

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 37

30th June 1927

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

CONTENTS

- N. I. Bucharin: The Results of the Plenary Session of the E. C. C. I.
- Against Imperialist War.**
Pierre Sémar d: The Struggle against the Danger of War and the Tasks of the C. P. of France.
- Hands off the Soviet Union.**
Extract from the Statement of the White Terrorist Elvengren.
- China.**
E. Zeitlin: The New Stage of the Chinese Revolution. The Kuomintang at the Crossroads.
- Politics.**
J. B.: Egypt Submits Again.
- The White Terror.**
J. Louis Eng dahl: The "Daily Worker" Goes to Prison.
- In the International.**
Communication of the Central Control Commission of the C. P. S. U.
- Klara Zetkin's 70th Birthday.
- N. Krupskaya: Reminiscences of Joint Work in the Movement with Klara Zetkin.
- Kaethe D uncker: Comrade Klara Zetkin and her Life Work.
- Organisation.**
Jay Lovestone: The Organisation and Growth of the Workers' (Communist) Party of America.
- The Women's Movement.**
Katherine B. Cant: The British Labour Women's Conference.
- The Co-operative Movement.**
Proletarian Co-operators of all Countries! Appeal of the E. C. C. I.
- In the Camp of our Enemies.**
M. Pokrovsky: Georgia under British Rule.
The International Entente against the Third International.
Ten Years Ago.

The Results of the Plenary Session of the E. C. C. I.

Report given at the Plenum of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. on 4. June 1927.

By N. I. Bucharin.

We append the Stenographic Protocol of Comrade Bucharin's Speech, with some abbreviations. Ed.

Comrades!

The Plenary Session of the ECCI. just ended, although it has been formally an ordinary regular plenum of the ECCL., is no less important, will prove indeed to be perhaps of even greater importance, than the sessions of the Enlarged Executive. This greater importance arises from the circumstance that the work of the Plenum has been done in the midst of a most extraordinary international situation — extraordinary for a number of reasons.

First of all, it was during the session of the Plenum that the rupture of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the British Empire took place. This in itself was an event fully exposing the extreme acuteness of the international situation.

Further, the session has coincided with a new phase in the development of the Chinese revolution, and with this with a new phase in the history of the world. These two events alone suffice to give this Plenary Session, whose main task it has been to deal with these events, a position of unique importance in the history of the development of the Communist movement and in the history of the struggles of the Communist International.

The third factor imparting special importance to this session has been the attitude adopted by the Opposition. It need not be said that I do not think of ranking the attitude of the Opposition in a position of importance to be compared with the great historical events just mentioned. But it is none the less necessary that attention should be drawn to this attitude, the more that the Opposition has never before expressed itself in such a form, in such a tone, or with such purport. Never before has the Opposition taken a stand so brusque, so anti-Party, and at the same

time so "decided", as at the Plenum of the Executive Committee which we have just concluded.

There were three important questions on the agenda. The question of the fight against the danger of war and against war as likely to arise out of the present international situation; the Chinese question; the English question. In the course of the session a fourth question arose: that of the judgment to be formed on the attitude of the Opposition.

On the War against War.

As point of departure we take the incontestable fact that in China a capitalist intervention is going forward against the forces of the Chinese revolution; we base our conclusions for the most part on the assumption — which has already almost become an axiom, or will presently become one — that the British Government is working systematically, not only to surround the Soviet Union on all sides, but for the preparation of actual war on the Soviet Union. The problems which the Executive Committee of the Comintern set itself the task of solving at this session are the result of the peculiarity of the present international situation, which differs greatly from the situation in 1914, the period which brought us to the threshold of the "great" imperialist war. The tasks confronting us at the present time differ correspondingly from those faced by the organisations of the revolutionary proletariat in 1914. A large number of the problems, slogans, and various tactical tasks, with which we have to occupy ourselves at the present juncture, are bound to differ greatly from the problems, slogans, and tasks falling to the Bolsheviks during the first world war.

The main difference between the events now impending and the events of the year 1914 consists of the fact that this time it is not a question of conflicts among the imperialist powers themselves — although such conflicts are in themselves not unlikely — but above all of an attack made by the imperialist states against the Soviet Union on the one hand, and against the Chinese revolution on the other. The existence of a Union of proletarian republics, the existence — at the same time and under the great influence of this Union — of the great Chinese national struggle for emancipation, which has already been able to adopt state forms to a certain extent, and which possesses its organised state centre, — the existence of these two mighty historical facts has naturally caused certain questions to be raised by the Comintern, and has influenced its answers.

At the beginning of my report I stated that the existence of the Soviet Republics and of the Chinese revolution changes not only the objective situation, but the whole course of events, and with this the method dealing with the tasks of the proletariat. It need scarcely be said that in the case of a war between imperialist states, it is highly probable that the majority of the working people would take sides with their own government, would once more attempt to solve the question of which side had attacked first, and so forth. But the fact of the Chinese revolution, and of the existence of a Union of Socialist Republics, especially in view of the peace policy which has been pursued, and will continue to be pursued, by this Union of Socialist Republics, are likely to alter the probability of this prognosis a little. For it is easily comprehensible that the greater part of the workers would lend themselves with very heavy hearts to an attack on the Union of Socialist Republics — if they can be induced to take part in such an attack at all.

The bourgeois governments will find it increasingly difficult to throw their hirelings and their armed forces against the proletarian republics and their national revolutionary allies in China.

What are the decisions come to by the ECCI. in the question of fighting methods? The ECCI. has decided that the slogan of the general strike, the slogan of insurrection, and the slogan of the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, are all slogans for the orientation of our Party, and that our main task lies in the preparation for the realisation of these slogans. It is impossible to prophesy when these slogans will emerge from the agitative and propagandist stage into the stage leading immediately to an actual insurrection or strike, when we pass from the propaganda of the general strike or the insurrection to their actualisation. It is perhaps possible to prophesy with a certain amount of certainty that this actualisation will not be possible in the overwhelming majority of states immediately after the beginning of the war. But even today we must face the fact that it may be possible in isolated cases, even if

these are exceptional; there can be no doubt that this possibility exists.

The exact moment at which the agitative and propagandist slogans merge into slogans of immediate action will be determined by the situation itself, by the arising of a revolutionary situation, by the strength of the Communist Party, by the degree of fermentation among the masses, by the trends of feeling among the leading strata — in a word, by a number of objective and subjective premises. These slogans will merge into slogans of immediate action as soon as the proletariat is offered a chance of their realisation.

1. Fighting Methods. General Strike and Insurrection.

I now pass on to the question of fighting methods. When this question is raised, two extremely important documents are generally referred to. Firstly, the resolution passed by the Basle Congress of the II. International, with the well-known amendment to that resolution, proposed by Comrades Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg at Stuttgart and incorporated in the Basle Resolution, and stating that in the case of war it will be necessary: "to make full use of the economic and political crisis caused by the war for the purpose of arousing the people, and accelerating the overthrow of the rule of capital" (Lenin, Complete Works, vol. 13). Secondly, reference is made to one of the last documents dealing precisely with the question of the fight against war — the often quoted instructions issued by Comrade Lenin to our delegation to the congress of trade union, co-operative, pacifist, and other organisations, held at the Hague.

In these instructions Lenin first advances the thesis that we must combat with our utmost energies the foolish and senseless idea that it is possible to "reply" to war with a general strike or a revolution; that in reality the majority of the workers will take sides with their bourgeois government during the first days of a war; that it is of the utmost importance to expose the foolishness of the standpoint of those who imagine themselves in possession of a universal remedy against the "evil" of war; that we must unmask the opportunists, the semi-pacifists, the pacifists, etc., who fancy that they "know" how to fight against war; that we must contend determinedly against the empty phrase of a "reply" to war by means of a general strike or a revolution. These theses are the main import of the instructions drawn up by Comrade Lenin.

Whilst our Commission was working, various interpretations were brought forward with reference to the connection between these instructions of Lenin's and the Basle Resolution (it must not be forgotten that the formula of the Basle Manifesto was taken from a document which had already been accepted at the Stuttgart Congress. The original wording of the amendment referred directly to revolutionary action, that is to strike and insurrection). The Basle Resolution makes mention of the Paris Commune and of the revolution of 1905, in which the general strike and insurrection formed the "leading forms" of the struggle. The slogan of the general strike and of the armed insurrection was here indirectly presented as a slogan determining our action during preparation for war on the part of the bourgeoisie, and further during the war itself. But on the other hand the Hague instructions state that the phrases on "replying" to a war by revolution are nonsensical; that we have to obey the dictates of common sense, and face the fact that at the beginning of a war the majority of the working people take sides with their bourgeois fatherland.

Various shades of opinion have arisen during the course of our work in the Commission, and we have come to various decisions upon them. One of these may be formulated as follows: The slogans of the general strike and of armed insurrection must stand, without reservation, as rules of action for the Communist Party, both during the period of preparation for war on the part of imperialist states, and during the war itself. Another standpoint: The point of main importance is precisely the exposure of the absurdity of the standpoint that a war can be "replied" to by a general strike, revolution, or insurrection.

What is the right answer to this question? First of all, it is absurd to confront one document with another in this case; it is absurd to confront a document with the demands of the mass struggles of the communards and the revolutionists of 1905, with the "instructions" given by Lenin to the Hague Delegation, dealing with the necessity of forming a careful

and attentive judgment of the position, free from all illusions, during the first days or a war.

We must by no means interpret Comrade Lenin's instructions to the Hague Delegation to be a condemnation of the slogans of the general strike and of insurrection as fighting methods against war danger and war. The sole correct interpretation of Comrade Lenin's instructions is to realise that they were directed against the mere phrase, the empty phrase, of general strike, revolution, and armed insurrection, as "reply" to war, etc. Lenin said no word against these slogans themselves. All that Lenin did was to fight with the utmost political energy against mere phrases, against the empty phrases of reformism.

We know very well that a large number of Social Democratic Congresses, a large number of Trade Union Congresses, and a large number of the leaders of Social Democratic parties, have repeatedly declared their intention of "replying" to war with a general strike. In the same manner a considerable number of the heroes of the so-called "revolutionary" syndicalism have preached the general strike as the salvation from all evil. But all the same there is no sign to be observed, either in one camp or the other, of systematic preliminary preparation, carried on steadily from day to day, for the actuality of the fight against war.

It need not be emphasised that if anyone were to issue the slogan of revolution and insurrection as "reply" to a war, the single and isolated action of this proclamation would be the vainest of boasts, an utter deception of the masses, unless those issuing the slogan had previously carried through a systematic course of preparation for the organisation of the general strike, the organisation of insurrection, and the organisation of revolution, in accordance with an accurate Marxian analysis of the objective situation.

The point decisive for Lenin — and it must be decisive for the standpoint adopted by the Communist Party — was the orientation of our Party in such manner that our first consideration, our most urgent, important, decisive, and fundamental task, the innermost core of our problem — is to be the proper preparation for the war against war.

This preparation involves the creation of an illegal organisation, it involves work amongst soldiers and sailors, energetic work in the trade unions, the systematic exposure of socialist and opportunist lies, the systematic propaganda of Bolshevik ideas in the struggle against war, and the exertion of every effort for the mobilisation of every possible agitative and propagandist activity, legal and illegal, military and civilian, for the fight against the danger of war. In this manner the question can and must be treated. Those who cry for the general strike as reply to war danger are mere talkers, if not actual betrayers. Those who declare that the working class will "reply" to war by revolution, are mere dealers in words. It is utter nonsense to imagine revolution to be one isolated action, a "reply". To promise such a "reply", without a basis of previous work of the intensest nature, is to deceive the workers.

This is the purport of the instructions given by Comrade Lenin to our delegation. The "Hague" instructions do not contain the slightest contradiction of the Basle instructions. These two documents must not be confronted as if one cancelled the other. On the contrary, one gives orientation on certain slogans and fighting methods, whilst the other shows the pivot upon which the whole struggle turns, in order that these slogans may not exist on paper only, but become working slogans leading to corresponding political results.

2. The Central Slogans in the Fight against War Danger and War.

This is the first problem discussed by the Plenum, in its connection with the preparation for war. The second problem is the question of the leading slogan for the Communist Party at the present juncture, under the present given circumstances. An interesting discussion arose sight the question appears perfectly simple, but the course of the discussion showed it to be more complicated, under existing conditions, than in the situation obtaining before the outbreak of the imperialist war. We have to deal with a series of unique situations. First of all, actual war has not yet broken out in Europe, nor has it even actually broken out against the Soviet Union; the main fact is the attack upon the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union represents a factor of extraordinary political importance, and upon its flag the slogan of peace is written.

Let us recall to our memories the manner in which the Bolsheviki dealt with the question of a central slogan at the beginning of the imperialist war, and what differences of opinion existed at that time. The differences of opinion dividing the Bolsheviki from all other ideologies were here very far-reaching indeed. Those of our opponents tending most to the "Left", including Comrade Trotzky, advanced the slogan of peace as the central unifying slogan, whilst our party and its Central Committee were opposed to the slogan of peace as central slogan, substituting for this the slogan of civil war, the slogan of the metamorphosis of imperialist war into civil war. Here the Party did not advance this slogan as one running parallel to the slogan of peace, not as a slogan compatible with the slogan of peace, but as a slogan excluding the slogan of peace. At that time we contended against all our opponents, including the group "Our Word", headed by Comrade Trotzky. They advanced the slogan of peace. We advanced the slogan of peace, the slogan of civil war. We regarded this slogan of civil war as the mightiest weapon in the fight against pacifist illusions, including those illusions prevalent in the "left" groups, and claiming to represent a "revolutionary internationalist" standpoint.

Can we, in the present situation, refrain from a recognition of the slogan of peace, at a time when the Soviet Republics, the state organisations of the proletariat, are defending this watchword with their utmost powers, at a time when this watchword actually represents the real and vital interests of this greatest and most important stronghold of the international proletarian movement? And finally, it must not be forgotten that war has not yet broken out in Europe, that an armed attack has not yet been actually made on the Soviet Union, although preparations being made for it with feverish energy.

These are some of the considerations which show how complicated the situation has become. On the surface it would appear to be simplest to solve the question as follows: Since there is no war at the present moment, since it is impossible to that the slogans of the proletarian state should contradict the slogans of the Communist Parties, since there is no doubt that enormous masses of the people would support the slogan of peace, and since it is just here that the connection lies between the line of the proletarian republics and the slogans of the broad masses, then the slogan of peace should be made the central slogan for all Communist Parties. It would appear as this method of dealing with the question would be most suitable at the given moment. And yet this is not so.

How should we approach the question of the central slogan for all Communist Parties, for the whole Communist International? In order to give an adequate answer to this question, we must find out the hardest knot in the present situation. The knottiest problem of the moment is in the relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, and in the attitude taken by the imperialist front towards the Chinese revolution. The driving mechanism actuating all these international entanglements, all the multifarious conflicts, blockades, armed raids, etc., is to be found at the present time in China. The development of the Chinese revolution is the dynamic force throwing out of balance everything upon which our Soviet Union was depending for its pause for breath. The decided advance of constructive socialism in the Soviet Union coincides with a rapid development of the Chinese revolution, a development threatening to overthrow capitalist stabilisation. It is in China and the Soviet Union that the knot of international relations is drawn the tightest.

The Chinese Communist Party is exposed to the direct fire of its antagonists. Can we then put forward the slogan of peace as the leading slogan for the Chinese Communist Party? At the present moment the Chinese Communist Party is faced with an emergency demanding a powerful fighting spirit, an offensive spirit, I might almost say, the strongest possible military revolutionary spirit. Should the Chinese Communist Party, the left Kuomintang, the corresponding military organisations, etc., support the slogan of peace, this would be tantamount to a slogan of peace with the traitor Chang Kai-shek, a slogan of peace with the imperialists, etc. And this at a moment when the military struggle against the feudal regime and the imperialists is a constituent of the revolution still in the initial process of its development.

Should we proclaim the slogan of peace as central slogan, we should thus find ourselves in the position of advancing a slogan supposed to be suitable for all Communist Parties, and especially for the Chinese Communist Party in its present

capacity as outpost, and yet having the actual effect of dispersing the forces of one of the most important of the Communist Parties. But the whole political situation demands that precisely this Party should not cry for: "Peace with the feudal lords!", "Peace with Chang Tso Lin!", "Peace with Chang Kai-shek", "Peace with the imperialists!", but rather that it pursues precisely the opposite course, and exerts its utmost efforts to intensify its struggles against these counter-revolutionary forces.

The Chinese Communist Party, at the present political juncture, is not merely one of the Sections of the Comintern, but a Section upon which a political duty of the utmost importance has fallen, a Section which bears upon its shoulders an enormous burden of political responsibility. This Party is under the fire of the enemy, and holds at the moment a place of honour in the field of international revolution.

It goes without saying that a large number of other arguments could be brought forward against the slogan of peace, in so far as it is necessary to contend against pacifism, etc. After somewhat comprehensive debates in the commission we held it to be necessary to accept, as central and general slogan, the **slogan of the defence of the Russian and Chinese revolution**. Everything is included in this slogan: war against war, the transformation of the imperialist war against us into a civil war, the struggle for peace, action taken by the Chinese Communist Party under the slogan of the formation of a front against the imperialists, against Chang Kai-shek, against the feudal lords, etc., etc. Every action for the promotion of the revolutionary struggle can be classified under the heading of this slogan.

These are the most important considerations arising out of the second problem. As you will see, the peculiarity of the decision come to in this question, and the peculiarity of the slogan, which is by no means a simple repetition of the slogans of 1914, arise out of the special peculiarities of the given international situation.

3. Defence and Attack. Defence of Fatherland.

A considerable number of other problems have had to be revised in the same manner. You will all certainly remember that one of the most decisive blows which we dealt against the social patriots was the blow against their "theory" of the defensive and offensive wars of the imperialist states.

At the beginning of a war every single imperialist state involved asserts that it has been "attacked". The social chauvinists of the different countries have based their policy on the "analysis" of this question, the question of who has "attacked" and who "defends". Our Bolshevist standpoint on the matter has been that this whole definition of the question is nonsense, since in an imperialist war there is neither defence nor attack — every side is attacking. The object of the attack is the colonial countries. Among the imperialist states themselves any attempts to differentiate the "guilty" parties attacking from the innocent who are merely "defending themselves", is completely absurd.

