

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 69

8<sup>th</sup> December 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: laprekorr, Vienna.

## C O N T E N T S

- N. I. Bukharin: The Menshevist Character of the Ideology and Tactics of the Opposition.
- Politics.**  
Fritz Wieser: The Unmasking of the League of Nations.  
A. Verhaeren: The Political Situation in Belgium.  
Willi Schlämm: The Coalition Offensive of the Austrian Social Democrats.
- Against Colonial Oppression.**  
Willi Münzenberg: On the Eve of the Second Brussels Conference.
- For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.**  
P. R. Dietrich: The Opposition and the Social Democrats.  
P. Vaillant-Couturier: Why We Fight against the Opposition.  
The Communist Party of Norway on the Question of the Russian Party Opposition.
- The Labour Movement.**  
August Enderle: A Gigantic Struggle Approaching in the German Steel and Iron Industry.
- Ramingo: Amsterdam's Aid to the Italian Proletariat. Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. to Trade Union Educational League Conference.
- Fascism.**  
Ercoli: The Political Significance of the Trial of the Communist Party of Italy.  
G. S.: Intensified Exploitation of Female Labour under Fascism in Italy.
- The White Terror:**  
Ali Riza: The Terror of the Kemalists against the Labour Movement in Turkey.
- Documents.**  
The E. C. C. I. on the Tasks of the Communists in Indonesia.  
The Discussion Before the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.  
L. B.: The Discussion Supplement No. 6 of the "Pravda".  
H. K.: The Discussion Supplement No. 7 of the "Pravda".

## The Menshevist Character of the Ideology and Tactics of the Opposition.

By N. I. Bukharin.

### Speech delivered at the XVI. Party Conference of the Moscow Gouvernement.

We publish below the first portion of the speech of Comrade Bukharin in which he deals with the Opposition. Ed.

Before all allow me to welcome in the name of the Central Committee the Conference of the organised Party proletariat. (Applause.) Our Conference meets immediately before the ordinary XV. Party Congress, after the Ten Years' festival of our proletarian revolution, under conditions in which we have a bitter fight within the Party, which partially goes beyond its borders and is characterised by certain peculiarities. This fight does not mean any broad Party crisis of crisis in the country, but it was bitter as there were never such great differences of opinion within our Party and such anti-Party fighting methods as those employed by the very insignificant opposition group in our ranks, a group which in part already goes beyond the confines of our Party organisation.

I should like in my report, in the first place, to draw some conclusions from the discussion which we have conducted recently.

#### I. The Ideology of the Opposition.

If we attempt to summarise in a few words the results of this discussion, we can say that in the sphere of fundamental differences of opinion the Trotzkyist Opposition is almost completely on the path of Menshevism, and this in the fundamental questions of our Revolution. We have in the shape of the Opposition a new Menshevism, a "Neo-Menshevism", which naturally differs in some peculiarities from classical menshevism, whilst at bottom it coincides with it. In the question of the estimation of the driving forces of the Revolution and the estimation of the situation now obtaining in our country, there is repeated, on the threshold of the second decade after the victory of the proletariat, in an extraordinary large portion of the views of the Opposition, almost word for word that which classical Menshevism maintains through the mouths of its most characteristic representatives.

But not only in that, also in the fighting methods and in the tactical line, our Opposition is repeating those fighting methods which characterise the elements of those political

organisations which stand outside of our Party. I have in mind in the first place the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, i. e. the organisation of the Mensheviks. That is the result.

What underlies that theoretical estimation of the situation in our country as put forward by the Opposition? There underlies the assumption that our country, owing to its technical and economic weakness, is not capable of continuing successfully the work of socialist construction without the support of the victorious proletariat in other countries. This Trotskyist formula, which has been put forward and championed by Trotsky more than once, underlies in an altered form the October errors of Kamenev and Zinoviev. This formula is also now finding expression.

From this formula there arises the conclusion of the Opposition that our ruin is inevitable, that — in view of the delay in the world revolution — our degeneration, which according to the oppositional and menshevik theoreticians is passing through a number of stages, is inevitable. From the standpoint of the distribution of the most important class forces in the country we should now have the following regrouping: from the proletariat to the peasantry, consequently from the proletariat to the petty bourgeoisie, from the peasantry to the kulaks, i. e. from the petty bourgeoisie and from the simple producers of goods to the capitalistic elements, from the kulaks to the bourgeoisie, to the NEP-man. It is alleged that we are proceeding, through a number of intermediate stages, through various links in this great process, to a point where the main control, the hegemony, passes from one set of hands into another, from the working class to the capitalists, to the NEP-man bourgeoisie.

Upon the basis of the regrouping of the forces in our country under the influence of the policy which our Party is conducting, there is alleged to be taking place a corresponding degeneration of our State apparatus, i. e. a radical alteration of the class character of the power in our country. In the first place there is proceeding, it is alleged, the separation of the general State apparatus of the proletarian dictatorship from its proletarian class basis; then there occurs the transformation of the State apparatus into a sort of independent force standing above the classes; thereupon this independent apparatus, alleged to be free from the proletarian class basis, as Trotsky expresses it, obtains another "social content", a "social content" of another class; it gropes after another social basis, a bourgeois basis. And that is the expression of Thermidorianism, of Bonapartism.

From this there is drawn the practical conclusion that the existing Party regime is the chief danger and that its overthrow is the first duty of every Party member, of every revolutionary. That is how the picture of the regrouping of the class forces within the State apparatus, within our Party, is characterised. All go one single way, pass through the same stages, and at the same time the general sense of this process is the process of thermidorian-Bonapartist degeneration.

It goes without saying that it would be beneath the dignity of our Party to refute this theory, that is, to prove that our Party is not Bonapartist, is not thermidorian.

I should like to give a few facts: This theory is common to our Opposition and the Mensheviks. I say this with full consciousness of responsibility for my words, with the full consciousness that I am not exaggerating in the least. I shall give some quotations from Menshevik works and from the utterances of the Opposition, from which you will see not only the complete coincidence of the political sense, but also the complete and literal agreement of some formulations.

I shall quote three extracts from a speech of Trotsky and two extracts from the "Socialist Messenger".

This is what Trotsky said at the last Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C.:

"The whole policy of the Party finds its expression in the Party regime. This policy has in the last years shifted its class course from the Left to the Right: from the proletariat to the petty bourgeoisie, from the worker to the specialist, from the ordinary Party member to the 'apparatchik', from the agricultural worker and poor peasant to the kulak, from the Shanghai worker to Chiang-Kai-Shek, from the Chinese peasant to the bourgeois officer, from the English proletariat to Purcell, Hicks, the members of

the General Council etc. without end. Therein consists the actual nature of Stalinism."

And now the second quotation, which crowns the whole edifice:

"The Party regime results from the whole policy of the leadership. Behind the extreme apparatchiki there stands the bourgeoisie at home which is awaking to life. Behind the back of the latter there stands the world bourgeoisie. All these forces are exerting a pressure upon the proletarian advance-guard by not allowing it to raise its head or open its mouth. The further the policy of the C. C. deviates from the class line, the more it must force this policy upon the proletarian advance-guard from above with methods of compulsion. Therein lie the roots of the present revolting Party regime." (Ibid.)

Here is the dot to the i: behind the extreme "apparatchiki", i. e. behind the kernel of the Central Committee (as Trotsky expresses it), there is concealed not even the petty bourgeoisie, not even the kulak, but the ripe, full blown bourgeoisie, behind the back of which, in turn, there is concealed the world bourgeoisie. That means therefore that we, the representatives of the C. C., are the ideologists of the policy of the NEP-man, of the policy of the world bourgeoisie. (Laughter.) That is very ridiculous but it was said at the meeting of the C. C. and of the C. C. C.

That is the characterisation given by Trotsky. But what do the Mensheviks write? The Mensheviks are more consistent here; they derive the origin of our "Bonapartist fall into sin", not from the recent times and not even from the moment of the setting up of the great Bloc of Zinoviev and Trotsky: they derive our origin from the moment of our Revolution, from the moment when the Bolsheviks seized power. Dan writes as follows in the "Socialist Messenger" No. 21/22:

"The same speech of Lenin that announced the 'New Economic Policy' ended with a new slogan, which prescribed from now on 'to keep the socialists in prison'.

"Thus the bolshevist dictatorship has entered on a new phase of its development, the phase of the 'NEP', in which the revolutionary tasks of which history has appointed it to be the accomplisher are becoming more and more a thing of the past, and in which its self-maintenance is becoming more and more its self-sufficient aim, even when it is cloaked by phantastic 'theories'.

From the revolutionary force it is becoming more and more a conservative force, from something that, in a definite, historically determined situation, expresses the interests of the masses it is becoming a hindrance to the formulation and the advocacy of these interests under the new conditions created by the Revolution.

For under these new conditions, under which the petty bourgeois peasantry is becoming the social main force of Russia; under which a capitalist economy is being conducted in the nationalised factories and workshops of the State; under which powerful cadres of people (officials, administrators, managers) have been formed, the source of whose existence is the surplus value created by the labour of the workers and mobilised by the State; under which, in a word, the bourgeois society, and with it the class antagonisms are again arising in the Russian classes; under these conditions the interests of the workers; and especially the interests of the working class, both in Russia and in every other country, require freedom of class organisation and of class struggle, which is unthinkable without political freedom.

The Bolshevist dictatorship has historically outlived itself as a factor of revolution; it is changing into a dictatorship of the 'apparatus', which is becoming more and more estranged from all classes and is opposing itself to all of them, and which comes more and more into conflict with the interests of social development and is therefore rotting while still alive."

You see that Dan is even somewhat more moderate in his estimation than Trotsky, because Dan stops at this point at which the apparatus estranges itself and has estranged itself from the proletariat. Trotsky, however, says that this apparatus has passed this stage of its estrangement, that it has already

created the class basis of the NEP.-man, behind whose back there stands the international bourgeoisie.

The last quotation is from the leading article of the latest number of the "Socialist Messenger", which is devoted to the Ten Years Jubilee of our Revolution. In an article entitled: "The devastation of the Jubilee" there is given a direct estimation of the action of the Opposition in recent times, and this is made from the standpoint of tactics. In this leading article we read the following:

"Something from the oppositional theories must meet with a general response. Their characterisation of the degenerating dictatorship is in many respects correct and corresponds to actual facts. It may in some respects not be new; it may have borrowed something from political opponents, but that is not the main question. What is important is that it is correct, that it declares openly that which up to now one could only speak of in the illegal socialist press. What they point out is very true: the process of degeneration which the Opposition calls Thermidorian is going on rapidly: the activity of the mass of the people is replaced by the activity of the leaders; the place of the people is occupied by the government; this is the case in all spheres. In place of the activity of the workers there is the activity of the specialists; in place of the Soviets, the work of the Presidium; in place of the masses of the army, the self-confidence of the officers; in place of the masses of the Party, the circulars from the Political Bureau. Trotzky is right, that is the actual picture; but whether this development will lead, we have already had to write more than once. Is it to be wondered at if now, when even the Communist Opposition has seen that which only the blind do not see, it is capable of winning sympathy for itself and to enforce a hearing?"

For myself I add to the above that as a symbol of the "sympathy" of the workers there can serve galoshes and pickled cucumbers. (Applause.) But that it not what is important in the given case. What is important in this case is that here we have before us an agreement. Formerly the Opposition and the Mensheviks only called to each another; now however we have an agreement of political ideas, not an approachment to something in common but an agreement of political ideas. For if the "Socialist Messenger" says that "something is correct" with the Opposition, this proves that this "certain something" is the class relations in the country; that this certain "something" is the characterisation of our Party. What remains of these important questions apart from this certain "something"? Absolutely nothing. The main thing is exhausted. What is characteristic is the circumstance that the chain of these mutual embracings still remains. It was mentioned in our newspapers that Miljukov printed the documents of the Opposition in his organ with the following editorial comment in thick type:

"We print below two extracts from the Bolshevik Oppositional literature. They are so well suited to the 'Jubilee'. These extracts cannot be published in Soviet Russia. They were printed there in secret printing works, just as under the old regime, and they were, also discovered and destroyed, just as under the old regime. In this manner we realise the freedom of the press for citizen Trotzky. We do not expect any thanks, but ourselves express satisfaction that the Bolshevik 'Opposition' has arrived at the stage of the illegal press. We hope that this stage will be followed by another stage."

That is an estimation, that is a "class truth of the class enemy". Comrades, I consider it to be superfluous to deal any further with the ideological content of the Oppositional platform. It is perfectly clear that our ideological differences of opinion have already grown beyond the limits of tactical differences of opinion; that they have become differences of opinion of the programme, and I am of the opinion that for people with such views there is no place in our Party. (Loud applause.)

Everybody can understand that differences of opinion regarding tactics are differences of opinion which presume a certain common language. I can, for example, be of a different opinion from my Party comrades regarding the numerical estimation of those mistakes which exist with us; I can be of another opinion regarding the estimation of this or that method of combating these mistakes. If, however, I have a difference of opinion with a partner, with whom I fought together

for many years, regarding the estimation whether our Party is the Party of the revolutionary proletariat or whether it is a degenerated Party which must be swept away, and that the picker the better, then there exists nothing in common between us, then we are enemies, who from this fact must draw our conclusions. I know that there exists a logic of fight; certain people do not say that which they believe; certain people go farther in their fight than they themselves intend. This probably also applies to certain members of the Opposition.

But it does not by any means follow from this that one must continue to be patient. For certain things are set going which bring people to the other side of the barricade. If we have a Thermidorian power, then our power must be destroyed; if, however, it is a proletarian dictatorship, then it must be defended. If with us there exists a Thermidor, then one must organise strikes in the factories; if, however, there exists with us a proletarian dictatorship, one must build up a socialist industry. If our Party has degenerated, it must be destroyed; if, however, there exists with us a proletarian dictatorship, our country must be defended to the last drop of blood.

These are two different programmes and not two different tactics; and when the oppositional politicians go over from one to the other, now approach to this, now approach to the other (according to how many clouts they receive from the workers) we say: Pardon, dear people, this is an undignified game, we will not allow anybody in the Party with the platform of Thermidor (Applause).

## 2. The Tactic of the Opposition.

From all that I have already said there arise the tactics which the Oppositionals are pursuing. I shall not deal here again with these questions and not relate the story again, beginning with the "forest brothers" and ending with all their country houses, the seizure of possession of the Moscow Technical High School etc. You have learnt all this from the newspapers, and I only wish to say that in general we have here to do already with all forms of fighting, with a single exception, namely, that of the armed revolt. We have illegal work and illegal printing offices. We know how Rakovsky organised a semi-strike in Charkov. That proves to you already that they would not stop short at going over to the strike struggle. Further, we have street demonstrations. It is not the fault of the Oppositionals that they led only a mere handful of people on the streets and that nothing resulted from it. What is important is that they have gone over to the street fight. When, however, we have already the attempt at a street demonstration, when we have already an attempt to organise a street fight, then there follows only one thing: the armed revolt.

