

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 64

17th November 1927

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

CONTENTS

Expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

J. Stalin: The Trotzkyist Opposition Now and in former Times.

A. Evert: The Cup is Full.

Against Imperialist War! For the Soviet Union! For Revolutionary China! (Appeal of Congress of Friends of the Soviet Union to all Workers.)

For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.

Two Letters of Lenin from the October Days.

The Bureau of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. Demands the Expulsion of the Opposition Leaders.

The C. C. of the C. P. S. U. on the Latest Action of the Opposition Leaders.

The Balkans.

G. Dimitrov: The Situation in Roumania.

Politics.

J. B.: Imperialist Vengeance in Syria.

Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.

The World Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union.

The Labour Movement.

P. Noel: The General Strike of Miners in Asturia.

The Trial of Szanto and Comrades.

The Trial of Zoltan Szanto and Comrades.

The White Terror.

In Defence of the Class Trade Unions of Turkey.

The Discussion Before the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

N. Krupskaya: Construction of Socialism.

A. Kollontai: The Opposition and the Rank and File of the Party.

A. Kon: The Distribution of the National Income and the Trotzkyist Opposition.

Ten Years Ago.

The Bolsheviki Bring Peace.

Expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Moscow, 15th November 1927.

The Central Control Commission and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have adopted and published the following decision with regard to the anti-Party actions of the leaders of the Opposition:

In order to guarantee the correct and normal preparation of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. for the whole Party, the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., according to the Party statutes, published more than a month before the Party Congress the theses of the C. C., and published in the discussion sheet the counter-theses of the Opposition immediately after they had been submitted, as well as the articles and speeches of the Opposition. The C. C. afforded the Opposition every possibility to defend their views, both in the press as also in Party meetings and Party nuclei. But neither Zinoviev nor Trotzky considered it necessary to appear at Party meetings, but continued to arrange illegal meetings without the participation of representatives of the Party.

In spite of this the Opposition has not only not abstained from a disruptive policy and violation of Party unity, but has increased its destructive work. The Opposition, which has been defeated in all the nuclei in which discussion took place and which could not even get one per cent of all the votes of Party

members, continues to issue its illegal, anti-Party papers in which the activity of the Party is slandered; it is printing its writings in secret printing works which were equipped with stolen type, paper etc. It is organising a number of anti-Party, illegal meetings, to which non-proletarian elements are attracted, elements which are alien to the Party and the working class. The Opposition is preparing an anti-Party demonstration in these anti-Party, illegal meetings; it is working out plans for the further fight against the Party; it attracts anti-Party, bourgeois elements to these conferences and thereby lets loose those elements which are hostile to the proletariat and the Soviets. The Opposition arbitrarily occupies an auditorium of the Technical High School in Moscow in order to hold there an anti-Party meeting and forcibly attacks the representatives of the Party. The Opposition even goes so far as to arrange public meetings at which speeches are delivered directed against the C. P. S. U. and against the Soviet Power.

Instead of mounting the joint tribune of the Lenin Mausoleum on the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution and welcoming from there, together with the other comrades, the millions of workers of Moscow and Leningrad, the Opposition leaders withdraw to various small streets and side turnings, and attempt there to arrange demonstrations against the Party; they

distribute and post up illegal, anti-Party leaflets, wherein they appeal to elements hostile to the Party and the Soviet Power, they occupy halls, whereby they remove the Soviet guard and set up their own, armed guard. In this way they are transgressing the limits of Soviet legality and are openly becoming the mouth-piece of those forces which are hostile to the regime of the proletarian dictatorship.

The C. C. C. and the C. C. consider these actions altogether incompatible with membership of the Party, and all the more incompatible for members of the C. C. and the C. C. C. They therefore resolve:

The following members and candidates of the C. C. are expelled: From the C. C. and C. C. C.: Comrades Kamenev, Smilga, Jevdokimov, Rakovsky, Avdejev and the members of the C. C. C.: Muralov, Bakajev, Shklovsky, Peterson, Solovjev and Lisdin. It is considered necessary to remove the above mentioned comrades from leading functions in the Party and the Soviet organs.

With regard to Trotzky and Zinoviev, the chief leaders of this whole activity directed against the Party, an acti-

vity which goes over into an anti-Soviet activity, undermining the dictatorship of the proletariat, the C. C. and C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. resolve:

In view of the fact that Zinoviev and Trotzky replied to the decisive demand submitted to them at the meeting of 11th November to cease immediately the organisation of illegal, anti-Party meetings and to refrain from carrying the inner-Party discussion into circles standing outside the Party, by demonstratively leaving the meeting of the Presidium of the C. C. C. and some hours later sent a written reply, dated 11th November, in which they rejected in essence these, for every Party member, most elementary obligations towards the Party, Trotzky and Zinoviev are expelled from the C. P. S. U.

Kamenev, Smilga, Jevdokimov, Rakovsky, Avdejev, Radek, Muralov, Bakajev, Shklovsky, Peterson, Solovjev and Lisdin are informed that the Presidium of the C. C. C. will submit for examination to the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. the question whether their fractional activity is compatible with their remaining within the ranks of the C. P. S. U.

The Trotzkyist Opposition Now and in former Times.

By J. Stalin.

Speech delivered at the October Plenary Meeting of the C. C. and the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

I. A few minor Questions.

Comrades, I have not much time, and for this reason I shall only deal with a few individual questions.

Above all I should like to discuss the personal factors. You have heard here how the Opposition abused Stalin without sparing their strength. I do not wonder at that, comrades. The circumstance that the most violent attacks are directed against Stalin is explained by the fact that Stalin knows perhaps more of the whole treacherous doings of the Opposition than others among our comrades, and that it is therefore not so easy to deceive him. This is the reason why they are aiming their blows chiefly at Stalin. Well, let them scold as much as they like. For who is Stalin? Stalin is a person of little significance. Think of Lenin. Who does not know that the Opposition, with Trotzky at its head, carried on an even more impudent campaign of calumny against Lenin at the time of the "August Block". Just hear what Comrade Trotzky for instance said:

"What absurd conceit is that wretched quarrelsomeness which Lenin, a master in affairs of this kind, a routine exploiter of every form of backwardness in the Russian Labour movement, is fanning systematically." (See "Trotzky's letter to Tcheidse", April 1913.)

What language! Note it well, comrades! And this is how he writes about Lenin! Is it then to be wondered at that Trotzky, who treats the great Lenin with so much disregard though he is not even worthy to unloose the latchet of his shoe, is now abusing with all his might Comrade Stalin, one of the numerous disciples of Lenin? It is clear that there is no reason for being astonished... But I even consider it a distinction that the whole Opposition is directing its hatred against Stalin. I think that it would be at the same time curious and offending if the Opposition, which is trying to destroy the Party, were to praise Stalin who is defending the basis of Lenin's party.

Lenin's "Testament". The Opposition raised a cry — you heard it, all of you — that the Central Committee of the Party was "keeping Lenin's "Testament concealed". As you know, this question was dealt with repeatedly at the Plenary Meeting of the C. C. and the C. C. C. (Cries of: "Dozens of times.") It has been proved over and over again that nobody has concealed or is concealing anything, that Lenin's "Testament" was ad-

ressed to the 13th Party Congress and that it, this "Testament" was read at that Party Congress. (Cries of: "Quite true!") That the Party Congress resolved unanimously not to publish the testament, among other reasons because Lenin himself did not wish or demand its publication. The Opposition knows this as well as we do. It has nevertheless the audacity to maintain that the C. C. is "concealing" the "Testament".

If I am not mistaken, the question of the "Testament" of Lenin was raised already in 1924. There is a certain Eastman, an American and former Communist who has been expelled from the party. This gentleman, who mixed a good deal with Trotzkyites in Moscow and overheard some rumours and calumniation, with regard to Lenin's "Testament", went abroad and published a book under the title of "Since Lenin Died" in which he did not spare his colours to paint the Party, the Central Committee and the Soviet Power as black as possible and in which he bases everything on the presumption that the C. C. and our Party were "concealing" Lenin's "Testament".

As Eastman had formerly associated with Comrade Trotzky, we, Comrades Rykov, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Stalin and Molotov, members of the Polit bureau, requested Comrade Trotzky to dissociate himself from Eastman who, by clinging to Comrade Trotzky and referring to the Opposition, laid the responsibility for the calumny of our Party with regard to the "Testament" at Trotzky's door. In view of this obvious fact, Comrade Trotzky actually dissociated himself from Eastman and made a statement to that effect in the Press, which was published in No 16 of the "Bolshevik" in September 1925. I should like to read out to you the passage from Comrade Trotzky's article dealing with the question as to whether or not the Party and the C. C. were concealing Lenin's "Testament". I quote from Comrade Trotzky's article.

"In some parts of the brochure, Eastman maintains that the C. C. was concealing a number of extraordinarily important documents which Lenin wrote in the last period of his life (by which the letters about the national question, the so-called "Testament" etc. are referred to); this cannot be described otherwise than as a calumny of the C. C. of our Party.

Eastman's words suggest the conclusion that the letters, which bear the character of advice in internal affairs

of the Party had been intended by Lenin for publication in the Press. In reality, this is absolutely wrong. During his illness, Lenin addressed himself repeatedly to the leading functionaries of the Party and the party meetings with suggestions, letters etc. It is a matter of course that all the letters and proposals were always handed over to those to whom they were addressed, that the delegates of the 12th and 13th party congress were duly informed of them and that they naturally exercised their influence on the resolutions passed by the Party. If not the whole of these letters was published in the Press it is because this was not in the writer's intention.

The fact is that Lenin did not leave any "Testament" at all and that both the nature of his connections with the Party and the character of the Party itself actually exclude the possibility of such a "Testament". In the Emigrants' Press, the bourgeois Press of other countries and the Menshevik Press, one of Lenin's letters (distorted to such an extent as to be unrecognisable) is usually mentioned, containing advice with regard to organisation. The 13th Party Congress which received this letter with the greatest attention, as it did all the other letters, drew from it the conclusions which were in keeping with the situation and the circumstances at that very moment. All talk about a "Testament" being kept secret or about an infringement of that "Testament" are malicious inventions which are entirely directed against Lenin's actual wishes and against the interests of the Party created by him. (See Comrade Trotzky's articles "On Eastman's Book", "Since Lenin Died" in No. 16 of the "Bolshevik" September 1st 1925, page 68. Italics by me. J. St.).

This seems to be clear, this is what Comrade Trotzky wrote and no one else. What is the reason which now induces Comrades Trotzky and Kamenev to misrepresent things by maintaining that the Party and the C. C. are "hiding" Lenin's "Testament"? A slip of the tongue is "possible", but there must be limits.

It is said that in the "Testament" in question Lenin suggested to the Party Congress that it should deliberate on the question of replacing Stalin and appointing another comrade in his place as General Secretary of the Party. This is perfectly true. Let us read that passage, although it has already been read repeatedly at the Plenary Session:

"Stalin is too uncouth and this fault of his, which is tolerable within our intimate group and in view of the connections between us, becomes unbearable from one who holds the post of General Secretary. I therefore suggest that the comrades should discuss the question of dismissing Comrade Stalin from this post and appointing for it another person who, in all other respects, is only distinguished from Stalin by one quality, i. e. that of being more tolerant, loyal, civil and considerate towards the comrades, less moody etc."

Yes, comrades, I am rude towards those who are rudely and disloyally destroying and disintegrating the Party. I have never made a secret of it and shall not do so now. Even at the first meeting of the Plenary Session of the C. C., after the 13th Party Congress, I handed in my resignation of the function of General Secretary, asking the Plenary Session to relieve me of this duty. The Party Congress itself dealt with this question. Every single delegation has dealt with this question and all the delegations, including Trotzky, Kamenev and Zinoviev unanimously resolved that Stalin should remain in this post. What could I do? Relinquish my post? It is not in my character to do that.

I have never abandoned a post, whatever post it was. And I have no right to abandon it, because that would be desertion. As I have said before: I am not a free man; when the Party binds me, I have to submit. A year later, I once more handed in my resignation, but the Party again obliged me to remain in my post. What else could I do?

With regard to the publication of the "Testament", the Party Congress decided not to publish it, as it was addressed to the Party Congress and not intended for publication. There is a resolution of the Plenary Session of the C. C. and the C. C. C. dating from 1926, requesting the 15th Party Congress to permit that the said document be printed. There is further another resolution of the same Plenary Session of the C. C.

and the C. C. C. in reference to the publication of other letters written by Lenin, in which Lenin mentions Kamenev's and Zinoviev's mistakes before the October Revolution and demands that they be excluded from the Party. It is evident that all this talk about the Party concealing the said documents is nothing but vile calumny. It is out of the question that the Bolshevik Party, the C. C. of the Bolshevik Party, should ever have been afraid of the truth. The strength of the Bolshevik Party lies just in the fact that it is not afraid of the truth and looks it straight in the face. Does the Opposition suppose that the C. C. is hiding away letters in which Lenin speaks of the necessity of excluding Kamenev and Zinoviev from the Party? This would be ridiculous and stupid.

The Opposition intends to play a trump card with Lenin's "Testament". It is, however, only necessary to read through this "Testament" in order to understand that there is no trump card in it. On the contrary, Lenin's "Testament" does away with the present leaders of the Opposition. It is indeed a fact that in his "Testament" Lenin accuses Trotzky of "non-Bolshevism" and expresses his opinion that the mistakes made by Kamenev and Zinoviev during the October Revolution were not merely incidental. What does this mean? It means that neither Trotzky, who is suffering from "non-Bolshevism", nor Kamenev and Zinoviev, whose mistakes were not mere "incidents" and may or even must therefore recur, cannot be trusted politically. It is a characteristic fact that not a single word, not a single allusion in the "Testament" touches on Stalin's mistakes. Only his rudeness is mentioned. Lack of civility, however, is not a shortcoming in Stalin's political attitude or political position and cannot be so.

I quote here the corresponding passage from the "Testament".

"I shall not characterise any other members of the C. C. with regard to their personal qualities. I should like merely to remind you that the October episode of Zinoviev and Kamenev was no mere chance occurrence, but that it can just as little be regarded as a personal fault as Trotzky's "non-Bolshevism".

Comment is superfluous.

2. The "Platform" of the Opposition.

The next question. Why did we not print the well-known "platform of the Opposition". Zinoviev and Trotzky explain it by saying that the C. C. and the Party were afraid of the truth. Is that true? Of course it is not true. But in addition to that it is simply absurd to say that the Party or the C. C. were afraid of the truth. It is the custom with us to make stenographic notes of the plenary sessions of the C. C. and the C. C. C. These stenographic reports are then printed in several thousands of numbers and distributed among the party members. In them are recorded the speeches of the Opposition members and of the representatives of the views held by the Party. They are read by tens of thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands of party members. (Cries of: "Quite true!")

If we were afraid of the truth, we would not distribute these documents. The value of these documents is just that they afford the party members the possibility to compare the attitude of the C. C. with the views of the Opposition and then to draw their conclusions. Can anyone see fear of the truth in this?

In October 1926, the leaders of the Opposition made a boast of their assertion in exactly the same way as they are now maintaining that the C. C. is afraid of the truth, is keeping its platform secret, is concealing it from the Party etc. This is why they kept at that time in hiding in the Moscow nuclei (think of the "Aviopribor") and in the Leningrad nuclei (think of "Putilov") etc. And what became evident later? It became evident that the Communists from the rank of the workers hit such hard blows at the members of the Opposition that they fled from the battlefield. Why did they not at that time resolve to visit all the other nuclei in order to examine who was afraid of the truth, the Opposition or the C. C.? For the simple reason that they lost courage and that the actual (not the invented) truth frightened them.

And at the present time? If we put the question of conscience — have we now no discussions in the nuclei? Let them show us a single nucleus, in which there is only a single supporter of the opposition, a single meeting which took place during the last three or four months without the Opposition

coming to the fore and without discussions taking place. Is it not a fact that the Opposition has brought forward its counter-resolutions in the nuclei wherever there was an opportunity to do so in the last three or four months? (Cries of: Quite true!)

Why do Trotzky and Zinoviev not try to visit the nuclei and expound their views there? The following fact is very characteristic. After the Plenary Session of the C. C. and the C. C. C. in August this year, Trotzky and Zinoviev sent in a declaration stating that they wished to speak at the meeting of the Moscow functionaries if the C. C. had no objection to this. The C. C. replied (the answer was sent to the local organisations) that it did not object to Trotzky and Zinoviev appearing on the platform, under the condition however that, being members of the C. C., they would support the resolution of the C. C. What happened? They renounced appearing on the platform. (General laughter). Indeed, comrades, there are some among us who are afraid of the truth, but these are not the C. C., still less the Party itself — but the leaders of our Opposition.

Why do we not publish the "platform" of the Opposition in the case in question?

Above all because the C. C. did not wish to legalise Trotzky's fraction, and was not entitled to legalise it, as it is altogether not entitled to legalise fractional groups. Lenin said in the resolution of the 10th Party Congress "On Unity", that the existence of "platforms" is one of the most important signs of a fractional struggle going on. In spite of this, the Opposition worked out a "platform" and demanded its publication, which was in contradiction to the resolution of the 10th Party Congress. How would it be if we were to print the "platform" of the Opposition? It would be tantamount to our agreeing to take part in the activities of the Opposition which are aiming at an infringement of the resolutions of the 10th Party Congress. Could the C. C. and the C. C. C. engage in such matters? It is evident that not a single C. C. would find it compatible with its self-respect to embark on such a fractional step. (Interjection: "hear, hear!")

In the same resolution of the 10th Party Congress "On Unity", which Lenin himself drew up, the following words are contained:

"The Party Congress prescribes that every group, without any exception, which has been formed on some "platform" or other, should immediately be dissolved. A refusal to fulfil this resolution of the Party Congress involves the unconditional and immediate exclusion from the Party."

This instruction is clear and definite. And what would happen if the C. C. and the C. C. C. were to print the "platform" of the Opposition? Could such a procedure perhaps be described as dissolving without exception all the groups which have formed on some "platform" or other? It is clear that this is not the case. On the contrary, a procedure of this kind would mean that the C. C. and the C. C. C. take on themselves the responsibility of not dissolving the groups and fractions and are helping in their organisation. Could the C. C. and the C. C. C. consent to such measures which are identical with producing a split? It is evident that it was impossible for them to do anything of the kind.

Finally, the "platform" of the Opposition contains such calumniations of the Party, that their publication would do so much harm to our Party and to our State that it could never be made good. As a matter of fact, the "platform" of the Opposition maintains that our Party is prepared to abolish the foreign trade monopoly and to pay off all the debts, consequently including the war debts. Everybody knows that this is a vile calumination of our Party, of our working class and of our State.

Let us for a moment suppose that we had printed the said "platform" with those calumniations of the Party and, of the State. What would be the result? The result would be that the international bourgeoisie would reinforce its pressure and demand concessions (such as the abolition of the foreign trade monopoly, the redemption of the war debts) to which we shall never agree, and at the same time threaten us with war. If members of the C. C. such as Trotzky and Zinoviev provide the imperialists of all countries with mendacious reports and assure them that we are prepared to make a maximum of concessions going as far as to the abolition of the foreign trade monopoly, this can only have one significance: you must only press the Party of the Bolsheviks harder. Messrs. bourgeois, only threaten

them with war, they, the Bolsheviks, are prepared to make every concession if you only insist firmly enough.

Intentional false denunciations of the Party, made by Zinoviev and Trotzky to the imperialists for the purpose of increasing the difficulties in the field of foreign policy, this is in reality the "platform" of the Opposition. Who suffers from it? It is clear that in this way harm is done to the proletariat of the Soviet Union, to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to our State as a whole. Who benefits from it? The imperialists of all countries. I ask you then, was it possible for us to agree to such base things being printed in our Press? It is clear that we could not possibly do it.

These were the reasons which compelled us to refuse the publication of the "platform" of the Opposition.

3. Lenin's Opinion on Discussions and Oppositions in General.

The next question. Comrade Zinoviev got caught in a trap when he tried to prove that Lenin was always and at any moment in favour of discussions. He supported his argumentation with the fact of the discussions on "platforms" which took place before the 10th Party Congress and at the Party Congress itself. He "forgot", however, to mention that Lenin himself regarded the discussion before the 10th Party Congress as a mistake. He "forgot" to say that in the resolution of the 10th Party Congress with regard to the unity of the Party, which Lenin wrote in his own hand and which represents an instruction concerning the development of our Party, not discussions about "platforms" are demanded but the dissolution of all groups without exception and distinction which were formed on some platform or other. He "forgot" that, at the 10th Party Congress, Lenin advocated the point of view that "no Opposition whatever should be permitted in the Party in the future. He "forgot" to say that Lenin considered it absolutely inadmissible to transform our party into a "discussion club". I should like to give an example of how Lenin estimated the discussion before the 10th Party Congress:

"I was already obliged to say to-day what I am going to repeat now, and it is quite natural that I could only say it with much precaution, that no small number of you are sure to regard the discussion as nothing more nor less than an immoderate luxury. With regard to my personal feelings, I could not but add that, according to my point of view, this luxury was really absolutely inadmissible and that we made a mistake in allowing the discussion to be held. (See the minutes of the 10th Party Congress, page 16.)

The following was said by Lenin at the 10th Party Congress with regard to the admissibility of oppositions in general after the 10th Party Congress:

"Consolidation of the Party. Inadmissibility of oppositions within the Party — these are the political conclusions of the present day... We now have no use for an opposition, comrades! I think the Party Congress will have to draw this conclusion, I think it will be necessary for it to draw the conclusion that there must now be an end to oppositions — we have had enough of oppositions!" (See above, page 61 and 63).

