens us.

After a breathing space of five years and unrelenting work at strengthening the readiness for action of the Red Army, it would of course be rash and wrong to say that we are not ready. We, the Red Army, are not prepared for the offensive but for the defensive, and are prepared at any moment to defend the frontiers of the Soviet Union (tempestuous applause). Our armed forces have not remained behind the growth of our whole country in their development (we must say this here openly so that all may hear). The political and moral condition of the armed forces of the Soviet Union leaves nothing to be desired. The party organisation in the Red Army is just as strong, just as united, just as well organised, just as uniform and stands the test of Leninism equally well as does the whole Party in the whole Soviet Union (applause).

As regards the special readiness to fight, we have also achieved considerable results. We get from the State all the means which it can possibly grant us. The Red Army, the Red Navy and the Red Air-Fleet will always be ready. If they are

told "Begin!", if they are told "There is immediate danger! You must seize arms and do your duty!", the Red Army and the Red Navy will be prepared (Applause).

Let me now ask you the question whether the Party and the country as a whole are prepared for the dangers of which Bukharin spoke yesterday, and on which I have reported to-day. The bourgeoisie of the whole world is mobilising.

How then are things with us in this respect? We usually hear official reports, we applaud and are frequently content with this. We are engaged in the great work of constructing socialism; this is very good, but we must not close our eyes to the fact that this construction may be destroyed to-morrow by an armed attack. While we, with our sleeves rolled up, are working at consolidating our industry, the enemies stand round us like jackals with open mouths and howl viciously and threateningly. We should not forget this even for a moment.

For this reason we must mobilise psychologically in the shortest possible time. The international situation is not developing in our favour, we may be attacked to-morrow, if not to-day.

We must not forget that we are on the eve of a war and that war is by no means a plaything. In peace-time our armed forces are fairly small. In modern wars, millions will fight. At the present moment, even the so-called border countries which encircle us, can call up stronger forces than we. In the future they will be able, in case of a war, to double or even treble their forces. When we bear in mind that they possess the powerful technique of the imperialism of Western Europe, we can picture to ourselves the dangers which threaten us. We have a good army, but this army would be small in a time of war; as soon as military action begins, it must be increased many-fold, and then we shall have to say to you — to 50 or 60% of those sitting here — "Up and at them, if you please!" (Prolonged applause).

If however, comrades, it were only a question of your readiness to respond to our summons, all would be well. As a matter of fact, the question is a much more complicated one. It is impossible to wage war without a hinterland which works as precisely as clockwork. The hinterland must be so organised that industry does not work less well than in peace times, so that the army may receive its supplies in a normal way etc. It must be remembered that the forces are unequal and that, for the time being, their proportions are not in our favour. In order to carry on a defence with success, preparations must be made, and I tell you straight out and frankly that things are by no means satisfactory as far as our preparations are concerned. The Party must begin to take a serious interest in the question of defence. In my opinion, the Moscow organisation is of sufficient importance to have a voice in the matter, to emphasise that the greatest attention must be paid to these complicated questions.

We must first of all mobilise our consciousness, our psychology, and then pass on to organisation.

The existing associations, which work at reinforcing our defence, must be developed not only in extent but as regards their spirit. After we have made ourselves ready within the Party itself for war we must set the Party to work a little and prepare the working class of the Soviet Union. Then we must impart this spirit to the whole population by raising them and improving their position. At present we have two organisations: Aviachim (Society for Promoting the Air-Fleet and the Chemical Industry) and Oso (Society for the Defence of the Soviet Union). They are now being amalgamated and called Oso-Aviachim. Many comrades maintain an indifferent attitude to this organisation, although it is of immense importance for strengthening our power of defence. I call upon the whole Moscow organisation to become imbued with the conviction of the importance of the defence of our State and to regard it with the earnestness which results from a true estimate of the International situation and of the possibility of conflicts.

We must see to it that through our Press and through our meetings the achievements of technical science become as well known to us as they are in the West.

We must put this on our agenda and carry it through with all energy. At the same time we must not frighten one another with the terrible things which the imperialists are said to have at their disposal in the form of chemicals and air-craft which can, in a moment, wipe immense towns off the face of the

earth etc. etc. All this is intended for school-children, but we must understand the matter aright. At the same time, however, we must not forget that the strength and the technical skill of the imperialists of Western Europe is very great and that it is directed against us in all its intensity. We must be quite clear about this, so that we are not seized by panic and do not act foolishly when the first bomb is dropped. It is not enough to hear a report once a year, but the Party comrades must become familiar with the defence of the country down to the smallest details.

If our Party and its best organisations, such as those of Moscow, Leningrad and others, take measures now, before we are attacked, to understand the nature of what is going on beyond the borders of our country, to realise the significance of the preparations for an attack and our measures for resisting this attack, to know what measures the Government will take at the moment of this attack, then, I can assure you that our numerically small Red Army and still smaller Red Navy and Red Air-Fleet will, with your full support — and of course on the condition that you become one organism with our whole army — be able to deal successfully with these dangers which threaten, and that our proletariat, when, personified by its army and its navy, it clenches its fist, will offer to the imperialists who have gone mad, such resistance that they will never again want to attack our Soviet Union! (Prolonged, tempestuous applause, the audience rise from their seats and give Comrade Woroshilov an ovation.)

HANDS OFF CHINA

Down with the British War on China!

By R. Palme Dutt (London).

The British war measures against Nationalist China are in full swing. The almost daily sessions of the Cabinet on China, the close consultations of Chamberlain, Lloyd George and MacDonald in unison, the conferences with the Chief of the Imperial General Staff and with the naval, military and air chiefs, as well as the feverish preparations, daily dispatch of fresh warships and reinforcements, overtime at the dockyards, requisitioning of merchant ships as troopships etc. — all these are the outward evidences of a big war crisis.

The preparation of this war crisis has proceeded continuously ever since the failure of the last British attempt to smash Nationalist China by the Chang-Wu combination last summer. That attempt was the culminating effort at intervention through the persons of mercenary generals. The Chang-Wu combination was laboriously built up by British diplomacy (and finance) to "smash the Reds", as the Times triumphantly announced in June. Chang was to rout the Kuominchun or National Army in the North; Wu was to overthrow the Canton Government. That attempt failed, first because Chang, still clinging close to Japanese support, was not prepared to risk his position beyond Peking and Manchuria; and second, because Wu could not secure the allegiance of his troops for his counter-revolutionary campaign, and collapsed before the victorious advance of the Cantonese armies.

Ever since the victorious advance of the Cantonese armies, raising the prospect of the rapid realisation of a United National China almost without a struggle, British Imperialism has recognised that a supreme effort would be necessary to re-establish its position. Already in September the Times declared in a special article entitled "Chinese Chaos. Need of United Action":

"There is a remedy and one only — foreign influence. Nothing short of intervention can save China, for herself and for the rest of the world. Intervention does not mean the use of armed force, though some degree of it at some period in the future might prove expedient."

(Times, 1st September, 1926.)

British Imperialism has set before itself a twofold aim. Either 1. to split the National forces by mingled diplomacy and threats of force, so as to reach a settlement with the Right Wing of the Kuomintang, on a basis of the partition of China, "joint" administration of the concessions, special "safeguards" for British interests etc., or

2. War with National China in the event of refusal of a "settlement" of this type; with the co-operation of the Powers, if possible; if necessary, alone — until the other Powers can be entangled.

The combined Peace Offensive, expressed in the hypocritical Christmas Memorandum and Lampson speeches, and the intensified military and naval preparations are the expression of this policy.

The lying and hypocritical character of the Peace Offensive should now be clear to the most unsuspecting. The Christmas Memorandum contained nothing positive, save two points:

1. the granting of the surtaxes, which, as the National Foreign Minister Chen has pointed out, give nothing new to the Nationalists, and most of all to Sun Chuan Fang, the Imperialists' watchdog for Shanghai;

2. the demand for "united action of the Powers" in defence of "the legitimate and vital interests of foreigners in China".

Deeds speak stronger than words. The thin pretence of pacific words is completely belied by the unprecedented naval and military concentration. The Peace Offensive is the familiar diplomatic preparation of war. The British workers, in particular, have cause to remember Baldwin's Industrial Peace Offensive, that preceded the attack on the miners.

If the intentions of the British Government are pacific, why are they not prepared to make a settlement at once with the National Government on the basis of the handing over of the concessions and negotiation of equal treaties? There is no question of the ability of the National Government to administer the concessions equally with the rest of Chinese territory and maintain order: the Imperialist news correspondents themselves all testify to this. Even at Hankow, over which the huge artificially manufactured scare has been raised, there is not a single suggestion of a single British citizen receiving a hairsbreadth of injury with the concession under Chinese administration. The whole propaganda about the protection of British lives, necessity of evacuation of women and children etc., is a gigantic smoke-screen. The only reality is the protection of British imperialist predatory interests. It is for these that the British Government is blocking negotiations by demanding as a preliminary condition the return of the concessions. The British Government is handling the negotiations in such a way as to make a pretext for a break.

The Hankow crisis has been handled entirely as a preparation for the main fight. A propaganda display has been made of British "pacifism" in surrendering the concession, as a justification for an "inevitable stand" later at Shanghai. But in fact there was never any question of opening the fight at Hankow, 300 miles up the Yang-Tse, in the midst of Nationalist country. The whole fight centres round Shanghai, the key of British power, trade and wealth in China. It is here that the arming of the foreign volunteer corps, the battalions of Russian Whites, the wholesale arrests, the shooting of workers' leaders, and the steady concentration of warships and armed forces, all show Imperialism in its living bloody shape, ready to fight to the last for its "rights".

The role of the international working class, and above all of the British working class, in the coming struggle is of overwhelming importance. There are three factors in favour of the Chinese national forces in their struggle with their mighty armed adversary:

1. the unity of the Chinese working masses around the Kuomintang and the National Armies;
2. the division of the Imperialist Powers; and
3. the action of the working class in the imperialist countries.

Of these the first factor is already directly in action in the struggle to its full strength.

The second factor is dangerous to count on too much. So far the trade hostility of the other Powers to British domination in China has defeated British plans of united action (during the past year British loss of trade has gone alongside the growth of trade of other Powers); and both American and Japanese Imperialism aim at present at courting nationalist sentiment in China, and have treated the British Memorandum with contempt. But this situation may change, especially if general Imperialist interests seem threatened; and British diplomacy may succeed, in securing united action (as at Tientsin, last spring), particularly with the aid of a few skilfully prepared "incidents".

Therefore the third factor is all-important as the new force to bring into play. Only the action of the working class can check the already begun armed intervention in China, and the sending of yet more warships, munitions and troops.

The British Government is already taking steps to endeavour to neutralise and counter beforehand the action of the working class. MacDonald and the Labour Party Executive have been used, in direct consultation with the Government, officially to oppose working class agitation against Chinese intervention. The formation of "Hands Off China Committees" has been officially forbidden by the Labour Party Executive; and workers have been recommended to agitate to demand a more pacific attitude — from the Canton Government! MacDonald has issued repeated statements that the attitude of the British Government is completely pacific, that there is no question of intervention unless provoked by the Chinese, that the Canton Government is "truculent", that the real danger lies in the "Chinese crowds", that it seems doubtful whether the Chinese really want peace, that it is to be hoped the Canton Foreign Minister will prove reasonable etc. "The attitude of Labour in Power", declares the Times with regard to China, "is not likely to differ greatly from that of a Conservative Government" (Times, 25. 9. 26). This record of MacDonald and the Labour Party Right Wing towards the heroic struggle of the Chinese millions is one of the ugliest chapters in the history of Social Democracy.

But the agitation in the working class is already strong. A "British Labour Council for Chinese Freedom" has been formed, with among its members Hicks, Chairman of the General Council, Maxton, Chairman of the Independent Labour Party, Lansbury, Bertrand Russell, Malone etc. This Council of "left" elements, although arising directly out of agitation associated with the Communist Party, has feared to include Communists in its membership. Nevertheless its formation reveals the strength of the agitation, and its programme is a sound one, covering the following six points:

1. Recognition of the full sovereignty and independence of China.
2. Recognition of the Canton Government as the National Government of China.
3. Renunciation of extra-territorial privileges.
4. New Equal Treaties with the National Government.
5. Withdrawal of all armed forces and warships.
6. Co-operation of British and Chinese Labour Movements.