After this there are no intermediate forms. Illegal fight, mobilising of their own forces, agitation, propaganda, mass actions, strike plus demonstrations. Thereupon follows only demonstration plus revolt. One cannot go farther.

They have another programme, the flag of which was displayed in the famous thesis on the Thermidor; they have another tactic which one cannot describe as anything else than the tactic of revolt against the Soviet Power and against our Party, a tactic, the first small flag of which was displayed in the well-known thesis on Clemenceau, from which Trotzky tried to exculpate himself when he said that it was not meant in that sense. The meaning of this thesis is now obvious even to the stupid. It means the upheaval in our country, it means another power, it means another party.

Of course the Opposition only had before their eyes the prospective of capturing the leadership of the Party. They believed that they enjoyed such a tremendous authority in the country that this would be easy to carry out; that they would succeed in convincing everybody, and that the elementary upheaval would proceed painlessly. Trotzky would show himself, two high school pupils would shout out: "Long live the leader of the Red Army!" and then everything would be finished. All the workers were therefore only waiting for this upheaval to take place. Everybody was only awaiting the arrival of the oppositional "saviours". As soon as they appeared on the steps of their sanctuary, everything would happen without pain, without any bloody collision, without any civil war. That is what they had hoped for.

But life has shown something different. They did not achieve anything in the Party. Thereupon they began to appeal to everybody. They began to appeal to the broad masses. But the broad masses knocked their heads in (Laughter). And now they must find some sort of self-consolation. This self-consolation is published today in the confessions of a comrade who has now come over to our side, but who had formerly been made a member of the district Committee of the Opposition and who had attended the meeting of the joint C. C. of Zinoviev and Trotzky in the house of the "joint" Smilga (Laughter).

The most tragically comical, or better said simply comical, is the circumstance that when they gathered together all their people, they recorded with complete unanimity that they "had overslept themselves". After they had admitted among themselves that they had overslept, they submitted on the following day to the C. C. two papers, in which it was stated that they had a whole million on their side. They sent papers in which it was stated that everybody was definitely for them and that only a miserable handful of "noisy Uglanovs" were against them. (Laughter.)

The Opposition constitutes a tiny handful, and this little group lives on self-deception and leads its leaders by the nose. Just recently a member of the Opposition in a factory rang up that Trotzky should come, as the workers were one hundred per cent for him. What turned out to be the actual case? The meeting was unanimously against the Opposition. They live on self-deception, illusions, oppositional phantasies. Many think they may hang on their own phantasies. But that which they are now doing is not only injurious in itself but lets loose other forces.

That, comrades, is a theme which deserves first attention. When you now go through the streets of a big town you see in the squares or in the tramways how the petty bourgeois pack are puffing themselves up in our country. Why? Because the Opposition has let loose all these forces. Conspiratory circles and groups are arising.

I recently received from Odessa the programme of a "Communist Labour Party", which represents a remarkably interesting document for characterising moods of this sort. One could see from the programme that it had been written by a cunning intellectual. It takes up the thesis on the Thermidor and the degeneration and develops it, and of course gives it a rougher and sharper form than does the Opposition: the leaders of the Party are said to have become new blood-sucking capitalists, and so forth. It is stated that we incite one nation against the other. It is very loud in its anti-semitic tone. Then, however, there is suddenly to be seen the ears of the intellectuals. The authors have found the chief crime in that we incite the workers against the intellectuals.

It is perfectly clear that the point of support for this programme was the theses of the Opposition which let loose all these stark reactionary forces. Further various counter-revolutionary proclamations are spread and so forth. There is considerably more of this now than some months ago.

There is to be noted at present a certain growth of circles and small groups which dream of Thermidor, of conspiracies etc. I believe that it will be necessary to show the fist to this whole crowd (Loud applause), in order to teach them a lesson...

The documents and actions of the Opposition are a means for reviving the third forces. We have all these documents and actions of the Opposition precisely at the moment when a powerful wave of international sympathy is sweeping towards us.

We are now witnesses of a state of affairs in which a great increase of sympathy for Soviet Russia exists even among the social-democratic workers, a fact which found its expression in the delegations, as well as in the Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union which has just been ended and which was held in this very hall. Here there were present about a thousand foreign delegates. But, comrades, if you had spoken with the delegates when they arrived here, then you would have seen what a change they underwent, with what feelings they went away from here. If you knew how they had been elected to come here; what a great fight took place; what difficulties they had in travelling here, then you would have felt that they were connected by threads with the broadest masses of the working class. Their whole enthusiasm is not

a chance — an enthusiasm even before the parade of gymnasts and sportsmen, not to speak of others. Their presence here is a proof that they are turning to our Soviet Union, to our proletarian State.

I should like to mention a particularly striking feature at this Congress. Here from this tribune there spoke a Frenchman, the chairman of the French delegation, Colomer, who is the editor of an influential French periodical. He had always been opposed to us. He had championed the whole time an anarchist standpoint; he was opposed to us the whole time, as he believed that we were soul stranglers, plunderers etc. Here he made a declaration in the name of the French anarchists and those anarchists who belong to a number of other delegations, that they fully and entirely abandon this attitude. And at the same time Trotzky and Co. propose to us to go to the anarchists!

In the Soviet Union the masses go to us; the Opposition believe that they are going to the working masses, and they thereby arrive in the chamber of Mr. Cherbakov. They say that the working class is with them, that they will appeal to it. At the same time, however, the working class in the whole world comes to us. To us there come even the social-democratic workers and say: "We will shed our blood in defence of the Soviet Union". Our "revolutionary" Oppositionals, however, look to the West and say that with us in Soviet Russia there exists a Thermidor.

Is not this picture clear? It is absolutely clear. We have a different programme and a different tactic. Of course we must fight for every worker who goes with the Opposition, but then he has not the right to make even a single ideological concession to people who in their programme and in questions of tactics are completely ripe and even over-ripe Menshevists.

From this whole discussion we can draw the following conclusion: At the XV. Party Congress the Opposition will stand before two ways: either they dissolve unconditionally and without reserve, in fact, their fraction, their party; abandon the Menshevist views described above, or they will not do this and then our Party will have to draw the appropriate conclusions.

Comrade Clara Zetkin rightly remarked at the meeting of the Communist members of the Congress of the Soviet Union, that the position which the C. C. has adopted is in fact only a formal expression of that which actually is. And this is absolutely correct. If they wish to return to the working class and to the Party, let them return on the basis of those conditions which the Party will submit to them at the XV. Party Congress. If they slink away, nobody will be sorry for it and no masses will come forward for their protection. They believed that the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev from the Party would be accompanied at least by a general strike. As a matter of fact the workers said: "At last! That is good", and the advanced non-Party workers have come into the Party.

Our Party must now proceed as quickly as possible to the matters standing on the agenda, because such a discussion and such a criticism has already become too costly.

We must raise the level of our self-criticism and of our positive work, because it must be said that we have in recent times, owing to the Opposition, begun to disregard the time at the disposal of the leadership. Everybody realises that especially our leading organs, our Central Committee, already has not sufficient time in order to follow the whole enormous machine that whole work which rests upon the shoulders of our Party, and we shall not tolerate further anti-Party actions. (Applause.) And therefore we must put to the Opposition, plainly and squarely, at the XV. Party Congress the question: Either with us or not, and if you wriggle out as you have already done twenty times in the conferences — we will not put up with it, for there has been enough playing with Thermidor, with demonstrations, with the dictatorship in the country; and with our Party. (Applause.)

# POLITICS

## The Unmasking of the League of Nations.

Social-Democracy as the Saviour of the Situation.

By Fritz Wieser.

Geneva, December 1st, 1927.

The appearance of the Soviet delegation at the very commencement of the session of the preparatory disarmament conference, caused it to be immediately obvious, who was really advocating disarmament and peace and who was merely employing phrases in regard to disarmament in order to create pretexts for further armaments.

If the absence of representatives of the Soviet Union had hitherto been "regretted" and considered as an obstacle to disarmaments, it was now apparent that no stone had been left unturned to prevent a common discussion on the disarmament question in the presence of the Soviet Union delegates. A second reading of the report of the April Conference was on no account to be permitted. The discussion was to be limited to the question of securities and to the election of a security committee. Finally it was at all costs to be prevented that the discussion be continued so long as to cause the Soviet Union delegates still to be present at Geneva at the session of the League of Nations Council and during the discussion in regard to the conflict between Poland and Lithuania. This at the express "desire", i. e. order, of Great Britain.

Thus it came about that for a time no one offered to speak on the first item of the agenda, the "position of disarmament work". Then Comrade Litvinov, chairman of the delegation of the Soviet Union, seized the bull by the horns and submitted the fundamental Declaration of the Soviet Government. The boldness of this Declaration obviously nonplussed the august assembly, for the meeting had to be broken off immediately afterwards.

The Declaration of the Soviet delegation pitilessly unmasks the bourgeois and Social-Democratic apostles of disarmament, pointing out that while the League of Nations is speaking of disarmament, armaments continue to increase, causing a gigantic growth in the total onus of militarism. The connection between the question of disarmament and that of securities and the general examination of partial disarmament, merely enabled the League of Nation States to effect a "legal increase of armaments". The entire method pursued hitherto in the treatment of the disarmament problem is therefore designated in the Declaration to be erroneous, and a demand is raised for total disarmament and not only the reduction and limitation of armaments. Thus it can be immediately ascertained who is willing to disarm, and it will no longer be possible to philosophise for years about the complications of the problem. The Soviet Union is hitherto the only State openly to declare its readiness to disarm totally. "Are you ready to do likewise?"

For the august peace assembly this question was most inopportune. Who was to reply? But to what purpose have the bourgeois Governments Social Democrats in their midst? Paul Boncour, the French Social Democrat, readily undertook the task of explaining the impossibility of a real disarmament, i. e. the necessity of further armaments. The representative of Great Britain, who sat opposite Comrade Litvinov when the latter proposed the destruction of all men-of-war, did not need to say a word. Paul Boncour was the hero of the day, saving not only the League of Nations but also the possibility of further armaments. As the creator of the new French military programme, by which the entire nation is militarised, he was fully qualified for this task.

Whereas the Dutch chairman, Lougon, had admitted in his opening speech that total disarmament would be the best guarantee of security, Paul Boncour maintained exactly the opposite. If all nations had disarmed completely, he queried, would the small nations feel secure? No, for then they would be wholly at the mercy of the big States. (As though their armaments were of any avail against the preponderance of the great Powers.) If the Social Democrat proclaims total disarmament to be Utopian, what need the capitalist say?

What positive facts has Paul Boncour to oppose to the suggestions of the Soviet delegation? Nothing else than that the safety of the States must first be ensured, before a disarmament can take place. The path to pursue would be one of inter-State agreements.

A thick network of such agreements already at present links up individual States and entire groups of States. At bottom, it is the same system of alliances that led to the world war. And Paul Boncour now tells us that the self-same system is to ensure peace.

The masterpiece of the League of Nations was Locarno! But was not the other side of the Locarno treaties, which contain nothing but pacifist phrases, of more practical importance? Locarno prepared the anti-Soviet front; a direct line led from Locarno to the raid on the Arcos and the rupture of relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

Another model treaty, the deposition of which with the Secretariat of the League of Nations is to ensure peace, is that recently concluded between Italy and Albania. Nobody has as yet gone so far as to maintain that this agreement is intended to ensure peace on the Balkans. The system of treaties intended to guarantee security is nothing but a diplomatic preparation of the next war.

Among the audience sits Friedrich Adler, Secretary to the Second International. The spectacle appears to alarm him. He, once the leader of the "two and a half", is surely right in asking himself: Is it really up to the Social Democrats to unmask themselves so openly? Will the workers still believe us, that we are fighting for peace? He obviously comforts himself with the reflection that time will bring counsel. He puckers his brow and looks eagerly for a way out of the difficulty.

Paul Boncour has voiced the sentiments of Poincaré, of militarist France. The representatives of her vassals pay the tribute due. Beneš points out that he thoroughly agrees with the expatiations of his "friend" Boncour. So does the Greek Politis, who also calls Boncour his "friend". "My friend Boncour" is to be heard all day long. How many friends this leading Social Democrat has among the capitalist statesmen!

All these three speakers point out that as Litvinov spoke to-day they themselves spoke seven years ago. That was Wilson's programme! But since then we have learnt that it was not a feasible idea.

It was not in vain that the leading Fascist paper of Geneva published a frontispiece portrait of Boncour this morning. He is the hero of the day. It will be all the clearer to the workers that they must range themselves on the side of the Soviet Union and not on that of Paul Boncour.

The short duration of this day's sessions shows how well the Soviet Government did to send a delegation to the conference. On the spot whither the eyes of all peace-desiring people have hitherto been directed, the pitiless truth has been spoken. If total disarmament is Utopian, as the League of Nations leaders affirm, peace is also Utopian, so long as the rule of the capitalist States endures. The capitalist peace apostles and their lackeys, the Social Democratic leaders, have been forced to proclaim the logical necessity of this conclusion.

That the result of the discussions to date represents a great success on the part of the Soviet delegation, is obvious from what has just been said. The leaders of the conference, the Governments of the great capitalist Powers, had firmly intended to make it impossible for the representatives of the Soviet Union to declare any programme in Geneva. This plan failed. It was next intended that the declaration should fall under the table and be buried for ever in the archives of the League of Nations. This hope was likewise vain. The suggestions of the Soviet delegates will have to be discussed at the February session of the Preparatory Disarmament Commission.

All those have been silenced who were wont from Geneva to spread abroad the lie that the Soviet Union is an imperialist State and a menace to peace. At any rate the international working class will now see clearly who is ready to disarm completely and thereby to make all further war impossible. The disarmament programme submitted at Geneva by the Soviet delegates and backed by the entire authority of the Soviet Government, has created a new situation. The hypocrites will find even fewer believers than hitherto among the working masses.



Geneva, 3rd December, 1927.