This was Lenin's view with regard to the question of discussions and oppositions generally.

4. The Opposition and the "Third Force".

The next question. Why was the communication of Comrade Menshinsky regarding the white-guardists, with whom a portion of the "workers" of the illegal anti-Party printing offices of the Trotzkyists was in connection, necessary?

1. In order to refute the lies and calumnies which the Opposition spread in their anti-Party papers regarding this question. The Opposition assured all and everybody that the affair with the white-guardists, who in this or that manner are in connection with the allies of the Opposition, people of the type of Cherbakov, Tverki and others, is only an invention put into circulation in order to convict the Opposition of sin. The communication of Comrade Menshinsky, with the statements of the arrested, leaves no doubt that a portion of the "workers" of the illegal anti-Party printing works of the Trotzkyists are in connection with counter-revolutionary elements, undoubtedly in connection with counter-revolutionary elements from the white guardist camp. Let the Opposition endeavour to refute these facts and documents.

2. In order to expose the lie that is now being spread by the Maslov organ in Berlin, the "Fahne des Kommunismus". We have only just received the last number of this miserable paper of the renegade Maslov, who occupies himself thereby in libelling the Soviet Union and betraying the State secrets of the Soviet Union to the bourgeoisie. In this press organ there are published for general information, of course in a lying, distorted form, the statements of the arrested white-guardists and their allies from the illegal anti-Party printing works. (Interjection: "That is a bit thick!")

Whence was Maslov able to obtain these communications? These communications are confidential, as from this circle of white-guardists who are involved in the affair of organising a conspiracy of the type of the conspiracy of Pilsudsky, not everybody has yet been found and arrested. Zinoviev, Trotzky, Smilga and other members of the Opposition obtained acquaintance with these statements in the C. C. C. They were for the time being forbidden to make copies of these statements. Obviously they have made copies in spite of this and taken the trouble to send these to Maslov.

But what does the handing over of this news to Maslov for publication mean? It means warning those white-guardists who have not yet been discovered and arrested, i. e. to warn them that the Bo'sheviki intend to arrest them. Is that right? Is that permissible for a Communist? It is clear that it is not permissible. The article in Maslov's organ had a piquant headline: "Stalin shatters the C. P. S. U., white-guardist conspiracy, letter from the Soviet Union. (Interjection: "Scoundrels!")"

Could we not after all this, after Maslov, with the help of Trotzky and Zinoviev, printed lying, distorted statements of the arrested, and thereby made them universally known, could we not, after all this, submit a report to the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. and oppose the calumnies with the real facts and the actual statements.

For this reason the C. C. and the C. C. C. considered it necessary to request Comrade Menshinsky to issue a communication regarding these facts.

What results from all these statements, from the communications of Comrade Menshinsky? Have we at any time accused the Opposition of having organised a military conspiracy, or do we accuse them of doing so now? Of course not. Did we any time or do we now accuse the Opposition of participating in this conspiracy? Of course not. (Muralov: "You made this accusation at the last Plenum!")

That is not true, Comrade Muralov. There are two communications of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. regarding the illegal, anti-Party printing works and the non-Party intellectuals who were connected with it. You will not find in these documents a single word which shows that we accused the Opposition of taking part in this military conspiracy. The C. C. and the C. C. C. maintain in these documents only that the Opposition has combined with bourgeois intellectuals in organising the illegal printing works, and that a portion of these intellectuals, as it has transpired, were in their turn in connection with white-guardists who were contemplating a military conspiracy. (Muralov: "Is that written down in the stenographic report?") (Interjection: "In what stenographic report?")

I should like to ask Comrade Muralov to give the passage in question in the documents given out in this question by the Pol Bureau of the C. C. and by the Presidium of the C. C. C. Comrade Muralov will not give us any such passage, for there exists no such passage whatever.

Of what are we accusing the Opposition in this question? We accuse the Opposition firstly that, while they conducted disruptive work, they organised an anti-Party illegal printing works. Secondly, we accuse the Opposition that, for the purpose of organising this printing works, they formed a bloc with bourgeois intellectuals, a portion of whom, as it transpires, stood in direct connection with counter-revolutionary conspirators. Thirdly, that the Opposition attracted to themselves bourgeois intellectuals and conspired with them against the Party, and thus, against their will and against their wish, have come within the orbit of a third force. It transpired that the Opposition placed far more confidence in these bourgeois intellectuals than in their own Party. Otherwise they would not have demanded the release of all those arrested in connection with the illegal printing works, including the release of Cherbakov, Tverski, Bolshakov and others who, as has been proved, were in connection with counter-revolutionary elements.

The Opposition wanted to have an illegal, anti-Party printing works; for this purpose they sought the aid of bourgeois intellectuals. A portion of the latter, as has been shown, were in connection with counter-revolutionaries, — that, comrades, was the "linking up" that resulted. The Opposition was duped against its will by anti-Soviet elements who endeavoured to make use of the disruptive work of the Opposition for their own purposes.

There was thereby fulfilled the predication of Lenin which he gave our Party at the X. Party Congress (see resolution of the X. Party Congress, "On the Unity of the Party"), where he said that certainly the third force, i. e. the bourgeoisie, will attempt, on the occasion of a struggle within the Party, to creep in in order to make use of the activity of the Opposition for its class purposes.

It is said that counter-revolutionary elements often penetrate into Soviet organs, at the fronts for example, without any connection with an opposition. That is true. But in that case they are arrested by the Soviet organs and shot. But how did the Opposition proceed? They demanded the release of the bourgeois intellectuals arrested at the illegal printing works, who were connected with counter-revolutionary elements. That is the trouble, comrades. To such results leads the disruptive work of the Opposition. Instead of thinking of all these dangers, instead of thinking of the abyss into which the Opposition is plunging, instead of doing this, they increase their calumnies against the Party and endeavour, with all their powers to disorganise and split our party.

There is talk of a former Wrangel officer who is in the service of the G. P. U. in order to discover counter-revolutionary organisations. The Opposition is excited over this and makes a great fuss because a former Wrangel officer, to whom the allies of the Opposition, all these Cherbakov's and Tverskys applied, turned out to be an agent of the G. P. U. What is there bad about that, if this same former Wrangel officer is helpful to the Soviet power in discovering counter-revolutionary conspiracies? Who can dispute the right of the Soviet Power to bring over to its side former officers and employ them for discovering counter-revolutionary conspiracies?

Cherbakov and Tversky applied to this former Wrangel officer, not as an agent of the G. P. U., but as an one-time Wrangel officer in order to employ him against the Party and against the Soviet Power.

That is how the matter stands, and that is the evil with our Opposition. And when the G. P. U. in pursuing these clues, quite unexpectedly for them, came across the illegal anti-Party printing office of the Trotzkyists, it turns out that Messrs. Cherbakov, who formed a bloc with the Opposition, was already in connection with counter-revolutionaries, with former Koltchak officers of the type of Kostrov and Novikov, regarding which Comrade Menshinsky has reported to us today. That is how the matter stands and that is the evil with our Opposition.

The disruptive work of the Opposition led to fraternising with bourgeois intellectuals, and fraternisation with bourgeois intellectuals facilitated the undermining of the Opposition with counter-revolutionary elements of all sorts. That is the bitter truth.

5. How the Opposition is "Preparing" for the Party Congress.

The next question. On the preparation of the Party Congress. Comrades Zinoviev and Trotzky have here laid themselves open to attack in that they maintain that we are preparing the Party Congress with repressions. It is strange that they see nothing except repressions. And the decisions of the Plenary meeting of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. to open the discussion at latest a month before the Party Conference, what is that according to your opinion? Preparation for the Party Congress or not? The uninterrupted discussions in the nuclei and in the other organs of the Party which has now been going on for three or four months? And the discussion of the stenographic reports and decisions of the Plenary sittings during the last half year, and before all during the last three or four months, touching all questions of home and foreign politics? What shall one characterise all this as, if not as increase of the activity of the Party masses and drawing them into dealing with the important questions of our politics, as preparation of the Party masses for the Party Congress?

Who is to blame here if the Party organisations have not supported the Opposition? Obviously the Opposition is to

blame, whose line is a line of complete bankruptcy, whose policy is the policy of the bloc with all anti-Party elements up to the renegades Maslov and Souvarine and against the Party and the Comintern. Comrades Zinoviev and Trotzky obviously think that one must prepare the Party Congress by means of illegal, anti-Party meetings; by organising illegal, anti-Party printing works; by lying gossip to the imperialists of all countries against our Party, as well as by disorganising and splitting our Party. Is that not rather a strange idea of preparing a Party Congress? And if the Party resorts to decisive measures — including expulsions — against the disorganisers and splitters, then the Opposition cries out regarding repressions.

Yes, the Party employs and will employ repressions against the disorganisers and splitters, for the Party must not under any conditions be shattered, neither before nor during the Party Congress. The Party would be committing direct suicide if it were to allow the out-and-out splitters, the allies of various such Cherbakovs to destroy the Party because there is still a month to the Party Congress.

Lenin did not consider the matter in this light. You know that Lenin in the year 1922 proposed to exclude Shlapnikov from the C. C., not, perchance, for organising an illegal, anti-Party printing works, and not on account of connections with bourgeois intellectuals, but solely because Comrade Shlapnikov ventured to come forward in a Party nucleus with a criticism of the Supreme People's Economic Council. Now compare this attitude of Lenin with that which the Party now adopts towards the Opposition and you will understand how far we have allowed the disorganisers and splitters to go. You doubtless know that Lenin in 1917, before the October Revolution, several times proposed to expel Kamenev and Zinoviev from the Party, solely because they criticised, in a semi-socialist, semi-bourgeois newspaper — "Novaia Zizn" ("New Life") — a decision of the Party that had not been made public.

And how many confidential decisions of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. is our Opposition now publishing in the columns of Maslov's paper in Berlin, which is a bourgeois, anti-Soviet, counter-revolutionary paper! And we still allow and tolerate this without end, and thereby give the splitters in the Opposition the possibility of destroying our Party! The Opposition has brought us to this shame! But, comrades, we cannot tolerate this without end! (Interjection! "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

They speak of the arrest of disorganisers who have been expelled from the party and who conduct an anti-Soviet activity. Yes, we have arrested them and will arrest them if they do not cease to undermine our Party and the Soviet Power. (Interjection: "Hear, hear!") They say that the history of the Party know no such example. That is not true. What about the group of Mjasnikov? And the group "Rabotchaja Pravda" ("Workers' Truth"). Who does not know that members of these groups were arrested, with the direct approval and support of Comrades Trotzky, Zinoviev and Kamenev? Why could we three or four years ago arrest disorganisers who had been expelled from the Party, and why can we not do so now, when some former members of the Trotzkyite opposition go so far as to get into connection with counter-revolutionaries?

You have heard the statement of Comrade Menshinsky. You are informed by this statement that a certain Stepanov (belonging to the army), member of the Party, follower of the Opposition, stood in direct connection with counter-revolutionaries, with Novikov, Kostrov and others, a fact which Stepanov himself does not dispute in his statements. What do you demand should be done with these types, who were formerly revolutionaries? Caress them or arrest them? What is there surprising if the G. P. U. arrests such types? (Interjections from the audience: "Hear, hear, quite right!" Applause.)

Lenin said that one can bring the Party to complete ruin if one indulges the splitters and disorganisers. That is quite correct. Precisely for this reason I think it is time to cease continually pardoning the leaders of the Opposition — it is now necessary to draw the conclusion that Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev are to be expelled from the C. C. (Interjection: "Hear! Hear!") That is the fundamental conclusion and the fundamental minimum measure to which we must resort in order to protect the Party from the disruptive work of the disorganisers.

At the last Plenary Session of the C. C. and C. C. C. in August last some members of the Plenum reproached me on account of my indulgence towards Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev, and because I advised the Plenum not to expel Trotzky

and Zinoviev immediately from the C. C. (Interjection: "Quite true, we still reproach you for it now!") It is possible that I was too lenient at that time and made a mistake when I proposed a more moderate line towards Trotzky and Zinoviev. (Interjection: "Hear! Hear!") Petrovsky: "Quite right, we will always rebuke such a bad policy")

But now comrades, after all we have passed through in these three months, after the Opposition has broken the promise given by it in the special declaration of 8th of August to liquidate its fraction, and has thereby once again deceived the Party, after all that there remains no place whatever for leniency. Now we must stand in the front ranks of those comrades who demand the expulsion of Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev from the C. C. (Tremendous applause. Cries of "Hear! Hear!" Voice from the audience: "Trotzky must be expelled from the Party!") The Party Conference will decide that, comrades. If we expel Trotzky and Zinoviev from the C. C. we must lay before the XV. Party Congress all the material which has accumulated in our hands regarding the disruptive work of the Opposition. The Party Conference will have the opportunity of adopting the appropriate decisions.

6. From Leninism to Trotzkyism.

The next question, Comrade Zinoviev in his speech touched on the interesting question of the "mistakes" of the Party line in the last two years and the "correctness" of the line of the Opposition. I should like to reply to this in two words by making clear the question of the bankruptcy of the line of the Opposition and the correctness of the policy of our Party in the last two years. I am taking up too much of your time, comrades. (Voices: "No, go on, go on!")

Comrade Rykov: (Chairman) Is anybody against? (Voices: "Go on, please!")

Wherein consists the chief sin of the Opposition, which determines the bankruptcy of the Opposition policy? The chief sin consists in the fact that they attempted, are attempting and will continue to attempt to adorn Leninism with Trotzkyism and to replace Leninism by Trotzkyism. There was a time when Kamenev and Zinoviev defended Leninism against the attacks of Trotzky. At that time also, Trotzky was not so bold. That was another situation. Then, however, Zinoviev and Kamenev became frightened at the new difficulties, went over to the side of Trotzky and set up with him something in the nature of a worsened "August Bloc", and in this way landed in the captivity of Trotzkyism. Here, too there was confirmed the prophecy of Lenin that the October errors of Zinoviev and Kamenev were no "chance" affair. From the fight for Leninism, Zinoviev and Kamenev went over to the line of the fight for Trotzkyism. That is already a quite different situation. That is the reason why Trotzky has now become much bolder. Wherein lies the main task of the present joint bloc headed by Comrade Trotzky? It lies in diverting the Party gradually and step by step from the Leninist path into the path of Trotzkyism. Therein lies the chief sin of the Opposition. The Party will, however, remain a Leninist Party. It is natural that the Party has turned its back on the Opposition and holds the flag of Leninism ever higher and higher. Therefore those who yesterday were leaders of the Party are now renegades.

The Opposition believes that it "explains" its defeat by a personal factor, by the rudeness of Stalin, by the obstinacy of Bukharin and Rykov etc. That is far too cheap an explanation! That is quackery, but not an explanation. Since 1904 Comrade Trotzky has fought against Leninism. In the period from 1904 up to the February Revolution of 1917 Trotzky hobnobbed with the Mensheviks and conducted a desperate fight against the Party of Lenin. During this period Comrade Trotzky suffered a whole number of defeats from the Party of Lenin. Why? Perhaps the rudeness of Stalin is responsible for this? At that time Stalin was not yet secretary of the C. C.; at that time he was not abroad, he was conducting the fight in the illegality; but the fight between Trotzky and Lenin was fought abroad. What had the rudeness of Stalin to do with it? In the period from the October Revolution up to the year 1922 Comrade Trotzky — already as member of the Bolshevik Party — brought about two "magnificent" attacks on Lenin and his Party; in the year 1918 in the question of the Brest peace and in the year 1921 in the trade union question. These two attacks ended with the defeat of Comrade Trotzky. Why? Is, perchance, the rudeness of Stalin to blame? Stalin was at that time not yet secretary of the

C. C. The post of secretary at that time was occupied by generally well-known Trotzkyites — what has the rudeness of Stalin to do with that? Further, the Party encountered a whole number of attacks on the part of Comrade Trotzky (1923, 1924, 1926, 1927); and every attack resulted in a defeat for Comrade Trotzky. Is it not clear from all this that the fight of Comrade Trotzky against the Party of Lenin has far-reaching, deep historical causes?

Is it not clear from all this that the present fight of the Party against Trotzkyism is a continuation of that fight which the Party, with Lenin at the head, has conducted since 1904?

Is it not clear from all this that the attempt of the Trotzkyites to replace Leninism by Trotzkyism constitutes the main reason for the defeat and the bankruptcy of the whole line of the Opposition?

Our Party was borne and grew up in the storm of revolutionary battles. It is not a Party which grew up in a peaceful period of development. Precisely therefore it is filled with revolutionary traditions and free of any fetish-like attitude to its leaders. Plechanov was for a long time the most popular figure in the Party. Nay more, he was the founder of the Party, and the popularity of Trotzky and Zinoviev cannot even be compared with his popularity. And in spite of this the Party of Plechanov turned away from Plechanov as soon as he began to wander from Marxism to opportunism. Is it surprising if such not so very "great men" as Trotzky and Zinoviev run behind the Party after they began to deviate from Leninism?

The clearest proof of the opportunist degeneration of the Opposition, the clearest sign of the bankruptcy and decay of the Opposition is, however, its voting against the "Manifesto" of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union. The Opposition is against the transition to the seven-hour day. The Opposition is against the "Manifesto" of the C. E. C., of the Soviet Union. The whole working class of the Soviet Union, the whole of the advanced sections of the proletariat of all countries, welcome the Manifesto, received with unanimous applause the idea of the transition to the seven-hour day. The Opposition however, votes against the "Manifesto" and joins in the chorus of bourgeois and Menshevist "critics", joins the calumniators in the "Vorwärts". I did not believe that the Opposition was capable of such shameful conduct.

7. Some Important Results of the Party Policy in the last Few Years.

Now with regard to the question of the line of our Party in the last few years, the examination and appraisal of this line. Comrades Zinoviev and Trotzky said, the line of our Party has proved to be untenable. Let us look at the facts. Let us take the four fundamental questions of our policy and examine the line of our Party in the last two years from the point of view of these questions. I have in mind such decisive questions as the question of the peasantry, the question of industry and its new equipment, the question of peace and, finally, the question of the growth of the Communist elements in the whole world.

The question of the peasantry. How was the situation with us two or three years ago? You know that the situation in the village at that time was very difficult. Our district executive chairmen and our village functionaries generally were ill-treated and killed. Village correspondents were murdered. Here and there especially in the border districts, we had to do with raids by bandits. And in such a country as Georgia we even had a revolt. It is natural that in such a situation the forces of the kulaks grew, that the middle peasant gathered round the kulak, that the village poor disintegrated. What had a specially severe effect upon the situation in the country was the circumstance that the productive forces of the village grew at an exceedingly slow rate; a portion of the arable land was not cultivated at all. The area under cultivation fell to about 70 to 75% of the pre-war level. That was in the period of the XIV. Party Conference. At the XIV. Party Conference the Party undertook a manoeuvre in the shape of some concessions in favour of the middle peasants, which were calculated to raise the peasants' economy at a much more rapid rate; to increase the production of food and raw products from the land; to set up a firm alliance with the middle peasants and to make progress in isolating the kulaks. At the XIV. Party Congress the Opposition, with Zinoviev and Kamenev at the head, endeavoured to frustrate this manoeuvre of the Party and proposed to replace it, in essence, by a policy of de-kulakising, by a policy of restoring the committees of the village poor. That was, at bottom, a policy of

renewing civil war in the village. The Party repelled this attack of the Opposition, confirmed the decisions of the XIV. Party Conference, approved the policy of reviving the Soviets in the village and issued the slogan of industrialisation as the main slogan of socialist construction. The Party steadfastly pursued the line of a permanent alliance with the middle peasants and of isolating the kulaks. What has the Party achieved thereby? It has succeeded in creating peace in the village, improving the relations to the fundamental mass of the peasantry, created the pre-conditions for organising the village poor into an independent political force, a further isolation of the kulaks and a gradual embracing of the individual undertakings of several million peasants by the State and Co-operative organs.

What does it mean however, to create peace in the village? That is one of the fundamental conditions for the building up of Socialism. One cannot build up Socialism in an atmosphere of raids by bandits and peasants revolts. Today we have an area under cultivation nearly as large as that obtaining before the war (95%), a village in which peace prevails, an alliance with the middle peasants, a more or less organised village poor, strengthened village soviets and an increase in the authority of the proletariat and its Party in the village. In this way we created conditions which rendered it possible to continue the attack on the capitalist elements in the village and to secure the further successful building up of socialism in our country.

These are the two years' results of our Party policy in the village.

It has become evident that our Party policy in the main question of the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry has been correct.

The question of industry. History shows that not a single young State in the world has developed its industry, particularly heavy industry, without foreign help, without foreign loans, or without plundering foreign countries, colonies etc. That is the usual way of capitalist industrialisation. England developed her industry in the past by plundering for centuries all countries, all colonies and investing the proceeds of her robbery in her industry. In recent years Germany has been able to develop only with the aid of American loans, amounting in value to several milliards. We, however, cannot follow either of these two ways. Our whole policy excludes colonial robbery. We do not get any loans. There remains to us only one way, that indicated by Lenin: raising our industry, the re-equipment of our industry on the basis of means accumulated at home. The Opposition has croaked the whole time that the accumulation of our own means for the re-equipment of our industry is not sufficient. Already in April 1926 the Opposition, at the Plenum of the C. C., in their polemic against Comrade Rykov, maintained that our inland accumulation was not sufficient to advance the re-equipment of industry. At that time the Opposition prophesied one defeat after another. In the meantime it has turned out that we have succeeded in two years in making headway in re-equipping our industry. It is a fact that we have succeeded in two years in investing more than two million roubles in our industry. It is a fact that these investments have sufficed in order to make progress in re-equipping our industry and in industrialising our country. We have achieved that which not other State in the world has achieved; we raised our industry, we began to re-equip it, we brought it forwards, and all this with our own resources. There you see the results of our policy in the question of re-equipping our industry.

