

**English Edition.**

**Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint**

**- INTERNATIONAL -**  
**PRESS**  
**CORRESPONDENCE**

Vol. 7. No. 57

13<sup>th</sup> October 1927

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

**C O N T E N T S**

**R. Page Arnot: The Significance of the Labour Party Conference at Blackpool.**

**Politics.**

**Ernst Meyer: The Importance of the Elections in Hamburg and Königsberg.**

**D. Bennet: Altona and Tannenburg.**

**The "Pravda" on the Anti-Soviet Campaign in France.**

**R. Page Arnot: The English Conservative Party Conference.**

**Irlandust: The Treaty between Persia and the Soviet Union.**

**J. B.: England and Ibn Saoud.**

**China.**

**A. Platonov: The Fights among the Militarists in North China.**

**Appeal of the Workers' Federation of China.**

**The Labour Movement.**

**J. Berlioz: The Bordeaux Congress of the C. G. T. U. and its Significance.**

**For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.**

**For a Leninist Regime in the Party.**

**The Lenin Party on the Opposition.**

**The Y. C. I. Approves the Decision of the E. C. C. I. regarding the Expulsion of Comrades Trotzky and Vouyovitch.**

**Resolution of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. on the Factional-Disruptive Work of the Trotzkyist Opposition.**

**Unanimous Condemnation of the Disruptors.**

**The Sheffield District Conference of the C. P. G. B. for the Disciplinary Measures against the Opposition leaders.**

**The White Terror.**

**B. Smeral: A New Murder is Being Prepared.**

**Korsunski: Persecution of the Labour Movement in Cuba.**

**Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.**

**The Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution — one of the most important factors for mobilising the workers against imperialism.**

**Ten Years Ago.**

**The Insurrection in Tashkent Crushed.**

**N. Lenin: Marxism and Insurrection.**

**Manifesto of the C. C. of the Bolsheviki of October 13th 1917.**

**N. Lenin: The Crisis has become Ripe.**

**Chronicle of Events.**

**Ten Years of Soviet Power.**

**Johannes Wertheim: Prisons in the Soviet Union.**

---

---

## **The Significance of the Labour Party Conference at Blackpool.**

By R. Page Arnot (London).

The 27th Annual Conference of the British Labour Party, meeting at Blackpool from the 3rd to the 7th October, 1927, marks a further stage in silent coalition with the bourgeoisie. In such coalitions, the bourgeoisie exact a price; and each year the price rises. Two years ago, the definitive expulsion of the Communists was deemed enough. This year, the price of MacDonaldism is the expulsion of the left wing from its counsels and the expulsion of socialist items from its programme.

The British Labour Party retains to-day the quite unique composition with which it grew up before the War. It was

a federation of trade unions, socialist societies and local parties and trades councils, linked together for electoral purposes and with no set programme.

The last nine years have seen a steady attempt by the Reformist leaders to transform this body into something on the model of the British bourgeois political parties and fitted like them to carry on the King's Government. This process began with the institution in 1918 of an individual members section (a device to enable bourgeois and petty-bourgeois Liberals to enter in) and the publication of a Fabian-Imperialist programme: followed in 1919 by the support given to the robbers' treaty

of Versailles. In 1920, the newly-formed British Communist Party was refused the right of affiliation. Ever since then, each year has seen a further stage in the twofold process of casting out "extreme" elements from the organisation and eliminating "extreme", or "crude", or "wild" proposals from its programme.

But this yearly-repeated reformist purge gradually set up an irritation in the body of the working class movement. A counter tendency began to show itself. More and more, sections of the working class who had learned the worth of the Communists in the daily struggle and in strikes and resistance to the employers' offensive, could not bear to have the Communists driven out of the Labour Party.

The experience of the Labour Government hastened both the purge-process and its opposing tendency; so that when in 1925, against the most obvious signs of readiness for revolutionary struggle among the working class and of a desire for unity in order to carry through the struggle, the Labour Party chiefs pulled all their wires, gathered all their henchmen and carried through the **Liverpool Conference** the definitive expulsion of the Communists, the effect was to crystallise the leftward tendency into a definite movement within the Labour Party. Since then, the history of the Labour Party has been a struggle between the organised Left Wing representing the militant working class elements on the one hand, and on the other hand, the Labour Party chiefs (Henderson, Thomas, MacDonald, Snowden) and their associates in the trade union bureaucracy.

Into the fight between these two an element of confusion has been introduced by the **Independent Labour Party** (one of the socialist societies affiliated to the Labour Party) which has brought out a number of pseudo-left slogans such as "Socialism in our Time"; and though the ideological structure of this pseudo-left has been shattered by R. P. Dutt's new book on "**Socialism and the Living Wage**", they may still brandish their broadswords and fight a stage-duel or two with MacDonald at this and later Conferences.

The fight between left wing and right wing in the last eighteen months is the immediate prelude to this **Blackpool Conference**. A first **National Conference of the Left Wing** was held in September, 1926, attended by 52 local labour parties and as many delegates from left wing groups in areas where the majority were for the right wing. At this Conference it was decided to set up a **National Committee** to organise left wing sentiment and at the same time a programme was worked-out. As the left wing grew during 1926, the alarmed officials of the Labour Party began to disaffiliate Labour Parties which had not given effect to the **Liverpool Communist-excluding resolutions**. It had become clear that the **Right Wing policy**, carried through at Labour Party Conferences by the block vote of the large trade unions in opposition often to the feelings of the local labour parties, could only be enforced by a policy of ultimatums and schisms. Those Labour Parties who did not promptly cast out the Communists would themselves be threatened with expulsion.

In spite of these threats, the **National Left Wing Provisional Committee** continued its campaign to reverse the policy of the last three years. On September 25th, 1927, a second annual conference of the **National Left Wing Movement** was held one week before the **Blackpool Conference**, attended by 145 delegates representing 54 labour parties and numerous other bodies such as branches of the I.L.P. etc. The Conference adopted a left wing programme for its constituents to put forward inside the Labour Party and at the **Blackpool Conference**.

The programme urged the scrapping of Versailles and the Dawes Plan, the cancellation of international debts, the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between England and the U.S.S.R., support for the Nationalist revolutionary movement in China, support of the right of all peoples in the British Empire to self-determination, together with detailed proposals under these headings. At the same time, the Labour Party was urged to demand a minimum weekly wage of £4 together with a legal 44 hour week and nationalisation without compensation and with workers control of all basic industries. On land and agriculture, unemployment, taxation, health and housing, local government and constitutional reform ("abolition of the House of Lords and the Monarchy") the items were those of a militant programme of struggle against capitalism.

The **Right Wing**, on the first day of the **Blackpool Conference**, made it clear that they stood for an exactly opposite policy. The opening paragraphs of the **Chairmen's speech** were an attack on the **Left Wing** and the **Minority Movement**, together with praise of the "courageous and constructive address" delivered by the **Chairman of the Trades Union Congress** a month before. On the same day, the curt and arbitrary disaffiliation of the **Teachers' Labour League** by the **Executive Committee** was brought under review. The offence committed had been the non-expulsion of the Communists and a critical attitude towards the **Right Wing policy**. The endorsement of the **Executive's dismissal** of this **Labour League** for daring to think otherwise than the **Reformist licensers** would have them do was a warning to all and sundry that rebels must either follow **Lansbury** and make their submission to the **Right Wing** or be driven out into the wilderness like the **Teachers' Labour League**. Direct discussion of **Communist expulsion** there was none; for that had been prevented by the simple method of expunging from the **Agenda** every resolution dealing with Communists in relation to the **Labour Party**.

It was significant that the **Chairman** did not attack the **Liberal Party**; while the **Executive Committee** asked the **Conference** to agree to the preparation of "a programme of legislation and administrative action for a **Labour Government**". One after another, the **Labour Party chiefs** made it clear that the programme should be one of such immediate measures as would meet the wishes of the electorate, that is, presumably, not something "vague" like socialism, and presumably something on which the **Liberal Party** and the **Labour Party** could combine. **Harry Pollitt** pointed out that it was towards this coalition with bourgeois parties that the resolution might lead. **A. J. Cook** and **Ellen Wilkinson** were anxious that the programme should not be one addressed to catch the votes of the middle class, or in the case of two **I.L.P.** speakers that it should be an **I.L.P.** "**Socialism in our Time**" Programme. The **Right Wing Speakers** in reply, made it clear first, that an election programme was needed in order to muzzle "grotesque presentations of the Labour case by indiscreet persons" — a further tightening of the reins. Secondly, that since a first **Labour Government** could not accomplish socialism there should be a "short programme of immediate objects that Labour could really hope to accomplish". Thirdly, that the programme should appeal to trade unionists who were supporters of the **Baldwin Government**.

What relation had this to socialism? The bourgeois **Liberal newspaper the Manchester Guardian** caustically summed-up what it called **Mr. MacDonald's** "appropriate theoretical reconciliation" as follows: In the background of all our schemes is socialism, in the background as the completion of all that is going on, of all that is working out on the great stage of parliament, is socialism. All our plans and schemes would be meaningless if we were not socialists. The comment is added that it is "pretty comfortable doctrine!".

Altogether the Conference was full of comfortable doctrine, comfortable at any rate for the bourgeoisie. The same "**Manchester Guardian**" in its editorial openly welcomed the Conference as giving shape to a common policy on which **Liberal and Labour** could co-operate, while they congratulated the **Labour Party** on cutting out or having "relegated to an unspecified future" things that would have stood in the way of co-operation. "The capital levy and the nationalisation of the mines are to find another place in the immediate programme... the ban on the Communists is not lifted but enforced... There should be little difficulty here in finding an agreed policy between **Liberals and Labour**."

There is a cheerful ring about these comments of the chief organ of **Liberal Capitalism** in Britain which accords well with the "**Industrial harmony**" of the recent **Trades Union Congress**. No declamation by **Mr. MacDonald** in favour of nationalisation in the future or sneers at **Mr. Lloyd George**, will shake the belief that a **Liberal-Labour Alliance** is being prepared. Nothing can shatter that belief but the adoption of a real socialist policy. On that the **Labour Party Conference** this week have more definitely than ever turned their back.

## POLITICS

### The Importance of the Elections in Hamburg and Königsberg.

By Ernst Meyer (Berlin).

The elections in the State of Hamburg and the municipal elections in Königsberg on the 9th of October show, as was already to be seen 14 days previously at the municipal elections in the Prussian suburbs of Hamburg, that there has taken place a considerable re-grouping in the relation of forces of the parties as a result of the policy of the bourgeois bloc. Already at the municipal elections in Altona the Communists were able almost to reach the level attained in May 1924, the highest point of the Parliamentary successes of the Communist Party of Germany. At the elections in Hamburg and Königsberg the Party even surpassed this record. At the elections in Hamburg the Communists were able to record an increase of over 32,000 votes in comparison with the last Senate elections held in October 1924, i. e., an increase (in round figures) from 78,500 to 111,300.

In Königsberg the number of Communist votes increased from (in round figures) 23,800 to 26,000. Thus, contrary to all the predictions of the bourgeois parties and the Social Democracy, and in spite of the frightfully bitter campaign of the government and all the hostile parties, the Communist Party has exceeded all previous records.

But these elections not only show great successes for the C.P.G.; they are at the same time an important symptom of the changed relations of power between the working class and the bourgeoisie and of shiftings of the proportion of forces of the parties, both within the bourgeoisie and within the proletariat.

The bourgeois bloc, which was set up in January last as a result of the special initiative of Reichs President Hindenburg, has undermined the confidence of the broadest masses of the working population by its reactionary policy in the questions of customs duties, taxation and education. The German nationalists who of all former opposition parties have made the greatest promises to their electors, are now, by their government policy, disappointing broad circles of their followers. In Königsberg, for example, at the Reichstag elections in December 1924, they polled nearly 29,000 votes. At the last municipal elections, on the other hand, they received less than 12,000 votes. At the Presidential election the Hindenburg parties polled altogether, in round figures, 93,500 votes in Königsberg. At the municipal elections this year they received only 50,000 votes. That proves how great is the disappointment with the policy of the bourgeois bloc not only in proletarian circles, but among the whole of the working population, including the petty bourgeoisie. In Hamburg the Hindenburg parties lost four seats, while the Socialist Party of Germany and the C.P.G. together won 13 seats.

The petty bourgeoisie has no confidence whatever in the bourgeois opposition, as represented by the Democratic Party, against the bourgeois bloc. In Hamburg the Democrats lost five seats compared with the last municipal elections held in October 1924; in Königsberg the Democrats show a decline of nearly 50% as compared with December 1924.

The disappointment of the working population is expressed in a great increase in the votes polled by the S.P.G. and the C.P.G. In Hamburg the S.P.G. vote increased from 162,300 in May 1924 to 249,200. In Königsberg from 13,400 votes in May 1924 to 25,900 votes on October 9th last. Both in Königsberg the S.P.G. did not maintain the level attained in December 1924 and November 1925, when they received more than 27,000 votes. In Hamburg, on the other hand, the S.P.G. show a considerable increase compared with Autumn 1924, when they received over 170,000 votes.

Whence comes this growth both of the S.P.G. and of the C.P.G.? Whilst the S.P.G. received votes which were formerly given to the petty bourgeois parties, the C.P.G. has increased its influence particularly among the working class. In Königsberg the C.P.G. is today already again stronger than the S.P.G. In Hamburg, it is true, the C.P.G. did not receive

half the number of votes polled by the Social Democracy, but even here there is an undeniable tendency to increase at the cost of the S.P.G. In this connection it must be particularly emphasised that the S.P.G. and the C.P.G. are both increasing at the cost of the bourgeois parties. In Königsberg the S.P.G. and C.P.G. have together 30 seats as against 34 seats held by the bourgeois parties. In Hamburg the S.P.G. and C.P.G., with 89 seats, have a firm majority over the bourgeois parties, who have only 70 seats.

It is easy to understand that in view of these election results the bourgeois bloc has the greatest apprehensions as to the further development and the coming Reichstag and Diet elections. Six months of the bourgeois bloc has sufficed to enlighten the working masses of Germany regarding its character and its policy. The new measures which are becoming law, in particular the clericalisation of the schools, will weaken the positions of the bourgeois bloc still further.

But also the S.P.G., which has achieved undeniable successes at these elections, is involved in considerable difficulties. The Social Democracy has conducted in the various States a coalition policy with the bourgeois parties (Centre and German People's Party), whilst in the Reich it conducts a sham-Parliamentary opposition. In Hamburg the S.P.G. is now confronted with the question how it intends to make use of the social democratic-Communist majority of 90 seats against 70 bourgeois seats. It is clear even to the most bigoted social democratic worker that in Hamburg there does not exist the necessity for a coalition policy with bourgeois parties, as is asserted by the S.P.G.

The C.P.G. will therefore, as it did formerly at the municipal elections in Berlin and the Diet elections in Saxony, propose to the S.P.G. that the latter form a social democratic government (Senate) which would be tolerated by the C.P.G.