To-day's closing session of the preparatory disarmament commission was awaited with great attention as a sharp struggle was expected in connection with the date of the next session of the disarmament commission and the security commission. The Benesch-Boncour group wishes to make the question of disarmament dependent upon security, i. e. upon the conclusion of the very considerable work which the security committee has proposed in its resolution. That would mean the postponement of the disarmament conference indefinitely and thus settle the Russian proposals comfortably. In order to make this sabotage impossible, Litvinov proposed the following resolution at the beginning of the session:

"Having regard to the complicated nature of the work of the security committee, the difficulty of the problems with which it is faced and the inevitable slowness of its progress, and having regard to the further fact that the solution of the disarmament question would be the best guarantee of security, and therefore, neither the discussion nor the solution of the problems facing the security committee can be taken as the preliminary conditions for disarmament, the preparatory commission decides that the treatment of the disarmament question and the fixing of the date for the conference in no way depends upon the work and the results of the security committee, and decides further, that the date will be fixed in the present session of the commission."

In connection with this proposal, Litvinov proposed the 10th January 1928 as the date for the Vth session of the preparatory disarmament commission.

Count Bernsdorff is in general agreement with the Russian resolution but proposes an amendment intended to make the resolution of Litvinov fit better into the frame of the League of Nations.

Benesch declares himself as opposed to the resolution of Litvinov as it was in contradiction to the last meeting of the League of Nations.

After a pause in which the representatives of the capitalist governments discussed amongst themselves, a number of speakers spoke against the proposal of Litvinov without going into the matter on principle. Cushendun declares himself opposed both to the resolution of Litvinov and to the amendment of Bernsdorff and stresses that a postponement of the session of the preparatory commission would make it impossible to hold the disarmament conference in 1928.

Boncour then made another speech of praise in favour of the Locarno system and requested the Russian delegates to take the difficulties of the question into consideration.

In the voting the Russian proposal was rejected and the date fixed for the next session of the preparatory disarmament commission to be the 15th March 1928 and for the session of the security committee to be the 20th February 1928.

These decisions mean without a doubt that the disarmament conference can only take place at the earliest in 1929.

The soviet delegation has signed the convention concerning the prohibition of poison gas in war.

## The Political Situation in Belgium.

By A. Verhaeren (Brussels).

The socialists have withdrawn from the Belgian coalition government. The old Cabinet has been reformed without the socialists. Their places have been taken by the Catholics, the Christian Democrats and the Liberals.

At the first moment and on a superficial view it might appear as if the Belgian Labour Party, before all the Socialist Parliamentary fraction, by withdrawing from the coalition, wish to conduct an energetic defensive policy directed against capitalism and reaction. It suffices, however, to consider the situation of the political parties in general and of their election tactics in particular, in order to understand what the "heroic" pose of the Belgian socialist parliamentary fraction really means.

The Cabinet of Jasper, known as the Stabilisation Ministry, has practically completed its task. It put a stop to the currency crisis insofar that the Franc has been stabilised at the rate of 175 to the Pound Sterling (i. e. 40% higher than the French Franc). There then followed, as in other States, a restoration of State finances. The budget was balanced. By what means? By the well-tried means always applied in such cases: mass taxation, increase of the various customs tariffs, duties etc., by leasing the State monopolies, by handing over the railways to American capitalists. In a word, by the Dawesation of the State economy. At the same time a rationalisation propaganda has set in and rationalisation has also been partly carried out. In short, the restoration of the bankrupt Belgian finances was carried out at the cost of the working masses by the literal starvation of the Belgian proletariat.

All these "successes" have been achieved with the energetic co-operation of the socialist leaders, of Vandervelde, De Brouckère, Huysmans etc. It has been apparent for some months past that the Catholic Party leaders had ceased to treat their socialist coalition brothers with the consideration shown previously. The attacks on the socialist Ministers became more and more fierce; the reactionary parties no longer attached the same value as formerly to the direct collaboration of the socialist leaders, who unconditionally delivered over the masses to them.

This attitude of the Catholic Party facilitated and promoted the change in the tactics of the Belgian Labour Party and its leaders. This change was also conditioned by the fact that the ruthless starvation policy of the coalition government provoked great bitterness among the broad working and peasant masses, which found expression also in a certain radicalising of the trade union movement and in wages struggles in the country districts.

What, in such circumstances, could be more effective and successful in pacifying and catching the masses than a "radical opposition tactic"? This tactic appeared all the more necessary the nearer the elections approached. The break with the coalition was then carefully prepared. The Belgian Labour Party instituted a campaign in favour of certain demands of the industrial workers and of the rural population. Thus there were issued as slogans: reduction of the period of military service to six months, nine years land tenancy for small farmers, general social insurance.

The reactionary members of the government naturally could not and would not completely accede to Messrs. Vandervelde, De Brouckère and Co. in fulfilling their "radical" demands. They felt strong enough to carry on the government without the coalition socialists, and thus the breach became inevitable.

The new clerical-liberal government issued a high-sounding declaration in Parliament. They made the promise that they will continue and end the work of the old government. The reorganisation of the army, which is to secure the "inviolability of the country", is to be undertaken first. The government is also dealing with the question of reducing the period of military service, and will initiate investigations with this object in view. As regards social insurance, the law on compensation for industrial diseases, which was unanimously accepted, is to come into force immediately. The law on accident insurance is to be submitted to Parliament shortly, so that a law on general social insurance and protection of motherhood will be kept in view.

The debate on the government's declaration was extremely interesting. The speakers for the Liberal Party regretted (?) the withdrawal of the socialists from the government and expressed the hope that the Labour Party would also collaborate in future in building up the national economy. The Catholics, too, were conciliatory and called for patriotic collaboration. The socialists, of course, could not resist these general friendly appeals, and thus they declared that with regard to the currency reform they are in agreement with the government. No obstacles were placed in the way of the draft bills on social insurance. They also expressed the hope that the Christian Democrats would work in the government for the reduction of the period of military service to six months.

One can see that the "radical Opposition" is behaving very tamely. The reformist tactics are showing themselves to be an impudent demagogic election swindle. While Vandervelde and Co. seek to appear very radical in the eyes of the masses, they

are enabling the clerical-liberal bourgeoisie to carry out completely its restoration programme. Not a word is heard in Parliamentary regarding the increasing impoverishment of the masses.

The Communists alone point out that the price index has risen from 521 before the stabilisation, to the present level of 853, while wage increases do not in any way keep pace with the rising prices. During the inflation period the capitalists made enormous profits. They are the same capitalists who are deriving benefit also from the stabilisation. No matter whether it is a case of inflation or stabilisation the working masses alone have to bear the consequences. The Belgian franc is today, even after the stabilisation, far below the level of the other stabilised currencies, which circumstances provides a very favourable export opportunity for Belgian industry. This circumstance insures on the one hand the ruthless exploitation of the masses and on the other hand extra profits to the ruling classes.

The reformist leaders are calculating on the credulity of the masses. There is no doubt, however, that the organised Belgian working class, who have for years seen M. Vandervelde and his consorts at work, will more and more see through the election swindle of the reformist leaders. They will be able to perceive on what side the true defenders of their interests are to be found.

## The Coalition Offensive of the Austrian Social Democrats.

The Attempt on the Life of the Burgomaster of Vienna.

By Willi Schlam m (Vienna).

On November 26th, Karl Seitz, Burgomaster of Vienna and Chairman of the Austrian Social-Democrats, was fired at in the street. The assailant, a young man of twenty-three is a member of the reactionary organisation of ex-service men ("Frontkämpfer"). Seitz was not injured.

This attempt was not directed against the person of the Burgomaster of Vienna, but against the Austrian working class. The Austrian "Frontkämpfer" organisations are known to be of a monarchist and Fascist tendency, enjoying the special protection of the Seipel Government. Many of the murders of workers that have occurred so frequently in Austria of late years were committed by "Frontkämpfer", a particular instance being the Schattendorf murder, which by reason of the acquittal of the murderers ultimately led to the events of July 15th.

Since that date and the defeat of the Austrian proletariat occasioned by the capitulation of the Social Democrats, Austrian Fascism has developed extraordinarily. Whereas for many years the backbone of the Fascist movement was the Frontkämpfer organisations, it is — now that all Fascist forces are systematically organised — rather in the "Heimwehr" (home defence) movement, similar to the German "Orgesch", that the chief strength of the Fascists lies. The "Frontkämpfer" supply the "Heimwehr" with military commanders and instructors, but otherwise restrict their activity to Vienna. The Union of Industrialists supports them by means of a special tax levied on all industrial enterprises, while prominent Christian-Social politicians, such as the former Ministers Dr. Rintelen, Dr. Mataja, and Dr. Steidle, are the political leaders of the Fascist organisations.

The Social Democratic policy of capitulation is responsible for the fact that since July 15th Fascism has been constantly gaining ground in Austria. Any one seeing the effects of the development and victory of Italian Fascism must recognise that the working class cannot prevent a victory of Fascism by "prudent" yielding, but only by the active employment of all the class forces available.

The Austro-Marxists deny this. Since the Vienna Party Congress — the import of which is more and more apparent in the sense of the bankruptcy of Austro-Marxism — the political directives of the Austrian Social-Democrats have been quite obvious. For fear of the Fascists, the Austrian Social-Democrats are seeking shelter in the Coalition Government. This is the

line adopted by Renner, the present leader of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, the victor of the Vienna Party Congress.

The offers of coalition, dozens of which have already been made by the Austrian Social-Democrats, all contain the same guiding principle, viz. that Austria is threatened with Fascism, or, as Renner calls it, "macedonised"; the slightest provocation might cause civil war. What is to be done? The class differences — abolish them! The "internal disarming" must find its material expression in the piecemeal disbandment of the defensive organisations on either side and its political expression in a coalition government.

The Austro-Marxists have possibly never before so energetically set out to realise their political objectives as they are now endeavouring to effect the formation of a coalition government. It is in truth a struggle between the Austrian Social-Democrats and that section of the Austrian bourgeoisie which is opposed to a coalition. The Austro-Marxists, who both before and after July 15th have repeatedly capitulated in all questions of a struggle of the working class, are now militant, developing a systematic offensive for the purpose of a coalition.

Since July 15th, the Austrian Social-Democratic Party is in regular flight from the enemy, feared nothing so much as a street demonstration. Now even demonstrations have been resumed. On November 12th, the Party summoned its adherents to demonstrate for the bourgeois Republic and in favour of the coalition government, though, as a matter of fact, the demonstration was nothing very extraordinary.

All that is said and done by the Austrian S. D. Party today is intended to serve the Social Democratic coalition offensive. The Party has suspended all and every obstructive opposition in Parliament, is co-operating "materially" in the settlement of the budget (a matter which was formerly considered as the obligatory occasion for "wangling" small concessions), and has quietly permitted its member Wallisch to be delivered up by the Styrian Diet — all this with a view to proving itself a "statesmanlike, constructive party, fit to govern". Day by day Renner or one of the big-wigs makes a "coalition speech". At the same time a considerable portion of the bourgeois press has taken up the idea of a coalition.

This is likely in time to prove a very difficult situation for the bourgeoisie. Its pro-coalition wing is gaining new strength by Renner's policy. Undoubtedly the more "reasonable" among the capitalist employers know very well that a realisation of their rather long-sighted rationalisation programme can but profit by being camouflaged behind Social-Democratic Ministers, all the more so seeing that it is by no means impossible for a coalition government to exist side by side with a development of Fascism, which may, so to say, be carried on by the bourgeois rulers with one hand while the other is co-operating in the government with the Social-Democrats.

Under such circumstances the position of the anti-coalition wing under Seipel is rendered very difficult. For this wing, which is making common cause with the more energetic members of the employers federation and with certain momentous forces in foreign financial circles, a coalition with the Social Democrats is unthinkable. But under the pressure of the Social-Democratic coalition offensive this wing of the bourgeoisie is constantly losing ground.

In the midst of this situation there occurred the attempt on the life of Karl Seitz. It was not the question of the individual action of a madman, but of an action inspired by the Austrian Fascists. It was established that on the eve of the attempt the assailant had a secret meeting with the head of the "Frontkämpfer" organisation and that all had been very carefully prepared. The idea was that of creating the premises for an armed coup, a coup de main.

The attempt failed. Sometimes the direction of a revolver-shot becomes a politically decisive factor. This time it was so in a sense opposed to that which those who were behind the attempt had intended. The shots fired at Seitz will probably be recorded in Austrian history as "coalition shots".

For the Social-Democratic leaders immediately started exploiting the attempt in the interest of their coalition offensive. After the rumour had been spread, with the help even of Seitz himself, that the assassin was a communist, the main object was that of preventing all expression of proletarian indignation

or militant steps against the Fascists. The Social-Democratic party guard, the so-called "Schutzbund" was ordered out for the purpose of nipping in the bud any demonstration on the part of the workers. The Social Democratic party leaders published an appeal containing not a single fighting slogan, not a single demand, nor any announcement of tactical measures of any sort. Its only slogan was "No demonstrations! Long live Seitz! Long live the Social-Democracy!" The gesture was plain enough and was addressed to the bourgeoisie. "Look at us. How calm and fit to govern we are".

The Austrian Social Democrats are hoping that the Fascist shots may partly regain for them the ground lost on July 15th. And indeed, since the day of the attempt the bourgeois press has been full of conciliation and of readiness for a coalition. Seipel sent his congratulations, so did Schober. The coalition offensive has entered upon a vital stage of its development.

The conclusion that should be drawn from the Fascist attempt, however, in the class interest of the Austrian proletariat is exactly the opposite of the above. It is the conclusion which the Communist Party has drawn and is spreading among the masses. The attempt was directed against the Austrian working class and shows how strong Austrian Fascism feels itself to be.

It is a question of at once taking up the struggle for a very immediate demand, which the attempt has made exceedingly urgent, viz., the dissolution of all Fascist organisations. And what is just as imperative is that immediate steps should be taken to form a revolutionary defence organisation of the proletariat in opposition to the Fascists. The "Schutzbund" has altogether ceased to be a fighting organisation of the working class, having become a guard under the leadership of Renner for the purpose of keeping down the revolutionary energies of the proletariat.

For this policy the Communist Party of Austria is agitating among the broad masses of the Austrian working class.

## AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

### On the Eve of the Second Brussels Conference.

By Willy Münzenberg (Berlin).

The Executive of the Anti-Imperialist League, founded at Brussels in February last, has resolved to initiate the first ordinary session of its General Council on December 9th, the seat of the conference again being Brussels.

The General Council comprises about 50 leading politicians, economists, and artists of the most varied party politics and tendencies, united by the consciousness of the necessity of organising the fight for the freedom of the oppressed peoples and creating a great bloc of the revolutionary parties among the oppressed peoples together with the proletariat of the imperialist countries.

Besides the members of the General Council, a great number of other important delegations, from China, Syria, and the North-African colonies, have announced their intention of taking part.