Only a blind man can deny the fact that the policy of our Party has here been essentially correct.

The question of foreign policy. The aim of our foreign policy, in so far as diplomatic relations with the bourgeois States are concerned, is to secure peace. What have we achieved in this sphere? We have achieved that, in spite of the capitalist encirclement, in spite of the hostile work of the capitalist governments, in spite of the provocative raids in Peking, London and Paris, in spite of everything we have not responded to any provocation and have understood how to defend the cause of peace. We have no war. In spite of the manifold prophecies of Zinoviev and others — that is the underlying fact, in the face of which the cries of our Opposition are impotent. And that is important for us, as we can only bring forward the work of building up Socialism at the speed desired in our country, only under conditions of peace. And how often with us has war been prophesied. Comrade Zinoviev prophesied that we would have a war in the Spring of this year. And then he

began to prophesy that the war would in all probability break out in the Autumn of this year. Meanwhile it is already Winter, and still we have no war.

These are the results of our policy of peace.

Only blind people cannot see these results.

Finally, the fourth question — the question of the conditions of the Communist forces in the whole world. Only a blind man can deny that the Communist Parties in the whole world, from China to America, from England to Germany are growing. Only a blind man can deny that the elements of the crisis of capitalism are growing and not declining. Only a blind man can deny that the growth of socialist construction in our country, the successes of our policy within our country, constitute one of the main causes of the growth of the Communist movement in the whole world, only a blind man can deny the continual growth of the influence and the authority of the Communist International in all countries.

These are the results achieved by our Party in the four main questions of home and foreign policy in the last two years.

And what does the correctness of the policy of our Party mean? It can, apart from everything else, mean only one thing; the complete bankruptcy of the policy of our Opposition.

8. Back to Axelrod.

All this is very fine, one could say. The line of the Opposition is incorrect and hostile to the Party. Their behaviour cannot be described as other than disruptive. The expulsion of Comrades Zinoviev and Trotzky is consequently the natural way out of the situation which has arisen. That is as it may be. There was a time when we all said that we must keep the leaders in the C. C., that we must not sever them from us. Why is there such a change now? How can this change be explained? Is there here any change at all?

Yes, there is a change. Wherein lies its explanation? Its explanation lies in the profound alternation of the fundamental line and of this disruptive "scheme" of the leaders of the Opposition. The leaders of the Opposition have changed, above all Comrade Trotzky, and they have in fact become worse. It is natural that the Party had to alter its policy towards these comrades.

Let us take for example such an important fundamental question as the question of the degeneration of our Party. That is the denial that there exists a dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. What standpoint did Comrade Trotzky hold in this question three years ago? You are aware that the Liberals and the Mensheviks, Smenovechovzy and all sorts of renegades spoke at that time regarding the necessity of a degeneration of our Party. You know that at that time they drew examples from the French Revolution, and maintained that the Bolsheviks are bound to collapse, just in the same way as did the Jacobins in France in their time.

You know that the historical analogies with the French revolution (fall of the Jacobins) are still the main argument of all the Mensheviks and Smenovechovzys against the maintenance of the dictatorship and against the possibility of building up Socialism in our country. What was Comrade Trotzky's attitude to this question three years ago? At that time he unconditionally rejected such analogies. This is what he wrote at that time in his brochure: "The New Course" (1924).

"The historical analogies with the Great French Revolution (overthrow of the Jacobins!), upon which Liberalism and Menshevism live and with which they comfort themselves, are superficial and untenable." ("The New Course", Russian edition page 33, italics by me. J. St.)

Clear and definite! One could not express oneself more decisively and definitely. Is this assertion of Comrade Trotzky regarding the historical analogies with the French Revolution, which all the Smenovechovzy and Mensheviks so eagerly made use of, correct? Indisputably correct.

And now? Does Comrade Trotzky still stick to this standpoint? No, unfortunately. On the contrary, in fact. During these three years Comrade Trotzky underwent an evolution in the direction of "Menshevism" and "Liberalism". He himself maintains today that the historical analogies with the French Revolution are a sign, not of Menshevism, but of "real", "genuine", "Leninism". Have you read the stenographic report of the meeting of the Presidium of the C. C. C. in July last?

If you have read it, then it will not be difficult for you to understand that Comrade Trotzky now bases himself in his Party upon the Menshevik theory of the degeneration of our Party after the type of the collapse of the Jacobins in the period of the French Revolution. The gossip regarding "Thermidor" is with Trotzky a matter of good breeding.

From Trotzkyism to "Menshevism" and "Liberalism" in the fundamental question of degeneration — that is the way of the Trotzkyites in the last three years.

The Trotzkyites have changed. The Party must also change its policy towards the Trotzkyites.

Let us now take a no less important question such as the organisatory question, the question of Party discipline, the question of the submission of the minority to the majority, the question of the role of the iron discipline in the Party, in the cause of consolidating the proletarian dictatorship. It is generally known that the iron discipline in our Party is one of the chief conditions for upholding the proletarian dictatorship and for the successful building up of Socialism in our country. It is generally known that the Mensheviks of all countries are striving above all to undermine the iron discipline of our Party. There was a time when Comrade Trotzky realised the importance of the iron discipline in our Party and highly respected it. The differences between our Party and Trotzky have actually never ceased. Nevertheless Trotzky and the Trotzkyites knew how to submit to the decisions of the Party. The repeated declarations of Comrade Trotzky, that no matter how our Party may be, he is prepared to "stand at attention", to obey when the Party orders, are generally well known. And it must be said that the Trotzkyites often succeeded in preserving their loyalty towards the Party and towards the leading organs.

And now? Can one say that the Trotzkyites, the present Opposition are prepared to obey the decisions of the Party, to "stand at attention" etc.? No, one can no longer say that today. After a twofold violation of their own promises regarding submission to Party decisions, after a twofold deception of the Party, after organising illegal printing offices together with bourgeois intellectuals, after repeated declarations by Zinoviev and Trotzky from this platform, that they violated the discipline of our Party and would violate it in the future — after all this there would hardly be a single person in our Party bold enough to assume that the Opposition is prepared to "stand at attention" before the Party. The Opposition is following a new way, the way of splitting the Party, the way of creating a new Party. The most popular pamphlet among the Opposition today is not the Bolshevik pamphlet of Lenin "One step forward, two steps back", but the old Menshevik pamphlet of Comrade Trotzky: "Our Political Tasks" (published in 1904), which was directed against the organisatory principles of Leninism, against the pamphlet of Lenin: "One step forward, two steps back". (Interjection: "We ought to publish a new edition!") You know that the essence of this old pamphlet of Trotzky consists in rejecting the Leninist view regarding the Party and Party discipline. In this pamphlet Trotzky designates Lenin as nothing else than "Maximilian Lenin": by which he means to infer that Lenin is a repetition of Maximilian Robespierre and represents a striving after personal dictatorship. In this pamphlet Trotzky says openly that one must submit to Party discipline only insofar as the Party decisions do not contradict the wishes and views of those who are called upon to submit to the Party. That is a purely menshevik organisation-principle. What, among other things, is interesting in this brochure is that Comrade Trotzky dedicates it to the Menshevik P. Axelrod. It is written there: "To my dear teacher Pavel Borisovitch Axelrod." (Laughter, interjection: "Open Menshevik.")

From loyalty towards the Party to the policy of splitting the Party, from the brochure of Lenin: "One step forward and two steps back" to the pamphlet of Trotzky: "Our Political tasks", from Lenin to Axelrod — that is the organisatory way of our Opposition.

The Trotzkyites have changed. The Party must also change its organisational policy towards the Trotzky Opposition.

Now a pleasant journey to the "dear teacher Pavel Borisovitch Axelrod"! Pleasant journey! Only make haste, Comrade Trotzky, as Pavel Borisovitch is a feeble old man, who may soon die and you may arrive at your "teacher" too late. (Prolonged applause!)

The Cup is Full.

By Arthur Ewert (Berlin).

At the moment when the most advanced workers of the whole world, when the revolutionary forces of the suppressed peoples turned their eyes to the Soviet Union, there arose the shrill, discordant cry of a number of oppositional leaders. They chose of all times, the tenth anniversary of the existence of the Soviet Union in order to oppose, in the streets and squares of Moscow and Leningrad, the slogans and demonstrations of the Party with their own slogans and demonstrations. In this attempt they suffered a complete defeat; they were driven away by the workers.

Thereby the cup became full. The long-suffering patience of the leading Party of the proletarian dictatorship came to an end, and it faced Zinoviev and Trotzky with the question: either or. Either they give up their work which is destroying the Party and undermining the dictatorship of the proletariat, or they must be expelled from the Party. Zinoviev and Trotzky have made their decision. Against the Party! Thereupon they received the only possible answer: the Party has severed all ties connecting them with it.

When four years ago Trotzky came forward with his opposition, he cried out: The dictatorship of the proletariat is in danger! The disaster must occur at latest within six months. In order to prevent this, industry must be transferred from the big towns, from Moscow, Leningrad etc. to those places where it is possible to produce more cheaply. In other words Trotzky wished to throw down the strategic main pillars of the proletarian dictatorship. The Party, with Zinoviev and Kamelev still in its ranks as fighters against this bureaucratic adventure of a revolutionary inventor, rejected this pessimism, and history proved it right. There set in a comparatively big advance on the basis of the directives worked out by the Party. True, this did not take place without difficulty. The building up of an industry from the economic forces of a single country is up to now unexampled in history, and the Soviet Union has accomplished this miracle. It is true this could not proceed without great difficulties. In the face of these difficulties Kamelev and Zinoviev also became suddenly frightened and unexpectedly they also came forward as an Opposition. And what did the "New Opposition" propose? To raise still higher the prices of industrial articles and thereby endanger the alliance with the peasants, to shake the stability of the chervonet in favour of an increase of wages in paper, and finally to recall to life the methods of war communism. And all this at a time of incredible sharpening of the international situation of the Soviet Union. To these adventurous proposals in home politics there was joined the still more adventurous proposal of the Opposition in questions of international politics.

The breach with the English trade unions was to be carried out at a time when it would have best suited Chamberlain and the reformist traitors. That, according to Trotzky, would have been the only "revolutionary" way of "breaking away". The same Trotzky who in the year 1921 cried out that the course of the Russian Revolution is a very important historical example but is by no means a political rule, demanded for undeveloped China that it should copy precisely the proletarian revolution of the year 1917. The C. P. S. U., in accordance with its Leninist training, has remained calm, and has precisely for this reason achieved incredible successes which have caused all enemies of the Revolution, from the imperialists to the social democrats of all shades, to tremble with rage and fear. All this has no place in the conceptions of Trotzky and Zinoviev, and they now reveal themselves to be people who have completely lost their heads.

From "saving" the proletarian dictatorship they have cheerfully gone over to destroying its foundations, the C. P. S. U., to undermining the Soviet Power and to disintegrating the Communist International.

The fight against the Communist International logically follows from the fight against the C. P. S. U. Just as the Opposition in the Soviet Union seeks connection with all possible elements, so it is not very squeamish in the choice of its agents inside and outside of the various sections. Zinoviev, it is true, shook off Katz. This gentleman, who has long become a comical figure and even in Hanover no longer possesses any influence, is too much compromised. But in what way does Katz —

apart from his greater stupidity — differ from that ally of Zinoviev, Maslov? Does not the Maslov group publish a journal containing the most vile calumnies against the C. I.? Is it not doing everything in order to discredit the work of the C. I. and of the C. P. S. U., to shake the confidence of the workers in it? Is not the Maslov band everywhere organising, where it is in a position to do so, candidatures against the C. P. G., thereby creating confusion in some sections of the working class? Is it not trying to organise a new "party"? Yes, it is doing all this. Trotzky, Zinoviev and the other "Bolshevik-Leninists", however, maintain connection with these enemies of the Communist Party of Germany, support them and promote their disintegrating work by supplying them with confidential documents and publishing their own fractional exudations. The allies of Trotzky and Zinoviev in the other countries are not of a better quality. They gather round them everywhere all the Right wing and ultra-Left waste products of the Labour movement. It is clear, that the C. I. and everyone of its sections has the duty to conduct the fiercest fight against this "work" of the Russian Opposition leaders. The wounds which our movement sustained from the Maslov group, so long as they were at the helm, are not forgotten. And along with the fight against opportunist errors, along with all the endeavours to overcome the weaknesses of the Party, we shall continue the fight against the anti-Bolshevik allies of Trotzky and Zinoviev until they are completely annihilated. For this reason we understand and approve the expulsion of the Opposition leaders from the C. P. S. U. as decided by the C. C. and the C. C. C.

Are the Opposition leaders injuring the Soviet Union? They are doing so by their fight against the C. P. S. U. and the C. I. They do so in that they encourage all hostile forces in Russia. They break the laws of the proletarian State. By their discrediting campaign they retard the development of the social democratic workers to Communism. They encourage the attacks and speculations of the imperialists. They weaken the defensive force of the country. All this the Opposition would do in a far greater degree if their views could penetrate to the working class without encountering resistance. This, however, must be prevented in the interest of the development of the revolution. Whoever treads under foot the laws of the proletarian State must be called to account by it, no matter, how great his services may have been in the time he still worked under the directions and guidance of the Party.

The Opposition talks about accelerating the world revolution. But how can the world revolution be accelerated if at the same time the strongest support of the revolution, the Soviet Union, is calumniated by those who only recently were regarded as leaders of the revolution? The increasing power of the Soviet Union is one of the most important points of attraction for the proletariat and the suppressed peoples. Of course, the Communists in the capitalist countries must not look with self-satisfaction at the development of the Soviet Union and neglect the revolutionary tasks in their "own" country. They must rather make the greatest efforts to preserve the proletariat from stray paths and intermediate stages which the Austro-Marxists are now preparing with increased energy. The fight against the social democracy and opportunism in the working class still remains one of the main tasks in the fight against the bourgeoisie, and it will so remain until the time, when power lies firmly in the hands of the workers. But because we see that opportunism is strengthened by the tirades of Trotzky and Zinoviev and the attractive power and power of action of the Party is weakened, therefore our fight is likewise directed against the views of the Opposition as being a special variety of opportunism, i. e. petty-bourgeois disbelief in the revolution, petty-bourgeois "dramatic" rebellion against the Party, the alliance with the various off-scourings of the first period of West European revolution and of the present stabilisation. In its measures against the disorganisers of the revolutionary world Party, the C. P. S. U. has the full support of the overwhelming majority of the C. P. G. which thanks to its experiences in the fight against Maslov, recognised already before the necessity and inevitability of this step.

Against Imperialist War! For The Soviet Union! For Revolutionary China!

Appeal of the Congress of Friends of the Soviet Union to all Workers.

The Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union has addressed the following appeal to all workers

**Against Imperialist War!
For the Soviet Union!
For Revolutionary China!**

We, representatives of workers, peasants, co-operatives, representatives of the peoples suppressed by imperialism, we, workers in the field of science, art, education and culture, we, social democrats, non-Party, Communists and members of national-revolutionary Parties — all we assembled here in Moscow, at the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union on the occasion of the ten-years festival of the great October Revolution, consider it to be our duty to declare openly before all the world:

We regard war against the Soviet Union as a shameful counter-revolution, as the greatest crime against toiling humanity.

War against the Soviet Union is a war against the working class and the peasantry for the benefit of the landowners and capitalists. War against the Soviet Union is a crusade against Socialism for the benefit of capitalism.

War against the Soviet Union means war against the workers of the whole world, means the promotion of the blackest international reaction in its endeavours to annihilate the Labour Movement of all countries and to crush the struggle for freedom of the oppressed peoples.

War against the workers' State means support of the system of ever recurring imperialist wars, which will be more and more reactionary, atrocious and annihilating and will convert into a heap of ruins the achievements of technique, culture, science and art, gathered in the course of thousands of years.

We address to all honest opponents of war, to all workers by brain and hand the summons to take up a ruthless fight against the preparation for war against the Soviet Union, as well as against every attack on the proletarian dictatorship, no matter from whence these attacks may come, no matter by whom they are supported nor behind what ideological slogans they may be concealed.

The Congress records that the international situation has become extremely acute in recent times. The policy of the imperialist great Powers in the post-war period has completely exposed the true character of all phrases such as "defence of native country", "righteous war", "last war" "war for freedom and progress" etc. This policy found expression in shameful robber-treaties (Brest-Litovsk, Versailles, Trianon, St. Germain etc.) This policy found further expression in intensified exploitation and the brutal policy of violence in the colonies and in the Republics of Central and South America, the populations of which are exploited even more than formerly, and in addition are exposed to barbarous and abominable raids on the part of the imperialists whenever they, politically provoked, attempt to free themselves from the despots. (Egypt, India, Syria, Morocco, Indonesia, China etc.)

The Congress stigmatises these actions of the imperialist governments and resolves to defend with all its powers the oppressed peoples, and in the first place the great Chinese people, this people which is conducting a heroic fight against the combined forces of the imperialists and of the feudal bourgeois counter-revolution, which now, under the flag of the Kuomintang, is annihilating the best forces of the Chinese struggle for freedom.

The Congress declares, that this policy of the ruling capitalist classes inevitably causes conflicts between the capitalist States and also leads to a bitter fight against the State of the proletarian dictatorship.

The Congress declares that the so-called League of Nations has proved itself to be the fighting alliance of the great capitalist robber States, as a union, directed in the first place against the Soviet Union, for a ruthless fight against the proletariat and against socialism.

The Congress further declares that the ruling classes of Great Britain, just as more than a hundred years ago, at the beginning of the European bourgeois revolution, they stood at the head of the counter-revolutionary coalitions against revolutionary France, so today they stand at the head of the "Holy Alliance" which the capitalist States are preparing for the fight against the first Workers' Republic. The breach of the Conservative government of Great Britain with the Soviet Union, the revolting acts of violence and the infamous executions of revolutionary heroes in China, the demand for the recall of the Ambassador of the Soviet Union from France, the incitement against the proletarian State by the press, the acts of terror, the insane piling up of armaments, the diplomatic, financial and economic encirclement of the Soviet Union — all this points to the threatening danger of an attack on the State of the victorious workers.

The Congress welcomes the policy of peace of the Soviet Union and declares that it is only thanks to the firm will for peace of the Soviet Union that the outbreak of war has not occurred up to now. The Congress declares that any capitalist government would long ago have resorted to sharper measures if it had been exposed to such disgraceful acts of violence as the organs of the proletarian State in London, Peking, Shanghai and Warsaw (murder of Voikov) have been subjected.

The Congress declares that the confidence of the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, as well as of the Red Army, in their government's desire for peace and the necessity of defending the achievements of the Revolution, would mobilise all the working masses of the Soviet Union in order to conduct with success the defensive fight against every attack.

The Congress approves the initiative of the Soviet government which, on the occasion of the Disarmament Conference convened by the League of Nations, puts forward a real programme of peace and disarmament.

The Congress is of the opinion that this Conference is aimed chiefly at arriving at an agreement among the Powers regarding arming against the Soviet Union. The Congress therefore calls upon all workers and all honest fighters against imperialist war to support with all their power the action of the Soviet government and to expose more plainly and unmistakably the fraud of the League of Nations and the organisations which support it.

The representatives of the workers and of the toiling peasants, the revolutionary intelligentsia and of the oppressed nations call for courageous support of the Soviet Union and of the Chinese Revolution.

Only the systematic organisational and propagandist preparation for mass action can be regarded as an honest fight for socialism and for the abolition of capitalist wars.

The Congress addresses to all workers, to all genuine supporters of peace and to all defenders of culture and civilisation the appeal to conduct with all means the fight against war preparations and the military attacks on the Soviet Union.

Hand and brain workers of all countries, fight unitedly against the base forces of capital!

Against the imperialists' policy of violence in China!

Against bloody fascism!

Against intervention in the Soviet Union!

Fight, defend, protect in every way and with all means the Soviet Union, the fatherland of the workers, the guardian of peace, the stronghold of emancipation, the citadel of Socialism!

FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

Two Letters of Lenin from the October Days.

I. Lenin's Letter to the Members of the Party of the Bolsheviks.

As is to be seen from the text, the letter from Lenin printed below was written exactly a week before the October upheaval.

The circumstances preceding the writing of this letter were, in broad outline, the following: On the 10th (23rd) October, Lenin, at the risk of falling in the hands of the counter-espionage, arrived in Petrograd and appeared at the meeting of the C. C. of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks), where he delivered a speech in which he insisted upon the inevitability of insurrection and the necessity of making the technical preparations for it. The Central Committee, **against the two votes of Kamenev and Zinoviev**, adopted the resolution drawn up by Lenin which declared that both the international situation and the inner situation of the Russian Revolution "placed armed revolt on the agenda"

"Recognising that armed revolt is inevitable and that the time is fully ripe for it, the Central Committee instructs all Party organisations to let this serve as the guiding line and to consider and solve all practical questions (the Soviet Congress of the Northern district, the removal of the troops from Petrograd, demonstrations of the people of Moscow and Minsk) from this view-point."