The central question of the hour is the withdrawal of all armed forces from China. This is the decisive question. MacDonald and the British Government apologists declare that there is "no intention of intervention". So long as the guns and the ships are in China and in Chinese waters, such talk is barefaced hypocrisy. The intervention is already there. The intervention is the guns and the ships — which, even though not a shot were fired, remain powerful arguments to supplement the "pacific reasonings" of the British Government. The decisive weeks are the next few weeks, during which the newest and heaviest reinforcements are steaming on their way to China with their freight of instruments of death. By March the British Government will deem itself ready, if it has not already forced a crisis. Only the action of the working class can stop this. It is for the workers of Europe and America to see that the guns turned upon their Chinese brothers are withdrawn.

POLITICS

The Senate Elections in France.

By Paul Marion (Paris).

On January 9th, 1927, thirty Departments of France, forming roughly one third of the country, were called upon to elect their representatives for the French Senate. Great political importance attaches to these elections, which, occurring in the very middle of the period for franc stabilisation, a few months after the fiasco of the bloc formed by the parties of the Left, were held under the auspices of the Ministry of "National Union".

There is little need to describe the reactionary rôle played by the Senate in the Democratic constitution of France. It consists of 300 members, elected by a system of restricted suffrage, that is to say, by elective bodies composed of Deputies, General

Councillors (i. e. members of the Provincial Councils), and delegates of the Municipal Councils. It constitutes the Upper Chamber and possesses the right of vetoing any law determined by the Chamber of Deputies. It has at all times been the centre of social reaction and Conservatism. Elected by a majority of agrarian and bourgeois voters, it was, at the inception of the Third Republic, the stronghold of the monarchist landed proprietors; subsequently it became, by reason both of its composition and of the interests it constantly defended, the most reliable prop of capitalism, of the industrialists and the banks.

It must be pointed out that, since the elections of May 11th, which secured the Left a majority in the Chamber of Deputies, one of the arguments most used by Socialist and Radical members in vindication of the failure of a bloc formation on the Left, declared that the "reactionary" Senate opposed the "Democratic" measures about to be determined by the Lower Chamber. Since the fall of Herriot in April, 1925, the "Quotidien", the official organ of the Left Bloc, even gave voice to the slogan "Down with the Senate!", by which expression of opinion it was doing no more than merely re-assuming the programme of an abolition of the Senate, originally set up by the Radicals and only recently adopted by the Socialists.

However, the Socialists themselves no longer adhere to their bellicose announcements. The municipal elections of May, 1925, which caused numerous boroughs to pass into the hands of the Socialists, thus ensuring them a very considerable number of delegates for the Senate elections, induced them to "modify" their standpoint in this regard. And during the last two months which preceded the Senate elections in January, all the bourgeois parties, from the utmost Right to the extreme Left, evinced a degree of avidity more gross and brutal than has yet appeared even in the halcyon days of our Democracy.

Though on January 9th it was a question of electing one third of the Senate, seeing that the Senators are elected for a period of nine years and one third of their number retires every three years, this political event is not without its significance; since it could mean either a consolidation of the capitalist "National Union" or else a diminution of the importance of the Poincaré Cabinet.

The economic crisis, which continues to develop in France from day to day, is indeed beginning to cause the industrial and agricultural circles serious misgivings, the former in view of the degree of unemployment and the stagnation in business it is occasioning, and the latter by reason of the low prices of agricultural products, under which the small farmers in particular have to suffer.

In the case of these elections, we were faced with the astounding fact that the "National Union", while managing to hold its own in the Ministry and the Chamber of Deputies, disappeared altogether from the electioneering horizon, where Radicals and Socialists on the one side and moderate Republicans and Conservatives on the other were making their preparations for combat. In this way it was possible for the Left Bloc to reappear in opposition to the old National Bloc in almost all of the Departments participating in the election. This results mainly from the fact that the bourgeois political groups are desirous of safeguarding the economic interests they represent and their own future at the elections, though it is also an outcome of the circumstance that the "National Union" is no longer as compact a body as it was a few months ago.

Moreover, it should be remarked that the opponents were far from setting up contrary principles and programmes. Apart from some fine phrases on the part of doctrinary Democrats, who united with the Socialists in demanding the curtailment of the full powers of the Senate and precedence of general over restricted suffrage, the candidates and parties were engaged in totally different matters. These elections witnessed the most outrageous personal and political combinations. Every candidate, whether from the Left or from the Right, endeavoured in the first place to gain personal sympathies in the hostile camp with a view to cutting out his competitors. The Seine Department, in particular, was the scene of the most despicable manoeuvres. Here former Communists, like Morizet, who now styles himself a "Social-Communist", could be seen leagued with representatives of the most aggressive capitalist enterprises, such as Billiet, the candidate of the "Union of Economic Interests", the main financier of the National Bloc. A Socialist, such as Longuet, humbly solicited the votes of the Radicals, while Pierre Laval, the intimate associate of Briand, a renegade Socialist and the

candidate of the Right, was elected at the first poll thanks to his very obliging Socialist friends.

True to the tactics of Lenin, who advises that the petty-bourgeois parties be assisted to get the power into their hands, to the end that the masses be helped to acquire the experience requisite for their revolutionary education, the Communist Party of France had from the very beginning given utterance to the wish that the candidates of the Left, and the Socialists in particular, be "got" into the Senate. These tactics, which were pursued with a great degree of discipline and with remarkable agility, enabled us to defeat the most notorious reactionaries, such as Millerand and Billiet, to eliminate some particularly dangerous and obstinate Radicals and Socialists, such as Henri Sellier, Longuet, and Berthelot (one of the most rapacious financiers of France), and to help in ensuring the success of certain Socialist candidates.

All in all, the results of the Senate elections on January 9th, though not entailing the great flood of new Senators from the Left announced by the Socialist and Radical herolds, yet embodied an advance of the Left against the National Bloc, with some prospect of a revival of the Left Bloc on the occasion of the elections of 1928. Of the 107 mandates to be occupied, the National Bloc had about 60 in its possession and now has only 50, while, as a complete innovation in the history of our Third Republic, a Socialist group of 16 members has been installed in the French Upper Chamber.

Apart from the indignation felt by a considerable portion of the Socialist proletariat at the combinations effected by their leaders. (of whom Leon Blum, e. g., led an open campaign in favour of the big profiteer Berthelot), the political consequences of the elections of January 9th will soon become manifest in the realm of Governmental politics. In spite of a certain tendency to gravitate to the Left, the Ministry of the National Union is undoubtedly threatened. The decrease of industrial and commercial activity in the country questions the possibility of a currency stabilisation à la Poincaré, since the sterling parity at 122 francs to the pound no longer permits of the export of our industrial products and the latest price index published by the Statistical Office states that French products already cost more on the world market than those of foreign origin.

Like Belgium, we shall possibly experience a failure of the first attempts at stabilisation. The French bourgeoisie will be obliged to seek other means than those hitherto employed, while the existence of a Radical and Socialist majority in the Senate will certainly be one of the factors which will influence the Ministerial combinations of the future. (It is a well-known fact that the conflict between Briand and the Right in regard to the evacuation of the Rhineland is growing more and more acute.)

However this may be, our industrial capitalists will endeavour to stabilise the currency and to "rationalise" production at the cost of the proletarians, the peasantry, and the middle classes. The tactics of the Communist Party of France have since the recent Senate elections facilitated the main object which the Party has in view, viz., that of gaining access to the masses for the purpose of rallying them and leading them into the fight against the capitalist system of rationalisation, whatever political form the latter may assume.

Letter from Italy.

By N. N. (Rome).

The Fascio loan is a complete failure, although the Fascist Press is using every endeavour to prove the contrary.

The Fascist corporations and sections, having realised that the wide-spread and costly propaganda for the loan had not produced what they expected of it, resorted to compulsory measures, to deductions from wages and to threats of dismissal. Even these means however have not altogether produced the desired effect.

In some towns, such as Milan and Turin, the committees for the loan organised propaganda meetings outside the doors of the factories; but the great majority of the workers did not bother about them, but left the speakers alone with a few dozen employees and some Fascist workers.

In the same way as the ill-famed so-called dollar loan was handled, many industrialists told the workers that "the firm, rightly interpreting the patriotic feelings of the workers, had deducted this or that sum from the weekly wages and had bought Fascio loan with it".

ceeded in capturing the grain market — this is one of our greatest victories.

We shall continue, in the future, our unwearied struggle against the kulaks, the exploiters of the poor peasantry, and we shall continue to work for the firmer establishment of our indissoluble alliance with the middle peasantry. The poor peasantry have always been, and will continue to be, our firmest social support in the rural districts, and it is an important part of our task to aid and organise them further.

In the sphere of the class struggle various new events are to be recorded, for instance, the revival of certain anti-Soviet or semi-hostile tendencies among the intellectuals. Our Party must accord due attention to this movement, but must at the same time adhere to its policy of utilising the services of real specialists (experts) for its work.

Every possible attention must be paid to the directions issued by our Party and its Congresses with respect to the increased activation of the proletariat. We for our part shall do our utmost to ensure that the directions of the Party are correctly followed. And we shall win success in every direction, for the objective basis of success is there, and our economic life, the foundation of the living and creative energy of the working class, is on the upgrade.

The Party as the Vanguard of the International.

In conclusion, a few words on our Party. At the present moment our Party has closed its ranks on a standpoint perfectly Leninist, alike with respect to economics and to politics. It is steadily pursuing the right course. It has energetically repulsed the Opposition. This task of inner unity is, however,

not the only one of importance to the Party. It is now more than ever our duty to establish close connections with the broad masses of the non-Party workers, to establish the Party influence over these masses. Where new strata of workers have sprung up we must fight more energetically than ever to win over these masses, we must endeavour to convince them, to ensure the closeness of our connection with them, to extend and deepen our influence upon the non-Party workers, and through them upon the peasantry.

Thanks to our great success, our cadres may perhaps be inclined to "stand at ease", and may even forget the necessity of maintaining the closest and most intimate connection with even the most backward working strata. Only he is a true Communist who, despite the most dazzling success and brilliant prospects, never forgets for a moment the hard conditions under which the working people, who are our own flesh and blood, are living. The Party must always remain fully conscious of the necessity of maintaining the closest relations with those classes whose vanguard the Party is and will always remain.

In the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. we fought a decisive battle with the Opposition. The International Communist Labour Movement was the highest court of appeal for the trial of the correctness of our policy. The whole of the representatives from Western Europe, China, and other countries, unanimously declared our policy to be correct. This is a further guarantee that we are on the right path, that our Party, with many successes behind it and now again on the eve of gigantic events, will always remain the great and mighty Party of our victorious proletariat!

The Policy of Encircling the Soviet Union and the Red Army.

Speech of Comrade Woroshilov at the 15th Party Conference of the Province of Moscow.

A considerable part of the detailed and brilliant report of Comrade Bukharin was devoted to throwing light on the processes which are going on beyond the borders of our Soviet Union and which threaten us and the whole world with a new war, with new bloody collisions. Comrade Bukharin has given us in complete outline a picture of the mad competition which is raging at present between the imperialist Powers as regards preparations for new wars.

Comrades, all that we have heard from Comrade Bukharin corresponds in the minutest detail to the truth. War, against which even its instigators, the organisers of the bloodshed of 1914—1918 invoked the protection of the saints, war which was so cursed by all pacifists and all the blockheads of Social Democracy as soon as it was over, this war is once more approaching Europe, threatening the whole world. Unfortunately we are not in a position to say that the proletariat already possesses the means and the forces to prevent this war. We can however say that the world proletariat, even at the present stage, possesses the means and the forces to postpone a war of this kind, to arrest and perhaps even to prevent it. Nevertheless it must be clearly stated that the bourgeoisie, which is passing through the most complicated and contradictory circumstances of its own post-war development, is inexorably advancing towards war.

Comrade Bukharin (whom I will not supplement as it would mean to a certain extent a task to which I am now not equal), has very eloquently pointed out all the reasons and causes which are leading the imperialist Powers into war. I will only supplement it so far as to say that such questions as those of the Pacific Ocean about which enough was spoken at the Conference of the Enlarged E. C. C. I., which recently came to an end, and the question of the Mediterranean, about which, unfortunately, we do not know nearly as much as would be desirable, should be added to the reasons which will inevitably lead to military conflicts between the bourgeois States. All these causes plus a number of others, in their sum total make a complicated conglomerate which will undoubtedly

sooner or later lead to a collision, to an armed fight between the chief Powers.