The Second Brussels Conference meets under very different world-political circumstances to those prevailing at the time of the initial congress of the Brussels League in the spring of this year. At the first Brussels Congress discussion centred on the support of the Chinese revolution, then in a state of turbulent development. It was the culminating point of the meeting when, amid deafening applause on the part of all delegates and participants, Lansbury embraced Hansin Liau, the representative of the Kuo-Min-Tang, while Brockway, Secretary of the British Independent Labour Party, embraced the Chinese General Lu, both representatives of the British working class solemnly engaging to help the Chinese revolution by all means at their disposal, including strikes and the prevention of munition supplies to the British troops in China.

The snows of March had not yet melted when the oaths of February had already been forgotten by the leaders of the

British Labour Parties. So as to be able to work "more freely" for the Anti-Imperialist League in England, Lansbury shortly after the February Congress retired from the post of its chairman and exchanged this charge for the presidency of the British Labour Party, conferred on him by this year's Congress in place of MacDonald. With the help of the British troops and under the protection of the British battle-ships, the treachery of Chiang-Kai-Shek and other Kuo-Min-Tang leaders was possible in China. The Cantonese general Lu, so vociferously cheered by the Brussels Congress, was condemned to death by the hangman of Great Britain's dummy, Chang-Tso-Lin, without anything being done in England to prevent it.

It will be the first and foremost duty of the new Brussels Congress to demand the actual realisation of the international resolutions and obligations of all sections of the Anti-Imperialist League. In England there is a section of that League. The League has frequently made public protests and the attitude of its members is undoubtedly more sympathetic than that of various party-friends of theirs in the Second International on the Continent, who have not only done nothing in support of the Chinese, or of any other, revolution, but have done their utmost to beat down and suffocate the revolutionary movement.

The Anti-Imperialist League, however, must demand more of its members than a merely platonic declaration of love for the oppressed and enslaved peoples; it must demand the most serious and energetic Parliamentary fight in support of the revolutionary struggle of emancipation in the subjugated countries.

The Second Brussels Conference, moreover, will have to assume an attitude to the Chinese organisations and parties and seriously to revise its attitude towards the Kuo-Min-Tang. In its manifesto and its resolutions, the Brussels Congress established a series of rules and principles, to apply to all organisations and movements supported by it. The leaders of the Kuo-Min-Tang altogether altered their attitude in the social and national revolution, so that their present attitude towards all these problems has no longer anything in common with their attitude in the spring. The centre of the Kuo-Min-Tang went over to an open support of the counter-revolution and has made itself jointly responsible for the endless series of sanguinary acts of terror which crowd the last few months and have, without exception, been directed against the really revolutionary masses of workers and peasants. Madame Sun-Yat-Sen, the chief reporter on the present situation in China, is bound to criticise this state of affairs and to draw corresponding conclusions in her report on the relations between the Kuo-Min-Tang and the Anti-Imperialist League.

The temporary defeat of the Chinese revolution was certainly a most fatal loss for the Anti-Imperialist League. The latter was founded under the impression of a vigorous advance on the part of the revolutionary Canton army, which in an unparalleled series of victories had carried its banner from Canton until close to the walls of Shanghai.

In spite of the Chinese defeat, however, the Brussels Congress awakened an echo in the semi-colonial and colonial countries, such as no organisation or movement have aroused since the Communist International.

Little more than half a year has passed since the Brussels Congress and to-day its manifesto has been translated into dozens of languages, being received with the same enthusiasm and hopefulness by the workers of India and the dock-labourers of Canton, by the down-trodden black proletarians of South Africa and the enslaved Indos of the Mexican steppes. In South Africa, the South African Trade Union Congress announced its adherence to the Brussels League, and the negro organisations will be represented at Brussels on December 9th by La Guma and Gumede.

At the invitation of the League, Richards, Secretary of the Railwaymen of Sierra Leone, hastened to Moscow to the October celebrations of the Soviet Republic and took his place beside Clara Zetkin and Krupskaya on the presiding board of the Congress of the Friends of Soviet Russia. In the North-African colonies vigorous and energetic bureaux of the League have been established, a considerable delegation from which will take part in the Brussels Congress. The Egyptian National Party has transmitted the General Secretariat of the League



its thanks for the League's intervention on the occasion of the last conflict with Great Britain. In the form of handbills, newspapers, and pamphlets, the Brussels decisions have been reproduced in thousands of copies in Arabic. In Holland, the Dutch police have arrested Mohammed Hatta, member of the Executive of the Brussels League, and have been keeping him captive for months along with other leaders of the movement in Indonesia.

It is in the Central and South American countries, however, that the Brussels Conference has awakened the most pronounced echo. Even though President Calles, conciliated by a compromise with the dollar-imperialists, is no longer on the committee of the League, a powerful section of the Anti-Imperialist League has developed in Mexico editing a paper of its own. Other actively working sections are to be found in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Cuba, and other South and Central American States. The Second Brussels Conference will, for the first time, be attended by a delegate from the Philippines.

British imperialist circles, which are evincing particular nervousness and excitement in regard to the Brussels Conference and recently caused the famous "Augur", foreign political writer to the "Times", to publish a voluminous pamphlet against the League, arbitrarily forbade any publication in India of news and remarks in regard to the League and any publication of its press service. Nevertheless, dozens of Indian newspapers copied all the reports, publishing a special issue in regard to the Brussels Conference and developed the liveliest propaganda in its interest. The All-Indian National Congress resolved on a collective affiliation to the League, remitting £ 100 as its first subscription. Numerous trade unions followed its example, also becoming collective members of the League.

The movement set on foot by the Brussels Congress soon became one of the greatest and strongest movements of the last few years, so comprehensive and radical that even the social chauvinists of the Second International were forced to define their attitude towards it. At the most recent session of the Executive of the Second International, which also met in Brussels a few months ago, a night meeting was held in connection with the Anti-Imperialist League, at which men like Friedrich Adler and Wels resolved, against the sole vote of Fenner Brockway, to ostracise the League. Adler "exposed" the League in more than 20 pages in the press service of the Second International ("I. I."). But neither "Augur" nor Adler will be able to throttle the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples and the working masses.

## FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

### The Opposition and the Social Democrats.

#### A Vain Speculation.

By P. R. Dietrich (Berlin).

Day after day the Social Democratic press of all countries publishes whole columns in regard to the "sad fate" of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. Injured innocence has once again found in the Social Democrats very vociferous and generous protectors. Generous not only as regards space in their newspapers, but also in respect to the hospitality of the capitalist States. "Come to us" is the cry the Social Democratic press addresses to the leaders of the Opposition. "We have given both the White Guards and Maslov the possibility to carry on from here the fight against the Comintern of Stalin, against Stalin's C. P. S. U., and against the Russia of Stalin. Here you can convince yourselves — or rather, here you can be confirmed in the conviction you have yourselves proclaimed — that there is a better form of democracy in our countries than in the Soviet Union." And turning to the workers, they add with fatuous smiles, "Now you can see for yourselves, where freedom really dwells. Everywhere, in the Austria of Seipel, the Germany of Hindenburg, the England of Chamberlain, the France of Poincaré, and the Switzerland of Motta — only not in the country of proletarian dictatorship".

For the Social Democrats the struggles of the Opposition were a welcome motive for finally dealing an annihilating blow against Communism and for mobilising the entire working class against the Soviet Union. And the Opposition itself speculated with this mobilisation of the Social Democrats. From its former custom of appealing to the Party, it has passed to an appeal to the working class, or, more truly, to an appeal to the petty bourgeoisie. It has instituted a special service, for the purpose of keeping the Social Democrats regularly and quickly informed by means of the Maslov clique, and of supplying them with the most confidential documentary evidence. The object in view was that of using these documents for the purpose of starting a movement which should eventually force the C. P. S. U. to capitulate. The plan was not badly thought out and it has once more proved true that even Trotzky and Zinoviev did not count in vain on the Social Democrats where there was the prospect of a campaign against the Soviet Union. Fortunately, however, the Social Democrats are not identical with the working class.

It may already be safely asserted that both the speculation on the Social Democrats and the speculation of the Social Democrats themselves have proved abortive. They reckoned on the fact that the blatant publication of the persecution to which all revolutionaries are allegedly subjected, would shake the confidence of the workers in Soviet Russia and the Bolsheviks. They forgot, however, that the workers see these things in quite a different light. Any one infringing proletarian solidarity is the workers' enemy. Whatever radical phrases and whatever circumstances the blackleg uses to excuse his line of action, he will find no pity among the workers.

The workers are fighting against the terror of the employers against the terror of the police and the State, which is directed against them. But they do not derive from this fact any generally valid theory against terrorism on the whole. On the contrary. They make full use of the weapon of terror against blacklegs. When, at the time of the trial of the Social Revolutionaries in the summer of 1922, the Social Democrats tried to protest in mass meetings against the "Bolshevist terror" directed against all revolutionaries, these meetings summoned by the Social Democrats assumed an attitude against the Social Revolutionaries and in favour of the Bolsheviks. Of what avail was it to the Social Revolutionaries that they had formerly fought against Tsarism and had sacrificed much in so doing? They subsequently turned in co-operation with Tsarist officers, with the mercenaries of the bourgeoisie and the great landowners, against the rule of the working class. It is therefore only meet and right that all the assets of the proletariat and the proletarian State be employed against them in defence.

All campaigns hitherto started by the Social Democrats in favour of the imprisoned Mensheviks, have been doomed to fail. They could not gain the sympathies of the working class. And if Bauer and Crispian are seized with consternation and think it a wonder that their comrades, sent to Russia as worker delegates, should unconditionally approve of the incarceration of the Mensheviks, it is only a proof that they have learnt certain tricks whereby to bait the workers from time to time, but that they do not really understand them. The proletarians are at bottom just as little sentimental as their opponents, and that is why they are bound to throw down all obstacles laid in the way of their victorious advance not only by their avowed enemies but also by the allies of these enemies in the proletarian camp. The proletarians erected barricades for the salvation of revolutionaries, but when the Maslovists, counting on this class solidarity against the class enemy, turned to the workers and wanted to make another Sacco-Vanzetti case out of the case of Trotzky and Zinoviev, their own adherents shouted them down.

The Social Democrats, who until quite recently had not a single good word to say for Trotzky and still less for Zinoviev, now suddenly assume the rôle of their champions. What the campaigns in favour of the Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks failed to do, was to be attained by the fight for Trotzky and Zinoviev, that is to say, a tremendous movement was to be put into operation with a view to forcing the leading party of the proletarian dictatorship to capitulate. But the proletarians very naturally asked themselves, what had suddenly happened and who it was that had changed. Zinoviev and Trotzky? Or the

Social Democrats? Obviously men like Stampfer and Noske, MacDonald and Grumbach, Bauer and Vandervelde have remained what they were, so that it can only be **Trotsky and Zinoviev that have changed**. They have sunk to the level of the old protégés of the Social Democrats. If this is so, however, they deserve just as little indulgence as the rest of the permanent victims of "Bolshevist terrorism". Trotsky and Zinoviev have been unmasked by their new friends in the eyes not only of the revolutionary workers but of the entire working class.

This personal bankruptcy is nothing but the logical outcome of the theoretical bankruptcy of Zinoviev and Trotsky, the bankruptcy of the reformist adventurers of the Opposition. They have broken altogether with Marxism and Leninism, and therefore they were bound to go under. That is what we must remember, if this whole sad episode is to leave us at least one useful lesson. In the era of a declining imperialism and an advancing world revolution, any doctrine or movement within or in connection with the proletariat is doomed to failure, as soon as it breaks with the teachings of Marx and Lenin.

Whether the suggestions of the Opposition are ultra-Right, such as the creation of special organisatory representative bodies for the peasants, as proposed by Zinoviev, depopulation of the proletarian centres, as suggested by Trotsky, or the abandonment of the entire trade to the speculators, as generally demanded by the Opposition, or else adventurous, such as the declaration of war on China, as demanded by **Rakovsky** — one thing they have in common, viz., their disregard for the most important facts and experiences. They are suggestions "out of an empty stomach", reckoning not with reality but with the tortuous opinions of fractions within fractions. They are not derived from real life and are not meant for real life but for fractional interests; they are therefore at best to be employed for the concoction of fractional programmes, and being recognised as such have been summarily disposed of together with their originators.

What a tragedy for the working class, that again and again its own ranks should produce aiders and abettors of its greatest enemies! What an additional tragedy that just around the tenth anniversary of the victorious proletarian revolution men who took part in that revolution should now appear as witnesses against it, the only existing witnesses against it, indeed. Thanks to the internal solidity of that revolution and thanks to the strength of the Parties of the Communist International, thanks also to the sound proletarian attitude as regards the treatment of blacklegs and to the circumstance that the teachings of Lenin have taken root far beyond the confines of Communism in the entire working class, this crisis could be overcome with relative ease.

This is likewise a good sign of the strength of Communism and an earnest pledge of victory for the serious fights with which we are faced.

## Why We Fight against the Opposition.

By P. Vaillant Couturier. (Paris).

Comrade Vaillant-Couturier, who formerly sympathised very strongly with Trotsky, has now taken up the fight against the Opposition with all energy. Regarding this fight Comrade Vaillant Couturier, who has just returned from the Soviet Union, writes as follows:

The Oppositionals, Treints, and Souvarines are vying with the bourgeois press in calumniating the Soviet Union. They are repeating all the lies and fairy tales which have already been refuted a hundred times; they are endeavouring, so long as it is not too late, to take advantage of the sentimental attitude of the French proletariat.

When I, putting on one side all personal admiration for this or that October revolutionary, have this time flung all my energies into the fight, it is because I have been able to ascertain on the spot what evil for a young revolution an Opposition can

create which violates and contemns the most elementary principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

And I declare from my deepest revolutionary conviction:

I have come from Russia. In the year 1925 I had left a Russia which was still bandaging its wounds. I have found a Russia that is building itself up. I had left workers in bad clothing, in bad footwear. I see them again in new clothes. There where formerly was a piece of waste-ground, there has now arisen a magnificent building. There where one dilapidated house stood next to the other, I see a whole quarter of new, workers' houses. There where there was a factory with worn out machines and employing only 6000 workers, I now see 11,000 workers and modern machines. There where I had seen private shops, I now see the branch shops of the co-operatives or the State stores. There where I saw an army of 100 bureaucrats rampaging, I now see 20 active clerks. There where miserable villages painfully toiled, cultivating heavy soil, I now see the powerful buildings of the Dnieprostroy, the great electricity power works on the Dniepr. There where I had seen only a forest of lances and bayonets, I now see swarms of aeroplanes under the flag of the world revolution. There where I had seen a people which had become weary through the many battles in the civil war, I now see an enrolment of new generations which are ready for every sacrifice in order to defend the Socialist Republic.