On the following day, 11th (24th) October, Zinoviev and Kamenev, who were in the minority, appealed to the larger Party organisations with the well-known leaflet: "For the present moment". In this document, contrary to the decision of the C. C., they energetically opposed revolt.

In the meantime the question of revolt acquired ever increasing importance.

On the 16th (29) October there took place a conference of the C. C. of the R. S. D. L. P. with responsible party workers, at which, again against the two votes of Kamenev and Zinoviev, the resolution proposed by Lenin was adopted, that "the meeting welcomes and fully supports the resolution of the C. C. and calls upon all organisations, as well as all workers and soldiers, to make all-round and intensive preparation for the armed revolt and to support the centre set up for this purpose by the Central Committee; it expresses the profound conviction that the C. C. and the Soviets will indicate in good time the most favourable moment and the most suitable means for the action".

As the practical centre for conducting the revolt there were elected: Sverdlov, Stalin, Djershinsky, Bubnov and Uritzky.

On the same day there was formed the Military Revolutionary Committee in the Petrograd Soviet.

In these days, so decisive for the revolt, there appeared in the "Novaia Zizn" of 17th (30th) October an article by W. Basarov discussing the contents of the leaflet issued by "two noted Bolsheviks" against an action, and on the 18th (31st) October there appeared in the same paper a note by J. Kamenev on the "action", in which he declared in his own and Zinoviev's name that it was their duty, "in the given circumstances, to pronounce against any attempt to take the initiative for an armed revolt, as this would be doomed to defeat and would have the most injurious results for the Party, the proletariat and the fate of the revolution. To stake all this on an action in the next few days would be an act of desperation".

The reply to this proclamation of Kamenev and Zinoviev in the "Novaia Zizn" was Lenin's letter to the Party members, which constitutes a document of extraordinary historical importance.

The letter is written in black ink and occupies four closely written pages without hardly any deletions.

The Lenin-Institute.

* * *

Comrades! I have not yet been able to obtain the Petrograd newspapers for Wednesday, 18th October. When I was informed by telephone of the complete text of the proclamation by Kamenev and Zinoviev published in the "Novaia Zizn", a paper which does not belong to the Party, I could not believe it. But all doubt was impossible, and I therefore make use of the opportunity to send these lines to the members of the Party on Thursday evening or Friday morning, for in face of the fact of such a monstrous act of strike-breaking, silence would be a crime.

The more serious the practical result, the more responsible and "noted" the people are who have committed this act of strike-breaking, the more dangerous it is, and the more emphatically the strike-breakers must be thrown out and the more unpardonable it would be to hesitate on account of former "services" rendered by the strike-breakers.

One can hardly believe it! It is well known in Party circles that the Party has discussed the question of revolt since September. Nobody has heard anything of a written statement, of a leaflet by either of the persons in question. Now, however, one can say, on the eve of the Soviet Congress, two well-known Bolsheviks come forward **against** the majority and, what is quite clear, **against** the C. C. This is not spoken straight out; there is thereby involved, however, a greater damage to the cause, for to speak by means of hints and allusions is much more dangerous.

It is quite clear from the text of the declaration of Kamenev and Zinoviev that they have turned against the C. C., for otherwise there would be no sense in their declaration; but **what** decision of the C. C. is combated by them is not mentioned.

Why?

That is quite clear; because the C. C. has not published it.

What situation arises here?

In the most important fighting question, two "noted Bolsheviks", on the eve of the critical day, 20th October open in the press **not** belonging to the Party, and in fact in a paper which in the given question **goes hand in hand with the bourgeoisie against the workers' party**, an attack on a decision of the Party Central which has **not** been published.

That is a thousand times more contemptible and a **million times more injurious** than, for example, all the proclamations of a Plechanov in the press not belonging to the Party in the years 1906 and 1907, which the Party so sharply condemned. At that time, however, it was only a question of an election, now, however, it is a question of insurrection aiming at the seizure of power!

Can one think of a more treacherous, blacklegging way of acting than, in such a question, **after** the adoption of the decision by the Centre, to combat this decision, **which has not been made public**, in face of the Rodsiankos and Kerenskys, in a paper which does not belong to the Party?

It would be a shame for me were I, because these former comrades were closely connected with me, to hesitate to condemn them. I say it right out, that I no longer regard these two as my comrades, and I will fight with all means, both in the C. C. and at the Congress, for the expulsion of these two from the Party.

For a workers' Party which life confronts more and more frequently with the necessity of a revolt is incapable of solving this hard task, if unpublished decisions of the Centre, after their adoption, are combated in the press not belonging to the Party, bringing vacillation and confusion in the ranks of the fighters.

Let Messrs. Zinoviev and Kamenev form a Party of their own with a few dozen people who have lost their head, or set up their candidates for the Constituent Assembly. Workers will not join this party, for its first slogan would be:

"It is permitted members of the C. C. who have been defeated in a decisive struggle in a meeting of the C. C. to resort to the press not belonging to the Party in order to attack Party decisions which have not been made public."

Let them build up such a Party: Our workers' Party of the Bolsheviks will only gain thereby.

When all documents are published the strike-breaking act of Zinoviev and Kamenev will be rendered still more plain. In the meantime, however, there may arise before the workers the following questions:

"Let us suppose that the Executive Committee of the All-Russian Federation of Trade Unions had decided, after months of discussion and by a majority of over 80 per cent, that preparations must be made for a strike, but that nothing must be made public regarding the time fixed for the strike, or anything else. Let us assume further that two members, under the dishonest pretext of having a "separate opinion", after the decision, not only write to local groups regarding a reconsideration of the decision, but also have their letters published in the press not belonging to the Party. Let us assume, finally, that they themselves attack the decision in this press, although the decision has not been made public, and run down the strike in face of the capitalists."

"The question now arises, shall the workers hesitate to expel such strike-breakers from their midst?"

* * *

With regard to the question of revolt at the present moment, on the eve of the 20th October, I cannot judge from a distance to what extent the cause has been injured by the strike-breaking proclamation in the press not belonging to the Party. It is beyond all question that great practical damage has been done. In order to rectify the matter one must above all set up the unity of the Bolshevik front by the expulsion of the strike-breakers.

The weakness of the ideological arguments against the revolt will be all the more striking when we drag them into the light. A few days ago I sent an article on this subject to the "Rabotchy Putj", and if the editor does not consider it possible to publish it, then the Party members will probably become acquainted with its contents from the Manuscript*).

These "ideological" (pardon the word) arguments proceed along two lines: First, on the "expectation" of the Constituent Assembly. Get us wait a bit, perhaps we shall be able to hang on till then. That is the whole argument. Perhaps we shall be able to drag on with the hunger, with the disorganisation, with the exhausted patience of the soldiers, with the measures of Rodsjanko to go over to the Germans (perhaps with lockouts)!

Perhaps, perhaps; that is, luck and chance, that is the whole strength of the argument!

Secondly, loud-crying pessimism. With the bourgeoisie and Kerensky everything is in excellent order; with us everything is bad. With the capitalists everything is wonderfully prepared, with the workers everything is bad. The "pessimists" shout themselves hoarse regarding the military aspect of the matter, while the "optimists" keep silent, for it would be hardly agreeable to anybody but a strike-breaker to disclose something in face of Rodsjansko and Kerensky.

* * *

Serious times, serious tasks, serious treachery!

And yet the task will be solved, the workers will rally together, the peasants' revolt and the extreme impatience of the soldiers at the front will also do their share! We will close up the ranks more firmly, the proletariat must triumph!

N. Lenin.

II. The Second Lenin Letter.

The following letter of Lenin was written after the above letter, either on the 18th (31st) October in the evening (on this day there took place the meeting of the Petrograd Soviet mentioned in the text, at which Comrade Kamenev came forward), or on the 19th (1st November). The letter is printed from a copy (type-written copy) from the year 1917 which was preserved in the archives of the October Revolution and which the archives placed at the disposal of the Institute. The Institute considers it necessary to reprint the text in that form in which it arrived in our hands, without making any improvements in style.

The Lenin Institute.

* * *

*) This article, "Letter to the Comrades", was published in the "Rabotchy Putj" of 19th, 20th and 21st October. Ed.

Dear Comrades! A Party which respects itself cannot tolerate any strike-breaking or strike-breakers in its midst. That is quite clear. The more one thinks over the proclamations of Zinoviev and Kamenev in the press not belonging to our Party, the more evident it becomes that their attitude amounts to a complete act of strike-breaking. The excuse of Kamenev at the meeting of the Petrograd Soviet is absolutely contemptible; he is, just see, completely in agreement with Trotzky. Is it then really difficult to understand that Trotzky could not, ought not and should not say more before the enemies than he did? Is it really difficult to grasp that it is the duty of the Party which has kept the decision secret from the enemy (the decision of the necessity of an armed revolt, as well as the decision that it has completely matured, the decision of all-round preparation etc.), that this decision, in the event of public demonstrations, pledges to cast not only the blame, but also the initiative on the enemy? Only a child can fail to grasp such a thing. The excuse of Kamenev is simply a peace of trickery. The same must be said of Zinoviev's excuse, at least of his "letter of justification" (in the Central organ, I believe) which I have just read, (for a separate opinion, an alleged separate opinion, of which the bourgeois press makes a great show, I, a member of the C.C., have up to now never seen). From the arguments of Zinoviev: "Lenin has sent his letters..." "They have also not protested before the acceptance of any decision." That is what Zinoviev actually writes, and underlines the word **before** four times. Is it really hard to understand that **before** the decision of a question of the strike by the Centre one can agitate for and against, but that after the decision in favour of the strike (and after the supplementary decision to conceal this from the enemy), to agitate against the strike means strike-breaking. Every worker will understand this at once. The question of the armed rising was discussed in the Centre since September. At that time Zinoviev and Kamenev could have and ought to have put forward their objections in writing in order that all could realise by means of their arguments their complete defeatism. To conceal his views from the Party for a whole month until the acceptance of the decision, and then, only after the decision, to publish his separate opinion, that means nothing else than to be a strike-breaker.

Zinoviev acts as if he did not know the difference, as if he did not understand that after a decision to strike, after a decision of the Centre, only strike-breakers can agitate among the lower bodies against the decision. Every worker will grasp this.

Zinoviev, however, has agitated and violated decisions of the Centre, both at the Sunday meeting, where he and Kamenev did not receive a single vote, and in his present letter. Zinoviev has the impudence to maintain that the Party was not asked, and that such questions must not be decided by ten people. Just think! All members of the C.C. know that at the deciding meeting there were more than ten members of the C.C. present; that the majority of the Plenum was present; that Kamenev himself declared at this meeting, "This is a meeting competent to make decisions"; that the absent members of the C.C. were perfectly aware that the majority was not in agreement with Zinoviev and Kamenev. And now, after the decision of the Central Committee at the meeting, which Kamenev considered to be competent to make decisions, a member of the C.C. has the impudence to write, "the Party was not asked", "such questions must not be decided by ten members"; that is nothing short of strike-breaking. Up to the Party Conference decisions rest with the C.C. The C.C. has decided. Kamenev and Zinoviev, who before the decision did not bring forward any objections in writing, began to combat the decision of the C.C. after it had been adopted.

This is a complete case of strike-breaking. After the adoption of a decision no opposition is permissible when the matter concerns the immediate and secret preparation of a strike. Zinoviev has the effrontery now to charge us with "warning the enemy". Are there, then, no limits to impudence? Who else has injured the cause, has betrayed the strike by "warning the enemy" but the people who have come forward in the press not belonging to the Party?

To come forward against a "decisive" resolution of the Party in a newspaper which in the given question goes hand in hand with the bourgeoisie! The Party which permits such a thing renders itself impossible, ruins itself.

To call that a "separate opinion" which Basarov learns and publishes in a paper not belonging to the Party, that means to treat the Party as a joke.

The proclamation of Kamenev and Zinoviev in the press not belonging to the Party was particularly despicable because the Party cannot openly refute their contemptible lies: I am not aware of the decision regarding the time, writes and publishes Kamenev in his own and Zinoviev's name. (After such a declaration Zinoviev is fully responsible for the whole behaviour and proclamation of Kamenev.)

How can the C. C. refute this?

We cannot say the truth in front of the capitalists, i. e. that we had decided on a strike, and that we had likewise decided to conceal from them the time fixed for the strike.

We cannot refute the contemptible lies of Zinoviev and Kamenev without injuring the cause still further. Therein, indeed, consists the boundless baseness, the real treachery of these two persons, that they have given away the plan of the strike in face of the capitalists, for if we keep silent in the press, then everybody will see how the matter stands.

Kamenev and Zinoviev have betrayed to Rodsjanko and Kerensky the decision of the C. C. of their Party regarding the armed revolt and regarding... concealing the preparation of the armed revolt, the choice of the time for the revolt, from the enemy. That is a fact. This fact is not to be refuted by any excuses. Two members of the C. C. have, by contemptible lies, divulged to the capitalists the decisions of the workers. To this there can and must be only one answer: The immediate decision of the C. C.:

"After establishing the complete case of strike-breaking in the proclamation of Zinoviev and Kamenev in the press not belonging to the Party, the C. C. expels both from the Party."

It is not easy for me to write this of comrades with whom I was formerly closely associated, but I would regard hesitation here as a crime, as otherwise a Party of revolutionaries which does not punish strike breakers among its prominent members is bound to come to ruin.

The question of the armed revolt, even if the strike-breakers who have betrayed the cause to Rodsjanko and Kerensky have postponed it for a long time, is not pushed into the background, is not pushed into the background by the Party. How can we prepare the armed revolt and commence it, if we tolerate "noted strike-breakers" in our midst. The more noted, the more dangerous, the more undignified a "pardon", as the French say. Only one out of our own midst can become a traitor.

The more "noted" the strike-breakers; the more incumbent it is to punish them by immediate expulsion.

Only by such means can one make the workers' party sound, purge it of a dozen intellectuals without character by closing the ranks of the revolutionaries; only thus can the great and greatest difficulties be met, only thus can one go with the revolutionary workers.

We cannot publish the truth, that after the decisive meeting of the C. C. Zinoviev and Kamenev had the audacity to demand at the Sunday meeting a reconsideration, that Kamenev shamelessly called out, the C. C. has made a fiasco, for it has done nothing for a week (I could not refute this, for one cannot say what has actually been done); but Zinoviev, with an innocent air, moved the resolution that had been rejected by the meeting: "Nothing shall be undertaken before the conference with the Bolsheviki, which must meet on the 20th for the Soviet Congress".

One could not believe it: After the decision of the Centre regarding the strike, to propose to the meeting of the masses to postpone the question, to entrust its solution to the Congress (to the Congress on the 20th — the Congress was, however, postponed later... the Zinovievs believe the Libers and Dans), to refer it to a collegium which is not provided for in the statutes of the Party, over which the C. C. has no control, which Petrograd does not know.

And after this Zinoviev still had the brazenness to write: "One can hardly strengthen the unity of the Party by such means".

Can that be described as anything else than a threat to split the Party.

I replied to such a threat, that I shall go to the end, that I shall obtain the right to speak before the workers, that I shall at all costs brand the strike-breaker Zinoviev as a strike-breaker. To the threat to split the Party I reply with the proclamation of an inexorable fight until the expulsion of the two strike-breakers from the Party.

The Executive Committee of the Trade Union Federation has, after long months, of debate, decided: the strike has become inevitable and the time is ripe, the time fixed for the strike must be kept secret from the employers. Thereupon two members of the Executive Committee go to the masses in order to combat the decision, but fail. Then these two go to the press, and by means of treacherous lies betray the decision of the executive committee to the capitalist press, thereby ruining the chances of the strike by a good half and, by warning the enemy, cause it to be postponed to a less favourable time.

That is a complete case of strike-breaking. And that is the reason why I demand the expulsion of the two strike-breakers and hereby reserve myself the right, in view of the threat to split the Party, to publish everything when the time for doing so shall have come.

The Bureau of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. Demands the Expulsion of the Opposition Leaders.

Moscow, 9th November 1927.

The following decision of the Bureau of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. in the question of the political results of the demonstration of the Moscow proletariat on the tenth anniversary of the October revolution and in the question of the street demonstrations of the Trotzky opposition, has been published:

"The bureau of the Moscow Committee declares that the demonstration of the forces of the Moscow proletariat on the tenth anniversary of the October revolution showed the enormous political enthusiasm and the complete confidence of the Moscow working masses in the Party. The Moscow proletariat demonstrated its devotion to the international revolution and its forces and will to build up socialism. The attempts of the Trotzky opposition to organise a counter-demonstration of split-up little groups of fractionalists suffered a shameful political defeat. This action of the Opposition in calling counter-demonstrations against the Party on the tenth anniversary of the October revolution can be regarded by the Moscow Committee as nothing else than an anti-soviet action and an undermining of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Having regard to the fact that the activity of the Opposition in the present period has the character of a second, non-bolshevist Trotzkyist menshevist party, the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. considers it necessary to expel the leaders of the Opposition Trotzky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Smilga and others including all active disruptors. This measure is necessary to prevent the organisation of a new party and the legalisation of the political work of anti-soviet elements.

"The Bureau of the Moscow Committee considers it impossible to permit leaders of the Opposition to hold prominent positions in the Soviet State which are then used by them in the struggle against the Party and for their fractional and disruptive ends.

The Bureau of the Moscow Committee considers it necessary immediately to submit this proposal to the Central Committee of the Party."

The C. C. of the C. P. S. U. on the Latest Action of the Opposition Leaders.

Moscow, 11th November 1927.

The C. C. of the C. P. S. U. has addressed the following communication to all Party organisations:

The Opposition has been completely defeated in the Party organisation. The Party as a whole and in particular the workers nuclei have definitely and decisively rejected the Opposition and isolated it as a little group of disruptive elements. The leaders of the Opposition who recognise that they are isolated are adopting a "new" menshevist way. They are turning from the Party, loosening the last bonds with it and beginning to seek help from anti-Party forces, petty bourgeois, bourgeois intellectuals and other non-proletarian sections. The anti-soviet street demonstrations of Troitzky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Smilga etc. on the tenth anniversary of the October revolution in Moscow and in Leningrad, the forcible occupation of a hall at the Moscow technical high school for an illegal, anti-Party meeting, the violence offered to representatives of the Party policy in illegal meetings organised by the Opposition, all these and similar facts prove that the Opposition after having lost the battle in the Party and compromised itself before the whole working class during the demonstration on the 7th November, is beginning to mobilise anti-proletarian forces and is preparing new anti-soviet actions.

The C. C. of the C. P. S. U. considers such an attitude on the part of the Opposition and above all of its leaders to be completely impermissible and inconsistent with the dignity of members of our Leninist Party. The C. C. has therefore considered it necessary to place the matter of the recent anti-Party actions of the Opposition before the Central Control Commission.

At the same time the C. C. has decided to instruct all Party organisations to act according to the following directives in their work for the policy of the Leninist Party and for the maintenance of the unity of our Party.

Firstly, decisive steps must be taken to prevent the attempts of the Opposition to carry the Party discussion outside the ranks of the Party.

Secondly, where a Party member speaks in circles which do not belong to the Party he must only represent and defend the policy of the Party. Oppositionists who oppose the policy of the Party in non-Party meetings are to be immediately expelled. Thirdly, illegal meetings called by the Opposition must not be permitted. Should such meetings be called despite the measures taken by the organisations, then they are to be dissolved with all the forces of the Party and the working class.

THE BALKANS

The Situation in Roumania.

By G. Dimitrov.

Roumania has recently been passing through a sharp political crisis. This crisis has not the character of a temporary episode, of a simple conflict over the dynasty, but it has very profound causes, it will inevitably become more acute and call forth new and more serious inner fights.

The ruling Liberal Party of Bratianu is the oldest and best organised big bourgeois party of Roumania. It is the party of Roumanian bank capital, of the Roumanian big bourgeoisie and of the former feudal lords who, after the semi-agrarian reform had been carried out, closely allied themselves with bank capital, and through it exploit the peasant masses in another form.

The Liberal Party is in the first place a political organisation of the old Roumanian bank capital, which during the war became enormously great and more consolidated, and is aiming at extending its domination over the whole industry and the financial system of Great Roumania. The so-called Bratianu bank trust comprising about a dozen of the big Bucharest banks, with the "Banca Roumaniasca" at the head,

practically possesses almost the financial monopoly in the country. By means of the "Nationalisation law" and a number of other political and financial measures, this liberal bank trust exerts influence over the bank capital and industry of Transylvania. The Bratianu bank trust finances the industrial undertakings under the most severe conditions. It receives a considerable higher rate of interest than the banks of the European countries. The Bratianu banks pay out dividends as high as 40%. The foreign capitalists who wish to invest their capital in Roumania, are in general compelled to do so through the mediation of these banks, or under their control, and to share a part of their gains with them.

The old Roumanian bank capital (the present Bratianu bank trust) has always been closely connected with French capital and places special obstacles in the way of the investment of English and Italian capital in Roumania which is striven for by various Roumanian industrial groups in order to free themselves to some extent from the exclusive financial monopoly of the Bratianu trust. Industrial development in Roumania after the war created new industrial groups which, together with the industrialists of the new provinces, especially Transylvania, desire at all costs to break the financial monopoly of Bratianu. The former Avarescu government, in agreement with Italy and England, made serious attempts in this direction, but precisely for this reason it was overthrown by the powerful Bratianu trust.

By the lowering of prices of agricultural products the Bratianu bank trust is plundering the peasantry in the most frightful manner. By monopolising the great stocks of provisions and other articles of necessity it is exploiting the masses of consumers in town and country without limit.