In order to justify my assertion, I should like to give a few figures regarding the growth of the armaments of the most important world Powers, France, Great Britain, Italy and the United States of America in the period between the beginning of the great war and the present day.

In 1913, on the eve of the preparations for the great war, all these Powers together spent 1980 million gold roubles on armaments. In 1926 the war Budget of the same States amounts to 3500 million roubles, i. e., 80% more. This certainly does not savour of pacifism or of a love of peace! In 1913, these same States had only 150 air-craft. This, it is true, was only the very beginning of air-fleets. At present these four Powers have 3,500 air-craft ready for action, not counting air-craft in the reserve. It must not be forgotten that these Powers, especially France and Italy, but now Great Britain and the United States also, have possibilities of production which would enable them to build any quantity of flying machines at any given moment, should the exigencies of war demand it.

The numerical strength of the armies in these countries amounted to 1,610,000 in 1913, at present it amounts to 1,800,000. This is a small increase, but when we consider that in addition to the regular troops, each of these countries has so-called concealed forces, as for instance the Fascist organisations of the bourgeoisie which are systematically armed, we find an enormous figure which almost doubles the armed forces of these States.

In spite of all the talk of the imperialists of Western Europe and especially of America as to the necessity of restricting naval armaments, the naval forces of all Powers do not cease to grow. The number of cruisers and submarines is increasing particularly; thus for instance the United States had in 1922 a total tonnage of 210,000, in 1926 of 230,000 and, according to their programme, they will have in 1930 300,000 tons. Great Britain had 272,000 in 1922, but in 1930, according

their own, amnesty — thus, just the demands which the rebels had made as their minimum programme.

Of course there were also individual groups and small groups who wished to turn to account the difficult position of the Arabian people in Syria in order to make capital for themselves; amongst these were above all members of the rich and "noble" families, who were prepared to help the French to solve the crisis by all kinds of treachery. Thus the Sheriff Ali Haidar, supported by the renegade Ramadani el Shelash, who had gone over to the French, suddenly put in a claim to be King of Syria (of course under French supremacy) and entered into negotiations with Ponsot; but the unanimous disapproval with which this plan was received by the Nationalists, caused the pretender to the throne to disappear quickly from the scenes.

Now Ponsot is to return to France, to give a report on the result of his studies and to make proposals. He is previously to enter into negotiations with the English Commissioners in Palestine and Egypt; for the contradictions between England and France are still far from being smoothed out. They crop up on every occasion, and the existence and intensity of these contradictions was undoubtedly one of the reasons for the long duration of the anti-French campaign in Syria.

Immediately before Ponsot's departure, the insurgents began to make new attacks. Several divisions have been re-organised and have caused the French serious losses in the last fights near Salkhad, Douma and Deraa. After a short interval, French ships are again conveying hundreds of wounded soldiers home and the "citations, a l'ordre de l'armee", with which the generals commemorate fallen officers, are again filling the columns of the French papers appearing in Syria.

At the same time the insurgents are carrying on an intensive propaganda; the Emir Shekib Arslan has gone to America to mobilise the large colonies of Arabian emigrants over there for the Syrian cause. Dr. Shahbandar is travelling in Bagdad and Egypt, where he (a "bandit", who has been several times condemned to death by the French authorities) is received with much enthusiasm, invited to official banquets and overwhelmed with expressions of sympathy. Another delegation is on its way to India and Arabia. In this way the whole of the Mohammedan world is to be drawn into the fight against French imperialism, and the insurrection to be placed on a new solid basis.

THE TRIAL OF RAKOSI AND COMRADES

The Result of the Rakosi Trial before the Court of Appeal.

Letter from Budapest.

16th January 1927.

The result of the appeal in the Rakosi trial before the Court of Appeal shows that also the Bethlen government has drawn its conclusions from the first Rakosi process, and that it has taken international public opinion, above all the opinion of the international working class into consideration. Its aim now is to conceal the terror against the working class under a policy of "democracy", under a mantle of "objective jurisprudence". On the one hand the government is continuing its persecutions of the whole left-wing working class movement, particularly the Socialist Labour Party with aid of force, the police, numerous and frequent arrests etc., but on the other hand it admits its defeat in relation to the S. L. P. before the Court of Appeal according to all the laws of "Objective jurisprudence". At the very beginning of the appeal the prosecutor withdrew his accusation that the Socialist Labour Party was a communist party. With this the verdict of the first court that the Socialist Labour Party is no communist party, has become legally valid. This double tactic was also used against the communist accused in the process. The result of the appeal in the Rakosi process is a warning for the whole international working class movement to be on guard against this double policy of the Bethlen government.

The most important points resulting from the process are the following:

1. The Socialist Labour Party of Hungary has been acquitted upon the charge that it is a Communist party. The attempts of the government to prove the contrary by means of police terror, tortures to produce "confessions" etc. failed completely. The government was compelled to admit its defeat.

2. The Communist Party has made splendid propaganda thanks to the attitude of its members before the court. The prosecutor was compelled to retreat in face of the communist accused also. The latter were acquitted upon the charge of common crime. The attempt of the Bethlen government to maintain the appearance of objective jurisprudence can be seen in the reduction of the sentence imposed upon comrade Weinberger. His sentence was reduced from eight to six years hard labour. Having regard to the fact that he has already been legally sentenced to ten years hard labour, thus making sixteen years hard labour in all, the reduction of his sentence by two years is ridiculous.

3. In consequence of the death of comrade Nemet following upon maltreatment in prison, the defence has succeeded in securing a conditioned release for comrades Katharina Haman, Mitterer and Szilagyi on account of serious illness. The Franco-forgery Windischgretz has been in a sanatorium for weeks and his pardon and the pardoning of his fellow-accused is expected in the near future. The "clemency" now shown to comrades Haman, Mitterer and Szilagyi "conditionally" is a preparation for the extension of pardons to the Franco-forgers.

The Proceedings of the Rakosi Trial before the Court of Appeal.

Budapest, 16th January 1927.

On the 13th of January the proceedings began before the court of appeal in the Rakosi process. Both the prosecutor and the defendants Rakosi and his 59 comrades appealed against the sentences. The accused appealed against their condemnation and the prosecutor against the acquittal of the members of the Socialist Labour Party and against the sentences passed on the communist accused on the ground that they were too mild.

The second day of the proceedings brought the surprising news that the prosecutor would withdraw his appeal against the acquittal of the members of the Socialist Labour Party. This retreat was all the more surprising because several weeks before the beginning of the process the heads of the Budapest police had made known in the press that they would bring forward new proofs at the appeal proving that the Socialist Labour Party was actually a Communist Party. The defence had pointed in its appeal to the methods used by the Budapest police in political processes. It pointed not only to the tortures and to the paid reports of spies, but also to the whole system of provocation with the assistance of which the police had brought about the process. As a counter to the threats of the police in relation to the Socialist Labour Party, the defence prepared new revelations. The government considered a retreat advisable and instructed the prosecutor to withdraw his appeal against the acquittal of the courageous members of the Socialist Labour Party so that the acquittal of Stefan Vagi and his 29 comrades and also the declaration of the court that the Socialist Labour Party is a legal socialist party and no Communist Party and that its existence is perfectly legal, have now become finally valid.

The defence demanded that the protocols relating to the police tortures and the medical evidence, should be read. 18 such protocols were read.

The speech of the prosecutor exhausted itself in the usual phrases and abuse against the communists. He called the communist leaders a "sordid gang", he abused the Soviet Union and the third International. He declared that he could not understand how the communists could dare to show themselves again in Hungary after the dictatorship of the proletariat, the memory of which was cursed by so many workers. He demanded an exemplary sentence against the communists.

The (bourgeois) council for the defence Lengvel pointed out that the remarks of the prosecutor could perhaps only have been made in Hungary.

"The prosecutor should not forget" — declared the council for the defence — "that the Soviet Union is the only state which did not submit itself to conditions of peace imposed by force and that it has been able to build up a new and important state from its own resources. The prosecutor should not forget that

the Third International has fought most energetically against the peace treaties of Versailles, St. Germain and Trianon. In almost all states the communists are represented in parliament, etc. and are permitted to propagate their ideas openly. Hungarian consolidation demands that this should also be the same in Hungary. One cannot suppress ideas with abuse and with force. Even if the idea should proclaim the end of the present social order, it can only then be fought with ideas. If anyone wishes to form a Communist Party, he is not breaking the law. I demand an acquittal."

The other councils spoke to the same effect.

The following accused spoke: Rakosi, Weinberger, Haman, Oeri, Goegoes, and Juhazs.

Comrade RAKOSI

dealt chiefly with the abuse of the prosecutor.

"The prosecutor has called the communists a sordid gang. When people say that to defend present day society, with its prisons and its gallows, then the abuse only redounds to our honour. Such abuse is powerless against all those who are fighting for the emancipation of the proletariat and who have staked their lives in its cause. Our communist martyrs have gone to their death by the thousands in order to free humanity of the yoke of capitalism. One of us, Comrade Nemet, has found his death within the last few days in this prison because he would not submit himself to the will of the bourgeoisie and would not compromise with the treachery of the social democracy.

One sixth of the world — the Soviet Union — is administered by communists who are building up socialism there. These are facts which make it unnecessary to reply in detail to the abuse of the prosecutor. It is also superfluous to defend the glorious memory of the proletarian dictatorship in Hungary against the prosecutor because this memory lives on in the hearts of tens of thousands of Hungarian workers. If the memory of this dictatorship is so accursed, if the working class thinks in this way about the leaders of the dictatorship, why do they not commence the process against me on account of my activity as a People's Commissar. I welcome this process. I declare myself in solidarity with all those who held office during the Soviet Republic. I do not fear the accusation of murder in 110 cases. But it seems to me that the rulers of present day consolidated Hungary fear to recall the memory of the proletarian dictatorship.

When I was arrested, I declared that I had returned to Hungary in order to do my best to assist in the development of the Communist Party into a powerful mass party and in order to propagate the idea of communism in Hungary. Naturally, if I want a Communist Party I must also want the dictatorship of the proletariat. I declare that the Communist Party is the only party which seriously challenges the existing social system of misery and that only the dictatorship of the proletariat will be able to free the Hungarian working class. The social democracy has long ceased to be the fighting party of the proletariat, it betrays the interests of the working class, it does not fight for the daily needs of the working class, and because the Communist Party alone fights for the daily needs of the working class, neither gallows nor prisons nor the abuse of the prosecutor can prevent the Communist Party developing into a mass party and breaking down all barriers put in its way. The court can sentence me to eight years or to life long hard labour, I cannot prevent it. But from day to day the number of those fighters will grow, who will fight for a powerful Communist Party capable of opposing the present system, freeing the Hungarian proletariat and calling to life a new and victorious dictatorship of the proletariat."

Comrade WEINBERGER

attacked the verdict of the court in the beginning of his speech and pointed out that the court in its verdict had declared the communist movement to be "unreasonable and illegal" and attempted to explain its unreasonableness by the lack of education of the accused. Unreasonableness is not necessarily an accompanying feature of a low standard of education, but it apparently is an accompanying factor of the higher level of education of the court, that it dares to deliver a verdict upon communism about which it knows absolutely nothing.

"Your verdict only concerns us personally. It puts a number of people temporarily out of action, but behind these people who have been torn away from the masses stands the indestructible

army of the Communist Party and behind the Communist Party the working class and the peasantry is developing into a revolutionary unity. The permanent and uninterrupted development of the Communist Party of Hungary defies your verdict, defies the tortures of the police and defies the gallows. At every arrest of communists your press declares triumphantly that the Communist Party has been destroyed, but no matter how many trees you may fell in the wood of communism, the time will come when the wood itself will set itself in movement against you and will destroy you whilst you are occupied in felling individual trees. Your verdicts are absolutely useless. You cannot wipe out the working class and a party which has grown up on a blood soaked ground. You cannot destroy the Communist Party.