It is obvious that the existence of the Soviet Union, and of such a factor as that formed by the Chinese revolution, at once set aside any such general definition of the question. For here it is not a question of two imperialist parties, but of state organisations representing different classes.

In our conflict with Great Britain we cannot but maintain the fact that Great Britain has attacked us. We cannot define the situation otherwise, for the truth is that the attack has been made upon us by Great Britain. The policy pursued by the Soviet Union is a true peace policy. Our "attack", if we may thus express ourselves, has consisted mainly of our economic uplift. But this falls under quite another category.

The standpoint to be adopted in the question of defence of fatherland is even more altered by the latest events. We could not countenance a defence of fatherland among the "great powers" of the first imperialist war, since these powers were imperialist, but in the proletarian republics the situation is entirely reversed, and the defence of the fatherland is the first duty of the proletarian parties. Where in the capitalist countries the Communists have been right in adopting the defeatist standpoint, in the Soviet Union our proletarian fatherland must find the fullest support from all sides. There we must reject all "defence of fatherland", here it must be our first thought. This train of thought is rightly applied to the proletarian republics.

But it is equally right when applied to such a government, to such a state organisation, as that represented by the national revolutionary state in China, fighting against imperialism.

Lenin differed from many in dealing with perfect clearness with this question of the defence of fatherland. Whilst condemning with the utmost severity the social patriotic defenders of imperialist fatherlands, Lenin never dealt with the question in such a manner as to assert that if a fatherland is not a proletarian one, there is no reason to defend it. Lenin was very far from such a simplification of the question. He designated the formula of "defence of fatherland" as vulgar and Philistine, as a justification of war, and considered that it had no other meaning whatever.

When we hear of the British defence of the mother country, for instance, this is nothing more than the current expression used to justify a war carried on by the British imperialist government. When we speak of the defence of our fatherland, the question is the justification of a war carried on by us. Lenin did not state that every war is an evil solely because it is a war. War is an evil, and it must be combatted when it is carried on by imperialist states; but we can and must support a war, not only when the working class is in power and is defending its state; a war may be supported and justified when it is a national and progressive national emancipation war against imperialists, even when the proletariat is not yet its leader. We Communists must therefore stand unconditionally for the support of such a war as that being waged in China for the defence of the Chinese fatherland, for the Chinese revolution.

4. Alliances with Bourgeois States. The Slogan of Fraternisation and of Joining Revolutionary Armies.

The question of the possibility of forming alliances with bourgeois states must be discussed. This question has already been raised at one of the Comintern Congresses, during the debate on the programme. Should such a combination really come to pass that some bourgeois state, under some unlooked for circumstances, and during mighty upheavals, should really take sides with the Soviet Union against the imperialists, then it would be the duty of the Communist Parties to aid the anti-imperialist war being waged by such a state. Should for instance one of the Eastern states, not belonging to the imperialist coalition, be desirous of entering into an alliance with the Soviet Union during a great conflict between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, a conflict into which the whole of Europe would be involved, and the proletarian state had the right, from the Communist standpoint, to enter into this alliance, then the Communists would be bound to aid this alliance.

Here we should not be dealing with an imperialist state, but with a state fighting against the imperialists and on the side of the Soviet Union; this would not simply be a bourgeois state as such, but a bourgeois state directing its fire against the imperialist regime. Such a state would not be a constituent of the imperialist coalition, but would inevitably, apart from its own volition, as consequence of the objective condition, play the rôle of a kind of appendage of an anti-imperialist coalition headed by the proletarian republic. One passage from Lenin's writing contains a direct reference to a revolutionary alliance of India, China, and Persia, without any assumption of the existence of a proletarian dictatorship in these countries. You will therefore realise that this question too has its place on our agenda.

I must pass over a number of other questions of lesser significance, and shall turn to a slogan which appears at the first glance to require no alterations conditioned by the development of present events. The elementary and specifically Bolshevist slogan of fraternisation. This slogan was of far-reaching significance for us for our fight against war during the years of the first great international massacre.

Whilst the Executive Committee was working, we asked ourselves whether it would be necessary to undertake any alterations in this slogan as result of the present situation. Can we proclaim this slogan under all and every circumstance, as we could in the years between 1915 and 1918? We came to the conclusion that the present situation demands certain corrections in this slogan. We applied the experience gained in our own civil war. The slogan of "fraternisation in the trenches" played a rôle of enormous importance when the armies of the imperialists, the Czarist army, or Kerensky's army, fought against the imperialist coalition headed by Germany. But when the Red Army was fighting against Yudenitsch, against Koltchak etc. did we then

proclaim the slogan of fraternisation? No, we did not proclaim it. This is a plain fact which we can all remember.

How did it happen that the slogan of "fraternisation" played so great a part during the imperialist war, but vanished as soon as the Red Army was formed, and this Red Army fought against our antagonists? We came to the conclusion that the slogan of fraternisation is a slogan implying the disorganisation of both parties thus fraternising, and when two imperialist armies confront one another, the slogan of fraternisation, in so far as it is actually realised, shakes both sides. This being the case, it is clearly comprehensible why we did not proclaim this slogan after we had our own revolutionary army fighting against the enemy. This slogan is a two edged sword, and those fraternising on our side must be really firm in their convictions if the slogan of fraternisation, and the process of fraternisation itself, is not to shake our own revolutionary discipline.

In this question we have adopted the standpoint that in the case of a conflict between two imperialist opponents on the one side, and, let us say, of a proletarian army and a national revolutionary army on the other, our slogan must be a slogan calling upon the soldiers of the hostile forces to come over to us, not a slogan of fraternisation, but a slogan calling upon the others to join us. This does not exclude the process of fraternisation, but it must be very differently organised. We must not induce the whole of our forces to creep into the trenches, but must have our special propagandists, who must be scattered about among the camps of the enemy, and undermine the counter-revolutionary discipline of the enemies of revolution.

Thus the present situation, the existence of the proletarian Soviet state, of the national revolutionary organisation in China, etc., forces us to undertake certain corrections of even such an elementary slogan as that of fraternisation, a slogan apparently perfectly clear and unequivocal.

The Fight against War and against the Opposition.

In connection with the war question I must deal with the "platform" of our Opposition with respect to this question. The general estimate of the international situation laid before the Plenum of the E. C. C. by the Opposition concludes that at the present time we are weaker than we were before. The comrades of the Opposition have cited a number of defeats: the defeat in Bulgaria, in Esthonia, the defeat in Germany in 1923, the defeat of Chang Kai-shek's change of front in China, etc. The final result and the final balance is to be summed up in the conclusion that we are weaker than before.

I am of the opinion that in the first place this estimate is entirely wrong. There is of course no thought of denying that there have been defeats, severe defeats. But it is entirely useless to attempt to place these defeats to the account of the so-called "opportunist" majority of the Central Committee, since a large number of these defeats coincided with the culminating point of the leading rôle played by Comrade Zinoviev in the Comintern, and of the fairly important part taken in the Political Bureau of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. by those comrades who are no longer members of this Bureau. I am however not desirous of drawing attention to these matters. I only wish to point out the incorrectness of drawing such wholesale conclusions as the statement that we are weaker at the present time than formerly. There has been a certain regrouping of forces in Europe of late. This phenomenon has received due consideration in the thesis on the "partial stabilisation of capitalism". The present period is characterised by a temporary firmer footing of European capitalism, especially of central European capitalism.

The utterances denying the partial stabilisation of capitalism are pure nonsense. The economics of European capitalism have become stronger, especially the economics of German capitalism. Enormous amounts of capital have been invested in industry. The fact of an economic uplift is further confirmed by the literary data at our disposal, by the index figures, and by the reports of comrades coming from this country. What will happen later is another question. It is probable that the limited capacity of the home markets will lead to a mighty collapse after the lapse of a certain time, but it is possible that the curve of development may continue to rise for the time being. There is no doubt whatever that German capitalism has a securer footing than before; and there is as little doubt that there is a simultaneous political consoli-

disation of the forces of German capitalism, a co-operation among the agrarians and industrialists belonging to every wing, a firmer establishment of the Fascist organisations, a consolidation of these organisations and their united front, accomplished in the united front in combination with the present German government.

The assertions that Polish capitalism is falling rapidly into decay, are not true by any means. On the contrary, we see that Polish capitalism is passing through a period of incontestable temporary consolidation, both politically and economically. This is based on a number of causes. In the first place, the Polish bourgeoisie was helped by the British strike, and then by a large number of loans and investments, especially from American capitalists.

There is thus no possibility of throwing doubts on the regrouping of forces in the direction of a stabilisation of capitalism, and a consolidation and firmer establishment of its political positions in Central Europe. And there is as little doubt that Zinoviev was in error when he lately stated that the stabilisation had already disappeared.

The greatest peculiarity of the present situation is however the fact that that inequality in the development of capitalism, referred to at the VII. Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee, has become more conspicuous than before. The many-sidedness, diversity, and inconsistency in the development of the various departments of the world's economics have found even clearer expression. And though on the one hand we must admit the advancing consolidation of European continental capitalism, on the other hand we observe with equal clearness the rising tempest of the Chinese revolution, which is sweeping through the whole system of international relations in our present state of society, shaking them to their foundations.

When we take into account all these facts of present day development, and when we duly estimate the immensity of the Chinese revolution and its consequences, and the growing power of the Soviet Union, then we can scarcely arrive at the conclusion "that we have become weaker". It is true that our antagonist has become stronger (this we admit when we recognise the "partial stabilisation"). But a general comparison of forces does not show him to have gained any advantage. The formula of our having "become weaker" does not express the actual state of affairs.

The general estimate laid before us by the Opposition is therefore wrong.

Now to the "definite proposals" made us by the Opposition. It must first be observed that all these proposals have been accompanied by unheard of attacks on the C. C. of our Party and on the Comintern. We have never before heard such utterances as these, so rude and insulting, so entirely adventurous, not even during the inner Party and Comintern discussion of the last few years. And yet Comrades Trotzky and Vuyovitch, who have represented the Opposition in the Plenum of the Executive Committee, have literally not brought forward one single definite proposition, not one single word, with respect to the problems which I have touched upon here. And this although I questioned Comrade Trotzky most urgently, in my speech, to deal with the most important questions concerning the preparations being made for war.

During the imperialist war Comrade Trotzky was opposed to the defeat slogan, — is he conscious, or is he not conscious, of the error committed by him in the years between 1914 and 1917? Is he conscious of having been in error in rejecting the defeat slogan, and even the slogan of "the conversion of imperialist war into civil war"? Is he conscious of this, or does he acknowledge being in the wrong in advancing the peace slogan as our central slogan?

In asking these questions I am not referring to past times. We are concerned with burning questions of the moment. It is an open secret that we are moving rapidly towards an epoch which will put an end to our "pause for breath", and are entering on a period involving wars and attacks upon the Soviet Union. We do not know when the storm will break over our heads, but we know that it is approaching, dark and threatening. And now consider carefully! If we take this estimate of our situation seriously, then we must be ideologically prepared for it; fully prepared for it, prepared to hundred per cent. Is it possible to take it less seriously? It is only right to speak of one hundred per cent. We are not dealing with a mere bagatelle; we have to adopt either one definite

standpoint, or another; we have to adopt one central slogan, or another. Our decision is of immediate practical importance, and not merely of practical importance for some secondary matter, but for a question of **principle**, laying down the actual **line of orientation** for our Communist Parties.

Have such problems as that of "defeatism", of the peace slogan, of civil war, etc., lost anything of their acuteness? Can we simply pass them by?

Does not the most elementary political conscientiousness demand that Comrade Trotzky either **acknowledges** that he has been in error in these cardinal questions, or that he is in **open opposition** to Lenin? Is it so difficult to understand that an attempt to **avoid** this question at the present time would show utter lack of principle?

And yet, in spite of the open challenge made to Comrade Trotzky, he has uttered no word on all these matters, and we are still in the dark as to what he thinks about "defeatism" and about all his former errors. According to Comrade Trotzky's conceptions, Bolshevism was "re-equipped" as early as the spring of 1917, and, having become "Trotzkyfied", it drew all its weapons from Trotzky's arsenal. Perhaps Comrade Trotzky advances similar pretensions with regard to the war questions?

Here a **definite answer** is required. But this definite answer has **not been given us**.

More than this. We have been given no answer **whatever**, either definite or indefinite. And this in spite of the unusual energy shown by the comrades of the Opposition, who have let off innumerable quantities of essays, speeches, declarations, explanations, "unheld" speeches, etc. etc. for the benefit of the Plenum. They have placed on this occasion on record documents to the extent of about 500 pages. But in all this voluminous written matter no room has been found for the **most important** questions of all, no room for a reply to the **most fundamental** problems, no room for a spark of courage to acknowledge opportunist errors.

In place of this we find Comrade Trotzky touching upon one question only: the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee. To Trotzky this appears to be the **sole question** worthy of attention, and his reply to it is all he accomplishes in connection with the war preparations! And these are the comrades who pretend to political farsightedness! I too must however devote a few words to this question. Every one of us is able to understand that among the enormous arsenal of defensive weapons at the disposal of the international labour movement, the Anglo-Russian Committee is only one among many. There are other weapons too; there is the Comintern, there is the Red International of Labour Unions, there are about 60 Communist Parties, there is the C. P. S. U., there is the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviet Union, there is the Chinese revolution, etc. etc. All these weapons must be mobilised against the danger of war.

But our comrades of the Opposition ignore all these factors with the sole exception of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and have concentrated on this one question the whole of their eloquence, their temperament, their "indignation", their slanders, and the rest of virtues, with the object of persuading our foreign comrades that the C. P. S. U. has been acting the part of a traitor to the proletariat. It must also be observed that the tone adopted by the Opposition, and by Comrade Trotzky, at this meeting, has been extremely strange. Every word, and every second printed line, contains accusations of "treachery", of "unfaithfulness", of "crime", etc., hurled against the C. C. of our Party and against the Comintern. This has aroused, and is bound to arouse, the greatest indignation among our comrades from abroad. And if a certain amount of sympathy was felt at first, among especially softhearted comrades, for the comrades of the Opposition who have been "pushed aside" and "humiliated", this sympathy was speedily destroyed, and Trotzky aroused general indignation against himself.

This you may see from the resolutions passed on the attitude taken by the Opposition. The comrades of the Opposition advanced an urgent demand that the **Anglo-Russian Committee should be dissolved**. We replied that we must not delude ourselves that the British section of the Anglo-Russian Committee would help much during or before a war, but that in the **given historical situation**, under the given circumstances, it is **better to avoid a rupture**, since such a rupture would have made an extremely unfavourable impression in view of the various other "ruptures" which we have to record. The Op-

position repeated what they said long ago, merely using stronger expressions: You are co-operating with the scoundrels who betrayed the General Strike, etc., and therefore you too are traitors to the working class!

The arguments brought forward here by the Opposition differ solely from their former arguments in being more "definite", more "decided", and more violent in their attacks on the leaders of our Party and on the Comintern. And yet it is obvious that the problem is not solved by designating both the "Left" and the Right leaders of the General Council as opportunists, reformists, scabs, servants of imperialism, etc. These are sacred and entirely elementary truths. The question is, whether it would have been right to dissolve the Anglo-Russian Committee in the midst of an extremely difficult international situation. We were of the opinion that the situation obliged us to make a number of concessions. This did not by any means signify that our trade unions abandoned their right to criticise. The interview with comrade Tomsy, shortly after the Berlin Conference, showed this plainly enough.

These were the considerations (and not illusory considerations expecting active help) which led to our approval of the tactics pursued by the All-Russian Central Trade Union Council. This does not exclude the possibility that the leaders of the General Council may be induced by our criticism to dissolve the Anglo-Russian Committee themselves. This is not impossible. Our criticism is perfectly necessary. And the English workers will be fully able to realise that our action forces the traitorous leaders to **unmask their own treachery**, whether they name themselves right or "Left".

Finally, two further "proposals" were made by the Opposition in connection with the war danger. Both of these proposals are simply ridiculous. One of them was brought forward by Comrade Vuyovitch, with Trotzky's approval, the other by both Vuyovitch and Trotzky, and is repeated in their speeches, proclamations, etc. The first proposal is that **under the given circumstances, and in view of the war danger, our orientation should be in the direction of the anarcho-syndicalist workers**. The second proposal is that the **group around Maslow, Ruth Fischer, etc., should be readmitted into the Comintern and into the German Party**.

A few words must first be devoted to the present "anarcho-syndicalists". The anarcho-syndicalists count a total of 2½. For the most part these are "leaders" without an army. No great anarcho-syndicalist organisation exists anywhere, with the exception of the American "I. W. W.". It is characteristic that all anarcho-syndicalist organisations still existing in Europe are violently **opposed to the Soviet Union**, their ideology not differing in the very slightest degree from the **Menshevist-social revolutionary ideology**. They hold the standpoint that the Bolsheviki have been guilty of threefold treason against international revolution, that our dictatorship is an oligarchy, that our dictatorship is not of the proletariat; they agitate against the Soviet Union with the most despicable methods, etc. And these are the allies to whom Trotzky and Vuyovitch would have us apply, that they may "defend" us! Complete and absolute nonsense!

We have not the slightest leaning towards an "orientation" in the direction of that counter-revolutionary petty bourgeoisie which is doing its utmost, from day to day, to compete with the leaders of the Social Democrats in the choice of the dirtiest weapons to be used against us. It must be remembered that these elements are **not backed up by the masses**. This is the rub. In 1914 Trotzky ran accidentally against a few anarcho-syndicalists, and stuck there for a time. But now it is no longer 1914. Many regroupings have taken place since then. We have surely no need to light a lantern and go seeking for a handful of anarcho-syndicalists to protect the Soviet Union in an emergency against the imperialists.

Comrades, the idea is perfectly ridiculous, complete nonsense. And it is especially ridiculous at the present moment, when our **chief task is to win over the average worker, especially the European average worker**, who is, regrettably enough, still in the clutches of the Social Democratic parties and of the Amsterdam International. The problem of winning over the average worker was first raised at the time of the III. Congress of the Comintern, held with the aid of Lenin's authority, and this problem still confronts us today, more urgently than ever. To create a diversion with respect to this problem would mean substituting Lenin's slogan, demanding the conquest of

the masses, by a slogan calling for the "conquest" of a few counter-revolutionary leaders.