It is only natural that the above mentioned industrial groups, as well as the middle bourgeoisie, the big landowners, the kulaks, the middle peasants, the town petty bourgeoisie, and to a still greater extent the proletariat, are dissatisfied with the exclusive, brutal and predatory dictatorship of bank-capital exercised by the Bratianu government.

The national minorities are likewise dissatisfied with the dictatorship of Roumanian bank capital, because the latter pockets the lion's share of profits in the provinces, enjoys the privileges of State administration, suppresses all independent development and, in addition, conducts a policy of denationalisation.

Finally, English and Italian capital are opposed to the Bratianu government because it limits their sphere of activity in Roumania.

The Ferdinand dynasty was in reality a tool in the hands of Roumanian bank capital, i. e. of the Liberal Party. The present regency is an instrument of Bratianu and means a complete domination of bank capital. The regency is in fact a Bratianu dynasty, with the difference that the dynasty now, for very obvious reasons, possesses much less authority than under King Ferdinand.

In spite of a certain growth of the Liberal Party even in the newly annexed provinces, in spite of its well-known elasticity and capacity to manoeuvre, it cannot, owing to its aiming at a financial monopoly and its exclusive policy, unite the whole bourgeoisie under the regency, i. e. the Bratianu dynasty. The Liberal Party is still less able to extend its influence among the mass of the people. It can neither overcome the profound contradictions between the various sections of the bourgeoisie and bank capital nor prevent the intensification of the struggles among them, and still less can it abolish the growing oppositional mood among the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the proletariat.

In these circumstances Ex-Crown Prince Carol has become a sort of rallying centre for the discontented section of the bourgeoisie, of the landowners and officers. At the same time, however, the so-called Carlist movement is giving rise to illusions and hopes among the petty bourgeoisie and the masses of the peasants. Behind Carol there stands the Avarescu Party (the landowners, a section of the discontented industrial and commercial bourgeoisie and a part of the officers' corps), the Jorgas Party (the bourgeois intelligentsia), as well as the Cuzas group (anti-semitic intellectuals' and students' group). The more the dictatorship of Bratianu sharpens, the more possibilities the Carlist movement will have of winning broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry. The utter bankruptcy

of bourgeois democracy and of Parliamentarism in Roumania creates at the same time a favourable atmosphere for the growth of the Carlist movement.

The national-zaranist (peasant) movement, as the only mass opposition party against the Bratianu government, contributes much to the promotion of this movement. Based upon the kulaks, allied with the peasant masses and the popular intelligentsia, the National Zaranist Party is grouping round itself a portion of the middle bourgeoisie, and is giving expression to the general discontent with the Bratianu regime prevailing in the country. It is now making use of the dynastic crisis in its fight against Bratianu. The leadership of the National Zaranist Party, particularly since the union of the national party with the former zaranist party, goes with the oppositional bourgeoisie and the Carlist movement, betrays the interests of the peasant masses, and has at the same time, by its opposition to the Bratianu bank dictatorship, the possibility of dragging these masses in the train of the Carlist movement. In these circumstances one can reckon on a **fascist coup** in Roumania, under the Carlist cloak, which is apparently directed from the **Left** against the dictatorship of bank capital, and is thus to some extent similar to the Pilsudski movement in Poland.

There is not the least doubt that behind Carol there stands **England and Italy**. Apart from the interest English and Italian capital have in overcoming the resistance of the Roumanian Bratianu bank capital, England has certainly also a great interest that the Carlist movement shall succeed as a mass movement, because the Carol dynasty is very convenient for an adventurous policy against the Soviet Union.

Of course a victory of the Carlist movement is possible by the going over of a decisive portion of Roumanian bank capital to the side of Carol, by the "reconciliation" of Roumanian capital with English capital, which would mean subjection of the old Roumanian capital to the tutelage of English capital by a regrouping of bank capital itself and of the political forces of the Roumanian bourgeoisie in general. Such a perspective is by no means out of the question in the course of time, because in the first place the Liberal Party is far too much exhausted, secondly because it cannot overcome alone the inner economic and political difficulties, thirdly because the bourgeoisie of old Roumania and of the provinces have a lively interest in combining and concentrating their forces against the masses of the people and against their revolutionary movement, and fourthly because Roumania urgently needs a loan which, in the present situation, it can hardly obtain without England.

Such a development of the political situation will, of course, mean the complete victory of **fascism** in Roumania. For the rest, the Roumanian bourgeoisie has for long been following the path to fascism. The historical task of carrying out the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Roumania will not be solved by and under the leadership of the Roumanian bourgeoisie, but without and against the bourgeoisie by the proletariat in alliance with the peasant masses.

In these fights the Roumanian proletariat must actively pursue its independent political class line. The attitude of the proletariat cannot be other than: **determined fight against the Bratianu dynasty** (the Parliamentary dictatorship of bank capital); **against the Carol dynasty** (the fascist dictatorship of the big Roumanian bourgeoisie); **for the workers' and peasants' Republic**. And as this fight is closely bound up on the one hand with the imperialist pressure on the Balkans and of Balkan counter-revolution, and on the other hand with the fight of the working masses of the Balkans, it must of course be brought in connection with the slogan of the **Balkan Federation of workers' and peasants' Republics**.

The mobilising of the working and peasant masses for the most energetic fight against fascism and against counter-revolution, is the most urgent task of the Roumanian proletariat and of its advance-guard, the Communist Party.

The Communist Party must know how to draw the lessons from the failures of the Bulgarian Communist Party during the fascist patch of 9th June 1923 (the so-called tactics of "neutrality") and of the Polish Communist Party on the occasion of the Pilsudski Putsch (actual support of the fascist action of Pilsudsky under the false idea of supporting a petty-bourgeois democratic-revolutionary movement) and not repeat such extremely dangerous errors.

POLITICS

Imperialist Vengeance in Syria.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

Since the Syrian rebellion was suppressed by military force, the French Generals have been wreaking a brutal vengeance on all those who are in any way suspected of revolutionary actions or sentiments. As regards such active revolutionaries as have fallen into the hands of the French, they are without exception condemned either to death or to many years' incarceration. The court-martials proceed summarily in their treatment of the prisoners, and five or six death-sentences on one day are no rare occurrence. The executions are performed in public, by means of hanging, close to the gates of the cities, **Damascus, Aleppo, Homs**, or that "hub of French culture in the Levant", **Beirut**.

In this connection, moreover, the ruthless nature of the campaign of vengeance greatly exceeds what is known in the imperialist jargon as "political expediency". The arrests and executions in Syria are carried out for the purpose of satisfying the desire for vengeance of the "glorious" French generals, of gratifying the petty private aspirations of certain colonial officials, and of keeping the population in a permanent state of terror. The French press is most cynical in its reports on these acts of French justice. It is no rarity to come upon reports such as the following, quoted from "La Syrie", the organ of the French High Commissioner: "On the...th of the month in the morning, the awakening population of Aleppo could remark at the city gate three persons dangling between heaven and earth. A closer inspection showed them to be three rebels, whose nefarious practices had thus been cut short." And so on, in the same strain.

Those that are condemned to incarceration are slowly tormented to death. Months after the pacification of Syria was proclaimed as an accomplished fact, hundreds of nationalists and revolutionary workers are still pining in the prisons in compulsory exile, and so forth. Far from being made the object of an amnesty these prisoners have rather seen their lot aggravated by more stringent measures. The imperialist Mandatory Power, however, is not content with the victims languishing behind bolts and bars. Every denunciation and every act of arbitrary violence increases the number of its victims. Thus, in the little Drusian town of **Rasheya**, no fewer than 73 peasants were recently arrested on the denunciatory assertion of some neighbours to the effect that they had sympathised with the Drusians at the time when that tribe was advancing.

Punitive expeditions are meanwhile scouring the country. They have not only orders to nip in the bud any attempt at insurrection, to disarm the population, and to collect with force of arms the taxes inflicted on the poor population; they also collect extraordinary contributions which were levied from the towns and villages at the time of the rebellion and on the punctual and complete payment of which the French High Commissioner, deaf to all entreaties for postponement or remission, rigidly insists.

Meantime, on the heels of the bloodthirsty generals, the French capitalists are penetrating the country. The impoverished peasantry furnishes cheap labour for the cotton plantations leased by French concessionaries; French industrial products are foisted on the population, while the country is separated from its neighbours by insurmountable customs barriers. **Ponsot**, the French High Commissioner, who, silent and smiling, conducts the policy of oppression, is to remain at his post until the French economic programme has been fully realised.

In such circumstances it is a matter of course that the political aspirations of the population should remain wholly disregarded. In the place of the promised "constitution", there is at present a tendency towards a restriction of such pseudo-democratic institutions as hitherto obtained. The ruler of Syria is the French puppet **Ahmed Bek Nami**, an incapable feudal lord who is engaged in filling his own pockets and those of his colleagues, without troubling about the weal of the population, by whom he is heartily detested. In the **Jebel Drus** and in the **Alaouit** district, again, there are French governors. Steps are now being taken for the establishment, along the

eastern frontier of Syria, of a miniature State for the Bedouines of Deir-*ez-Zor*, so that the unhappy country of Syria may be the more thoroughly dismembered and mutilated.

The inhabitants of the Lebanon district, meanwhile, who, in return for their fidelity during the rising, were presented by *de Jovenel*, the predecessor of *Ponsot*, with a republican form of government, together with a President, two Chambers, a Ministry, etc., have now again been deprived of these baubels. The Lebanon constitution, now barely one year old, must be "revised", reformed, and in fact abolished. Its place is taken — even here, in a country at all times favoured and privileged by the French — by the tutelage of the French Republic.

The French leave no means untried to drive the Syrian population to desperation. They rely on the fact that, in view of the reaction prevailing throughout the world, their united front with the British, the demoralisation which they manage by means of their secret agents to bring into the ranks of the nationalist leaders, in view, in a word, of the permanent system of terrorism, no power can be forthcoming to hinder them in the realisation of their designs.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

The World Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union,

Report of Comrade Rykov on "Ten Years of Constructive Work in the Soviet Union".

Moscow, 9th November 1927.

The World Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union was opened this evening in the Hall of Pillars in the Moscow Palace of Labour.

There were 947 delegates present from 43 countries. Germany was represented by 173 delegates, France by 146 delegates and Great Britain and Ireland by 127 delegates.

The chairman of the organisational committee, Comrade *Melnichansky* pointed out in his opening speech the significance of this world congress which united the representatives of the working class, the peasantry and the best sections of the radical intellectuals both in the victorious and the defeated countries.

The chairman of the British delegation *Lawther* prefaced his remarks by reminding the delegates that the initiative for the calling of the congress had come from the British delegation. The latter had been of the opinion that it was necessary to utilise the presence of so many delegates from all parts of the world in Moscow in order to discuss practical measures for the defence of the Soviet Union. The danger of war was not a matter of the distant future, but an immediate and threatening menace. The congress would therefore have to find ways and means of making war against the Soviet Union impossible. The delegates who are now being given the opportunity of assuring themselves that, contrary to the hostile contentions of the bourgeoisie, the working masses stood four-square by the Soviet power, should inform the workers in their home countries upon their return of their experiences here in Russia and thus speed up the coming of the world October.

The congress then elected its *Presidium* consisting of representatives from all countries. Amongst the members of the *presidium* were *Clara Zetkin* (Germany), *Henri Barbusse* (France), representing the group of intellectuals, *Krupskaya* (Soviet Union), *Piechoki*, *Enwert* and *Holitscher* (Germany).

Comrade *Mihailov* greeted the congress in the name of the Moscow Trades Council and pointed to the development of the labour union movement in the Soviet Union since 1917 and to the significance of the improvement of the standard of life of the workers in the Soviet Union. The successes of the workers in the Soviet Union were also successes for the international proletariat, which was demanding its own freedom by defending the achievements of the working class of the Soviet Union. The proletariat of the Soviet Union was determined to resist the attacks of the imperialists with all the means at its disposal.

Comrade *Rykov* then delivered his speech upon "the ten years construction work in the Soviet Union".

When Comrade *Rykov* mounted the platform he was greeted with great applause by all the delegates who rose in their seats to applaud the chairman of the Council of People's Commissars.

"The soviet government", declared *Rykov* at the beginning of his speech, "holds that it is responsible not merely to the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, but to all those who have made the struggle for the abolition of exploitation their life aim, to all those who are striving for the abolition of the oppression of one country by another.

In what does Soviet Russia differ not merely from old-time Tsarist Russia, but also from the bourgeois capitalist States of the west? The basis of political power in the Soviet Union is the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the peasantry. The hypothesis for the rule of the workers is the socialisation of the means of production and transport etc. The control of these important economic positions enables the workers to conduct an organised system of economy in contradistinction to the anarchy of capitalist production.

There is no need to hide the great difficulties with which we have to contend in building up this new form of State, this new order of society, difficulties which arise both from the poverty and the backwardness of the country when it was taken over by the *Bolsheviki* and from the fact that the workers of the Soviet Union have to build up their country with the means at their own disposal, without the assistance of the capitalist countries of Europe and America.

Despite all these difficulties, the socialist elements of the economic system have grown tremendously and the private capitalist elements are being pressed back further and further. The private capitalist elements in the countryside, the *Kulaks* who exploit outside labour power, are being held in check by the socialist State. The means adopted to this end are, disenfranchisement and other political measures on the one hand and pressure on the economic front on the other, the squeezing out of the *Kulaks* by the co-operatives and the State undertakings.

The most important conclusion to be arrived at from the results of the economic constructive work during the last ten years is, that the material situation and the cultural level of the masses has risen considerably and has already surpassed the pre-war level. On the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution the State and socialised portion of our economic system is so strong that there is every guarantee that no danger will threaten from the side of private capital. There is no possibility of resuscitation for the latter and the work of building up socialism will continue.

A few words concerning the introduction of the seven hour day in the Soviet Union. I must very energetically reject the contention that this decision has been arrived at purely for agitational purposes. I declare categorically that first of all we take the responsibility for this decision, secondly the government of the Soviet Union, which is the embodiment of the power of the working class, cannot fail to carry out this decision, the workers would not permit it to. And thirdly, the seven hour day results from the whole policy of the workers' government, because during the last two years our economic system has entered the phase of construction and socialist rationalisation. In bourgeois society this process is coupled with an increased rate of exploitation of the workers. In the workers State it must and will be coupled with the improvement of the situation of the working class.

Comrade *Rykov* then proceeded to speak of the political structure of the Soviet Union. In the international press one can often find comparisons between the dictatorship as it exists in the Soviet Union and democracy. If one understands under democracy that the toiling population is given every possibility of participating in the direction of the country and the work of all the economic organs, the administration, culture etc., then there has never been a more democratic State organisation in the existence of humanity than the Soviet Union. At an approximate calculation, from 100 workers, at least 30 take part in some form or the other in the organs of the State power.

Our relations to the parties belonging to the Second International are coupled with this question of democracy. In October 1917 the government of the Social Revolutionaries and *Mensheviki*, that is to say, the government of the Second International held power. The October Revolution consisted in over-

throwing this government by armed violence and barricade struggles. This struggle against the Parties of the Second International did not limit itself to the October Revolution alone. The civil war was also carried on against the parties of the Second International, for the mensheviks and the social revolutionaries attempted, supported upon the Constituent Assembly, to form a government against the soviets and against the October Revolution. After the close of the civil war the Soviet Republic turned out to be the only State where the power was still in the hands of the workers. We have not yet a socialist society. The class struggle still exists upon the territory of the Soviet Union. Terror as a principle of the State administration of course does not belong to our programme. However, in all cases where the dictatorship of the proletariat is threatened, we apply the terror and will always do so.

Our standpoint with regard to the question of nationalities and in a number of other questions has been very clearly laid down by Lenin and very completely. The soviet power inherited a sad heritage from Tsarism. There were a number of peoples who possessed no alphabet of their own and no writings. At the present time all these people have their own alphabets and their own writings. At the same time the alphabet and the grammar of the peoples has been so simplified that their literatures have been made understandable to the broad masses.

Our foreign policy culminates in the policy of peace, in the struggle for the security of our peaceful constructive work in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. We have proposed again and again, and we still propose to other States that they should conclude a pact of non-aggression with us. We repeated this proposal a little while ago with special reference to the governments of France and Poland, but we have received no satisfactory answer.

In Western Europe the legend of "red imperialism" is being industriously spread. This legend has been disproved on many occasions. It is probably unnecessary to prove to this congress that it is a lie, and an insolent lie. This legend is invented in order to prepare public opinion for a very probable intervention, for a very probable war against the Soviet Union. It is one of the phases of the ideological preparation of war against the Soviet Union.

A little while ago we expressed the wish to participate in the disarmament conference. In full consciousness of my responsibility I declare that we are prepared to carry out the most logical and rational policy of disarmament in the world, but we are not prepared to support any proposals which would result in deceiving humanity, any policy which wishes to cloak the preparations for war with phrases about pacifism.

The progress which has been made in the Soviet Union has been achieved without any help from other States. The past ten years have proved that the Soviet Union is capable of carrying on the organisation of the socialist State to the very end, supported by the organisations of the working class and the peasantry, and irrespective of whether we receive loans or not. If, and this is the condition, we are not hindered from so doing by an intervention, a war, a raid upon the frontiers of the Soviet Union by the bourgeois States. (Prolonged applause.)

* * *

Moscow, 11th November 1927.

The discussion upon the speech of Comrade Rykov was begun this morning.

Comrade Clara Zetkin, who was enthusiastically welcomed, greeted the assembled delegates in the name of the Comintern and the C. P. of Germany. She spoke in glowing terms about the great work of the October Revolution, the results of which had been convincingly presented in the speech of Rykov. Through the October Revolution the proletariat of the Soviet Union ceased to be the object of history and became its subject, working consciously for the formation of a new social order. The tremendous achievements which the delegates could see in the Soviet Union had only been made possible by the proletarian dictatorship, which in the short space of ten years had accomplished a tremendous work for progress and for a higher culture.

Comrade Zetkin pointed to the attempts of world imperialism to destroy the Soviet Union, and appealed to the assembled delegates to work with all the means at their disposal to counter the attempts of the imperialists to isolate the Soviet Union. Should

the imperialists really begin war against the Soviet Union, then the working masses must answer them by destroying the belligerent powers, by destroying the class rule of the bourgeoisie.

The speaker declared that a complete guarantee for the continued development of the building up of Socialism in the Soviet Union could only be given when the Soviet Union was surrounded by States in which the proletarian dictatorship was at the rudder in place of the present ring of capitalist States. (The speech of comrade Zetkin produced a prolonged storm of applause, the delegates rising in their seats and singing the "International".)

Shan Tsung-ia greeted the congress in the name of 33 millions of organised Chinese workers and peasants and expressed his satisfaction with the report of Comrade Rykov concerning the achievements of the October Revolution, which had broken the imperialist chain of oppression. The hatred of the imperialists for the Soviet Union and their desire to destroy it were explained by the progress made by the Soviet Union in all directions. The speaker pointed to the intensification of the Chinese revolutionary movement, which produced sharper measures of suppression on the part of British imperialism which feared for the safety of its world hegemony. Amidst great applause he appealed to the delegates to defend the Soviet Union with all the means at their disposal as the Fatherland of the world revolution.

Ackermann (Germany) spoke of the deep and lasting impressions the German workers delegation had received from the work of socialist construction proceeding in the Soviet Union. The workers of the Soviet Union were carrying on the revolution not for themselves alone, but for the whole international working class. It was therefore the duty of the international working class to follow in the footsteps of the Russian workers and strive for the great world revolution. The delegates must ensure that the workers of their respective countries become acquainted with the progress being made by the work of building up socialism in the Soviet Union, and they must take all measures to defend the Soviet Union against the danger of imperialist war so that this peaceful constructive work should not be interrupted. The delegates should also make propaganda in their own countries to persuade technicians to assist the Soviet Union in manufacturing the necessary technical equipment. Ackermann closed his speech with the cry of "Long life international proletarian solidarity!"

Wadell (Great Britain) thanked the Russian comrades for their consideration in making it possible for the delegates to study the institutions etc., of the Soviet Union and refute the slanders of the capitalists. The British trade unions had promised to fight against the danger of war and upon their return the British delegates would do all in their power to see that this promise was kept also with regard to the defence of the Soviet Union against an imperialist war of aggression.

Klein greeted the conference in the name of the non-party workers of the French delegation and spoke warmly about the soviet system whose leading principle was to ensure the greatest possible well-being for the working class. The delegates should work in their class organisations that the working class of all countries foil the attempts of the capitalist States to disturb the wonderful constructive work proceeding in the Soviet Union.

In the name of the Irish delegation Jim Larkin expressed satisfaction at the report of Rykov and admiration of the progress of the work of building up socialism in the Soviet Union which Rykov had explained to them. The working class of the whole world would have to see to it that this peaceful constructive work be given the opportunity of full development and that the Soviet Union be effectually defended from the attacks of world imperialism. "We must convince the workers of our respective countries that their emancipation is coupled with the progress achieved by the Soviet Union".

* * *

Moscow, 12th November 1927.

To-day's session began with a speech by Marouf who expressed satisfaction at the constructive work being carried on in the Soviet Union and declared that the solution of the nationality question by the soviet power had given freedom and equality to all the oppressed peoples of the one-time Tsarist Empire. The speaker stressed the necessity of furthering the revolutionary movement amongst the colonial peoples.

Kasantzakis (Greece) declared that an imperialist war was unavoidable. The working masses should prepare themselves to turn the imperialist war into a social revolution.

The debate upon the first point on the agenda was then closed.