But the S.P.G. has just recently intensified its anti-Communist policy. In its attacks on the C.P.G. the S.P.G. far surpasses the bourgeois parties. The offer of the C.P.G. to help to form a social democratic minority government places the S.P.G. in a very embarrassing situation. If it accepts the Communist offer, then it shows that its attacks on the C.P.G. were a deliberate manoeuvre to prevent a C.P.G. and S.P.G. majority. If the S.P.G. rejects the Communist offer, then it is likewise exposed in the eyes of the workers as an alleged workers party, but which in reality in every case makes pacts with the bourgeoisie, even when there exist those Parliamentary pre-conditions which, according to the opinion of the S.P.G., are necessary for a social democratic government.

The real victor at the last elections is the C.P.G. It makes headway in spite of the bourgeois terror and the incitement of the Social Democracy. It is growing in spite of the petty bourgeois agents of the bourgeoisie in an ultra-Left garb who attempted to trip up the Party. In Altona the ultra-Left Urbahns-Maslov group received only 365 votes as against the 19,000 votes polled by the C.P.G. In Hamburg the Urbahns-Maslov group likewise attempted to set up its own list, but did not even receive the necessary 3000 nomination signatures, whilst the C.P.G. polled over 111,000 votes. All the lying assertions of the Russian and the German opposition regarding the decline in the influence of the C.P.G. have been completely refuted by the result of the elections.

In spite of this the C.P.G. will not simply book its successes without any criticism. The C.P.G. knows that the recent successes can be increased still further. It will devote the greatest care and attention to the work of consolidating organisationally these political successes. After the May elections of 1924 Maslov and Ruth Fischer conducted a policy which led to a weakening of the influence of the C.P.G. Contrary to this policy the C.P.G. will today do everything in order to extend its successes and will devote its chief attention to exposing the sham opposition of the S.P.G., so that in the future the fight against the bourgeois bloc will be led more and more by the C.P.G. The overthrow of the bourgeois bloc must and will come about under the leadership of the C.P.G., which has directed its whole policy to opposing the bourgeois bloc by a bloc of the workers in town and country.

The C.P.G. considers the bloc of the workers as a bloc outside of Parliament which will organise outside of Parliament the Left movement within the working class which was

revealed at the elections, and make use of it in the fight against the bourgeois bloc and trust capital. This Left movement which is making its appearance in spite of the relative stabilisation and as a result of the effects of stabilisation, must find its expression more than hitherto in the daily fight of the proletariat. The Parliamentary successes at the last elections are for the C. P. G. a symptom of the enormous possibilities of an increased fight against trust capital and the bourgeois bloc.

In spite of all defeats of 1919 and 1923, the German working class is not crushed; it is again rallying to the fight. The C. P. G. regards it as its chief task to prepare and carry on this fight in all fields and with every means.

## Altona and Tannenburg.

By D. Benne't (Moscow).

Hindenburg's Germany, with the support of the German Social Democracy, endeavours to restore the spirit and sentiments which prevailed in August 1914. Hindenburg delivers passionate, patriotic speeches about the victories during the summer months of the first years of the world war. Ex-Kaiser Wilhelm warmly greets and congratulates his faithful servant. The cinematographs display a picture "The World War", which shows the triumphant march of the German army during the victorious months near Tannenburg. The "Vorwärts" is ardently combating the Soviet Union and the revolutionary labour movement throughout the world.

The elections in the maritime district took place under these conditions. Naturally, the role and achievements of the Communist Party in this electoral fight are to a certain extent symptomatic of the pending elections in the other districts of Germany and are of great significance.

The procedure and outcome of the elections in Altona merit especial attention.

In May 1924, the Communist Party of Germany received in Altona 17,535 votes. At the next parliamentary elections (in December of the same year), the German Communists received only 14,257 votes. During the presidential elections, Comrade Thälmann received 11,144 votes. Now, the Communist Party received in October 19,000\* votes. The persistent work of the Communist Party in Germany during the last few years among the masses gave its results.

During the elections in October, the Communist Party clashed with a new factor which is also a peculiar expression of the new imperialist, militarist orientation of capitalist Germany. To the extent that imperialist strivings grow and develop, the ultra-Left renegade Maslow-Fischer group, expelled from the Comintern, has taken definite shape and in its own way is supporting the Hindenburg reaction. During the Tannenburg celebrations, this group openly entered the elections in Altona as an independent anti-Communist Party.

The open action of these renegades against the Communist Party was preceded by an open letter, illiterate in content and insolent in tone, addressed to the Communist Party, proposing a "united front". It would not be worth our while to deal with this letter were it not for the fact that it revealed either blindness or extraordinary impertinence on the part of the renegades. On the basis of an "estimation of forces" which the Urbahns' and Maslows made, they proposed that the candidate list of the Communist Party consisting of 20 candidates, should include four of their candidates. This "very moderate" proposal shows that the Urbahns and Maslows pretended that their strength and influence will be one fifth of the strength and influence of the Communist Party.

Their estimate proved absolutely absurd. Against the 19,000 votes cast for the Communists, the candidates of the Urbahn Maslow group received only 364 votes. The Urbahns expected a ratio of 1:5, they received a ratio of 1:52. Instead of four candidates, they did not elect even one. The Com-

munist Party, however, secured in Altona more votes than during the three preceding election campaigns.

Maslow wanted to reward his protector, the hero of Tannenburg, with a birthday present, by setting up a new election ticket against the Communist Party. The proletarians of Altona answered the renegade with a mighty slap in the face.

Ruth Fischer, Maslow, and their friends, utilising the advantages of Hindenburg democracy, circulated the writings of our Oppositionists with great zeal. Our oppositionists used their utmost endeavours in order to arm the German renegades ideologically. The German workers, by delivering a blow to Ruth Fischer, Maslow and Urbahns, struck a blow also at the Opposition of the C. P. S. U.

Altona proved whom the renegades serve and whom the revolutionary workers follow.

## The "Pravda" on the Anti-Soviet Campaign in France.

Moscow, 3rd October 1927.

The "Pravda" is of the opinion that the decision of the French government to demand the recall of Rakovsky is the first step towards destroying the agreement planned between France and the Soviet Union.

The anti-Soviet campaign of the venal French press is paid for with British money. The British oil industrialists and the Diehards who issued the instructions to the bribed press to demand the recall of Rakovsky are also urging the government of France to take steps which are calculated to worsen the relations existing between France and the Soviet Union, if not to cause a definite breach between the two countries. Nevertheless, the government of France does not dare to express itself openly in favour of a breach, for it fears the indignation of French public opinion.

The "Pravda" points out that the policy making for a breach with the Soviet Union is an open piece of treachery not only against the masses of the workers and peasants, but also against the millions of French small investors who would receive considerable advantages from the carrying out of the financial offer of the Soviet government. The policy of a breach would also be damaging for French consumers and for French industry and commerce and would render the French navy and French foreign transport completely dependent upon Deterding.

Public opinion in France does not want a breach with the Soviet Union; there is a danger however, that the fascists Millerand, Foch, Coty and Sarraut will continue their anti-Soviet campaign and that the united forces of the reaction in Great Britain and France will gradually attain their end and worsen the relations between France and the Soviet Union, eventually causing a complete breach.

The "Pravda" is of the opinion that the French government has only declared its preparedness to conclude an agreement with the Soviet Union in order to deceive French public opinion, for the French government knows very well that the results achieved by the negotiations up to the present were chiefly due to the initiative of Rakovsky whose recall the French government is now demanding.

The "Pravda" deals with the role played in the matter by the French ambassador in Moscow, Herbet who brought the whole matter of the declaration of the Opposition in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. into the public view and thus rendered the French people very bad and Deterding very excellent service.

The "Pravda" declares that those behind the action against the Soviet Union must bear the full responsibility for any worsening of the relations between the two countries; for the possible frustration of the agreement which is being negotiated between the two countries; and for all the consequences of the decision taken by the French government at the dictate of Deterding.

\* These figures show that the communication of the Tass Correspondent that the Communist Party received at these elections less votes than in 1924 was wrong.

## The English Conservative Party Conference.

By R. Page Arnot (London).

Once a year the Conservative Conference meets, and once a year the Prime Minister addresses it as a large Party demonstration. Only on occasions of a division has this **Annual Conference of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations** the importance of, say, a Labour Party Conference. It is not attended by the Cabinet or by the big bankers and monopolists that pull the Cabinet strings. It does not govern the Conservative Party, which is ruled by the party leader, Prime Minister **Baldwin**, who is elected leader by a meeting (if need be) of Members of Parliament and Peers of Parliament. Nevertheless there is a certain importance in the precise degree of warmth with which it supports the government: and Mr. Baldwin, just as he goes each Autumn to take the Waters at Aix, so afterwards he goes regularly to take the political waters at the Party Conference.

What is the situation this year? The Conservative Premier comes to meet his supporters, wreathed with the laurels of victory. The General Strike and the Miners' defeated, the defeat turned into a pursuit of the trade unions by the Trades Disputes and Trade Unions Act, the formal capitulation of the trade union leaders, the acceptance of "industrial peace" ("I welcome the speeches at the recent Trades Union Congress" says Baldwin) and the renunciation of socialist policies by the Labour Party are his victories on the home front: while there is added to them the raid on the Arcos, the breach with Soviet Russia and the disintegration of the Chinese Kuomintang. But he who has to fight against "the three columns of the world revolution" — the revolutionary classes of Britain, of China and of the Soviet Union — may ere long find the laurels wither on his brow. Of this they take no heed: and today is Baldwin's day. Every prospect seems rose-coloured. Even the decline in British capitalism is regarded optimistically, and the Prime Minister cites morsels from the statistics of trade to show that the position is "not unhelpful" — at a moment when Sir Josiah Stamp, bourgeois economist and railway administrator, is commenting on the dangerously unfavourable balance of trade. Baldwin even feels confident enough to attack Lord **Rothermere**, the brother of the dead Northcliffe, the controller of the **Daily Mail** which has been conducting a Fronde against the Premier, particularly on his pledge to grant "votes for flappers".

What are the main offerings of the Conference to Baldwin? First, they approve his proposed **House of Lords policy**, and second his programme to **extend the franchise**. In addition they ask for more rapidly applicable protective tariffs, they condemn any raising of the school leaving age above 14 and they congratulate the government on its naval policy, put forward at the Geneva tripartite Conference in July-August.

Almost unanimously the resolution is carried,

"That this Conference offers its hearty congratulations to the government on its resolve to deal with the problem of the House of Lords during the life of the present Parliament (i. e. without a general election being held to "consult the democracy", R. P. A.) and will support those measures necessary to assure that the will of the people shall be safeguarded by an effective second Chamber."

The **House of Lords**, the old Chamber of the hereditary nobility, had its power of veto restricted by the Parliament Act of 1911. The proposal is now to strengthen it as a stronghold of the Conservative bourgeoisie against the workers' advance, against confiscatory measures which they dread might come from the House of Commons with a working class majority.

The second main resolution was:

"The Conference calls on the government to introduce and pass without delay a measure conferring the franchise on all women at the age of 21, (30 is the present limit) in accordance with the undertaking so definitely given (by Jix and Baldwin)."

The calculation is that the great majority of women of from 20 to 30 years of age will be non-political, which in practice will mean support of the Conservatives, at any rate in the next election after the franchise has been thus extended.

Thus the British bourgeoisie, even at its moment of transient triumph is even endeavouring uneasily to lay the spectre of communism. At any moment it may drive the Labour Party, they fear, into a socialist programme: and against that the dyke of a reinforced feudal Chamber must be built. Again the next election is crucial; and Red Letter or whatever other variant of "Bolshevik plot" document may be forged must have new reserves of credulity brought into play to be effective; and amongst the unpoliticals these reserves are found. 1928/29 may be the climax of the British foreign policy of encirclement, of the attack on the three columns of the world revolution; and every precaution must be taken to maintain the Conservatives in power when the climax is reached.

## The Treaty between Persia and the Soviet Union.

By Ir andust.

On October 1st, 1927, six documents of the greatest political importance were signed at Moscow by representatives of the Governments of the Soviet Union and of Persia. To give an idea of the significance of this event, let it suffice to point out that it marked the conclusion between the two Governments in question of a **guarantee of neutrality**, a **commercial agreement** (in the form of an exchange of notes), a **customs convention**, an **agreement as to the fishing rights on the Persian shore of the Caspian Sea**, an **agreement regarding the port of Pehlvi** and a **lease contract** referring to this port, concluded in the name of the Caspian Steam Navigation Company.

It is not possible to enter here into any detailed account of these agreements, wherefore we shall simply deal with their **political significance**, which extends far beyond the limits of relations between Persia and the Soviet Union.

While in the West we can observe a feverish activity on the part of the so-called Great Powers and their retainers with a view to **masking the deep-rooted antagonisms** by which the capitalist world is rent, to preparing for a renewed armed conflict for raw materials and markets, and to removing the menace of a socialist revolution, the Government of the **Soviet Union** gives proof, by each successive step it takes, of a foreign policy of a fundamentally different character. It is tenaciously and systematically endeavouring to pursue a policy of peace and of creative work, not only within its own borders but also in its international relations. The agreement of neutrality just concluded with Persia is a logical factor in this peaceful work of construction, which has already found expression in a series of other agreements, concluded by the Soviet Union with **Turkey, Afghanistan, Germany, and Lithuania**.

If for the **Soviet Union** the agreement with Persia represents a further step forward along the traditional path of a peaceful policy, it is of yet greater political significance to **Persia**. The present international situation is characterised by extreme tension and the accentuation of all differences underlying the international capitalist system.

**British imperialism**, which being in its decline has had recourse to a policy of imperialist adventurism, aspires to create a uniform bloc of the forces hostile to the Soviet Union and to organise a kind of crusade against the Soviet republics. One of the tasks of British diplomacy on the Eastern front was the inclusion of Persia in the chain of British dependencies, which was to have extended from the **Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean**. This chain, which Great Britain started to forge shortly after the end of the war, began in **Egypt** and was to have reached, by way of the **Arabian mandatory States and Persia**, as far as **Beluchistan**. Alreading from 1918 till 1920, the Persian link in the chain was firmly grasped in the hands Great Britain. The success of the Soviet Republics in their struggle against intervention and the blockade, and the establishment of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Persia in 1921, thwarted the customary colonisation tactics of Great Britain, which aimed at the dismemberment of Persia and its conversion into a buffer-state or a rampart for Great Britain's **Indian stronghold**.



It must be admitted that Persia is not yet sufficiently strong to withstand once and for all the disintegrating policy of British imperialism. Every step taken towards an emancipation from British influence costs Persia dear. Suffice it to recall the fact that the Persian policy of an approach to Turkey and the conclusion of a treaty with that State contrary to the interests of Great Britain, caused a series of Kurd revolts and provocative actions on the Turco-Persian border, all of which were organised by the British military authorities at Baghdad.

A number of circumstances, however, have of late tended to show that Persia is accumulating internal forces enabling the country to pursue an increasingly independent and self-determined policy. One of the circumstances in question was the abolition of the capitulations, which was not very well received by British diplomatic circles. In this connection the British diplomats attempted to bring about the formation of a bloc against Persia by Great Britain, France, and Spain. Another fact in point was the steadfast refusal by the Persian government to submit to Parliament the question of war-indebtedness to Great Britain, as also Persia's refusal to accede to the International Air Convention, under which the British "Empire Line" from London to Karatchi via Cairo and Baghdad would have been completed across Persian territory. All this led to violent attacks and complaints on the part of the British press, which expressed great dissatisfaction at the too independent spirit displayed by Persia in this connection.