As to Maslow, the proposal with regard to him and his group has aroused extreme indignation among the members of the Executive Committee. You will no doubt recollect that the declaration of repentance made by the Opposition on 6. October, and expressly stated by Comrade Zinoviev to be "meant seriously", one point was the assurance that the Opposition entirely gives up every connection with the group expelled from the Comintern, the names of Urbahns, Maslow, and others being given. I must here relate a few details on the position of these excluded members. They have their own newspaper, they have already converted this paper into a weekly, and are taking steps towards issuing it daily; they are taking steps towards the formation of a party of their own. There is no doubt whatever that they are in receipt of help from our Opposition, from whom they receive material about our Party life, even to reports on the sessions of the Political Bureau, and information on occurrences in this Bureau.

Steering their course in accordance with the political wind, they direct their attack at times directly against the Soviet Union itself, whilst at other times they adopt a milder tone towards the Union, and direct their efforts to violent attacks on our Party and the Comintern. On one occasion, for instance, they wrote that Stalin does not differ in the least from Noske (Disturbance). I do not understand why you are surprised at that, it is nothing new (A voice: "It is new to us"). Then I am pleased to have been able to inform you of it. (Laughter.)

Their newspaper, which has become the organ of our "Opposition" at the present time, dishes up every morsel of gossip or slander in circulation against our Party and the Comintern. These good people will presently arrive at a slogan of "Soviets without Communists". They have already published an article on war in which they state that, unless the present leaders of the Comintern change their political and organisatory course radically at the last moment, they will play the same rôle as the leaders of the Second International at the beginning of the great war. ("The Flag of Communism", No. 12.)

This writes the Maslow pardoned by Hindenburg's Government, the Maslow who disgraced himself at his trial, about the Parties of the Comintern, and that at time when the Chinese Communists are being strangled, when the French Communists are being thrown into prison, when the Italian comrades are perishing in their dungeons, when the German Communists are organising hundreds of thousands of workers in the struggle against war, when an incredible agitation is being carried on against the Soviet Union, when the whole capitalist world is conspiring together against the Comintern! And these hostile elements (who seek to provoke us further by dubbing themselves "orthodox Marxists", "Leninists" etc.) are proposed to us as saviours of the German Party.

Our policy in preparing for war, in all that concerns inner Party questions, must consist of ensuring the strength and unity of inner relations in the Party, and of steering a definite course towards winning over the broad masses of the Social Democratic workers.

Our Parties are well aware that they will be plunged into situations in which their lives will be literally at stake if they are to remain true to the Comintern, and to protect with their own bodies the socialist fatherland of the proletariat against the attack of the imperialists. But instead of demanding that our ranks stand closer together than ever, instead of demanding the expulsion of apostates and the winning over of the broad masses, the Opposition proposes that we admit any offal into our Party, the various types of anarcho-syndicalists, the more than suspicious Maslow, the "disciplined" Ruth Fischer, etc., and meanwhile we may forget the Social Democratic workers for the present. We are not in agreement in any single point with this standpoint; not a single comrade has said a word in favour of these "measures", with the exception of Comrade Vuyovitch, whose fractional interests make him Trotzky's supporter in all these attacks, sallies, and proposals. Not one single member of the Plenum is agreed with the readmission of Maslow and his group, or with the idea of turning our backs on the broad masses and starting on a search for a few syndicalists to help us to defend the Soviet Union.

(To be continued.)

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

The Struggle against the Danger of War and the Tasks of the C. P. of France.

By Pierre Semard.

Comrade Semard wrote this article in the Santé Prison in Paris. After recovering his freedom on the 25th June by a Royalist trick, he returned to his post in the Party without making any attempt to hide from the Party without making any attempt to hide from the authorities. He wished neither to make use of royalist mercy nor to give himself up voluntarily to the courts. The courts have given him a period of ten days in which to present himself at the prison to serve his sentence. Ed.

The working class of France is under the pressure of the bourgeois offensive: reduction of wages and growing increases of prices; increase of indirect taxation and customs which fall upon the proletarian consumers; ruthless measures of rationalisation the costs of which the workers have to pay. Hand in hand with the economic offensive there is also a political offensive whose object is to crush the resistance of the proletariat: persecution of the advance guard of the working class, the Communist Party; the arrest and imprisonment of its officials; attacks upon the trade union movement; abolition of the right to strike etc.

At the same time the danger of war internationally is growing. International capitalism is arming for the final struggle under the leadership of British imperialism against the first Workers' and Peasants' State in the world, against the bulwark of the workers in all other countries. It is the broad masses of toiling humanity in the capitalist countries who are to bleed in this next war for the salvation of the capitalist system in the whole world. The French bourgeoisie is also taking up its position in the war front. Although its diplomats hypocritically deny this to the outside world, yet the actions of the French bourgeoisie show that it is no better than the British. Side by side with the British imperialists it is already carrying on war in China against the revolution. In Indo-China and in the other French colonies it is oppressing the native population and trying to throttle its movement for emancipation. And in France itself it is systematically preparing for the new war. The military budgets and the shameful mobilisation law of the socialist Paul Boncour which aim to place old men, women and children, in the services of the militarists as also the trade unions and the co-operatives, mean nothing less. There is no doubt about the enemy in this new war. The furious campaign of the French press against the Soviet Union should open the eyes of the blindest.

In this international situation, the National Conference of the Communist Party of France will meet on the 26th June. The chief tasks which it will have to perform arise with iron necessity from the double pressure of the capitalists.

First of all the Party must set its aims in the struggle against the campaign of the bourgeoisie against the living conditions of the working class which threatens also the existence of the working class organisations. Secondly, it must prepare and organise the struggle to prevent the planned armed attack of the imperialists against the Soviet Union and for the destruction of the Chinese Revolution. This task must be the central point in the coming National Conference and indeed in the whole policy of the French Communist Party.

Some of our comrades assume that the danger of war is not immediate, that we have still sufficient time to awaken and mobilise the masses. That is a great mistake which may have serious consequences. For the latest events show with all clarity that the danger of war is increasing and that it is as great as it was on the evening of the 4th of August 1914. Just as in the period which preceded the great imperialist slaughter, all the imperialist States are arming feverishly. Almost everywhere incidents are taking place reminiscent of Agadir and Sarajevo.

The clouds of war are gathering over the Pacific. Big guns have already sounded in China.

The intervention of the imperialists in China is not only aimed to defend the concessions, but it is a part of the offensive plan of the Great Powers against the Soviet Union. It is necessary that all workers, all toilers realise clearly — for some of them are not yet conscious of it — that under the leadership of capitalism a real class war of the imperialists against the workers and peasants of China and the Soviet Union is in preparation.

Communism threatens the capitalist States from within. It threatens them still more from Russia where it is in power, and it threatens them in China where it acts as a spur to the revolutionary movement. Thus capitalism can feel the ground rocking under its feet. That is the reason for its determined preparation for a class war. In order to create the anti-Bolshevist united front, the capitalists of the various countries are striving, up to the moment without success, to milder their mutual contradictions. If they once succeed, then the war against revolutionary China and against the Soviet Union can take its course.

According to the imperialist plans, the Soviet Union is to be attacked upon all fronts at once. First of all economically and politically, through the breaking off of diplomatic and commercial relations and by the formation of an economic and financial blockade of the Soviet Union. Then militarily; by the forcing of the border States into war, in China by the destruction of the revolutionary movement and finally with the assistance of the reactionary generals, by attacking the borders of the Soviet Union in the Far East.

All the forces of the working and peasant masses must be mobilised tirelessly against this imperialist plan to force an anti-Bolshevist war, against this hellish attack upon the bulwark of peace in the world, the Soviet Union. That is the task before the Communist Parties. The united front of the imperialists must be met with the united front of the working class, the united front of the toilers.

The Communist Party of France will place itself at the head of the action against the threatening war. Recently it has been shown, for instance by the parliamentary by-election in the agricultural Department Aube and in the municipal elections in Paris and the surrounding country, that the influence of the Communist Party both inside the working class and inside the peasantry, is steadily growing. This explains the bitter campaign of the French government, of the Minister of the Interior Sarraut and the Minister for Justice Barthou against the Communist Party and its leaders. But it is just the man hunt after the communists which proves to the broad masses that it is only the communists who are feared by the bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party alone is the defender of the old revolutionary traditions of the French proletariat. The Socialists have entered the united front with the bourgeoisie. And, as the new mobilisation law of Paul Boncour proves, they even do not hesitate to take the initiative in preparing for new war. Despite all persecution however, the Communist Party will continue its struggle against the offensive of capital and for the defence of the Soviet Union and it will double and treble its forces in this fight. Our immediate task is an intense political enlightenment of the masses, and to give our rising influence an organisational expression, so that we may do our duty victoriously.

HANDS OFF THE SOVIET UNION

Extracts from the Statement of the White Terrorist Elvengren.

In the Autumn of 1926 the G. P. U. learned of the intention of the Russian monarchist organisation in Paris to send a group of terrorists to Moscow with a view to carrying out a series of attempts upon the People's Commissars of the Soviet Union.

In the summer of the same year a suspicious looking foreigner had been arrested at a Moscow railway station. He had a Roumanian passport under the name of Pavel and was stated to be a merchant. He was armed with a revolver.

After brief denials the arrested man was compelled under the overwhelming weight of evidence against him, to admit that the passport with which he had entered the Soviet Union was a false one, and that in reality he was the well-known

Russian White Guardist Georg Eugenevitch Elvengren, a very well-known member of the leading "White Guardist authorities". At the same time the arrested man admitted that he had come to the Soviet Union with the sole aim of organising terrorist groups.

At first Elvengren refused to name his accomplices, but later his detailed statements were of considerable assistance to the G. P. U. in its work of exposing and foiling the terrorist machinations of the Russian White Guardist organisations abroad. Elvengren made an exhaustive statement concerning the real instigators of the white terror. In particular he declared that the terrorist group to which he himself belonged was formed with the energetic co-operation of the member of the British Secret Service Sidney George Reilly, and with the assistance of the Commerce and Industry Society in Paris which is formed of emigrants, and of the terrorist group of Aubert, the well-known Swiss White Guardist.

Who is Elvengren?

Elvengren is one of the most "respected" of the leaders of the bloodiest undertakings of the Russian reaction, counter-revolution and terror.

In the past he was Staff Captain of Horse in a Cuirassier Regiment of Guards. From the first moment of the revolution in 1917 he was in the first ranks of those who waited for an opportunity for revenge and utilised the fury of the obstinate monarchists. He began an active and bloody struggle against everything approaching "revolutionary rebellion".

Immediately after the March revolution Elvengren entered the ranks of the monarchist military organisation, which aimed at the overthrow of the Provisional Government and the restoration of the Romanov monarchy. The organisation called itself the "War League", and Admiral Koltchak was one of its most prominent leaders.

After the destruction of the "War League" by Kerensky, Elvengren joined the infamous Georgian organisation of nobles where he was a particular friend of the chairman.

In the days of the October Revolution, Elvengren entered the organisation led by Boris Savinkov, Gotz and Avksentiev known as the "Committee for Salvation". The first task which Elvengren received from the Committee was to take companies of Cossacks, surround the Smolny and arrest all the Bolshevist members of the Soviets.

After the defeat of the counter-revolution in the Crimea in which Elvengren took a leading part, he left with other well-known White Guardists and participated actively in the crushing of the revolutionary working class movement in Finland by General Mannerheim. Upon the conclusion of this "heroism" Elvengren began to participate steadily in a number of adventures and he allied himself with the most various Russian organisations and foreign governments and groups whenever he saw the possibility of a bitter struggle against the revolution.

Elvengren himself, his activity and at the same time all those forces which carry on a life and death struggle with the Soviet Union, are best characterised by the personal written statements of Elvengren. We give him the floor to speak, expose and to accuse:

The Conspirative and Espionage Work of Elvengren in Finland.

Elvengren describes a number of counter-revolutionary and espionage organisations which were formed in Finland in the years 1918—21 and which sent their agents, spies and murderers to the Soviet Union and then mentions the following details:

"Upon the initiative of Count V. Buksgvedyden (at present chairman of the Russian emigrant colony in Finland and delegate to the foreign congress of the monarchists in Paris) who had addressed himself to me, a meeting was called at which it was decided to form a permanent group meeting regularly and sending its representative to the united session of the chairmen of all organisations.

At this meeting at which, apart from the founders, also Captain Wilken was present, the chief question discussed was how the struggle against the Soviet Union could be best developed, how it was to be prepared and what should be done.

I used the opportunity to make the acquaintance of Wilken. He interested me, and I made efforts to become closely acquainted with him and to establish connections with him... I was very soon able to discover that he was chairman of an active group of English spies, that he was working under the instructions of the group and that he participated in the provocations of the English who were striving to force Finland into a war with the Soviet Union.

Before the Kronstadt rising, Captain Wilken went to Kronstadt under the instructions of the English receiving papers, obviously under English influence, (the English had great influence in Finland at that time) from Professor Zeidler (Chairman of the Red Cross in Finland) purporting him to be an official of the International Red Cross. He was allegedly to take over the supply of Kronstadt. The one time general Yavid who was a friend of Professor Zeidler received a similar document. They both went to Kronstadt, and when I learnt that the Kronstadt rising was dragging itself out and that connection had been established with Vyborg, I determined to take part in the events also and journeyed from Helsingfors to Vyborg. There I approached Zeidler who as intermediary with Kronstadt was best informed about events."

At the same time when Elvengren was participating in the Kronstadt events, he also took up connection with the monarchist organisation in Leningrad under the leadership of Tagentzev. This organisation, as is known, saw its chief task in the carrying out of terrorism.

"The Russian monarchist groups in Finland knew of my connection with Savinkov, but in this connection I acted completely independently and did not often speak of the matter, for the monarchists rejected all connection with Savinkov, for the most part.

In Finland I was the representative of the 'Russian Political Committee in Poland' led by Savinkov. When I was once in Warsaw, I participated in the composition of the so-called 'Warsaw Document'. This document contained an appeal for support for the continuation of the struggle. It also contained a point inserted by me attacking the emigration."

The Various "Specialities" of Elvengren.

The reactionary Russian monarchist Elvengren was at the same time a "democrat", almost a Social Revolutionary, a supporter of Savinkov and if necessary, a rebellious, anarchist, Kronstadt seaman.

He attempted to use the supporters of Savinkov and also Kronstadt for the monarchist machinations. At the back of all these activities there was the function of Elvengren as "White Russian Ambassador" in Finland and Ambassador of the "National White Russian Republic" to the government of Finland.

Such a government at whose head was the Minister Lastovski, existed at that time in various countries, Poland, Esthonia and Latvia. Upon this point Elvengren writes as follows:

"... in the Summer of 1920 I arrived in Reval... where at that time there was a delegation of White Russians. They were conducting negotiations with the Esthonian government with the authority of the White Russian Rada and their aim was to bring about the formation of a national White Russian Republic. I was acquainted with this delegation and with the history and situation of the national White Russian movement. I can only remember the leader of this delegation Sakharko with whom I mostly conducted negotiations. The members of the delegation proposed that I should go to Riga and make the closer acquaintance of their government. Before I left, Sakharko wrote a letter to the head of his government Lastovski, and armed with this letter I went to Riga.

After making the acquaintance of Lastovski and a number of other White Russians, they proposed to me that up to the clarification of the question whether or not it were possible to form a national White Russian government, I should undertake the post of Consul of the White Russian government in Finland.

I accepted this proposal and received the necessary papers, a diplomatic passport, seals, etc., and departed for Finland."

The Terrorist Career of Elvengren.

Elvengren writes the following about the commencement of his terrorist activity:

"When I was active in Finland as the representative of Savinkov — I can't remember the exact year, but it must have been about six months before the Genoa Conference, — the representative of the Commerce and Industry Society in Paris, Pavel Tixton, arrived one day from Riga. I learned from him that leading circles of the Russian monarchist emigrants in the West were of the opinion that the only possibility for the continuation of the active struggle was a wide-spread and well organised campaign of terrorist acts both inside Russia and abroad. I thought over the matter and came to the conclusion that terrorism was the only salvation of the struggle and agreed with Tixton. Tixton complained that the matter was very difficult chiefly because the affair was very confidential and delicate and one could therefore speak with hardly anyone about it, for there were hardly any people who could be trusted to such an extent. With regard to means, Tixton expressed the opinion that for such undertakings money would always be available. Tixton left me an address in Paris and we agreed to correspond upon the matter. His object in coming to Finland under the instructions of the Commerce and Industry Society was to examine the possibility for terrorist activity.

When afterwards I went to Warsaw for the last time and saw that Savinkov's work there was coming to an end, I expressed my opinion for the first time in the presence of Savinkov and Derental, that the only possibility for the continuation of the struggle was terrorism, and I suggested that Savinkov should take the matter up as he had had experience in just such a connection in the past. I also mentioned that if he would decide to organise such an action, money for the purpose could be obtained from the Comrade and Industry Society in Paris.

I afterwards met Savinkov in Paris and learned that up to then he had been able to do nothing with regard to the organisation of terrorism. I also met Tixton who declared that having regard to the coming conference in Genoa it would be particularly interesting to organise acts of terrorism, and that he would provide the necessary means. Tixton told me that he had made the acquaintance of an inventor who had invented a very interesting little mechanism. By means of this invention, the lighting of a cigarette would release notwithstanding the small size of the apparatus, poison gas sufficient to kill everyone in the room. He said that he was very interested in the invention and intended to be present at an experiment with it on the following day and he invited me to accompany him which I agreed to do."

At this time of active preparation for the carrying out of the terror, in the society of Elvengren, the Englishman Tixton and the honourable Naptha industrialists there was an experienced terrorist who was used in the Lockhart conspiracy and in a series of murders, the member of the British Secret Service, Captain Sidney George Reilly, mentioned in the report of the Soviet government. Reilly who was informed about the new terrorist organisation, did not hesitate to go to Paris and took with him the moral support of the British government and, what was more important still, the financial means from the British Treasury.

The Role of the British Spy Reilly.

"I told Reilly that I had a strong organisation at my disposal in Finland, that good connections had been established with Petersburg and that the action there was developing well. I reported about the organisation of Zeidler in Finland which was prepared if necessary to support St. Petersburg with food and other assistance. I also told Reilly about my participation in the Kronstadt rising. At later meetings with Reilly we discussed the plan for terrorism which Savinkov, Derental and myself had come to Paris to prepare."