The conference adopted unanimously a resolution recognising the great successes of the ten years period of struggle in the Soviet Union.

The resolution points out that the Soviet Government is the only government in the world which not only accounts for its work to the toiling masses of its own country, but also to the representatives of the workers and the oppressed of all other countries. In the name of the workers represented by them the congress delegates declare their unshakeable solidarity with the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union and declare themselves prepared to defend the achievements of the October Revolution from all the attacks of the capitalist and imperialist countries. The successes of the last ten years prove indisputably the capacity of socialism to live. The economic advance of the Soviet Union was a victory for socialism over capitalism. The resolution specially mentions the growing industrialisation of the country, the systematic squeezing out of private capital, the strengthening of the socialist sections of the national economic system, the progress made by the electrification plans the economic progress of the peasantry. The economic policy of the soviet government is directed towards improving the situation of the working class. The best proof of this is the planned introduction of the seven hour day. The Soviet Power has achieved tremendous cultural work and is successfully abolishing illiteracy. The nationality policy of the soviet power gives complete freedom and equality to all peoples and thus furthers their cultural progress.

The resolution closes with the following words:

"We hereby undertake to prepare the defence of the first Workers and Peasants State in the world with all the means in our power and in our own countries. We undertake to fight against the interventionist plans of the capitalist world against the Soviet Union, to expose the intrigues of international imperialist diplomacy and to oppose the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union everywhere, to fight for the recognition of the Soviet Union, to support the Soviet Union in the disarmament question, no matter what the imperialists may do to avoid disarmament.

We will, in the class struggle of the proletariat, fight against imperialist war, we will support the cause of the colonial peoples fighting for their freedom, in particular the cause of the Chinese workers and peasants, and we will fight for the freedom of all oppressed nations and exploited classes all over the world."

* * *

Moscow, 12th November 1927.

At the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union, **Putz**, a member of the German peasant delegation spoke of the impressions received by the delegation whilst visiting the autonomous German Volga Republic. The peasant delegation had been able to see how much the soviet government had done to raise the level of culture, the level of scientific knowledge on the part of the peasants and to promote agriculture. Putz described the new life which was springing up in the villages, the development of the peasant co-operatives, the complete cultural and political autonomy of the Volga Germans and declared that the members of the delegation would tell the German peasants that their Russian comrades had only been able to gain all that they had gained on account of their close alliance with the industrial working class.

Lever (America) denied the untruthful allegation that the American workers had no interest in the working class of the Soviet Union. "Hundreds of thousands and even millions of American workers are proud of your achievements and hope that your success will continue."

In the name of the Co-operative delegation, **Boegan** expressed pleasure at the speech of Rykov and at the speedy development of the co-operative movement. The great demonstration on the 7th November had convinced the delegations that the workers and peasants really held the power in the Soviet Union. The speaker then spoke with admiration of the work

of the Russian co-operatives, which with their 15 million members really performed a cultural and economic work amongst the broad masses of the people.

Devillers (Belgium) and **Ugarte** (South America) expressed the solidarity of their delegations with the Soviet Union and the preparedness of the workers of their countries to defend the workers State against the danger of imperialist war.

At the evening session of the congress the discussion upon the speech of Rykov was continued. All the speakers, **Jonnet** (Switzerland), **Mrs. Tucker** (Gt. Britain), **Sochatzky** (Poland) and **Nejedly** (Tchecoslovakia) spoke with admiration of the successes achieved by the socialist constructive work in the Soviet Union and stressed the solidarity of the working class all over the world with the Soviet republics.

Saklatvala declared that the Soviet Union was the hope of all the oppressed nations of the whole world. The international working class must oppose the danger of imperialist war and defend the Soviet Union.

Galileo (Italy) greeted the congress in the name of the Italian working class oppressed by Fascism. (The delegates demonstrated against fascism, there were cries of "Down with Mussolini!")

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The General Strike of Miners in Asturia.

By P. Noel (Barcelona).

For the last few months there have been in Spain increasing signs that in contrast to the passivity of the workers during the first three years of the dictatorship, a revival of the Labour movement is in progress. The characteristic features of this rising tide are: the general strike of textile workers in **Barcelona** in June of this year; the **Biscay** general strike on October 10th; the general strike of the miners in the Province of **Asturia**, which at the moment of writing is still proceeding.

The last named conflict arose out of the circumstance that the mine-owners of Spain have for a long time been urging the dictator government to lengthen the working day in the mines by one hour. According to the statement of the owners, this would have permitted of a reduction of the price of Asturian coal, which is not in a position to compete with the cheap coal imported into Spain from **Great Britain**. At the end of September **Primo de Rivera** issued a royal decree, whereby the working day in the coal mines was to be lengthened as from October 1st from seven hours to eight and the Commission for Solid Fuel, consisting of representatives of the mine-owners, of the reformist trade unions and of the Government, was at the same time empowered to regulate the miners' wages, which the owners desired to reduce.

The **Communist Party of Spain** has for a long time anticipated this offensive on the part of the capitalists in the Asturian mines, and in the course of this year has carried on a big campaign of agitation in order to prepare the resistance of the workers to the prospective attack. During the course of this campaign, brutal reprisals have been carried out against the Communist League of Asturia, the best functionaries of which have been thrown into jail. In spite of this, the large majority of the miners appeared to be ready to fight with all their might against the demands of the coalowners.

The royal decree of **Primo de Rivera** brought the conflict to a head. On October 2nd, the reformist miners' union of Asturia, which is alleged to comprise 6000 of the 25,000 miners in the district, resolved by a slight majority of votes and against the vehement resistance of the Communists and of the minority delegates to lengthen the working day by half an hour and empowered the committee to go into the question of a wage cut with the Government and the employers.

In spite of this decision of the reformist trade unions, 85 per cent of the workers next day went on strike under the leadership of the Communist Party of Spain and of the illegal revolutionary trade union, which at this juncture joined in the agitation.

In view of this failure, the reformist traitors tried to overwhelm the leadership of the movement in order to strangle it. For this purpose they themselves two weeks later declared a general strike under the pretext that they had not been able to come to an agreement with the representatives of the employers and of the Government concerning the wage question — which affected directly only a single category of the workers. But three days later they ordered the men to return to work on the basis of an eight-hour day instead of the seven-hour day, with the same wage for the eight hours as had previously been paid for seven.

The effort on the part of the reformists to create a diversion misled nobody. The ballot resulted in a complete defeat for them. The great majority of the workers did not even cast a vote but resolved to continue the strike with the slogan: **Not a minute on the day, not a penny off the pay, reinstatement of all miners dismissed for the purpose of simulating a crisis.**

As was only to be expected, this firm stand of the strikers exasperated the Government in the extreme. On October 29th, **Primo de Rivera** sent to the **Governor of Asturia** a telegram, published in the whole of the Spanish Press, instructing him to take reprisals against all those "who advocated the strike or its conversion into a general strike". Naturally, the Governor carried out his master's orders. A few days later more than 200 arrests were made.

But still the men remained on strike. The C. P. and the illegal revolutionary trade union intensified their secret agitation and propaganda and managed to keep the leadership in their hands. Their proclamations are distributed everywhere. The few workers, who had returned to work upon the resolution of the reformist trade union, came out again and rejoined the strikers. The strike is practically general.

The civil guard of Asturia and of the neighbouring provinces is concentrated in the coal mining area for the purpose of violently suppressing Communist agitation and of "protecting freedom to work". Their efforts are, however, vain. In spite of the starvation involved, in spite of the measures of violence, the miners are determined not to give in.

Under the conditions at present prevailing in Spain, the fight of the Asturian miners is of great political significance. It shows up the solidarity existing between the employers and the dictator government. It shows to the workers of the whole of Spain, who are also threatened by the capitalist offensive, the line that they, too, must take.

The Communist Party of Spain is organising the solidarity of the workers of the whole of Spain for the miners of Asturia. But the help of the international proletariat is also required. The miners of the Soviet Union have already rallied to the aid of their brothers in Spain. All other organisations of the revolutionary miners must follow this example.

THE TRIAL OF ZOLTAN SZANTO AND COMRADES

The Trial of Zoltan Szanto and Comrades.

Twelfth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, 3rd November 1927.

A great sensation was caused at the opening of the session of the proceedings this morning, when four stenographers appeared in the court to take down the speeches of the defence.

One of the defending lawyers, Dr. Eugen Kiss sharply condemned the system which, he declared, commenced with the tortures applied by the police, found its continuation in the fabrication of false passports and the kidnapping of prisoners and reached its culmination in limiting the freedom of the defence by threatening the lawyers for the defence with prosecution for insulting the nation and thus striving to intimidate them. Under the appearance of legality these stenographers have been sent here to prevent the defence exposing the ruling system any more thoroughly than it has exposed itself here.

The first lawyer for the defence who spoke was Dr. **Vambéry**:

Apart from abuse of Soviet Russian and of Communism there was nothing in the speech for the prosecution against the accused. The fact that under the Hungarian dictatorship of the proletariat there was a red terror cannot possibly be an excuse for robbing people of their freedom now, quite apart from the fact that the white terror in Hungary has made the country into the worst possible example of the counter-revolution. But what has that got to do with the concrete accusations? The contention that there is no production in the Soviet Union is refuted by the statements of the British Foreign Office, a much greater enemy of Soviet Russia than the Hungarian public prosecutor.

But what has that got to do with the indictment? Concretely, all the prosecutor said was that in this criminal world process represented by Communism, everyone must be sentenced who has anything, no matter what, to do with a communist. For this reason the members of the Socialist Workers Party are to be condemned. According to the same reasoning, any woman who had sexual relations with a communist should be prosecuted and her child should be arrested immediately after birth and handed over to the tender mercies of Schweinitzer. The whole indictment is built up upon such reasoning. And for this reason the court must acquit the accused.

Following Vambéry the defending lawyer **Sopronyi** spoke.

He declared, *inter alia*, the accused recognise violence as one of the weapons of communism, but according to Hungarian law only persons actually guilty of using such violence against the existing order can be punished. The evidence for the prosecution could produce no weapons, but what we did see was the mediaeval torture chamber still in operation at the hands of the police. Here is armed violence in all its mediaeval brutality. If nothing else had happened in this process than the fact that even the prosecutor did not propose that the detectives be heard on oath, then all the accused would have to be acquitted.

In a speech which lasted two hours, Dr. Eugen Kiss declared: In his evidence Schweinitzer declared casually that apart from criminal files the Hungarian police also has political files in which everyone has a place who has anything to do with politics. That is, in Hungary everyone who has anything to do with politics is officially kept recorded by the police. Such a thing exists nowhere else in the world. It is perfectly clear that such an institution will seek to prove its own necessity. Upon the basis of the material it collects, processes are made. If it is written in this material that X or Y is a dangerous communist, then in political processes the accused are tortured, spies are bought and everything is done to prove the correctness of this statement.

The indictment in this process is based upon such material, the process is intended to prove the infallibility of the political department of the police, to prove that this department is absolutely necessary if Hungary is to continue to exist. The net of this bureau does not merely catch the politicians, it also catches the courts, and the judges themselves often do not know that they are passing sentence according to the dictates of the chief of the political department. Such things must be said plainly here, even at the risk that to-morrow a process is commenced against the defence for insulting the nation. It is our duty to refute the impossible statements of the prosecutor, not merely because we are the lawyers for the defence, but because if we did not do so, other nations might be led to believe that all Hungary is on the same intellectual level as that of the prosecutor.

Personally, I am a social democrat and carry on a bitter struggle against the communists. It is, however, a fact that the Third International stands honestly upon the basis of the self-determination of the peoples and opposes all unjust treaties. The president himself read out that the C. I. was opposed to the Treaty of Trianon. The Hungarian ruling class stands upon the basis of Trianon although it continually declares the contrary.

The statement that Russia is a desert ruled by a band of criminals can only damage the reputation of Hungary abroad. Other countries are doing big business with Soviet Russia. Educated people abroad will see from the speech of the prosecutor, which reflects the opinions of the so-called educated

classes here, that the latter are really living from foreign credits and from their "patriotism" and are exploiting the working class.

It is not my business to defend Lenin, Soviet Russia and the present leaders of Soviet Russia, I will merely quote what a bourgeois writer said about them: "Some say that the leaders of Soviet Russia are geniuses, others say that they are nothing but self-seeking men. Neither the one nor the other is correct. They are clever, conscious of their aims, and above all so unselfish that we can all learn from them."

In this process we have seen in the place of evidence and reasoned argument, scourges, instruments of torture, blows, kicks, forged passports, kidnapping, forgeries, and abuse of Soviet Russia and of communism. The prosecutor ought to see that the indictment has fallen to pieces, if he does not, then the court must make the fact apparent.

The proceedings were then adjourned.

Fourteenth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, 5th November 1927.

To-day the other defending counsel made their speeches in the trial of Zoltan Szanto and his comrades. The terrorising attempt of the President to force all the defending lawyers to speak yesterday, suffered a fiasco. Following upon the speeches for the defence the prosecutor made his closing remarks. A number of the defending lawyers answered, whereupon the President adjourned the proceedings until the 7th November. On this day the accused themselves will deliver their speeches. The sentences will probably be passed on the 10th November.

In to-day's proceedings the defending lawyers made a number of sensational revelations. Despite all the attempts of the President to gag the defence, the defending lawyer Dr. Fuerst read the official declaration of the Berlin Police Presidium that Rubin had been received there with the recommendation of the Royal Hungarian State Police.

President: "We heard that yesterday."

Defence: "Perhaps, but you have not yet heard that the Berlin Police President declares that he officially forwarded the reports of Rubin to the Hungarian Embassy and to the Budapest State Police."

The statement of Dr. Szoeki caused a tremendous sensation: "Two days ago I informed this court of the address that Hetényi gave Rubin to use as a cover address so that he could write from Berlin to Hetényi. I declared that the man in question was a certain Greilinger from the Barczay Gasse, the brother-in-law of Hetényi. I can tell you now that this address is actually the address of business of Hetényi. Even if there were nothing else against him, Hetényi ought to be put into the dock for giving in such a simple and stupid manner a police spy the address of his own business as a covering address. In its great simplicity this matter is a worthy counterpart to the case of the photographic copies received from the foreign embassy.

The same lawyer for the defence protested against the fact that in order to mislead the public the police had placed the whole of the defence under police supervision, and that in a case where the police had been found guilty of forging documents, misusing the power entrusted to them—kidnapping prisoners and a series of similar offences. And all this in order to prevent that the police system be exposed. Even in the days of the bloodiest white terror it was not the custom to cause all defending lawyers to be accompanied by detectives with a view to overhearing the conversations between the members of the defence.

The defending lawyer Fuerst has already pointed out that not merely is the freedom of the defence limited, but still worse, the possibilities of the defendants to defend themselves are almost abolished. One of his clients was arrested on the 22nd February, he, the lawyer, presented himself at the police to see his client on the next day, the 23rd, but it was not possible for him to secure an interview with his client until the 29th March, that is, 35 days later. The prosecution had also perpetrated this breach of the law. When he was finally permitted to speak to his client, he was not permitted to talk about the indictment. The present prosecutor Lindmeyer was present when my client Krieszl wished to explain to the Public Prosecutor Miskolczy why he withdrew the statements he had made to

the police, he saw also that Miskolczy, in the most brutal fashion, forbade my client Krieszl to speak and also refused the matter to be entered into a protocol. Up to this process he had not dared to use this brutal and illegal system, nor dared to fling off the mask in this fashion. Every reasoning person can only come to one conclusion from all this, the system which produced it must go.

The prosecutor Lindmeyer declared that it was a shameful thing for the Hungarian lawyers that there were those amongst them who attempted to place the State police in the dock in the interests of their bolshevik clients (sensation in the court and then laughter). It was not possible to suppose that the police forged passports (Interruption: "Who did then?") the prosecutor: "Rubin" (loud laughter). The defending lawyer Dr. Szoeki produced the original passport. "What do you say to that?"

The prosecutor: "I am not going to let myself be terrorised by that, anymore than by the declaration of the Berlin Police Presidium or the telegram of the League against White Terror which demands that I should not indict the accused. In the consciousness of the justice of its struggle against Bolshevism, Hungarian justice can afford to ignore the declarations of the Berlin Police Presidium and the telegrams of well-known artists and writers (interruption: "It can afford to ignore the laws too?" Loud laughter.). The President then threatened the accused that unless they ceased their interruptions he would punish them with the dark cell.

The prosecutor: "A number of the defending lawyers have declared that Communism cannot be destroyed because it was a cause which had the sympathy of many great minds. Amongst the defending lawyers there are some who sympathise with Bolshevism. We pay no attention to what happens abroad, but here in our own country we will crush Bolshevism, and if the defending lawyers sympathise with Bolshevism, then I will see that they are put in the dock also (tremendous indignation in the court). Many people dare not merely to compare Bolshevism with Christianity, but also with fascism. I declare that fascism is the greatest and most glorious idea of the twentieth century" (storms of laughter).

In the name of the defence, the defending lawyers Vambéry and Eugen Kiss answered the senseless speech of the prosecutor. The proceedings were then adjourned until the 7th November.

Fifteenth Day of Proceedings.

Budapest, 7th November 1927.

To-day, the accused made their concluding speeches. Not one of them was allowed to continue till the end. The President the court interrupted them all and forbade them to speak on. The accused spoke spiritedly against the present system in Hungary and rebutted the brutalities of the President with calm superiority, in a manner never before witnessed in a Hungarian court. The first speaker was:

Zoltan Szanto: "As a communist I cannot and will not make any speech of defence before a bourgeois court. I feel myself here in the dock like a soldier of communism before the court martial of his enemies, capitalism."

The President called him to order.

Szanto: "I understand perfectly well that the prosecutor and the court seek to defend bourgeois society with all the means at their disposal. I understand perfectly that in Hungary, where the dictatorship of the proletariat existed for four and a half months, where the workers were the ruling class for four and a half months, the present ruling class has a much greater fear of the Communist Party than in other countries. That is why we saw in this process all the mediaeval methods of torture with which in Hungary the police, the gendarmes, the prosecution, the courts and those under their orders, try to hamper the growth of the Communist Party into a mass party."

The President called him once again to order.

Szanto: "However, the greater the persecutions against us become, the greater our camp will become, the greater will become the number of those who long for a second, a victorious dictatorship of the proletariat and who are prepared to sacrifice their lives at any moment for the attainment of this aim.

Before the exceptional court I declared that I was firmly convinced that the dictatorship of the proletariat was the inevitable transition period from the history of class struggles, from the preparatory history of humanity into the real history, and I know that this transition period cannot be brought about without an armed insurrection, for the ruling class will never voluntarily surrender power. The prosecutor who defends the present order, accuses me upon the basis of this declaration of mine and upon my actions which are consistent with this declaration, justly of being an enemy of existing society and that if necessary I would not hesitate to use force to overthrow the existing order. We know perfectly well that in Hungary, severe terms of hard labour, if not the gallows await communists. But what will the social order which the prosecutor defends, attain with all this? All the punishments have not made any single communist hesitate. After the overthrow of the dictatorship the communists were thrown into the Danube, now, in the period of consolidation, the communists are being tortured with all the methods of mediavalism. But the work of the communists is not held up for one minute by this fact."

The President called him to order for the third time and warned him that if he continued in the same strain he would be prevented from continuing.

Szanto: "We perfectly understand the fear the ruling class has of the communists, and we know that the draconic sentences passed here are passed as a result of this fear, but mark well these draconic sentences will not lengthen the life of present-day society by one single day."

The President called him to order once again and demanded that he speak only concerning the indictment against him.

Szanto: "Even the blind must see that our persecutors know how weak present day society in Hungary is, how weak it is, this social order which has turned Hungary into a mortuary for the workers."

The President called him again to order.

Szanto: "The prosecutor and the courts defend this society. Why does not the prosecutor defend workers who after a life of toil, becoming unemployed, receive in Hungary instead of unemployment support, the whip?"

The President called him to order.

Szanto: "The prosecutor defends that order of society which for fear of a second revolution promised the peasants land, but which gave them only land enough for their graves, and that at usurious prices."

The President: "I warn you that you will not be allowed to proceed in this tone."

Szanto: "I wish to speak concerning three questions still. The prosecutor attacked the Soviet Union in an unqualified tone. The Soviet Union, our proletarian Fatherland, to-day celebrates the tenth anniversary of its existence."

All the accused rise in their seats like one man.

The President, trembling with anger: "Sit down, sit down immediately."

It took many minutes before a section of the accused sat down slowly and hesitatingly, twenty remained standing.

The President: "Sit down immediately!"

The accused remained standing whilst Szanto read the following declaration: "In the name of the Hungarian workers and peasants, and in the name of our comrades who are lying in Hungarian prisons for our cause, we send from this place our revolutionary greetings to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the tenth anniversary of the existence of the glorious Russian dictatorship of the proletariat."

There was tremendous excitement in the whole court room.

Szanto: "Here also our hearts beat together with the hearts of the workers all over the world and in the Soviet Union, where wonders have been wrought and where our immortal leader Lenin lies."

The accused resumed their seats.

Szanto: "Against this country the prosecutor dares to spread slanders, against the glorious proletarian State the Bethlen system intends to shed the blood of Hungarian workers and peasants in the pay of foreign imperialism."

The President: "I forbid you to say one word more about Russia. If you do, then I shall prevent you continuing."