"Eight years ago tens of thousands of young workers demonstrated in Budapest against the murderers of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. Liebknecht and Luxemburg were murdered exactly eight years ago with the assistance of the German social democracy. The German bourgeoisie which carried out this murder was urged by the same considerations as those which caused the creation of paragraph 3—1921 of the Hungarian criminal code (the exceptional laws against the communists) and today the spirit of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg lives on in the hearts of hundreds of thousands of young proletarians and every year on the 15th of January the whole Young Communist International gathers around the grave of these two martyrs. Today Hungarian young workers are forbidden to organise themselves. The tremendous army of young workers in Hungary is unorganised. It is a cheap commodity on the labour market. The young workers of Hungary have been forced into illegality. But I feel now before this court that they are demonstrating for Liebknecht and Luxemburg even if silently and I am convinced that they will follow the example of their great heroes and rally round the banner of the Young Communist League of Hungary.

Long live the Young Communist League of Hungary!"

Comrade OERI:

"The verdict said that I am a fanatic who cannot be improved by a normal punishment. It wishes to represent me as a mentally sick person revolting without conviction. However, the basis of my so-called fanaticism is communist conviction. Only after bitter experience did I take my place under the banner of the Communist Party. I was a swineherd, my brothers are still, I know the misery of the village. I have also known starvation as an industrial worker. I have learned from my own experience that this cannot continue for ever. By learning I discovered the way out — socialism. My experiences as a trade unionist have convinced me that the Social Democratic Party has betrayed the class struggle and bowed down before the bourgeoisie. No verdict of this court will be able to shatter my communist conviction.

"The exploited agricultural and industrial workers have only one hope — the Communist Party, for the social democratic leaders have not only sold themselves but also the workers to the bourgeoisie."

The President: "Don't talk about that, we cannot examine it."

Comrade OERI:

"But the workers know about it and will pass their judgment upon the traitors."

Comrade Oeri then dealt with the tortures carried out by the police and pointed out that even the verdict of the court was compelled to admit the facts in this connection. He then dealt with the abuse of the prosecutor against the Soviet Republic.

The President: "Don't discuss those things here, tell me why are there thousands of beggars in Russia?"

Comrade Weinberger (interjecting): "Do you know anything about that?"

The President: "How dare you! Behave yourself."

Comrade OERI:

"We communists are fighting despite all hindrances for the unity of the working class and only we are fighting for it. Despite all verdicts I will fight to my last breath for the establishment of the united battlefield of the working class. Long live the united front of the working class! Long live the Communist Party!"

Comrade GOEGOES:

"The court sentenced me rather more severely than the average sentence imposed upon my comrades. It did this because I was allegedly a leader. I feel at one with my fellow accused. I am no leader, I am just a simple proletarian like my fellow accused. I do not say this in my defence or because I wish to have a few months removed from my sentence, but because I am convinced that I did not show enough interest for the building up of the Communist Party and did not work as hard against the present governmental system and for the freedom of the working class as I ought have done. I wish to regain my freedom only to work much harder, with greater knowledge and with greater determination for the building up of the Communist Party.

I am a communist. That means that I shall never improve in the bourgeois sense, that I shall never compromise with the existence of bourgeois society and that I shall fight against it always.

I am a communist. That means that I fight for the daily needs of the working class as well as for its final emancipation, that means that I regard the Communist Party as the leader in this struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat as the transitional form leading to communism.

I am a member of the Communist Party of Hungary. That means that it is my duty, even from here, from prison, to fight with all the means at my disposal against the restoration of the Habsburg monarchy, against the Bethlen system which has resulted in the complete pauperisation of the working class, and against the social democracy which supports this system.

The government is once again promising all sorts of wonderful things with a view to lulling the working class and the peasantry. But the working class knows that it has nothing to expect from this government which has granted 30 milliard crowns (about 100,000 pounds sterling) from the taxes which it has squeezed from the toilers, for the breeding of race horses and not one singly crown for the support of the unemployed. Nothing is to be expected from a government which, instead of building houses for the working class, restores the old palace, and which offers as the only medicine against the fearful spread of tuberculosis, the propagation of the monarchy.

The poor peasantry also knows what it has to expect from a government which has buried its promises of land reform under the thousands of other broken promises. The landworkers know what they have to expect from people who will not even permit them to organise themselves. The same is true of the small farmer who loses even what little he has, by excessive taxation.

Only the Communist Party of Hungary really struggles against this double system of broken promises and brutal oppression. Only the Communist Party is fighting for the unity of the workers and peasants, as only an alliance of workers and peasants under the leadership of the Communist Party can free Hungary from the present system and prevent a restoration of the Habsburg monarchy.

If I have been able to do something by my Party work for the building up of the Communist Party, for the creation of a revolutionary alliance between the workers and peasants for the penetration of the idea of the proletarian dictatorship into the hovels of the workers and the huts of the peasants, then I don't care in the least if you increase my sentence.

Long live the revolutionary alliance of the workers and peasants!

Long live the Communist Party of Hungary!"

Comrade KATHARINA HAMAN:

"I do not intend to defend myself any more than we defended ourselves at the first trial. We have accused the existing system as the cause of the misery of the working people. In support of this accusation it is only necessary to point to the growing number of suicides, to the growing unemployment and to the growing discontent. We have accused the servants of class-justice, the police. In support of our accusation we have presented the medically corroborated testimony of our own tortured bodies. We have accused the social democracy of betraying the cause of the working class and in support of our accusation it is only necessary to point to the bankruptcy of the bloc policy, to the terrible decrease in the membership of the trade unions, to the unorganised condition of the railwaymen and the landworkers and to the terrible exploitation and the in-

tense misery of the working women. No one was able to disprove our accusations. No one even attempted to, you contented yourselves with putting many of us out of harms way.

The six months which have passed since the first trial have only corroborated the correctness of our accusations. Whilst you are condemning us here, the present system is condemning the whole of the working people of Hungary by its preparations for the restoration of the Habsburgs. The measures of oppression have been perfected, the exploitation has been increased and the domination of the banks and the large industrialists consolidated, everything is ready for the moment when a king is forced upon the shoulders of the working class.

Who is fighting against this? The elections have shown that the working people in town and country have no confidence in the bourgeois oppositional clique, but neither have they confidence in the social democracy. The withholding of the working class votes was a demonstration against the ruling powers and in favour of that party which stands outside the law and which could not take part in the elections, the Communist Party of Hungary. Those masses of the workers who withheld their votes are rallying round the Communist Party. It is useless for you to sentence us, for you cannot kill the Communist Party. That which we say is not our word alone. Do not believe that by putting us in prison you have robbed the Communist Party of its existence. Do not believe that the heart of our Party has ceased to beat for one moment. Our pulse is beating in the working class, our Party is the expression of the unbreakable will of the working class to victory.

I spoke of the terrible misery and the lack of organisation of the working women. That which I said at the trial has been corroborated up to the hilt. The only branch of industry which is developing in Hungary, the textile industry is pressing its profits from thousands of working women and children. Tens of thousands of women are engaged in this industry, but neither the social democracy nor the trade union bureaucracy bother about organising them or leading their economic struggle. This task is waiting for the Communist Party, as well as the task of protecting the unions from the fascist policy of the ruling class.

The prosecutor appealed to the Fatherland and demanded that we should think in terms of the Fatherland. Who is working for the Fatherland? The working class. And what sort of a Fatherland is that for which they are working? This Fatherland is capitalism, is the bourgeoisie. I understand very well why the prosecutor recommends the workers so warmly to fight for the Fatherland.

Judging the punishment from a proletarian standpoint. I must say that it is a great honour to be called "a sordid gang" by the representatives of the bourgeoisie. The prosecutor applied this term to the leaders. I don't think that I have earned this title for I have never been a leader. I shall be very happy when I have earned this distinction. Those whom the bourgeoisie terms a "sordid gang" — the leaders of the working class — have the confidence of the workers.

I do not doubt but that you also will condemn and sentence me. You can do that, but you cannot break my will.

Long live the Communist Party of Hungary!

*

The Verdict.

The verdict was announced in the afternoon of the 15th January. The sentences were in all cases, with the exception of comrade Weinberger, ratified. The sentence of eight years hard labour passed upon comrade Weinberger was reduced to six years hard labour. The accused have given notice of appeal against the verdict.

Against the Persecution of the Leaders of the Hungarian Working Class.

Moscow, 17th January 1927.

The workers of the People's Commissariat for Transport who have taken comrades Rákosi, Weinberger, Oery, Goegoes and Haman under their care, have held a great protest meeting at which a resolution was unanimously adopted condemning the fascism of the Hungarian bourgeoisie and expressing enthusiastic approval of the attitude of Rákosi and the other revolutionaries. The meeting despatched a telegram of protest

to the chief judge, and further telegrams to the International Transportworkers Federation to Fimmen and to the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress appealing in the name of international proletarian solidarity for a protest action against the suppression of the Hungarian working-class movement and the imprisonment of its leaders.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS

The Construction of the Dniepr Power Works.

By Professor Alexandrov (Moscow).

The year 1926 undoubtedly opened up one of the most remarkable pages in the annals of the economic history of the Soviet Union. At the end of 1926, great power stations were opened up at two extreme ends of the Soviet Union: at Zem-Avchaly, on the site of the ancient capital of Georgia, Mtskhet, 18 kilometres from Tiflis a hydro electric power station with a capacity of 21,000 kws. has just been completed. This station has already commenced work. At the other end of the Soviet Union on the river Volkhov, a few days ago the great "Volkhovstroï" station with a capacity of 54,000 kws. commenced functioning. This is the most powerful of all stations in the U. S. S. R. and one of the biggest in Europe. Finally, at a meeting of the Presidium of the State Planning Commission on November 6, last, it was decided that of the many other big constructional plans, the construction of a high power electric station on the rapids of the Dnieper should receive first attention. This station is to provide 250,000 kws. power and it has been decided to start to work on it at once.

Thus at the commencement of the economic year, 1926-27, there were already in existence powerful new hydro-stations constructed more than half by the attainments of Soviet technique, while the foundations are being laid for a new power station. This station will be unequalled among the existing power stations in Europe as regards power capacity or from the point of view of profit.

What is still more remarkable is the fact that in pre-revolutionary Russia there did not exist any powerful hydroelectric stations for overland use for which form there is a great future. The biggest power station in Russia before the Revolution was the "Electro-Peredatcha" situated 45 versts from Moscow, at that time with a power capacity of 12,000 kws. It was situated on a peat bog and peat fuel utilised; all the equipment was procured exclusively from abroad. All this goes to show the undoubted progress in the field of Soviet technique and also the correct estimation of the Soviet authorities in regard to the resources of energy for the development of the country's productive forces and in restoring and accumulating basic capital.

"Dnieprostroi" represents a complete organic economic unity; it comprises the construction of: a) a powerful hydro-electric station, b) the inauguration of a shipping thoroughfare along the Dnieper and c) bringing the iron ore of the Krivorog District nearer to the Donnetz coal basin by means of a great main railway line from Demurino to Margenetz. On the basis of the considerable improvement in the conditions of the transport and energy in the district, a number of new branches of production can be created of vital necessity to the country; these include aluminium, ferro-manganese, synthetic nitrate, carbide of calcium, etc.

Experts have testified to the fact that "Dnieprostroi" is a profitable enterprise, not only because of the cheapness of power production, but because of the wealth of mineral resources in the region of "Dnieprostroi", the fertile nature of the soil. Further, also there is an extracting and manufacturing industry in the district which has existed for a considerable number of years, highly developed agriculture, a relatively dense population, all of which point to the undoubted development of shipping on the Dnieper in the near future.

The territory bordering on the Dnieper rapids and the lower Dnieper region is composed of 75% black soil. But as a result of the dry climate, especially in the south of the region, the soil requires artificial irrigation in certain places. This is possible because of the existence of cheap power and the higher level of the Dnieper water which at the town of Zaporozhi is 37½

metres high and thereby the existing fertility of the district can be increased.

The problem of establishing a shipping thoroughfare along the Dnieper is the oldest of the economic problems of "Dnieprostroi". Investigations for the solution of this problem were made already a long time ago under the tsarist regime. In fact in 1912 the question of a sluice at the Dnieper rapids was already decided upon, but this decision like many others, remained on paper.

River routes have served and continue to serve as the main routes for freight traffic as this form of transport is cheaper than railway transport. This is especially the case for cargoes of low value such as timber, coal, wheat, manuring substances, etc. In view of the tremendous distances over which Soviet export cargoes such as timber and wheat must be carried, the Dnieper system after the introduction of sluices will form an uninterrupted water-way, providing the possibility of cheap transportation of mass cargoes from one economic district to another with quite different geographical conditions and different natural resources. For example: White Russian timber could be transported to the woodless steppes of the Black Sea and Sea of Azov, while grain and to certain extent, coal and oil could be transported in the opposite direction.