In this way the machinery of terrorist conspiracy which was regulated and fed by the British agent Reilly, was put into movement.

"Finally Tixton told me that he had decided to draw Savinkov into the matter, but that there could be no question of the sum which had been mentioned before (one and a half million Francs), but that money would be supplied according to the success achieved and as a first trial 100,000 Francs to finance the first action. If we were able to do anything with that sum, we would be able to reckon on more. I informed Savinkov of this who became very excited and declared that he was no paid murderer etc. We also met Nobel. He told us that the action interested him from the commercial point of view. He was not interested, he said, in the development of the political and party organisations. Savinkov answered that he considered the terror to be the only salvation for the struggle, but that the mutual relations between them would have to be based on something other than pure business. He, Savinkov, acted from motives of idealism. Nobel gave us 80,000 Francs. I asked him who then amongst the leading Bolsheviks did he want put out of the way. He then gave us the names of Krassin, Tchicherin, Radek, Rakovski and Bukharin and perhaps still others. He was particularly interested in getting rid of Krassin.

We commenced with the practical work, and I went to Berlin with Savinkov and Derental. Here we went straight from the station to the house of the monarchist secret agent Orlov who was the chairman of the Wrangel secret service in Berlin. He was closely connected with and completely dependent upon the British secret agent Reilly. Orlov assured us that as far as weapons, passports, photographs and descriptions of the Soviet representatives were concerned, he could do everything necessary. He had in his possession various tins with poison, bombs etc. Savinkov ordered five revolvers and photographs and descriptions of Krassin, Tchicherin, Radek and Bukharin.

We discovered the stopping place of the Soviet delegation to Genoa and made preparations to carry out an attempt upon its members. I learned in Berlin that Tchicherin would also come. As I had not sufficient time to get into touch with my co-operators, I went alone to the station, but I found so many police there that I left the station. I got into touch with my co-operators with a view to carrying out an attempt upon the members of the delegation which included Litvinov, when it set off. We knew that a special train with a saloon-waggon was waiting at Potsdamer Railway Station, and we succeeded in gaining access to the platform which was closed to the general public. All my companions had false passports and sufficient money in case of flight. It turned out that only less important members of the delegation were in the saloon-waggon of the train and that the chief members of the delegation were attending a dinner at the German Foreign Office, and so the train left without them. But Tchicherin and the other members of the delegation reached the train by automobile at another station. After the delegation departed for Genoa, I remained with my group in Berlin and we intended to carry out terrorist attempts upon the Bolshevik leaders who had remained in Berlin. It was rumoured that Rakovski had remained in Berlin. We intended to carry out an attempt against Litvinov, but we found out only too late the waggon in which he was travelling. With this failure ended this depressing epic."

From the statement of Elvengren it is clear that he did everything he could of a technical nature to kill our delegates to Genoa. At the decisive moment, the real "Mastermind" in the affair appeared, Sidney George Reilly. Our delegation only escaped death thanks to our own precautions and to the watchfulness of the Berlin police. Elvengren writes then about his further activity:

"Up till the autumn of 1925 I was in France and met periodically various monarchist personalities, for instance, the Czar Kyril, the Grand Duke Andrei Vladimirovitch, etc. This time was occupied with a search for means to continue the struggle."

In this purely monarchist environment Elvengren directed his attention once again to his chief and favourite weapon against the Soviet Union, i. e. the weapon of terrorism against the Soviet leaders, but Elvengren himself saw the physical impossibility of organising a wide-spread conspirative activity inside the Soviet Union.

Together with Andrei Vladimirovitch and Aubert, Elvengren organised an attempt upon Comrade Tchicherin utilising the circumstance that Tchicherin was in the South of France for purposes of convalescence.

The detailed statement of Elvengren in relation to this attempt may be summed up briefly:

"Under the directions of Andrei Vladimirovitch an active terrorist group was organised to act independently and without entering into any connection with the other emigrant organisations. The financial means were to come through Kyril from Americans, and negotiations for this purpose were going on. Through the White Guardist Lashenski who was a member of the group connection was taken up with Aubert and the group expected to receive money through the mediation of Aubert from Ford.

When we heard that Tchicherin was in the South of France, our group decided to carry out an attempt upon him. General Voloshin, Prince Vayasemski, the one-time Chancellor General Kulenev and myself were entrusted with the carrying out of the attempt. However, we were not successful in discovering the exact place where Tchicherin was staying."

After the failure of this plan Elvengren occupied himself up to the time of his arrest with a plan for a campaign of terror on the territory of the Soviet Union itself.

The statements of Elvengren alone expose sufficiently the work of the white guardist monarchists and their imperialist masters. The statements of Elvengren are however only a fraction of the whole material in the hands of the Soviet government.

CHINA

The New Stage of the Chinese Revolution.

By E. Zeitlin.

The development of events in China in the last few weeks throws light on the danger which threatens the further victorious development of the revolution in China.

The victory of the Wuhan Army over the Northern militarists, its considerable advance towards the North, provide the preliminary conditions for a new and powerful expansion of the Chinese revolution. The Northern campaign, the great significance of which was correctly characterised by the Opposition two months ago, and with regard to which the Opposition now maintains that it has only strengthened the bourgeoisie, this Northern campaign has led to an extraordinary spread of the worker and peasant movement. Since the bourgeoisie, the passionate opponent of the worker and peasant movement, has gone over to the camp of the counter-revolution, the new advance of the National Revolutionary Army can and must extend this movement to still wider and deeper strata of the people.

Thus, the victory of the Wuhan Army has a decisive influence on the progress of the agrarian revolution. The Plenum of the E. C. C. I. was right in pointing out that nothing but a development of the mass movement, the expansion of the agrarian revolution can guarantee that the victory of Wuhan's army is firmly established. The bourgeoisie wanted to fight against the militarists, it wanted to carry on the Northern campaign without developing the agrarian revolution, and it was just the growth of the agrarian revolution which decided them to join the counter-revolution. The higher the revolutionary wave rises in the villages, the stronger will be the tendency towards an amalgamation of the camp of the bourgeoisie with that of the militarists.

The agrarian revolution however has **only begun**. Organised in leagues, relying on their armed troops, supported by the working class, the peasants are making decisive but yet their first steps on the path towards the agrarian revolution. In individual villages, the peasants are driving out the landowners, in others they are disarming the troops of the landed proprietors, whilst in others again the land is being expropriated. There are some districts in which the whole power is concentrated in the hands of the Peasant Unions and Committees. Millions of peasants are gathering round the slogans of the agrarian revolution. The peasants are expropriating the whole land, including that of the officers of the National Revolutionary Army. The agrarian revolution is directed not only against the large landed proprietors but also against the small property owners, in some cases against the Kulaks.

The agrarian revolution is only beginning. The fluctuations which exist in its development, in the ranks of the Left Kuomintang and even in the Communist Party, show that the peasant movement still lacks the necessary leadership and that the movement is growing in an elementary way without being sufficiently supported by the Kuomintang.

In this respect, it is necessary to follow the events in **Changsha** with great attention and quite dispassionately.

The settling accounts with the landed proprietors, the disarmament of their troops, the formation of peasant troops which resist the local authorities, the Peasant Unions, the expropriation of the property of the landowners, have met with armed resistance on the part of the officers of Wuhan's army. The officers have completely destroyed the Peasant Committees of hundreds, they have disarmed the troops of workers, they have dissolved the Kuomintang Committee and the local Government and have formed party organs and organs of power of their own. This was a counter-revolutionary subversion in **Hunan**, the very heart of the peasant movement.

The treachery of **Hsiaotuying** and the appearance of **Yangsen** and the counter-revolutionary subversion in **Changsha** are closely connected with one another and show that the agrarian revolution will deepen more than ever the differentiation between the class forces. The fundamental split between the class forces has already been completed. The Plenum of the E. C. C. I. has called attention to the special character of the present moment in China.

The present moment is characterised by the existence of three camps: **Chang Kai Shek** is already shooting the workers and peasants but he is still fighting the Northern militarists.

The logic of the fight however makes two camps out of these three. In so far as the large bourgeoisie (with **Chang Kai Shek** and **Baitoundshi** at their head) approaches feudal reaction and foreign imperialism, this process is accelerated.

At this point we must emphasise the fact that we have no historical example in which, in the advance of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, every class camp had its own army, its own apparatus of State and could carry on the fight relying on these armies.

The French Revolution in 1789, that in Russia in 1917, were revolutions against the class which held the army and the apparatus of State in its hands. The revolution defeated and annihilated the army of the landowners and created its own armed force consisting of workers and peasants.

The army of the National Revolutionary Government is not yet an army of armed workers and peasants, but is a mercenary army. It is however playing an important part in history by its fight against the militarists, which means also against imperialism. The decisive fight against the militarists, the fight which must be carried on to the end, is now making the camp of the bourgeoisie the chief enemy of the Chinese revolution.

The fight against **Chang Kai Shek**, which possesses a power of attraction for various elements of the officers' corps of the National Revolutionary Army, which is being partly turned to account against the worker and peasant movement by **Chang Kai Shek's** methods, whilst on the other hand it tends towards the formation of a block with **Chang Kai Shek**, demands a higher degree of class consciousness on the part of the soldiers of the National Revolutionary army.

The fight against **Chang Kai Shek**, who is anxious to preserve the appearance of hostility to the imperialists but, in reality, tends towards compromising with them, demands that the slogans of the agrarian revolution become the slogans of the National Revolutionary army.

This can only be achieved if new masses of workers, who have already had some training in the class war, join the ranks of the army, peasants who have taken part in the active fight against the landowners. Energetic work at the transformation of the so-called Wuhan army into an army of armed workers and peasants, the extension of the control exercised by the Left Kuomintang over the National Revolutionary army, an approach between the army and the worker and peasant organisations — these are at present the chief tasks, and their fulfilment will be a certain guarantee that in the next, direct fight with the army of the bourgeois counter-revolution, the victory will be on the side of Wuhan.

In connection with this, we must point out the circumstance that in **Chang Kai Shek's** negotiations with the militarists, a first and main condition was that **Chang Tso Lin** should recognise the three fundamental principles of **Sun Yat Sen**. This hypocritical casting sheep's eyes at the principles of **Sun Yat Sen** is a manoeuvre which is intended to create a platform on which all forces can be combined against the Labour movement, against the agrarian revolution. The fate of the struggle against the class enemy of the Chinese revolution, against **Chang Kai Shek**, who has been promised the support of world imperialism will be decided by how soon the Communist Party and the Left Kuomintang cease to vacillate in the question of the expansion of the agrarian revolution and whether they can lead this movement. The issue of the fight depends on whether the working class can get the petty bourgeoisie under its influence.

All this shows more clearly than ever the mistake in the attitude of the heroes of Left phrases who mask their idea of seceding from the Kuomintang by the formula: "The present is not the time to secede from the Kuomintang" (!).

On the contrary, the revolutionary policy of the Communists consists in increasing the influence of the Communists in the Kuomintang to the maximum, in effectually carrying through the democratisation of the Kuomintang and in openly criticising the vacillating Left members of the Kuomintang.

The Plenum of the E. C. C. I. has pointed out that the defection of vacillating groups, even of Left members of the Kuomintang, that the treachery of individual generals and leaders of the army are inevitable. They are inevitable because the agrarian revolution will bring about a differentiation of classes which will drive those who are obviously adherents of the imperialists, out of the national revolutionary front.

In connection with the counter-revolutionary subversion, the panic-makers of the Opposition have raised a great clamour about the fresh defeat of the Chinese revolution. This clamour, prompted by malicious joy, will not convince anybody. Our Party is following with undiminished attention the events in China, the success and defeats of our comrade in the fight, the Chinese Communist Party, with firm faith in the power of the Chinese revolution.

The revolt of the officers in **Changsha** which was met by decided resistance on the part of the armed workers and peasants, has already been suppressed. The revolution is constantly producing fresh forces to help it to approach nearer to its aim, through all the difficulties and all the betrayals which it experiences. The just and clear recognition of the experience it has gained through individual mistakes and defeats, is a true pledge that the Chinese revolution will issue victoriously from all the innumerable difficulties which still beset its path.

The Kuomintang at the Crossroads.

Letter of the C. P. of China to the Kuomintang.

Wuhan (Hankow), 16th June 1927.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has addressed the following Open Letter to the Central Committee of the Kuomintang upon the situation in the Province of Hunan:

"The revolution is going through a critical period of development. The chief problem at the present moment is how to carry out certain measures in connection with the agrarian reform. The moment for the carrying out of the agrarian policy is the present. This is the historic task of the Kuomintang. The future of the revolution depends upon whether or not the Kuomintang takes decisive steps in this question.

The commencement of the agrarian revolution has driven reactionary elements to counter-revolutionary action. Feudal and militarist elements have turned their weapons against the peasantry and threaten to destroy the Kuomintang and the National Government. The aggressive attitude of these reactionary elements has caused a certain vacillation in leading circles. These circles are afraid that the whole National Army would take up a hostile attitude should the agrarian reform be carried out. This is incorrect. The soldiers are peasants without land and cannot be opponents of the peasant movement. The majority of the subordinate officers belong to the middle class which will experience great advantages from the agrarian reform. Only a reactionary minority is opposed to the agrarian reform. Under the revolutionary leadership of the Kuomintang and the National government, the army must support the carrying out of the agrarian reform.

The Kuomintang is now at the crossroads: the way of agricultural reform is the revolutionary way, the way of the reactionary militarists is the way of the counter-revolution. The reactionary militarists have definitely gone the way of the counter-revolution. This is proved by the insurrections in Siatung and Changsha. These militarists are going the same way as the northern and south eastern militarists. They tell the workers and peasants that in time of war the Kuomintang Committees must be dissolved etc. In Changsha the reactionary militarist bands made an insurrection against the National Government, against the Central Committee of the Kuomintang and against the Supreme Army Command. The Kuomintang must now either win or capitulate in face of the reactionary bands.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China proposes the following measures for the suppression of the counter-revolution: The National Government must issue a decree declaring the committee of the insurrectionaries in Changsha for counter-revolutionary and calling upon the soldiers to overthrow it. This committee must be dissolved and the rightful government of the province re-established. A punitive expedition must be sent immediately to suppress the insurrection. Tang Cheng-chi must be authorised to send troops to overthrow the counter-revolution. The usurping local committee of the Kuomintang must be dissolved and in its place a new one nominated. The workers' and peasants' organisations and the Communist Party must continue to exist unmolested in the province of Hunan. The National Government must order all arms to be returned to the workers' and peasants' guards. The peasantry must be armed in order to create a guarantee against further reactionary outbreaks.

The Kuomintang must now take closer feeling with the masses of the people and lead them unanimously to an offensive against the counter-revolution. Unless the Kuomintang and the National Government do this, the revolution will be endangered.

POLITICS

Egypt Submits Again.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The fifteen-inch guns, whose muzzles are directed from the decks of British dreadnoughts upon the Egyptian ports, have had their effect: After the first storm of indignation and bitterness concerning the methods of compulsion employed by the British rulers to enforce their will upon "independent" Egypt, the decision lay with the responsible leaders of Egyptian policy, Sarvat Pasha and Zaghlul Pasha. In spite of the demands of radical members of parliament, they eschewed public discussion of the conflict with England. Negotiations were carried on behind the scene until public excitement had subsided and it could be admitted that Egypt had accepted the British demands in their entirety.

The leaders of the Liberal-Constitutionals and Zaghlul Pasha are responsible for this new compromise, which is so humiliating for Egypt, and in justification of their action they refer to the British threats simply to dissolve parliament in case of non-compliance and place Egypt once more in direct subjugation to Britain, as was demanded by a portion of the British Press. Decision was made in the favour the compromise that parliament and the parliamentary Government should

maintain the appearance of power, in order that the greater evil might be avoided.

But there can be no doubt that the compromise is painful enough even for the present government, though the latter is founded on a "good understanding" with the representatives of Great Britain: the hope of a reform of the army must be abandoned for the time being and the immediate future, the contracts with the British officers must be renewed and British supervision must be acknowledged. The Zaghlul press, which at the beginning of the crisis proclaimed pathetically: "The army — that is the nation; and an army under foreign supervision is tantamount to the enslavement of the whole nation" — must now accept such enslavement with good grace, for on this occasion the British have scarcely permitted the Cabinet to preserve an appearance of dignity.

But to every Egyptian it is clear that brute force is once more triumphant and that nothing is to be expected for the future from a good understanding with Britain. If Egyptian public opinion was made uncertain in this instance by the united front of the various European powers — France, and Italy openly supported the British action — it found to its surprise the support of the United States representative, Dr. Morton Howell, who at the height of the crisis expressed his disapproval of the "compulsory measures" of the foreign powers. Among the supporters of Zaghlul this incident is accepted as an indication of the orientation Egyptian Nationalistic policy should have in the future.

At the same time it has become manifest to the Egyptian national movement in the course of the recent conflict that its interior forces must be strengthened in order that the country may not be for ever at the mercy of British violence. The Radical wing of the Wafd, as also the National Party, has undoubtedly increased their influence in the course of the crisis. Although to all appearance the extremely tense situation was relieved after two weeks, Lord Lyod went away on holiday, Parliament continued the debate concerning questions connected with the budget, the king set out on his postponed visit to London, the dreadnoughts are shortly to be withdrawn — the dissatisfaction of the masses with this solution by compromise will undoubtedly find expression in a marked intensification of the revolutionary feeling in the country.

The subjugation of Egypt, which Britain has once more achieved, is still by no means a solution of the conflict, but merely a shelving of the issue. The compromise is again merely a redressing of the basic problem, which the British Government has to solve in Egypt: the protection of that most important thoroughfare of the shipping of the British Empire, namely, the Suez Canal. But as security in this regard involves the oppression of the Egyptian nation, will to freedom among the Egyptians must continue on every slight occasion to develop into a conflict with British Imperialism.

THE WHITE TERROR

The "Daily Worker" Goes to Prison.

By J. Louis Engdahl.

Another admission by American imperialism that it feels itself in a state of war, during which Communist opposition must be crushed, is seen in the jailing of the manager and one of the editors of *The Daily Worker*, the central organ of the American Communist Party, issued in New York City. Our comrades are now awaiting sentence which may be anywhere from two to five years in prison.

In addition the federal government, through its post office department, plans the suppression of *The Daily Worker* through the withdrawal of its so-called second class mailing privileges, a peculiar American form of declaring our Communist publications illegal, since without this privilege a publication cannot be circulated through the mails.