Is that retrogression? Capitulation? Is that Thermidor? Is that the work of a majority which is leading the Soviet Union to defeat? Ridiculous!

We are now in the second heroic phase of the Revolution.

He who does not see this is blind.

He who opposes this is, owing to the pitiless force of facts, a criminal.

Those who are endangering the revolution are those who, whether they will it or not, are, by their attack upon the majority of the Russian Party, placing weapons in the hands of our enemies.

## The Communist Party of Norway on the Question of the Russian Party Opposition.

The Central Committee of the C. P. of Norway has **unanimously** adopted the following decision on the question of the Russian Opposition.

The Communist Party of Norway has followed with great attention the fight which the Russian Opposition has conducted against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the past two years.

On the inner questions, before all on those referring to the relation to the peasants and the wage question, the Opposition advocates a Trotskyist policy in contradiction to the Leninist policy which realises that a correct policy with regard to the peasantry constitutes the main prerequisite for the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship, and which further strives for a gradual and systematic improvement of the standard of life of the working class along with the carrying out of the socialist rationalisation of industry.

The Opposition has, on the most important international questions — attitude towards the Chinese Revolution and the Anglo-Russian Committee —, deviated from the fundamental and tactical line of Leninism in the colonial and trade union question and attempted to carry out in these spheres a policy of mere demonstration without any understanding for the different stages of development of the revolutionary movement.

The C. C. of the C. P. of Norway repudiates the Trotskyist line of the Opposition, which is thoroughly wrong and harmful to the Communist movement, and is in entire agreement with the political line which has been followed and is being followed by the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. and by the Executive Committee of the Comintern. This policy, which proceeds con-

sistently without deviating either to one nor to the other, is based on Lenin's teachings.

The two years' activity of the Opposition has shown that it expresses on the one hand the pressure of the petty bourgeoisie and the imperialist forces on the Soviet Power, and on the other hand encourages by its activity the petty-bourgeois elements and thus threatens to become a centre round which these elements are consolidating.

The Russian Opposition has become, against its will the organisatory centre of all anti-proletarian and counter-revolutionary forces not only of the Soviet Union, but also of the capitalist countries and has continued the whole time the collaboration with Ruth Fischer, Maslov, Souvarine, etc., as well with other expelled elements who slander and calumniate the Soviet Union and the Comintern and who do not shrink from allying themselves with those elements who strive for the overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, the bulwark of world revolution. Therefore the organisatory measures which were adopted against the Opposition were not only justified, but were an absolutely necessary step.

The C. C. of the C. P. of Norway records with satisfaction that the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. and the Executive Committee have without hesitation shielded the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist construction. It fully and entirely approves of the organisatory measures which were adopted against the leaders of the Opposition. These measures are the more necessary as the Soviet Union is at present again threatened by an acute danger from the side of the imperialist States, the more so as the action of the Opposition has become more and more dangerous and would have led not only to a splitting of the Party of Lenin in Soviet Russia, but also of the Comintern, which would have meant the setting up and organisation of a new party. The leaders of the Opposition have by these methods placed themselves outside of the Party and of the Comintern.

The latest steps of the Opposition show most clearly their defection from the Party and from the working class, in that they voted against the introduction of the seven hour day at the Session of the Central Executive Committee, attempted to discredit the ten years jubilee by organising their own demonstration, established their own, illegal printing offices and spoke against the policy of the Party in face of a non-Party public, in that they held fraction meetings under the leadership of Trotzky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others, although they were free to attend the discussion meetings of the Party in the nuclei etc., and forcibly removed the elements faithful to the Party who had come to these illegal meetings.

The C. C. gladly welcomes the result of the discussion in the Russian brother Party, which proves that the Opposition cannot even muster one per cent of the Party membership, and likewise welcomes the results of the recruiting campaign, which show that also the non-party workers are unshaken in their faith in the Party and its Leninist leadership.

The C. P. N. is firmly convinced that the XV. Party Congress will, with a firm hand, put an end to the criminal disruptive work of the Trotzkyist Opposition. The C. P. N. will support with all its forces the further struggle against the Opposition and will do its share in order to check the harmful effects of the oppositional work upon the international revolutionary movement.

**Long live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which stands unshakably strong and firmly disciplined in face of all the exterior and inner enemies!**

**Down with the Trotzkyist disrupters and their attacks upon the Party of Lenin!**

**Long live the unity of the Comintern on the basis of Leninism!**

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### A Gigantic Struggle Approaching in the German Steel and Iron Industry.

By August Enderle (Berlin).

The fight over the working day in the German crude iron and steel industry which has been latent for some months past has at one stroke experienced a high political intensification. The Rhenish-Westphalian industrialists, the leaders of the Steel Trust, of the German Crude Iron Combine, and at the same time the controllers of the Continental Steel Cartel announced on the 3rd of December the closing down of all their works on the 1st of January 1928. They have for this purpose submitted to the Labour Ministry for the Reich the legally prescribed notice of intention to close down. The industry working up iron in Rhenish-Westphalia has to a great extent joined in this action of the trust magnates. That means in practice the locking out about 500,000 workers and, as a further consequence, the paralysing of the greater part of the whole of German industry.

The cause of this tremendous attack on the part of German iron and steel capital is the following:

By the decree regarding working hours issued in the Autumn of 1923 on the basis of the Emergency Powers' Act, the eight-hour was abolished and the ten and twelve-hour day was introduced in the whole of the heavy iron and steel industry. Clause 7 of this decree provides that the exceeding of the eight-hour day permitted by this law can be restricted or abolished by supplementary provisions of the Labour Ministry for the Reich in the case of workers working at blast furnaces, smelting works, iron rolling mills, as well as for workers working in front of fires and in factories injurious to health. In April, 1925, on the basis of this provision and against the will of the employers, the eight-hour day was again introduced for workers directly employed in smelting works and coke factories. This however, only affected a relatively small number of workers.

The whole of the workers in the smelting works in the whole of the Rhenish-Westphalian iron and steel industry have been demanding for years the general re-introduction of the eight-hour day and of the three shifts system in place of the present two shifts system. They have repeatedly attempted to realise these demands by trade union struggles. In July, 1927, the collective tariff regarding working time expired and the workers prepared for the fight for introduction of the eight hour day. In this threatening situation the Labour Minister for the Reich issued on the 16th of July, 1927, a decree providing an eight-hour day for the greater part of the smelting and iron-rolling workers from the 1st January 1928. The Labour Minister and the trade union leaders succeeded, with the help of this decree, which constitutes a promise for the future, in preventing the threatening strike and in carrying out the prolongation of the twelve hour tariff up to the 31st December. At that time the employers did not raise any objection to the decree.

Now the promise contained in the order is to be converted into fact. For months past the employers have been conducting a campaign against it both in the press and with the government. They are demanding the suspension of the order of 16th July, or at least its postponement for several years. Already in October they proclaimed a fight with the sharpest means against an eventual maintenance or carrying out of the eight-hour decree on the 1st of January. For this purpose they already at the end of August last set up a huge strike fund, to which every employer has to pay five marks per month for every worker he employs.

Their present threat to close down their works means, on the one hand, a command to the bourgeois block government to withdraw the decree or to postpone it, and on the other hand, the attempt to induce the trade union leaders to give up the demands submitted by them under the pressure of the

workers, i. e. eight-hour day for all Rhenish-Westphalian metal workers (about 250,000), complete levelling up of wages, a 10% wage increase —, and to make them prepared for a foul compromise.

The action of the steel magnates is of the very greatest importance not only for Germany but internationally. The Rhenish-Westphalian steel industry has enjoyed the greatest prosperity for the last eighteen months. It has, by means of low wages and a long working day, defeated its competitors on the world market. It has far exceeded its quota within the Continental crude Steel Cartel, so that from the 1st September, 1926, to 31st August, 1927, alone it had to pay, or better said was able to pay, in normal contributions (1 Dollar per ton) and in "penalties" (4 dollars per ton) for exceeding the quota, a total of 112 million marks into the central fund of the Continental Crude Steel Cartel. As the eight-hour day prevails in the steel industries in the other countries, the German steel industry would lose its advantage by the introduction of the eight hour day in Germany. It is in order to prevent this that they are prepared to wage a desperate struggle, with the employment of the most drastic means.

The bourgeois bloc government will undoubtedly accede to the demand of heavy industry and, unfortunately, it is to be feared that the social-democratic trade union leaders will also evade the fight. If in spite of this, under the pressure of the working masses, this gigantic fight breaks out, then from the very first hour it will acquire not only a huge economic, but a tremendous political importance.

## Amsterdam's Aid to the Italian Proletariat.

By Ramingo.

On October 28th in the organ of the French reformist General Confederation of Labour "Le Peuple", a report was printed on the "International Conference on the Question of the Conditions of the Workers in Italy", held on the previous day. The Conference had been convened by Amsterdam, and part was taken in it by representatives of the Central Federations of Belgium, France and Switzerland, and the International Federations of Builders, Miners, Foodworkers, Metal Workers, Textile Workers, and Transport Workers. Among other participants in the Conference were the members of the alleged foreign committee of the Italian G. C. L., Buozzi, Sardelli, Bensi, Caporallik, Quaglino who were promoted, as everybody knows, by Amsterdam into the rank of representatives of the Italian labour movement.

As it is known, the last Congress of the Amsterdam International did not find time to take up the question of the Italian situation. The delegation sent to the Congress by the illegal General Confederation of Labour from Italy was not considered authoritative, whilst the private conference organised by Sassenbach between the Foreign Committee people and the "unrecognised" delegates of the G. C. L. failed to bring any results. Officially, Amsterdam remained "uninformed" as to the existence of the organisation of the working class which has been revived in Italy, whilst Jouhaux had the audacity after the Congress to declare to the "Trud" correspondent that "no such organisation exists upon Italian soil."

Yet this "unexisting" organisation is stubbornly living and fighting, in the teeth of the Fascist terror, and recently it appealed for aid to the R. I. L. U., the Amsterdam International and all the national federations of class trade unions in Europe and America\*). It may be guessed that this particular appeal was most annoying to the Amsterdam crowd: supposing that there be found such an Amsterdam organisation which, in the kind simplicity of its heart, might send some contri-

bution to the Italian revolutionaries! And Amsterdam, ten months after the desertion and treachery by the reformist leaders of the G. C. L. and eight months after the revival of the organisation, "makes haste" to discuss the Italian labour movement.

Of course, the real representatives of the Italian labour movement were not invited to the Conference; but the Italian workers living abroad, as well as the G. C. L. in Italy, learned about it from the newspapers. The "Defence Committee of the Italian G. C. L.", formed in Paris by ex-members of the G. C. L. now living abroad, published a protest against the non-admission of G. C. L. representatives to the Conference, and against the discussion of questions concerning the Italian proletariat without the participation of its direct representatives.

There was also a direct appeal made by the G. C. L. of Italy to Amsterdam, asking for the admission of its representatives to the Conference, to which it was entitled both by the statutes of the Amsterdam International (for the G. C. L. did not withdraw from its ranks, and its organs were elected with due observance of the Rules), as well as by the numerical strength of its membership. At the same time the G. C. L. proposed to include in the agenda of the Conference the question of organising the resistance of the Italian proletariat to the second wage-cutting campaign undertaken by the Fascists, and of linking up this question with the fight against Fascism and the capitalist reaction. The proposals of the G. C. L. in regard to the forms of the further existence and the alliance with Amsterdam amount to the following:

1. The G. C. L. shall exist and work illegally in Italy.
2. The organisational forms and fighting methods worked out by the G. C. L. during the period of its restoration have stood the test of experience in practical work and constitute the best guarantee for the continuance of its successful activity.
3. The G. C. L. shall be the only class organisation of the trade unions embracing all the forces of the Italian proletariat.
4. All the political revolutionary tendencies of the Italian proletariat shall be represented upon the Executive Board of the G. C. L.
5. For purposes of contact with Amsterdam and for the purpose of anti-Fascist agitation and propaganda abroad, several members of the Executive Board of the G. C. L. shall be located abroad, but they shall work in compliance with the decisions of the Executive Board.

The Italian G. C. L. gave notices of its absolute rejection of any proposals amounting to the repudiation of the existence of an independent labour movement in Italy proper.

The Conference, under the chairmanship of Jouhaux and Mertens, was opened with an address by Sassenbach on the events in the Italian labour movement during the past year, and on the "Communist manoeuvre designed to capture the leadership of the G. C. L.", i. e., on the Milan Conference held on February 20th last. After reporting on the fruitless negotiations with the representatives of the "Milan Group" during the last Congress of Amsterdam, he told his audience that "the representatives of the Milan Group, having learned from the newspapers about the calling of the Conference, requested the opportunity to state their reasons in favour of recognising them as the duly authorised representatives of the G. C. L. of Italy". The Conference magnanimously consented to listen to their argument in the afternoon session, in the meantime receiving the report from the secretary of the "authorised" Parisian G. C. L. of Italy, Buozzi. As to the discussion which followed upon Buozzi's report, no mention of this is made in the minutes. It is merely stated that part was taken in it by Mertens (Belgium), Ilg (Switzerland), Shaw (International Textile Workers' Federation), Fimnen (International Transport Workers' Federation), and Peplow (International Building Workers' Federation), all of them agreeing with Jouhaux's ruling "that the admission of representatives of the Milan group should by no means imply a reversal of the decision adopted by Amsterdam in regard to the Italian G. C. L. which has been removed abroad." On being admitted to the afternoon session, the Italian delegation acquainted the

\*) As it is known both the R. I. L. U. and the Soviet A. C. T. U. C. responded to the appeal by sending the former 5000 rubles, and the latter 10,000 rubles, to the G. C. L. of Italy.

conference with the history of the revival of the G. C. L. and its activity, answering to a number of questions raised by those present, whilst to Fimmen's question whether the ground could be found for an agreement between the "Milan Group" and the "Foreign Committee" the answer was that such an agreement could be reached only upon the basis of recognising the G. C. L. in Italy as the only duly constituted representative of the Italian Trade Union Movement.

The further discussion of this question took place in the absence of the representatives of the Italian G. C. L., and the decision, of course, could be easily foreseen. Its official text reads as follows:

"The Conference declares that:

"1. The Italian Trade Union Movement, which stands upon the platform of the class struggle, should be materially supported, so as to enable it to continue its further activity.

2. As the centre of the united Italian labour movement at the present time can be considered only the Italian trade union centre in Paris recognised by the International Federation of Trade Unions.

3. The proposal is made to the International Federation of Trade Unions to watch the development of events in Italy and to determine its attitude in accordance with the circumstances."