Under this head we may also include the declaration of the Persian delegate at the League of Nations Council at Geneva regarding the participation of Persia in the interpretation of Article 16 of the League of Nations statutes in the sense of Locarno, and also the participation in sanctions ordained by the League. It will be remembered that at one of the latest sessions of the League of Nations Council the Persian delegate seconded the protest of Finland against the interpretation in the sense of Locarno of the obligations of Germany based on Article 16. The present attitude of Persia in this matter proves that its Government has recognised the danger threatening the weak States through their unwilling participation in international conflicts prepared by the great imperialist Powers, even though based on the pretext of Article 16 of the League of Nations statutes. True, the same delegate declared at Geneva that Persia did not consider the conclusion of treaty agreements between individual States as contrary to the principles of the League of Nations.

In discussing the recent events pointing to a desire on the part of Persia to pursue an independent policy, there should be mentioned the measures adopted by the Persian Government against the activity of the White-Guard emigrant organisations on Persian territory.

The possibility of a systematic independent policy on the part of Persia ultimately depends on the consolidation of its economic position and the attainment of a certain economic independence. The latter fact in particular would form a serious obstacle to all attempts of the imperialist Powers to convert Persia into a suitable area for marshalling their array.

For these reasons the conclusion of the economic and commercial treaties between the Soviet Union and Persia is likewise of the utmost political importance. These agreements are just as much factors of peace as is the treaty of neutrality. By establishing conditions of economic co-operation between Persia and the Soviet Union, they strengthen the economic hinterland of both these States and create the presumptions for a speedier growth of the independent and national elements of Persia, thereby securing for that country the possibility of an independent course in home and foreign politics by depriving Great Britain and the other leading capitalist Powers of the chance of using Persia as a tool in their imperialist intrigues, so dangerous to international peace. Therein consists the international significance of the treaties signed on October 1st by Persia and the Soviet Union.

## England and Ibn Saoud.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The negotiations which the representative of Great Britain, Sir Gilbert Clayton, conducted with the Sultan Ibn Saoud, who, as a result of his victory over King Hussein of Hejaz, has become the most important factor in Arabia, were very prolonged and tedious. At the end of 1925 there was concluded the first provisional agreement between England and Ibn Saoud; but this did not touch any of the questions which interested British policy in Arabia and are of vital importance for Ibn Saoud. The aim of British policy to secure the greatest possible influence in the kingdom of Ibn Saoud, to make the Bedouin king completely dependent on their favour and then to use him as an instrument, encountered great difficulties right at the beginning. Ibn Saoud would not give up his independence; he had no reason to. On the contrary, he wanted to consolidate his positions in Arabia which he won in the course of arduous and long years of military activity; he cherished the dream of a united Arabia under his rule. It is true that in order to reach this aim he needed a neutral attitude on the part of England, the certainty that he would not be disturbed by powerful British intrigues. He obtained this neutral attitude by the Treaty of Behera (1925), in which he promised the British representative to respect the frontiers of the British mandatory territory.

Since then, however, the antagonisms between England and Ibn Saoud have become acute. Ibn Saoud rejected the British proposal that his kingdom should be represented abroad by the British Ambassadors. He refused officially to recognise as legally valid the separation of Maan and Agaba (which occurred during the war between Hussein and Ibn Saoud) from the territory of Hejaz. He permitted a Congress to be held in Mecca (1926) which was in fact directed against England. He would not abandon his right in the administration of the Hejaz railway in favour of England. He took good care not to conduct an anti-English policy himself, but always acted on his own account. The attempts of Clayton to arrive at an agreement on the disputed points continually failed.

Thereupon British policy commenced to work by means of pressure against Ibn Saoud. In a quiet, unostentatious manner, every weakness, every failing of Ibn Saoud was taken advantage of in order to prove the necessity of British support.

In the first place there occurred a change in the public opinion of the Indian Mohammedans who were at first among the most enthusiastic supporters of Ibn Saoud. There commenced an agitation against Ibn Saoud in all the Mohammedan countries which sent pilgrims to the "Holy places" of Islam. Ibn Saoud became involved in a conflict with the Egyptian government, which resulted in the proclamation of a semi-official boycott against him. In fact the English even began to resume their relations with the pensioned off king Hussein; the old man was suddenly given an English decoration; he was allowed to hold a conference with his sons and to write against Ibn Saoud in the pro-English press.

It was intended by these means to render Ibn Saoud docile. In addition there were the difficulties which the conqueror had in the interior of Hejaz itself. The "holy land" of Islam has a population whose social structure differs considerably from that of the highlands of Nedshd (the native country of the Wahabites and Ibn Saoud), which are inhabited by Bedouins who live by robbery or cattle-breeding. In Hejaz there are poor peasants, dealers and merchants. The rigorous laws of the puritanical Wahabites are unpopular in Hejaz. On the other hand the efforts of Ibn Saoud to introduce technical achievements (automobiles, electric light etc.) encounter the mistrust and discontent of the fanatical "Ikhwan" (Wahabite fraternities). The result is the growth of a mood hostile to Ibn Saoud, which even finds expression in conspiracies, attempts etc. against the person of the king.

Finally Ibn Saoud is threatened by his rival and most powerful opponent, the Imam Jihie of Yemen. The latter has concluded an agreement with Italy under which he receives great stores of weapons from Italian factories, as well as technicians and officers. The Imam Jihie threatens the Southern frontiers of Ibn Saoud and forces him to make constant war preparations.

In spite of everything Ibn Saoud has not submitted to British pressure. The agreement that was ratified some days

ago as the "Treaty of Jidda" and was published simultaneously in London and Mecca, takes no account of the chief desires of England. It is true Ibn Saoud pledges not to permit any conspiracies against England on his territory, not to interfere with the protégés of England, the principalities of Bahrein and Koweit (on the East coast of Arabia), to protect the pilgrims from the British countries etc. — but in the main points, in the question of Maan and Akaba, as well as in the question of representation abroad, Ibn Saoud has not given way.

On the other hand the treaty of Jidda contains an important gain for Ibn Saoud: the English officially annul all the arrangements they have made with the Hachimitic dynasty.

The new treaty between England and Ibn Saoud does not in any way mean the solution of the Arabian question. It rather renders more evident than hitherto the profound antagonisms which exist between the imperialist designs of England and the efforts of Ibn Saoud to remain independent.

## CHINA

### The Fights among the Militarists in North China.

By A. Platonov.

The action of the governor of the province of Shansi, General Yen Si Shan, against Chang Tso Lin thoroughly alters the relations of power among the militarists at the seat of war in North China. Up to quite recently the fight between the generals of North China and South China was confined to the operations of Sun Chuan Fang's troops and the Nanking group in the Southern portion of the province of Shantung and in the Northern part of the province of Kiangsu.

In spite of the fact that Feng Yu Hsiang had treaty relations first with Chiang Kai Shek and then with the latter's successors in the Nanking government, the former people's army did not display any noticeable activity. The armed forces of Feng Yu Hsiang which were concentrated in the province of Honan were held up by inner frictions between the generals as well as by the generally unfavourable strategical situation.

The revolt of General Chin Yu Ao in the central portion of the province of Honan and the constant danger of an advance by the Moukden troops from Paoting to Shenchow did not permit Feng Yu Hsiang to come to the aid of the Nanking army even at the most critical moments of the latter, when Sun Chuan Fang had succeeded for the time being in making himself master of almost the whole province of Kiangsu.

As regards Chang Tso Lin, his passivity in the course of the last few months was due to a lack of an understanding with Yen Si Shan. The Tupan (provincial ruler) of Shansi has remained neutral the whole time and conducted negotiations simultaneously with Moukden, Nanking and Feng Yu Hsiang. He nevertheless controlled with a portion of his troops the Peking-Hankow railway line south of Chengting. Under such conditions an attack by Chang Tso Lin on Honan could force Yen Si Shan into the camp of the enemies of the Moukden group. For this reason Chang Tso Lin did not for a long time decide to support Sun Chuan Fang by an advance against the South and by the occupation of the Lunghai railway between Chengchow and Hsüchow. The changed situation on the front between the provinces of Chili and Honan could not however last for any length of time.

The attack commenced in the last few days by Sun Chuan Fang on the South of Hsüchow demanded urgent help on the part of the other militarists of North China. Chang Tso Lin was compelled to proceed to concentrate his forces in Chengting, whereby he obviously calculated on confronting Yen Si Shan with an accomplished fact and had decided not to halt even at the possibility of a collision with the latter. This regrouping of the Moukden troops brought with it a final understanding between Yen Si Shan and Feng Yu Hsiang and furnished a pretext for declaring war on Chang Tso Lin.

The military operations were commenced by the Shansi troops simultaneously in two directions. The main forces of

Yen Si Shan are attacking Paoting whereby they protect Taiyuan, the capital town of Shansi, and threaten the left flank of the Moukden troops. The auxiliary troops are operating on the Tatung—Kalgan—Nankow—Peking railway.

The plan of campaign of Yen Si Shan obviously provides for active actions by Feng Yu Hsiang from the Northern most corner of the province of Honan in the direction of the capital of the province of Chili, Tsinan. An attack by Feng Yu Hsiang in this direction would have as its chief aim to secure the right flank of the Shansi troops from an attack by Chang Tsun Chang. It would have at the same time a tremendous importance for the success of the Nanking troops in the province of Kiangsu, as it threatens the army of Sun Chuan Fang in the rear.

The declaration of war by Yen Si Shan on Moukden is of course determined by a previous understanding between him and Feng Yu Hsiang. The army of Yen Si Shan is far inferior in numbers, weapons and preparedness to the armed forces of the Moukden group. Yen Si Shan would hardly have decided to fight against Chang Tso Lin unless he had a strong ally.

It is therefore very probable that the new outbreak of war among the generals will divide the militarists into two camps. In the one there will be the whole of the northern groupings, consisting of Chang Tso Lin, Chang Tsun Chang and Sun Chuan Fang; in the other there will be Yen Si Shan, Feng Yu Hsiang and the Nanking government.

The attitude of the Wuhan group is still uncertain for the time being, as General Tan Chen Chi has already commenced aggressive action against Nanking, but is said at the same time to be conducting negotiations for the conclusion of an alliance with Feng Yu Hsiang, and Yen Si Shan. In any event the further development of operations in North China, and hence also the fate of Peking will depend to a considerable extent on the attitude of Tan Chen Chi.

### Appeal of the Workers Federation of China.

Shanghai, 3rd October 1927.

The "Pan-Pacific Worker" the organ of the Workers League of the countries of the Pacific, publishes an appeal of the Workers Federation of China containing the programme, the activity and the fight of the Federation in the present critical situation.

After describing the heroic struggle of the workers of China for the aims of the national revolution, the appeal declares that the united front of the national revolution was broken, the trade unions dissolved, the workers persecuted by the militarists, the leaders of the trade unions arrested and executed, fascist bands hostile to the workers formed, the working class press prohibited and strikes forbidden, thus taking away from the workers the possibility of obtaining an increase of their hunger wages or of defending themselves against the constant increase of prices and against capitalist exploitation.

The appeal gives reasons why the Workers Federation of China, which still has 2,900,000 members, has always supported the Communist Party of China and will continue to do so. "In the critical moments of the struggle the Communist Party was always to be found upon the side of the workers."

The appeal declares that despite the oppressive measures of the government, the workers will defend their organisation, for "the forces of the working class of China are still undestroyed and the Workers Federation is still alive and will continue its activity in the working class movement".

The appeal calls upon the people of China to form a revolutionary government and to support the Workers Federation and its executive. The appeal concludes with a call for the establishment of the international unity of the workers of all countries.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Bordeaux Congress of the C. G. T. U. and its Significance.

By J. Berlioz (Paris).

There can be no doubt that the 4th Congress of the C. G. T. U., held from September 19th to 24th, was a milestone in the history of the labour movement in France. The Congress hinged on one main problem, viz., how to create mass trade unions capable of working with the most suitable means for the overthrow of the present order.

In France there have never been any mass trade unions. At the time when the old C. G. T. was yet undivided, i. e. in 1920 and 1921, it counted a maximum of 1,300,000 members. To-day the three leading trade-union centres, the revolutionary, the reformist, and the Christian, number together slightly more than one million members, despite the fact that there are 12 millions of workers in France.

That the C. G. T. U. should not yet have developed into a mass trade union organisation is in no inconsiderable degree attributable to the remnants of anarchist and syndicalist traditions. Before the war the trade-union movement in France was based on a backward economy of small industries.

The war completely transformed the economy of France, which has now become a country of great industries and concentrated capital. The trade-union movement, however, did not keep pace with this development, and the main lesson in regard to the Bordeaux Congress lies in the fact that it has almost completely rid itself of the inherited weaknesses of pure syndicalism and has placed itself on the standpoint of the present stage of evolution.

The composition of the Congress was a guarantee of its capability, for nine-tenths of the total of more than 600 delegates came from the factories and workshops, thus representing a broad basis of workers. Among these there were more than 50 women, numerous juveniles, foreign workers, and workers from the French colonies. Nor must it be overlooked that the Congress met at a time of the most violent capitalist persecution of the revolutionary movement. A number of the leading functionaries had been imprisoned and many active foreign trade-unionists had been expelled from France, while Algerian delegates had been prevented by the police from embarking. Comrade Monmousseau, one of the secretaries, had been released from prison only immediately before the Congress.

It was in such circumstances that the Congress did its work, and it was well done. The oppositional minority, grouped around the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet periodical of Pierre Monatte, were allowed plenty of scope to develop their standpoint. And this standpoint proved to be nothing else than the remnant of anarcho-syndicalism. Hence their assault on the formula, "Dictatorship of the Proletariat", on the collaboration of the C. G. T. U. with the Communist Party of France, on the inclusion of the C. G. T. U. secretaries in the leading bodies of the Communist Party; hence their fight against a centralisation around the national organisation of mutual aid, hence their pessimism, hence their belief in the firm stability of capitalism. This minority received a crushing answer at the hands of the Congress, which passed the executives report by 1995 votes to 60. In the course of the Congress, indeed, various oppositional delegates were even found to vote for certain resolutions of the majority. Outside the above-mentioned items, the opposition had no programme and no positive suggestions to put forward. No wonder their influence is nil.

The Congress furnished a thorough analysis of the present situation. It worked out the tasks with which the revolutionary trade union is confronted in view of the prospects of an industrial crisis and the attempts made to re-establish French imperialism. The C. G. T. U. recognised the two main

problems to be the danger of war and rationalisation. The resolution passed against imperialism and the danger of war characterises the threatening conflicts, brands the pseudo-pacifism of the reformists in their adherence to the League of Nations, and energetically advocates the active defence of the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution and for the support of the emancipatory movements in the colonies. It points out practical means of struggle, such as fraternisation with the soldiers, the strike of the key industries, and the boycott of means of transport. As regards rationalisation, which is just now beginning to be reintroduced into France, the C. G. T. U. declares that "capitalism is essentially incapable of realising any rational organisation of production." The C. G. T. U. therefore calls upon the workers to put forward their claims arising from the consequences of rationalisation, without any regard for the bourgeoisie and the capitalist crisis.