The immediate crime charged against *The Daily Workers* was the publication of a short poem entitled "America", which attacked the vicious onslaughts of American imperialism against the peoples of Mexico and Nicaragua, and especially China. In the court hearings it was brought out that the government officials and agents of private patriotic societies, and fascist organisations had been carefully reading *The Daily Worker*

for some time with the object of finding material on which to base this prosecution.

This is the second time within the year that *The Daily Worker* has been attacked. During the visit of Queen Marie, of Roumania, to the United States, the question of the suppression of *The Daily Worker*, because of its campaign waged on this occasion against the white terror in Roumania, was discussed at a meeting in Washington of Coolidge's cabinet. The matter was brought up by Secretary of State Kellogg, Wall Street's best agent in the Coolidge administration, and an investigation ordered started through the post office department. These proceedings, however, were dropped, due to following the speedy and unexpected departure of Queen Marie from the United States, following the cancellation of a large part of her American tour because, it is said, of the tremendous hostility displayed against her visit in Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago and other cities.

This latest attack on *The Daily Worker* has its close connection with the growth of Communist and left wing, influence in the trade union movement. Among those participating in the prosecution of *The Daily Worker* is Jacob Cash, president of the American Patriotic Society, but who is also a vice president of the International Tailoring Co., against which the workers of New York, Chicago and other cities where this concern has huge plants, have waged energetic organisation drives. The New York plant was run under union conditions. The owners declared a lockout against the union in the fight to establish open shop conditions. Mass picketing was conducted under Communist leadership and union conditions were maintained, although the right wing, Socialist reaction in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers fought the militant methods that alone made a victorious struggle possible.

Now the bureaucracy in the American Federation of Labour has joined with the employers in the fight against the left wing and the Communist leadership of large sections of the New York trade union movement. *The Daily Worker* is singled out for special attack by William Green, president, and Matthew Woll, vice president, of the A. F. of L., because it effectively voices the programme of the left wing struggle. Thus the reactionary labour bureaucracy provoke and abet capitalist government in its attack on the Communist press.

With the employer, Cash, there also appeared in court several officials of the American Legion, an embryo fascist organization dominated by high military officers of the late world war, who carry on an organized activity against all progressive efforts of the working class. The attack on *The Daily Worker* has been accompanied with a raid on the Italian Communist weekly in New York, *Il Lavoratore*, growing out of the agitation for the release of Sacco and Vanzetti, and the tour of the United States by the agent of Italian fascism, the airman Pineda.

These are merely steps of the American reaction to crush all opposition to its imperialist adventures in Latin America (Mexico, Nicaragua), and in China, as well as smash such organized resistance at home to its bitter exploitation as may be offered by an aroused working class.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Communication of the Central Control Commission of the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 26th June 1927.

In connection with the violation of Party discipline by Comrades Zinoviev and Trotzky, the Presidium of the Central Commission of the C. P. of the Soviet Union has taken the following decision:

Since 1923 the opposition, with Comrade Trotzky at its head, and since 1926 with Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev, as leaders, has utilised every difficulty met with in the course of the building up of Socialism, to attack the unity of our Party and its leadership, without stopping at breaches of Party discipline.

In 1923 when the Party was fighting against the difficulties caused by the opening of the "scissors", Trotzky and the "46" attempted to utilise the difficulties which had arisen, for frac-

tional purposes and published a declaration that the country had been brought to the brink of destruction by the policy of the Party. The XIV. Congress of the C. P. of the Soviet Union unanimously pointed out that the New Opposition (Zinoviev and others) had left the Leninist position by denying the socialist character of our industry, under-estimating the role of the middle peasantry and demanding freedom of action for fractions and groupings within the Party.

In the spring and summer of 1926 the block of the New Opposition with Trotzky was formed, the New Opposition with Zinoviev at the head definitely going over to the ideological position of Trotzkyism. In the summer of 1926 the Opposition went so far in its ceaseless attacks upon the Party that it formally founded a fractional organisation, illegal organisations with illegal mass meetings in the woods (case of Lashevitch and others). Defeated upon all points by the experiences in the practical work of building up Socialism, the Opposition definitely entered the path of disruption with its appearance in the "Avioribor" and "Red Putilovetz". After the Opposition had experienced a united rejection from the Party, and especially from the workers nuclei, it was compelled to undertake to cease the fractional struggle (Declaration of the 16th October 1926).

In this declaration the Opposition recognised as its "duty" "to carry out the decisions of the Party concerning the impermissibility of fractional activity". In this declaration the leaders of the Opposition recognised "as particularly impermissible, any and every support of the activity of persons already expelled from the Party and from the Comintern such as Ruth Fischer and Maslow". In this declaration the Opposition says:

"We regard the decisions of the XIV. Party Congress, of the Central Committee of the Party and of the Central Commission of the Party as absolutely binding for us. We shall obey and carry them out without reservation."

The whole of the further activity of the Opposition after the October declaration showed that the Opposition only regarded the undertakings contained in the declaration as a means to prepare and disguise a new offensive against the Party. Although the XV. Party Conference whose decisions were ratified by the E. C. of the C. I. declared the policy of the Opposition to be a social democratic deviation, to be a right-wing deviation disguised by left-wing phrases and decisively condemned it, although the Opposition was supported by no single Party nucleus, it continued to represent obstinately its anti-bolshevist opinions and did not cease its fractional work.

Recently, the Opposition has attempted to utilise the special difficulties arising in connection with the international situation of the Soviet Union and with the partial defeat of the Chinese revolution, and has concentrated its attacks upon the international policy of the Party (China, Great Britain). The Opposition answers the increased danger of war for the Soviet Union with declarations that directly undermine the work of the Party to mobilise the masses for the struggle against the danger of war and for the strengthening of the defences of the Soviet State. A declaration such as that recently made by the Opposition with Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev at the head, that "should war really break over our heads, every worker, every day labourer and every poor peasant will ask the question clearly: what sort of a war, what for, with what means and where to?", a declaration such as the declaration of Trotzky to the last session of the E. C. of the C. I.:

"The most dangerous of all dangers is the Party regime", represents a direct attack upon the part of the oppositional leaders against the Party and against the proletarian dictatorship. The left-wing pseudo-radical phrases with which Trotzky attempted to disguise his menshevist deviations in the Plenary Session of the E. C. of the C. I., were, as the E. C. declared in its decision, nothing but an

"attempt to conceal the desertion of Trotzky from the communist workers."

All this was accompanied by fractional work hostile to the Party, work which has recently grown to an extraordinary degree. Instead of honouring the undertakings which the opposition agreed to on the 16th October 1926, fractional literature has been printed and distributed, the organisation of openly fractional declarations like that of the "84" with unparalleled slanderous accusations against the Party, the attitude of Trotzky in the E. C. of the C. I., the speech of Zinoviev on the 9th May in a non-Party meeting appealing to the workers outside the Party against the Party, which was condemned by the E. C. of

the C. I. as crassly fractional and which violated all the traditions of the Party of the bolsheviks and violated elementary Party discipline. Finally, Comrade Trotzky made unbelievable accusations against the Party in the Session of the Presidium of the Central Control Commission on account of alleged Thermidorism.

Although the question of Comrade Zinoviev's attitude had been placed before the Central Control Commission for examination, although the E. C. C. I. had condemned the attitude of Comrade Trotzky as openly fractional, on the 9th June during the days of the bitterest attacks of British imperialism upon the Soviet Union, Trotzky and Zinoviev took part in a demonstration arranged by the Opposition at the railway station under the pretence of seeing off Smilga. At the moment of open war preparations of Great Britain, the breaking off of diplomatic relations, the assassination of Vojkov, which clearly showed the transition of the imperialists to terrorist means against the Soviet Union, Comrade Trotzky addressed a demonstration consisting not only of the members of the Opposition drawn there by the fractional apparatus, but also of the normal public at the station.

Through this Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev have shown that their undertaking to preserve discipline was purely a tactical manoeuvre upon their part with a view to deceiving the Party. At a moment when the chief task of the Party is to consolidate its position and when the chief condition for such a consolidation is an increase of the fighting preparedness and the discipline of the Party, the opposition in its own fractional interests proceeds to destroy the Party discipline and demand the loosening of the anti-Soviet forces inside our own country.

For years the Party has shown the greatest patience and given the Opposition one warning after the other with a view to persuading the leaders of the Opposition to subordinate themselves to the discipline of the Party. The latest actions of Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev show that after having exhausted all the means of warning the leaders of the Opposition, it has not been able to persuade these leaders to subordinate themselves to the will of the Party, that the leaders of the Opposition systematically and flagrantly violate the Party discipline which is binding for everyone, no matter who he may be, that the Opposition under the leadership of the oppositional members of the Central Committee of the Party, is conducting a fractional activity and steering towards a split and that the Opposition has completely broken its undertaking to cease the fractional struggle.

All this forces the Presidium of the Central Control Commission in accordance with the decisions of the XIV. Party Congress to raise the question of removing Comrades Zinoviev and Trotzky from the Central Committee of the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the Plenary Session of the Central Control Commission and the Central Committee.

CLARA ZETKIN'S 70th BIRTHDAY

Reminiscences of Joint Work in the Movement with Klara Zetkin.

By N. Krupskaya.

To be frank, I can write very little about this theme. It is easier for me to speak of the influence which Klara Zetkin exercised upon me.

At the beginning of the 'nineties when our Party was slowly beginning to collect its forces, when there were only individual small groups of marxists and when our organisation was not built up even in the chief centres, the influence of the German Social Democracy upon our growing Social Democratic movement was very great.

When in 1890 the Anti-Socialist Law was abolished, a period of quick growth commenced for the German Social Democracy, a growth which was both broad and deep and applied not only to the political organisations, but also to the trade unions, co-operatives and educational organisations. The Russian Social Democracy learned from the German how to connect the Marxist theory with practice, with the daily questions of interest to the workers. The name of Klara Zetkin was indissolubly

bound up for us with the German Social Democracy, and it was dear to us.

The necessity of extending the work amongst the women in Russia, of carrying on the work in Russia which Klara Zetkin carried on in Germany, was obvious for us women members of the Social Democracy. My first illegal pamphlet was entitled: "The Woman as a Worker". The influence of Klara Zetkin showed itself clearly in this pamphlet.

Later on, when we were fighting the opportunist deviations in our working class movement, under the leadership of Lenin, we always supported ourselves upon the left wing of the German Social Democracy. Klara Zetkin belonged to this left wing. In his pamphlet "One Step Forwards and two Steps back", Comrade Lenin, who was describing the struggle at our Second Party Congress against the Mensheviks, quotes Klara Zetkin's reproach to Bebel for not drawing a sufficiently clear line of demarcation between him and the opportunist Vollmar: "I am sorry to see you (Bebel) in such company".

I learned very much from Klara Zetkin's newspaper "Gleichheit" ("Equality"). Zetkin's articles always contained a broad Marxist treatment of educational and artistic questions etc.

I saw Klara Zetkin for the first time in Munich in 1902 at a great workers' meeting somewhere in the workers' quarter. I can no longer remember what she said; I only know that she spoke very passionately. I can remember the strained attention with which the assembled workers listened to her speech. I remember that she spoke not only of the economic struggle of the working class, not only of the political struggle, but also of the advance of culture and the emancipation of the individual through the struggle for Socialism.

At that time our Party had to conduct a struggle against the so-called "economists" who limited the class struggle and confined it to a struggle for economic demands. And although Klara Zetkin said nothing about our "economists" and indeed, could say nothing, yet her speech was a justification of the policy of the "Iskra" (The "Iskra" was the illegal Social Democratic political newspaper which appeared in Munich at that time and was smuggled into Russia).

Later I met Klara Zetkin in the international women's movement. An international congress was planned to take place in Vienna in 1914 and parallel with it an international conference of women. Upon our part we proposed Inessa Armand, who was in regular correspondence with Klara Zetkin, as reporter. I collected the material referring to Russia.

The war prevented the carrying out of the Vienna conference. In the Autumn of 1915 I met Klara Zetkin in Berne at the International Women's Conference. During the war Klara Zetkin worked together with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. The calling of an international conference in a period when the war was developing into a world war, was very difficult. Klara Zetkin was heartily supported by the Russian women Bolsheviks, above all by Inessa Armand. The conference was well-visited. And although the resolutions which were adopted, were not sufficiently decided, the fact alone that it was called at all, was of great importance. It was a demonstration against imperialist war.

Later I met Klara Zetkin in Russia. I have never had to work directly with Klara Zetkin. Her work was chiefly connected with the international movement whilst I worked chiefly for the enlightenment of the people, but we often met at all sorts of meetings. To-day Klara Zetkin is one of the most popular leaders and is known not only amongst the working women in Russia, but also amongst the peasant women in the farthest villages. Our work amongst the women developed along the path traversed by Klara Zetkin. Our working class movement owes her very much.

Those who know Klara Zetkin value her not only as a leader and zealous fighter in the cause of the proletariat, but also as the agreeable and attentive comrade in whose society one can win new courage and energy.

On Klara Zetkin's 70th birthday we shall all remember what she has done for our struggle. We send her our warmest good wishes.

Comrade Klara Zetkin and her Life Work.

By Kaethe Duncker (Berlin).

Comrade Klara Zetkin whose 70th birthday we shall celebrate on the 5th July, is one of the old guard of the international working class movement. She is one of those who have passed through the "heroic age", through that time when it required much greater courage and heroism to champion the cause of Socialism than it does to-day, for then there was nothing but persecution and personal sacrifices for the upholders of socialism.

Klara Zetkin was one of that small group of personalities including **Bebel** and **Wilhelm Liebknecht**, which set its stamp upon the Social Democratic Party or at any international congress and who represented a part of the tradition of the international working class movement. And, most important of all, she was one of those few who, when the German Social Democratic Party developed into a petty bourgeois party of reformism, never sacrificed her revolutionary principles. In this respect her name is bracketed with the names of **Karl Liebknecht**, **Rosa Luxemburg** and **Franz Mehring**. When in these days we honour the life work of Klara Zetkin therefore, it is a considerable part of the history of the international working class movement which passes before our eyes.

The work of Klara Zetkin in the proletarian women's movement shows us more clearly than anything else, the great possibilities of a leading personality inside a mass movement. Mass movements do not grow from thin air; they develop more or less quickly under the direct influence of economic transformations. But the task of a leading personality is to assist that which lies in the sub-consciousness of a mass movement to give itself conscious expression and thus to ensure that the movement itself, which might otherwise expend its forces in a disorganised and wasteful manner, expresses itself in a united and consolidated form. Assuming, as was the case with Klara Zetkin, that the leader is perfectly clear with regard to the idea expressed in the mass movement and with this clarity combines a passionate devotion and a prodigious will.

The work of women in industry in Germany had already taken on a very considerable extent in the 'eighties of the last century. In 1882 there were four and a quarter millions of women apart from female servants, earning their own living. There were at this time, it is true, only a million and a half directly engaged in industry and commerce. But in the textile industry alone, over 300,000 women were working, and great numbers in the tailoring, dressmaking, tobacco and paper industries.

The objective conditions for a growth of class consciousness amongst women were therefore present. The subjective circumstances were not favourable to this growth. The majority of the women workers was petty-bourgeois in its ideas and still bound to the churches. The women who were compelled to go out into the world, clung nevertheless to the ideas of the past, and above all to the principle that the women belonged in the home. They regarded women's work as a temporary phenomenon both for the individual and for society as a whole. No wonder! The men who had become class-conscious, were nevertheless still backward and reactionary in this respect. Added to this, it was very difficult to approach the women with socialist agitation. Many of them worked in small-scale workshops or at home and further, the application of the laws relating to coalition and organisation — as kaleidoscopic as the map of the German Federal States — made it difficult to organise the women in trade unions and rendered their political organisation impossible almost everywhere.

All these circumstances together prevented the speedy growth of a conscious proletarian women's movement. Small groups which might act as collecting points for the rest of the country formed themselves only in a few industrial districts, such as **Berlin**, the textile districts of **Saxony**, in **Mannheim** etc. On the other hand the bourgeois women's movement had already attained a very considerable growth and did not lack intelligent leaders and eloquent speakers. In its first flush this movement even felt itself to be the representative of all women irrespective of class distinctions. It commenced to make propaganda for its ideas and its organisations amongst the petty bourgeois-proletarian sections, amongst the women working at home, amongst

the tailoresses, washerwomen etc. It was therefore of very great importance that the proletarian women had a leader in Klara Zetkin, marxistically schooled, manysided, eloquent in speech and writings, to organise the isolated small groups of proletarian women under the banner of the international working class movement.

In the 'eighties of the last century Klara Zetkin lived abroad, first in **Switzerland** and then in **Paris**. She was active in the working class movement both in speech and in writing, together with her husband, **Ossip Zetkin**, a Russian refugee expelled from **Germany**. After her husband's death and the abolition of the Anti-Socialist Laws, Klara Zetkin returned to **Germany** where she found employment in the publishing house of **Dietz** in **Stuttgart**. In 1892 she took over the Social Democratic women's newspaper "**Gleichheit**" ("**Equality**") which had been founded a year previously by **Emma Ihrer** under the name "**Arbeiterin**" ("**Woman Worker**").

Klara Zetkin devoted her chief activity as editor and speaker in numerous meetings, to making the proletarian women class conscious. She taught them to realise that women's work in industry and commerce was an economic necessity which, despite the dangers for health and the family which it brought with it, was nevertheless calculated to free the women from their economic and spiritual subordination. The women should fight not the necessity for then to take part in industry and commerce, she taught, but the accompanying evils. Comrade Zetkin did everything possible to save the proletarian women from falling into the tow of the bourgeois women's movement. It was of very great assistance to her that she was exactly acquainted with the bourgeois movement for the rights of women, for she had been as a student a follower of **Auguste Schmidt**, one of the leading pioneers of this movement. She was exactly acquainted with the whole complex of phrases with which the bourgeois women's movement habitually transformed the economic and class conditions into a struggle for "**Freedom, Equality and Fraternity!**"

With great clearness, Klara Zetkin defined that which separated the proletarian women from the bourgeois women's movement. This is shown in many articles which appeared in "**Gleichheit**", and in her speech upon the "**Agitation amongst the Women**" held at the Congress of the Social Democratic Party in **Gotha** in 1896, and also her speech upon "**Women's Suffrage**" made before the Women's Conference in **Mannheim** in 1906. She showed how the bourgeois women were being condemned by the economic circumstances ever more and more to spinsterhood and thus, being faced with the question of existence, became ever more and more involved in contradictions to the men of their class. They were fighting for the right to take an equal part in public life, commercial activity and training, and their struggle was opposed by those who feared the competition of female labour in their own field. The proletarian women on the other hand, did not need to fight this fight for the right to take part in industrial and commercial life, the needs of capitalism to exploit had removed the necessity. They were in the same front with the men, and their conditions were still more oppressive. For equal work they received less pay and were then forced to work at home when their day's work outside was at an end, to fulfil their wifely and motherly duties.