The Dnieprostroi is of great importance. On the basis of the most modest calculations it is estimated that during the first years 200—250 million poods of goods of various categories will pass through the sluices. The transportation of such a large quantity of goods along this water-way as compared with railway transport will save the national economic system about 10 million roubles per year.

As regards the problem of the "Dnieprostroi" energy, here the quite exceptional cheapness of "Dnieprostroi" current must above all be borne in mind. According to the estimations the Dnieper power will cost 0.5 kopeks per unit. Such cheap current can be obtained partly owing to the favourable objective conditions on the Dnieper, but also, because the Dnieper station can count on good utilisation of its capacity up to 6000 hours work per year.

Such a high yield of the Dnieper station is above all explained by the fact that up to a minimum of 80% of its power, would be utilised by branches of industry which work 7—8000 hours per year. This includes the production of synthetic nitrate, aluminium and ferro-manganese. The chemical section of the Supreme Economic Council alone, has already placed an order for 80,000 kws. with a yearly consumption of 480,000,000 kw. hours.

The production of synthetic nitrate, which is a necessary fertiliser, fully replacing Chile salt-petre for non-black earth and also for the south-western sugar plantation of "Dnieprostroi" power. Thus this new giant station will play a tremendous role in the work of restoring agriculture in the U. S. S. R. which in turn will undoubtedly serve in the future as a further basis for industry.

Another undoubtedly big future customer of "Dnieprostroi" power will be the aluminium industry which during the last few years has been more and more widely adopted in electrical engineering construction and also for household utensils where it is gradually ousting copper. In the production of aluminium cheap power plays a tremendous role. With current at 0.5 kopeks per kilowatt, the production of a ton of aluminium in the "Dnieprostroi" from Soviet boxite will cost only about 900—1000 roubles whereas the price on the world market is 1,200 roubles per ton. At first the production capacity of the Dnieper Aluminium Works will be 6,000 tons per year, i. e. for a yearly consumption of 300 million kw. hours current.

The pre-war production of ferro-manganese was conducted exclusively by means of smelting in blast furnaces, for which the blast furnaces in works used for smelting ferro-manganese soon ceased productivity, as the furnaces wear out four times quicker in the smelting of ferro-manganese than in the smelting of pig iron. This method is too costly and what is more, the ferro-manganese obtained is of relatively poor quality. Besides this, about 10,000 tons of ferro-manganese were imported yearly from abroad where it was made out of Russian ore.

The smelting of ferro-manganese in the Zaporozhi district by electrical methods will be very profitable, especially when compared with furnace smelting. First of all, works will be constructed in the "Dnieprostroi" region for the smelting of 100,000 tons of ferro-manganese for which about 50,000 kw. power is

required. This works will only satisfy the demands of the southern metal industry for ferro-manganese. But before many years elapse the Dnieper electro-thermic manganese will undoubtedly also find access to Poland, Czechoslovakia and Germany.

Finally, as far as the significance of "Dnieprostroï" in the development of the iron and steel industry is concerned, it will even be more advantageous for the relatively distant metallurgical works to purchase the cheap "Dnieprostroï" energy than to run their own power stations even if the latter be run by utilising furnaces and coke gasses. And naturally this also applies to the powerful metallurgical works which will be constructed in the town of Zaporozhi as soon as the "Dnieprostroï" is erected. Furthermore, the coke gasses will be able to find ample utilisation in other productive regions.

Cheap electrical energy in the locality of the works, its situation in between ore and coal districts at the crossing of main transport routes, including the Dnieper shipping artery, the proximity of the manganese ore, the existence of lime deposits and finally, particularly important for a big metal works, the existence of an inexhaustible source of good soft water — all these factors make the Zaporozhi district a highly suitable centre for the metallurgical industry of the South.

Such are the immediate main perspectives connected with the problem of "Dnieprostroï" which is already being realised in our times and which is of vital importance for the economics, not only of the Ukraine, but of the whole Soviet Union. "Dnieprostroï" as the results of the work of the Planning Commission and the American experts opinion have shown, will become a powerful lever for the restoration of our agriculture and industry, thus the popularity of the present slogan being broadcast throughout the Ukraine: "All to the aid of the "Dnieprostroï"! is quite comprehensible. Thanks to this slogan sufficient sums have already been collected within the confines of the Ukraine alone necessary for commencing constructional work. This undoubtedly shows the growth of political consciousness amongst the population of the Ukraine where, not so very long ago, the spirit of Machno and Petlura was rampant. It shows that a process of real construction is commencing.

The words of Schiller are here applicable: "Das Alte stürzt, es ändern sich die Zeiten und neues Leben blüht aus den Ruinen". ("The old collapses, the times change and new life blossoms from the ruins".)

FOR LENINISM

Our Programme.

By N. Lenin.

The following article by Comrade Lenin was written in 1899, i. e. 28 years ago. The article was written for the "Rabotshaja Caseta" ("Labour Journal"), of which two numbers had appeared in 1897. This paper was chosen as the central organ of the Party at the first Party Congress of the Russian Social Democracy. In consequence of the arrest of a number of Party leaders, the third number of the "Labour Journal", for which this and some other articles by Lenin were intended, could not appear, so that the article remained unprinted until 1925 when it was published by the Lenin Institute. It appears in our issue for the first time in the English language.

Ed.

International Social Democracy is at present going through a period of theoretical vacillations. Up to the present the doctrines of Marx and Engels were regarded as a firm foundation of revolutionary theory — nowadays voices are raised everywhere declaring these doctrines to be inadequate and antiquated. Anyone calling himself a social democrat and having the intention to publish a social democratic organ, must take up a definite attitude as regards this question, which by no means concerns German Social Democrats alone.

We base our faith entirely on Marx' theory; it was the first to transform socialism from a Utopia into a science, to give this science a firm foundation and to indicate the path which must be trodden in order further to develop this science and to elaborate it in all its details. It discovered the nature of present-day capitalist economy and explained the way in which the employment of workers — the purchase of labour power — the enslavement of millions of those possessing no property by a handful of capitalists, by the owners of the land, the factories,

the mines etc. is concealed. It has shown how the whole development of modern capitalism is advancing towards the large producer ousting the small one, and is creating the prerequisites which make a socialist order of society possible and necessary. It has taught us to see, under the disguise of ossified habits, political intrigues, intricate laws, cunning theories, the class struggle, the struggle between, on the one hand, the various species of the possessing classes and, on the other hand, the mass possessing no property, the proletariat, which leads all those who possess nothing. It has made clear what is the real task of a revolutionary socialist party — not to set up projects for the transformation of Society, not to preach sermons to the capitalists and their admirers about improving the position of the workers, not the instigation of conspiracies, but the organisation of the class struggle of the proletariat and the carrying on of this struggle, the final aim of which is the seizure of political power by the proletariat and the organisation of a socialist society.

We now ask: What new elements have the touting "renovators" introduced into this theory, they who have attracted so much notice in our day and have grouped themselves round the German Socialist Bernstein? Nothing, nothing at all; they have not advanced by a single step the science which Marx and Engels adjured us to develop; they have not taught the proletariat any new methods of fighting; they are only marching backwards in that they adopt the fragments of antiquated theories and are preaching to the proletariat not the theory of struggle but the theory of submissiveness. — Submissiveness to the bitterest enemies of the proletariat, to the governments and bourgeois parties who never tire of finding new methods of persecuting socialists. Plekhanov, one of the founders and leaders of Russian Social Democracy, was perfectly right when he subjected to merciless criticism the latest "Criticism" of Bernstein whose views have now been rejected even by the representatives of the German workers at the Party Congress in Hanover (October 1899 — Ed.)*.

We know that, on account of these words, we shall be drenched with a flood of accusations; they will cry out that we want to turn the Socialist party into a holy order of the "orthodox", who persecute the "heretics" for their aberrations from the "true dogma", for any independent opinion etc. We know all these nonsensical phrases which have become the fashion nowadays. Yet there is no shadow of truth in them, no iota of sense. There can be no strong socialist party without a revolutionary theory which unites all socialists, from which the Socialists draw their whole conviction, which they apply in their methods of fighting and working. To defend a theory of this kind, of the truth of which one is completely convinced, against unfounded attacks and against attempts to debase it, does not mean being an enemy of criticism in general. We by no means regard the theory of Marx as perfect and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that this theory has only laid the foundation stones of that science on which the Socialists must continue to build in every direction, unless they wish to be left behind by life. We believe that it is particularly necessary for Russian Socialists to work out the Marxist theory independently, for this theory only gives general precepts, the details of which must be applied in England otherwise than in France, in France otherwise than in Germany, and in Germany otherwise than in Russia. For this reason we will willingly devote space in our paper to articles about theoretical questions and we call upon all comrades openly to discuss the matters in dispute.

What are the main questions which arise in applying the common programme of all Social Democrats to Russia?

We have already said that the essence of this programme consists in the organisation of the class struggle of the proletariat and in carrying on this struggle, the final aim of which is the seizure of political power by the proletariat and the construction of a socialist society. The class struggle of the proletariat is divided into: The economic fight (the fight against individual capitalists or against the individual groups of capitalists for the improvement of the position of the workers) and the political fight (the fight against the Government for the extension of the rights of the people, i. e. for democracy, and for the expansion of the political power of the proletariat). Some Russian Social Democrats (among them apparently those who

* The article referred to is Plekhanov's: "Bernstein and Materialism" in the ("Neue Zeit") "New Time" (July 1898). Ed.

conduct the paper "Raboishaja Mysl") regard the economic fight as incomparably more important and almost go so far as to postpone the political fight to a more or less distant future. This standpoint is quite wrong. All Social Democrats are unanimous in believing that it is necessary to organise the economic fight of the working class, that it is necessary to carry on an agitation among the workers on this basis, i. e. to help the workers in their daily fight against the employers, to direct their attention to all kinds and all cases of chicanery and in this way to make clear to them the necessity of unity. To forget the political for the economic fight, would, however, mean a digression from the most important principle of international Social Democracy, it would mean forgetting what the whole history of the Labour Movement has taught us. Fanatical adherents of the bourgeoisie and of the Government which serves it, have indeed repeatedly tried to organise purely economic unions of workers and thus to deflect them from the "politics" of socialism. It is quite possible that the Russian Government will also be clever enough to do something of the kind, as it has always endeavoured to throw some largesse or rather sham presents to the people in order to prevent them becoming conscious that they are oppressed and are without rights.

No economic fight can give the workers a permanent improvement of their situation, it cannot, indeed, be carried on on a large scale unless the workers have the free right to call meetings, to join in unions, to have their own newspapers and to send their representatives to the National Assembly as do the workers in Germany and all European countries (with the exception of Turkey and Russia). In order, however, to obtain these rights, a political fight must be carried on. In Russia, not only the workers, but all the citizens are deprived of political rights. Russia is an absolute monarchy. The Czar alone promulgates laws, nominates officials and controls them. For this reason, it seems as though in Russia the Czar and the Czarist Government were dependent on no class and cared for all equally. In reality however, all the officials are chosen exclusively from the possessing class and all are subject to the influence of the large capitalists who obtain whatever they want — the Ministers dance to the tune the large capitalists play. The Russian worker is bowed under a double yoke; he is robbed and plundered by the capitalists and the landowners and, lest he should fight against them, he is bound hand and foot by the police, his mouth is gagged and any attempt to defend the rights of the people is followed by persecution. Any strike against a capitalist results in the military and police being let loose on the workers. Every economic fight of necessity turns into a political fight, and social democracy must indissolubly combine the economic with the political fight into a united class struggle of the proletariat.

The first and chief aim of such a fight must be the conquest of political rights, the conquest of political freedom. Since the workers of St. Petersburg alone have succeeded, in spite of the inadequate support given them by the Socialists, in obtaining concessions from the Government within a short time — the passing of a law for shortening the hours of work — the whole working class, led by a united "Russian Social Democratic Labour Party" will be able, through obstinate fighting, to obtain incomparably more important concessions.