Szanto: As I have still two important questions to deal with I will not say any more on the subject. The second question, which has been much discussed here, is the question of violence. The defending lawyers have pointed out that the law refers to the immediate application of violence, and that in our case therefore it is not applicable. They pointed out that we are living in a period of partial stabilisation and not in an acute revolutionary epoch, the epoch of the armed insurrection is therefore, not present. As a communist I must oppose this opinion which is liable to be misconstrued, even if it is represented by the defence. I myself, also said that we are living in a period of partial stabilisation and that the Communist Parties of the whole world are fighting for partial demands, for the daily needs of the proletariat. It would however be silly to believe, and the bourgeoisie should not deceive itself, that the Communist Party of Hungary and the Third International have thrown the weapon of armed insurrection out of their armoury, like ballast out of a ship. To-day the armed insurrection is not on the agenda, but to-morrow perhaps it will be, and it alone. And in Hungary, where the proletariat is oppressed with murderous violence, I do not know whether perhaps this "to-morrow" is not already a "to-day". I do not know but what the bitterness which has been caused by the victorious counter-revolution, may not in the immediate future lead to an armed insurrection under the leadership of the Communist Party."

The President (quite beside himself): "Don't agitate here. I have forbidden you repeatedly to speak about this question."

Szanto: "The third question about which I wish to speak is that of the mass Communist Party, legality and illegality. Prosecutor, please mark the fact that all the efforts you may expend to suppress the Communist Party, are wasted. Gallows for the communists do not solve social questions. On the contrary, they strengthen the growth of the revolutionary Communist Party. To-day tens of thousands of workers know that this is the Party which wishes to overthrow the Bethlen regime."

The President then prohibited him to speak on.

Szanto: I believe in the Communist Party of Hungary, I believe in the armed resurrection of the Hungarian proletariat."

The President: I forbid you to proceed. Sit down!"

The next accused to speak was Ignaz Glanz: "I came from Russia in order to fulfil my revolutionary profession..."

President interrupting, beside himself: "I forbid you, not one syllable about Russia here. We don't want to know anything about Russia. Defend yourself from the accusation that you founded a printing shop and intended to spread revolutionary material."

Glanz: "I shall defend myself against being accused of the one thing of which I am most proud in my life, that I did my best, if illegally and underground, to spread the great truths of communism in Hungary, the home of illiteracy and obscurantism? In the home of the backward, mediæval almost, primitive printing shops, is that a crime?"

The President called him to order.

Glanz: "In Russia the Soviet government has reduced illiteracy to a minimum. Hundreds of rotary printing presses are pouring a stream of enlightenment into the villages, but in this country illiteracy and the hand press are dominant. But with the aid of the letters of our illegal printing works we will soon gather sufficient masses around us that we shall do here in Hungary what Soviet Russia..."

The President, furiously: "Sit down, sit down, I forbid you to talk like that."

After a pause of ten minutes the President announced solemnly that by the decision of the court Vagi, Glanz, Szerenyi, Normai, Hugo Kiss, Pohl, Tirier, Kriszl, Szanto, La-

katos, Veneczy, Hazy, Boer, George Tot, Papp, Kocsis, Loevy, Gosztola, Rostas and Pipic were each sentenced to seven days solitary confinement in the dark cell for a demonstration in the court on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the October revolution.

In his closing speech the accused Szerenyi declared: "In his indictment the prosecutor said that only criminals and madmen would want to tear down the wonderful fabric of the present social order. In his opinion the fabric of the present social order is wonderful; the prosecutor probably stands alone in the world. Even the most enthusiastic defenders of this social order are compelled to admit that it has serious deficiencies and that it presents serious problems for solution."

Szerenyi then explained why he was in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "Capitalism has changed its modus from the productive order of the pre-war period based upon free competition, to monopolistic price dictatorship. To-day this dictatorship exists unchallenged upon the economic field. It is not possible to fight this new order with the old and peaceful means. Even "liberal" England is abolishing the elementary rights of the workers, including the right to strike. This is proved by the history of the miners struggle there. A dictatorship is being exercised over the working class both economically and politically. I am firmly convinced that it is not possible to fight this dictatorship with the old democratic means. It has been said that we are in the dock because we wished to overthrow the old order of society with armed force. At the present moment that is not true. The supporters of the capitalist social order in Hungary know as well as we do that the time for an armed insurrection of the workers in Hungary has not yet come. We are being persecuted now because our demands cut into the flesh of capitalism, because capitalism is not willing to fulfil our demands for improvements in the situation of the working class. It is not agitation which is responsible for the spread of the communist idea, but the circumstances. The present circumstances force the masses to adopt the ideas of the communists. The fact that to-day the Hungarian workers earn in real wages 40% less than before the war, that the workers have no decent homes, that they are vegetating as slaves, that the suicides in the Danube are swelling terribly, all these facts stir up the masses far more than any agitation could ever do. Under these circumstances, it is not possible to believe that the emancipation of the workers can be achieved by a parliamentary majority, by the methods of democracy."

The accused Johann Kocsis began his speech by saying that he was proud to have been a red soldier and that he had willingly sacrificed his leg in the Hungarian Commune. Whereupon the President of the court immediately forbade him to continue. Kocsis insisted upon speaking and the President then ordered two warders to remove him by force from the court room. This was then done. In leaving the court room Kocsis called out "You promised the peasants land and you have betrayed them..."

The accused Stefan Vagi addressed himself ironically to the judges: "The assumption that I withdrew my confession to the police because prison had broken me is incorrect. In prison I have a relatively greater freedom than outside. In prison I am left in peace, I am not dragged out of my bed in the middle of the night and hauled before the police. Actually I ought to beg the court to sentence me to a long term of imprisonment so that I might lead a comparatively peaceful life until these troublous times have passed."

Vagi then went on to show that the Socialist Workers Party was no covering organisation for the Communist Party. The Vagi Party had not adopted the methods of bolshevism. The Hungarian working class movement could not be crushed by violence. In the days of the wildest white terror, hundreds of thousands of workers had marched to the funeral of the murdered journalists Somogyi and Bacsa. They showed that even if the revolution were defeated, the working masses still lived and would continue to fight for their freedom. The leaders of the Social Democratic Party had betrayed the workers, concluded a pact with the government and abandoned the class struggle. "The formation of the Vagi Party was only a consequence of this treachery."

The President, interrupting: "Refer finally to the fact that you have sold yourself body and soul to the Third International!"

Vagi answered excitedly whereupon the President forbade him to continue.

The accused Alexander Loevy explained the reasons which had prompted him to become a communist. He closed his speech with the cry: "Long live the Young Communist International!"

President: "For that you remark you will spend two days in solitary confinement in the dark cell."

The accused Johann Pohl declared: "The capitalist social order is based upon the most brutal violence and it is even now preparing a new war. Hatred of this system caused me to become a communist."

The accused Johann Kreiszl also tried to explain why he had become a communist, but the President broke him off sharply and when he attempted to proceed he was removed from the court room with force.

The proceedings were then adjourned until the 9th November 1927.

Budapest, 9th November 1927.

To-day the verdict and the sentences in the trial against Zoltan Szanto and his comrades were announced. Most of the accused were found guilty of an attempt to overthrow the existing social order by violence.

Zoltan Szanto was sentenced to 8½ years hard labour and the loss of all civil rights for 10 years. Stefan Vagi was sentenced to 4½ years hard labour and the loss of all civil rights for ten years. Stefan Gosztola and Johann Kreiszl received 4 years hard labour each and Alexander Pohl received 3½ years hard labour. Thirty of the accused received sentences ranging from 8 months to 2½ years hard labour and 10 of the accused were acquitted.

During the reading of the verdict and the sentences there were demonstrations amongst the accused. They called out "Long live the Communist International!", "Long live the Communist Party of Hungary!", "Long live the revolutionary working class movement in Hungary!", "Down with bourgeois class dictatorship in Hungary!" etc. The President then sentenced a number of the accused to disciplinary punishments ranging from 4 to 5 days solitary confinement in the dark cell each.

After the reading of the verdict and the sentences the accused were escorted out of the court by a large body of police. The prisoners sang the "International".

THE WHITE TERROR

In Defence of the Class Trade Unions of Turkey.

To the Workers of All Countries!

Comrades!

The "Ameli-Teali", the All-Turkey Federation of Trade Unions, has been dissolved by order of the so-called revolutionary Government of Kemal Pasha. Its active workers have been arrested and the organisation destroyed. Apparently the crime of the "Ameli-Teali" consists in the very fact of its existence as a centre for organising the toiling masses of Turkey oppressed by need and subjugation.

The Government "People's Party" (Kemalists) have long been trying to get the trade union movement into their own hands and imbue it with the Fascist spirit. Neither police repression, bribery nor tyranny could, however, avail to subdue the spontaneous attraction for the toiling masses of class trade union organisations. And so we have the very day after the victories at the parliamentary hustings of the "People's Party", immediately after Kemal Pasha's five-day speech on the great achievements of Turkish democracy, a fresh attack on the moderate trade union centre. Such are the words and such are the deeds of bourgeois democrats all over the world.

Although the "Ameli-Teali" was not affiliated to the R. I. L. U. the Executive Bureau of the latter nevertheless expresses its intense indignation at this new act of violence of the Turkish People's Party and its profound sympathy with the oppressed toiling masses of Turkey.

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. appeals to the workers of all countries to make an energetic protest against the destruction of the class trade unions in Turkey and to support

the Turkish workers in their onerous struggle against the Kemalist methods of destruction and disintegration, and the efforts to corrupt the working class with Fascist ideals.

The Kemalists hope to subjugate the working masses of Turkey by forcible measures and repression to the native bourgeoisie, and to construct "their own" unions, thus rooting out the class labour movement. The whole plan, however, of subjugating working class mass organisations to the exploiting classes, will come to grief against the resistance of the Turkish working class, which will, with the help of the workers in all countries, shake off the Kemalist yoke, build up its own class organisations, and wage a determined struggle for its final liberation from the yoke of the exploiters.

Executive Bureau
of the Red International of Labour Unions.

THE DISCUSSION BEFORE THE XV. PARTY CONGRESS OF THE C. P. S. U.

Construction of Socialism.

By N. Krupskaya.

There was a time when we had a rather naive idea of the coming of Socialism: "death knell of capitalism, expropriation of expropriators, etc." and there is an end of it. If we revert in thought to the pre-October period we will remember that some comrades even doubted if some kind of transition period from capitalism to socialism would be necessary.

We have had already 10 years of this constructive transition period and we have learned much. We have learned that not everything depends on our aspirations, energy and decisions. We have learned that in order to progress one must be able to take into account a whole series of conditions, one must be able to establish a connection between a whole series of measures in the various spheres of construction, — only then something sensible can be achieved. During the first years after the October revolution we approached many questions in a rather slap-dash manner. Let us take for instance the question of our big and small industry. What was our attitude to it? Small and home industry is no use to us, we must develop our big industry? In regard to the home industry our policy was very harsh during the first years with the result that this industry deteriorated. At the same time big industry was not developing, in May 1921 Ilyitch was already saying: "our main task is re-establishment of our big industry. To be able to take seriously and systematically in hand the re-establishment of the big industry we must first of all re-establish the small industry".

Ilyitch spoke then of the necessity of putting our entire work on a more sound foundation.

He said that "after a period of unprecedented achievements in the sphere of proletarian, military, administrative and political creativeness has come a period of a much slower accumulation of new forces, and that this is not due to change but was inevitable, that not individuals or parties are responsible for it but objective causes."

A year later in April 1922, Ilyitch said at the XI. Party Congress: "The main thing is — to march on now in a much broader and more powerful mass, certainly in company with the peasantry proving to it by deed, practice and experience that we are learning and will learn to help it and to bring it forward. In the present international situation and with the present state of productive forces in Russia such a task can only be solved if one goes about it very slowly, cautiously and in a business-like manner, verifying a thousand times by practice every new step."

Five and a half years have passed since XI. Congress. During these years the Party followed the path of which Ilyitch spoke — it put the entire work of the Soviet power on a sounder foundation, it established closer contact between the higher economic organs and the lower — which was advocated by Vladimir Ilyitch — it drew the masses more and more into the construction of socialism.

Work became much more difficult when Ilyitch was no more, but we knew the path we had to follow.

Let us now consider what we have achieved by the XV. Congress of the Party.

We had recently an All-Union Congress of Working and Peasant Women — members of village Soviets, volost executives and urban Soviets.

This Congress was a test firstly in how far our work has been put on a sound basis and secondly to what extent we have been able to draw broad masses into the construction of the new Social order.

The first thing which struck one at the Congress was, — the different language of the peasant and working women delegates. Two — three years ago, working and peasant women did not speak like this. Although their language has not lost its local colour it is full of new expressions which give vent to new ideas. We had on the platform peasant women and women agricultural labourers from the various Republics, pit-brow lassies, textile workers, fisher women, all of whom spoke openly and boldly about everything — the good and the bad, — kerchieves on their heads and their hands soiled with hard labour and yet they speak of planning, of a calendar plan, of objects of taxation, of practical work, attendance at the presidium, agricultural equipment, the system of promotees, struggle against bureaucracy and red tape, improved production, control, deficit, etc.

Where has this language come from? I sat there with a pencil and dotted down these expressions. A fisher-woman said that two years ago she did not even know the first letter of the alphabet, and yet she spoke in cultured Soviet language and the same can be said of the woman who had worked 18 years in the mines and the woman agricultural labourer who called herself, "an ignoramus". The same kind of language on the part of peasant and working women I listened to recently in Briansk and Leningrad.

If you want to know where they have got this language from, — they hear it at meetings and over the radio, they read it in the newspapers. Language more than any reports bears witness of cultural development.

What do working and peasant women talk about? I will begin with Leningrad where I attended only one business session. The subject of discussion was: how to raise the quality of their work. Some of the delegates were complaining that no correct instructions and directions are given, that there are cases when the apparatus itself cannot teach, that literature is needed, "the apparatus refers us to the women's organisers who are unable to give instructions in regard to all branches of work, secretaries are frequently at a loss in regard to a proper distribution of work, etc.", if this is to go on we won't do much good, the government's money will be wasted, we do not want to be elected simply "for show", we are willing to tramp 20 versts to a meeting if we are only invited, etc. But when a woman employed in the "Treugolnik" started complaining that she did not get the notice in time and that there is no one to instruct her there was great indignation and cries from all parts of the hall: "you ought to be ashamed of yourself, to work in a factory where 17,000 are employed and to wait for a notice, can't you help yourself? Comrades, this kind of thing will not do", "you cannot have nursery maids running after you", women working in factories and works must help the peasant women", "practical work is needed and not only for ourselves, we must draw others into it, etc."

Finally it was stated that the attitude of lower organs to peasant women has improved, "that women muster courage to work in the Soviet", that they are becoming more active. "Of course work is frequently difficult, but we must bear in mind that only world revolution can achieve everything that is needed for peasant women".

The same note was struck at the All-Union Congress: a White Russian peasant woman said that a practical example must be set; others said that directions in regard to practical work must be given; others spoke of the lack of consciousness among "comrade-husbands", about "peasant women being in a different position than working women and that they find it therefore more difficult to get sex equality, some of the women described how they tramp with their little children to the election meetings because they want to be builders of the State." The peasant woman who was sitting next to me said: "It is difficult for peasant women to leave the home, it happened once that a woman who was in a hurry to get to a meeting closed the chimney of the stove too soon and her husband and two children

were asphyxiated. And yet peasant women go to election meetings because they want to win the confidence of the masses and the authorities by their work."

There were poor peasant women and women agricultural labourers on the platform. Their fighting spirit is remarkable. A woman agricultural labourer from Vitebsk, who called herself an ignoramus, said that she was tired of listening to complaints over husbands: "Our comrades abroad are not afraid to work illegally, why should you be afraid of your husbands: is your husband going to hang you or send you to prison?" ("there were days when they broke our ribs, but now they dare not do it", said my neighbour). "Besides, said a woman agricultural labourer from the platform, it is sickening to hear always, give, give!, arrange, organise! And what about ourselves, can't we do something?"

There were over 1,000 delegates but only poor peasant women and women agricultural labourers spoke. Peasant women belonging to the Kulak class dare not speak, they know, that the whole audience know that the Soviet government is against kulaks; they only venture to send up to the platform a note without signature: the words 'kulak' and 'bedniak' (poor peasant) should not be used for they do much harm."

In October 1917 the Soviet power was only proclaimed and its foundation was laid. Its aim was to organise around itself all workers and to draw every one of them into the construction of the new social order through the Soviets. Such was the aim but it took many years before one could properly tackle the question of wholesale inclusion of the masses into the constructive work of our Soviets.

It is being realised more and more of late that Soviet sections (commissions) are the organs through which the masses can be drawn into Soviet construction. A woman delegate from Siberia pointed out that kulak elements hinder the work of the sections. Kulaks are agitating among poor and middle peasants and are trying to persuade them not to work in the sections. Other delegates said that poor people find it difficult to work in the sections as this takes up a great deal of time. Here is food for thought.

I am sure that no one who was present at the Congress could entertain any doubt as to the attitude of these women delegates to the Party. For instance a Samoyede woman was among the speakers. She used a language which no-one understood but one could distinctly here in Russian the words "Communist Party", "world revolution", with which her speech was interspersed; the speech could not be understood but its meaning was clear and in keeping with the atmosphere at the Congress, — and the Congress applauded.

I would like to deal with one more question — **work on the cultural front.** This is an important and pressing question. Working and peasant women take a very definite attitude towards it. They are dissatisfied because there are not enough political education institutions, because village reading rooms are being closed; they have a passionate desire to learn to build schools, they are dissatisfied because many of the teachers are still tainted with the ideology of the past, they demand that teachers be given a genuinely revolutionary training, they are alarmed at the insufficient number of schools, they are dissatisfied with the lack of proper provision for the teaching of orphans and of the poorest peasantry, they are against school fees in the second trade schools and complain about the absence of hostels. What is done in this direction does not do justice to cultural demands and requirements and one cannot help being reminded of what Ilyitch wrote about cultural revolution. This is undoubtedly our weak spot, here help on the part of the Party and the government is needed.

In conclusion just a little illustration of what happens to our industrialisation if local conditions are not considered. A woman delegate from Saratov said that in her district an elevator has been constructed instead of oil refineries; the existing refineries have been closed and one now has to take the sunflower seeds a long distance to the elevator where one has frequently to wait three days for one's turn. The elevator has hit hard the poorest sections of the population for the price of sunflower oil has gone up from 14 to 40 kopeks per pound because of the elevator. A trifling fact but an eloquent illustration how important measures are sometimes achieving just the opposite of what they were intended to achieve, if they are taken in a hurry.

Why am I saying all this? It seems to me that all the above statements is a reply to the question: has our constructive work been put on a sounder basis, have we succeeded in drawing

the masses into it and of organising them around the Party and the Soviets?

Yes, we have succeeded. The working and peasant women congress has reflected the state of the country.

Our slogans have reached the masses, the October achievements have become dear to them, have become their slogans.

In this lies the strength of the Soviet power and the strength of the Communist Party.

"Soviet power is nothing but an organisational form of proletarian dictatorship, of the dictatorship of the leading class which is marching towards the new democracy, towards full participation in the administration of the State, — tens of millions of workers and exploited, who by their own experience learn to consider the disciplined and conscious vanguard of the proletariat as their most reliable leader", — wrote Ilyitch.

If the number of kulaks has increased by 1 or 2% it is not important, but that their proportional weight in the political life of the country is dwindling, is a matter of considerable importance.

An error of judgment here or there is not so important; work of such magnitude is impossible without it. Together with the masses and with their support we will make good the errors, we will put our entire constructive work on a yet sounder basis, we will co-ordinate it even to a greater extent than before.

The Opposition and the Rank and File of the Party.

By A. Kollontai.

The lower down the Party ladder, the nearer to the rank and file members of the Party, the more definite and pronounced is the negative attitude to the Opposition. This is a characteristic phenomenon. Hostility and bitter resentment in regard to the opposition prevail among the Party rank and file. To explain this phenomenon by saying that the apparatus "is keeping a tight-hold" on the rank and file, that its true voice is being stifled, as this is done by the Opposition, is utterly impossible because, to mention just one reason, the resentment against the Opposition is of a mass character. Since this is so one must go deeper to find the roots which are the mentality and the mood of the masses.

In the Party as a whole as well as in every nucleus this or that mentality prevails whenever a definite situation has arisen. No matter how strong the apparatus at the head of the Party or nucleus, if there be disharmony between the policy and the working of the apparatus and the mood prevailing among the majority, this disharmony will show itself by the way the rank and file reacts to this phenomenon.

The bitterness, hostility and resentment shown by the rank and file of the Party in regard to the speeches and actions of the Opposition are the outcome of a definite mental and spiritual growth among this rank and file, a growth in the direction of consolidating collectivist thinking.

The Union which is celebrating its tenth anniversary is at the same time going through the honeymoon of its feverish construction. Workers and the more advanced peasantry are up to their eyes in important every-day work: elaboration of new forms of economy, habits and customs, establishment of new relations between the various parts of the State and the economic organism. All this work is centred in innumerable collective bodies: Soviets, trade unions, commissions, committees. Nowhere in the world does the collectivist system of work predominate to such an extent over individual initiative as here in the Soviet Union. Of course it frequently happens that collective organs impede individual initiative, but this is another question; important is the fact that all these collective beginnings are an education in themselves, they teach the masses a new ideology and a new way of looking at life. The masses are getting accustomed to not depending on "leaders" but on puzzling out everything themselves by collective efforts. One has only to watch how even the least prepared organisations are conducting their meetings. Even if everyone present, taken individually, be "an unimportant person" even if he had no special merits in the past and is not particularly brilliant, he contributes to the session

just what is needed, a business-like remark which adds something to the work which is going on. Bits of thought, bits of proposals and the result — a solid mass of practical and well thought out decisions and instructions.