The struggle of the proletarian women for freedom would therefore have to take a different direction to that taken by the bourgeois women's movement. There should be no competition with the men of their class, but a fight with the men of their class against capitalist exploitation. The proletarian women would also struggle for political rights, but not for reasons based upon the natural position of women, but solely as a means to better their situation. The slogan of the proletarian women's movement was not a struggle of the sexes, but a struggle of the classes.

That was what Klara Zetkin made clear to the proletarian women. It is thanks to Klara Zetkin that the proletarian women's movement in **Germany** has kept itself free from the bourgeois suffrage agitation and acted from the very beginning as part and parcel of the general working class movement.

Whilst pointing out the general line to be followed, she also took pains to ensure that this ideology should spread widely and deeply. As editor of "**Gleichheit**" she worked to create a school of capable agitators to work amongst the proletarian women armed with good material and fully conscious of their

aims. Therefore, "Gleichheit" dealt with every political question which arose and attempted to rouse the interest and understanding of the proletarian women for these questions. Klara Zetkin also sought to win capable collaborators for "Gleichheit", and she fulfilled her pedagogical tasks conscientiously. Very often she worked through and thoroughly altered the contributions which arrived for "Gleichheit" and when the authors protested, she never failed to explain the reasons for the alterations in long and detailed letters. Finally the authors were compelled to admit that she was right, and thus they learnt very much.

This was the work of Klara Zetkin amongst the women. She edited "Gleichheit" until 1916 when the war enthusiasts of the Central Committee of the Party took it out of her hands. She led the women's conferences which from 1900 on biannually preceded the Congress of the Social Democratic Party. The pamphlets which she wrote during this period, have mostly had their origin from speeches made at such women's conferences.

But with all this, we have only touched upon a part of her work. Klara Zetkin was not only the leader of the proletarian women's movement, but she took a prominent part in the general Party struggle. From 1892 onwards she attended the Party congresses first as a delegate and then from 1895 on as a member of the highest Party body, the Control Commission. And, as has already been mentioned, she belonged from the beginning to the revolutionary marxist wing of the Party.

In the 'nineties of the last century the development began in the Social Democratic Party which was completed by the world war. The party of the proletarian revolution became a petty-bourgeois party of reformism; the ideology of the class struggle was pressed to one side by the ideology of industrial peace, coalition and industrial democracy. The international Social Democracy exposed itself as the national party for the defence of the Fatherland. But this radical change of front took place slowly and at first imperceptibly. The right wing, Vollmar, Bernstein, David, Heine, Schippel, attempted to alter the attitude of the Party to the bourgeois State. Thus the criticism of militarism was weakened, the colonial policy was ratified, the ratification of the budget justified etc. In short, the way was being prepared for the coalition policy to follow later.

Unfortunately the Party did not realise how dangerous these beginnings were. At the end of the 'nineties, Bernstein was still opposed by the whole Party. At that time even Kautsky fought against the man who was trying to undermine revolutionary Marxism. But ten years later the reformist wing of the Party had grown tremendously in power. The worst thing of all was, that the previous critics under the leadership of Kautsky took up a mediatory, "centrist", policy. During the whole period Klara Zetkin fought tirelessly upon the extreme left wing of the Party. She opposed Bernstein in 1898, she condemned the deviation in the debate upon militarism, she attacked those who had voted for the budget, and declared herself in favour of the mass strike as a revolutionary weapon. When Kautsky became "tame", Klara Zetkin belonged together with Rosa Luxemburg and Mehring to the little group of "incorrigible" lefts who did not even hesitate on the 4th August 1914.

After the outbreak of the world war Comrade Klara Zetkin was the first to attempt to restore the broken connections with the comrades in other countries. In March 1915 she convened the Women's Conference in Berne, at which she unfortunately could not be present as she was given no passport and was watched closely in her home in Stuttgart. The distribution of the manifesto of Berne cost her several months of preventative detention. Together with Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring she issued the first and only number of the "International" which was able to appear in Germany during the war. Logically her way went over the Spartacus Bund to the Communist Party and the Third International.

We are glad that the brave old fighter has had the good fortune to be a witness and a collaborator in the work of building up Socialism in the Soviet Union. May she be a witness of the victory of Communism in Germany!

ORGANISATION

The Organisational Growth of the Workers (Communist) Party of America.

By Jay Lovestone.

It is now (at the end of May 1927) only a little more than one month since the various districts of the Workers (Communist) Party of America have swung into full activity in the Ruthenberg enrolment. Already the results achieved are gratifying evidence of the vitality of our membership.

In the first three weeks of the Ruthenberg enrolment to secure new members and activate our units, our party members showed their capacity for work, their ability to meet difficulties and a spirit and devotion of the first magnitude to respond energetically to the Party's tasks under the severest hardships. Our leader, Comrade Ruthenberg, died. A vicious offensive by the labour lieutenants of American imperialism, the employers, and the government had been going on for months against our Party. All our enemies were busy singing our requiem. They said: The Communist Party in America was a thing of the past. The Communists were no more.

Here are some interesting figures that will make the socialist historians of the bourgeois chairs sit up and be paralysed with disappointment.

In September, 1925, our Party counted 14,037 dues paying members. Of this number there were at least from three to four thousand who were counted as members through the dual stamp column; that is, they were wives of members who purchased dual stamps — one stamp for husband and wife. Particularly among the former foreign language federation was this practice in vogue.

In October, 1925, the National Organisation Department began the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of shop and street nuclei. We proceeded with great energy to reorganise the party. We had just emerged from the most costly, disastrous factional struggle our Party had ever experienced. Also, our Party was then completely isolated in the labour movement. Practically only half of our membership responded immediately to the reorganisation call. To be exact, the dues payments in October 1925, the first month of reorganisation, were only 7,213. By November of 1925 the number rose to 8,064. In December it mounted to 8,154. By January 1926 the figure reached 8,389. In March 1926 we totalled 9,052. This was the high point for some months to come. The summer period drew on, and our dues payments naturally shrank.

No one will deny that due to reorganisation our Party has temporarily been reduced in size, numerically. But we must keep clearly in mind that the loss of dues-paying members is not as great as it would appear to the superficial observer. First of all, a minimum of twenty per cent of our dues payments before reorganisation were not dues stamps actually sold to individual members but were only dual stamps — stamps given away to wives of comrades who were members of the party by grace of their husbands holding membership in the party. After reorganisation, this social-democratic practice was dropped. There are no longer any dual "by grace" members in the Workers Party.

Furthermore, the newly organised shop and street nuclei do not as yet all function regularly and well. There are many party members — far more active than many of the "regular dues payers" in the pre-reorganisation days of our party — who, because their units to which they are attached do not function as well as they should, are unable to pay dues regularly. We make these remarks not by way of seeking to explain away anything or to hide any of our weaknesses. The case is quite the contrary. We are here pointing out one of our most serious shortcomings.

The death of our leading communist fighter, Ruthenberg, was an irreparable loss to the Party. This has been recognised by our sworn foes as well as by our most loyal followers. But the Party set itself to work with a zeal and a determination to make good as much as possible the loss thus suffered by us. The Ruthenberg drive to build our Party was launched under

the most trying circumstances. The response of the membership exceeded the most sanguine hopes of the most optimistic in our ranks. There was a new spirit in the Party. The inactive, to a large extent, became active. The active members redoubled their efforts. Better results were evidenced in all our fields of activity. Every section of the Party responded promptly and vigorously to the call of the Political Committee, the leadership of the Party, to close ranks and build the Party.

Immediately the new communist spirit showed itself in the status of our organisation.

For the month of March 1927 the dues payments rose to nearly 9,500 — to be exact 9,490. This is the highest dues payments we have had since September 1925, the last month preceding reorganisation. We must here keep in mind the fact that many hundreds of our members are at present involved in the severe unemployment in the needle trades of New York and in the strike of the United Mine Workers of America. The largest proportion of these party members who are blacklisted, locked-out, striking, or out of work, refuse to take exempt stamps and prefer to wait in their dues payments until the time when they can afford to pay their back dues. This means that we now have a minimum active party membership of more than twelve thousand.

April reports are not yet complete. All indications point to the upward swing in dues payments being continued.

The number of initiation stamps are not an exact index of the number of new members entering the Party during a particular month. Some units do not report promptly such entries. Other units even permit a new member to be in the Party months before securing from their district offices the necessary initiation stamps. Yet, inaccurate an index of the influx of new members as the sale of initiation stamps may be, it has quite some value as an index of party organisation progress. Let us again examine some figures.

In September 1925 — the last month of the party organisation on the old basis of foreign-language federation branches — 286 initiation stamps were bought from the national office by the various federation bureaux. With the first month of reorganisation, October 1925, the number fell to 253. It continued to fall in November to 158 and to 135 in December. By January 1927 the new units began to function with increasing regularity. There was an upward swing in the number of workers initiated into party membership. The total initiation stamps sold in January 1927 was 214. In the short month of February last the number rose to 278.

By mid-March most of the party districts had not yet swung into the Ruthenberg drive. Still the few days which the districts participated in the drive, told appreciably in the influx of new members. These figures of new members will be especially important for April. In March 336 initiation stamps were sold. This means that a minimum of 336 workers were admitted to party membership in March. This is the highest figure reached in many months. Of course, there were many hundreds who applied for membership in the rousing Memorial demonstrations held immediately after Comrade Ruthenberg's death. Not all of these workers were immediately enrolled into party membership.

It is clear that the Party organisation has taken a turn for the better. We have seen our most difficult days in the immediate post-reorganisation period. We still have many serious problems of reorganisation to solve. Some of these problems we have not even scratched the surface of in the least. But on the whole we have turned the corner — for the better.

Table showing condition of the Party organisation.

	1925			1926			1927		
	October	November	December	January	February	March	January	February	March
Dues Payments	7,213	8,064	8,154	8,389	7,146	9,052	8,368	7,714	9,490
Initiation Stamps	253	158	135	105	125	145	214	278	336

The pessimists may throw sand into their own eyes. The enemies of the party may hope in vain and perish in disappointment. The Workers' (Communist) Party of America is a living, growing force, moving forward in the revolutionary spirit and line of its dead leader Comrade Ruthenberg.

THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

The British Labour Women's Conference.

By Catherine B. Cant

The British Labour Women's Conference held at Huddersfield in May gave many evidences of the growing acuteness of the struggle between the reactionary leaders of the Labour movement and the more revolutionary rank and file. The attempted stifling of every effective Left wing proposal to deal with the present critical situation of the workers in Great Britain showed up clearly the working of the united front of the bureaucracy with the bourgeoisie. Signs were not wanting that many of the delegates, rank and file women from the labour movement realised and resented this.

At the conference which is supposed to be yearly, all Labour organisations in Great Britain which consist either partly or entirely of women are represented. The body responsible for calling it is the Standing Joint Committee of Women's Industrial Organisations, which consists of representatives of Trade Unions, Women's Sections of the Labour Party and Women's Co-operative Guilds and to which all these women's organisations are affiliated.

To the conference each individual women's Section of the Labour Party is entitled to send two delegates. National organisations such as the Trade Unions containing large numbers of women, the Co-operative Women's Guild, the Fabian Society, the I. L. P. etc., are allowed to send any number up to 30.

The last Labour Women's Conference was held at Birmingham in 1925. In 1926 owing to the miners' strike there was no conference. The Birmingham Conference was the scene of sharp conflicts on various subjects notably on the Geneva Protocol, and the Labour Parties' emigration policy. But at Huddersfield there was a sharpness of conflict unknown at Birmingham or previously.

The period which has passed since May 1925 has been full of grave events for the working class of Great Britain. Today, after the defeat of the General and Miners' Strikes the working class movement is faced with new attacks more vicious than any before — the Blanesborough attack on the unemployed, the Trade Union Bill, the attack on the Soviet Union. It has been driven from the offensive to the defensive and this not because of any disunion or lack of fighting spirit among the masses, but because time after time the treachery and cowardice of the yellow leaders have sold the advantages possessed by the workers.

In the course of these events the women of the working class have been in the first ranks of the fighters, and the effects were fully visible at Huddersfield.

At the last Labour Women's Conference, Communist women were still admitted as delegates if appointed by any organisation, though the Communist Party was unaffiliated to the Labour Party. In 1925 the Communist fraction was responsible for the discussion on many vital points. This year's conference, however, was, as far as the most painstaking efforts of the Bureaucracy could make it, entirely free from Communist contamination. Not only those Labour Party women's sections which have been disaffiliated for refusing to operate the Liverpool decisions were denied representation but even such an important body as the London Trades Council was not allowed a delegate because the comrade chosen being a Party member was refused credentials. In some places attempts were even made to exclude Left wing women, members of the unemployed organisation, etc.

In the "Labour Woman" and elsewhere, delegates were warned that in every case the instructions of their organisations were to be regarded as sacred. And no personal opinions and no eloquence from the conference should be allowed to weigh. One Communist woman from Manchester who did penetrate the Conference was ignominiously ejected before she could speak. In spite of all this the most outstanding thing about the conference was the strong fighting spirit of the rank and file.

This year's agenda was a very long one, containing 238 resolutions. The official nervousness on the question of Communist affiliation and various other inconvenient resolutions was

evidenced by the fact that they were left to the end. In the face of present events the programme put forward for discussion can only be characterised as deliberately calculated to deceive and confuse the masses of working class women. Reports as well as resolutions did not deal thoroughly with the burning questions which face the women of the British working class today. The subjects were **Juvenile Offenders, Agricultural Policy, the Poor Law, Constructive Policy for Peace, and the Blanesborough Report on Unemployment.**

The Trade Union Bill and the situation with regard to China, surely the two most momentous questions of the day were represented only by emergency resolutions, couched in the most general terms. That on the Trade Union Bill declared only that the women "stood foursquare with the men in their determined opposition". The "Constructive Policy for Peace" which ostensibly should have given the policy of the Women's Committee in the face of the present situation where Great Britain is actually waging a war of aggression in China and forcing on the first steps of an attack on the Soviet Union, was couched in the following terms:

"That all women should advocate opposition to any government threatening war by organising general resistance including the refusal to bear arms, to produce armaments, to render any material assistance; that a world conference of the Labour and Socialist, Trade Union, and Co-operative Internationals should be held to prepare concerted action on these lines, that this conference believing that International conferences for the purpose of partial disarmament are of little value urges that this country should take the initiative in making a definite proposal to the other nations for immediate and complete disarmament".

That such a policy should have been endorsed can only be ascribed to the fact that the Communist voice which could have brought clarity to this subject was sedulously excluded from the Conference. Amendments proposing the general strike, propaganda among the troops, co-operation with Communist International for real international action against war, were all rejected. To talk of "opposing any Government threatening war, by urging refusal to bear arms", of "preparing" concerted action by international "conferences", that **Great Britain** should take the first steps in proposals for complete disarmament at a moment when thousands of British troops are on Chinese towns have killed thousands of unarmed workers, is deliberate and treacherous deception, consciously aimed at confusing the workers and preventing decisive action, — such as the use of our real effective weapons, the general strike, fraternisation, propaganda among the forces, strikes in munitions works.

The first sign of the feeling of the women became evident when **Dr. Marion Phillips** on reading fraternal greetings from Trinidad, France, Austria and other countries was asked if no greetings from the **Soviet Union** had been received. Her explanations that she had "misaid" them was followed by an immediate question as to why the decision of the Birmingham Conference that a delegation of women of the Soviet Union should be invited, had not been carried out. The reply that no Labour Party existed in the Soviet Union from which a delegate could be invited, met with a storm of protest. Delegates from the mining areas instantly rose to recall the wonderful aid received from the women of the Soviet Union during the strike. In these areas the memory of this aid is still powerful. Its effects have been seen in the beginnings of a real international spirit among the women and in the increasing influence of the Party among them. In connection with the delegation it was also pointed out that the conference was not, as **Marion Phillips** had said, a Labour Party Conference, but was composed of delegates from many widely different women's organisations, that therefore there should have been no objection to a delegate from the Soviet Union being invited.

The report of the Standing Orders Committee on the **Blanesborough Unemployment Report** gave rise to the strongest protests of the conference. This report over which the "**Daily Herald**" and the "**Labour Woman**", both before and after the conference, have maintained an unbroken silence, involved support of **Margaret Bondfield's** notorious action in signing the findings of the Blanesborough Commission, was acclaimed as favourable and "sane" in its policy towards these infamous propositions by the Liberal newspaper, the "**Manchester Guardian**". It will be remembered that the Blanesborough Report recommending among other "reforms" the cutting down of unemployment relief granted the young workers under 21 years

of age from 15/— per week to 8/— per week, was signed by the three "Labour" representatives on the Commission including **Margaret Bondfield** and **F. Hodges**.

The resolution of the **National Union of Distributive and Allied workers**, condemning the action of these "Labour" representatives and urging a determined fight by the whole labour movement against the provisions of the report being embodied as legislation, could only be moved by **Mrs. Bamber of Liverpool** after an attempt had been made by the Standing Orders Committee to rule out discussion on any of the thirteen resolutions sent in on this subject and only allow the reference back of their report. A scene of disorder occurred when **Margaret Bondfield**, one of the signatories of the report, rose to defend her actions while **Mary Carlin**, once a so-called "Left" woman, was shouted down for supporting her. The report and the action of these who signed it was condemned by a vote of 408 to 265. This verdict and the statement of **Marion Phillips** that in voting thus the conference had condemned the official policy of the Labour Party, was greeted with jubilation.

As a matter of fact the most burning questions concerning women in industry were pushed into the background by the **Standing Orders Committee** while a long discussion on **Birth Control** was allowed to take up the time of the conference. For the third year in succession the Women's Conference declared itself in favour of the giving of Birth Control information at Public Maternity Centres. In opposition to the declared policy of the Labour Party Executive which is at present to declare Birth Control a matter for each individual and entirely outside of the scope of politics, the vote was 581 to 74.