In the second place, the Congress discussed the ways and means by which to create the organisatory cadres destined to comprehend the broad masses of workers. To this end, it radically altered the structure of the trade unions, creating industrial-district unions based on the factory sections, and thereby taking capitalist concentration into account, which was not the case in the numerous professional associations hitherto in existence, since these were devoid of any intimate connection with the workers. The Congress, furthermore, drafted a project which is entirely new in the trade-union movement of France, that of a national mutual-aid fund, to operate in cases of sickness, unemployment, strikes, etc. Finally, the Congress discussed in detail the connection between the trade unions and the co-operatives and the necessity of strengthening and radicalising the latter. Here again the fundamental directive was that of concentration accompanied by a broadening of the trade-union basis. In other words, a plain breach with bad traditions.

In the third place the Congress set up the immediate demands of the day, as they result from an examination of the present situation. These demands must at the same time be the starting-point for gaining the sympathies of broad sections of the working class. 75 per cent. of the activity of the trade unions must be devoted to the struggle for better salaries and wages, for the eight-hour day, against unemployment and the sad plight of the unemployed, for social insurance, against oppression, etc.

The C. G. T. U. has set itself the task of gathering all those who are exploited into one class bloc. The reformists have hitherto constantly repudiated the suggestions of unity put forward by the C. G. T. U. At Bordeaux the latter again declared its maintenance of the tactics of unity; it is willing to enter the C. G. T. as a bloc upon the guarantee of freedom of opinion and of trade-union democracy. At the same time, however, it pointed, in view of the determined resistance of the Social-Democratic bureaucrats, to the only path really leading to a realisation of unity, i. e. that of energetic propaganda among the eleven millions of unorganised workers, realisation of a united front on all questions of the day without regard to tendencies, and support of the Left wing of the C. G. T.

The former leaders of the C. G. T. U., practically all of them Communists, were re-elected by 1486 votes to 35. A member of the minority will henceforth belong to the Executive Committee, which is not afraid of any discussion with the minority.

The significance of the Bordeaux Congress may be summed up as follows: It has improved our defences and worked out tactics which are better adapted to the development of capitalism; it marks the victory of the Leninist spirit in the French Labour movement.



## FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

### For a Leninist Regime in the Party.

(Leading Article of the "Pravda" of 1st October, 1927.)

The Moscow and Central Control Commissions established a fact, absolutely unprecedented in the history of our Party which guides the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. This fact has no equal to it. An anti-Party illegal typography was discovered printing secret Party and anti-Party Opposition documents for circulation, in spite of the repeated prohibitions by the Party. The 14 members of the Trotsky Opposition called to account by the Moscow Control Commission, are accused of "establishing jointly with non-Party bourgeois intellectuals an underground anti-Party organisation with an illegal typography to carry on activities towards the disruption of unity within the C. P. S. U. (b) and the formation of a new party". The fact that this work was carried on by Trotskyists jointly with bourgeois intellectuals, some of whom were found to be connected with avowedly anti-Soviet elements, is particularly striking.

The crime committed against the Party by these 14 Party members (12 of them have already been expelled by the C. C. C. and 2 were strictly censured and warned) is monstrous. By committing it, they placed themselves outside the Party. The Control Commissions only had to strike the balance of the crimes committed against the Party.

However, the organisation of an illegal printing press for the purpose of combating the Party, is the work not only of these 14 Trotskyists and their bourgeois intellectual confederates. It is the work of the entire Trotsky Opposition as a whole; and the leaders of the Opposition bear full and complete political responsibility for the deeds. They do not show any intentions to dodge responsibility. They defend the "clandestine" workers by every means. Moreover, three Opposition leaders, Preobrazhensky, Serebriakov and Sharov openly declared, in a special document addressed to the C. C. that they are politically responsible for the affair and its organisers. Comrade Trotsky, the leader of the Opposition, exhibited his solidarity with the participants in the illegal printery at a Session of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. He openly praised their anti-Party disruptive work. Can there be any doubt that the Party will call the leaders to account?

The Opposition declares that it combats the existing "Party regime". The question arises; against what regime is the Opposition fighting, and by whom has that regime been established? There can be no doubt that it is combating the "regime" which has been established in the Party under Lenin and under Lenin's leadership. We should recall Trotsky's Opposition activities in October 1923. In the well-known declaration of 46, signed by the Trotskyists, E. Preobrazhensky, L. Serebriakov, G. Piatakov, M. Alsky, E. L. Smirnov and others, submitted to the Polit-Bureau of the C. C. on October 15th 1923, it was said:

"The regime established in the Party is absolutely unbearable. It kills the self-activity of the Party, substituting the Party by a selected bureaucratic apparatus, which acts well in normal times but which inevitably shows defects at critical moments, and which threatens to prove absolutely inefficient in the coming serious events. The existing situation may be explained by the fact that the regime of factional dictatorship established within the Party since the Tenth Congress, has outlived its usefulness."

Comrade Trotsky, in his declaration "to the Members of the C. C. and C. C. C.", submitted one week before the declaration of the 46 (October 8th 1923), expressed the same idea only more hypocritically and jesuitically:

"The regime which in the main developed even prior to the Twelfth Congress, and was finally established and consolidated after it, is much farther away from workers' democracy than the regime of the most severe periods of War Communism".

Thus there can be no doubt as to against which and whose regime the Opposition declared war and is fighting within our Party. It is the regime established by Lenin and under Lenin's leadership.

The X. Party Congress took place in 1921. It was a Congress at which the Party, under Lenin's leadership, smashed the Trotsky Opposition on the Trade Union question, and categorically prohibited factions within the Party. The regime "which in the main developed even prior to the Twelfth Congress", as Comrade Trotsky puts it, is Lenin's regime, because "prior to the Twelfth Congress", we had the Eleventh and the Tenth Congresses, which worked under Lenin's guidance, and at which this very "Party regime" was formally established, and which was and is so "unbearable" for the Trotskyist Opposition.

Thus it is precisely "Lenin's regime" that was characterised by the Opposition as a "regime of factional dictatorship within the Party". After this, it is easy to determine the real value of the present false alarm of the Opposition about the "dictatorship of the majority fraction" within the Party. In reality, the slander about "fractional dictatorship", both under Lenin and after, served and still serves as a simple covering of the anti-Leninist struggle carried on by the Trotskyists.

What does the "horror" in the regime consist of which is so hated by the Opposition? It consists of the fact that by enacting extensive internal democracy, the Party firmly prohibits the existence of any kind of factions. Here is what the decision of the Tenth Party Congress, written by Lenin, and which calls forth such vituperation on the part of the Trotskyist Opposition about the regime, says:

"The Congress prescribes the immediate dissolution of all groups, without exception, which have been formed around various platforms, and authorises all organisations to follow closely and see to it that there should be no factional activity. The infringement of this Congress decision entails the unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party.

In order to realise strict discipline within the Party, and in all Soviet activity, and to attain the highest unity by liquidating all factionalism, the Congress authorises the C. C. to apply in all cases of violation of discipline or degeneration, or admission of factionalism, all measures of Party punishment, even to the extent of expulsion, and in respect to members of the C. C., reducing them from membership to candidacy, and as an extreme measure, even expulsion from the Party." (§§ 6 and 7 from the Unity Resolution, Russian Edition.)

The Trotskyist faction wanted in 1923 the abolition precisely of this decision of the Tenth Congress. It insisted on an amendment to the Draft Resolution of the Polit-Bureau, to permit "factions and groups" within the Party.

Why does the Party side with Lenin on the point of unconditional inadmissibility of factions within the Party which is guiding the Proletarian Dictatorship in the U. S. S. R.? An answer to this question is given by the same Unity Resolution of the Tenth Congress, written by Lenin which says:

"It is necessary that all conscious workers should clearly realise the harm and inadmissibility of any kind of factionalism, which inevitably leads to the weakening of our joint work and to more vigorous repeated attempts on the part of those enemies which came into the ruling Party under false colours to deepen the division and to utilise it for counter-revolutionary purposes..."

"These enemies, having realised the hopelessness of counter-revolution under the open white guard banner, exert now all their efforts in order to help the counter-revolution, utilising the divergencies within the R. C. P., in one way or another, by handing over the Government to political groups which, according to outward appearances, are more in favour of recognition of the soviet government. Our propaganda must make clear also the experience of former revolutions when the counter-revolution supported the petty-bourgeois groups, which were most closely related to the extreme revolutionary parties in order to shatter and overthrow the revolutionary dictatorship, thus opening the road for the further complete victory of the counter-revolutionary capitalists and landlords." (§§ 2 and 3.)

Factionalism in the ruling Party endangers the Proletarian Dictatorship. Not so very long ago, Kamenev and Zinoviev, the present followers of Trotzky, understood this perfectly well. Factions within the C. P. S. U. are used by a "third factor", outside the Party, consisting of anti-Soviet elements hostile to the proletariat, and inspired by the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, in its own interests. Following Lenin, the Party warned the Opposition about this on many occasions, but without success. The Opposition slid from step to step and has finally reached such a depth that anti-Soviet elements begin to use it, not only politically, but even organisationally, establishing contact with it through non-Party bourgeois intellectuals.

The August Joint Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C. this year, gave a "final warning" to the Opposition, demanding the abandonment of factional activity. The Opposition itself made a statement in which it declared its readiness "to do absolutely everything towards the liquidation of all factional elements". It turned out that the Opposition once again deceived the Party as it did before by giving the statement of October 16th last year in which it was said:

"We declare that we resolutely abandon the factional methods of defending our views in view of the danger that these methods constitute to Party unity, and we call upon all Comrades, who hold our views, to do likewise."

In face of the new and unprecedented accentuation of factional struggle on the part of the Opposition, in face of the new deception of the Party by the Opposition, the Executive Committee of the Communist International was compelled to take measures of an organisational character against Comrade Trotzky, as the leader of the Opposition. The Presidium of the E. C. C. I., jointly with the International Control Commission, decided to expel Trotzky and Vuyovitch from the E. C. C. I. By this decision, the E. C. C. I. properly appraised the disruptive "work" of the Opposition which, on the one hand, utilises Hindenburg's "freedom" of the press in Germany to slander the Comintern and the U. S. S. R. in the columns of Maslow's and Ruth Fischer's yellow sheet, and on the other hand, organises underground printing presses in the U. S. S. R., with the purpose of organising a split in the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern, helping thereby the enemies of the Dictatorship of the Working Class.

The Party will welcome unanimously the decision of the E. C. C. I. to expel the disruptors. People who take the liberty to do what is essentially incompatible with ordinary membership of a Party affiliated to the Communist International, can at any rate not remain any longer in the leading organs of the Comintern.

Our Party was founded, trained and nursed by Lenin. Lenin made the statutes of our Party. Lenin wrote the decisions of the X. Congress concerning the expulsion of factionalists from our Party. Lenin established our Party regime, the basis of which established itself many years before Trotzky was accepted to our Party, they were established not accidentally, but in a fierce struggle of the Party against Menshevism and particularly against Trotzkyism.

The Party will allow no one to change Lenin's regime. No one can come into our Party with his "own statutes". Those whom "Lenin's shoe" pinches should make their choice: they should either continue their disruptive work against the Bolshevik Party and thereby forfeit their right to be called Bolsheviks, or remain in the Party and unconditionally submit to all Party decisions and the decisions of its leading organs and immediately stop all factional activity.

They must make this choice.

## The Lenin Party on the Opposition.

In the recent numbers of Soviet newspapers, Party organisations have been expressing their views in connection with the decisions of the control organs of the C. P. S. U. (b) re the illegal printing press of the Trotzkyite Opposition.

The abominable disruptive activity of the Opposition caused — as was to be expected — an outburst of indignation in Party ranks. All Party organisations without exception welcome the decision of the C. C. C. to expel the fraction-mongers from the Party, and insist on the adoption of very strict measures against the ideological inspirers and leaders of underground methods of struggle against the Party.

Whom does the Opposition help? Does it help the Party and the working class to strengthen the defence of the country and to build up a socialist order, or does it help the enemies of the working class, all those to whom proletarian dictatorship is an abomination? This is mainly the question which the workers are asking and to which they give themselves the reply:

"The Opposition has again deceived the Party, through its counter-revolutionary methods of fractionism it is working against the Leninist unity of the Party. It is organising an underground press, is spreading anti-Party literature and is duplicating and distributing secret Party documents. This is an open attack on proletarian dictatorship."

The resolution of the nucleus of one of the Moscow tramway depots contains the following statement:

"In its infringement of Leninist traditions, the Opposition has transgressed all limits. A handful of former leaders, dissociated from the workers and from Communism, are impudently infringing not only the decisions of the Party, but also the promises they themselves made to the Party. We demand the expulsion of the traitors to Leninism from the Party."

The resolution of the Communists of the chief workshops of the Moscow-Kursk railway is to the same effect.

The resolution of the Communists on the staff of the Leningrad engineering works "Krasny Putilovetz" contains the following statement:

"The organisation of an underground printing press by the Opposition is not only an anti-Party act infringing elementary Party discipline, it is an act by which only counter-revolution can profit. The Communists of the "Krasny Putilovetz" consider the decision of the Control Commission re expulsion of these fraction mongers from the Party correct and declare: 'Those who take upon themselves the political responsibility for such fractional work deserve to be immediately expelled from the Party. There is no room in the Party for those who disorganise its ranks and endeavour to undermine its authority.'"

Similar resolutions have been passed by Communists employed in a number of other works.

## The Y. C. I. Approves the Decision of the C. P. S. U. on the Factional Disruptive Work of the Trotzkyist Opposition.

Moscow, 3rd October 1927.

The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International has adopted a resolution unanimously declaring that the Y. C. I. is in agreement with the decision of the Presidium of the E. C. of the C. I. and the International Control Commission concerning the expulsion of Comrades Trotzky and Vuyovitch from the E. C. of the C. I. The resolution reads:

"The Presidium of the Young Communist International considers it necessary to declare that Comrade Vuyovitch, who was expelled from the E. C. of the Y. C. I. for fractional activity by the plenary session of the E. C. of the Y. C. I. in November/December 1926, has for a long time no longer represented the standpoint of the Y. C. I. in the E. C. of the C. I. although the Y. C. I. had proposed him as a candidate for the E. C. of the C. I. at the World Congress. His participation in the work of the Opposition and his flagrant and persistent breaches of discipline as expressed in his refusal to subordinate himself in the question of his activity to the decisions of the Central Committee of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R., proves that Comrade Vuyovitch has taken up a position incompatible with the bolshevist tradition of the Young Communist International and that he has not justified the confidence placed in him by the young communists of all countries.

The Presidium of the Y. C. I., in which Comrade Vuyovitch has not a single supporter, will continue to fight against the disruptors and for the unity of the communist ranks as this was taught by Lenin.

## Resolution of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U on the Factional Disruptive Work of the Trotzkyist Opposition.