Once a decision is made, the Party or nucleus insists that the decision be not infringed. It has come to the pass that collective bodies demand that their will and decisions be taken into account by everyone, be they big or small. This is healthy reaction of the organising principle which got the best of the inevitable broad "self-activity" of small collective bodies and individuals in the epoch of civil war. When this selfactivity degenerated at times into anarchic individualism, it was a different epoch then, "taking matters into one's own hands" sometimes saved the situation. Now we are in the epoch of construction and we want first of all unity not only in action, but in thinking. By a healthy instinct the masses understand this spontaneously. That is why they are so indignant and resentful against the Opposition which disturbs the unity in Party ranks which welds together the human bricks into one powerful edifice fringes the fundamental demand of the masses: **observance of discipline**. It is precisely group work, collective work which produces an utterly new idea of the meaning of discipline, — not as submission to an "order" but as merging one's own will with the will of the collective body. Discipline is the cement which welds together the human bricks into one powerful edifice — the collective body.

The main cause of the hostility of the rank and file to the very term "opposition" is caused to a great extent by the instinctive feeling of the rank and file that the Opposition is acting "anarchically".

The rank and file are angry because the Opposition which is infringing their will is speaking at the same time on their behalf, on behalf of the masses. One frequently hears among workers the remark: "Nice defenders of our interests. Who has empowered them to speak for us? We do not hold their view. If we are dissatisfied with anything we will fight it out in the Party itself".

This kind of mood and temper has nothing in common with "pressure of the apparatus".

The rank and file do not believe the Opposition, they meet all its statements with derision. Does the Opposition really imagine that the masses have such a bad memory? Even if there be shortcomings in the Party in regard to policy, are not prominent members of the Opposition responsible for them? It would seem that the policy of the Party and the construction of the Party apparatus have become worthless from the day when the group of Opposition members disagreed with the Party. "This is suspicious", say the workers, "they attack the apparatus and the policy of the Party but in reality it is a question of who should lead . . ." And the masses turn away in disgust.

Another reason for the rank and file not believing the Opposition is: that the rank and file have always a profound disgust for **lack of principle**. First of all the utterly incomprehensible (for people not versed in political intriguing) bloc of opponents of yesterday. Then a still less comprehensible solemn promise in writing on the part of the Opposition to submit to the will of the Party, a Communist word of honour of a peculiar kind, broken almost the very next day. The jesuit rule: the aim justifies the means cannot be a rule for members of one and the same collective body. One cannot build up a collective body if there be no confidence in the word of its members, if one cannot rely on promises . . .

Such acts tell the masses more eloquently than words: those who have broken their word to the collective body of which they are members are no longer with us . . . The rank and file cannot forgive this game which is being played with the collective body, they cannot forgive these "round-about" ways. The rank and file who, by such labour and such efforts is gradually overcoming the principles of petty bourgeois individualism will never understand nor tolerate and forgive those who infringe the obligations which they have taken upon themselves in regard to the collective body.

The rank and file will have nothing to do with the disorganising infringement of discipline and unity on the part of the Opposition. The rank and file does not believe in the Oppo-

sition and will never forgive its jesuitical intriguing with the Party.

The rank and file dissociates itself indignantly from the criticism and the statements of the Opposition, — they are not in harmony with the moods predominating in the rank and file of the Party.

If the Opposition has no ear for the moods and temper of the rank and file (it was V. I. Lenin's strong point that he always could feel what the masses are demanding and aiming at), how can it be victorious? One cannot with impunity endeavour to set one's "group will" against the will of the collective body. Those who endeavour to do this, cease to be "one" with the masses.

The rank and file think that the live spirit of "collectivist democracy" which clashes with the petty bourgeois interpretation of democracy will be dormant in the Opposition until it is willing to understand that the decision of the Plenum of the C. C. is the reflection of the will of the rank and file of the Party. When the Opposition will have understood this, it will cease to sabotage the unity of the Party and to go against the mood and will of the millions strong Party membership.

The Distribution of the National Income and the Trotzkyist Opposition.

By A. Kon.

"Real wages in 1927 are at best on the same level as they were in the fall of 1925. At the same time, the country has undoubtedly become richer, the general national income has increased, the upper layers in the villages have enlarged their reserves very rapidly, the accumulation of private capital, and the trader and speculator has tremendously increased. It is clear that the share of the working class in the general income of the country has declined, whereas that of the other classes has increased. This is the most important fact to be considered in judging the present situation."

That is how the Trotskivists estimate the results of our work towards the Socialist transformation of our society.

I have before me a copy of the "Control Figures" of the State Planning Commission of the U. S. S. R. for 1927—28. It is not my object to deal with that now. What I want to call the reader's attention to in my article is that section of the book which deals with the distribution of the national income. The main figures of that section may be reduced to the following table which we present owing to the lack of space in the form of relative figures:

The Income of the Population and Socialised Economy of the U. S. S. R. in Percentage of the Total National Income.

	1924/25	1925/26	1926/27
1. The Agrarian Population	55.1	51.2	49.3
2. Wage Workers*)	24.1	27.7	29.4
3. People of Free Professions	0.4	0.4	0.4
4. Artisans and Craftsmen	3.4	2.8	2.7
5. The bourgeoisie	5.5	5.4	4.8
6. Miscellaneous	3.7	3.7	3.8
7. Socialised economy	7.8	8.8	9.6
Total	100%	100%	100%

Does this table confirm the contentions of the Opposition concerning the distribution of the national income in favour of

*) This group embraces all those who work for wages including office workers of government and commercial enterprises, domestic servants, etc., not including agricultural labourers. The corresponding figures for industrial workers including transportation were: 10.7, 12.7, 13.3. This includes only wages leaving out of calculation extra earnings and social insurance.

the propertied classes? Absolutely not. The table shows the direct opposite. We can note without any difficulty that the income of only two groups increases in the general income of the country: 1. Socialised economy and 2. people working for wages. On the other hand the share of the bourgeoisie, the peasantry and craftsmen decreases.

The table clearly indicates that the relative strength of the proletariat in the economics of the country is increasing along two directions: on the one hand the proletariat builds and strengthens the Socialised economic elements and thus guarantees the further raising of its relative strength and on the other hand it increases its standard of living and improves its material welfare.

It is clear from his, by the way, the another contention of the Opposition, namely, that the accumulation of the elements of Socialist economy proceeds exclusively at the expense of the proletariat, is unfounded. If this was so the share of the proletariat in the national income would be declining and at a more rapid rate than that of the other groups of the population. The growing share of the proletariat in the general income of the country refutes this absolutely unfounded contention.

On what basis does the Opposition conclude that the share of the proletariat in the national income of the country is declining? Their "platform" presents certain figures. It says:

"The increased earnings per capita in 1926 as compared with 1925 were, according to some figures, 19% for the peasants 26% for workers and 46% for tradesmen and manufacturers."

We do not know by whom, when and how these figures were concocted. The figures of the State Planning Commission give us an entirely different picture. If we express the income of the different groups of the population in percentages, as compared with the preceding year, you will have the following picture:

Income of the Population and of Socialised Economy of the U.S.S.R. in Percentage as Compared with the Preceding year.

	1925/26	1926/27
1. Agrarian Population	120.8	107.2
2. Wage workers*)	149.0	118.1
3. People of Free Professions	115.1	105.3
4. Artisans and Craftsmen	108.0	107.2
5. The bourgeoisie	126.7	99.9
6. Miscellaneous	132.8	114.1
7. Socialised Economy	146.5	122.2
Total	129.9	111.4

Compared with 1925/26, the year 1926/27 shows an increase of 7.2% for the peasantry, 18.1% for the workers, and a decrease of 0.1% bourgeoisie. Where do the figures on the increase of 19%, 26% and 46% come from? This remains a secret of the authors of the Opposition platform.

We will call attention to the fact that the income of the bourgeoisie decreases not only relatively (in relation to the entire national revenue) but also absolutely. This decrease is a result of course not of the decrease of the income of every individual capitalist but of the entire capitalist group of the population. The number of people classified in this group has changed as follows (in thousands):

1924/25	1925/26	1926/27
742	772	750

*) The corresponding figures for industrial workers, builders, and transport-workers are as follows: 155.5 and 116.2 (wages only).

At the same time we have an absolute increase in the number of employed workers. The number of usefully employed people of that group increases from year to year which may be seen from the following figures (in thousands)*):

1924/25	1925/26	1926/27
6573	7899	8327

However, it would be mistaken to think that the growth in the number of employed workers is the only reason for their increasing share in the national income. The income per capita of every individual of this group of the population was (in chervonny roubles)**):

1924/25	1925/26	1926/27
572	710	795

We can see that the per capita income of this group continuously increases.

The growing share in the national income of the wage workers increases owing to the general increase in the number of people belonging to that group and also owing to the increase in the average income of every member of that group. This does not prevent the Opposition platform from claiming that the "numerical growth of the working class and the improvement of its position is practically on a standstill."

We will, however call attention to the fact that the average income of every employed worker of this group of the population increases considerably faster than that of the other groups. This may be seen from the following table:

Income Per Usefully Employed Worker (%% as compared with 1924/25).

	1924/25	1925/26	1926/27
1. The Agrarian Population	100	122.6	128.9
2. Wage Workers***)	100	124.1	139.0
3. People of Free Professions	100	112.4	115.5
4. Artisans and Craftsmen	100	108.0	114.4
5. The bourgeoisie	100	121.8	125.3

The growth of the income of the average wage workers surpassing that of the average income of the other groups of the population within the framework of a general increase in the revenue of the country means an increase in the real wages of the workers. (We find in the same volume of "Control Figures" direct indications of the growing real wages which we find unnecessary to present here.)

Taking into consideration these figures it really becomes incomprehensible why the Trotskyist Opposition says that "real wages in 1927 have at best remained on the same level as those of the fall of 1925".

We conclude.

The Trotskyist Opposition maintain that real wages have remained unchanged since 1925. We see that they have considerably increased and still continue to increase.

The Opposition maintains that the share of the working class in the national income has decreased. We see that it continually increases.

They claim that the share of the other classes in the national income has increased. We see that it continuously declines.

Thus we see that "the most important fact to be considered in judging the present situation" has been found wanting.

*) The number of industrial, building, and transport workers has changed as follows: in 1924/25 3,428,800, in 1925/26 4,235,300, in 1926/27 4,465,900.

**) The corresponding figures for workers of the enumerated groups are: 485,500; 611,200; and 673,800 (wages only).

***) The same is true for the enumerated groups of workers, the figures being 100; 126 and 138.7 (wages only).

TEN YEARS AGO

The Bolsheviki Bring Peace.

Consternation of the Imperialists at the Victory of the Proletarian Revolution...

Berne, 10th November. The new turn in the Russian revolution has aroused the greatest consternation in the French press. The papers publish the Petrograd telegrams with huge headings and specially emphasise the removal of Kerensky. "Journal de Debats" very sharply attacks Lenin and Trotzky, who has been a convict (!) and certainly is in the pay of Germany (!!). The proclamation of the workers' and soldiers' council characterises the whole manoeuvre as a defeatist manoeuvre. The masses of Russia are promised the realisation of their greatest demands, peace and land. This is a cynical appeal to the basest instincts and the meanest greed. The sore spot of Russia has broken out, it is only a question whether the pus will penetrate the whole organism of Russia or whether normal conditions will be restored. The attempt of Kornilov must be renewed on a much broader basis. So long as Russia is not governed by a firm hand, the allied powers must not send a gun nor a shell nor even a cent to Russia.

... and at the Will to Peace of the Bolsheviki.

Rotterdam, 10th November. The "Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant" writes:

The influence which the fresh changes in Russia will have upon the war cannot yet be estimated. It is certain that they will not work in the direction of "continuation of war until final victory".

The "Journal de Genève" writes:

We shall soon learn what the regime of the workers' and soldiers' Council will force upon Russia. As a matter of fact Russia is being driven more and more to peace. This will be the first task of the workers' and soldiers' council. The consequences of this event for Europe are incalculable.

Copenhagen, 10th November. As is reported from the Finnish-Swedish front, the new events in Petrograd are already having an effect upon the troops at the front, and thousands of soldiers have deserted. Moscow is said to be swarming with such deserters.

Kerensky — the Field Marshal without an Army.

Vienna, 11th November. The War Correspondents' Quarters' report: As regards the situation in Russia, where probably open civil war has broken out, the following appeals and reports from Kerensky's camp give a picture:

1. To all troops of the Petrograd Military District:

I, the Prime Minister of the Provisional Government and Supreme Commander of the armed forces of the Russian Republic, have arrived today at the head of the troops who are loyal to the fatherland. I command all troops of the Military district of Petrograd, who either by force or as a result of a misunderstanding have joined the bands of the betrayers of the fatherland and of the revolution, not to hesitate an hour but to return to fulfil their duty.

The Prime Minister of the Provisional Government and Supreme Commander:

Kerensky.

2. To the Troops of Petrograd:

The glorious front troops who are loyal to the revolution and the fatherland have come to the capital. In order that no innocent blood shall be shed, arrest all those who have betrayed you and who are ruining and betraying the country. In order that we shall know which regiments are loyal to their

duty, send delegations to the front troops who are marching to the capital.

The Council of the All-Russian Committee for the Salvation of the Country and of the Revolution, the Commissar of the Petrograd Military District:

Malevsky.

3. To the Army Organisations and Commissars:

The indignation against the Bolsheviki is daily becoming greater in Petrograd; today open riots took place against them and in the streets shooting was heard in different places. The Telephone exchange is occupied by the junkies and the General Army Committee, which has driven away the Bolsheviki guards. In Moscow the Red Guard has been defeated. Towards evening Kerensky will stand before Petrograd. Connection with him is established. A delegation of the Committee for Salvation has gone to Kerensky. The termination of the adventure of the Bolsheviki is a question of the next few days or hours. For the sake of the most systematic termination of this adventure the rallying of all forces of democracy and of the All-Russian Committee for the Salvation of the country and of the revolution is necessary.

The Commissar of the Commander in Chief.

The War Correspondents' Quarters add: According to all appearances bloody fights are proceeding between the adherents of both parties in and round Petrograd. The Russian sailors are wholly on the side of the Bolsheviki, as are also the greater part of the land front troops.

Kerensky Defeated.

Vienna, 13th November. An appeal of Trotzky to the army speaks of the glorious victory won in the night of 13th November against Kerensky in the vicinity of the capital. This night belongs to history, the fight is still going on, there are still obstacles to overcome, but the cause is worth the sacrifices. At the Russian front the declarations of sympathy for the workers' and soldiers' council are increasing.

Reuter Reports the Victory of the Bolsheviki.

London, 13th November. (Reuter Report.) The admiralty reports on the basis of a wireless Russian press report: After a fierce fight which took place yesterday near Zarskoe Selo, the revolutionary army completely defeated the forces under the command of Kerensky and Kornilov:

The "Allies" of Russia Threaten the Soviet Government.

Berne, 10th November. The "faithful Allies" of Russia are making spiteful gestures and vie in making open and concealed threats against the Soviet government. While the French press is raging in impotent fury, England is using her favourite weapon — the hunger blockade, employing it equally against enemies, neutrals and allied who do not accede to England's wishes. The rage of the Russian bourgeois circles at the victory of the Bolsheviki is expressed in the strike of the Ministerial Privy Councillors and the strike of the Councillors to the legations; the Russian Embassy in New York refuses to recognise its own government!

* * *

Washington, 10th November (Reuter Report). The Russian Embassy reports that it refuses to recognise the authority of the Maximalist government.

THE PROVINCES IN THE DAYS OF THE UPHEAVAL.

The Example of Petrograd is Followed.

Reval, 9th November. The Military Revolutionary Committee at the Executive Committee of the Soviets of Esthonia issued a Manifesto "To all soldiers, sailors, workers and the whole population of Esthonia", in which it is declared that the whole power in Esthonia has been transferred into the hands of the Military Revolutionary Committee. A Revolutionary court has been set up.

* * *

Ostrov, 9th November. The Military Revolutionary Committee adopted a decision to take measures for the arrest of Kerensky.

* * *

Helsingfors, 9th November. The Finnish artillery regiment (12th army) adopted a resolution declaring for the support of the new power.

* * *

Minsk, 9th November. The Soviet of the workers and soldiers' deputies issued the "decree No. 1", in which it is declared that power in Minsk and the vicinity has passed into the hands of the Soviet. A Revolutionary military staff has been set up. A special regiment, named after the Minsk Soviet, has been formed out of the liberated political prisoners; revolutionary commissars were set up at all administrative organs, the revolutionary censorship has been introduced.

* * *

Kiev, 9th November. The public meeting of the Soviet proclaimed the Soviet power in Kiev. A Military Revolutionary Committee was set up, consisting mostly of Bolsheviki with insignificant participation of the Left S. R.'s.

* * *

Jekaterinoslav, 9th November. 6000 workers of the Brjanski factory, 2500 workers of the railway depots, of the Jekaterinoslav railwaymen's union, the 228th and 271st regiments, and workers of various factories in the neighbourhood adopted a resolution declaring complete support of the Petrograd Soviet and the victorious revolt. The resolution demands that also the Jekaterinoslav Soviet at once takes over the power.

* * *

Voronesh, 9th November. The commander of the garrison ordered Cossacks to come to Voronesh. The regimental committee of the 5th reserve machine gun regiment thereupon formed the "Commission of Six" whose task consists in keeping the regiment in fighting readiness in order, if necessary to prevent the Cossacks from marching through Voronesh on Petrograd.

* * *

Saratov, 9th November. The Soviet of the workers' and soldiers' deputies proclaimed the Soviet power; a Military Revolutionary Committee was elected. The whole land was handed to the land Committee. The Mensheviki have resigned from the Soviet.

* * *

Kasan, 9th November. Power has passed into the hands of the Soviet. The Military Revolutionary Committee was elected at a meeting of factory councils and the representative of the garrison.

* * *

Jekaterinburg, 9th November. After the arrival of news of the overthrow of the Provisional government, the Executive Committee of the Soviet declared itself to be the only power in the town; the commissar of the former provisional government was deposed and a revolutionary Commissar put in his place. The post and telegraph, railway etc. were occupied by revolutionary guards, the newspaper of the Cadets was suppressed. The taking over of power was decided unanimously, including the votes of the Mensheviki and S. R.'s. At the extraordinary session of the Soviet the representatives of all the fractions welcomed the Soviet power. The town дума maintains a waiting neutral attitude.

* * *

Archangel, 9th November. A Military Revolutionary Committee has been elected.

The Menshevist Brake on the Revolution.

Luga, 9th November. The Soviet of the workers' and soldiers' deputies condemns the revolt of the Petrograd proletariat and decides not to recognise the Soviet government.

In the night of the 9th November a detachment of Cossacks under the command of the S. R. members of the Soviet executive surrounded the building in which the Military Revolutionary Committee was stationed: The latter had to withdraw.

* * *

Valk, 9th November. The Executive Committee of the Soviet of the soldiers' deputies of the 12th army sent a telegram in which the "unreasonable action of the Petrograd Soviet" is condemned. The telegram demands that all the revolutionary organisations be subordinated to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet of the workers and soldiers' deputies, as the only authoritative organ of the whole revolutionary democracy. The "Committee for the Protection of the Fatherland and of the Revolution" has been formed.

* * *

Minsk, 9th November. The front committee formed a "Committee for the salvation of the revolution" and called a Cossack regiment into the town. The Bolsheviki have resigned from the front committee.

* * *

Tiflis, 9th November. A joint session of the provincial central of the Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the Executive Committee of the Tiflis Soviet adopted a resolution by 145 votes against 13 and 9 abstentions with an amendment against the taking over of power. In the amendment the population is called upon to maintain peace. The resolution of the Bolsheviki for supporting the Petrograd Soviet and the Military Revolutionary Committee was rejected by 147 votes against 15 with 9 abstentions.

* * *

Nishni-Novgorod, 9th November. The meeting of the Soviet of the Workers and Soldiers' Deputies adopted by 105 votes the resolution of the Mensheviki and S. R.'s condemning the Petrograd revolt and the action of the Petrograd Soviet. The resolution of the Bolsheviki obtained 62 votes.

The Joining of the Baltic Fleet.

Petrograd, 9th November (Report of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency). According to reports from Helsingfors the representatives of the Baltic Fleet and the Soldiers' Committees decided to affiliate to the Workers' and Soldiers' Council of Petrograd and to the Military Revolutionary Committee and to support them.

London, 10th November. It is officially reported that the representatives of the Baltic fleet and the committees of the Russian troops in Finland have decided to affiliate to the new government.

Order in Petrograd.

Petrograd, 9th November (Report of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency). This morning the newspapers appeared as usual, with the exception of the majority of the bourgeois dailies, whose linotype machines has been taken away by the workers' and soldiers' council in order to secure the printing of the newspapers of the soldiers, workers and socialists. Order prevails in the town. The Town council has formed a Committee of Public Welfare, composed of representatives of the town council, of the chief committee of the workers' and soldiers' council, of the peasants' soviet and of the military and workers' organisations. The Committee for Public Welfare is at the disposal of the population in case of riots.

The Military Revolutionary Committee informs all officers, soldiers and committees at the front and in the country of its decision to convey Kornilov and his followers to the Peter-Paul fortress and immediately to place them before a revolutionary military tribunal.