Towards the end of the conference the Right wing won a victory by carrying a refusal to give any further assistance to the organisation of women's trade union guilds for the female relatives of trade union members. At the Women's Trade Union Conference last year a resolution calling for the organisation of such guilds was passed. The leaders of the Labour Party and Co-operative women's organisations at once declared against such a slip because since then the leadership of those guilds which have developed has been very much to the Left.

In his final address to the conference, **Hicks**, the Chairman of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, said that the Labour movement was at this moment being attacked with a ferocity and vindictiveness never before experienced. A statement which sounded strangely at variance, with the rest of the official utterances.

Taking everything into consideration, the leaders appear to have determinedly concentrated their efforts on trying to draw the teeth of any real resistance to the attacked described. On the question of war, of resistance to the Trade Union Bill, or other repressive legislation, they showed quite clearly that nothing effective was intended.

In sharp contrast was the real fighting spirit of many of the rank and file delegates particularly noticeable in those from the mining areas. There can be no doubt that the women of the labour movement are ready to respond to revolutionary leading. Their strong discontent with their conditions and the treachery of the bureaucracy of the movement are preparing them for revolt.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

Proletarian Co-operators of All Countries!

Workers and Peasants!

The International Co-operative Alliance has fixed July 2nd for the International Co-operators Day. On this day the Co-operators of all countries should make great endeavours to strengthen the field of the co-operative movement. The need for this campaign and endeavours is clear and urgent, but the present economic and political situation makes it imperative that we should be also clear as to how to strengthen the co-operative movement. Unless the co-operative movement is strengthened to become a component part of the labour movement it will be weak and ineffective to resist the attacks of the capitalist class.

The economic and political pressure of the ruling class weigh heavily upon the workers and peasant masses. Increased

exploitation, lower wages, longer hours, extensive taxes and high protective tariffs — such are the results of the offensive against the workers and peasants throughout the world.

Only a united action of the whole forces of labour, including the co-operatives, can battle against these conditions.

This demand for accord between the co-operatives and the labour movement on the basis of class solidarity is more than ever urgent in the face of the menace of the impending imperialist war. Already the imperialists are making war against the Chinese revolution. Already they are seeking to strangle the efforts of the Chinese workers and peasants to secure their liberation. But more, they are preparing rapidly for war against the Soviet Union, the stronghold of the working class and oppressed of the whole world. To disassociate the co-operative movement from the class struggle in the face of this tremendous menace, to isolate the co-operative movement on the plea of neutrality from the world labour movement under these circumstances is a crime. The 85,000 co-operators with their 50 million members co-ordinated in the Co-operative International are a powerful mass organisation whose strength must be used to defend the workers and peasants against all forms of exploitation, against the menace of war.

Make the Co-operators Day into a powerful demonstration against the warmongers! Declare your solidarity with the First Workers' Republic! Declare for the united labour front against capitalism! Help the liberation struggle in China!

Let every Co-operative, every section of the Co-operative movement be a weapon in the hands of the working class!

Let the Co-operative movement form part of the united front against capitalism!

Reject the deceptive pacifist slogans!

Long live the International Proletariat!

Long live the co-operative movement as a weapon of the class struggle for the emancipation of the toilers of the world!

The Executive Committee of
the Communist International.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

Georgia under British Rule.

By M. Pokrovsky.

I have before me a stenographic report of the negotiations conducted by the representatives of the Georgian Menshevik Government, primarily its president Noi Jordania, with the different representatives of the British Government in Transcaucasia during the period February-September, 1919*).

No more instructive reading on this subject could be imagined at the present time.

Georgia, as is well known, is "oppressed" by the Bolsheviks. The entire civilised world is striving to rescue it from this oppression, particularly is that the case with the price and beauty of the world, the British Conservatives, or is it perhaps the British Parishkevitches? You will agree with me that one can call a man who chooses as his profession the blowing up of safes, "conservative" only conditionally. The British junkers are thus assuming now the role of the "liberators" of Georgia. This is commonly known.

It is however not so commonly known that Georgia is for the British junkers not at all an unknown country for them to be discovered. Churchill's accomplices have already been there. They were its guests for about a year, they left behind their memoirs and documents, some of which we are going to quote here. That was already some time ago, it was in 1919. "Seven years like seven centuries", as Briusov said, have flown by. Never were his words so true as they are today. It is not so easy to find "old timers" who could remember what happened seven years ago. For many inhabitants of the Soviet Union in general and here in Moscow in particular, the British epopee in Georgia will be a revelation.

*) I secured this material through Comrade Safe, who found it in the Historico-Revolutionary Museum of Georgia. One of the stenograms was quoted in Shafiro's famous work "The Georgian Gironde", but as far as I know the material was never published in full.

The Menshevik Government of Georgia which shot down Bolshevik workers in the Alexander Park and which did "not recognise" the shameless Brest Litovsk Peace invited German forces to its territory. This of course was a great crime against the Entente. The Mensheviks must have realised that.

"The strongest argument against Georgia" — Gegetchkori, the Menshevik Minister of Foreign Affairs, admitted to the British representative, Wardrop, — "was the fact that there are German forces in our country which produced an unfriendly feeling towards us".

To uproot this feeling it was necessary to start to work over and over again before every British soldier whose boots trampled on "free" Georgian soil.

"When, however," continued Gegetchkori, "after much effort we finally dispelled this feeling, the commander of the forces would withdraw and in his place new ones arrived and again our government had to start the same work of explaining..."

Poor Government! The stenographic records show that all its efforts were concentrated in the great task of "uprooting feelings".

"I, personally am a great friend of the Entente and being a professional journalist (!), I always wrote both prior to and during the war in favour of Great Britain and France",

was what Noi Nikolaevitch Jordania pleaded before the first British soldier who honoured Tiflis with his presence, General Forester Walker. We are not going to dwell here on the original conception of the duties of a journalist who is supposed to be called upon by his profession to defend one imperialist power or another. There was a time when there existed Socialist journalists who defended the interests of the working class and not those of the banking or industrial combines. We will pass over this.

Noi Nikolaevitch accomplished nothing anyway. Walker maintained a polite silence by way of reply, but his "elder", the notorious general Milne — the British representative under Denikin — simply refused to receive the members of the Georgian Government who deemed it necessary to pay him a visit in Tiflis. And again, by dint of the fact that Milne could not hear Jordania's pleadings in person, the latter was obliged to address himself to one of his subordinates, General Cory, thus:

"I personally have agitated in favour of the British for 25 years, and many other members of the present government did likewise, but now I must declare that such behaviour on the part of the British authorities undoes all our work..."

Poor things! For 25 years they worshipped truth and faith and just see the result! They are not even permitted to cross the threshold of their shrine.

Jordania almost cried. He pleaded: "We are not accustomed to such treatment", and Cory decided to soothe him a bit; he said:

"General Milne will undoubtedly visit the honourable president next time. As far as I know, the head of your government was in England, speaks English and we should be very pleased if he would visit us again."

Jordania was somewhat calmed and expressed his thanks, but anecdotes of the same kind were apparently repeated also later, and during the negotiations between Gegetchkori and Wardrop, the Mensheviks already knew that they will get no more favours from England for their former services. The British are practical people. They want no sentiments, but action. It is immaterial to them what the sentiments behind the acts may be.

And thus, having had the experience of three British generals who as one man "on returning to England undoubtedly spoke unfavourable of our country" after "the prejudicial ill feelings" in relation to the former German allies, Gegetchkori decided to take the fourth one by the horns and to present him with a businesslike programme of the Menshevik Government. There was not much time left as this was already in September 1919. The British were getting ready to withdraw and the Mensheviks risked the chance of being unable to declare their undivided love to the "ruler of the seas".

We must repeat the Menshevik "businesslike programme" verbatim. Gegetchkori said to Wardrop:

"I now take the liberty of presenting to you the point of view of my government. We understand perfectly well that it will be difficult for Georgia to achieve its independence without the help of a strong ally because not only we, but also the comparatively large States of Europe which are better off financially, cannot exist now without support from the outside. The Georgian Government realises that it must rely on some strong government organism, and this realisation has dictated to us a certain orientation to Great Britain. We of course, know that we must compensate for help from the United Kingdom in one way another.

Unfortunately, we have so far been unable to receive a reply to the question which is so vital to us. I shall repeat what I have already said. In the given situation, Georgia cannot go through the hard times without support. Georgia wants this support from England and she wants to know what England wants in return. What I propose has been decided by a conference of our government, and it should be mentioned that there were no divergent opinions on this question."

And these people spoke and still speak of "independent" Georgia. These people who in 1919 never thought of small countries, but as vassals of larger imperialist powers, who considered this servile, in the literal sense of that word, condition under imperialism as normal and were even ready to pay the price that would be demanded. These people now speak of oppression and strive for "liberation". They will "liberate", be sure of that...

But the British wanted no "compensation", and it was necessary to ponder over the question as to what they did want after all? This is the sad difference between a political lackey and an ordinary one: An ordinary lackey knows more or less what to ask for, a political one knows more or less what is expected of him. In the first place, "of course our forces will always be at your service, but they may not be adequate". From the further unclear or distorted stenographic record of Gegetchkori's sentence, it is apparent that he considered the Georgian army hardly sufficient "to maintain order" even in Armenia alone. History has proved that he was wrong also on this point. But be that as it may, weak or strong, the army of "independent" Georgia was placed at the disposal of British imperialism. The Menshevik Government was tormented by the thought that perhaps this will not seem enough to the British. The more so since the British bull taken by its horns gave no reply to the Menshevik proposals beyond an inarticulate roar.

Then they decided to fire the last shot. For one reason or another (did he get tired?) Gegetchkori's tongue became paralysed, and the "greatest" Menshevik proposal was made by his Comrade Sabakhtarishvili.

"Our proposals are as follows: Georgia hands over the Batum district where a government will be set up based on the broad masses of people. The municipal administration will be organised on the electoral basis. The port will be given over to the British as a military base and also the coal station on the Black Sea."

This was a proposal of unusual importance. There is no doubt that it constitutes the basis also of the present Anglo-Menshevik negotiations. The transference of Batum to the British signified the transference of Transcaucasia to British imperialism. Such is the price the Tiflis Mensheviks wanted to pay for British help against the Turks and against the Bolsheviks — Gegetchkori spoke of "complications in the South and North". He cherished the hope that "Georgia, being the road and anti-chamber of Asia must be of interest to Great Britain and that the latter will undoubtedly extend its support to the Georgian people which was the beacon-light of culture and civilisation for ages" (!) Once it was a question of imperialist gains, one had to speak "culture and civilisation".

We may be accused of having deliberately composed these quotations, as Herten and Saltikov at one time were accused of having composed quotations from Pogodin's diary, which, by the way, subsequently on publication of the original diary proved absolutely correct. But this time this is not so. This stenogram was, together with others, appertaining to the same negotiations, and they contain an enormous amount of details which exclude every possibility of "composition". The readers

will see that for themselves, when the full text will be published in the "Red Archive".

It is not surprising that Wardrop was not much interested in the military alliance proposed by the Mensheviks. The bourgeois army of Georgia which was continuously engaged in "pacifying" their own workers and peasants would hardly have strengthened the military forces of British imperialism in Asia Minor. But the reader may be surprised that the Englishman did not even, what may be called, turn a hair on seeing such a fat bait as Batum. The enigma, however, is solved very simply: the British regarded Batum as their own. On taking it from the Turks, they did not give it to the Georgians. The story of the administration they established there must also be told in Gegetchkori's own words.

"The British authorities on taking the town, having no confidence in us and not knowing on whom to rely, authorised the remaining Russian officials to organise the administrations in the Batum district. Who those gentlemen were and what was their political physiognomy, you can understand from the fact that they were the first to congratulate the Turks and served in their time as Turkish agents in taking Batum. The Council organised by them to administer the Batum district was soon dispersed by the British military staff in view of the absolute tyranny that they established. Now there is no government there, and it is evident that our interests dictate the establishment of law and order in the Batum district."

Alas. The British Die-hards thought the least of "law and order" and when this idea, by chance, finally penetrated their skulls, their conception of law and order was that which existed under Tsarist Russia. In the exceedingly interesting "Memoirs of the Georgian Socialist Delegation at the Lucerne Conference to the Labour Fraction of the House of Commons" we read:

"The town of Batum and the whole Batum district are temporarily occupied by British forces as a result of the reconciliation with Turkey..."

What does the British Governor-General do there? He transferred the administration of the Batum municipality to the so-called Provisional Committee of Nine, consisting exclusively of Russian self-appointed reactionaries. On protest of the Georgians against this injustice, the British General permitted them to participate in the administration only in an insignificant majority.

As far as the organisation of new democratic elections is concerned, which were demanded by the Georgians, the British Governor-General categorically refused to hold such elections. In this manner, the inhabitants of the town have been deprived even of that elementary right which they enjoyed under Tsarism when the administration of the town, in spite of the nationalist policy of the Russian Government, was in the hands of a Georgian majority.

The situation is still worse in the province where the officials of the various institutions were appointed by the Governor-General exclusively of Russian reactionaries who went over from Denikin to his service. It has come to that that the old Tsarist governor of the Batum district, General Romanovsky Romanko, was given his old position."

But the British love for "Russian style" was not merely limited to geographical boundaries and did not merely extend to Batum. Most of our stenograms deal with the Denikin offensive in Georgia, who made his attack on the territory of the present republic of Abkhazia and occupied Gagri, "the strategic key to Georgia", and intended to advance further with the help of British tanks, aeroplanes and cruisers. Denikin explained his action to the British by saying that the Georgians occupied Gagri "at the behest of the Germans", and, evidently, the British who were on Denikin's side readily believed him.

This caused Jordania to become vociferous, and the British generals considered his squeaking to be that of a capricious child. Occasionally, this attitude of theirs took the character of pure derision, particularly was this the attitude of General Walker. The Georgians wanted to establish the landing in Poti. The administration of the port, terrorised by the British, refused to allow this without the permission of the latter. The British on the other hand, refused to give their permission on the basis that "they had no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Georgian Republic". They did not succeed in embarking troops.

Finally, Jordania agreed that "the absolutely indisputable Georgian territory" (properly speaking, the indisputable Abkha-

zian territory) be declared a neutral zone and "occupied by British or Italian forces". But it was found that that was not enough. The British proposed that the whole Sukhum district be declared a neutral zone. This infuriated Jordania, but in reply General Beech calmly observed: "The Sukhum district is a secondary matter". And the statement of the President of the Georgian Government that General Briggs, who was with Denikin, represented in this respect, not British but Denikin's interest, met with reply that "General Briggs loves Denikin very much, and Denikin also loves Briggs". Besides, Denikin recognises Georgian "autonomy". Why worry? In this manner, the British despatched, through the Georgian railways, to Denikin who was fighting against Georgia, artillery and provisions from the former Russian fortresses of Transcaucasia secured through the Versailles Treaty.

To break through this wall of stupidity and impudence was absolutely impossible, and Jordania had to say as many unpleasant things to the British as he could think of to set his mind at rest. He said:

"Before the Allies came to us, we were at war with nobody and had no enemies anywhere. The only ones who menaced our well-being, were the Bolsheviks, but we drove them beyond Sochi, and our State delivered from that danger. I repeat, we were at peace with all our neighbours. With the arrival of the Allies the picture changed radically. We are always fighting. First we witnessed the treacherous attack of Armenia, then the offensive of the Volunteers (the Denikin army), and finally, the invasion of the Turko-Tartar hordes from Ardagan, Akhalts."

This, of course, was not without some fantasy. Not to speak of the shooting of the Bolsheviks and the war on the Georgian peasants, the Menshevik government made war on the Turks, and it is precisely their failure in this war that compelled them to invite the Germans to Georgia. But that the situation did not improve with the arrival of the Allies is an indisputable fact, and there is no doubt that this gave food for thought even to those who sympathised with the Mensheviks. Jordania said:

"After what I have said, the thought occurs repeatedly to every Georgian: Why do all these things happen, since the Allies have come to us?"

There was only one answer to all this, it was clear and definite. Namely: "Of what concern are your national interests and all 'secondary matters' to us" — all British generals said: "If we need Georgia only as a base for our struggle against Bolshevism?" General Beech said:

"An agreement with Denikin would greatly raise the authority of Georgia in the eyes of civilised Europe which is combating Bolshevism. In Europe they would say that this small Georgia, which lost and suffered so much in the Sochi question, revealed so much capacity in the wisdom of government that sacrificed itself to the struggle against Bolshevism by coming to an agreement with the Voluntary Army and thus enabling Denikin to shift his forces from the Black Sea to the Bolshevik front. Even from an economic point of view (although I am not a Socialist) I believe that such an agreement would play a great role in opening the frontiers for supplying the country with grain and the revival of commerce, etc."

General Beech of course was not a Socialist — far from it. He was simply a military man, and once it is a question of war, then let there be war. A base is treated as a base. The Georgian railwaymen were not only compelled to transport arms to Denikin who fought against Georgia and on Georgian territory, but they were treated in a manner that even the great admirer of the British railway system of Jordania who defended British interests for 25 years, had to object. (See the stenographic record of his conversation with General Broad on February 6, 1919.)

"Unfortunately many excesses take place in running the British railways, and the British railways staff is responsible for that. They are also beating down their own agents and have brought the employees to a state where they threaten a strike."

A base is a base. There is nothing to be done. But in so far as this base gave resistance, then, measures had to be taken against it. The reader has already noticed in General Beech's words the expressive phrase that Georgian concessions to Deni-

kin "would play a great role in opening the frontiers". This is not an empty phrase. The highly civilised protectors held Georgia for seven months under a real blockade. But the story must be told in the words of the British Allies themselves. At the first meeting with Cory (the third British general in number). Gegetchkori said:

"Not a single boat entered our ports from abroad while in Constantinople an enormous amount of all kinds of goods have accumulated. Is it not possible to remove the blockade from our shores and send us some goods? This would mark, so to speak, your arrival and would play an enormous role in our relations. From authentic information at my disposal, I find that one of the boats on the way to Odessa could not land there because it (Odessa) was captured by the Bolsheviks. Half of its goods were unloaded in Constantinople. Could not the second half be sent to us? ..."