The V. Plenum of the Moscow Committee places on record a sharp factional struggle carried on by the Trotzkyist Opposition against the Party and against the C. C. such as has never been before in the history of the Bolshevik Party. It has recently expressed itself in:

1. The drawing up and circulation of a special platform which essentially constitutes a new programme for a new Party. 2. The organisation of an illegal printing press together with bourgeois intellectuals and the setting up of special organisation centres.

3. The impertinent statement of Trotzky that the discipline of the Bolshevik Party is not binding upon him and its repetition by all representatives of the Opposition that they will not submit to the decision of the Central Committee against the circulation of the platform and that they would continue to circulate it.

4. The impertinent speeches on the part of representatives of the Opposition in the nuclei and outside of the Party slandering the leading Party centres and the individual Party leaders.

All these facts clearly show that the Opposition has taken the course of violation of the organisational principles of the Bolshevik Party and organisation of a new, Trotzkyist Party.

The main point in the disruptive work of the Opposition at the present time is that directed towards the disruption of the businesslike preparation of the Party Congress and the discrediting beforehand of its representatives and thus also its decisions.

The Plenum of the Moscow Committee fully and entirely approves of the decision of the E. C. C. I. re expulsion of Trotzky and Vuyovitch from the E. C. C. I. for their disruptive work within the C. P. S. U.

The Plenum of the Moscow Committee approves of and fully supports the decision of the M. C. C. and C. C. C. re the expulsion of the factionalist disrupters from the Party for disorganising activities.

The Plenum of the Moscow Committee fully and entirely approves of and supports the policy and measures of the Central Committee directed towards the guaranteeing of a Party, Bolshevik and businesslike preparation of the XV. Congress, the firm action in stopping the factional activity of the Trotzkyist Opposition and the insuring of Leninist unity within the ranks of the Party.

The Plenum of the Moscow Committee calls upon the entire Moscow organisation to resist the factional disruptive work of the Oppositionists in a Bolshevik manner and to continue on the basis of Leninist principles the preparation of district, uyezd, and the sixteenth gubernia conferences and XV. Party Congress.

**Long Live Leninist Unity in the Bolshevik Party!  
For the Bolshevik Preparation of the XV. Congress!**

## Unanimous Condemnation of the Disruptors.

The whole Party is indignant at the disorganising work of the Opposition.

All Organisations endorse the decision of the E. C. C. I. to expel Trotzky and Vuyovitch.

In Moscow, Leningrad and industrial centres of the Soviet Union, mass meetings of Party members and Emergency Bureau Sessions of leading Party organisations, have been held during the last few days. These meetings discussed the recent disruptive activities of the Opposition and the decision of the C. C. C. to expel the Moscow factionists.

In many nuclei, recent followers of the Opposition, on learning about the disruptive "work" of the leaders of the

Opposition, declared that they were leaving the Opposition. Those who had signed the well-known declaration of the "83" declared that they were withdrawing their signatures, were acknowledging the errors which they had committed and were considering all the decisions of the C. C. binding for themselves.

"The Opposition has become the centre of attraction for counter-revolutionary elements and what is more — these elements have found defenders in the person of the Opposition. All this shows that the Opposition has reached the limit. It has even transgressed the limit. Henceforth, the work of the Opposition leads straight to counter-revolution." (Nucleus of the Trokhgornaya Manufactura, Moscow.)

"By adopting forms of struggle against the Party such as the organisation of an illegal printing press, and distribution of its libellous documents through elements alien to the Party, the Opposition is clearly on the way to counter-revolution."

This being the view which the nucleus of the State Brake Works takes of the "work" of the Opposition, it declares:

"That the Opposition has received enough warnings from the Party and that it (the nucleus) demands of the leading organs of the Party, the expulsion of the fractionists who have exceeded all bounds."

The special meeting of the Communists of the Moscow Goods Station look upon the recent tactics of the Opposition as:

"An open action against the Party as a whole. We protest emphatically against the loose and disgusting attacks of the leaders of the Opposition on the C. C. and its General Secretary, Comrade Stalin, who has the confidence of the Party and whose authority in it is unshakable. This confidence cannot be shaken by the leaders of the Opposition blinded as they are by fractional animosity."

In its resolution, the Polit-Bureau of the C. C. and Presidium of the C. C. C. of the C. P. of Ukraine expresses:

"Indignation at the recent actions of the Opposition which are impudent beyond all bounds (organisation of an illegal printing press, Trotzky's speech in the E. C. C. I., drawing non-party bourgeois intellectuals into the struggle against the Party).

In spite of the promise made at the July Plenum of the C. C. to cease fractional disruptive work, the Opposition continues this work, which is directed towards the formation of another Party.

The leaders of the Opposition take on themselves the responsibility for the work of their followers who have gone the length of setting up printing presses, who produce and disseminate secret Party and anti-Party documents, and collaborate with anti-Soviet elements. The Polit-Bureau and Presidium declare that the Ukrainian Party Organisation will rally even more than before around the Leninist C. C. and will give it full support in the decisive struggle against the criminal, disintegrating actions of the Trotzkyite Opposition."

The news of the unheard of disruptive activities of the Opposition roused great indignation among the Party masses in the factories and works of Tver. The resolution of the Communist Gubernia Organisation in Tver contains the following statement:

"The organisation of an illegal printing press by the Opposition together with non-Party bourgeois intellectuals is a fact hitherto unheard of in the history of our Party. The meeting considers that this shameful fact is in the nature of an attempt to sabotage a businesslike preparation of the Fifteenth Congress of the Party, an attempt to form another party. We protest emphatically against such actions of the united Opposition and we demand that measures be taken in regard to the fractionists which will guarantee normal Party work. This meeting of active Communist workers impresses the C. C. and C. C. C. with the necessity of expelling from the Party Comrades Preobrazhensky, Sharov and Serebriakov, who took upon themselves the political responsibility for the organisation of an illegal printing press. The Tver body of active Communist

workers also fully endorses the decisions of the E. C. C. I. and C. C. C. re the expulsion from the E. C. C. I. the Opposition leaders, Comrades Trotzky and Vuyovitch and expresses the confident hope that the forthcoming Party Congress will put an end to the Opposition once and for all, and will not shrink from expelling Opposition leaders from the Party."

All the resolutions received from bodies of Party workers in Moscow, Leningrad and the provinces, speak of the great indignation aroused in the rank and file of the Party by the disruptive actions of the Opposition, which has even infringed and made light of its own recent promise given to the Party at the last Plenum of the C. C., and welcome the decisions of the C. C. C., the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. and E. C. C.

It is also declared in all the resolutions that the rank and file of the Party will no longer permit anyone to infringe the unity of the Party and Leninist discipline within it, and will not tolerate the sabotage of the preparations for the Fifteenth Congress of the Party. All the resolutions express confidence in the Leninist Central Committee and promise whole-hearted support in the struggle against renegades, who are parting company with the Party and Leninism.

### **The Sheffield District Conference of the C. P. G. B. for the Disciplinary Measures against the Opposition Leaders.**

Moscow, 6th October 1927.

The Secretariat of the E. C. of the C. I. has received a telegram from the Sheffield District Conference of the Communist Party of Great Britain unanimously approving of the disciplinary measures taken against the leaders of the Opposition and demanding that speedy organisational measures be taken against the Opposition, in particular against Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev, in order to further the preparation of the struggle against the danger of war and to assist the work of socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

## **TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION**

### **The Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution — one of the most Important Factors for Mobilising the Workers against Imperialism.**

Moscow, 8th September 1927.

The "Pravda" discusses the reports concerning the preparations being made by the workers of all countries to convert the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution into a world celebration of the international working class. It points to the great interest of the working class in the Soviet Union to organise the celebrations with the participation of workers delegations from other countries. The interest of the working class of all countries in the question of sending delegations to the October celebrations is greater than ever before. However, the sending of delegations is only a part of the general October campaign, for the various workers delegations are in favour of making the October celebrations the commencement of the realisation and the strengthening of the unity of the workers of other countries, in particular of Germany and France, and Peasants State with the feelings of greatest friendliness.

The initiative for the holding of a joint conference of all workers delegations in the capital of the Soviet Union came from the ranks of the revolutionary proletariat in Great Britain, and this idea was taken up with great enthusiasm by the workers of other countries, in particular of Germany and France. The Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions has received a telegram from the Secretariat of the London October Committee

informing it that the British National Committee for the organisation of a workers delegation to the October celebrations has been informed by the French, Belgian, German and Austrian delegations that they are in agreement with the proposal to hold a joint conference of the delegations in the Soviet Union with a view to discussing the measures to be taken to defend the Soviet Union and against the danger of war. The British National Committee asks if the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions approves of this proposal and whether it is prepared to undertake the necessary preparations for the organisation of this conference. In its answering telegram the Central Council declares itself in favour of the proposal of the British delegation and that it is prepared to assist in the organisation of the conference.

The "Pravda" contrasts the efforts of British imperialism to isolate the Soviet Union and to prepare a war against it with the movement commenced by the October Committees of the five countries. In France, India, China, Belgium, Germany, Persia, everywhere, emissaries of British imperialism are at work to forge plots against the first Socialist Workers Republic. At the same time however, there are efforts in the British capital to organise the real friends and defenders of the first workers Republic. Although the telegram of the London October Committee only mentions one point for the agenda of the proposed conference, it is to be seen from the British working class press that the Committee intends at the joint conference of the workers delegations to raise not only the question of the danger of war, but also the results of the creative work of the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union in the last ten years.

There are efforts in progress to unite the delegations of the various organisations in the various countries. Thus today the delegations of the various workers and peasants organisations of France have addressed a request to the soviet organisations which had invited them, to make it possible for them to form a joint delegation. They also requested that a soviet steamer be placed at their disposal. The British and German delegations wish to undertake the journey to the Soviet Union as a joint international delegation. The tenth anniversary of the Soviet Union will be celebrated not only in the Soviet Union but in all other countries. The soviet organisations which sent out the invitations have also been invited to take part in the celebrations in the capitalist countries. The tenth anniversary of the October Revolution will thus be made an important factor for the mobilisation of the working and peasant masses for the struggle against the imperialist coalition which is at present carrying on war against revolutionary China and which is preparing a new war against the Soviet Union.

## **THE WHITE TERROR**

### **A New Murder is Being Prepared**

By B. Smeral.

For some weeks past a case which could easily develop to similar serious consequences as the bestial murder of Sacco and Vanzetti in America, has aroused the greatest indignation among the broad masses of Czechoslovakia. The life of the well-known leader of the Roumanian Labour movement, Comrade Köblös (Balthasar) is threatened. The Czechoslovakian government wishes to render the Roumanian hangmen positive help and make possible the murder. Many signs lead one to the conclusion that the Czechish government is acting under English influence.

Comrade Köblös was arrested on the 19th of August 1927 on Czechoslovakian soil near the Roumanian frontier, just as he was about to cross the frontier into Roumania without a passport. He was conveyed to the police prison of the town of Berehodo. Comrade Balthasar has been for many years a tried leader of the trade union movement in Roumania and is also a member of the Central Committee of the C. P. of Roumania. The Roumanian courts condemned him in his absence to ten years hard labour on account of participation in the Communist movement. The Roumanian Siguranza who a year ago shot the Communist leader, Comrade Tkachenko, "while trying to escape", after having mishandled him in the most fearful manner, who tortured Boris Stefanov for more than year in their prisons, want also to get Comrade Balthasar out of the way



at any price. They have placed a sum of 100,000 Lei on his head.

According to the bourgeois law obtaining in Czechoslovakia Comrade Balthasar cannot be delivered over to Roumania as a political prisoner. There are, however, powerful forces at work in order, in this case, to deliver over the victim.

Some days after the arrest, some automobiles in which were Roumanian fascists and Siguranza people, entered Czechoslovakian territory. They demanded from the governor of the prison in Berehodo — quite simply and as private people — that he hand over to them Comrade Köblös. At the same time each one of them asked for a written confirmation that he was the first to arrive. This monstrous proceeding is to be explained by the enticing prize of 100,000 Lei. Two days later there came to Berehodo the representative of the Roumanian Siguranza, Hershkovitz, and with him a group of agents from Satu Mare.

On the 4th of September there arrived at the court of Berehodo an official communication from the Siguranza of Satu Mare, demanding the extradition of Comrade Balthasar on account of "common crimes", namely on account of "Communism, murder and robbery". At the same time there was asked the name of the official who arrested Comrade Balthasar (this again was on account of the 100,000 Leis placed on the head of Comrade Balthasar). On the 13th September there came in a surprising manner a new request for the extradition of Comrade Balthasar from the Austrian government, as Comrade Balthasar was wanted on account of acts of violence. From the circumstance that Austria has hastened to exert pressure on the Czechoslovakian government in order to deal with Comrade Köblös as a common criminal, one can conclude that the influence of the English wirepullers of the international counter-revolution is at work.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia a broad protest movement is proceeding among the working population in the towns and also in the villages against the government's intention to deliver over Comrade Köblös. This movement has been joined by numerous intellectuals as well as by a number of local organisations of the reformist trade unions. An eminent French woman lawyer has arrived in Prague from Paris as the representative of the "League for the Defence of the Victims of the White Terror in the Balkans", of which Henri Barbusse is the President. She has endeavoured to interview President Masaryk on behalf of Comrade Köblös. But it seems that the influences at work demanding the extradition of Comrade Balthasar are too strong. The bourgeois press is continuing its incitement. The legal mass protest demonstration called by the Communist Party in Prague was forbidden by the police, just as happened in the case of Sacco and Vanzetti.

Comrade Balthasar himself went on hunger strike on the 5th September. The decision regarding his fate is to be made in these days. This new crime of the international counter-revolution must be frustrated at the last moment by powerful protest demonstrations on an international scale.

## Persecution of the Labour Movement in Cuba.

By Korsunsky.

The Republic of Cuba, a large group of islands belonging to the Antilles, is independent in name only. In reality it is a colony of the United States, from which it is only a six-hour steamer-passage distant. Immediately after its liberation from Spain in 1898 it fell into the claws of the United States, which forced into its constitution the Platt Supplementary Clause (named after the man who drafted it), whereby the young republic was compelled to permit the United States to use its two best harbours as naval bases and to agree to bring its foreign policy and even its home policy into consonance with that of the United States.

The bourgeoisie, incapable of managing the economic life of the island, allowed the immense natural wealth of the country gradually to pass into the hands of the capitalists of the United

States. The Yankee imperialists are in control of the customs policy, the finances, the agriculture and the industry of Cuba. The productive power of the country is exploited in conformity with the interests of the capitalists of the United States: coffee, formerly the basis of Cuba's wealth, has ceased to be planted since the United States gained predominance; the manufacture of the famous Havana cigars has fallen off, because New York so desires. Thousands of workers are exposed to misery. Everything is controlled through the production of sugar, which is in the hands of two big trusts in the United States, the Cuba Cane Sugar Corporation and the General Sugar Co. The Government of Cuba, under the presidency of General Maciado, a creature of the sugar planters and of Wall Street, obeys punctiliously the orders of the Yankee imperialists.