The Russian working class will see its way to carrying on an economic and political fight alone, even if no other class comes to its help. The workers are not alone, however, in the political fight. The fact that the people is absolutely without rights and the unbridled arbitrary rule of the officials rouses the indignation of all who have any pretensions to honesty and education, who cannot reconcile themselves with the persecution of all free speech and all free thought; it rouses the indignation of the persecuted Poles, Poles, Jews, Russian sects, it rouses the indignation of small traders, of the industrialists, the peasants, of all who can nowhere find protection against the chicanery of the officials and the police. All these groups of the population are incapable of carrying on an obstinate political fight alone; if however the working class raises the banner of a fight of this kind, it will be supported on all sides. Russian Social Democracy will place itself at the head of all fights for the rights of the people, of all fights for democracy, and then it will be invincible.

These are our fundamental ideas which we shall develop systematically and from every point of view in our paper.

We are convinced that in this way we shall tread the path which has been indicated by the "Russian Social Democratic Labour Party" in its "Manifesto".

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

Appeal of the Young Communist International against American Imperialism.

Moscow, 17th January 1927.

The Executive Committee of the Young Communist International has issued the following appeal to the working class youth of America and of the whole world:

North American imperialism has blockaded Nicaragua and landed troops and guns in order to defeat the workers and peasants who are fighting against their oppressors. U.S. imperialism is carrying war into a country into which it has already sent misery and slavery.

The struggle of the people of Nicaragua against the oil barons of Wall Street is the fight of all the South American peoples. All the oppressed and exploited must join them.

The Y. C. I. appeals to the working youth, the first victims of imperialist war, to enter the struggle. Fight against the exploitation of the people of Nicaragua. Fight against the threatened war with Mexico!

Down with the robber imperialism of the U. S. A.!

Young workers of Nicaragua and Mexico! show your strength in the struggle against American imperialism!

Young workers and peasants of the United States, prevent your exploiters from warring against Nicaragua and Mexico!

Young Workers and Peasants of all countries, support the struggle of the peoples of South America for freedom!

THE WHITE TERROR

Traces of White Terror in Roumania.

Bucharest, January 3rd, 1927.

The Roumanian oligarchy, which is responsible for the unbounded white terror against the workers and the national minorities in that country, has at all times had reason to shut publicity. For a time, indeed, it succeeded in hoodwinking the European public into believing that all the gruesome tales spread abroad in regard to Roumania were inventions of the wicked Bolsheviks, and that in reality Roumania was a country of the most perfect peace and democracy.

This network of lies, which was spread all over Europe by a richly-endowed system of foreign propaganda supported by the "great press" of Europe, was for the first time thoroughly destroyed when the so-called Barbusse delegation submitted to Europe at the close of 1925 its report on the white terror in Roumania. If up to that time official quarters in Roumania had acted as though they were only too happy to have any one come to their country for the purpose of making inquiries, the Barbusse report caused the Roumanian Government to initiate a furious attack on the "champions of humanity and legates of the public opinion of Europe", to represent their terrorism as being a measure of self-defence against the Bolshevik danger and eliciting an interpellation in Parliament in regard to the measures contemplated for the purpose of counter-acting "undesirable foreign interference".

At the same time, the Roumanian press was forbidden, under the threat of the severest reprisals, to report on the various terrorist occurrences, so that such report might not be employed by foreign papers as documentary evidence. This, however, only resulted in a constant increase in the visits of foreign journalists to Roumania for the purpose of a careful study of conditions there; after a short sojourn these correspondents, in compliance either with necessity or with their own inclination, quitted the country again and compiled their reports abroad. For the "black cabinets", the severe censure of press telegrams, and the possibility of expulsion from the country by order of

the Ministry of the Interior (as e. g., in the case of the general representative of the "Press Association of America") obviously made an objective criticism impossible so long as the writer was on Roumanian ground.

In the last few days, again, much dust has been raised by the visit to Roumania of **George Pioch**, the well-known musical critic, writer, and editor of "Le Soir", a leading Paris evening paper. There was again much talk of the "champions of humanity", and the Fascist press of Roumania (i. e. the semi-official press of the Minister of the Interior) bristled with threats against the unduly inquisitive aliens.

And indeed, in official quarters in Roumania there is every reason for concern in connection with the visit of M. Pioch, who, in the course of a stay of barely two weeks in the country, was in a position to collect ample evidence of the terrorism of the Roumanian oligarchy, which he will certainly not withhold from the European public.

Pioch went about his work of investigation with as open a mind as could possibly be expected of him. He visited the Home Secretary **Goga**, the Minister of Justice, the Governor General of the Prisons, he conferred with the Roumanian Attorney General, he got into touch with the Social-Democratic Party and the unitarian Trade Unions, visited workers' quarters, attempted to see the inside of some of the prisons, and in short made inquiries of all the accessible initiators of terrorism and of those who had been its main victims. Needless to say, he also got into connection with the Roumanian press and listened to reports on the condition of the national minorities by the competent representatives of those sections of the population.

Our correspondent had occasion to speak to Pioch shortly before his departure and to receive the following general outline of the results of the French journalist's inquiries.

In the first place Pioch declared that the representatives of all parties and political directions had not only corroborated, but also considerably supplemented the reports in circulation as to the effects of the white terror in Roumania. The editors-in-chief of the leading Bucharest dailies had unreservedly answered in the affirmative to all his questions in regard to various occurrences of terrorism, the regime in the prisons, the shooting of prisoners "while attempting to escape" and so forth, merely adding the ingenious request that these things might not be made known, seeing that they might harm the "far reputation" of Roumania abroad.

In the Ministry of Justice, Pioch could only interview the Under-Secretary of State of that Department, who likewise begged him not to conceive too bad an opinion of Roumania. Pioch put a number of very definite questions to the Under-Secretary of State, asking him, inter alia,

"Why is a state of siege still maintained in Roumania, eight years after the conclusion of the war?"

To which the other replied, "There is no state of siege. You have been misinformed."

Upon the subsequent reference by Pioch to the activity of the courts-martial, by which, in 1926, no fewer than 29,680 cases were officially reported to have been tried, and to the constant occurrence of political trials, the Under-Secretary of State finally admitted:

"Well yes; but that is only at Bucharest and in the border districts, where there is a state of siege."

Another highly characteristic passage in the interview was as follows:

"How is it that we hear so constantly of the hunger-strikes of political prisoners?"

"In Roumania political prisoners are treated like ordinary criminals in view of the non-existence of any special legal provisions in regard to their treatment. As a matter of fact, however, hunger-strikes are as a rule not fatal."

At this juncture **Demetrescu**, the Attorney General, who happened to be present, joined in the conversation, which was ultimately carried on between Pioch and himself. Pioch asked him for information as to the conditions of imprisonment and inquired how it was possible that political prisoners could actually be placed for periods of more than ten days in upright cubicles of the size of coffins. It was only when the Frenchman referred to the official prison regulations and the utterances of various Roumanian statesmen, that the Attorney General ad-

mitted the existence of the mediaeval punishment of incarceration and likewise that of the "Section H", a dark cement cell of an area of one square metre, in which the prisoner is chained to the wall in a stooping position. He explained that both these forms of punishment were necessary in view of the "menace of Bolshevism".

Pioch immediately took him up at this word and maintained that the most tremendous abuse is made of it in Roumania. Thus he had with his own eyes seen a manifesto of the Government parties, in which **Costa-Foru**, who is a well-known Conservative politician, was described as a Bolshevist.

"In Roumania every member of the Opposition is called a Bolshevist. Conspiracies are framed up as a pretext for stifling the least movement on the part of the Opposition, and dangers to the State are artificially created so that those that initiate them can then pose as saviours of the State and can as such claim dictatorial powers for themselves."

When Pioch came to speak of the pogroms and anti-Semitic disturbances which had occurred during his own stay in Roumania, the Attorney General himself began, to the great astonishment of his hearer, to rail at the Jews, designating them as harmful to the Roumanian nation, which, he declared, was obliged to combat any expansion of the Jewish population or influence. In this fight against the Jewish danger, the Roumanian nation was merely defending itself and was naturally forced in such an embittered fight to resort to extraordinary and arbitrary means. As for the anti-semitic students, Home Secretary **Goga** had only recently pointed out that their "national demonstrations were nothing but the maintenance of the spirit of the trenches".

Pioch also interviewed a delegation of Jewish students on the subject of anti-Semitism in Roumania. These young men proved by means of actual figures that in practice the "numerus clausus" at the Roumanian high schools was already a fact, adding that what the Fascist students now aspired to was a "numerus nullus".

With the Governor General of the Prisons, Pioch had only occasion to speak about a few insignificant matters. The longer interview which had been promised him in answer to his request, did not materialise, nor yet did the promised permit to visit some of the prisons.

The hypocrisy of the Roumanian statement was well characterised by the interview granted Pioch by Home Secretary **Goga**, who in the Averescu Government conducts himself like a sort of Roumanian Mussolini. **Goga** assured Pioch that for him who "sympathised with many Socialist principles and had languished in Hungarian prisons as a national-revolutionary Roumanian, it was mental torture to be Home Secretary of a Government". To this utterance Pioch replied by inquiring after the fate of **Tkatschenko**. **Goga** answered literally that he "had unfortunately no knowledge of **Tkatchenko's** fate, having been at Carlsbad at the time".

In speaking of **Stefanov**, **Goga** said that as he had made his bed so he would lie. He was, in **Goga's** opinion, a very dangerous enemy to Roumania, a Bulgarian and an agent of the Soviets, and he would be made to feel the whole weight of the law.

In answer to a question on the part of Pioch in regard to the persecution of the liberal press, **Goga** assured him on "his honour" that the latter enjoyed his fullest protection, only that he "could permit no attacks on the reigning dynasty or the present form of government". At the close of the interview, **Goga** gave the French writer some intimation as to the sort of investigations a Roumanian Home Secretary would expect a foreign journalist to make, by offering Pioch a free pass on the railways throughout the country and all sorts of facilities for such a trip, an offer which Pioch naturally declined.

During his entire sojourn in Roumania, Pioch was under the observation of agents of the "Siguranza", before which authorities he was once even "erroneously" summoned to appear. Nevertheless, he was able at a meeting of the unitarian Trade Unions, to address a few encouraging words to the persecuted Roumanian working class.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LENIN'S DEATH

The Decisions of the VII. Enlarged Executive of the C. I. from the Leninist Viewpoint.

(For Propaganda during the Lenin Week.)

Published by the Agitprop of the E. C. C. I.

1. In its theses and decisions the last (Seventh) Enlarged Executive of the C. I. dealt decisively and in detail with the present position of world capitalism, the new groupings of the social and political forces and the tactical tasks of the Communist Parties in the individual countries. It laid particular stress on the tactical problems which are at present confronting the Communist International and its Sections, on the basis of a detailed investigation of the "relative stabilisation" of world capitalism and of the specific peculiarities and effect of this stabilisation in the various countries. Hence, it behoves the Agitprop departments of our Sections to carry on during Lenin Week a broad propaganda campaign inside and outside the ranks of the Communist Parties, in order to make the proletarian masses understand these tactical tasks connected with the everyday struggle and with the preparation of big revolutionary actions.

"The closest linking up of the theoretical and tactical principles of Leninism with the burning political problems of the Party", "Without Lenin's theory there can be no revolutionary tactics" — it is under these two slogans that the entire propaganda of our Sections must be carried henceforth.

2. It goes without saying that the revolutionary workers and peasants of all countries cannot be given the right orientation with respect to modern tactical problems unless they can be made to understand the economic-social character of the so-called "relative stabilisation" of world capitalism. This is the only way to make our Parties fully understand the historical stage through which we are passing, the stage "between two waves of revolution". On the other hand the relative stabilisation of world capitalism can only be properly analysed and appreciated on the basis of the Leninist theory of imperialism and by the full application of his methods of investigation into the stabilisation processes and types of stabilisation in various parts of the world, groups of countries and individual countries.

3. The Leninist theory of imperialism gives us an opportunity to consider the stage of relative capitalist stabilisation only as a chapter in the decline of world capitalism, and this temporary fictitious development of its individual parts and of the individual capitalist countries only as a clear symptom of the progressive consumption which affects all capitalist world economy, looking upon the rapidly alternating booms and slumps of the postwar period only as a proof that all "organic" upward development of capitalism and its "normal" crises are a thing of the past.