Yesterday, General you asked us to speak openly about everything, and here I tell you that during the seven months that the British forces have been on our territory, we did not receive a single thing, not a single grain of corn from England."

During the seven months, England sent three generals, many bruises to the railway workers and still more arms to Denikin, but not a single grain of corn for the Georgian people. The British aim, of course, was not to help the people, but to fight Bolshevism.

In the cause of this great aim, the population could starve. Denikin was more important than they.

Jordania did not have the honour to rise to any height during his 25 years of faithful service to British imperialism. Every newly arrived British general was met by him with the hope that "we will work in common" (!!) and in every case he had the occasion of using such bitter words as "Georgia has become disillusioned in Great Britain". Disillusioned or not, the Mensheviks had to do the work. The "businesslike" agreement between Gegetchkori and Ward, on the conditions on which the Georgian Mensheviks were hired by the British, completes chronologically the series of our quoted stenographic reports.

We naturally did not quote all the pearls from these documents. Anyone who is interested to see the samples of classical prose of the Second International will read them in full in the "Red Archive". One thing I must admit, for a long time it seemed to me that the phrase "lackeys of the Entente" is an agitational phrase. But on reading these stenographic records, I became ashamed of my scepticism. This is not a phrase at all, dear reader, it is simply a concise historical definition of the Georgian Mensheviks of 1919.

The International Entente Against the Third International.

The "Popolo d'Italia", Mussolini's journal, prints the following in its leading article of June 12th, 1927:

"In Geneva an 'International Entente Against the Third International' is being formed.

It is proposed to convoke a juridical conference at the Hague. For the time being the matter has gone only as far as the submitting of a questionnaire to the organisations in the various countries, which will take part in the conference.

The questionnaire contains four points:

Does your programme include:

a) Punitive measures for offences committed against the exterior security of the State? (For instance, individual or collective communistic propaganda, which is carried on abroad against your State.)

b) Punitive measures for offensive committed at home against the constitution and the security of the State? (Such as individual or collective communistic propaganda within the territory of the State.)

c) Punitive measures against other offences committed against the State or against national defence? (For example, forcing the hand of the Government by means of a general strike or the receiving of funds from foreign countries for the support of strikes with political aims.)

d) Punitive measures against Anarchistic and Communistic agitation? ...

The questionnaire is followed by an illuminating covering note. In this note attention is drawn to the fact that the punishment of Communists does not imply punishment for the expression of opinion, for the Communistic doctrine permits violence and the use of terroristic intimidation. The Communist is to be regarded as a common felon and the Communist Party as not within the law. For this reason, any civil servant who is a Communist thereby commits a breach of duty against the State, to which he has sworn allegiance, and, therefore, loses all legal claim to his position.

In view of the fact that Communistic activity is internationally organised, the repressive measures must also be made international. The result of this conception would be: abolition of refusals of extradition, solidarity of States in the procuring of evidence, an end to the misuse of diplomatic immunity...

At the conference — if it is held — Italy will be able to attend well armed. It will state that it has replied promptly to the questions and has answered them, as is its wont, with deeds, and without any international conferences beforehand.

And if a united front is desired, we will lend a hand...

We shall take part in the debates and are curious to know how the fundamental and absolute dogmas of the liberal States will be reconciled with the suggestions of the questionnaire. We are curious to learn whether the conference will come to any decision and when and what it will decide. If they do not find themselves called upon before the discussion to take every available means in order to defend Western civilisation...

TEN YEARS AGO

Bread Peace! Freedom!

Proclamation of the Bolsheviks.

(Drawn up by Comrade Stalin.)

The following proclamation served originally as the appeal for the demonstration which was called for June 23rd and was posted in the working class districts on June 22nd. When the demonstration was prohibited and had consequently to be postponed, the proclamation appeared again in the "Pravda" of June 30th, the day before the great demonstration of July 1st. The difference in the wording of the two proclamations on June 22nd and 30th is quite insignificant. The following text is that of June 30th. — Editor.

To all Toilers, to all the Workers and Soldiers of Petrograd!

Comrades!

Russia is passing through a time of severe trial.

The war is still going on and demanding millions of victims. The bankers, those robbers and leeches who are making profits out of the war, are deliberately protracting it.

The ruin of industry caused by the war leads to the closing down of works and to unemployment. The capitalists who lust for fabulous profits and who lock out the workers, are intentionally adding to this chaos.

The lack of food caused by the war is constantly assuming a more alarming form. There is a serious danger of the poor in the towns succumbing to the high prices. The marauders and speculators are all the time screwing the prices higher and higher.

The spectre of famine and ruin hovers above us, full of evil omen...

At the same time, the dark clouds of revolution are gathering over our heads.

The Duma of June 3rd, which helped the Czar to oppress the people, is now demanding that our army immediately take the offensive at the front. To what purpose? In order to drown in blood our hard-won freedom for the sake of the "allied" and Russian robbers.

The State Council, which supplied the Czar with blood-thirsty ministers, is secretly laying snares. With what object in view? In order, for the sake of the "allied" and Russian oppressors to ensnare the people at the right moment.

And the Provisional Government, with its ten bourgeois members, holding a position between the Czarist Duma and the Soviet, is obviously becoming subject to the influence of the landowners and capitalists.

In the place of a guarantee of the rights of the soldiers — Kerensky's "declaration" which violates their rights.

Instead of consolidating the freedom won by the soldiers in the days of the revolution — new "orders" and threats of Katorga and the dissolution of the regiments if they are not fulfilled.

Instead of guaranteeing the liberties won by the Russian citizens — the introduction of political informers in the barracks and arrest without legal examination. Extension of § 129 which threatens with Katorga.

Instead of arming the people — a threat to disarm the workers and soldiers.

Instead of liberating the oppressed people — there are quarrels with Finland and the Ukraine, and freedom is anxiously withheld from these peoples.

Instead of a determined fight against the counter-revolution — inactive toleration of the doings of the counter-revolutionaries who are openly preparing to fight against the revolution.

In the meantime, the war continues, and no really serious steps are taken to put an end to it and to propose a peace which would do justice to all the peoples.

In the mean time, disorder continues, and ineffective steps are being taken to combat it.

Is it any wonder that the counter-revolutionaries are becoming more and more insolent and are spurring the Government on to the fresh measures of reprisal against the workers and peasants, against the soldiers and sailors?

Comrades! We have no right to let all this go on any longer without protest! After all that has happened, silence is a crime!

You are free citizens, you have the right to protest and you must make use of this right before it is too late.

May to-morrow (June 18th), the day of a peaceful demonstration, be a day of weighty protest on the part of revolutionary Petrograd against the revival of oppression and arbitrary rule!

May the victorious banners unfold to-morrow to the terror of the enemies of freedom and socialism!

May our slogan, the slogan of the combatants of the revolution, travel over the world, to the joy of all who are oppressed and enslaved!

Over there, in the West, in the belligerent countries, the dawn of a new life is already suffusing the sky, the dawn of the great Labour revolution. May your brothers in the West learn to-morrow that your flags bring them not war, but peace, not serfdom, but liberation.

Workers! Soldiers! Extend a brotherly hand to one another and forwards under the banner of socialism!

Turn out into the streets, comrades, all of you!

Rally closely round your flags!

March in serried ranks through the streets of the capital! Calmly and with determination, make your demands heard:

Down with the counter-revolution!

Down with the Czarist Duma!

Down with the State Council!

Down with the ten capitalist Ministers!

All power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies!

Revision of the "Declaration of the Rights of the Soldiers"!

Revocation of the orders against soldiers and sailors!

Away with the disarmament of the revolutionary workers!

Hurrah for the People's Militia!

Away with anarchy in industry! Away with the capitalists who lock out the workers!

Hurrah for the control and organisation of production and distribution!

Down with the policy of taking the offensive!

Put an end to the war! Let the Soviet of Deputies proclaim just peace conditions!

We want neither a separate peace with William nor secret treaties with French and English capitalists!

Bread! Peace! Freedom!

The Soviet Congress in Favour of the Offensive.

From the resolution on the war.

St. Petersburg, June 25th. The Soviet Congress passed a resolution on the war, which contains the following:

"In view of the fact that the revolutionary Provisional Government has made the peace programme drawn up by Russian democracy, the basis of its international policy, the Congress declares that, until the war has been brought to an end by the united forces of the nations, Russian revolutionary democracy feels itself bound to contribute in every way towards the consolidation of the fighting forces of our army and to its capacity for a war of defence and attack . . . The Congress holds the point of view that the question of the offensive at the front is to be regarded exclusively from the strategical standpoint."

Menshevist Leaders Demand that the Bolsheviki be Disarmed. The Meeting of the Party Leaders on June 24th.

St. Petersburg, June 26th (Pravda). On June 24th, a meeting took place on the premises of the Cadet Corps which, without exaggeration, can be called historical. It was attended by all the members of the Soviet Executive, all the members of the managing bodies of the fractions which are taking part in the Congress. A discussion of the demonstration on June 23rd, which was prohibited, was on the agenda.

Dan, who made a report, recommended that a resolution against the Bolsheviki be passed. He said that what the Bolsheviki had done, had been a political adventure. In the future, demonstrations ought only to be held by individual parties with the knowledge and consent of the Soviets. The Soviets alone should have the right to call upon armed divisions of soldiers, as, such, take part in a demonstration. Any parties which do not submit to this resolution place themselves outside the ranks of democracy and cannot remain in the Soviet. He thus, in other words, recommends an exceptional law against the Bolsheviki.

Dan's proposal rouses protest even amongst the Mensheviki. Bulkin, a Social Patriot, is opposed to repressive measures on the grounds that times change and that the majority of to-day may one day be in the minority. At the request of the meeting, Kamenev gives some information about the preparations for and the calling off of the meeting. In the meantime Zeretelli enters. He demands that no more questions be put to Kamenev. It is not a case of any small facts, but it is necessary to throw quite a different light on the subject. Dan's resolution — says Zeretelli — is inadequate. The proceedings had been nothing more nor less than a conspiracy on the part of the Bolsheviki to overthrow the Government and seize the power. What the Bolsheviki are now doing is no longer a propaganda of ideas but a conspiracy. The weapon of criticism is being replaced by the criticism of weapons. Weapons should be taken away from those revolutionaries who do not understand how to handle them with dignity. The Bolsheviki ought to be disarmed.

The excitement in the hall becomes more and more intense. An officer has a hysterical attack. Kamenev calls out to Zeretelli: "Mr. Minister, if you seriously mean what you say, you must not restrict yourself to words. Arrest and condemn me for conspiracy against the revolution!" Thereupon the Bolsheviki leave the meeting.

Lenin Explains his Reasons for not Attending the Meeting.

St. Petersburg, June 26th. The "Pravda" publishes the following letter from Lenin:

"I am asked why I did not take part in the conference of the Executive, of the presiding body of the Congress and of all the leaders of fractions, on Sunday evening. Because, on principle, I hold the point of view that the Bolsheviki should not take part in this Conference, but should send in a declaration to the following effect: 'We will take part in no discussion on questions of this kind (the prohibition of demonstrations).'"

The Bolsheviki Call for a Fresh Demonstration.

St. Petersburg, June 27th. In its leading article, the "Pravda" calls upon the revolutionary proletariat to join in a new demonstration on July 1st in order to fight for the same aims for which the demonstration of June 23rd, which was prohibited, intended to take up the cudgels.

The Increasing Popularity of the Bolsheviki amongst the Soldiers.

St. Petersburg, June 24th. ("Russkoye Slovo"). In view of the fact that the Cossack regiments of the Don district which are quartered in Petrograd, have refused to obey the Coalition Government and have sympathised with the Leninists, the military authorities of the Don district have resolved that the First and Fourth Cossack regiments in Petrograd shall immediately take their oath to the Coalition Government and shall at once obey a possible order to the front, should it be given.

St. Petersburg, June 26th ("Pravda"). The fear of the Bolsheviki is steadily increasing in that section of the Soviet Congress which proudly calls itself the representative of the majority of the revolutionary democracy. An whilst, in the general meetings this fear is already making itself noticeable, at the meetings of the war section, it is threatening to exercise such an influence as to interfere with the work of that section. Many speakers have criticised the "declaration of the Rights of the Soldiers" in their speeches, but have declared their disapproval of any alteration being made in the ill-famed points 14 and 18. They give as the reasons for their point of view that this would be making concessions to the Bolsheviki which would still more increase their influence.

It is very desirable that the war section should overcome this dread of the influence of the Bolsheviki and not follow Meierovitch and his gang. They demand that the voice of the masses should not be listened to, that no concessions should be made to the masses of soldiers, for they allege that the latter "do not understand the true principles of democracy".

A strange democracy! "Some" call the protest against death sentences at the front a lack of understanding and a lack of culture. But the "democracy" which breaks with the masses, remains isolated and misunderstood.

The Government fixes a date for the Constituent Assembly.

St. Petersburg, June 27th. The Provisional Government has resolved:

1. That the Constituent Assembly shall be called for October 13th 1917.
2. That the election shall be held on September 30th.

* * *

The Cadet newspaper "Ryetch" writes with regard to the calling of the Constituent Assembly:

"The provisional Government could not in any way justify the fixing of the date for calling the Constituent Assembly. It is evident that we are here confronted by a political measure which is demanded by the political circumstances of the present moment; the weapon must be struck out of the hand of the opponent before the anticipated Bolshevik manifestation on July 1st, in order to deprive him of the possibility of accusing the Government of sabotaging the elections."

The Parties prepare for the Demonstration on July 1st.

St. Petersburg, June 29th. The "Isvestiya" publishes an appeal from the Soviet Executive to join in the demonstration on July 1st, with the slogans:

"Peace without annexations and contributions!" "Right of self-determination of the peoples!" "Early summoning of the Constituent Assembly!" "A united revolutionary movement of the workers, peasants and the army!"

St. Petersburg, June 30th. In the "Dyelo Norada", the CC. of the SR. party recommends the following slogans for the demonstration:

"Land and freedom!", "Socialisation of the land!", "The whole land to the people!" "Peace throughout the world!", "The solidarity of the workers will put an end to the war!", "Long live the 3rd International!", "Down with the imperialists in all countries!", "Hurrah for the Constituent Assembly as ruler over the Russian world!", "Rally round the Soviets!", "Away with divisions!", "Long live the unity of the revolutionary forces!", "Confidence in the Socialist Ministers!", "Support the Provisional Government!"

The Slogans of the Bolsheviki.

Down with the counter-revolution!
 Down with the 4th National Duma and the State Council!
 Down with the ten capitalist Ministers!
 Down with the "allied" imperialists who are backing the counter-revolution that is being organised!
 Down with the capitalists, with the sabotage of production and with the masked lockouts!
 All power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies!
 Demand that the control of the production and distribution of products be in the hands of the workers!
 Down with the anti-democratic points of the Declaration of the Rights of the Soldiers!
 Oppose the disbanding of the revolutionary regiments!
 Resist the disarming of the workers!
 The whole people, above all the workers, must be armed!
 No separate peace with William, no secret treaties with the English and French capitalists!
 Immediate publication of really just conditions of peace by the Soviet!
 Resist the policy of the offensive!
Bread! Peace! Freedom!

The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

Sanguinary Demonstration in Ireland.

St. Petersburg, June 28th. ("Pravda"). From London we have received a report that crowds of Irish Nationalists assembled in the streets of Cork during the whole day and late into the night. The police fired into the crowd several times, the military was called out. The crowd dispersed when the soldiers occupied the main streets in the centre of the town and set up machine guns. One person was killed and about thirty wounded.

Disturbances in Germany.

St. Petersburg, June 28th. ("Pravda"). We have received reports from Stockholm of disturbances in Stettin in the middle of June. The crowd destroyed a number of shops and smashed the windows with stones. The police resorted to extremely harsh measures. Seven persons were killed at the Hansa Bridge. Machine-guns were set up in the centre of the town and the soldiers behaved as though they were at the seat of war. The machine gun fire continued throughout the night. Ambulance waggons plied through the town incessantly, taking the wounded to the hospitals. The next day, machine-guns were seen at various street corners, the town seemed deserted.

The Bolsheviki on the Summoning of the Constituent Assembly.

(From the "Pravda" of June 29th 1917.)

Until a short time ago, it was said that the Constituent Assembly could not be summoned before the end of the war, that in any case there were insuperable technical difficulties in the way of summoning it. Up to the present time, the worthy Ministers have only talked about it, negotiated about it, passed it over in silence. Now, however, the St. Petersburg workers and soldiers have decided the question. A demonstration was arranged for the 23rd, and this demonstration, which has been

prohibited, has had a striking influence on the summoning of the Constituent Assembly.

In its issue of yesterday, the Government newspaper "Rabotchaya Gazeta" demanded that the Constituent Assembly be summoned for August 15th. The paper points out that the present situation can only be saved by the Cadets, the Mensheviki and the Narodniki exerting their combined forces. Nevertheless, the Provisional Government has successfully bargained for a delay of a whole three months.

You want three months' grace? Life does not even give us three minutes' grace. The intensification of the crisis does not stand still even for three seconds. We stick to our demand:

All power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies!

Let this power rule the country until the Constituent Assembly meets! The ten capitalist Ministers must go! That is the only service they can still render to our country.

Chronicle of Events.

June 27th.

The Provisional Government resolves to summon the Constituent Assembly for September 30th.

June 28th.

Two revolutionary regiments are sent to the front from Kasan.

The leading article of the "Pravda" writes: "Famine is approaching with more and more rapid strides. Unemployment becomes more and more alarming. The capitalists are systematically sabotaging production. The fuel crisis is constantly becoming more threatening. The capitalists are leading the country to the edge of a precipice. Their plan is clear and simple, to disorganise everything, to produce a terrific chaos in the life of the country, to thrust hundreds of thousands of workers into the streets, to exasperate the people beyond endurance, to provoke a rebellion and then to disperse the most irreconcilable section of the proletariat and to disband the revolutionary regiments.

June 29th.

Opening of the 1st National Conference of the Bolshevik military organisations.

Kerensky issues an order commanding the people to support the offensive.

On the South West front, preparations are being made for the offensive by the artillery.

TO OUR READERS!

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

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1,50 marks
Austria	2 (Austrian) Schillings
Norway	1,50 crowns
Sweden	1,50 crowns
Denmark	1,50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble.

The subscription rate for other countries is three dollars (or equivalent in local currency) for six months.

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers besides