At the beginning of 1927 the trade-union movement of Cuba was the object of vehement persecution on the part of the Government. In 1925 there had taken place two trade-union congresses, which had exercised strong influence upon the Labour movement of the country. The trade-union congress of February 1925 had resolved in principle to create a National Trade-Union Federation, the foundation congress of which actually took place in August. The Trade-Union Federation, which united about 200,000 workers, did not join any trade-union international, though it sympathised with the Red International of Labour Unions. Persecution very soon began. Trade-union leaders were arrested, the textile-workers union and other organisations were dissolved. The activity of the sections of the Anti-Imperialist League and of the Communist Party, both of which were also founded in the year 1925, and a big strike formed the pretext for strengthening the offensive. The Communist Party of Cuba was forced into illegality. The leader of the railwaymen of the northern provinces, Enrico Verona, and other active labour leaders were assassinated.

The year 1926, too, was characterised by Terror. The secretary of the Trades Council of the capital town, Havana, Alfred Lopez, "disappeared" on July 20th, 1926, which means that he was thrown into the sea by the police.

In spite of these persecutions, the Cuban Labour movement did not abandon the principle of class-war. Reformism could keep a foothold for but a short time in the national federations of the railwaymen and the electricians.

In Spring, 1927, the Government tried with the help of venal leaders to create a trade-union federation standing for peace between capital and labour, but this was impossible on account of the resistance of the workers.

On March 19th, 1927, the newly-elected executive under the chairmanship of the general secretary, Nicolas Nuniesco, conducted a campaign for the unification of the trade unions and for an amnesty for workers under arrest. The movement gained hearty support from the working masses, a fact which found marked expression during the May celebration. On June 19th there was a conference of the trade-unions of Havana, which accepted a proposal for the creation of a new Trades Council.

A fresh wave of White Terror set in against the successful campaigns, especially when the working masses under the leadership of the illegal Communist Party of Cuba opposed the re-election of Maciado as president for a further five years. A large number of trade-union leaders, of whom the majority were not Communists, were immediately arrested. The trade unions were made impossible and the Labour journals were suppressed.

The reprisals have become more rigorous during the course of the summer. The chairman and the secretary of the Trades Council of Havana, the assistant to the general secretary of the National Trade-Union Federation and numerous other trade-union functionaries languish in jail.

In consequence of these events the work of uniting the trade-unions has become quite impossible for the present. The conference of the trade unions of Havana, which was arranged for July 31st, could not be held.

The working class of Cuba appeal to the trade unions of other countries for a campaign against the persecutions to which the trade-union movement of Cuba, a country suffering under the yoke of the United States, is exposed. The C. G. T. U. has already handed to the Cuban legation in Paris an energetic protest.



# TEN YEARS AGO

## The Insurrection in Tashkent Crushed.

Petrograd, 11th October (P. T. A.) The strike in Tashkent has been stopped and the state of siege abolished. Meetings are forbidden. The government has set up an investigation commission; those guilty of the insurrection will be handed over to a military court.

### Bolshevist Majority in the Soviet of Saratov.

Petrograd, 13th October. "Rabotchy Puti" writes: Some days ago a solemn meeting of the newly elected Soviet of workers and soldiers' deputies in Saratov took place; the new Soviet consists of: 300 Bolsheviks, 90 S. Rs. and 53 Mensheviks. The Executive Committee consists of 18 Bolsheviks, 8 S. Rs. and 4 Mensheviks.

### The Central Executive Committee of the Soviets against the Convocation of the Soviet Congress.

Petrograd, 14th October. In the newspaper "Golos Soldata" (Voice of the Soldier), the organ of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, there has appeared an article entitled "The Soviet Congress" which takes an attitude against the convocation of the Congress.

### The Working Masses Stream into the Trade Unions.

Petrograd, 14th October. According to statements of the Minister for Labour there existed on the 1st October in Petrograd 34 trade unions comprising 502,839 members, of whom 432,086 (86%) are organised in 14 big trade unions and 70,753 members (14%) in 20 smaller unions.

### BEFORE THE STORM.

#### Revolutionary Peasants' Risings in the whole Country.

Petrograd, 20th October. ("Times") One of the most disturbing symptoms is the growth of anarchy. The news from the province becomes continually worse; the peasants are not only taking possession of the land and soil, but also of the houses and cattle of the landowners . . . . .

#### Punitive Expeditions against the Insurgent Peasants.

Petrograd, 16th October. ("Rabotchy Puti") Everybody is now speaking of the food crisis in the cities. The spectre of starvation is stalking through the cities. But nobody will admit that starvation is also prevailing in the country. Nobody will understand that most of the "peasant disturbances" and "pogroms" are the result of starvation.

A peasant writes as follows on the disturbances in Koslov, Tambov and Kiev:

"I ask you to explain to us "ignorant peasants" whence do these pogroms come? You believe that they are the work of vagrants and drunken hooligans? You are greatly mistaken. These are not vagrants and hooligans but men driven by starvation . . . . . With us, for example, there are five pounds of flour per head per month. Just imagine our situation. How can one live under such conditions? . . . . . Those who make these pogroms are not drunk with wine, they are driven crazy from hunger."

The bourgeois press ("Dni", "Russkaya Volya") talks of the wealth of the village, the superfluity of the peasants etc. Meanwhile the facts speak of starvation and misery. The situation of the peasants is becoming more and more difficult, because the Kerensky-Konovalov government has nothing for the peasants but punitive expeditions. The winter is fraught with new miseries for the peasants. The same peasant writes:

"It will soon be winter, the rivers freeze, then we must die of starvation. The railway station is far. We go in the street in search of bread. Whatever you may call us, we are forced by hunger to do this".

That is the significant report of a peasant.

The social revolutionary and menshevist compromisers are talking of coalition which will save everything. Now we have got the coalition government, and where is salvation?

What can it give to the starving peasants but punitive expeditions?

Do the compromisers feel that this simple letter of the peasant means the death sentence of their coalition swindle?

### Critical Situation at the Front.

Petrograd, 19th October. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency). "Novoye Vremye" reports: On the 16th October there began the evacuation of Reval as a result of the dangerous situation created by the landing of German troops. The greater portion of the inhabitants are leaving the town and proceeding to the interior of Russia.

### The Soldiers at the Front Want Peace.

Petrograd, 14th October. A meeting of soldiers and workers in Rostov on Don and several soldiers' meetings (61st Siberian artillery regiment etc.) adopted resolutions demanding immediate peace.

### Demobilisation as a Result of Food Difficulties.

Petrograd, 14th October. In view of the enormous difficulties in connection with food supplies for the army, the Minister for War decided to demobilise the men of 1895 and 1896 groups. In addition to this furlough is granted from five to eight weeks.

### The Factory Councils demand Revolutionary Solution of the Economic Crisis.

Petrograd, 14th October. The Factory Councils of a number of factories and the Central Council of the Factory Committees elected an organisation Bureau for calling the National Conference of the Factory Councils. The Conference is to take place in Petrograd on the 15th October. "The situation in the country" — the decision states — both economic and political, is worsening from day to day and has already become desperate. The economic ruin can only be combated by the exertion of all forces. The approaching All-Russian Soviet Congress must fulfil this task, and it is the duty of the revolutionary organs of economy and production to do their share in this general action".

## Marxism and Insurrection.

(Letter to the Central Committee of the R. S. D. L. P. (Bolsheviks), Sept. 1917.)

By N. Lenin.

One of the most malicious and widely spread distortions of Marxism practised by the predominant "socialist" parties, is the opportunist lie that preparation for revolt, the treatment of revolt at all as an art, is "Blanquism".

Bernstein, the leader of opportunism, was the first to acquire this sad celebrity by accusing Marxism of Blanquism, and the opportunists of to-day who write about Blanquism do not in reality "enrich" or render new, by one jot the miserable "ideas" of Bernstein.

What an idea, the Marxists are accused of Blanquism because they treat insurrection as an art! Can you imagine a more revolting distortion of the truth, since no Marxist will deny that it was Marx who expressed with the greatest determination, exactness and incontestability the view that insurrection is an art, when he said that insurrection ought to be dealt with as an art, that one must win the first success by fighting, and proceed from success to success without inter-

rupting the offensive against the enemy, making use of his confusion etc. etc.

In order that insurrection be successful, it must be based on conspiracy, it must rely on the progressive classes, not on a party. — This is the first point. Insurrection must be founded on the revolutionary impetus of the people. — This is the second point. Insurrection must be founded on a **turning point** in the history of growing revolution, when the activity of the advance guard is at its greatest, when indecision on the part of the enemies and in the ranks of the **weak, vacillating, undecided friends of revolution** reaches a culminating point. — This is the third point. These three conditions in the question of insurrection distinguish **Marxism from Blanquism**.

Where these three conditions exist, it would be treachery to the revolution to give up dealing with insurrection as an art.

In order to prove why precisely the moment in which we are now living is to be regarded as such in which the Party considers insurrection placed **unconditionally** on the agenda by the course of objective events and must be treated as an art — in order to prove this the best method to employ is perhaps that of comparison, and to compare the 3rd and 4th July with the September days.

On July the 3rd and 4th it was possible, without running counter to truth, to put the question as follows: it were better to seize the power, for our enemies will in any case accuse us of revolt and treat us as rebels. From this we cannot however draw the conclusion that it would have been necessary at that time to seize power, for at that time the objective conditions for the victory of insurrection were lacking.

1. We were not yet backed by the class which represents the vanguard of revolution.

We had not yet at our disposal the majority among the workers and soldiers in the capital cities. Now we are in the majority in both Soviets. It was brought about **exclusively** by the historical events of July and August, by the experience of the "settling" of the Bolsheviki and the experience of the Kornilov affair.

2. At that time the general revolutionary elan of the people was lacking. Now, after the Kornilov affair, it has come into being. The provinces and the seizure of power by the Soviets in many places bear witness to this fact.

3. There were no **vacillations** of a serious general political nature among our enemies and the vacillating petty bourgeoisie. At the present moment, there are tremendous vacillations; our chief enemy, the imperialism of the allied Powers and international imperialism is **oscillating** between war to a victorious finish and a separate peace against Russia. Our petty bourgeois democrats, who have evidently lost the majority among the people, have become frightfully undecided and have foregone the formation of a bloc, i. e. to enter into coalition with the Cadets.

4. A revolt on the third and fourth of July would therefore have been a mistake; we should not have succeeded in maintaining the power either physically or politically. It would have been physically impossible for, in spite of Petrograd being temporarily in our hands, our workers and soldiers were not willing to **fight** and to die for the possession of Petrograd. There was not yet the "fury", the seething hatred **both** against Kerensky and against Zeretelli and Chernov, our people had not yet been steeled by the experience of the persecutions against the Bolsheviki, in which the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviki took part.

On the 3rd and 4th of July we could not have maintained the power politically, for the provinces and the army were in a position to march on Petrograd **before** the Kornilov affair, and would have done so.

Now the picture is very different.

The majority of that class, the vanguard of the revolution, the vanguard of the people which is capable of carrying with it the masses, is now following us.

We are backed by the majority of the people, for Chernov's resignation is by no means the only, but the most evident, the crassest sign of the fact that the peasants **will receive no land** from the bloc of the Social Revolutionaries (nor from the Social Revolutionaries themselves). This is the cardinal point of the All-Russian character of the revolution.

We have the advantage of belonging to a party which is

sure of its position and direction, whereas the whole of imperialism and the whole bloc of the Mensheviki in common with the Social Revolutionaries is absolutely undecided.

We are **certain** of victory, for the people are almost driven to despair and it is our Party which has shown the people the certain way out, since, in the "Kornilov days", we convinced the whole people of the value of our leadership, then offered the Blockists a compromise and, after constant vacillations on their part, **received a refusal from them**.

It would be the greatest mistake were we to assume that our proposal of a compromise is **not yet rejected** because the Democratic Conference may still accept it. The compromise was offered by the **party to the parties**; it could not be offered in a different way. The parties rejected it. The Democratic Conference is merely a conference, nothing more. There is one fact which should not be forgotten; the **majority** of the revolutionary people, the utterly destitute and embittered peasantry is not represented in it. It is a conference of the minority of the people — this obvious truth should not be forgotten. It would be the greatest mistake on our part, the worst form of parliamentary idiocy were we to treat the Democratic Conference as though it were a parliament; even though it had proclaimed itself to be a parliament, the sovereign parliament of revolution, it would pass no decisions; decisions lie **outside its domain**, in the working class suburbs of Petrograd and Moscow.

All the objective preliminary conditions of a successful insurrection are in our favour. To us belong the extraordinary privileges of the situation, as **nothing** but our victorious rising will put an end to the vacillations which have been a torment to the people, those vacillations which are the most tormenting thing in the world. As **only our victorious revolt** would put an end to the playing with the idea of separate peace directed against the revolution — would put an end to it in that a more complete, just and less distant peace in favour of revolution would be offered.

Finally, our Party is the only one which, when it has carried off victory in the rising, can save Petrograd, for, if our offer of peace is rejected and we are not even granted an armistice, we shall turn into "defenders of the Fatherland", we shall place ourselves **at the head of the war parties**. We shall be the most "bellicose" party, we shall conduct war in a truly revolutionary way. We shall take from the capitalists all the bread and all the boots. We shall leave only breadcrumbs for them and make them wear bast shoes. We shall send all the bread and boots to the front.

And we shall then keep a firm hold of Petrograd.

In Russia, both the material and intellectual resources of a really revolutionary war are still immeasurably vast. There are 99 chances to 100 that the Germans will grant us at least an armistice and, obtaining an armistice at the present moment would in itself be equivalent to conquering the whole world.

\*

Having recognised how absolutely necessary it is for the workers of Petrograd and Moscow to rise in order to save the revolution and to protect Russia from being "by separate agreement" split up by the imperialists of the two coalitions, we must, firstly, adapt our political tactics in the Conference to the conditions of growing revolt and must, secondly, prove that it is not merely lip service if we profess our adherence to Marx' conception of insurrection being an art.

We must, without delay, weld together the faction of the Bolsheviki at the Conference without aiming at numerical strength, without hesitating to leave those who vacillate in the camp of the undecided; they are there more useful to the cause of revolution than in the camp of the determined and self-denying combatants.

We should draw up a short Bolshevik proclamation and lay the greatest stress on showing how inappropriate long speeches, in fact "speeches" altogether are; how necessary is immediate action for the salvation of revolution; how absolutely necessary is a complete breach with the bourgeoisie; a complete overthrow of the whole of the present Government, a complete break with those who are preparing for a "separate" dismemberment of Russia by the English and French imperialists; how urgent it is that the whole power should immediately be transferred into the hands of a **revolutionary Democracy which is headed by the revolutionary proletariat**.

Our declaration ought to be quite a brief and sharp formulation of these conclusions along with the draft programme: peace to the peoples, land to the peasants, confiscation of scandalous profits and restriction of the scandalous harm done to production by the capitalists.

The shorter, the sharper the declaration, the better will it be. Two very important points should be clearly emphasised in it; the people are tormented by the vacillations, they are kept on the rack by the indecision of the Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks; we finally break with these parties, for they have betrayed and sold revolution.

One thing more: by offering peace without annexations and by breaking at once with the allied imperialists and all other imperialists, we arrive at either being granted an armistice at once, or the whole revolutionary proletariat taking the side of the defenders of the country, which would make it possible for revolutionary democracy to carry on a really just, really revolutionary war under its leadership.