On the strength of a Leninist analysis of imperialist development we declare that all so-called "positive" sides of the present relative stabilisation, particularly the achievement of the pre-war level of production, the re-establishment of world trade and world credit, of stable currency, etc., must inevitably be transformed into negative sides — into potential antagonism inherent in imperialism. In fact the accelerated levelling of production and transport conditions in the individual sections of capitalist economy must once more bring to a head the fundamental contradictions of imperialism, the contradictions between the enormously developed production apparatus and the ever decreasing market possibilities which are bound to lead to violent crises. This levelling process, which also finds its expression in the forced attempt to form international trusts and cartels, is but the result of the laws of the world market, which were considerably restricted through the world war and its consequences for the individual national economic bodies, coming again into full force for all capitalist countries as soon as the pre-war level was reached. But this raises at the same time the question of a new economic distribution of the world market, i. e. of violent expansion of the individual imperialist powers at the expense of the other powers.

The strenuous efforts of the capitalist class to solve this question are coupled with increasing competition between the imperialist states, enormous pressure on the working class and all workers, inevitable collision between the imperialist

countries and the colonies and last not least with a relentless struggle carried on by the world of capitalism against the world of socialism, against the Soviet Union.

4. The Leninist theory which has coordinated all these phenomena in the doctrine of the uneven development of the imperialist powers teaches us at the same time that the "positive" sides of relative stabilisation as they strike the casual observer, — the Social Democrats advertise them as a "real settlement of the post-war crises of capitalism in general" — are already showing many gaps. It further teaches us to appreciate at its right value the epoch making importance of the gigantic struggle of the British working class, the growing triumph of the national-revolutionary movement of China and finally, the continuous consolidation of the Soviet Union. It completely destroys the pitiful illusions of the super-imperialists and "pan-Europeans" of all shades who want to interpret the superficial semblance of the temporary consolidation of certain sections and countries of world capitalism as the new upward development, propagating the idea of harmony between the interests of the exploiters and the exploited, the imperialist "mother countries" and the colonies which Messrs. Bauer and Vandervelde call patronisingly "cultural circles of a lower order".

But the Leninist theory is just as hard on the heroes of revolutionary phraseology, the ultra-Left of all shades, who without any theoretical hesitation simply deny the existence of the stage of relative stabilisation and deceive, knowingly or unknowingly, the revolutionary masses with pseudo-radical phraseology as to the concrete truth of the Leninist doctrine and the reality of facts, endeavouring to keep them in the dark concerning the necessity of an every-day struggle, of a thorough organisation of the Communist Parties and of the difficult process of coordinating all the forces into a revolutionary united front.

Lenin's struggle against "Leftism at any price" which is merely the ultra-Left cloak for the Right disbelief in the revolutionary strength of the masses, in their perseverance and loyalty, teaches us that the further development of the revolutionary labour movement will only be possible after a relentless exposure of the ultra-Left phrase-mongers whom we must discredit in the eyes of the workers.

Leninism alone with its doctrine of the uneven development of imperialism teaches us to judge all questions of the present historical stage of relative stabilisation. It shows us the tendencies of their development by rejecting all arbitrary constructions which come from the Right and the ultra-Left, it proves the erroneousness of Comrade Zinoviev's dictum that relative stabilisation has come to an end, it rejects the one-sided Trotskyite formula of the antagonism between Europe and America, in order to point out to the revolutionary proletariat the tactics which it must adopt on the basis of an exact analysis of that which really is.

5. In the present stage of development, when the powerful offensive of the capitalist class destroys all the social-political achievements of the workers under the pretext of rationalisation, subjects them to maximum exploitation through the intensification of labour and the prolongation of working hours and holds before the eyes of the workers employed in its enterprises the spectre of permanent unemployment — in this stage the theoretical enlightenment activity of our parties must pursue the task of providing the gradual radicalisation process of the proletariat and the peasantry with the ideological platform of joint interests and joint struggle.

At this stage the idea of proletarian hegemony on a world scale must be propagated in all the sections of the working population. The struggling proletariat must be made to realise that it cannot achieve its own emancipation unless it becomes the champion of all the exploited, unless it is capable of organising a people's revolution in its own country, unless it be prepared to sacrifice everything for the victory of the proletariat in other countries and unless it makes the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples its own. Inside and outside the ranks of the Communist Party, we must never cease to explain that the Leninist theory of proletarian hegemony, as practically carried out by the working class of the U. S. S. R., is the only way to the conquest and preservation of political power, of proletarian dictatorship. It is only on this basis that we can find at present also in the capitalist countries the revolutionary synthesis of the struggle for the everyday demands of the workers and pea-

sants and of their struggle for "ultimate Aims". This Leninist doctrine alone will enable us to do away with the Right and ultra-Left deviations within our Parties and within the labour movement in general.

6. At the present stage, "between two waves of revolution", we have the best objective premises for the permeation of the mass of the workers with Leninist ideas. The surest sign of the present tendencies within the European labour movement is the ideological radicalisation of the masses of all countries, which unfortunately has not yet found an adequate organisational expression. This ideological radicalisation which is the result of the powerful process of differentiation which is developing in the ranks of the exploited masses, of their instinctive desire to think over, to thoroughly examine the terrible experiences of the last years of revolution, to find new organisational forms and new theoretical formula of revolutionary practice. It is with this process, this instinctive desire of the proletariat for an objective clarification of the problems of its revolution which is also expressed in the demand for undisguised class struggle, for the united front, etc., that our entire Leninist propaganda work must at present link up. This propaganda must help the struggling masses to realise who has been always at their side in the stormy days of the revolution, and who has shamefully betrayed them. It must make them realise that all the big political parties of the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat had to show their true class character in this historical test of the revolution. These revolutionary experiences of the past must be linked up with the experiences through which the working class of the capitalist world is passing now in its struggle against capitalist rationalisation and stabilisation, by the example of the British strike, the events in China and the peril of international Fascism.

7. But the toiling masses cannot come to a full understanding of the truth of the Leninist theory of the proletarian revolution, they cannot assimilate it unless they make short shrift with their own illusions and weaknesses and drive out of their own ranks the spirit of Social Democracy, of Social Democratic theory and practice. The forthcoming Lenin Week must be the prelude to this task of relentless struggle against Social Democratic ideology and its consequences wherever it has a foothold.

In fact, Leninism can only be triumphant through absolute polemics against all Social Democratic doctrine and the practical conclusions drawn from them. Therefore, we must develop now a big ideological campaign against the so-called "Left" platforms and programmes of the Social Democrats which are to be again dangled before the eyes of the masses by the treacherous Social Democratic leaders in order to divert their radicalisation into wrong channels. With the help of the so-called "Austrian programme", and of the "Socialism in our time" of the Independent Labour Party, we must brand once more the shameful dissociation of the coalition Socialists and Social pacifists from the revolutionary substance of the Marxist doctrine. We must prove to the masses that Bauer, Renner and Co., want to mislead the masses which regard to the experiences of the revolution, being unscrupulous enough to misuse for this purpose Lenin's doctrine of the proletarian hegemony over the peasantry. The mendacity of the leaders of the miserable bankrupt 2^{1/2}. International is now divulged by the fact that they are prepared to make the ideas of Leninism their stock in trade, just as they did formerly with respect to Marxist ideas, by deliberately destroying their revolutionary substance. These eclectics by nature, these "compromisers" and social-traitors by profession are even going the length of quoting in the same breath the idea of proletarian hegemony which is based on Leninism, on the principle of the armed struggle of the proletariat for its dictatorship and the idea of coalition with the bourgeoisie.

This misinterpretation of the idea of hegemony by the Social Democrats must be met by us with the assertion that the struggle of the proletariat for its hegemony is based on three pre-requisites: 1) on persistent representation of the aims of the proletarian class on national and international scale, 2) on a fighting alliance of the proletariat of the imperialist States with the revolutionary peasant masses of their own country and the oppressed colonial peoples, and 3) on the assumption that, given a directly revolutionary situation, the proletariat cannot establish its hegemony except by armed action against the bourgeoisie and by means of the revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Councils whose purpose is the destruction of the bourgeois state. But all these conditions can only be carried out and coordinated

through the vanguard of the proletariat — the C. I. and its Sections, by propagating the Leninist idea that whoever espouses the idea of proletarian hegemony must also espouse the idea of Workers' Councils as the supreme expression of this hegemony, as the proletarian organs for struggle and domination and thereby also of the disintegration of the bourgeois states under the leadership of the Communist Party, we must make all the sections of the exploited once more realise that the "Left" statements of the Social Democrats found their expression in the Noske practice of the years of revolution, a practice which is likely to be continued.

In our propaganda campaign during Lenin Week we must once more lay stress on the pure Marxist-Leninist theory of state power and on the ways and methods of the proletarian revolution. We must energetically expose the hypocritical notion of the petty-bourgeois Austro-Marxism, that the proletariat can achieve power through the ballot-box. The real meaning of this theory, of the subtle distinction between a defensive application of violence and the historically inevitable application of violence by the proletariat, as expressed in the Russian revolution and as it is bound to be expressed in all future proletarian revolutions, and the practice of the Social Democrats, who in all countries help fascism and pave the way for it, is obvious. Just at the present moment when the international monster of fascism is raising its head throughout South and East Europe, when the White Guard bands in Italy, Poland, Lithuania, Roumania, etc., trample underfoot the sacred constitution of democracy and establish their brutal dictatorship without much consideration for the scholastic difference between defensive and offensive power, — at such a moment the real counter-revolutionary character of the theory and practice of the peaceful transition of the proletariat into Socialism must be explained to the masses. This work of enlightenment must be done during Lenin Week, when the terrible danger of the rapid spread of Fascism in all the countries of Europe, the peril that international complications will lead to war, the intervention with which China and Soviet Russia are threatened, and for which the Fascist coups d'etat in the Border States are only a prelude, must be brought home to the toiling masses in town and country. But this work cannot be properly done unless the shameful actions of the Social Democrats, be it with respect to the "theoretical" struggle against Fascism, or with respect to their "struggle" against war preparations and intervention, are relentlessly exposed.

8. The last Enlarged Executive declared that at the present stage the revolutionary world movement is marching on in three mighty columns and is finding expression in the heroic defensive struggles of the British proletariat, in the victorious progress of the national-revolutionary forces of China, and finally in the rapid political and economic development of the U. S. S. R. There is no doubt whatever that the brutal offensive of the capitalist class on all the fronts, the progress of Fascism, the war-like preparations of the bourgeoisie against Soviet Russia and China will call forth in the immediate future mighty defensive and offensive struggles of the revolutionary workers and peasants in all the countries. This being so, the question of the establishment of a revolutionary united front of all workers in town and country assumes enormous importance. But this question cannot be solved in a positive sense and on a national and international scale unless the Communist Parties first of all make their own members realise the necessity of the tactical tasks and organisational forms of Communist activity in the trade unions.

Therefore, the Communist Parties must bring home to all our members the Leninist doctrine of the character of the trade unions as the elementary class organisations of the proletariat, of the close connection between economic and political struggle and of the necessity of the organisational and ideological capture of the trade unions by the Communists. The objective premises for the development and the Bolshevik organisation of our Communist trade union work are the ever-growing active participation of the masses — under the pressure of capitalist rationalisation and stabilisation — in the economic struggles, the instinctive desire of these masses to strengthen their trade unions and to convert them into real fighting organs. Linking up with these extremely favourable objective conditions, our propaganda must divulge to the mass of the workers the real meaning of the present economic and political "stabilisation" of the bourgeoisie, and must expose, particularly by the lessons of the British strike, the shameful treachery of the yellow Amsterdamers, the "solidarity at a certain amount of interest" which they showed to the struggling British workers. Our pro-

paganda must use the development of this struggle to prove that only the revolutionary trade union organisations of the Profintern and first and foremost the Russian trade unions showed true international and revolutionary solidarity, that the general-strike tactics have proved to be the most powerful weapon of the workers, thanks to the heroism of the British proletariat and its capacity to organise, in spite of the avowed and disguised treachery of the MacDonalrites, and finally that the small Communist Party of Great Britain, persecuted as it was and depending almost entirely on its own forces, has become the mightiest driving power in the struggle against the class enemy. On the other hand, our propaganda must not conceal either from our Party members, or from the masses the weak points and defects exhibited by our Communist Sections in the other capitalist countries, as a result of inadequate trade union work, with respect to the solidarity action, particularly in connection with the attempt to prevent the export of coal to Great Britain and to organise an international miners' strike. It is only by severe self-criticism that our Parties and the international proletariat can draw from the British strike the necessary lessons for their further tasks: **The task of establishing the revolutionary united front, revolutionary unity in the international trade union movement, and the task of supporting the Anglo-Russian Committee by exposing the "Left" trade union leaders who are intent on preventing this.**

9. When explaining the tactical problems of our movement our propagandists must base themselves on the Leninist characteristic of our epoch as the "epoch of the world social revolution". They must represent the character of the present stage of "relative stabilisation" as the stage "between two waves of revolution". It is only thus that all liquidatory attempts from the Right and from the "Left" can be refuted by theoretical analysis and practical deductions and that we will be able to expose the counter-revolutionary machinations of the ultra-Lefts who insist on looking upon events in Great Britain and China and particularly on the development of Soviet Russia as the "expression of complete capitalist stabilisation" and talk twaddle about "the impossibility of world social revolution", as this is, for instance, done by the Korsch crowd.