Such is the resolution of the Conference which has yet to be ratified by the Amsterdam Executive at its next meeting.

Its purport is quite clear. The labour movement of Italy is reviving despite the unparalleled hardships through which it is passing. This is a fact which can no longer be ignored. The economic crisis in Italy is growing more and more acute, and accordingly there is an ever-growing fury in the political and economic pressure upon the working class. The masses of the workers are moving. Here and there the movement breaks out in manifestations of protest and indignation. Fascism, even on the admission of some of its British friends, is passing "through the most critical moment of its existence". The Italian and International reformers have every reason to fear that the leadership of the reviving labour movement will fall into the hands of the revolutionary elements into the hands of those who did not desert their posts even at the most critical moments for the Italian labour movement. Such an outlook does not seem pleasant to Amsterdam and to its Italian friends in particular. The reformists are already anticipating with delight an agreement with the "sobered" bourgeoisie, whilst Turatti recently hailed Nitti as "the former and future head of the Italian Government". In the political machinations both contemplated and consummated, the labour movement of Italy is considered as a matter of no slight importance. This is fully realised by the Italian politicians abroad and by their high allies and protectors in the Second International and Amsterdam. The only concern of both of them is not to let loose of the firm of the G. C. L. Hence the revival of the solicitous care of Amsterdam in regard to the Italian labour movement. The Amsterdam people are worried over the fate of the firm of the G. C. L. which has been transferred from Milan to Paris. Having no chances to gain control over the Italian labour movement from Paris, they are planning to break it up, under the guise of vague resolutions about offering aid and assistance. As against the united front of the vanguard of the working class formed in Italy, the reformists intend to advertise the activity of the "foreign G. C. L.", which, according to their plans, should "enliven" the trade union activity in Italy by introducing the elements of strife and contention.

## **Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. to Trade Union Educational League Conference.**

(Opening on December 3, 1927.)

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions greets the Trade Union Educational League as being the decisive factor in the struggle for a working class trade union movement in America. The increased reaction on the part of the trade union bureaucrats and the swing to the Left on

the part of the masses are creating favourable conditions for the work of the League. An unrelenting struggle must be carried on against the agents of imperialism in the A. F. of L., especially when they attempt to lead the struggle in order to betray the workers as observed during the strikes of the garment workers and miners. The R. I. L. U. considers that the tasks that confront you to-day can serve as a basis to unify all real progressive elements. These are: 1. Trade Union democracy, the Unions to be cleaned of corrupt leadership; 2. Organise the unorganised in the old and new unions; 3. Organise new unions wherever the corrupt bureaucrats are causing the workers to leave the organisations and disintegrating the trade unions; 4. Amalgamation of trade unions; 5. Struggle against class collaboration; 6. Struggle against imperialism; 7. Struggle against new danger; 8. World trade union unity.

"Organise the Unorganised" should not be turned into an abstract slogan. Neither should we expect the reactionary leaders, like Lewis of the Mine Worker's Union, to do this work for us. The League itself must take up the work of organising in the trade unions the millions of unorganised workers. The present organisational weakness of the League must be eliminated, and all Left-wing and real progressive elements of the American Labour Movement both inside and outside the American Federation of Labour must be lined up.

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. sends through the League revolutionary greetings to the whole working class of America and expresses the conviction that the League will turn from a propaganda organ into an organisation leading the Class struggle of the American Proletariat.

Executive Bureau  
Red International of Labour Unions.

## **FASCISM**

### **The Political Significance of the Trial of the Communist Party of Italy.**

By Ercoli.

After the fourth attempt on Mussolini's life in November 1926 the permanent state of emergency was declared in Italy which has been subjected to the rule of terror of the Blackshirts for the past five years. All parties of the working class, all its organisations were dissolved. The non-Fascist Press was suppressed. By the application of the exceptional laws which were issued immediately after that, the notorious Special Tribunal was created among other things, an institution which, in two months of its "work", passed sentences of about 1200 years of imprisonment on numerous champions of those organisations which openly profess to be organisations of the working class, above all on the Communists. Thousands of "subversive" elements, chiefly Communists, have been deported to remote islands where life is unbearable, partly because of the lack of food and of the most primitive hygienic measures, partly because of the brutal and arbitrary behaviour of the Fascist militia, in whose hands the fate of the deputies has been placed.

Immediately after the attempt on Mussolini's life, hundreds of Communists and "insurgents" were thrown into prison. The comrades of the parliamentary fraction of deputies were also imprisoned. This was done before the Fascist Chamber had declared that they and other deputies of the Opposition had forfeited their mandates.

56 Communists, among them the best-known leaders of the Communist Party, such as Antonio Gramsci, Umberto Terracini, Fabrizio Maffi, Mauro Scoccimarro etc. have been detained in prison for a year and are awaiting their trial. This trial however is constantly being postponed. It is evident that the discussion which is to be anticipated in the course of that trial, is inconvenient to the Fascist Government. The trial had been fixed for the middle of November, but it has been postponed until the next session of the court, i. e. till January, as the "judges" will have their Christmas holiday in December.



The Fascist Government is anticipating this trial with great uneasiness, not only because of its juridical monstrosity, the accused must defend themselves for an activity which was absolutely "legal" as it took place at the time before the announcement of the exceptional laws — but also because of the great popularity of the accused. Thus the juridical monstrosity of the accusation is followed by the other monstrosity of an endless waiting for the trial.

Even according to the Fascist laws which are despicable enough, the persons under arrest cannot be accused of any "crime". This is however no obstacle to the Fascist regime, that regime of violence and arbitrary action.

The coming trial is not the first monstrous trial of the Communist Party. Already in 1923 such a monstrous trial took place. In the latter, the accusation referred to the activity developed by the Communist Party two years before the "march on Rome", the object of which was to organise the resistance of the proletarian vanguard to the offensive of reaction. In that trial, Fascism hoped to break the neck of the political organisation of the vanguard of the working class by a brutal blow being dealt at it by Fascist justice. The trial however resulted in a fiasco of the Fascist plan; it did not have the desired political effect. After a short period of uncertainty and reorganisation, the Communist Party once more — at the end of 1923 — became a political power with which Fascism was obliged to reckon. The Communist Party was closely bound up with the best and most active section of the working class. In the years which followed, the significance of the Communist Party in the struggle against Fascism asserted itself in an ever increasing measure whilst the other Oppositional groups disintegrated and dissolved more and more. Towards the end of 1926, Fascism had almost completely succeeded in destroying all anti-Fascist groups with the exception of the Communist Party. The exceptional laws and the wave of terror which swept the country in November 1926 had reached their end.

Fascism had not gained a "final" victory over the Communist Party. After every blow it received, the Communist Party raised its head afresh, certain that it was impossible to suppress it. The same happened after November 1926. The Communist Party continued its activity as the centre for the organisation of the working class, whilst all the other groups with an anti-Fascist tendency actually renounced carrying on the fight and not only deserted but declared desertion to be a duty.

This is just the reason why our comrades have to justify themselves before the Special Tribunal.

The political significance, the political object of this trial is obvious. The trial is an act of terror of a peculiar character, which can only be explained by the present political situation in Italy. This political situation has grown out of and is characterised by the economic crisis which is constantly increasing, by the first signs of the re-awakening fighting force of the working masses and by the indefatigable activity of the Communist Party.

Signs indicating that the ruling class of capitalist society, that the Fascist regime will have to account for the economic and political crisis into which it has drawn the broad masses, are growing apace. The fresh offensive against the workers' wages not only threatens them with distress and starvation; to these calamities must be added unemployment which has never been as wide-spread as it is to-day in the towns and in the country. The agrarian crisis is bringing the middle and small peasants into an unbearable situation. The same applies to the middle and petty bourgeoisie which has, to a certain extent, been driven on to the side of the proletariat. Only the fact that the policy of suppression is being carried out with utmost severity prevents the discontent of the population from flaring up into a general crisis of society.

The situation is however insufficiently characterised unless we take into consideration that the working class has not remained idle in the last few months. It has begun to re-organise itself, it has given the right reply to the treachery of the Reformists by engaging its best forces in the purpose of maintaining the existence of the general trade union league. It has not been tardy in reacting to the deterioration of the economic situation and in getting a move on. So far, it is true,

it is only a case of partial movements, such as are in keeping with the present strength and organisation of the proletariat; but the working class has determinedly entered on the path which will finally lead to the overthrow of Fascism and of the capitalist regime in Italy, and has taken into its hands the lead of all anti-Fascist movements. At the present moment, the rural proletariat, the peasants, are also beginning to stir and to fight, and the activity of that section of the population is developing in an organical connection with the activity of the workers.

The Communist Party is throwing a revealing light on the juridical monstrosity of the said trial, for that monstrosity is a symptom of the situation in which the enemy finds himself, being forced to abandon even the mere appearance of a legality of his power. The Communist Party knows very well that in this case it is not a question of right and legality but of resistance, obstinacy and strength. Before the court at which the trial will take place, not judges and accused will therefore be present, but two armies, two worlds, two classes will stand face to face in an irreconcilable contest.

The important thing now is to close our ranks, the ranks of all the militants, of all the active members of the working class, the ranks of all the enemies of Fascism, the ranks whose leader is the working class. We have not been defeated in 1923; it has proved impossible to destroy us for the past seven years; it will prove equally impossible to defeat us to-day or on any day to come.

## Intensified Exploitation of Female Labour under Fascism in Italy.

By G. S.

The Fascist Government of Italy boasts that it is one of the first capitalist governments to ratify the well known law of Washington for the protection of female labour and child labour. Fascism furthermore claims the merit of initiating the foundation of a "national campaign for the protection of motherhood and children". In reality, however, there is no other capitalist country where female labour is so intensively exploited as in Italy; in no other capitalist country are children employed in such great numbers in industry and agriculture, and, moreover, without the slightest control. Just as Fascism has forced down to the lowest level the general standard of living of the working population, it has also intensified the exploitation of working women and made child labour still more inhuman. The intensified exploitation of the working women and of child labour is a direct consequence of the increasing deterioration in the strata of the working population and of the uncurbed arbitrary measures, which Fascism permits employers to take.

The latest wage agreements, signed by the Fascist trade unions in Verona, lay down for an experienced woman spinner 9.50 lire per day. When it is taken into consideration that a kilogram of bread costs two lire in Italy, it is immediately clear how far a wage of 9.50 lire falls short of the requirements of a working woman. But before a woman is treated as a competent spinner she must put in six years of apprenticeship. During this period the woman is treated as an apprentice and receives only 50% of the wage of a competent spinner, i. e. 4.75 lire a day. Fascism really understands how to protect the working woman in a proper manner! A further example: the same Fascist trade unions of Verona have established the following wages for women working in stocking-knitting shops: women of the first category two lire an hour; women of the second category 1.86 lire an hour; women of the third category 1.10 lire an hour; women of the fourth category 0.75 lire an hour. The majority of the women belong to the last two categories and have wages ranging from 6.0 to 8.80 lire per day (except when they are on short time, which is often the case). And in spite of such low wages, a cut of fifty per cent. was recently made under the pretext of an alleged improvement in the cost-of-living index.

Let us mention another agreement made by the Fascist trade unions, namely, the one concluded on behalf of the brick-makers of Macerata. For the earth-workers a wage of 1.50 lire per hour was established, for women 0.50 lire and for juvenile

workers (from 15 to 18 years of age) 0.60 lire an hour. It will be seen that a girl's wage does not exceed 5 lire a day (and a kilogramme of bread costs 2 lire!). When we take the above rates in conjunction with an examination of the wage conditions of female labour and child labour in agriculture, the picture we get is a still gloomier one. We will only cite a few figures — one might say official figures — which we have taken from the working agreements concluded by the Fascist trade unions.

The agreement concerning agricultural work, made by the Agricultural Workers' Association (dissolved by the Fascists like all the other class organisations) in 1921 for the district of Cremona, established the following wages: women 1 lira an hour, overtime 2.40 lire, working day: 6 hours in winter and 8 hours from February 15th to November 15th. The wage limit for the woman's wage was set at fifteen. When the Fascists captured the power, the wage per hour was reduced from 1 lira to 0.80 lire, with corresponding reductions for lower grades. The age limit for the woman's wage was put up from 15 to 18. The women therefore had to work a further three years in agriculture before earning the wage which they had previously received at fifteen. And these wages have been still further reduced. The present wage agreed upon for the women amounts to only 60 centesimi up to the age of eighteen. In short, reduction of wages, raising of the age limit for the right to adults' wages and extension of the working day (7—8 hours in winter and 9—10 hours in summer).

Female and child labour, paid for at the above starvation rates is employed extensively by the Fascist government in the manufacture of munitions of war. In spite of all the laws against the employment of juveniles on night work, many cases are reported of juveniles doing night shifts. The "protection of motherhood and of children" which was brought about by Fascism consists of intensified exploitation of female and juvenile labour. This is also the reason for the fact that the women and the juvenile workers are always prominent in the fight against Fascism.

The fighting spirit displayed by the women against Fascism in the general awakening of the working class is really remarkable. Let us recall some of the best-known events: During rice harvesting in Piedmont and in Lombardy, the women rice workers struck for three days against a cut in wages. This strike became very extensive; it was the biggest of the strikes in 1927 and was led by the Communist organisation and by the General Trade-Union Federation. In Turin, in Vicenza, in Biella, in Venice, in Bologna, in Trieste and in many towns of the province of Milan, such as Legnano, Gallarate, Caronno, the working women have defended their wages by strikes, interruption of work and other collective protest demonstrations. It may be said that the Fascist Government is obviously powerless in face of this resistance on the part of the women workers. In Caronno, where an effort was made to allocate to each woman a greater number of looms, the hands in the textile mills were out on strike for more than two weeks.

The Fascist Government is to-day afraid to proceed with the brutality which usually characterises it against women on strike and participating in street demonstrations. It is true that there is no lack of arrests and convictions even of women workers. The weapon which is most in use against working women is still dismissal. But it is certain that, in case the position becomes more critical and excitement and strikes increase, the Fascist Government will not hesitate to intervene with the iron heel they have used upon the workers, and indeed, with no less brutality towards the women. In connection with the tremendous increase of unemployment, the street demonstrations of the women and children of the unemployed — demonstrations which have already taken place in various towns — will become less avoidable and more frequent.

The Italian Trade-Union Federation is devoting great attention to the organisation of the working women, the women obey its appeals and they are rallying to the front in the fight which the working class constantly carries on against the employers and against Fascism.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### The Terror of the Kemalists against the Labour Movement in Turkey.

By Ali Risa.