When we have made this proclamation and called upon all to decide and not to talk, to act and not to draw up resolutions, we must throw our whole fraction into the factories and barracks; there is its place, there is the source of life, the source of salvation for revolution, there is the driving force of the Democratic Conference.

It is there that we should develop our programme in glowing, passionate speeches and put the question as follows: the Conference must either accept our programme entirely or there will be insurrection. There is no third alternative. It is impossible to wait. Revolution will wear itself out.

By considering the problem in this way, by concentrating the whole fraction in the factories and barracks, we shall succeed in seizing the right moment for the commencement of the rising.

In order to deal with insurrection in a Marxist way, i. e. as an art, we must simultaneously, without losing a minute, organise a staff of insurgent troops, distribute the forces, place the most reliable regiments at the most important points, encircle the Alexander Theatre, occupy the fortress of St. Peter and Paul, arrest the General Staff and the Government and despatch against the "ensigns" and the "wild division" troops who are prepared to face death rather than let the enemy advance towards the centre of the town; we must mobilise our armed workers, call them up to the last desperate final battle, we must immediately take possession of the telegraph and telephone services, place our staff in the Central Telephone Office and set up telephonic communication between the latter and all the factories, regiments, all the points where armed fighting is going on etc.

All this is of course only said in order to illustrate to some extent how impossible it is at the present moment, to remain true to Marxism and to the revolution without treating insurrection as an art.

## Manifesto of the C. C. of the Bolsheviks of October 13th 1927.

To All Workers, Soldiers and poor Peasants!

At the most critical moment of the revolution, when our country is passing through the most difficult time, the Mensheviks and official S. R. have repeatedly betrayed the interests of the workers, soldiers and peasants by leaving the power in the hands of Kornilov's Cadets. Not only did Kerensky's counter-revolutionary Government remain in power, but Bulygin's advisory Preliminary Parliament was formed which was intended by the Cadets to replace the Constituent Assembly and help counter-revolution to shatter the Soviets.

The will of the workers, soldiers, sailors and organised peasants found expression in the resolutions passed by the overwhelming majority of the Soviets of the Workers', Soldiers' and Peasant Deputies. The Kornilov affair, originated by Kerensky and fostered by the Mensheviks and S. R., opened the eyes of the people to the growing danger. At that moment the workers, soldiers and organised peasants were at last prepared to overthrow with one blow Kerensky's imperialist Government which was drawing the noose more and more tightly round the neck of revolution. Those who are in favour of compromise were however again standing between the re-

volutionary people and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Again and again, the spineless petty bourgeoisie went over to the side of the worst enemies of revolution. The patched-up "Democratic Conference" was transformed into the equally patched-up "Democratic Soviet". The Mensheviks and S. R. in common with Kerensky solemnly introduced into this Soviet 150 representatives of the large bourgeoisie, the landed proprietors and open adherents of Kornilov, and this gang was honoured with the name of the: "Provisional Council of the Russian Republic".

Hardly was the session of the "Democratic Conference" ended, when the Kerensky Government resorted to new reprisals against the workers, soldiers and peasants. In Tashkent a punitive expedition is at the helm, endeavours are made to arrest railwaymen on strike and hand them over to the courts of justice, the coal magnates who had locked out the miners, had merely to express the wish and a dictator is sent to the Donez Basin to "calm" the workers. The arrest of peasants who are members of the land committee are continued; the revolutionary Finnish regiments are disbanded, the Kornilov people maintain their posts, open conspirators against revolution are released from prison, revolutionaries detained in prison, the campaign of calumny against the Bolsheviks has never been discontinued even up to the present day, the judges of the time of Beilis are all in office still.

At the same time the capitalists, who lock out the workers, are raising their heads more boldly. Unemployment is on the increase. The economic collapse is becoming worse and worse. Starvation is spreading. Financial bankruptcy comes day by day more imminent. The financial help offered us by the allies is only adding to our debts, is making us more dependent on the handful of bankers and capitalists of international imperialism. So long as the present "new" Government is in power, there is not even the faintest idea of a serious fight against starvation, against the rise of prices, against the lack of goods and of bread. Neither will the programme of compromise of August 14th, though greatly curtailed and lately still more curtailed by the Cadets — be put into effect, not even a single point of this much curtailed programme. The bourgeoisie has fixed a fresh term, every day of which they will turn to good account for intensifying the crisis, for increasing the difficulties by which revolution is faced, for strengthening the ranks of the Kornilov people, for leaving the counter-revolutionaries time to collect their forces, for disintegrating the ranks of revolution...

In the meantime the robbers of international imperialism are casting lots for our garments. The card sharpers of diplomacy are preparing for an imperialist peace at the cost of Russia and of the weak smaller States. The English and French bourgeoisie does not disguise its wild hatred of the Russian revolution. Kaiser William's band openly admits that sparks from the revolutionary conflagration have flown from Russia to Germany and have set aflame a revolutionary movement in the German fleet. The imperialists of both coalitions hate the Russian revolution. They are prepared on the auspicious occasion of imperialist peace, to isolate our revolution and thus to stifle the international revolution of the proletariat which is already about to break out. In such circumstances the "Democratic Conference" trusts the fate of our foreign policy to the imperialist Cadets and entrusts Tereshchenko helped by Skobelev with the fight for peace.

Comrades! The revolution is threatened by danger! never has the danger been as great as it is at the present moment. The Constituent Assembly can only be summoned against the will of the present Coalition Government — which is doing everything in its power to frustrate it and will continue to do so in the future. The Soviet Congress whose meeting was fixed for October 20th owing to the pressure on the part of the workers, can only be convened against the will of those who are in favour of a compromise; these latter in the person of Dan and the official "Izvestija" have already embarked on an open fight against its being summoned. The Congress of the Peasant Soviets can only be called against the will of Avksentiev & Co., who are shamelessly frustrating the Congress and disregarding the demands of the Peasant Delegates from the villages who insist on calling the Conference.

Not only is it impossible for the Kerensky Government to rule without Bonapartist cunning, but the S. R. and Mensheviks, who govern with the help of "revolutionary Democracy" can

also not dispense with them. The counter-revolutionaries agree to anything in order to frustrate the Constituent Assembly. For this purpose they are even prepared to open the front to the German troops. The compromisers agree to anything in order to frustrate the Soviet Congress. Be on your guard, comrades! Do not rely on anyone except yourselves! Do not lose a single hour, get prepared for the Soviet Congress, call district conferences, struggle hard to get the opponents of compromise delegated to the Conference, do not recede a single step from the position gained by the Soviets!

The policy of compromise is collapsing from day to day with ever greater disgrace to the party. The workers are everywhere driving the Mensheviks and S. R. from their posts. The municipal election of the Moscow district shows that the confidence placed by the masses in our Party, is growing with tremendous rapidity, that "even" the intermediate elements are tearing themselves away from their path and that the revolutionary phalanx under the lead of the proletariat is moving along in a broad, ever increasing stream against the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and is becoming more and more convinced of its own strength.

In the camp of the S. R. and the Mensheviks themselves, disintegration has begun. Groups of revolutionaries and socialists are detaching themselves from the party of those who are in favour of compromise; we welcome them, we call upon them to join us in the fight for the interests of the workers and peasants, for a democratic peace, for the power of the Soviets.

The overwhelming majority of the workers is already siding with our Party. The masses of the soldiers are listening to our slogans in a more and more friendly way. The poor peasants must inevitably join us, for we are the only ones who represent their interests. The power is going over into the hands of the workers, soldiers and peasants. This is inevitable. The policy of the "new" Government and of Bulygin's preliminary Parliament is even opening the eyes of those who are most backward and is attracting to our banner ever increasing numbers of combatants. Counter-revolution cannot calmly stand by and watch our forces growing. The "new" Government now wants to bring about civil war, it wants to do it without delay, in order to drown the revolution in the blood of the workers and peasants. The Cadets and a considerable section of the defenders of the Fatherland are making every effort to bring about civil war immediately and under any circumstances, for the civil war is the only hope of saving themselves from the inevitable collapse.

Discontent has reached the boiling point among the mass of the workers, soldiers and peasants. The workers and soldiers refuse to tolerate any longer the mockery of the bourgeoisie, the insolence of the capitalists, the Bonapartism of the bourgeois Government. We share their discontent, we also curse those who want to throttle the greatest revolutionary movement in the world. For this reason we say: **We do not engage in the fight when it suits our enemies. No partial action!** The bourgeois counter-revolution is "restless" as it was restless before the Kornilov days. They are using their whole craft to lure the workers and soldiers into the street. Let us be on our guard! We want to unmask all attempts at provocation made by the bourgeoisie with a view to inciting civil war! The important thing is to concentrate all our forces on preparing for the Soviet Congress of October 20th, which alone is a guarantee that the Constituent Assembly will be summoned and will do its revolutionary work.

Our forces are growing and will grow from day to day. We want to penetrate deeper still into the masses. We want to come to the soldiers, sailors, peasants and workers. For a relentless fight against the treachery of the compromise group! For a relentless unmasking of the Coalition Government, the government of civil war and bourgeois dictatorship! For a merciless revelation of Bulygin's farcical, counter-revolutionary Preliminary Parliament, for a fight in favour of the Soviet Congress! Out for the mobilisation of our forces for the Soviet Congress! All the power to the Soviets! This is our path!

## The Crisis has Become Ripe.

By N. Lenin.

(Written on 12th October 1917.)

I.

There is no doubt — there occurred at the end of September a great transformation in the history of the Russian and, according to all appearances, of the world revolution.

The international workers' revolution began with the action of individuals who, in their unbounded heroism, represented all that remained honest in the rotting official "socialism" (in reality social chauvinism). Liebknecht in Germany, Adler in Austria, MacLean in England — these are the best known names of those individual heroes who had undertaken the difficult role of champions of the world revolution.

The second stage in the historical preparation of this revolution was a fermentation of the broad masses, which found expression in the splitting of the official parties, in illegal publications and in street demonstrations. The protest against the war increased; the number of victims of government persecution grew. The prisons of those countries which boasted of their legality and even their freedom, the prisons of Germany, France, Italy, England were filled with dozens, nay hundreds of internationalists, opponents of the war, supporters of the workers' revolution.

We are entering on the third stage, which can be described as the eve of the revolution. The wholesale arrests of Party leaders in free Italy and in particular the commencement of mutinies of the soldiers in Germany, are undoubtedly a sign of a great transformation, the sign that we are on the eve of revolution on a world scale.

There is no doubt that in Germany there had already occurred individual cases of mutinies in the army; but these cases were so insignificant, so isolated, so weak that the authorities were able to conceal them, to hush them up, and this was the chief means for preventing the masses from being infected with the spirit of mutiny. Finally, there grew up such a movement in the fleet that it was no longer possible to conceal this nor to pass it over in silence, not even with the aid of the strict measures of the German military prison regime, which were carried out down to the smallest detail and with incredible pedantry.

There is no longer the least doubt. We are standing on the threshold of the proletarian world revolution. And as we, the Russian Bolsheviks, enjoy the relatively greatest freedom of all proletarian internationalists in any country, as we have a legal party and 20 newspapers, as the Soviets of the workers' and soldiers' deputies of the chief towns are on our side and as the majority of the mass of the people in a revolutionary time are on our side, then one can and must apply to us the words: to whom much is given, much is required.

II.

There is no doubt that in Russia we are at a turning point.

In a peasant country, under a revolutionary Republican government enjoying the support of the parties of the S. R.s and of the Mensheviks who yesterday still dominated petty bourgeois democracy, the peasant revolt is growing.

This is unbelievable, but it is a fact.

We Bolsheviks do not wonder at this fact; we have always said that the government of the notorious coalition with the bourgeoisie is a government of treachery to democracy and to revolution; a government of imperialist war; a government for the protection of the capitalists and landowners against the people.

In Russia there was and there is, thanks to the treachery of the S. R.'s and and of the Mensheviks, in the Republic, in a time of revolution, in addition to the Soviets, a government of capitalists and landowners. That is the bitter and dangerous reality. Is it surprising that in Russia, with the enormous poverty, which has been increased by the prolongation of the imperialist war and by its consequences to the people, a peasant revolt has begun and is developing?

Is it surprising when the opponents of the Bolsheviks, the leaders of the official social revolutionary party, — the same party which supported the "coalition" the whole time, the same party which a few days or a few weeks ago had the majority

of the people on its side, the same party which the "new" S. R.'s, who have become convinced of the betrayal of the interests of the peasantry by the policy of coalition, are constantly criticising and attacking — is it surprising when these leaders of the official S. R. party, on the 29th September, in the editorial leading article of the "Djelo Naroda" (The Cause of the people), their official organ, write as follows:

"Up to now hardly anything has been done to abolish those slave conditions which still prevail in the country and especially in Central Russia. The law regarding the regulation of land conditions in the country, which was long ago introduced by the Provisional Government and which has even passed the purgatorial fires of the Juridical examination — this law has hopelessly disappeared in some government office.... Are we not right if we maintain that our republican government has not yet by a long way freed itself from the old customs and usages of the Tsarist administration, that the Stolipin manoeuvres are still to be seen in the methods of the revolutionary Ministers."

That is what the official S. R.'s write! Just think: the supporters of the coalition are **compelled** to recognise that, during the seven months revolution in a peasant country, "almost nothing has been done for the abolition of the slavery of the peasants" and against their suppression by the landowners! These S. R.'s are **compelled** to call their colleague Kerensky and his whole band of Ministers **Stolipinites**.

Can one have a more striking proof from the camp of our opponents, demonstrating not only the collapse of the coalition, not only the fact that the official S. R.'s, who tolerated Kerensky, have become a party **hostile to the people, to the peasantry and counter-revolutionary**, but also that the whole Russian revolution has arrived at a turning point?

A peasant rising in a peasant country against the government of the social revolutionary Kerensky, of the Menshevik Nikitin and Gvosdev and other Ministers who represent the interests of capital and of the landowners! The republican government is suppressing this revolt by military measures.

Can one, in view of such facts, still be a sincere supporter of the proletariat and at the same time deny that the crisis is ripe, that the revolution is undergoing a great transformation, that the victory of the government over the peasants' revolts would now mean the final death of the revolution, the final victory of the Korniloviad?

### III.

It is perfectly obvious: If in a peasant country, after seven months of democratic Republic, it could come to a peasant revolt, then this proves beyond refutation the general collapse of the revolution in the whole country; its crisis, which has reached tremendous acuteness; the advance of the counter-revolutionary forces right up to the "inner ring".

This goes without saying. In view of such facts as the peasant revolt, all the other political symptoms, even if they should contradict this growth of the general crisis, are practically of no importance.

On the contrary, all these symptoms show that the general crisis is ripe in the whole country.

In addition to the agrarian question, the national question is of great importance for the State life of Russia, especially for the petty bourgeois masses of the population. And we see that at the "Democratic Conference" patched together by Zeretelli and Co., the "national" Curia took second place as regards its radicalism; in radicalism it was surpassed only by the trade unions, and according to the percentage of the votes cast against the coalition (40 out of 55) it stood **higher** than the Curia of the Soviets of workers and soldiers deputies. The Kerensky government, the government which suppressed the peasants revolt, withdraws the revolutionary troops from Finland in order to strengthen the reactionary Finnish bourgeoisie. In the Ukraine, the conflicts of the Ukrainians in general, but especially of the Ukrainian troops with the government, are becoming more and more frequent.