This must be fully utilised by us to show that the ultra-Lefts are heart and soul with the most unscrupulous members of Social Democracy, that they are carrying on their shameful work of betraying all revolutionary movements throughout the world and are doing their utmost, together with the Noskes and Scheidemanns, with Pilsudski and Chamberlain to bring about an attack on Soviet Russia. It is from this viewpoint that our rank and file members, and all workers must be made to realise that merely the existence of the Soviet Union is a live proof of the continuance and further development of the world social revolution, — not only its point of departure and its signal on a world scale, but the basis and the source of all revolutionary energies and the means to transform the latter in the proletarian and Socialist sense.

It is only on the basis of the Leninist doctrine of world social revolution that the question of the ways, development and tendencies of the Chinese revolution can be solved. Therefore it behoves our propagandists during Lenin Week to draw special attention to the struggle of the Chinese workers and peasants, to brand again and again the infamous hypocrisy and policy of silence of social pacifists of the type of Bauer and Adler, as well as the misdeeds of the social-imperialists of the Vandervelde and MacDonald type, carrying at the same time into the ranks of the vanguard of the proletariat the theoretical conception that the further economic development of China need not necessarily go through a period of capitalism, — that it will depend on the strength of the Soviet Union and on the support of the proletariat of all countries if the national revolutionary movement of China is to be to us not only a common struggle against imperialism, but a direct struggle — in the true sense of the word — for Socialism. With the help of the resolution of the Enlarged Executive, we must explain the importance of the solution of this question in this or that sense to the widest circles of the working class.

10. Just as the present epoch of the world social revolution is nothing but the epoch of prolonged and stubborn struggle between dying capitalism and developing Communism, just as this historical transition is most graphically expressed and represented in the ten years' existence of proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R., — so all social and national struggles as well

as all ideological analyses of the present stage must necessarily group themselves around the one decisive conflict, around the fundamental antagonism: **Soviet Russia against world imperialism, socialism against capitalism.**

There is no doubt whatever that since the outbreak of the October Revolution and throughout all the stages of its development, the stage of civil war as well as that of the Soviet Russian proletariat's struggle for the establishment of the economic basis of Socialism, the attitude of the various classes, strata and parties towards Soviet Russia has been the historical touchstone of adherence to the camp of revolution or to the camp of counter-revolution. Just as the Paris Commune captured immediately the hearts of all workers, so has the Soviet Republic rallied to its banner the working class of the world and all the oppressed nations, filling them with enthusiasm. On the other hand, the Soviet Power had to put up from the beginning with scandalous slanders and obliquity on the part of the world bourgeoisie and its petty-bourgeois ideologists, being made the object of monstrous lies and distortions. It was particularly the "international" Social Democracy and its "appointed spiritual leaders" such as Kautsky and Bauer, Parvus, Dan and Co., who let loose at the outset — in various shapes and forms "basing themselves on Marx" — an unheard of campaign of incitement against Bolshevism in order to confuse the workers, talking at one time about the bourgeois revolution in Russia (Kautsky) and at another time "proletarian despotism" (Bauer). These renegades have in fact done good service to the bourgeoisie, and their literary tirades were the worthy counterpart of the cannonades of Yudenitch, Wrangel, Churchill and Millerand.

Preparation for intervention against the Soviet Power is the main reason of the renewed campaign of incitement against Soviet Russia organised at present by the Social Democratic leaders and their ultra-Left helpers. Just as years ago, the renegades of all shades are beginning to talk about the bourgeois character of the Russian Revolution. They proclaim the inevitability of either a violent or a "comparatively peaceful" transformation of the Soviet Power, they refer to the general "crisis" in the Soviet economy and to its tendencies toward capitalist development, they speak of the degeneration of the Bolshevik vanguard.

On the other hand, the mass of the workers rally with ever growing sympathy to the Socialist construction work in the Soviet Union. Instinctively, they identify themselves with this constructive work and are preparing to stand up for it with all the strength at their disposal and to frustrate all the intervention "rationalisation" they are realising more and more that Soviet Russia's way must be their way, that there is no other way to emancipation from the capitalist hell.

11. Under these circumstances all the questions which concern Soviet Russia, i. e. the problem of the seizure of power by the proletariat in one country, of "ripeness" for Socialism, of the possibility of Socialist construction in separate countries, the character of proletarian dictatorship, relations between the proletariat and the peasantry of which it is the leader, etc., become not only theoretically, but, also in the light of the present political situation, the centre of interests for the international proletariat. This interest is fully justified, by the existence and the development of the first workers' State, not only with respect to its role in international politics, but also with respect to its constructive work at home, the mighty progress from the first stage of N. E. P. to the second, from the "reconstruction period" to the period of construction on the basis of Socialism which the proletariat of the Socialist Union is now carrying out.

This historical transition to a new and higher level of social development in the Soviet Republic was bound to bring up again the question of the victory of Socialism in one country, calling upon everyone — just as at the time of the October events — to decide himself "for or against".

The XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U. (b) and the last (VII) Enlarged Executive of the C. I. have fully discussed the question of the possibility of Socialism in one country and have given a clear answer to it. In the teeth of the Russian Opposition and of its followers inside and outside the C. I., they have given a positive answer with respect to the possibility of Socialist construction in one country, such as Soviet Russia, by exposing this Opposition as a petty-bourgeois Social Democratic deviation.

But the discussions between the C. P. S. U. and the C. I. on the one hand and the Russian Opposition on the other hand can only be fully understood if one realises that this is not a question of this or that problem of the proletarian revolution, but rather a question of its entirety, of the Leninist conception of it. It is obvious that the Opposition of Comrade Trotsky and that of Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev with respect to every single question of the Russian discussion, whether about the character of the proletarian State, or previously about the character of the State industry or about the various practical measures such as industrialisation, policy towards the villages, etc., was bound to clash with Leninism because from the very beginning it did not assimilate at all or only partially the Leninist conception of the character of the Russian Revolution and hence also of the development of this Revolution. In fact, because Comrade Trotsky fails to realise the possibility of a solution of the basic differences between the proletariat and the peasantry within the framework of the proletarian revolution of Soviet Russia and wants to find a solution of these differences outside "the national-State framework" of Soviet Russia, because Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev despaired, in fact, already before the October Revolution, of the possibility of using the peasantry as a positive auxiliary of the victorious proletariat for the construction of Socialism, or to put it differently, of the possibility of the proletariat in the capacity of leader, educating the working masses for Socialism by means of its class dictatorship and its commanding economic position, insisting on their collaboration in its Socialist constructive work, they have necessarily abandoned the basic Leninist conception of the proletarian revolution in general and of its development in one country, such as the Union of Soviet Republics in particular.

12. Leninism lays down on principle when determining "the economics and politics in the epoch of proletarian dictatorship" it is necessary "to differentiate between the peasants as working elements and the peasants as traders and speculators", in order that after the overthrow of the capitalists and landlords the victorious proletariat may be able to solve "the much more difficult task of the reorganisation of the entire social order". Leninism declares this differentiation to be the "substance of socialism", although in practice and in real life these two attributes of the peasants are bound together in spite of their contradictory character. This substance of Socialism has never been understood by the Social Democrats.

In its practical interpretation of this basic conception in connection with the application of the New Economic Policy, Leninism declares that the importance of the transition to the food tax lies in it being the transition "to the correct Socialist basis" and that the consequence of this transition must be: "exchange of the products of the ('Socialised') big industry for peasant produce" which "is the economic substance of Socialism".

Leninism declares that "alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry is the be all and end all of the Soviet Power" and "the essential and adequate premise for its strength".

Leninism declares that "this alliance for economic construction" is "tantamount to Socialist revolution".

Finally Leninism declares, in full harmony with its definition of the character of proletarian dictatorship and of the new forms and tasks of the class struggle under proletarian dictatorship, that the tasks of the latter consist in liberating from exploitation, all workers and in exercising systematic, leading influence over them, which is also a struggle, but a peculiar struggle — overcoming an utterly different resistance and overcoming it in an utterly different way". And Leninism explains this overcoming in the sense that by its revolutionary struggle, the proletariat destroys the conditions of capitalist ownership, "ergo it destroys for all the vacillating elements, the capitalist interpretation of will power".

A superficial comparison of this Leninist conception of relations between the proletariat and the peasantry in the Socialist revolution with the conceptions of Comrades Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, who, in the best of cases, look upon the peasantry as an unstable ally in an open armed conflict against the bourgeoisie and as an opponent on principle in the work

of Socialist construction, is enough to make one realise not only their theoretical deviation, but also the non-Leninist character of their practical proposals with respect to the policy of the Soviet State towards the peasantry. But this abandonment of Leninism in the fundamental question of the proletarian revolution, of correct relations between the proletariat and the working peasants whom it leads, was bound to lead the opposition to all its vacillations and doubts concerning the character of the Soviet State and of N. E. P., concerning the importance of the co-operatives and of the development of proletarian democracy, through the activation of the Soviets. It was bound to lead them to their perverted views on the ways and means of the industrialisation of the Soviet Union. The Opposition was bound to give up bit by bit the platform of Leninism and to accept gradually the platform of Trotskyism, it was bound to deny the possibility of Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. and to depart from all the organisational principles of Leninism by their repudiation on principle of the policy of the Party. The history of the Opposition bloc, its lack of principle and its internal instability show that whoever tampers with a single component part of Leninism must necessarily despair of its whole edifice and system of victorious proletarian tactics, i. e., must in a state of panic abandon the policy of determinate progress, approximating thereby to the Social Democratic policy of continuous retreat.

13. The XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U. (b) and the last Enlarged (VII.) Executive of the E. C. C. I. have strongly condemned the attitude of the Opposition in the resolution on the question of the C. P. S. U. They have shown the futility of the statements of the Opposition concerning the alleged narrow nationalist character of the general policy of the Bolshevik Party, and they have laid down that Soviet Russia is at present the objectively most important organisational centre of the international revolution. They have answered in the affirmative the question of the possibility of construction of Socialism in the Soviet Union from the standpoint of the social forces and technical possibilities of the country. They have emphasised the Leninist conception of the possibility of a durable economic alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry in the construction of Socialism and they have proved the futility of the oppositional standpoint that a too rapid development of the peasantry must necessarily lead to the development of the capitalist elements in the villages. They have fully endorsed the correct industrialisation policy of the C. P. S. U. whose success in the direction of developing industry and adding to its specific weight through the results achieved this year and the anticipated pace of development in the next few years, cannot even be denied by the enemy. They have unmistakably rejected the "practical" proposals of the Opposition all of which amounted to a severance of the alliance between the proletariat and the working peasantry, and they have drawn attention to the elimination of private capital even in the sphere of trade, to the ever-growing connection between the Socialised industry and agriculture by means of the co-operatives as a proof that the capitalist elements of the Soviet economy have been completely destroyed by the joint efforts of the proletariat and of the co-operated peasantry, which means that the economic basis of Socialism will be welded together into a united front through the direct amalgamation of the Socialist big industry and agriculture.

On the other hand the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U. (b) and the VII. Enlarged Executive of the C. I. have clearly demonstrated that Socialist construction in Soviet Russia and the victory of Socialism in one country can only be secured by international revolution, by the victory of the proletariat at least in a few advanced capitalist countries. To work for this is now the task of the revolutionary proletariat and of the oppressed nations throughout the world. This task of the present historical epoch, of the epoch of world revolution can and will be solved under the leadership of the Communist Party by energetic struggle against all deviations from Leninism from our own ranks, by a complete destruction of Social Democratic illusions which are not yet extinct among the masses and by the exposure of the treacherous machinations of the Social Democratic leaders.