Quite recently a report was spread in all the newspapers of the world stating that the Kemalists had carried off a complete victory at the last parliamentary election and that Kemal Pasha, on the occasion of the opening of Parliament, had made a speech which lasted six days and in which he expounded the tremendous achievements of the Kemaslist Government in the field of the strengthening of Turkey as a democratic State, in its economic and political independence from the imperialist Powers.

In reality however, the situation is far from corresponding with Kemal Pasha's description. The imperialist Powers, especially British and French imperialists, are straining every nerve to detach Turkey from the Soviet Union, to drive the Kemalists into the embrace of Fascism and to subject them to their own, decisive influence. The Kemalist leaders are getting completely under the spell of these intrigues. This can be seen very clearly for instance in the internal policy the Kemal Government is pursuing in recent times.

Quite recently a decisive rise of the labour movement in Turkey has begun to develop. This fact found expression in wholesale strikes in the tobacco factories in Constantinople (April and May last year), in the strike on the railway line of Aidin and in a whole number of other industrial branches. The majority of the strikes ended in a partial victory of the strikers. "Amele Teali Djimiet", the trade union organisation, which greatly gained ground during the last few years and began to play the role of a trade union centre for the whole of Turkey, has a big share in that victory. The "Teali" was beginning to collect the dispersed labour organisations and to consolidate the class forces of the Turkish proletariat. The influence of this centre was steadily growing among the workers of Turkey.

What attitude did the Kemal Government observe towards this leading trade union organisation of the workers? It made every effort to get this organisation under its tutelage and to check the activity of the "Teali" by force of police.

When the Kemal agents realised that they were unable to gag the independence and autonomy of the "Teali", the activity of which gradually paralysed the influence of the Kemal agents on the Turkish working class, the Kemal Government resolved to suppress the independent class movement of the Turkish proletariat by force. It dissolved the "Amele Teali Djimiet" and arrested the trade union functionaries. A large number of leading workers are now sitting in the Turkish prisons. Kemal's "Democratic Government" is applying the most horrible tortures against the persons under arrest. It has been reported from reliable sources that even women and children are suspended by their fetters and ill-treated in that helpless condition.

We quote the names of the leading workers who are being submitted to inhuman cruelties in the Kemalist prisons:

Hamdi was beaten until he was unable to walk. He is now lying entirely wrapped in dressings.

Nuri (a worker) received a hundred and fifty blows with a stick and is seriously ill.

Hassan was beaten until he lost consciousness.

Danielia (a worker) was cruelly beaten on his gastric region.

Nikkola, Hakki, Ibrahim, Jara, Kapolos, Nikko (all of them workers) were treated with special cruelty.

This list could be further continued, but these examples suffice.

In Smyrna and Adana also Turkish workers were arrested and ill-treated. Kemal agents visited the whole country in order to catch revolutionary workers. In Constantinople alone

more than 40 workers have been pining in prison for the past 1½ months without their cause being dealt with. Their relatives are refused permission to see them. No one knows what is happening with the persons arrested. Even the Press, which is otherwise so loquacious, is silent on this occasion. Only the newspaper "Djühuriet" reported briefly of the arrest of Comrade Sheffik Husni, the well-known editor of the newspaper "Aidynlök".

The dissolution of "Amele Teali Djimiet" and the arrest of the trade union functionaries, their ill-treatment and the beating they received throw a particularly clear light on the so-called "Democratic" regime of Kemalist Turkey.

These arrests and the destruction of the labour movement are in a way a "gift" presented by the Kemalist Government to the working class on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the proclamation of the Turkish Republic.

The reactionary policy of the Kemalist party against the labour movement shows that the Kemalist party is detaching itself from the broad masses of the people and especially from the proletarian masses and is taking its stand with both feet on the ground of the suppression and exploitation of the masses of workers. The next step on this way which is to be anticipated is the strengthening of the connections and of the economic and political dependence on the imperialist Powers whilst the relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union are worsening. The fact alone that such crass injustice is being done to the organisations of the workers shows that the friendship between the Kemalist Government and the Soviet Union of which the Kemalist Government always boasted, is losing every significance. As a matter of fact, it would be thoroughly naive were they to reckon on the possibility of keeping up friendship with the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union who are in power whilst they persecute and ill-treat the functionaries of the labour movement in their own country.

The Turkish workers and peasants should draw the logical conclusions from these last lessons taught by the Kemalist Government. The Kemalist Government is detaching itself from them and turning towards reaction and towards the imperialists. The Turkish workers and peasants must then turn away from such a government, they must put the question as to a decisive fight against this government. The fight against the Kemalist Government will, at the same time, be a struggle for the country's peace and independence. To renounce entering on this fight would have the most serious consequences for the workers of Turkey. The workers of all countries should raise their voice in protest against the policy of the leaders of Kemalism who are carrying on an obscure activity with the purpose of choking off the labour movement of the young country, a country which has only recently freed itself from the imperialist yoke with the help of the Turkish workers.

## DOCUMENTS

### The E. C. C. I. on the Tasks of the Communists in Indonesia.

Besides the revolutionary fights in China, the revolt which took place in Indonesia at the end of 1926 and at the beginning of 1927 belong to the most important events which show that the suppressed masses of the East are already drawn into the world struggle between labour and capital. The E. C. C. I. has submitted the lessons of the Indonesian revolt to an extremely careful investigation.

The national-revolutionary movement in Indonesia differs before all from similar movements in the colonies in that, owing on the one hand, to the lack of a native bourgeoisie, and on the other hand, to the existence of concentrated proletarian masses in the big factories of the imperialists, this movement followed another path and the working class succeeded comparatively easily in playing an active role in this movement.

The difficult economic situation of the masses, the deterioration of the petty bourgeoisie and of the intelligentsia, as well as the growth of the Communist Party (the C.P. is the most

important political organisation of the people) and of the Red trade unions, which accompanied this process — all this characterises the development of Indonesia in the last years. The approach of the mass struggle was no secret for the government of the Dutch slave-holders. It adopted every measure in order to deprive the movement beforehand of its Communist Party and of the trade union movement. The revolt broke out in November, 1926, at first on the island of Java and then in Sumatra. Both revolts were bloodily suppressed. But their significance is enormous. They constitute a **culminating point** in the history of the national-revolutionary movement of Indonesia. These revolts differ from all previous famine revolts, in which the history of this Dutch colony is so rich, in that they constituted a conscious and organised attempt to overthrow the Dutch occupation rule by armed force.

The revolt was carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party. Hundreds of the best Indonesian Communists were shot or thrown into prison. Even before the revolt the best leaders of the Communist Party were arrested. The Party had made great efforts in order to prepare itself for the revolt. The first hours of the revolt showed some signs of technical preparation.

The whole course of the revolt, however, betrayed the lack of an earnest, political and organisatory preparation of this movement as a whole. It is extremely characteristic that the revolt was conducted under the general slogan of the fight against Dutch imperialism, and without a concrete political and economic slogan which would have mobilised broad masses and would have made the revolt the last and deciding point of a **general strike** and a peasant insurrectionary movement. The Communist Party sent out its best forces to occupy the various government institutions, without having sufficiently prepared them beforehand, and thus enabled the government to overcome easily the advance-guard of the national-revolutionary movement of Indonesia.

During the revolt and the time following its defeat, the section of the Second International — the Dutch Social Democracy — consciously played the role of a "bodyguard" of the Dutch slave-holders.

The Dutch social-democrats openly defended Dutch imperialism in the period of the insurrection and the time following it, and played the role of advisers of the Dutch bourgeoisie when the latter endeavoured to bribe a portion of the Indonesian intelligentsia in order to make them complaisant for the betrayal of the national revolution.

The Dutch social-democratic newspapers and the reformist politicians did not confine themselves to designating the insurrection as a **putsch** arranged "on the order of Moscow", but they also declared that the Dutch government had full right to crush this revolt by armed force. The reformist trade union movement did not move a finger when the brutal suppression of the revolt set in; it rejected all the proposals of the Communist Party to protest against the white terror. The social-democrats voted in Parliament against the demands of the Communist members of Parliament for the withdrawal the Dutch armed forces from Indonesia.

Dutch imperialism found it comparatively easy to suppress the revolt, but it is powerless when it is a question of abolishing the causes which led to this revolt. The partisan war in Indonesia clearly proves this.

What are now the next tasks of the Communist Party of Indonesia?

The first task of the Indonesian Communist Party is to rebuild the Party as a completely independent organisation, be it at the cost of the greatest sacrifices.

The Party must exert all its forces in order to reorganise the trade unions and to fight for their legalisation. The Communist Party must, by basing itself upon the trade unions, build up a mass workers' party.

Based upon an illegal organisation, the Party must at the same time make use of all the legal possibilities (elections etc.) The Party must actively work in the national organisations, and before all in the youth organisations. It is necessary to establish connections with the Left labour movement of Australia, New

Zealand and Japan, before all, however, with the national-revolutionary and labour movement of China.

The Communist Party, by preparing the masses for a new attack upon Dutch imperialism and for the fight for the national, independent Indonesian Republic, must at the same time educate and organise the masses to fight for the daily demands, such as: amnesty for the political prisoners, withdrawal of the occupation army, freedom of combination etc. eight-hour day, abolition of the Dutch language as the official language etc.

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

### The Discussion Supplement No. 6 of the "Pravda."\*)

By L. B.

The discussion supplement No. 6 contains the third continuation of Comrade Kuusinen's article: "Zinoviev's present historical 'Untruth'" and an article by Comrade Artiuchina "On Work among the Women". Comrade Shliapnikov is carrying on a controversy against the line of action taken by the C. C. in a contribution bearing the title of: "The Lessons of the Struggle within the Party". Comrade W. Astrov, in his article "A Hopeless Attempt to take Revenge", deals with Comrade Shliapnikov's attacks and assertions. Comrade I. Dymshitz' article "A New Discovery made by the Opposition" deals with the question of how to organise the village poor. Comrade Jaroslavsky lays before the 15th Party Congress proposals with regard to the question of anti-religious propaganda in an article entitled "No Relaxation in the Struggle against the Influence of Religion". In conclusion, extracts from a number of practical suggestions made by various comrades with the object of supplementing the theses on the Five Years' Plan, are published.

\* \* \*

In Comrade Shliapnikov's opinion, "the lessons of the struggle within the party" are that the "Labour Opposition" which as is a matter of common knowledge, was most vehemently combated by Lenin himself (at the 10th Party Congress Lenin even proposed Comrade Shliapnikov's exclusion from the Party) — that the "Labour Opposition" has proved to be in the right. Shliapnikov repeats the various accusations raised by the Trotskyites against the inner party regime, but he is more candid and less hypocritical in his attacks than are the Trotskyites. He does not maintain, as is being done by the latter, that the party leaders had deviated from Lenin's tradition. On the contrary, his article shows that he condemns the course followed by the party leaders just because it does not deviate from the course advocated by Lenin at the 10th Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. For the rest, Comrade Shliapnikov's train of thought may be explained briefly as follows:

The inner Party struggle is a reflection of the class struggle in the Soviet Union. The intensification of the class struggle in the last few years has led to an intensification of dissensions within the Party owing to the fact that the C. P. S. U. unites elements from all the social strata which exist in the country.

Peasant farming has reached the pre-war level in its development, and in some respects has even surpassed it, but the fact that State industry is not able to satisfy the requirements of the peasantry is an obstacle in the way of its further development. From this there results the pressure of the village on the "town" with regard to raw materials, corn and other foodstuffs. The slow development brings the village poor and the poor population of the towns, the rising generation of workers and the cadres of the unemployed into a hopeless position.

Ever since the 10th Party Congress the Labour Opposition has stood up for "the defence of State large industry" and has at the same time defended the interest of the working class and of their organisations in the widest meaning of the word. Even in 1920 and 1921 it pointed out that large industry was being neglected. The result of a policy of this kind is that even at the present moment coal mining, ore and metal industries have not reached the pre-war level.

The Labour Opposition has been accused of demagoguery and of defending "craft interests" because of its fight "for a real and thorough improvement of the situation of the working class".

The fact that the wages of the metal workers amount on an average to only 83.4 per cent of their pre-war wages, that of the miners to 75.2 per cent of their pre-war wages proves how untenable were these accusations.

Anyone who states that the "innermost nucleus of the proletariat is materially, and consequently also morally oppressed" is accused of deviation to the Right; only he who glosses over this reality is regarded as a true member of the Left.

It is true that a Right deviation exists in the Party, but it is not represented by the Labour Opposition; its representatives are those members of the C. C. who issue slogans such as "enrich yourselves!" etc.

The C. C. is applying the method of the "mechanical suppression of those who differ from it in their views." The fight against the Labour Opposition which has been raging since the 11th Party Congress, has proved that this method is untenable. Even five and a half years ago the Labour Opposition warned the C. C. against "the danger of a complete degeneration of the Party" which showed itself at that time in an embryonic state.

The "C. C. of that time" (which was under the immediate leadership of Lenin. L. B.) replied to this by a party justice persecution of the Opposition. The circumstance that the questions which the Labour Opposition brought up at that time, have not been solved in the least degree, proves that these extraordinary fighting measures were not at all to the purpose. To-day, the majority of the Central Committee is repeating the old methods (i. e. Lenin's methods. L. B.) in its struggle against the new Opposition, methods which "have been used especially energetically in the fight against the Labour Opposition and have driven those who used them (i. e. Lenin. L. B.) into bankruptcy."

The great variety of the social composition of the Party facilitates the penetration of petty bourgeois ideology into the policy of the party. The harmful consequences of this social variety cannot be mitigated unless the non-proletarian elements are refused admission to the Party, unless the non-proletarian nuclei are dissolved and the whole Party cleansed, unless ninety per cent of the party membership is proletarianised and the internal regime of the Party changed.

\* \* \*

Comrade Astrov, in the introduction to his controversy with Shliapnikov, points out the lack of restraint with which the writer later on defends his opportunist views against Lenin and tries to "take revenge" on history. Shliapnikov's article cannot but convince all those who read it of the anti-Leninist character of the present Opposition, in whose ranks Shliapnikov is included.