Let us consider the army, which in war time had an extraordinarily great importance in the whole life of the State. We saw that the Finnish troops and the Baltic Fleet have completely deserted the government. We hear the statements of the

non-Bolshevik officer Dubassov. He speaks in the name of the whole front and speaks more revolutionarily than all the Bolsheviks. He says that the soldiers will not fight any longer. We are familiar with the government declarations stating that the temper of the soldiers is "nervous", that it is impossible to guarantee "order" (i. e. for the dispatch of these troops to suppress the peasants' revolts). We see, finally, the votes in Moscow, where out of 17,000 soldiers 14,000 voted for the Bolsheviks.

This voting at the municipal elections in Moscow is one of the most convincing symptoms of the profound transformation in the feeling of the whole nation. That Moscow is more petty-bourgeois than Petrograd is generally well known. That the Moscow proletariat has incomparably greater connection with the village, has more sympathy in the village, stands nearer to the sentiments of the peasants and of the village, is an indisputable and often mentioned fact.

And now, in Moscow, the votes for the S. R.'s and the Mensheviks have sunk from 70% in June to 18%. The petty bourgeoisie has turned its back on the coalition; the people has turned its back on it; no one can doubt that any longer. The cadets have increased their votes from 17 to 30 per cent; but they remain in the minority, in a hopeless minority, in spite of their being openly joined by the "Right" S. R.'s and the Right Mensheviks. The "Russki Vjedomosti" states that the absolute number of votes cast for the Cadets has fallen from 67,000 to 62,000. The Bolshevik votes alone show an increase, from 34,000 to 82,000. They have polled 47 per cent of all the votes. There can be not the slightest shadow of a doubt that we, along with the Left S. R.'s, now have the majority in the Soviets, in the army and in the country.

To the phenomena which have not only a symptomatic but a very real importance there must now be added the fact that the armies of the railway and postal workers, who have an enormous general economic, general political and military importance, are still engaged in a sharp conflict with the government, in which even the Menshevik defenders of native country are no longer satisfied with "their" Minister Nikitin, and call the official S. R. Kerenskys and Co. "Stolipinites". Is it not clear that such a "support" (if it can be so described) of the government by the Mensheviks and S. R.'s has only a negative importance?

V.\*).

Yes, the leaders of the Central Executive Committee are conducting the right tactics for defending the bourgeoisie and the landowners. And there is not the least doubt that the Bolsheviks, if they allowed themselves to be lured by constitutional illusions of faith in the Soviet Congress and the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, if they "waited" for the Soviet Congress — that such Bolsheviks would be miserable traitors to the proletarian cause.

They would be traitors to the proletarian cause; for they would by their attitude betray the German revolutionary workers who commenced a revolt in the fleet. Under such conditions, to "wait" for the Soviet Congress etc. is a betrayal of internationalism, a betrayal of the cause of the international socialist revolution.

For internationalism does not consist in phrases, in proclamations of solidarity, nor in resolutions, but in deeds.

The Bolsheviks would be the betrayers of the peasantry; for to tolerate the suppression of the peasants' revolts by the government, the suppression which even the "Djelo Naroda" has placed on a level with the Stolipin times, means to kill the whole revolution, to kill it for good and all. They cry out about anarchy and the growing indifference of the masses. How could the masses be other than indifferent towards the elections when the peasantry have been driven to revolt and the so-called "revolutionary democracy" calmly looked on at the military suppression of this revolt.

The Bolsheviks would be traitors to democracy and freedom, for the suppression of the peasant revolt at such a moment would mean to falsify the elections to the Constituent

\*). Chapter IV is missing. There has only been found the Manuscript minus chapter IV. That portion of the Manuscript headed Chapter V. is headed No. IV. in the first shortened publication of the article in "Rabotchy Puti". It would appear, therefore, that a chapter from the original Manuscript was left out by the Redaction. (Ed. "Inprecorr.")



Assembly, just as, and even still worse, more flagrantly than the "Democratic Conference" and the Preliminary Parliament have done.

The crisis is ripe. The whole future of the Russian Revolution is at stake. The whole honour of the party of the Bolsheviks is involved. The whole future of the international workers' revolution for socialism is at stake.

The crisis has become ripe.

29th September 1917 (old style. Ed.).

\* \* \*

Up to this point the article can be published. The continuation is to be distributed among the members of the C. C., the Petrograd Committee, the Moscow Committee and the Soviets.

## VI.

What is to be done? One must speak out what is the fact, one must recognise the truth, that there exists in our C. C. and among the leadership of the party a tendency or an opinion which is in favour of **waiting** for the Soviet Congress and is against the immediate seizure of power, **against** the immediate revolt. This tendency or opinion must be **fought**.

Otherwise the Bolsheviks would be branded with shame for centuries and **disappear from the surface as a Party**.

To let such a moment escape and to "wait" for the Soviet Congress would be **complete madness or perfect treachery**. A complete betrayal of the German workers. We must not wait until the revolution has begun. Then Liber-Dan will also be in favour of "supporting" it. But they cannot begin as long as Kerensky, Kishkin and Co. are in power.

A complete betrayal of the peasantry. As we have the majority in the Soviets of the **chief towns**, to permit the suppression of the peasants' revolt would mean the — **well-merited** — loss of all the confidence of the peasants, that is to say the peasants would lump us together with Liber-Dan and the other scoundrels.

To "wait" for the Soviet Congress is perfectly idiotic, for it would mean that we allow weeks to pass by when weeks and even days now decide **everything**. It means to shrink back with fear from the seizure of power, for on the 12th of November it will not be possible (neither politically nor technically), for on the day, foolishly "fixed" for the revolt, the Cossacks will be mobilised.

To "wait" for the Soviet Congress is idiotic, for the Congress **will not and cannot yield anything**.

The "moral" significance? Wonderful!! The "significance" of the resolutions and the negotiations with Liber and Dan, when we know that the Soviets are for the peasants and that the peasants' revolt is being suppressed! That would mean our giving the Soviets the role of miserable spouters! First vanquish Kerensky, then convene the Soviet Congress!

The victory of the revolt is now assured by the Bolsheviks: 1. We can\*\* (if we do not wait for the Soviet Congress) suddenly attack from three points: from Petrograd, from Moscow and from the Baltic Fleet. 2. We have slogans which guarantee us support: Down with the government which suppresses the revolt, of the peasants against the landowners!; 3. We have the **majority** in the country; 4. the disintegration of the Mensheviks and the S.R.'s is complete; 5. we have the technical possibility to seize power in Moscow (where we ought even to begin in order to take the enemy by surprise);

\*) To convene the Soviet Congress for the 20th October in order that it shall decide on the seizure of power — is that not the same as "fixing" the revolt in a stupid manner? We can seize power now, but on the 20th to 29th October we will not be permitted to seize it.

\*\*\*) What did the Party do to ascertain the position of the troops etc. For carrying out the revolt as an "art"? Nothing but speeches in the Central Executive Committee etc.!

6. we have **thousands** of armed workers and soldiers in Petrograd who could at **once** occupy the Winter Palace, the general staff, the telephone exchange and all the great printing works; they could not drive us out from there — and the agitation in the army will be such that it will be **impossible** to fight against such a government which stands for peace, and handing over the land to the peasants etc.

If we attack at once, suddenly at three points, in Petrograd, in Moscow and in the Baltic Fleet, our chances are hundred to one that we shall be victorious with fewer victims than the 16th to 18th July cost us; for **no troops** will proceed against the government of peace. Even if Kerensky already has a "faithful" body of Cavalry etc. in Petrograd, he would be compelled, when attacked from two sides and when the army sympathises **with us**, to **surrender**. If we do not seize power under such conditions as those obtaining at present, then all the talk about the power of the Soviets becomes lies.

To refrain from seizing power now, to "wait", to talk in the Central Executive Committee, to confine ourselves to the "fight for the organ" (the Soviets), "to the fight for the Congress" means to **kill the revolution**.

As the Central Committee has not even replied to my endeavours in this sense since the beginning of the Democratic Conference; as the central organ **deletes** the passages in my articles pointing out such crying mistakes of the Bolsheviks as the shameful decision to take part in the Preliminary Parliament, as that of conceding places to the Mensheviks in the Presidium etc. — I must infer from this that the Central Committee does not wish to deal with this question, that I shall keep my mouth shut and take myself off. I must submit my resignation from the C. C., which I hereby do, and reserve for myself freedom of agitation in the lower strata of the Party and of the Party Conference.

For I am firmly convinced that if we wait for the Soviet Congress and let slip the present opportunity, then we **destroy the revolution**.

P. S. A number of facts show that even the Cossacks troops would not proceed against a government standing for peace! And how many are there of such troops? Where are they? And will not bodies of troops from the whole army join us?

## Chronicle of Events.

October 9.

The All-Russian Textile Workers Conference declares in favour of the slogan: "All power to the Soviets".

The "Freedom house" in Tashkent is occupied by government troops and the Commandant nominated by the Soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies is arrested.

October 10.

The Provisional government decides on severe measures against peasant disturbances and "anarchy".

The results of the municipal elections in the Moscow district are: In 17 municipalities there are elected 350 bolsheviks, 184 Cadets, 104 S. Rs, and 31 Mensheviks.

October 11.

The Moscow Soviet of the workers' and soldiers' deputies, after a report of Comrade Bukharin on the political situation, adopted the resolution brought in by him, by 364 votes against 274.

The general strike in Tashkent is broken off, the state of siege has ended.

October 12.

The government receives reports on the intensification of the peasant disturbances.

October 13.

The Central Executive Committee of the Soviets declares itself against Lynch justice and individual actions.

# TEN YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

## Prisons in the Soviet Union.

By Johannes Wertheim.

In a booklet by E. Schirwindt, shortly to be published by the Vienna and Berlin Publishing Concern for Literature and Politics, the differences in the execution of punishments in the capitalist countries on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other are described in detail. In the following we wish merely to deal with the principles and the treatment of prisoners prevailing in the Soviet Union, without making a detailed comparison in each case with the methods obtaining in capitalist countries.

Since legislation in the Soviet Union has replaced the punitive system by measures of social protection, there result certain tasks of correction as an outcome of the Soviet system of detention. The criminal is not looked upon as an ostracised outcast from society. Nor does Soviet legislation recognise nothing but congenital and incorrigible criminals or believe in an evil will inducing to crime. It looks upon the culprit as the victim of difficult circumstances, unemployment, want, ignorance, drink disease, or the like. It therefore only provides such measures as neither cause physical suffering nor impair human dignity.

In the determination and application of measures of social protection it is taken into consideration that a worker or peasant can be no willing or personally convinced enemy of the Soviet State. The class policy, however, is only pursued in regard to classes in their entirety, and the Soviet State has no interest in tormenting an individual merely because he is a member of a class hostile to the Soviet Union. The Soviet State has not only the proper establishment of social protective measures at heart, but also their realisation in practice on the basis of the precise interpretation of the law. It thus employs a code of tasks of correction clearly establishing the attitude to be adopted towards the individual culprit and the measures to be taken by the responsible organs. The prisoner has not only duties but also rights, which are made known to him in a printed form as soon as he enters upon his term of detention. Before all, the detained prisoners have an unrestricted right of complaint.

The two fundamental factors in correction are the work to be performed by the prisoners and the cultural task of enlightenment. The prisoners are assisted in adapting themselves to the conditions of a working community and enabled to return to society with an improved strength of resistance and self-control. They learn to read and write or are afforded other possibilities of extending their knowledge; they either learn a trade or improve their professional efficiency.

Work is the sound social basis of the Soviet State. It is the normal function of every able-bodied citizen. Thus work is incompatible with the humiliation of human dignity. Therefore the conditions of work are quite particularly regulated in Soviet law. It follows that for the prisoners too the eight-hour day, an uninterrupted weekly rest of 42 hours, pauses for repose and the midday meal, and privileges in the case of pregnant women must be strictly observed. No citizen, even if in prison, may be forced in the Soviet State to work gratuitously.

In the way of instruction, every attempt is made to encourage independent activity on the part of the prisoners. They hold lectures and discussions, organise libraries and circles, and arrange concerts. They have, without exception, the right to subscribe to and receive any newspaper they desire, besides

which a sufficient number of newspapers are provided at the expense of the State. The wireless furnishes a special means of communication with the outer world.

Chains, handcuffs, incarceration, and deprivation of food are unknown in the prisons of the Soviet Union. Solitary confinement is employed only as a disciplinary measure and only for short periods. The prisoners have the right to receive visits twice a week, not only from relatives but from any persons who desire to see them. The prisoner may be provided with foodstuffs or even with money, for which he can buy whatever he pleases at the stores in the prisons. He may correspond without restriction and in whatever language he chooses. He may smoke whenever and as much as he desires. Soviet law knows no enforced silence. While working in their cells, while taking exercise, or while in their clubs, the prisoners may converse freely with one another. Each prisoner has the right to prison clothes, linen, and footwear, but may, if he prefers, wear his own clothing. Prisoners may be accorded leave of absence to the extent of one or two weeks in the year, besides which detained peasants are granted a leave of three or four months for the purpose of field work.

Disciplinary measures, which generally amount to a restriction of the right to receive visitors, newspapers, or presents from without for a term of not more than one month's duration, may only be inflicted after a proper investigation of the case, including a hearing of the culprit.

In the place of the old prison premises, the Soviet law has provided for the development, as far as possible, of the system of agricultural, handicraft and industrial colonies. The object ultimately in view is the organisation of real working communities, in which rational work and the discipline requisite in every community make the fact of imprisonment practically unnoticeable. In the working colony, therefore, there are no sentinels and no guards set over the prisoners, care simply being taken that the prescribed order is not infringed. In the course of the day the prisoners have the right to move about freely on the territory of the colony.

A very frequently adopted and highly effective measure of correction in the Soviet Union is that of conditional premature release. To attain this it is sufficient that the prisoner show signs of improvement. A prisoner, e. g., who has been condemned to three years of detention and who has done productive work (not only in the workshop but also as regards instruction, work in an office, etc.) may have his term of imprisonment shortened by one third; nay, even the remaining time may be commuted by one half, i. e. reduced to any year. Compulsory labour without imprisonment, again, is a measure by which the prisoner is bound over to work for a given time, determined by the tribunal but not exceeding one year, in a factory or other enterprise particularly assigned to him. When not at work, he is free.

Political prisoners enjoy extensive rights. If they refuse to do manual work, they cannot be forced, while their wishes as regards mental work are satisfied as far as possible. Imprisonment is made as easy as possible for them.

That the Soviet system of detention is fundamentally right is proved by the fact that prisoners released conditionally before the expiration of their sentences very seldom return to prison, and that a proportion of barely 20 per cent. of relapsed male criminals has been recorded, a fact which is all the more significant if compared, e. g., with the 67 per cent. of confirmed criminals inhabiting the prisons of Great Britain.