Was it not Lenin whom the declaration of the Labour Opposition, which Shliapnikov is drawing out of the waste-paper basket of history, described as the head of "the united forces of the Party and trade union bureaucracy which is abusing its position"? Lenin's methods of work were described by the Labour Opposition as "a pushing spirit, a spirit of intrigues and of flunkeyism"; the "party justice persecution" of the leaders of the Labour Opposition was indeed carried on under Lenin's lead, and it was Lenin who spoke with all energy for Shliapnikov's expulsion from the Party. This expulsion was only frustrated as a result of the voting in the C. C. In Shliapnikov's opinion, not he himself but Lenin got bankrupt politically in the struggle between himself and Lenin. By represen-

\*Published in the "Pravda" of 22nd November.

ting things in this way, the writer wanted to oblige the Trotzkyites, as it is to their advantage to-day if Lenin is discredited. He rendered them a bad service however, as he is only contributing to the exposure of the Trotzkyist lie alleging that the policy of the present C. C. is no Leninist one. It would be naive to believe that the Trotzkyites do not realise that they are fighting for Trotzkyism and against Leninism. The Trotzkyist declaration in 1923 maintaining that

"the regime of fractional dictatorship which came into being within the Party after the 10th Party Conference, has outlived itself"

as well as other remarks made by Trotzky and his adherents prove the contrary. Thus, Shliapnikov's attacks against Lenin are **nothing new** in so far as their content is concerned; what is new is that he now takes his stand against Lenin **openly in the Press**. The content of the former attacks of Shliapnikov who warned Lenin's C. C. and the Party "against degeneration" as early as in 1923, were in no way different from the present attacks made by Kamenev and Zinoviev. This ought to open the eyes of those partisans of the Opposition who are not yet lost to Lenin's Party; Shliapnikov's article itself ought to make them realise who is following the old Leninist line of action.

In his article, Shliapnikov once more shows his solidarity with the infamous letter written by Medvediev, his former faction colleague (1924) who, at that time, he himself represented as being opposed to Leninism and to the principles of the Communist Party. Even the Opposition, in its declaration of October 16th of the past year, condemned the said letter as an opportunist Right document. He only maintains that the text published differed from the original text and that the Labour Opposition had been "calumniated on the grounds of a forged text". In the "original text" of Medvediev's letter, however, it is said, that **great material sacrifices shall be made to foreign capital which, "in view of the present 'catastrophic' situation mean the lesser evil."**

What Shliapnikov's attitude has in common with that of Kamenev and Zinoviev is a deep pessimism with regard to the socialist possibilities of development in the Soviet Union, above all with regard to the possibilities of socialist development in the village. (For this reason Shliapnikov's making common cause with Zinoviev and Kamenev against Lenin in 1917 was no mere coincidence). Shliapnikov's and Medvediev's conception is that capitalism will grow all the more in the village the more socialist State industry grows. The logical consequence of this idea is the prospect of a detachment of the village from the town and the consequent collapse of socialism in the Soviet Union. This also explains that in Shliapnikov's and Medvediev's opinion the difference between socialist industry and industry carried on with the help of foreign capital is absolutely effaced.

Shliapnikov misrepresents things when he poses as a defender of heavy industry, maintaining that this was the reason why he has been accused of anarcho-syndicalism. In reality, Lenin accused him of anarcho-syndicalism because he demanded that the management of big industry be transferred into the hands of the trade unions. Shliapnikov omitted to quote in his article that chief demand of the platform of the Labour Opposition at that time.

With regard to the demagoguery of metallurgy "remaining behind" the pre-war level, it suffices to point out that six years ago the production of cast-iron only amounted to 0.3 per cent of pre-war production.

The C. C. is consistently and systematically steering the course towards the "ninety per cent proletarianisation" of the Party without there being any need **absolutely** to prohibit the admission of non-proletarian elements in the Party, as Shliapnikov demands from dread of the peasantry.

After dealing with the other inner-party demands of the "Labour Opposition" whose "numerous forces" now merely consist of Shliapnikov and Medvediev, Comrade Astrov characterises the rôle played by that "Labour Opposition" by stating that it is trying to turn to account any signs of oppositional views arising in the Party in order to fish in troubled waters and openly to attack Leninism, whilst it "moves off" from its

anti-Leninist views as soon as the Party members "stifle" the Opposition. Shliapnikov has only been encouraged to resume his attacks on Lenin and on the Party by the disintegrating, disorganising activity of the Trotzkyites.

Comrade Jaroslavsky demonstrated that there is a certain stagnation in our anti-religious propaganda and moves that the 15th Party Congress should pass resolutions containing the following measures: energetic struggle against liquidatory views in the question of anti-religious propaganda; all Party members should strictly refrain from taking part in religious ceremonies in those districts where they are still taking place occasionally; improvement of the organisation of the "League of Atheists"; a conference for anti-religious propaganda should be convoked; greater attention should be devoted to the training of a cadre of anti-religious propagandists by means of special courses, schools, etc.

The editor of the "Pravda" states that all the persons who sent in numerous suggestions of additional clauses to the theses of the C. C. concerning the Five Years' Plan, are without exception, in favour of the fundamental point of view of those theses. They only demand — as is evident from the extracts published — that more emphasis should be laid on the division of some question or other in the theses, for instance that the fighting measures against the different kinds of private capital should be differentiated with greater exactness, that the question of wages, of unemployment, should be dealt with more extensively and so on.

## The Discussion Supplement No. 7 of the "Pravda."

By H. K.

The Discussion Supplement No. 7 contains an article by Comrade Smirnov on "The Question of the Economic Tasks of the Party in the Village" (Liquidation of Peasant Farming without agricultural implements and Material), in which the writer expounds in detail the foundation of the programme of the Opposition concerning the policy in the village. In his article "On the Party's Policy in the Labour Question", Comrade Schmidt deals with the assertion of the Opposition regarding this question. Comrade Deutschmann's article "The immediate Tasks in the Fight against Alcoholism" refutes the demand made by the Opposition that the Government should as quickly as possible liquidate the sale of spirits. Comrade Gaister, in his article "The Kulak and the Opposition" refutes the attitude the Opposition with regard to the Kulak.

The discussion supplement is concluded by a short index of a number of articles and remarks referring to the counter-theses of the Opposition "On Activity in the Village", received by the "Pravda".

\* \* \*

Comrade Smirnov, in his article entitled "The Question of the Economic Tasks of the Party in the Village" (Liquidation of peasant Farming without agricultural implements and Material), states the reasons on which the proposals of the Opposition for the economic policy of the Party in the village are founded:

The development of agriculture under the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship is characterised by the fact that, in contrast to the capitalist process of the "hollowing out" of the middle peasantry, the Party has the possibility of consolidating the undertakings of the middle peasants and of raising the position of the village poor gradually and steadily.

A process of constant splintering off from the most prosperous farms is going on in the village. It is impossible to arrest this process. For this reason, the small producers should be collected, the individual units of agricultural production enlarged on the co-operative system in order to meet that process. Only in this way is it possible to increase the supply of the market with peasant products.

One of the worst defects is the disproportion between the land which is in the hands of the poor and middle peasants and the means for working the soil which are at their disposal.



Hitherto the help given to the village poor had "the character of support for production" and was an "individual, divided help". The most urgent task is now "systematically to reconstruct agriculture by including the whole number of the middle and poor peasant farms". Only by supplying the village poor with means of production will it be possible to give him his share in the process of reconstruction and to abolish in a beneficial way the disproportion between the area which ought to be cultivated and the means for working the soil.

This should be effected in the next ten years. On the basis of extensive investigations, the People's Commissariat for Agriculture has come to the conclusion that a supply of the village poor with agricultural implements and draught cattle is certainly possible. But it is only possible if the means for this purpose are not spent individually as has been done hitherto, but with the object of promoting vigorously the collective purchase of agricultural implements.

The total number of peasant farms with a complete lack of implements is very high (34.5 per cent in the R. S. F. S. R.); in this number fundamentally different types of farms are however included, which should be considered in a different way with regard to the supply with agricultural implements.

After characterising in this way the position of agriculture, Comrade Smirnov proceeds to conclude as follows:

The object of the plan for the development of agriculture must be to equip in the course of the next ten years the chief mass of farms which come into consideration with draught cattle and agricultural implements.

Beginning with the economic year 1928/29, the immediate practical measures should be carried out in the scope of the general economic plan.

With regard to the supply with draught cattle 1,555,000 peasant farms, i. e. two thirds, should be supplied with horses. This is perfectly feasible both in respect of the necessary number of horses and of the means required for that purpose.

With regard to the supply with agricultural machines, it will be possible, without altering the plans for the production of agricultural machines and without changing the plan of imports for this article, to equip about 2,200,000 farms, i. e. 25 to 50 per cent of them, according to the situation of the various districts, with agricultural implements.

According to the calculations of Comrade Smirnov there are available for obtaining the necessary quantity of horses and agricultural machinery for the first five years 420 million roubles without adversely affecting the other financial plans.

Thus all conditions exist in order to make this plan a reality, the realisation of which is the main preliminary condition for raising the position of the village poor and consolidating the middle peasantry.

Comrade Molotov's theses deal with a number of difficulties in agriculture which check the rapidity of its development.

In order to overcome these difficulties, Comrade Smirnov makes the following suggestions:

1. To provide the chief mass of the peasant farms which are not supplied with agricultural implements and draught cattle with these requirements in the course of ten years, mainly by means of co-operation and collective organisation.

To effect the supply of the village poor with agricultural implements and draught cattle chiefly on the basis of a complex number of measures as an organisatory and political task the general aim of which is an increase of agricultural production.

2. The point of the October manifesto of the C. E. C. concerning the regulation of the land at the expense of the State Budget should be interpreted to imply that this regulation must be carried out systematically and not only in those parts where the local population itself raises this demand. The sums from the State Budget assigned for the regulation of the lands should be increased every year; a detailed plan should be worked out for the reorganisation of agriculture throughout the country, the chief purpose of that plan being the extension of the agricultural production units.

"The immediate Tasks in the Fight against Alcoholism" is the title of an article by Comrade Deutschmann, in which he examines the demand raised by the Opposition that the sale of spirits by the State should be liquidated in the course of two to three years.

The sale of liquors containing 40% alcohol has been introduced by the Government in order to put a limit to the enormous growth of the secret distilling of spirits.

Experience gained with the prohibition of alcohol in the United States, Norway and Finland shows that the introduction of this prohibition is first followed by a period of actual decrease in the number of cases of alcoholic intoxication and of crimes committed in a state of drunkenness, which is, in its turn followed by a period of a tremendous increase in the consumption of spirits, especially of raw spirits which are injurious to health.

The carrying out of the prohibition of alcohol in the Soviet Union depends above all on the raising of the cultural level of the masses. It is obvious that the demand of the Opposition according to which the sale of strong liquors should be stopped in the course of two to three years is a purely demagogical demand as it is impossible to reckon on raising the cultural level of the masses in that space of time to a degree which would permit the abolition of the sale of spirits. It will be possible to do away with that evil chiefly by organising the proletarian public, by the application of the numerous laws issued to that effect, by enlisting the Party, Soviet and trade union bodies and by promoting teetotalism, the anti-alcoholic training of the children in the schools etc.

Comrade Schmidt, in his article "The Party's Policy in the Labour Question" gives a succinct statistical survey refuting the assertions made by the Opposition to the effect that the material position of the working class not only has not improved in the last few years but even shows a tendency to become worse.

The situation of the workers cannot be considered as something independent of the condition before the October Revolution. The number of industrial workers which had amounted to 3,751,000 in 1913, reached the number of 4,123,000 in 1926/27. In 1926/27 the average wages of the workers amounted to ten per cent above the corresponding figure in 1913.

With regard to the wages of women workers, a considerable approach to the wages of male workers can be recorded. Tremendous progress can also be demonstrated with regard to the wages of young workers. The use made of the wages shows a thorough change in that there is a great increase in the expenditure for cultural requirements and for foods.

In comparison to the housing conditions of the workers before the war, a decisive improvement has set in; in several districts the decrease of the normal housing area per head has come to a standstill and is even on the increase in some parts.

The average hours of work are steadily decreasing; in September 1926 it amounted to 75 per cent of the corresponding figure in 1913. The average holiday of industrial workers rose from 1920 to 1926 from 5.8 to 14.1 days.

The chief principles of labour legislation have not been interfered with. The achievements in this field of labour protection correspond to the general upward tendency in the development (prevention of accidents, insurance etc.).

With regard to the regulation of the labour market, a steady increase of the activity of the labour-exchanges can be recorded. The number of unemployed industrial workers keeps within normal limits. The overwhelming majority of the unemployed are unskilled workers or persons who offer themselves for work for the first time. The fight against unemployment is being carried on with the utmost exertion of forces.

Comrade Schmidt further deals extensively with the exceptions of the labour legislation and gives detailed reasons for them.

The most important section of these alterations was passed by all the organised workers at the 6th Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union, a circumstance which is known to the present leaders of the Opposition.

The whole opportunism and mendacity of the Opposition are brought into relief by its attitude toward the seven hour day. Its suggestion that the sums required for that purpose should be used for raising the wages and increasing the building activity hardly differs from the way the question is put by the Reformist trade union leaders and by the capitalists.

The carrying out of this question is perfectly certain just because we put the question of the seven hour day of work together with the question of the increase of the productivity of labour.

From this it is evident that the results achieved in the domain of the improvement of the situation of the workers is the necessary precondition for raising further the level already attained; this development will proceed in correspondence with the line mapped out by the C. C. of our Party.

Comrade Gaister, in his article "The Kulak and the Opposition" gives an exposition of the actual part played by the Kulak element in the national economy of the Soviet Union contrasting it with the wrong picture given by the Opposition of the relation of class forces in our country.

After pointing out that no exhaustive figures exist regarding this question, he quotes figures from a report of a commission of the Communist Academy for the Examination of the Agrarian Revolution, figures which make it possible to observe the development of the condition of the land in a number of districts in the time between the October Revolution and 1926. These figures prove that in that time there has been an extraordinarily strong decrease and, in some cases, a complete liquidation of farms with more than 16 desiatines of area under cultivation.

As it is wrong to analyse the social stratification of the village merely on the basis of the size of the area under cultivation, the figures quoted by the Opposition lose a good deal of their "argumentative power"; the attempt to make the distribution of draught cattle among the various groups the point of issue of a proof of an excessive increase of the Kulak

farms, is also a complete failure, as, almost without exception, farms with three and more pieces of cattle have strongly decreased in number in the time from 1917 to 1926.

Those assertions which are based on an analysis of the period during which the hands of one farm are employed on other farms as wage-earners, suffered a similar fate. The mere fact of their employing wage-earners does not characterise the employers as belonging to the "bourgeois" elements of the village; neither does the fact that workers are hiring themselves out as labourers (for short periods of time) always indicate that the persons in question belong to the purely proletarian elements of the village, i. e. to the agricultural labourers.

The development of Kulak farming since the introduction of the new economic policy is no reason to come to the extremely pessimistic conclusions with which all the theses and the whole tactics of the Opposition are imbued.

---



---

**TO OUR READERS!**

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

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

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

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers.