

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

# - INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 8 No. 3

# PRESS

19<sup>th</sup> January 1928

# CORRESPONDENCE

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

## C O N T E N T S

- M. N. Roy: The Pan-American Congress.  
Willi Schlammer: Storm Signals in South-Eastern Europe.
- Politics.**  
Noske-Wels-Stamper and the Russian Opposition.  
W. Gallacher: The Labour Movement in England in 1927.  
W. Mickiewicz-Kapsukas: The Lithuanian Social Democrats in Pilsudski's Service.
- Ten Years Ago.**  
Franz Koritschoner: The Strike in January, 1918, in Austria.
- For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.**  
Two Letters of Instructions from the Trotzkyist Centre to their Supporters Abroad.  
The "Pravda" on the Letters of Instruction from the Trotzkyist Centre.
- The Letter of A. Joffe.  
J. Yaroslavsky: The Philosophy of Decadence.
- The Labour Movement.**  
J. R. Campbell: The Situation in the British Textile Industry.  
R. V.: The Labour Movement in Argentina.
- Free Thought Movement.**  
Victor Stern: The Third Congress of the Proletarian Free-Thinkers.
- The White Terror.**  
Save the Independent Unions of Bulgaria!  
The XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.  
Molotov: On the Work in the Village.

## The Pan-American Congress.

M. N. Roy (Moscow).

The American government will not permit the **Monroe Doctrine** to be touched by any treaty of arbitration that may eventually be contracted between the Powers. The reservation has been made in the proposal presented by Kellogg to Briand for a multilateral treaty among the powers, the preamble of which will be a declaration outlawing war. The significance of this reservation is that the United States consider Latin America as its colony and demand that the European powers docilely recognize this as a fait accompli. There was a time, up to the middle of the Nineteenth Century, when the European Powers — France, England, Austria, Spain — disputed the pretention of the United States "to protect the republican system in the New World against the aggression from the Old". Those days are gone. The hegemony of the United States over Latin America is now tacitly recognized, although competition for economic and financial influence and political intrigues are never suspended. None of the European Powers, however, would now displease the rich Uncle Sam by openly disapproving his bullying methods of managing his southern neighbours. Otherwise, it might have been demanded by the European powers, who do not very much relish the recurring "peace-proposals" from Washington, that the war of open aggression against

Nicaragua ceased before any such proposal could receive serious consideration.

Uncle Sam has really beaten the other imperialist governments in bourgeois hypocrisy. In his own parlance, he has "some nerve" to talk superciliously of peace while cynically bombing the people of Nicaragua and planning to build 50 more battleships costing 800 million dollars. Whatever may be the attitude of Europe to American imperialism, Latin American resistance to it grows steadily. It is remarkable how even little Nicaragua has one uprising a few months after the other has been so brutally crushed. But the latest and the most unexpected resistance comes from Argentina. Being the farthest away from the United States the Argentine Republic has all along been rather lukewarm towards the anti-American sentiment generally prevalent throughout Latin America. While Uncle Sam was busy in putting the smaller republics bordering the Caribbean Sea and the Panama Canal Zone into order, the far off Argentine developed into a full-fledged modern bourgeois State without much interference from the north, and in closer economic connection with Europe. Until the war British capital was predominant in Argentine and her trade with Europe was much greater than that with the United States. During the war Wall Street gained

much ground; but obviously Argentina had passed that stage of political minority which might be a pretext of foreign intervention in her internal affairs. This being the case, there was no cause of open conflict between Argentina and the United States. The Argentinian bourgeoisie, which since the war is as much connected with New York as with London, did not care to displease Washington by mixing up in its quarrels with other Latin American republics.

On the eve of the Pan-American Congress, which meets at Havana on January 15, a powerful anti-American agitation has broken out in Argentina. Under the pressure of this campaign the government has been forced to consider what attitude its delegation to the Pan-American Congress should take in case the Nicaraguan question were excluded from the agenda as it is likely to be on the dictation of the United States delegation. The decision of the government is not yet known; but it is of significance and importance that the Argentinian government has abandoned its indifference to the situation in Nicaragua, an indifference which was a few days ago emphasised in Berlin by its Foreign Minister. The entire Argentinian press carries on, as the correspondent of the Berliner Tageblatt reports, "a campaign against American imperialism with bitterness hitherto unusual here". For example, the leading bourgeois daily "La Prensa" writes:

"It cannot be allowed that our delegation to Havana keeps quiet (on the Nicaraguan question). It must either express its opinion or withdraw from the Congress. The public opinion of Argentina cannot suffer its delegation to play the chorus girl in Havana. Before any other business the delegations from the (Latin) American Republics must demand immediate cessation of the aggression against peace that the American troops carry on in Nicaragua. While Nicaragua is attacked there can be neither alliance nor entente. While a country is occupied by foreign troops there cannot be any confidence in the speeches and declarations about continental solidarity."

It is doubtful that the American delegation, which is led by the Wall Street spokesman Hughes and the Standard Oil Co. man Fletcher (formerly Ambassador to Mexico), will have a plain sailing in Havana. It is very disagreeable for American imperialism that in the eleventh hour resistance should come from such an unexpected quarter in the Congress which will be attended by President Coolidge himself. By her political solidity and economic development Argentina is recognized as the premier republic of Latin America. An opposition to American imperialism led by her will be supported by other Latin American governments thus putting the question of Latin American Alliance in the realm of practical politics.

Mexico, which owing to close proximity bears the brunt of American imperialist aggression, has always been the champion of a Latin American alliance against the United States. But it always lacked the power and prestige to command the adhesion of all the other republics to its strivings. Owing to the lack of this general support, the government of Calles recently capitulated to American demands after a resistance of several years. Indeed, the struggle between Mexico and Washington over the Mexican Oil Law dates from 1917, when after the overthrow of the Wall Street protégé Victoriano Huerta from the presidency, a new Constitution was adopted embodying the principles of the revolution of 1911. The article 27 of the

new Constitution has ever since been the bone of contention. By this article all sub-soil riches were declared to be property of the nation. The meaning of the article was nationalization of petroleum and other mineral deposits which had all been leased out to foreign capitalists, particularly American and English by the Diaz government. That act of the Mexican government, of course, was met with undying hostility of the imperialist powers who refused to recognize the Carranza government until the article 27 was removed from the Constitution. A reactionary in internal questions, Carranza stubbornly refused to abide by the wishes of the foreign powers, and for the first time sought to unite all the Latin American republics in a common resistance to the northern giant. Failing to bring the Carranza government to terms by open armed interventions, American imperialism fell back upon the effective method of fomenting civil war. Obregon, who with the help of the United States, overthrew Carranza in 1920, for four years carried on a policy which was calculated not to annoy the powerful northern neighbour. In 1924 the United States tried to prevent the election to the Mexican presidency of Calles who was then notorious for his radical inclination. But supported by the workers and peasants, Obregon defeated the rebellion of the American nominee de la Huerta and secured the election of his candidate, Calles.

The struggle over the Oil Law revived. To break the deadlock on the petroleum question, which deprived the Mexican government of a rich financial resource, the Calles government amended the article 27 of the Constitution of 1917 making the law not retro-active. It was provided that oil leases granted before 1917 could be renewed for not more than 50 years on the application of the lease-holders. Even this did not satisfy the oil kings who wanted the renewed lease to be perpetual which would render the disputed article 27 practically null and void. At last on the eve of his exit from office Calles has given in. American imperialism has triumphed and the Pan-American Congress in Havana is to be staged as a demonstration of American hegemony over the New World. This is the first time that all the Latin American Republics will be represented at the Pan-American Congress. But in the eleventh hour comes the note of discord from Argentina, which is sure to crystallize the resentment of the little republics coerced by the Washington policy of "big stick", in a united Latin American opposition to the imperialism of the United States.

For obvious reasons, the United States government does not desire that the Nicaraguan question is discussed in the Pan-American Congress. To have the Congress leave the Nicaraguan question alone would mean that Uncle Sam's right to do whatever he pleases in the New World is indisputable. His supremacy is recognized by the very States over which he seeks to rule supreme. A part of the recent capitulation of Calles was that he very likely agreed that the Mexican delegation to the Congress would not raise the Nicaraguan question. Now, the attitude of Argentina may influence the policy of the Mexican delegation. The Calles government has all along been accused by Washington of helping the Nicaraguan rebels. Undoubtedly, there exists in Mexico a widespread sympathy for the Nicaraguan people fighting against American imperialism. Therefore the Mexican delegation will be obliged to support any move to raise the Nicaraguan question. Thus the Havana Congress, which is staged as the demonstration of American supremacy, may turn out to be a scene of Uncle Sam's defeat.

## Storm Signals in South-Eastern Europe.

The Smuggling of Machine Guns through Austria.

By Willi Schlämm (Vienna).

At the Austro-Hungarian frontier station of St. Gotthard (this little spot is already on Hungarian territory), there arrives a goods train with five waggons, which are described in the customs' declaration as containing "machine parts" taken over at the Italo-Austrian frontier, and which were transported right through Austria. On handing over the waggons to the Hungarian authorities, the Austrian railway officials discovered that the five waggons contained brand new machine-gun parts. In response to the insistent and angry demand of the Austrian

railway workers the responsible Austrian customs official attempts to have the "wrongly declared" waggons brought back over the frontier into Austria. Thereupon the Hungarian station-master calls in the gendarmerie and police, who with loaded revolvers drive the Austrian officials over the frontier. The whole affair occurred on the 1st of January at a time when, with the opening of the New Year, all the bourgeois newspapers in the world were full of sanctimonious peace articles.

Although after the disagreeable discovery of the smuggling

of weapons a frantic attempt to hush up the whole affair was commenced by all interested parties, the matter is today sufficiently clear.

In the first place: It was not the first consignment of Italian weapons to Hungary. During the past year the Vienna "Rote Fahne" repeatedly published reports of mysterious transports of weapons. The Austrian trade unions have for a year and a day sabotaged with all their power the demand raised by the Communists for the control of transport in order to prevent the smuggling of arms. Now however, after the "incident of St. Gotthard", concrete details, regarding numerous previous consignments of weapons, have become public. The Czechish paper "Lidove Noviny" reported on the 5th of January that the transport of weapons which had been discovered had been preceded by nine similar transports. In all these cases the name of the sender has been the same: "Commercio Universale di Formenti Ordighi S. A. Verona" — of course some cover firm of the Mussolini government; in all cases the weapons went to Hungary and to the same addressee; and in all cases the freight documents described them as "machine parts". On the 11th of January a certain Ladislaus Vattay, who is in prison in Pressburg (Czechoslovakia) on account of spying on behalf of Hungary, stated that he was specially engaged in dispatching weapons to Hungary. Three years ago, he declared, a whole train-load of arms went from Italy to Hungary.

Now to the political significance of the smuggling of weapons. It must have become clear even at the very first moment to the most simple pacifist that here it is a case of the arming of the bloc of States which are under English leadership, of the material realisation of the Hungarian-Italian Treaty of Friendship, of a result of Bethlen's visit to Rome. If anybody doubted this at the first moment, then his eyes must have been finally opened as a result of the attitude of the Little Entente.

A wasp nest has been stirred up. It was with a unanimity which showed that it was acting in accordance with common directions that the political public of the Little Entente adopted an attitude to the "incident" of St. Gotthard. The Czechoslovakian and above all the Yugoslavian government press attached tremendous importance to it. For the sending of arms from Italy to Hungary can, before all, serve but two purposes: a military strengthening of Hungary for a national war against Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and secondly however a preparation for an attack on the part of Italy on Yugoslavia. The military encirclement of Yugoslavia by Italy requires not only the encirclement of Yugoslavia from the Albanian side, which has already been successfully accomplished, but above all a securing of the broad Hungarian-Yugoslavian frontier for Mussolini. For many weeks past Italian General staff officers have been staying in Hungary, where, together with the Hungarian General staff, they are secretly "studying", the Yugoslav frontier. This is fact which was known in well-informed circles long before the discovery of the transport of weapons through St. Gotthard.

The political import of the affair of the weapons is therefore perfectly clear: intensified war preparations on the part of Italy and Hungary directed against the Little Entente. That English imperialist circles have their hand in the game is expressly pointed out by the Yugoslavia press. Thus "Politika" wrote on the 5th of January that the smuggling of weapons into Hungary is to be immediately attributed to the action of Lord Rothermere, who, as is known, is conducting with the help of the English Conservative press a broad campaign for the revision of the Hungarian peace treaties and for the handing back of the Hungarian territory ceded to Yugoslavia.

Of course it is only a flimsy excuse of the Bethlen government when they repeat every day in their press that the mysterious "machine parts" were destined for Poland. Poland has no reason whatever to conceal its import of weapons in such a manner, as according to the peace treaties it is at liberty to buy as many weapons as Pilsudski wants and Chamberlain is prepared to pay. On the other hand Hungary, owing to its disarmament obligations and the watchfulness of the Little Entente must do everything in order to hide its armaments.

The Little Entente is therefore right when it plainly declares that the machine guns were intended for Hungary. In the meantime English diplomacy has set to work and has "adjusted" the matter so far that this time the Little Entente

is satisfied by making an "Intervention with the League of Nations". Thus a protest is to be lodged with the League of Nations, which is led by England, on account of armaments for which England is politically responsible. Who knows, however, whether on the next occasion there may not be more far-reaching consequences?

The Austrian government, too, is participating in the machinations of Italy and Hungary. The Austrian customs authorities control with the greatest strictness every consignment of goods passing over the Austrian frontiers. It is almost impossible that this was not the case in regard to the consignment of "machine parts". But the attitude of the Austrian government after the chance discovery of the smuggling is exceedingly significant: The Seipel government declared that it could not do anything more than demand from the consigning Italian firm an after payment of the difference in the customs duty! The official government organ, "The Reichspost", had the effrontery to write that the Austrian government had no possibility of preventing the transport of weapons over Austrian territory. Yet everybody knows that the Austrian peace treaties expressly forbid the transport of weapons over Austria territory. The Austrian government could prevent all transport of weapons by merely calling attention to the peace treaty.

But the Austrian government does not want to do this, as it is closely allied with Italy and Hungary. Austria is today a faithful henchman of the English Foreign Office, and therefore constitutes a portion of the Italo-Hungarian front in Central Europe.

But it is not only the bourgeoisie that is interested in hushing up the affair and in distorting its real significance. The social-democratic leaders, too, would like very much to drop a veil over the whole matter. For, seen in its proper connections, the affair of St. Gotthard means a warning signal of the nearness of the war danger in Central Europe. To recognise this war danger means to fight it with all means, that is before all with the sharpest offensive against the Austrian bourgeoisie. But the social-democratic leaders want to prevent at all cost this mass struggle against the war danger and against the Austrian bourgeoisie with whom they wish to form a coalition government. Therefore they are doing everything to conceal the danger, and permit the Austrian government to continue to fulfil its obligations towards Italy and Hungary.

The smuggling of weapons at St. Gotthard signalises once again and in the most striking manner the immediate danger of war; it is on the basis of such incidents that wars usually break out before one realises it.

The reaction of the Little Entente to the discovery of the Italo-Hungarian transport of weapons shows how heavily charged and dangerous the atmosphere is not only towards the Soviet Union but also between the imperialist States and their vassals. The recognition of this fact renders it incumbent on the Communist Parties of all countries to intensify their struggle against the imperialist war.

## POLITICS

### Noske-Wels-Stampfer and the Russian Opposition.

January 1919.

The Lord: Cain, where is thy brother Abel?

Noske: Am I my brother's keeper?

A few days ago, the "Berliner Tageblatt" published a report to the effect that the leaders of the Russian Opposition "would be deported" to Siberia. That report was surrounded with a veil of mystery in that it was said to have been kept back by the censorship and had only been received by side-channels with a delay of five days. It was easy to guess that it was a case of some extraordinary sensation or other or, to put it more correctly, of an extraordinary blow aimed at the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, the report did not fail to make an impression — on Social Democracy.

Two days after the first report, the sensation was intensified by an extensive article written by the Moscow correspondent of

the "Berliner Tageblatt", interlarded with details and furnished with all sorts of subtleties in order even to surpass the first impression. The data of the first report, it is true, were given the lie. The reporter was obliged to admit:

firstly, that it was not a question of deportation but of an allotment of work, and that

secondly, the intention was to commission Trotzky, Zinoviev and Kamenev to do work in various big proletarian towns of the Soviet Union, in towns which are not at a distance of 500 kilometers from the nearest railway station but are, on the contrary, important railway centres, as is for instance Astrachan, — not however to dispatch them to some remote corner of Siberia. That does not in any way disconcert either the reporter of the "Berliner Tageblatt" or the social democrats — in accordance with the old prescription: A fellow such as I am, what do I care? Two lies more or less, what does it matter?!

It is now clear what all that means. It is now beyond doubt that the Opposition which tried to make an appeal to the street against the Party on November 7th, has now turned to account its connection with Mr. Schäffer in order to make an appeal to international Menshevism and to the international bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union. We must admit that it directed its appeal to the right address.

The Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung" has already, with great acuteness, traced the sad way Trotzky must travel from Moscow to Siberia by picking out the suitable places in old writings by Trotzky. A bold piece of anticipation, as even the "Berliner Tageblatt" acknowledges it.

In so far as the working class is concerned, we may however say without hesitation that, like all the other attacks of the Opposition, that blow will be brought to nought. Long before the Russian revolution, the proletariat has learned from the history of revolutions that not all the persons who embark on a revolution as revolutionaries, remain in it as revolutionaries unto the end. It was Plechanov, the Russian Marxist, who made the remark that social democracy also will split into a Gironde and a Jacobin group. Even in its first phase, the revolution showed that deserved pioneers of the proletariat, among them the said Plechanov, not only refused to join in the movement at the decisive moment, but, on the contrary, attacked it in the rear. A large number of Mensheviks and social revolutionaries were valiant pioneers of the revolution at the epoch of Tzarism. That fact did not however exculpate them when, later, they became traitors to their own past and entered into an alliance with counter-revolution.

Social Democracy and the bourgeoisie have repeatedly tried to turn the steps taken by the revolutionaries against ex-revolutionaries to account — but without success. It was therefore no novelty to us when international reaction and Social Democracy which is its chief support, made use of the struggle carried on by the Opposition which assumed more and more counter-revolutionary forms and compelled the Soviet State and the guardians of the proletarian revolution to take measures against it, turning that struggle to account in order to rouse the workers against the proletarian dictatorship.

So much the worse for the Opposition. It was indeed the only place of shelter of Social Democracy at the tenth anniversary of the proletarian revolution. It was the only thing which Social Democracy could take as witness against the revolution. This is the reason why those workers who have always adhered to the Russian revolution, did not stir a finger for Trotzky and Zinoviev when they were excluded from the C. P. S. U., and why they absolutely sided with the C. P. S. U. when not only the leaders but the second leaders of the Opposition in command were excluded. And the workers are now expected to shed tears because Trotzky is commissioned to do work in a town which, according to reports in the "Berliner Tageblatt", is said "eternally to smell of fish and to be intolerably hot in the summer"! Are there not tens of thousands of proletarians working there who have always done their duty for the revolution and are fulfilling it to the present day? Hundreds of loyal Communist Party workers are doing their work there, who never made themselves guilty of anything whatever. No, the revolutionary workers are not sentimental. They will realise that the Party is actually not inflicting a punishment, but is doing the utmost of magnanimity in offering to those comrades who have done wrong, the possibility of finding their way back to the Party, to the proletariat

without disciplinary deportation. It is indeed a different question whether the desired result will be achieved.

The appeal to international Menshevism and to the bourgeoisie which has certainly been prepared and made by nobody else but by the Opposition, makes it doubtful whether the Opposition will come to its senses in the eleventh hour. In any case, the Opposition, Social Democracy and the bourgeoisie can be assured that the revolutionary proletariat will hold out to the end at the side of the C. P. S. U., at the side of the Russian revolution.

The path of the revolution is a glorious but stony path which must be trodden with determination and, above all, without sentimentality, but it is certainly less painful than the road the proletariat is travelling under the yoke of capital. What would have become of the proletarian class war had not the workers mercilessly combated those within their own ranks who kept aloof of the fight or even turned against the fight? Sayings such as that about the "Terror against those who hold different views" have always recoiled from the struggling proletariat without having any effect on them. They only served to conceal the suppression of the proletariat. Should we now suppose that the workers fail to understand the sad condition of Trotzky's and Zinoviev's cause, when the international bourgeoisie stands up for them in the name of "liberty"?

But what can we say with regard to the incredible shamelessness of Noske's organ in Berlin which assumed an air of innocence towards the proletarian revolution shortly before the anniversary of Karl Liebknecht's and Rosa Luxemburg's assassination and is now making those responsible who are carrying on the revolution, who are carrying on the fight against the Opposition in the interest of the revolution — by asking: Cain, where is thy brother? In Berlin and throughout Germany, Noske, Ebert and Wels had tens of thousands of proletarians slaughtered under lively applause on the part of Stampfer, and the workers of the whole world, terrified, asked them the question: how can you lend a hand to make this massacre among the workers, how can you, who are of working class extraction, take over the rôle of the Cavaignacs and Gallifets in the interest of the bourgeoisie? Those Cains answered the question by saying: We do not know that brother. Those very same Cains who knew no brother, no sister, who did not even spare the children of the workers, are now putting on airs, assuming the rôle of the "Lord" and demanding satisfaction.

Those despicable hypocrits wear on their brows the brand of Cain which cannot be wiped off. The working class recognises at the first glance who is Cain.

## The Labour Movement in England in 1927.

By W. Gallacher (London).

1927 has been a significant year for the future of the working class movement in Britain. Following the betrayal of the General Strike and the sabotage of the long heroic struggle of the miners, the reformist leaders set themselves the task of making the Labour Party and the T. U. movement safe for capitalism. The bureaucratic apparatus has been strengthened and centralised and implicit obedience to the commands of the reactionary leaders has been imposed upon all. Hitherto the notable feature of the Labour Party was the wide scope that existed for minority opinion, but now, that is gone for ever. MacDONALD, Henderson & Co., as loyal servants of the bourgeoisie, have given a pledge for the good behaviour of the party, and woe betide those who try to interfere with their desires; the full power of the machine will be used to crush them.

For MacDONALD and his friends hope to have an opportunity of sitting on the Government benches again. And this time they mean to be prepared. On the first occasion, 1924 they got in more or less unexpected, permitted to taste the sweets of office while they were yet in a position where they could be turned out at any moment. As a Government MacDONALD & Co., gave no cause for complaint to the capitalists, in fact, their record of service to Capitalism was very high, but his own supporters gave quite a lot of trouble to MacDONALD. The next time they are not going to be taken unawares, they are going to have everything and everybody fully under control so that there can

be a nice quiet period of running the Government without complaint from the capitalists, and without noisy eruptions from the Labour members of Parliament.

The situation that thus presents itself is of very first importance to every party in Britain. For all are now in the period when the reformists are forced to expose themselves and when the Communist Party has the opportunity given to it of winning over the masses of the workers for their revolutionary struggle.

Lenin when discussing the tactics to be pursued by the Party in Britain in "Left Wing Communism" ends up with this prophetic passage:

"And, as the Hendersons draw nearer to the formation of their own government, it will be proved that I am right, it will draw the masses to my side and will facilitate the political death of the Hendersons and Snowdens."

What did Lenin mean by this? He understood exactly how the reformists would behave under given circumstances and he knew that the Hendersons and Snowdens when they come face to face with realities of the struggle, would scoop every vestige of Socialism and would make a complete capitulation to the bourgeoisie. And they are doing it now as rapidly as possible. 1927 was a record year for treachery to the workers and for cowardly submission to the bourgeoisie. On every issue that arose the same tale is to be told. The attack on China, the break with Soviet Russia, the Trade Union Bill, the cutting of unemployment relief and the Indian Commission. On every one of these MacDonald, Henderson & Co., proved their fitness to govern in the interest of British Capitalism. In fact on several occasions Chamberlain went out of his way to thank MacDonald for the assistance he had given and hold him up as a shining example of what a Labour Leader should be.

During all this the so-called "Left Wing" in the parliamentary labour party has played a sorry role. Now and again one or other of this group has offered a mild protest about the line that was being taken, but not one of them had the courage to come out openly and oppose it. Even on the question of the Indian Commission when several of them spoke against the time taken by MacDonald they were too cowardly to follow Saklatvala and vote against it. But even their mild protests have now to be stopped. "The Hendersons are drawing near to the formation of their own government", and the "Left-wing" phrase mongers must obey their cracks of the whip.

What other course is open to them? They dare not make a fight against the leadership or they immediately become identified with the Communists. If they make a claim to have their own policy and to have a right to openly criticise the leadership, then they must be prepared to fight for the same right for the Communists. Yet it was those very people like the I. L. P. ers and renegade Communists like Wilkinson, who were used by MacDonald to sabotage the fight of the Communists for affiliation to the Labour Party. Wilkinson in the "New Leader" suggests that someone should send MacDonald a little sheep for a new year's present, just to remind him that he has a very docile set of followers. She is right: And she herself would make a suitable present for such an occasion. This is one of the "sheepiest" of the lot, but she is so eaten up with vanity and mean conceit that every time she bleats, she hugs the delusion that it is the growl of a she-wolf.

Yes, MacDonald has docile followers, but many of them got the support of the masses because for a time they were able to masquerade as "wild-men", as men who were in earnest and who were going to do things. Now the wolf-skin has been torn off them and the wool is plain to be seen by all. No longer can they hope to hold the attention and support of the "Left-wing" masses. These latter must now shed another illusion, must face the fact that apart from the Communist Party there is no hope for victory in the struggle against capitalism.

And it has to be noted that while the process of capitulation to the bourgeoisie has been going on, on the part of the leaders, the fighting spirit of the working class has been steadily rising. Following the great betrayal of May 1926 and the long and terrible struggle that preceded the defeat of the miners, the workers fell back into a condition of despondency. Always this happens after a heavy defeat. But it does not last long. One of the surest guarantees of the ultimate victory of the workers, is the rapidity with which they recover, even from the heaviest blows.

The reformists and the trade union bureaucrats know this and they know that just as the time is drawing for the "formation of their own government" so also is the time arriving when the workers will press forward with new demands and force new deadly struggles on their exploiters. It is this knowledge and the fear that it brings, that is forcing the General Council on its present course of "industrial peace". Anything to prevent the workers from rising, anything to prove their loyalty to the imperialists. Hicks could declare in his loud, noisy way, while in America, that there would be more general strikes, but he will never face another.

Another general strike will mean a fight to a finish, — the finish of capitalism and of the reformist lackeys of capitalism.

And the next general strike will be under the leadership of the Communists. MacDonald and Henderson, Thomas and Hicks, Reformists of all shades have gone over body and soul to the bourgeoisie.

Our Party will make the most of its opportunity. It will rally the disillusioned masses behind the banner of Leninism.

## The Lithuanian Social Democrats in Pilsudski's Service.

By W. Mickiewicz-Kapsukas.

Pilsudski's method of using the Lithuanian emigrants for the purpose of taking possession of Lithuania dates from the time of the well-known anti-Fascist action in Tauroggen on September 9th. There are data to prove that Pilsudski's agents were at work even on the occasion of the putch of Tauroggen. It has been demonstrated that Pletchkaitis, a Lithuanian social democrat and one of the most famous organisers of the action undertaken in Lithuania on September 9th, had explained to his adherents in the former district of Suvalki, even before the putch of Tauroggen, that it was only necessary for them to organise a riot and that the P. P. S. would then come to their assistance. There also exists written evidence of that fact dating from the time before the putch of Tauroggen.

It was certainly no mere coincidence that Pletchkaitis chose Suvalki and the little town of Olita near the Polish frontier as the appropriate place for the "insurrection". When the "insurrection" failed in Olita (as a matter of fact; no action took place in that town), its organisers, i. e. the social democratic leaders Poplavsky and Kedis fled to Poland where they were received with open arms. The very day after the arrival of Poplavsky and Kedis in Vilna, an interview with these refugees appeared in the organ of the Pilsudski group ("Kurjer Wilenski"), in which they first sing the praises of the Polish authorities, contrasting them with "bloodthirsty Fascist Lithuania". As early as on September 17th, the "Kurjer Wilenski" reported in Vilna, on the expected arrival of Captain Majus and Mironas, the leaders of the Pletchkaitis putch in Tauroggen, who, as was communicated by Poplavsky and Kedis, did not want to flee to Germany, but to Poland. In that country, they began at once to found a basis for their activities directed against Fascist Lithuania. In this connection, there involuntarily arises the question, since when has Fascist Poland become a place of shelter for fights against a Fascist dictatorship and a basis for the further development of such a struggle? Fascist Poland used to persecute real revolutionaries from Lithuania just as Fascist Lithuania persecuted Polish revolutionaries.

At the beginning of October, a violent campaign against the persecution of Poles in Lithuania was started in the whole of the Polish Press, especially in that of Vilna; a letter signed by 28 Polish teachers who were said to be in the concentration camp of Varni (in Kovno-Lithuania) was fabricated. "Slovo", the organ of the Polish reactionaries in Vilna, demanded that the country should mobilise against Lithuania. On October 9th, Pilsudski arrived in Vilna and organised a meeting for discussing the Lithuanian question, which was attended by Goluvko the representative of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, by Skladkovski the Minister for Home Affairs, by Dobrucki, the Minister of Education, by Raczkowski, the Voivode of Vilna, by Lukazevicz, the Polish Ambassador in Riga and by many others.

After the putch of Tauroggen, the majority of the Lithuanian emigrants collected in Riga. In that town, **Lukaszevicz**, the Polish Ambassador, began to play an open game with them after his return from the conference in Vilna. Even on October 22nd, **Lukaszevicz** invited **Mizkus** (People's party), a member of the Committee of Lithuanian Emigrants in Riga, and promised to help him in every way to overthrow **Voldemaras'** Government, should the Lithuanian emigrants decide on a clear Polish orientation. In the hotel "Rome" in Riga, an interview took place between the emigrants **Mizkus** and **Vikonis** (a social democrat) and **Polakevicz**, one of **Pilsudsky's** partisans and a member of the Polish Seim, who had come to Riga solely for that purpose. Later on, on October 25th, he attended the Congress of the Lithuanian Emigrants in Riga.

On October 27th, a fresh meeting took place between **Mizkus**, **Vikonis** and **Polakevicz**, which was attended by **Lukaszevicz**, the Ambassador, and by **Tomszick**, the Military Attache of Poland. On that occasion, the Polish representatives declared that the overthrow of the government in Lithuania must absolutely be accomplished before the New Year's day, and promised to put military instructors at their disposal and to work out a plan for the "insurrection". They pointed out that a large number of Lithuanian generals (among others **Shukovsky**, the Commander-in-Chief, **Plechovitch**, the Commander of the General Staff, **Doykont**, the Minister of War and others) had, in their time, served in the Polish army and that Poland was carrying on negotiations with them.

At a later period, **Vikonis** and **Mizkus** revealed these plans of **Pilsudski**, whereas **Pletchkaitis**, **Poplavsky** and others are endeavouring to put them into effect and are — with that object in view — enjoying the financial support and every other support of **Pilsudski's** Government. **Pilsudski's** adherents ("Peoviaks" and others) have formed a special committee for the support of the Lithuanian emigrants in Vilna.

On the initiative of the Lithuanian emigrants in Vilna and with the active participation of **Pletchkaitis** and **Poplavski**, a congress of the Lithuanian emigrants was convoked in Riga on the 5th and 6th of November. The emigrants from Lithuania were in no way prevented from travelling from East Prussia to Riga via Poland. At the Congress, **Vikonis** and **Mizkus** revealed the intrigues of **Lukaszevicz**, the Polish Ambassador in Riga. A number of those who attended the Congress were decidedly opposed to a resolution according with the plans of **Lukaszevicz**, moved by **Pletchkaitis**, being passed, but the latter carried his point with the help of his friends, with a majority of 26 against 16 votes. Thereupon the minority demonstratively left the council-room. **Pletchkaitis** and **Poplavski** alone, those obviously Polish agents, remained at the Congress and concluded an unequivocal agreement with Fascist Poland, discussing that step merely with hypocritical phrases about a fight against Lithuanian Fascism. In this way, the Congress of Riga finally exposed **Pletchkaitis** and **Poplavski** as agents of Polish imperialism.

Even the C. C. of the Latvian Social Democracy was obliged to admit that fact, the representatives of which first received the Lithuanian emigrants in a very friendly manner and welcomed them very warmly at the Congress in Riga. When it was finally proved that the wire pullers of the Congress of Riga were nothing more nor less than a tool in the hands of the Polish imperialists, the "Social Democrat", the organ of the Social Democratic Party of Latvia, condemned them as being adventurers whose procedure endangered both the independence of Lithuania and that of the other Baltic countries.

On November 23rd, **Pilsudski** organised in Vilna a fresh congress to discuss the Lithuanian question. That Conference was attended by **Zalesky**, Minister of Foreign Affairs, **Knoll**, Secretary of State, **Gomluyko**, Head of the Eastern department of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, **Schnätzel**, Commander of the 2nd Division of the General Staff, **Patek**, the Polish Ambassador in Moscow, **Lukaszevicz**, the Polish Ambassador in Riga, **General Litvinovicz**, Commander of the 3rd Army Corps Group, **Kasprzicky**, Commander of the XIX. "Lithuanian and White Russian Division", **Raczevicz**, Voivode of Viena etc. — "Ritas", the organ of the Lithuanian clerical democrats, reported in its number of December 16th, that **Pilsudski** laid the following proposal before the Congress: Kovno should be occupied within three days, **Voldemaras'** government should be overthrown in two days and replaced by a fresh pro-Polish government and a safe and sound position established, where-

upon the Polish troops should be withdrawn from Vilna in another three days, the League of Nations thus being presented with an accomplished fact.

For the time being, that plan, the existence of which is confirmed by reports from other, absolutely trustworthy sources, has however been postponed. In order to put it into effect, it has been resolved to devote particular attention to the Lithuanian emigrants with a view to procuring, with their help, a cover for an attack on Lithuania. The "Kurjer Wilenski" reports that **Pilsudski** personally has had a discussion with the Lithuanian emigrants in order to achieve that end.

In connection with this **Pletchkaitis'** agents are beginning to enlist Lithuanian emigrants in Latvia and East Prussia, sending them to Vilna in order there to form with them special "insurgent" troops for Kovno-Lithuania. When they began to recruit Latvian social democrats also, the organ of the Latvian Social Democracy opposed them, and the Latvian Social Democratic Government prohibited the recruiting activity. In this way, only an insignificant number of men were enrolled, partly by means of fraud, by means of various promises, some even by making them drunk; these men were sent to Lida, in the Vilna district, for their military training. Some of them wanted to run away, when they discovered where they had been taken to, but were retained by force.

All that removes every doubt as to the plans **Pilsudski** is fostering against Lithuania, and also as to the part played by the Lithuanian social democratic emigrants, such as **Pletchkaitis**, **Poplavski** and others, concerning the realisation of these plans. They are obviously **Pilsudski's** agents. They are continuing their activities even at the present moment, after the Polish Lithuanian conflict has been "settled" by the League of Nations.

In spite of all that, the Social Democratic Party of Lithuania does not expel **Pletchkaitis** and his friends. The P. P. S. is openly showing its solidarity with them. **Pletchkaitis**, **Poplavsky** and **Anreitch** were invited by the 2nd International to attend the Congress of the Social Democratic Parties of the North East countries in Berlin. At that Congress the whole International placed those agents of **Pilsudski's** under its protection. All that gives evidence of the fact that not only the P. P. S. and the Social Democratic Party of Lithuania, but the whole 2nd International is actually serving **Pilsudski**.

## TEN YEARS AGO

### The Strike in January, 1918, in Austria.

By Franz Koritschner (Vienna).

Whilst the third Conference of the Zimmerwaldites was being held in Stockholm, the July upheaval of the Bolsheviki in Russia was crushed. The first declaration of the Left radical Austrian National Conference proclaimed solidarity with the vanquished Bolsheviki. A few weeks later the Left Radicals succeeded in holding a demonstration in Vienna. In Ternitz (an industrial district in Lower Austria) Renner had to march behind a placard bearing the inscription "Hurrah for the Zimmerwaldites!" The Brusilov offensive had rendered it impossible for Austrian Social Democracy to support their Menshevik comrades in Russia. The road was clear for the agitation of the Bolsheviki, and the appeal of the Russian peace delegation in Brest Litovsk influenced the psychology of the masses more strongly than even the news of the October Revolution. Although the Manifesto "To All" was mutilated, partly by the censor and partly by the reformists, the workers knew what it meant: "Our brothers in Russia are in need; Russia calls to us to fight against the imperialist war!"

On the 30th December the illegal groups met together in order to elect a joint committee of action. The illegal workers' and soldiers' council arose. The Left radicals were joined by anarchists, terrorists, syndicalists and Jewish and Czechish workers' groups. In the industrial town of Wiener Neustadt in Lower Austria there took place a last Conference with the legal Lefts. The breach was final. The legal Lefts wanted to be "a spiritual tendency within the Social Democracy" — the Left Radicals, a community of action. Connections with other

industrial districts were established and permanent contact was organised with the railway workers. The first strike manifesto appeared:

"Down tools everywhere!"

According to the decisions of the Central Committee, the strike was to break out on the 24th of January. Appeals to the soldiers were distributed. General Hoffmann had announced on the 12th of January in Brest-Litovsk the dictated peace of the Central Powers. The violent peace policy of the German junkers and industrial magnates, supported by their hangers-on in Austria, was a warning signal to the workers in Austria.

Behind the backs of the Party leaders the proletarians worked feverishly for the approaching action. On the 14th of January the workers in Daimler works (at that time mainly engaged on munitions) went on strike. Before the time fixed for the strike the discontent of the workers found an outlet in a spontaneous action. The preparatory work was now turned to the advantage of the strike movement that had broken out.

Renner immediately went in all haste to Wiener Neustadt in order to place his authority as a party leader and as a member of the food control committee in the service of national defence. Too late! It was no longer a "food riot", it was the uprising of the proletarian masses against the imperialist war. Renner was compelled hastily to leave the platform. The revolutionaries seized the leadership. Wiener Neustadt was followed by Ternitz. The workers in the Schoeller works went in groups of ten from factory to factory and called out all the workers, who immediately responded. After Styria, the glad tidings spread over to Hungary: Workers' delegations to Brest-Litovsk; peace on all fronts! Overthrow of the government!

On the 16th of January the arsenal and the Götz works joined the movement. The Fiat workers also joined in and the Kremenetzki factory took over the leadership among the metal factories of Brigittenau. The second strike manifesto appeared. The demands which were raised shook the very foundations of the system:

"The peace delegates are to be chosen by the people!

An immediate armistice is to be called on all fronts! The Munition Act and the militarisation of the factories are to be abolished at once! All limitations of trade union and political rights are to be abolished! Friedrich Adler and all other political prisoners are to be released! Gather together in crowds in the streets and squares, elect workers' councils as in Russia, and victory will be with the mass power of the proletariat!"

The strike spread continually and the old fight-to-the-last socialists had the choice either to place themselves at the head of the indignant working masses or to lose contact with them for ever. In the interests of national defence they adopted the first course.

It is true the strike was now proclaimed by the old leaders, after it had broken out against their will, but the vitally necessary services, the railways and mines, gas and electricity works, as well as the tramways, were to be exempted from the strike. The movement forced its way over the heads of the old leaders: the miners joined the movement and demonstrated for the Lenin peace.

On Friday, 18th January, the movement had already spread over Styria, to Upper Austria and Budapest and other parts of Hungary. Committees for unity of action and the first workers' councils arose in the districts. The old leaders, in the very first appeal, had diverted the attention of the workers from the immediate demands of the day by placing among the conditions the "reform of the municipal franchise", on the basis of which they wanted to negotiate with the government. The situation became more acute. The Bosnian troops who were called up against the workers in Wiener Neustadt fraternised with them. A delegation of the Daimler workers went to Berlin, where the old social patriots, as they themselves later admitted, took the lead of the movement solely in the interest of national defence!

The parliamentary negotiations of the Austrian social democrats served no other purpose than to pacify the masses. On the critical Friday, while the strike was spreading more and more and even the clerical Slovenian workers joined in under the slogan of right of self-determination of the people, the social democrat Seitz made a declaration in the budget com-

mittee expressing in the name of his party his confidence in Count Czernin, this lackey of German imperialism:

The social-democrats have repeatedly declared in Parliament, at meetings, as well as in the press, that they have confidence in Count Czernin, that he desires and is striving for peace."

Seitz further stated that the broad masses must first be given the "assurance" that peace with Russia would not be wrecked. Seitz did not demand any guarantee, he merely called for an "assurance".

The Minister for the Interior, Count Toggenburg, gave reassuring declarations and praised Count Czernin as a man "who would not deviate one step from his convictions, even if it should mean his becoming a beggar. He compared him with the Russian revolutionaries and thus prepared the way for the reading of the telegraphic declaration of Czernin, which briefly stated: "I promise and guarantee that the peace will not be wrecked owing to predatory intentions on our side." "We do not want anything from Russia, neither territory nor annexations nor war indemnities." The old leaders now began with their actual sabotage of the action. It is true they had not been able to prevent the railway workers from joining the movement over the head of the trade unions, and there also now began the solidarity strikes of the Czech workers. On the front the Austrian soldiers fraternised with the Russian. The printers even wanted to cease printing the war bonds and the bank employees wanted to bring the banks to a standstill. The old State, without munitions and without money, was shaken to its very foundations. A few days more and the government would have to capitulate. Then Renner, with the rest of the party leaders, came to the rescue of the threatened empire and its kaiser.

In the outer districts of Vienna the Left Radicals demanded the breaking off of the negotiations with the government, and Renner complained about the "irresponsible elements".

On the 19th of January there appeared the first Information Sheet of the reformists. The treachery began. "Count Czernin promises and guarantees" was the heading of one article. "The Party Committee takes note with satisfaction of the declaration and recognises its determination." A deputation waited upon the Prime Minister Seidler, and the Minister was very friendly. Already on the next day one could read in thick type: "It is the most earnest desire of His Majesty to bring the war to an end as soon as possible by means of an honourable peace." But the workers did not allow themselves to be misled, and continued to fight.

In the night from the 19th to 20th January the workers' council met. In a long debate, which lasted until half past three in the morning, the workers were talked over and Seitz proclaimed 'the necessity of resuming work'. Against a few votes the Vienna functionaries capitulated to the dictates of their leaders and thereupon again placed themselves under the yoke of imperialism. In the night Otto Bauer had prepared two editions of the party paper, one for the continuation and one for the throttling of the strike. The edition in favour of throttling the strike appeared in good time and the Party Committee ordered the workers to resume work immediately. The representatives of the Wiener Neustadt district protested and continued the fight as a demonstration against the party and trade union leaders.

By means of super-human efforts the illegal workers and soldiers' council succeeded in getting the greater portion of the Vienna workers to hold out. In spite of all the misleading reports of the "Arbeiter-Zeitung", on the 21st of January the workers in the Rothmüller factory, the arsenal workers and also the Fiat workers still remained on strike.

The pressure of the bureaucracy had, however, saved the tottering system of imperialism. By means of trickery and violence the workers were induced to resume work, and on the 22nd January there appeared the last fighting manifesto of the Left radical committee of action: "Sold and Betrayed!"

The social patriots triumphed. The "responsible" elements were victorious. On the 24th the workers in Ternitz also returned to work. Shortly afterwards Renner was able to record with melancholy "that neither the military regime in the facto-

ries had been abolished nor the municipal franchise improved". In Brest-Litovsk, however, Germany and Austria dictated to the Russian workers their brutal peace, in spite of the promises of the Kaiser and of the Ministers. Almost all the members of the committee of action were imprisoned; and in a brochure entitled "For peace, freedom and justice" Renner calumniated these victims of his policy. In the hour of danger the "responsible leaders" of the Austrian working class, after a heroic fight of the proletarian masses, capitulated to the class enemy. The 15th of July, 1927, completed what the 20th January, 1918, began: The capitulation of reformism to the class enemy.

## FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

### Two Letters of Instruction from the Trotzkyist Centre to their Supporters Abroad.

Moscow, 15th January 1928.

The "Pravda" publishes two documents containing instructions to the supporters of Trotzky abroad from the Trotzky central committee.

The first letter declares inter alia: The treachery of Zinoviev and Kamenev is a historical fact from which the necessary lessons must be drawn. We must break mercilessly with the capitulants and draw a clear line between us and the vacillating and those who are waiting to see what will happen. The attitude of Maslov and Ruth Fischer in this connection seems ambiguous. In the last resort they are trying to white-wash Zinoviev and Kamenev and to prove that they are no worse than the others, that is to say, Maslov and Ruth Fischer are trying to obliterate the dividing line between the revolutionaries and the capitulants.

As soon as the breach was accomplished, the Opposition, in contradistinction to the capitulants, handed in a declaration of Smilga, Muralov, Rakovsky and Radek. To make no distinction between the Opposition and the capitulants, means to support consciously the capitulants. The enclosed declaration of the leaders of the Opposition to the Executive Committee of the Communist International (Note of the "Pravda", according to our information no such declaration has been handed to the Comintern) leaves no room for doubt. If in the future Maslov continues to compare us with Zinoviev and Kamenev, then we must regard him as a conscious enemy.

It is necessary to tear off that mask behind which perhaps some oppositionalists may seek to join the capitulants under the excuse of a struggle against Trotzkyism. In this connection, our attitude to Wedding, Pfalz and Suhl must be made clear. The same criterion is true of the French groupings. If Treint and Susanne Girault vacillate between the capitulants and so-called Trotzkyism, then we shall have to leave them to their fate. If Treint and Girault vacillate under the excuse of a struggle against Trotzkyism, then we shall have to consider the group "against the Stream" as our only support and as our real comrades. The co-operation of Rosmer in the publication "Against the Stream" is very desirable. It is necessary to take up a correct attitude to the Monatte group. We will have to form a bloc with the revolutionary anarcho-syndicalists. As far as Souvarine is concerned, he has taken up a wrong attitude in a number of questions. However, he is a talented historian and revolutionary and we have not lost hope that his way and ours may unite.

Clarity must also be created quickly with regard to the Czechoslovakian opposition.

As far as we know, the attitude of the Belgian Central Committee is uncertain, a sort of buffer attitude. Couldn't we persuade the Belgian C.C. to issue our material? Particular attention must be paid to Belgium, but we must not rely upon the buffer C.C., but must seek to form for ourselves a reliable support in the masses of the party. French comrades should be given this task.

Formerly our material was printed in Holland, how is the situation now?

In conclusion, once again the question of two parties. We are opposed to a second party and to a fourth Comintern, from the point of view of the international working class as a whole, the Opposition would put itself into a hopeless situation of a sect if it permitted itself to be pushed into demanding a fourth international. The aim is the winning of the Comintern. The differences which exist are deep-rooted enough to justify the existence of a Left-Wing fraction. However, in the present period, this fraction is an instrument to influence the Communist Party.

The second letter which is addressed to a certain Peter, declares:

The chief task of the Opposition in the sections of the Comintern is to win the Communist Parties from within. To work from the assumption that the Thermidor has come about in the Soviet Union is wrong, that would mean to assist to bring it about. The class forces have not yet spoken their last word. The policy of the international Opposition must be together with the Opposition in the C.P. of the Soviet Union, to hinder the further progress of the Thermidor and to reconquer the positions which the proletariat has lost. The petty-bourgeois elements in the C.P. of the S.U. are leading the Party and the State, nevertheless they are forced to seek support from the working class and to maintain themselves in the face of world imperialism. A stronger pressure on the part of the bourgeoisie can cause a decisive turn to the Left in the Party.

Even with its present leadership the Soviet Union plays a revolutionary role upon an international scale. The existence of the Soviet Union was always the source from which the Chinese revolution was fed. The leadership of the C.P. of the Soviet Union abandoned the Chinese revolution to defeats. We must attack the leadership of the C.P. of the S.U. without putting ourselves into opposition to the Soviet Union itself. This is valid for the C.P. of the Soviet Union and for the whole of the Comintern. Should the Opposition declare the Soviet Union to be a bourgeois State and the C.P. of the S.U. and the Comintern as petty-bourgeois parties, then the Opposition would degenerate into a sect. The formation of a league of Left-Wing Communists is false. This name can give us nothing, but can become the pseudonym of a second party.

The attitude of Maslov and Ruth Fischer to the Opposition in the C.P. of the S.U. seems to be more of a manoeuvre than an honest attitude. Its chief task is to weaken the authority of the Opposition as a whole. Its next task is indirectly to justify the capitulants by proving that others are no better than they. Such a position permits Maslov to appear as a stern and incorruptible judge, whereas in point of fact an alliance with the capitulants exists. The struggle against so-called Trotzkyism is the hook with which Stalin pulls Zinoviev and Zinoviev his Left-Wingers. As far as Maslov hangs on to this hook he is compelled to justify the capitulants and to prove that they are not much worse than the others.

The Communists of the capitalist countries must always stress three factors: even under its present opportunist leadership, the Soviet Union offers the workers and peasants more than a bourgeois State with the same level of productive forces could offer them; the chief cause for the internal difficulties of the Soviet Union is the insufficient activity of the European proletariat and the insufficient fighting capacity of the European Communist Parties; the European social democracy, which joyfully prints every piece of news about the internal difficulties in the Soviet Union, must bear the chief responsibility for these difficulties.

In connection with the congress of the Red International of Labour Unions which will take place on the 15th March, everything must be done to secure the participation of oppositional delegates in the congress. Special theses and practical proposals must be worked out.

Preparations must be commenced now for the Congress of the Communist International. Theses must be prepared upon all points of the agenda, so that these theses may form the platform of the international communist opposition. A wide-scale action must be commenced with regard to the expelled members of the Opposition and to those banished. A commencement must be made with the drafting of a programme of the Communist International. The programme of Bukharin is the bad programme of a national section of the Communist International and not the programme of the International Communist Party.



## The "Pravda" on the Letters of Instruction from the Trotzkyist Centre.

Moscow, 15th January 1928.

In a long article entitled "The Destructive Activity of the Trotzkyists, the Assistants of Scheidemann at Work", the "Pravda" writes:

These letters expose to all Bolsheviks the attitude of the Trotzkyists after the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. of the Soviet Union. The first and clear conclusion is that despite all promises and declarations, the Opposition will continue its illegal work all along the line. After the Party Congress the Trotzkyists have not ceased their dirty anti-Party and anti-Communist activity, for one single day. These letters show that all the statements of the Trotzkyists at the Party Congress were nothing but Menshevist lies to deceive the Bolshevik Party Congress.

Both documents show a deeply-rooted split in the circles of the former Opposition. The Trotzkyists brand Zinoviev and Kamenev as traitors because they have subordinated themselves to the Bolshevik Party Congress. Such a term of course justifies once again the right of the Bolsheviks to regard the Trotzkyists as traitors to the working class. The Trotzkyists have no proletarian basis either inside or outside the Soviet Union. Instead their most reliable supporters prove to be the ultra-right and anti-proletarian elements in the camp of the renegades of the Comintern.

Inside the Soviet Union the Opposition seeks to cover itself with a Left-Wing mask. In the international arena, however, the Right-Wing social-opportunist essence of Trotzkyism shows itself clearly. The international "Left-Wing" proves to be the international Right-Wing. The only group upon which the Trotzkyists can really rely is the Right-Wing opportunist group of Loriot. The Trotzkyists hope to win the renegade Rosmer and the opportunist Souvarine over to their side etc.

The statement of the authors of the letter that a stronger attack on the part of the bourgeoisie would cause a decided move to the Left inside the Party, means in other words that when the bourgeoisie exercises more pressure, advantage for the Opposition might come from it. Such an attitude sprung from the theory of the Clémenceau coup d'Etat.

The Trotzkyist leaders fear above all to remain a hopeless sect. This fear causes them to be careful in many questions. They shamefully avoid calling themselves a second party, although in reality that is what they are. From this same standpoint they cannot decide to issue the slogan of a fourth international. Fearing the international proletariat, they add a reservation with regard to the Thermidor and are even prepared to admit that the Soviet State gives the workers and peasants more than a bourgeois State could give. However, they say nowhere that the Soviet State is not a bourgeois State, and mention with no single word the Socialist elements and their growth in the economic system of the Soviet Union: in this connection they are farther to the right than Otto Bauer. The slogan "to attack the C. P. of the S. U. without putting oneself in opposition to the Soviet Union", is a Trotzkyist phrase meaning no more than the old counter-revolutionary slogan: "Soviets without the Communists".

The real social-democratic essence of Trotzkyism is shown by these letters. The few words against the Social Democracy can deceive no one. The leaders of the Social Democracy will laugh at these words as Hilferding and Wels laugh at the antics of their "Lefts".

"We must break ruthlessly with the capitulants" declare the letters. These words are true of those who have capitulated before the international Social Democracy and have become assistants of Scheidemann. One must break ruthlessly with such traitors and cast them out of proletarian society.

## The Letter of A. Joffe.

The letter of A. Joffe was reproduced by the bourgeois and Social Democratic press of foreign countries partly in a mutilated and partly in a garbled form. We therefore publish below the full text of the letter and an article by Comrade Yaroslavsky, entitled "The Philosophy of Decadence" and dealing with the statements made in the letter.

Ed.

My dear Leo Davidovitch,

I have all my life maintained that a politician, or any person occupying a public position, must understand when to retire from life, and that it is better to do so too soon than too late. When, long ago, the suicide of Paul Lafargue and his wife Laura Marx created a great stir in the various Socialist parties, I, inexperienced youth as I then was, emphatically championed the rightness in principle of their standpoint, and, as I still remember, I very vehemently replied to August Bebel, who was greatly incensed at the suicide, that even though there might be objections to the age limit set by Lafargue and his wife, since it was here not a question of years but of the possible usefulness of a politician, the principle could by no means be attacked of the retirement of a politician from life as soon as ever he was convinced that he could be of no further use to the cause to which he had devoted all his efforts.

More than thirty years ago I acquired the philosophy that human life is only of value to us so long as and in so far as it serves that infinity which mankind represents to our mind. Seeing that all else is finite, work in its service is senseless; whereas humanity, though possibly not absolutely infinite, is yet not likely to meet with its end for such long ages to come that it may be looked upon as an infinity. And he who believes in progress as I believe in it, can very well picture to himself that, even if our own planet perishes, mankind will by that time know the means of removing to other, younger planets.

Mankind will thus continue to exist, and consequently everything done in its service in our time will also leave its traces in those distant epochs of the future, thus imparting to existence its sole possible sense and purpose. Herein and herein only can I recognise the sense of my own life. And if I now look back on my past life, 27 years of which I have passed in the ranks of our Party, I have in my opinion the right to say that throughout my conscious life I have been true to my philosophy, that is to say that I have lived my life purposefully, because I have lived it in fighting for the good of mankind.

Even the years of imprisonment and penal servitude, during which a man is separated from the immediate participation in the fight and work for humanity, cannot be deducted from the number of purposeful years of his existence, since they served, as years of self-cultivation and self-education, for the improvement of later work, so that they too can be counted to the years of work in the service of mankind, i. e. to the purposefully spent years of a man's life. In this sense of the word, I believe I can safely affirm that I have not spent a single day of my life purposelessly.

Now, however, the moment is obviously approaching in which my life will lose its sense and in which I shall consequently be faced with the duty of retiring therefrom, that is to say of ending my existence.

Already for some years past, the present leaders of our Party — in keeping with their general policy of not giving the members of the Opposition any work — have refrained from employing me on any work, either in the Party or on the Soviets, of such a character or extent as would enable me to exploit my abilities to their maximum degree of utility. For the last twelvemonth, as you know, the Political Bureau has removed me, as an Oppositionist, from all Party or Soviet activity.

On the other hand, partly perhaps as a result of my illness and partly for reasons that you will know better than I do, I have for the past year taken hardly any part in the practical oppositional struggle or in the work of the Opposition.

After great struggles with myself and with extreme reluctance I turned to that realm of work, to which I had hoped to have recourse only when completely invalided, and devoted

myself wholly and entirely to scientific, pedagogic, and literary matters. Hard as I found this at first, I gradually penetrated deeper into this work and began to hope that even in this connection my life would find that necessary inner usefulness of which I spoke above and which, according to my standpoint, can alone justify my life.

But my state of health grew worse and worse.

Around the 20th of September I was, for reasons unbeknown to me, invited by the Medical Commission of the Central Committee to a consultation of specialists. The Commission diagnosed an active tuberculous process of both lungs, myocarditis (inflammation of the cardiac muscles), chronic inflammation of the bladder, chronic inflammation of the intestines and appendix, and chronic polyneuritis. The examining professors told me categorically that my condition was much worse than I had imagined, and that I could not even hope to resume my courses at the high-schools (I. Moscow State University and Institute for Oriental Research), indeed that it would be much more reasonable to give up all such activity.

Furthermore, I was to remain no longer at Moscow and ought not to delay a single hour in getting treatment, but should go abroad at once to a suitable sanatorium. Since, however, such a journey could not be effected in the space of one or two days, a certain treatment in the polyclinic of the Kremlin was prescribed for me in the interim. In answer to my direct question as to what prospects of recovery I had abroad and whether I could possibly be cured in Russia without giving up my activity as a teacher, the Medical Commission declared, in the presence of the Chief Physician of the Central Committee, of another Communist doctor, and of A. J. Konnelly, Chief Physician of the Kremlin Hospital, that the Russian sanatoria could by no means help me, but that I could hope to be cured abroad, seeing that hitherto I had never been treated abroad for more than two or three months at a time, whereas now they must insist on a hospital treatment of at least half a year, without prescribing any maximum duration thereof; in such circumstances they did not doubt that, if not definitely cured, I could at least hope to be restored to sufficient health to be able to work again for a considerable time.

Some two months after this consultation, the Medical Commission of the Central Committee, which had itself invited me to the said discussion, had not yet undertaken a single step, either in regard to my journey abroad or in connection with my treatment here. On the contrary, the Kremlin pharmacy, which had been wont to make up my prescriptions for me, had been forbidden to do so any further, so that I was deprived of the gratuitous medicaments I had been accustomed to use and was forced to provide myself at my own expense with medicines from the city apothecaries. Obviously the leading group in our Party had about this time begun to fulfil their threat of "hitting the Opposition a blow in the stomach", a threat also applying to the other members of the Opposition.

As long as I was still healthy enough to work, I did not trouble much about this. But as I grew worse and worse, my wife commenced to take steps with a view to having me sent abroad, and applied not only to the Medical Commission of the Central Committee but also to N. A. Semashko in person, who had always been loud in advocating the principle of "preserving the Old Guard". The question, however, was shelved again and again and the only thing my wife could attain was that she was given the medical diagnosis in writing. This diagnosis enumerated my chronic diseases and pointed out that the council of doctors insisted on my going abroad "to a sanatorium of the type of Professor Friedländer's, for a stay of about one year".

In the meantime I have now been for about nine days in bed, since all my chronic ailments have aggravated and increased, as I suppose is only natural, and, worse than all else, my old inflammation of the nerves has entered upon an acute stage, so that I suffer excruciating pain and can no longer walk.

As a matter of fact I have during these last nine days been without any medical assistance, and the question of my going abroad is being discussed. Of the doctors of the Central Committee not a single one has been to see me. Professor Davodenko and Dr. Levin, who visited me, prescribed some trifles which were naturally of no avail, but themselves confessed that they "could do nothing" and that it was essential that I should go abroad without delay. Dr. Levin explained to my wife that the matter was presumably being delayed in

the Medical Commission for the reason that the latter was under the impression that my wife would accompany me and that "would naturally cost very much". If non-oppositional comrades fall ill, they, and sometimes also their wives, are sent abroad, accompanied by our doctors or professors; I myself know many such cases and must also admit that when I first contracted my nervous disease I myself was sent abroad together with my wife and child accompanied by Dr. Kannabich. But at that time these newly-introduced usages were unknown in the Party.

My wife replied that, however serious my condition might be, she by no means claimed that either she or any other of my relatives should be sent along with me, whereupon Dr. Levin assured here that in such a case the matter could be far more speedily settled.

My condition is going from bad to worse, and the pains grew so atrocious that finally I was obliged to ask the doctors for relief of some kind. To-day Dr. Levin was here and repeated that they could do nothing and that the only salvation for me lay in a speedy departure abroad.

In the evening my wife heard from Comrade Potemkin, the doctor of the Central Committee, that the medical council of the Central Committee had resolved not to send me abroad but rather to cure me in Russia, seeing that the specialists insisted on a more protracted treatment and considered a short treatment useless. On the other hand, the Central Committee was prepared to spend about \$1000 (2000 roubles!) for this purpose; more than that could not be granted.

As you well know, I have in the past more than once given our Party 1000 roubles and certainly more than I have cost the Party since I was deprived by the Revolution of my fortune and I could no longer pay for my own treatment.

Anglo-American publishers have frequently suggested to me that I should publish extracts from my memoirs, at my own discretion and with the sole condition that the period of the Brest negotiations be included. This for a sum of about \$20,000. The Political Bureau knows very well that I am too experienced a diplomat and journalist to publish anything that might harm our Party or our State. I have frequently acted as censor, both for the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs and for the Chief Concessionary Committee, and as a political representative I had to censor all Russian press matter appearing in the respective countries. A few years ago I applied for permission to publish some such memoirs with the engagement to hand over the entire proceeds to the Party, since I was loth to take money from the Party for my treatment.

In reply I received a direct resolution on the part of the Political Bureau to the effect that "diplomats or comrades engaged in diplomatic work are expressly forbidden to publish abroad their memoirs, or selections therefrom, without a previous examination of the M.S. on the part of the Collegium of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs and the Political Bureau of the Central Committee". I know how such a double censorship can be protracted and how vague it can be rendered, so that no arrangements can be made with publishers abroad, and therefore I refused the said offer in 1924.

Subsequently, when I was again abroad, another such offer was made me, accompanied by a guarantee of an honorarium to the amount of \$20,000. But as I know that the history of the Revolution and the history of our Party are now being forged and I would not lend my hand to such forgeries, I do not consider it possible to publish my memoirs abroad without directly infringing on the prohibition issued by the Political Bureau. At the same time, I have no doubt that the entire censorship of the Political Bureau consists in not permitting any true characterisation either of the one side or of the other, that is to say neither of the actual revolutionary leaders nor of the so-called leaders who have also been harnessed to the sledge, whereas it is just on the personal characteristics of the persons mentioned in the memoirs that the foreign publishers insist. I therefore see no possibility of undergoing medical treatment, since I receive no money from the Central Committee, which after twenty-seven years of revolutionary work on my part does not value my life and my health at more than 2000 roubles.

In the state in which I am at present it is naturally impossible for me to do any work. Even if I were strong enough to continue my lectures in spite of the violent pain I suffer, I should require considerable assistance. I should have to be

taken about in a Bath-chair and should require help to get the necessary books and materials in the library and from the files. When I was ill in former times, the entire staff of the Embassy was at my disposal. Now, however, since my rank is no higher than that of a simple "secretary", I am no longer entitled to such assistance; indeed, in view of the inattention paid of late to all my ailments (as in the present case, when I have remained nine days with practically no medical assistance and have not even received the electrical bed-warmer prescribed me by Dr. Davidovitch), I can not even hope for such trifles as the loan of a Bath-chair.

And even if I were treated and sent for the requisite length of time abroad, my position would remain highly precarious. On the last occasion that I contracted an inflammation of the nerves, I lay for two weeks immovable, though at that time I had no other illness besides the nervous complaint. Now I have half a dozen others. And even if I could devote so much time to my health as would be necessary, I should hardly have the right to expect to be really well even for quite a short space of time after this cure.

Now that it is not thought possible for me to be actually cured (for a treatment in Russia is hopeless in the opinion of the doctors, and even a longer treatment abroad would be hardly more efficacious), my life has lost all sense. Even were I not to start from the philosophical standpoint mentioned above, a person who is condemned to lie immovable without the possibility of doing any work, could hardly be expected to want to live.

I therefore repeat that the moment has come to put an end to this life. I know the adverse attitude of the Party in regard to suicide, but I hardly think that any one who considers my position in the present circumstances will seriously blame me.

Besides this, Professor Davidenko assumes that the reason of my relapse into my former serious nervous state is to be found in the excitement experienced in recent times. If I were healthy I should find sufficient strength and energy to struggle against the position which has developed within the Party. But in my present condition this state of affairs in the Party is insupportable to me, seeing that your exclusion from the Party is passed over in complete silence, though I do not in the least doubt that sooner or later there will be a revulsion in the Party which will force it to shake off those who have led it into this shameful act. In this sense my death will be the protest of a fighter, who is not in a position to respond to this shameful act in any other way.

If I may be permitted to compare a small thing with a big one, I should like to say that the great significance of the historical fact of the exclusion from the Party of yourself and Zinoviev, which must inevitably be looked upon as the beginning of the Thermidorian period of our revolution, and the circumstance that after twenty-seven years of revolutionary activity in responsible Party positions I have been placed in a position which leaves me no choice but to put a bullet through my head — that these two facts are manifestations of one and the same party policy; and most probably these two facts, the small one and the great one alike, will prove to be destined to give the Party that impulse which is required to hold it back from the path of Thermidorian error. I should be happy could I persuade myself of the fact that things will develop thus, for then I should know that I should not have died in vain. But though I am firmly convinced that the moment will come when the Party's eyes will be opened, I cannot persuade myself that moment is near at hand. Nevertheless, I do not doubt that my death will now be more useful than a continuation of my life could be.

With you, my dear Leo Davidovitch, I am connected by decades of common work and, I venture to hope, personal friendship. This gives me the right to tell you in parting what faults I find in you.

I have never doubted that the way pointed out by you was the right way, and you know that I have been going the same way as you for more than twenty years, since the beginning of the "permanent revolution".

But I have always been of opinion that you lack the inflexibility and firmness of Lenin, that determination to stick to the path recognised as right, even if wholly isolated, trusting in a future majority and a future recognition of the entire rectitude of your way.

Politically you have always been right, ever since 1905. And I have repeatedly told you that I heard with my own ears how Lenin admitted that you and not he was right in 1905. In the face of death men do not lie; and I repeat the same again. But you have often renounced your own truth in favour of an agreement, a compromise which you over-estimated. That was a mistake. I repeat, politically you were right. And now more than ever. Once the Party will come to recognise this, and history will appreciate it as it deserves. Therefore fear nothing if many turn from you at present, and still less so if there are not many that turn to you now as quickly as we all wished. You are in the right. But the guarantee of the victory of your truth lies in a great firmness, in strict adherence to the line of action, in the repudiation of all compromise, just as this was always the secret of the victory of Lenin.

I have often wished to tell you this, but it is only now, in taking leave of you, that I could make up my mind to do so.

Still a few words of a personal character. I leave behind me a wife who is unused to independence, a small boy, and a sick daughter. I know you can do nothing for them at present, and from the present Party leaders I expect absolutely nothing in this regard. But I do not doubt that the moment is not so far distant when you will again resume the position in the Party which is yours by right. Do not then forget my wife and my children.

I wish you no smaller degree of energy and courage than you have demonstrated up to the present, and a speedy victory. I embrace you. Farewell.

Your A. Joffe.

Moscow, November 16th, 1927,

This letter I wrote in the night from the 15th to the 16th. To-day Maria Michailovna went to the Medical Commission, to ask for me to be sent abroad, if only for one or two months. She was again told that in the opinion of the specialists a sojourn abroad for a short time was altogether useless and that the Medical Commission of the Central Committee had determined to have me transported at once to the Kremlin hospital. Thus even a short journey abroad for my health was denied me; though at the same time my doctors themselves admitted that my treatment in Russia was senseless and could lead to no result.

My dear Leo Davidovitch, I greatly regret that I could not see you again. Not that I doubt the rightness of my resolution and hoped you might persuade me otherwise. No. I do not in the least doubt that this is the most correct and most reasonable of all resolutions I could possibly arrive at. But I have some misgivings as to this letter of mine, for such a letter cannot but be subjective. And in view of such subjectivism the criterion of objectivity may be lost sight of. And any wrongly expressed phrase might distort the whole impression of the letter. Meanwhile I naturally hope you will make full use of this letter, since it is only thus that the step I am about to take can be efficacious.

I therefore not only give you complete authority to revise my letter, but also request you most urgently to omit from it anything that appears superfluous to you and to add anything you consider essential.

Forgive me, my dear friend. Be strong. You have still plenty of strength and energy at your disposal. And remember me without bitterness.

## The Philosophy of Decadence.

By J. Yaroslavsky.

By our publication of the letter written by A. Joffe just before his death, we desire to put an end to the irresponsible speculation which the Opposition started attaching to that event prior to the XV. Party Congress. Immediately before the XV Party Congress, the Opposition attempted to describe the death of Joffe as an act of heroism, a case of "death in the name of life and the fight". In the illegal publication "Material for Discussion" (November 19th, 1927), issued by the Opposition prior to the Party Congress, we find the following remarkable passage:

"The suicide of Joffe is no decadent phenomenon of social pessimism on the contrary, it is a phenomenon of social optimism. If our deceased comrade had not believed in the working class and its Party, if he had not believed in our future, he would not have departed this life merely because he had no longer the strength to carry on the fight.

As Joffe died, only revolutionaries can die who place not their personal interests but the interests of the class before all else. Joffe died, so as to induce others to do what he himself had not the strength to do, i. e. to carry on an uninterrupted fight for the sake of the future. That is really a death in the name of life and of the fight. That is a decided protest against the danger of backsliding, against the danger of contentment with what has been attained. Such a death can arouse neither discouragement nor pessimism among the fighters; on the contrary, (!!!! J. Y.!) it stimulates, it elevates, it leads us forward. Joffe did not throw aside the flag in dying; he died under the old flag (of Menshevism? J. Y.), in the name of the flag of Lenin, in the name of Communism, in the name of the great cause of the international proletariat (Those are indeed the words: "Under the old flag, in the name of the flag of Lenin . . ." J. Y.). Verily, the flag of Joffe is the flag of Marx and of Lenin.

We shall carry this flag forward, we shall carry it on to the end." (Emphasis ours. J. Y.)

It is not for the purpose of a polemic against the ingloriously decadent Opposition that we have cited this classic example of a speculation with the death of a sick man like Joffe, but we bear in mind that this rotten philosophy of decadence is being forced upon several thousand former and present members of our Party, that it is spreading its influence among them, and that in such circles individuals are living and "acting" who are determined to pursue their path "under the flag of Joffe".

Decadent opinions can also appear in an arch-revolutionary guise, a combination described by Lenin as "Left phrase and right action". At the time of the defeat of the first revolution, the decadent influences were disguised in an anarcho-syndicalist garb; religious mysticism frequently appeared robed in the most extravagant "Left", "revolutionary" phraseology. Even those who at the time of the "liquidators" placed the sexual problem in the centre of attention, desired to make this symptom of decadence appear as a revolutionary symptom. The Trotskyites are past-masters in the art of cloaking anti-revolutionary political tendencies with "Left" phrases. This is a fact often remarked by Lenin.

The period of transition to the "Nep" likewise proved too much for certain comrades. Some quitted the Party, others retired from their political activity, again others committed suicide. We may call to mind the suicide of J. Lutovinov. But no one thought of calling these events "phenomena of social optimism". All recognised that the difficulties and ordeals of the revolution owing to the delay in the advent of the world revolution had surpassed the powers of these comrades. No one dreamt of glorifying these suicides, though the victims were very valuable revolutionary and Bolshevik comrades, whose merits were at any rate not inferior to those of A. Joffe.

In analysing the reasons leading up to the suicide of J. Lutovinov Radek wrote as follows:

"Lutovinov sometimes failed to comprehend the fact that the proletariat cannot make one jump from capitalism to Socialism; quite particularly not in a petty-bourgeois country like Russia. He readily grasped all difficulties, but his whole nature revolted against them; and this contradiction between logical reason and sentiment imprinted upon him the tragic stamp of inner disharmony. He did not hear the calm and even tread of the advancing working battalions of which Lasalle once spoke; he was impatient and ill at ease. Were such sentiments to prevail among the broad working masses, the revolution would experience serious concussions at critical moments."

Have we here a single word in glorification of suicide? J. Lutovinov, who was a member of the Workers' Opposition, had serious differences with the Party, but only the worst enemy of the latter could have had the idea of justifying his suicide by the internal party regime. Radek, on the contrary, proved that the internal discord in the mind of Comrade Lutovinov cast discredit neither on him nor on us.

Now the case is different. The suicide of a member of the Opposition — can such a fine opportunity be allowed to pass by unused? Whatever may be the explanation of his death, it must be furnished with a justification making it appear as much as possible a matter of principle. Historical, philosophical, moral, and political motives must be attributed to him. In a word, the suicide of this sick man must at all costs be made into a case of "death in the name of life and the fight."

\* \* \*

In their illegal publication "Material for Discussion", issue of November 24th, 1927, the Trotskyites published such fragments from the letter of Joffe as they required for their attacks on the Party. Immediately after the death of Joffe, this letter was sent to all members of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission. Nevertheless the Trotskyites everywhere hastened to say that the letter had been suppressed, hidden, and so forth. With the full knowledge of the Trotskyites, (and on whose instructions?) this mean accusation was spread abroad by the foreign organs of the Maslovites and the French Oppositionists, e. g. in No. 2 & 3 of "Against the Stream", the journal of Treint and other muddle-heads.

Joffe imited this letter with the intention that it should be used against the Party. "I naturally hope you will make full use of this letter", he wrote L. Trotsky. But he did not think his letter would come into the hands of the Party before it had been altered in some way or other.

"I have some misgivings as to this letter of mine," he wrote, for such a letter cannot but be subjective. And in view of such subjectivism the criterion of objectivity may be lost sight of. And any wrongly expressed phrase might distort the whole impression of the letter."

Joffe's fears were not ungrounded. There are so many unharmonious phrases in this letter, that it would have been submitted to a wholesale revision, had the original not been in the hands of the Central Committee of the Party. Joffe gave his express consent to having it so revised.

"I therefore," he writes on November 16th, "not only give you complete authority to revise my letter, but also request you most earnestly to omit from it anything that appears superfluous to you and to add anything you consider essential."

This is more than a breach, this is pronounced disintegration. Nay, more. He had full confidence that his friends, the other members of the fraction, would be capable of adding to his last letter anything they considered essential i. e. to practise fraud and forgery. Only in the decadence and disintegration of this semi-Menshevist fraction, which is now fighting against the Party of Lenin, can such poisonous plants thrive. And it was only under the supposition that the illegal fraction of Trotsky would keep this "testament" secret that it could be drawn up at all. Had Joffe known that his letter would become known without any "dressing" whatever, he would never have dared to write it.

Only those who breathe this foul atmosphere of disintegration, of decadence, and of immorality in relation to the Party of Lenin, of which they themselves were members, while all the while engaged in constructing a party of their own — only the Trotskyites, under the "flag of Joffe", could in the face of all this still write in their illegal publication that "the suicide of Joffe was no phenomenon of decadence and social pessimism, but on the contrary a phenomenon of social optimism."

\* \* \*

It would be profitless to initiate polemics on the question whether Paul and Laura Lafargue were right when they came to the conclusion that they could be of no further use to the cause of revolution. But the bourgeois France of the late nineties is something altogether different from the Soviet Union. There is a great difference between the period of imperialist rule and the socialist construction in the first Workers' State. From the very first pages of Joffe's letter we learn that he had long before acquired such a fatalistic standpoint, which, sooner or later, was bound to lead him to commit suicide. But what has the Party to do with that? Certainly there is nothing proletarian about this philosophy. Every worker aiding in production and even such as are invalid and therefore

cannot aid in production but yet do their best to help in the public work of their class, would repudiate such a philosophy as something alien to them.

We do not intend, either, to polemicise against the other "thesis" of A. Joffe, that all our activity is in the service of infinity. We do not recognise this as a proletarian sentiment either.

Joffe was ill for several years. This illness of his made him not only irritable, but also, as is frequently the case in regard to sick people, unjust towards his surroundings. In this case his injustice expressed itself in complaints as to his treatment at the hands of the Party. This accusation has been taken up and spread abroad by the Opposition. But in what did this ill-treatment, this inattention, consist? One of the physicians who worked in the Medical Commission of the Central Committee reports as follows:

"Comrade A. A. Joffe was transported from Japan to Moscow in 1923 in a thoroughly sick condition and was immediately lodged in the Pokrovsko-Stryeshnevo sanatorium for nervous diseases, since his main complaints were morphinism and so-called Korsakov psychosis.

In 1922, Comrade Joffe had contracted an infectious disease in Manchuria and had for a year and a half undergone treatment first in China and then in Japan on account of the results of this disease, which had originally lasted for about ten days. The treatment included the use of opium and morphia preparations as pain-killing means. During this cure, Comrade Joffe absorbed great quantities of these drugs, as much as two grammes of morphia daily, though 0.1 gramme of morphia, taken at one dose, is sufficient to entail death.

Comrade Joffe, who was not only not cured of his general nervous malady, but had become a victim of morphia as well and suffered from a state of depression characterised by nightmares and hallucinations, a condition known as Korsakov's psychosis, was cured at the sanatorium near Moscow of his serious psychic complaint but had not overcome the drug habit in spite of the most careful treatment.

From the moment of his arrival in Moscow and his accommodation at the sanatorium, both Comrade Joffe and the members of his family were served by the specialists and the entire medical apparatus of the Kremlin sanitary service.

Comrade Joffe had the constant medical attendance of Dr. L. W. Levin, the chief physician of the Kremlin hospital and was throughout his illness treated and advised by the most eminent specialists, whose authority is recognised far beyond the borders of our country.

Among the doctors treating and attending Comrade Joffe, there were the professors Pletnyev, Getye, Vinogradov, Minor, Kramer, Davidenkov, Kamnitsch, Gannoushkin, Tarassievitch, Averbach, Fronstein and Salkind and the physicians Levin, Kanely, and Epstein; the consultations were also attended at different times by Pogossyantz, Roushchikov, Semashko, and Obrossov took part.

Comrade Joffe was in possession of a sick-ticket and as a doctor he enjoyed the right of procuring prescriptions directly for medicaments from the Kremlin pharmacy, so that he was sure of the maximum of medical assistance.

During his illness, Comrade Joffe was several times accommodated in the Kremlin hospital, and on one occasion, contrary to the ordinary rule, his wife and child were lodged there too, since he felt better for their proximity.

In 1924 to 25 and again in 1927, he was sent abroad by the Medical Commission, mainly to Vienna to Dr. Adler, on each occasion for three or four months. In 1926 he was sent with his wife to Yalta in the Crimea.

As to the members of his family, his daughter was sent in 1925 to undergo a treatment at Mazesta and then for a month to a sanatorium located near Moscow; in 1926 she was sent for a month to the Crimea, and 1927 for one month to a sanatorium near Moscow and for one month to the Shafranovo sanatorium.

Between 1924 and 1927, more than 36,000 roubles were spent on the treatment of Comrade Joffe abroad.

As already pointed out, the chief ailment of Comrade Joffe was his serious and obstinate morphinism. Most of the other ailments from which he suffered were direct or indirect consequences of this morphinism.

Since morphinism is an illness which can only be cured in a hospital, and since the recent journey of Comrade Joffe abroad failed to bring about any improvement, the question arose as to whether it would not be possible to treat him in Russia. This question was answered in the affirmative by the council of specialists (Professors Davidenkov and Vinogradov, with Dr. Levin and a doctor of the Central Committee), who pointed out that, if the necessary rules in regard to morphinism (a strict discipline and the assistance of psychiatrist) were observed, the Kremlin hospital was very well suited to attain the desired result. The hospital administration answered in the affirmative to the question as to whether it could afford Comrade Joffe the treatment and discipline of a closed establishment. It was therefore resolved to ask Comrade Joffe for his consent, a task entrusted to the Central Committee doctor. However, it proved impossible to inform the patient of the specialists' decision and to obtain his consent to their plan, since in the meantime he had committed suicide."

It is very sad that the Party should be obliged to answer such charges. But what else can be done when the Party is accused of not even agreeing to spend 1000 roubles on the treatment of the sick comrade, whereas in reality, if we consider only the treatment abroad during a period of three years, 36,000 roubles were spent on Comrade Joffe's health. Let the proletariat judge whether this is a case of stinginess or whether we were not rather as generous as this country can afford to be only in very exceptional cases.

But physical suffering is one thing and the complaint of having been deprived of a fortune by the revolution is another. Before the war, Joffe really was a rich man. But is it a proletarian characteristic to complain that the revolution has deprived a member of the Party of his fortune? The proletariat takes part in the revolution and knows that by the revolution it can but "lose its chains and gain the whole world". No, the complaints of Joffe do not spring from proletarian soil. They represent the philosophy of the petty-bourgeois revolutionary, who before his death casts up accounts in his notebook and reckons that he has spent so-and-so much more on the Party than the Party has spent on him. That is a rotten sort of "philosophy". That it not a Communist attitude towards the Party and the working class.

Just as inadequately founded is that the Party would not permit Joffe to write memoirs to the order of the Anglo-American bourgeoisie without the least control, and that the Party demanded the right of previously revising all that might be published by a member of the Party holding a diplomatic position. It is not only the right but also the duty of the Party, to demand such a revision by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee or by the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs. And it is a direct shame to have to read this complaint that in this way Joffe lost 20,000, and it is a still greater shame that such considerations should serve to conceal the fact that Joffe was interested in reporting characteristics of the "real leaders of the revolution". And that at the order of Anglo-American publishers! Such a rotten philosophy must be eradicated root and branch wherever its seed has fallen. It must be destroyed as anti-proletarian.

"The Party has offended me." He complained that the Party, actuated by the principle of "not giving the members of the Opposition any work", had not accorded him (Joffe) any work, "either in the Party or the Soviets, of such a character and extent as would enable me to exploit my abilities to their maximum degree of utility".

We all know that that is not true. The Party entrusted the Oppositionists with responsible positions, even with Government positions (two People's Commissaries, I. N. Smirnov and Byeloborodov) until the time of the XV. Party Congress, until a time when the Opposition openly committed actions hostile to the Soviets (illegal, anti-Party printing, street demonstrations, organisation of the illegal Red Cross with the participation of A. Joffe, even for the support of anti-Soviet and anti-Party activity). Whoever reads through Joffe's letter attentively must

say that the Party had no right to repose further confidence in people that could act in such a way towards the Party.

In one of the illegal publications ("Material for Discussion" of November 24th, 1927), the Trotzkyites attempt to "explain" Joffe's complaint that even the Opposition had not given him any occupation in keeping with his importance. Joffe's friends kept him away from open (but not from secret? J. J.) and active oppositional work, fearing that as a penalty, he would be prevented from going abroad for a longer cure, without which his work would necessarily be short-lived.

A curious explanation. Usually the Opposition complained, both in the Executive Committee of the Communist International and in the Party, of the contrary fact, they complained that they were sent abroad. It is easy to see how miserable, how hypocritical this "explanation" is. As a matter of fact, Joffe was so ill from the effects of morphinism, that neither the Party nor the Opposition could entrust him with any important tasks.

\* \* \*

"In the face of death men do not lie." What "truths" Joffe proclaimed in regard to himself and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we have seen. For such "truths" we can find a justification only if we disregard the fact that the letter was expressly written to be exploited against the Party. The entire morale of Joffe was so undermined by the illegal existence of the Trotzky group, that he was even capable of proclaiming "I heard with my own ears how Lenin admitted that you and not he was right in 1905". In the face of death men do not tell lies. "I have never doubted", writes Joffe to L. Trotzky, "that the way pointed out by you was the right way, and you know that I have been going the same way as you for more than 20 years, since the beginning of the permanent revolution".

When and where did Joffe hear Lenin say that even in 1905 not he, Lenin, and the Bolshevik Party, but Trotzky with his theory of the "permanent revolution" was right, a theory which Lenin was wont to call "disgustingly Left"? Was this not a hallucination of a morphinist suffering from nightmare? If in 1905 not Lenin but Trotzky was in the right, then Trotzky was also right in the following years, and the Bolshevik Party war wrong. Joffe "never doubted the correctness of the way pointed out by L. Trotzky", not even when Trotzky formed the August bloc, not when at the time of the imperialist war he wavered between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, nor yet at the time of Brest, nor in the trade union discussions. The Bolshevik Party, however, not only doubted, and Lenin not only doubted, that this way was right; but in a whole series of literary productions they most emphatically condemned Trotzkyism, both in 1905 and in the following years.

What purpose was this calumny of Lenin intended to serve? Why was he represented as having affirmed several times that the Party had erred and that Joffe and Trotzky were right, if not with a view to proving the relations between the Trotzky fraction and the name of Lenin, which they have so unpardonably misused? Nor is this a chance, morbid attack on the part of Joffe; it is part of the same philosophy of decadence which invents facts ("I heard with my own ears") for the purpose of justifying the mistaken paths of Trotzkyism. If the actual, non-invented facts, if all the things that Lenin said and did, contradict Trotzkyism and the assertions of the Trotzkyites, then all the worse for those facts, say Trotzky's adherents.

\* \* \*

In keeping with what Joffe's teacher, L. Trotzky, was wont to say, Joffe could not but estimate the exclusion from the Party of Zinoviev and Trotzky as "a historical event of great significance", which was "bound to be the beginning of the Thermidorian period of our revolution".

And just as the heroes of the petty-bourgeois Social-revolutionary Party imagined that they were giving an incentive to the movement of the masses by a provocative terrorism, Joffe also tried to impart a heroic motive to his suicide. He describes it as concurring with that "event of tremendous historical importance", the exclusion of Zinoviev and Trotzky from the Party, to give "that impulse which is required to hold it back from the path of Thermidorian error".

The XV. Party Congress showed who it was that failed to stop on a downward path, when it became obvious to all that the Party is sounder and stronger than ever before, and that, more closely than ever allied with the masses, it is full of

strength and energy for the work of Socialist construction and embraces more of the proletariat than it ever did. This miserable Menshevik whine about a Thermidor is altogether ridiculous. But it is the essence of that foul philosophy which sees nothing save political decline in a country in which the Socialist movement is developing with unprecedented power, a philosophy which sees in the downfall of its own plans the downfall and end of the revolution, mistaking its own deterioration and decay for the deterioration and decay of the Party. If this was not apparent enough hitherto, it must be patent to every one that reads Joffe's letter. This epistle is also remarkable for the fact that in it the entire incompatibility of Trotzky's philosophy with the fight for Socialism is fully apparent, as is also its incompatibility with the proletarian class, a class that believes in its own strength and in the justification of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin.

We know that for many who have chosen the path of fight against the Party, who have allowed themselves to be led astray by the names of some of the Opposition leaders and by their seemingly convincing criticism of the Party's shortcomings, the time through which our Party is now passing is a real tragedy. For two years — as a matter of fact for much longer still — the Opposition has been collecting its forces. Prominent leaders and famous orators and writers have arrayed themselves against the Party and armed some thousands of Party members for the fight against the Party of Lenin under the pretext that that Party was deteriorating, had already deteriorated, was becoming Thermidorian, and the like. All possible means were adopted. But the result was a tremendous defeat, an ideological and organisatory breakdown, the recognition of being in the wrong, and a frantic search for a way out of the blind alley into which they had been led by those that marched "under the flag of Joffe".

For many comrades, who have been brought by this fight against the Party to feel themselves morally or actually outside the Party, the way back to the Bolshevik Party will be the more difficult, the deeper this philosophy of decadence has eaten its way into their beings, this philosophy which is to be discerned in every line of Joffe's letter. Therefore we consider it our duty to point out most decidedly the anti-Leninist and anti-proletarian direction of this philosophy of decadence and disintegration, which has developed as a result of the defeatist mood of the Opposition, a body more and more inclining towards Menshevism.

This funeral philosophy can fortunately seize no more than an unimportant portion of our Party. The Party itself is so sound that it is in a position to instil the sap of life into any that are honest enough to recognise and unconditionally to condemn their faults; it can imbue such comrades anew with the joy of life, with joy of the victory of the proletarian party which is building up Socialism.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Situation in the British Textile Industry.

By J. R. Campbell (London).

The treacherous character of the proposal of the Trade Union leaders to confer with the leading employers on the question of "Industrial Peace" is well illustrated by the fact that the workers in a number of leading industries in Britain are facing intensive wage cuts.

Not only are the Durham miners faced with wage cuts in February, but both sections of the textile industry, woollen and cotton, are facing a similar situation. The agreement in the woollen textile industry has been terminated and it is likely that early in New Year the employers will table definite proposals for a reduction in wages. The most serious struggle is however, likely, to take place in the great cotton industry which normally employs about 400,000 operatives.

Like the woollen section of the textile industry the cotton industry experienced a tremendous boom following upon the termination of the war. So huge were the profits that were being earned that groups of speculators raised loans at high rates of interest from the banks and bought up old-established mills at four and five times their value. Not only was a con-

siderable amount of speculation in cotton shares, done by leading financiers but even large sections of the workers who had been earning comparatively good wages also engaged in this share speculation. In most cases the leading financiers were wise enough to unload their shares in the newly constituted companies on to the less experienced investors before the trade boom gave way to the trade depression. The result of this development is that to-day the industry is carrying an exceedingly heavy load of loan capital. In addition the banks have loaned no less than £ 15,000,000 to leading capitalist firms in the industry so much so that it is estimated that 200 out of the 390 large concerns in the industry are in the hands of the banks. 90% of those 200 mills are in the hands of four banks.

The cotton industry of Lancashire is divided into two sections known as the American and Egyptian sections after the cotton which they employ in production. The Egyptian section produces the finest qualities of cotton cloth and is able, on the basis of the long experience and skill of the Lancashire Cotton operatives, to maintain its former supremacy with regard to this class of cotton goods.

The American section however, produces the rougher types of cotton goods such as are produced in the new countries in which cotton textile production is fast developing. It is this section of the industry which is at the moment faced with a tremendous depression. According to Mr. J. M. Keynes "There are thousands of looms new standing. Two million spindles are silent. Twenty million spindles are working three days a week. There are forty thousand workers unemployed and most of the rest on half-wages. Mills in this section of the industry which were bought for £ 400,000 in 1920 cannot be sold for £ 30,000 at the present time."

In this situation the employers are turning towards wage reduction and lengthening of hours as a solution for the immediate difficulties in this section of the industry. The "Manchester Guardian" has printed the employers proposal demanding a cut in wages of 12½% and a lengthening of hours from 48 to 52½% per week.

The wages of the cotton operatives, at the present time are roughly about 61% above pre-war level and as the cost of living is about 65% above pre-war level this represents a reduction in real wages even if the workers were working a full working week. When it is remembered, however, that the workers have at the most been working three days a week it is obvious that any attempt to reduce their wages would be fiercely resisted. There are approximately thirty-seven Unions with an affiliated membership to the T. U. C. of 234,864. The skilled sections of those Unions are exceedingly well organised and capable of putting up a prolonged resistance. The less skilled workers are not so well organised, it being calculated that about 40% of the industry is still unorganised.

The cotton Unions are exceedingly conservative having worked for years under an elaborate system of negotiation with the employers. So elaborate is this system of negotiation that the local leaders of the workers are chosen rather for their skill as accountants than for their ability to lead a vigorous workers' struggle. The average Branch in the Cotton Unions comprises anything from 2,000 up to 10,000 members in a particular locality and generally does not meet more than once in six months or in many cases once per annum. All the day to day Union work is done by a Branch Committee in touch with shop delegates representing the workers in the various factories. There is thus little internal life in the Trade Unions as compared with most other Trade Unions in the country.

The cotton workers themselves have always voted conservative in spite of the fact that most of the Unions are affiliated to the Labour Party. This was due to the pre-war prosperity in the industry, where not only the men but the women and girls were able to earn comparatively high wages, enabling the family to purchase its own house, take shares in the industry and so on. At the last general election the great industrial towns in this area, Bolton, Preston, Blackburn Oldham, Bury and Stockport, containing an overwhelming majority of the working class returned conservative M. P.s. to the House of Commons. Since the last election however, there has been a noticeable sweep away from conservatism. At the recent municipal elections many of the cotton towns returned increased numbers of Labour men.

The attitude of the workers as far as it can be ascertained, is totally against wage cuts or lengthened hours. The Union officials are also arguing against worsening the conditions of

the workers. Their arguments however, are not so much based on the fact that the workers' wages are low enough as they are based on the fact that a reduction in wages or the lengthening of hours could lead to a reduction in export prices and therefore would not improve the selling capacity of the depressed sections of the industry.

The cotton industry is an industry with a high organic composition of capital. The wage cost in the industry is only from 8 to 10% of the total cost of production of finished cotton goods. Therefore, it is argued by the leaders, with a certain appearance of truth, that wage cuts would not enable the employers to substantially reduce their prices with a view to competing with the foreign market.

The idea that the employers are only concerned with reducing wages with a view to competing on the foreign market is however, rather naive. Whilst it may be true that wage-cuts would not enable them substantially to improve their competitive position abroad, immediate wage cuts would undoubtedly improve the financial position of the employers and increase the employers profits on the present production and it is doubtless this that the employers are aiming at. It would mean an immediate increase of profit in the depressed weaving and spinning section of the industry.

There is little left-wing opposition to the bureaucracy in the cotton Trade Unions. It is true that in one or two towns members of the Communist Party are on the Executive Committee of the local Weavers Unions. They are there, however, rather on account of their competency as Trade Union officials rather than on account of the acceptance of Communist policy by the workers as a whole. They are small in numbers in relation to the bureaucracy as a whole and it is safe to say that up to the present moment, there is no sign of any serious left-wing movement amongst the cotton operatives.

Such a movement is, however, possible of development if the cotton bosses carry out their threat as they are likely to do and are met, as is also likely, by a long and stubborn resistance on the part of the workers. The weak section of the Communist Party in this area has already commenced its campaign against extension of hours or reduction in wages, and for a revitalising of the internal life of the Unions by more constant meeting and for an explanation to the workers of the full facts of the present cotton crises. Should the struggle develop as there is every likelihood of it doing, the Communist Party will have an opportunity of securing an influence over a strong and well-organised body of the British workers who have hitherto been inaccessible not merely to Communist propaganda but in some districts even to ordinary Labour propaganda.

## The Labour Movement in Argentina.

By R. V. (Buenos Aires).

According to the National Dept. of Labour there are 438,000 workers in Buenos Aires, of whom 35,000 are metal workers, 25,000 bootmakers, 20,000 woodworkers, 40,000 workers in meat and conserve work, 15,000 printers, 12,000 builders, 40,000 workers in match factories, 9,000 textile workers, 120,000 employees, 20,000 chauffeurs, and so on. Of these 438,000, only 30,000 are organised. A very small percentage of organised workers is to be seen amongst the employees: despite the fact that there are 120,000 employees in Buenos Aires, the Federation of Commercial Employees in Buenos Aires has only 164 members.

There are at present in Argentine three trade union centres: 1. Union Sindical Argentina (T. U. F. A.); 2. Argentine Labour Federation, founded in February 1926, and led by Socialists; 3. the anarchist Federation — Federation Obrera Regional Argentina. The reformist Labour Federation consists mainly of the largest union of railwaymen — Confraternidad Ferroviaria — making up approximately 80% of the whole membership.

The F. O. R. A., which is really a federation of anarchist groups in various trades and professions, and being only an association of partisans, is not a real trade union centre.

Only the T. U. F. A. founded in 1922 at the unification congress of trade unions, embraces trade unions in various

industries and is the real centre of the revolutionary trade union movement. Workers with the most varied ideology are admitted into the T. U. F. A., but its Constitution disqualifies members or candidates to State-political organisations (as, for instance, parliament or municipality) from being members of the Executives of Unions, of the Central Committee of the T. U. F. A., or delegates to trade union congress.

Its greatest membership was in 1922/1923. Since then the bourgeois and government reaction which followed struck heavy blows at the unions affiliated to the T. U. F. A. and at present there are only 12,000 paying members, although the membership is 30,000 of whom 20,000 are marine transport workers. The fall in the T. U. F. A. was very strongly felt when the national federation of water transport workers was broken up, it being the largest affiliated organisation. Two years ago the water transport workers' federation was split by the mercantile marine officers' union which was part of it, and whose attitude was altogether individualistic, retaining its petty bourgeois ideology. After the split it began to struggle against the federation.

The authorities were not slow to take advantage of this internal war to carry out merciless repressions against the water transport workers' union and as a result, after an 18-month strike the Water Transport Workers' Federation was broken up in 1924. Just recently however, the officers' union renewed connections with the Water Transport Workers' Federation and published an appeal in favour of re-establishing the Federation and for the regaining of the positions lost by the water transport workers. It is therefore, to be hoped that in a very short time the water transport worker's federation will be reorganised.

There are altogether about 300 unions in the Union Sindical Argentina, the most important being in the capital of the country, Buenos Aires. The most important are the woodworkers' Union of Buenos Aires, with 3000 members, Shipbuilders' Federation — about 2000 members, metalworkers' Union of Buenos Aires, 1600 members. There are many unions in the provinces which during the summer seasonal work have 300 to 400 members each, and when the work finishes, and the workers depart for home, there are about 40 to 50 members left in them.

An important factor in the trade union movement of the country is the mass immigration. The immigrant workers — Germans, Czechoslovaks, Poles, and others, because of their great need, are often forced to become strikebreakers. Another disorganising factor is the activities of the socialists who split the trade union movement and formed their own trade union centre competing with the T. U. F. A.

Finally, no small harm was done by the split in the T. U. F. A. itself, the split in the trade union movement of Buenos Aires which took place last March. Many of the large trade unions were dissatisfied with the old Executive of the Buenos Aires Trade Union Federation and an actual breakdown threatened the city trade union movement. The Central Committee of the T. U. F. A. made several attempts to induce the old Executive of the city federation to settle the differences and consolidate the trade unions. When these attempts were unsuccessful the C. C. of the T. U. F. A. called a conference on the 12th of March of all the trade unions in Buenos Aires, which unanimously decided to displace the old executive of the Federation and elected a new executive. There were present at this conference 15 unions with 6454 paying members, whilst the 11 unions absent had altogether only 1858 paying members.

As the new Executive was elected by the over-whelming majority, the C. C. recognised it as legal and stated that if the old Executive would not consider itself dispersed, it would put itself outside the ranks of the T. U. F. A. The old executive refused to fulfil the demands of the T. U. F. A. It now functions as a second city federation and carries on a struggle against the city federation which is affiliated to the T. U. F. A.

In its international affiliations, the T. U. F. A. is still neutral, but there are very strong sympathies with the R. I. L. U. in its ranks.

## FREE THOUGHT MOVEMENT

### The Third Congress of the Proletarian Free-Thinkers.

By Viktor Stern (Prague).

The course and the result of the Third World Congress of the Proletarian Freethinkers, which was held in Cologne from January 4th to 8th, signify an important step forward, in spite of many shortcomings and weaknesses.

The agenda of the Congress was not particularly well arranged. For the short duration of the session, there were far too many reports, and the consequence was that there was practically no time left for a thorough discussion of the important points which were brought up; moreover, two reports could not be read, even though one of them was no less important than a treatise upon the tasks of the free-thought movement after the capture of political power. Among the reports themselves, the theoretic ones were given too much prominence, so that the consideration of practical free-thought work suffered sensibly. There was not even a debate upon the general report or upon the reports of the individual countries, although debate in this regard was highly desirable.

It was, indeed, a great and decisive advance that the Congress did not confine itself merely to the treatment of free-thinker questions, in the narrow sense of the term, but that it also treated of political questions in conjunction with the tasks of the free-thought movement, but the inadequate discussion of the narrower sphere of operations of the freethinkers had too much effect upon the proper relation. This effect was strengthened by the circumstance that of all the resolutions it was really only the political ones upon which a vote was taken.

The great progress achieved by this congress lies in the fact that in the first place, instead of general, vague formulation concerning "revolutionary class struggle", which the free-thought movement defends and in the service of which it wishes to engage, for the first time concrete conceptions of the sense of these ideas were opposed one to the other. The result was that the former idyllic but unwholesome appearance of complete uniformity of view in the freethinkers' international was destroyed and clarity was attained in regard to the tendencies which exist in the freethinkers' international.

The congress also made it clear that directives, programme of action and other matters put on paper do not by any means signify their execution in practice, their confirmation through deeds; that general acknowledgement of the programme of the freethinkers' international should not disguise the fact that a tough and arduous fight is required to ensure the retention of the line of this programme in the world of reality.

The principal questions of the session were that of the danger of war and, in closest relation thereto, that of the threat to the Soviet Union and the necessity of the international proletarian united front. The importance of all these questions remained undisputed throughout the conference.

But it also became very clear at the congress that in the freethinkers' international there are three main tendencies, one to the left, Marxist, one to the right, anti marxist, and, as everywhere else, a third one characterised by vacillations and uncertainty.

The rightward tendency was represented by the leadership of the German Association of Freethinkers. This may be regarded as the extreme "left" within the Social Democracy. The leader, Sievers, spoke in favour of the united front for the protection of the Soviet Union and of the colonial revolution, and he even attacked the "Left-Winger" Otto Bauer on account of the latter's attitude towards religion. He described the theory of State adopted by Social Democracy as seriously harmful to the proletariat. But the congress pretty thoroughly disclosed the true nature of this wing, and that is no mean achievement on the part of the congress.

The leadership of the German Association of Freethinkers, which combats most vehemently the Marxist opposition within its own organisation, arranged the delegation to the congress.



in the simplest fashion. The whole of the enlarged Executive, consisting of 35 men, including about three of the opposition, were sent to the congress, and the "atmosphere" of the congress was thereby prepared, for the delegates from other countries could naturally attend only in limited numbers. In voting, not a single one of the 20 votes which the German organisation had at its disposal was cast in favour of the opposition. In this way, the German association hoped to "win", as there were only 54 votes at the congress altogether.

The real, deeper sense of the report on "Ideological Problems of the Class Fight" delivered by Sievers was, even though thickly veiled, the old reformist wisdom, that the workers are not yet ripe for revolution. The thesis advanced by the speaker Luitpold Stern under the title of "Rationalisation of Educational Work", which would in the first place obviate the political division of the parties (naturally), by merging the parties), a thesis, which, as is well known, serves to combat the united front in practice, was declared by Sievers to be particularly right and important. When it was proposed to protest in the name of the congress against an article which accused the Soviet Union of concluding peace with the church, Sievers resisted resolutely. Finally, he even began to speak of the "violent suppression of the Opposition in Russia".

The significance of these attacks in themselves was clear enough, but still more clarity was furnished by the vote on the political resolution. In my speech I stated on behalf of the Left that all assurances of willingness to fight for the united front and the Soviet Union against war and imperialism were empty phrases, indeed, harmful and dangerous phrases, as long as sabotage of the united front and all support of imperialism and preparation for war was not fought against, and as long as it was not pointed out what grave danger was entailed when Socialist leaders engage in such mischief. The right wing insisted that a "short" resolution containing merely general assurances, should be passed. They again showed their love of the "united front" by their resistance to joining the Red Aid, even though many freethinkers have to suffer persecution. The resoluteness of their fight against imperialism and for the national emancipation movements was shown by their resistance to the affiliation of the P. I. F. to the Anti-Imperialist League.

The centre, represented by the chairman Hartwig and the Austrian delegate (general secretary of the I. P. F.), took objection to a portion only of these attacks, the second portion they assisted and the remainder they helped through passivity. The chairman, Hartwig, declared Luitpold Stern's report to be the best Marxist speech. Austria was the only country which voted with the German right-wingers. On the other hand, Sievers' attacks upon the Soviet Union were most energetically refuted by Hartwig, and it came to a conflict, in the course of which Hartwig withdrew from his position as chairman.

A definite Marxist attitude was adopted by the Left-Wingers alone. Comrade Lukachevsky (Soviet Union) pointed out the necessity of making concrete whatever had to be defended in the I. P. F. as revolutionary Marxism, and his numerous practical propositions were at one and the same time positive and friendly criticism of the work in the past. Comrade Maslovsky (Germany) discussed objectively a number of dangerous ideological deviations from Marxism. I expressed concretely the tasks which in the present circumstances arise out of the principle that the free-thought movement must help in the general class struggle and I showed how necessary it is to combat all adulterations of Marxism, of the Marxist philosophy as also of Marxist economy and political theory. The attitude of the delegation from the Soviet Union made a deep impression upon the congress.

On the last day, while several important speeches were still to be delivered and, what is more important, the voting was still to be done, the Right Wing, after delaying the commencement of the session through a special meeting of the German delegation, declared that the session must close at one o'clock, as they had to leave for home. On this account the most important work of the congress was rendered so difficult that it was almost impossible. A number of resolutions had to be left to the executive. Important resolutions such as that concerning the entry into the Anti-Imperialist League and the Red Aid were "forgotten" in the atmosphere of antagonistic voting on the political resolution. (!)

It was only with the greatest difficulty that voting was

secured on the political resolution. The Left Wing resolution was passed by 29 votes against 25. In framing the resolution, the Left Wing had made every possible concession in order to get it passed "unanimously". All the countries, with the exception of Germany and Austria, voted for the Left-Wing resolution, and among others the predominantly social-democratic German organisation of Czechoslovakia. This division showed that the entry into the Anti-Imperialist League, into the Red Aid and into the Workers International Relief, as also the protest against the libelling of the Soviet Union, would have been accepted, if the voting had not been "forgotten".

The congress constituted a handsome success for the Marxist Left Wingers. It would be wrong, however, to cherish the illusion that everything or even the most important points have been gained. What we have achieved is only a facilitation of the possibility of truly Marxist work in the P. I. F. and the proof that the united front of the P. I. F. is strong enough to stand a free and open fight over differences of opinion. This fight must be continued in order to carry genuine, unadulterated Marxism to complete victory in the international freethinkers' movement.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### Save the Independent Unions of Bulgaria!

Appeal of the R. I. L. U.

The Bulgarian Fascist Government has made another thrust at the trade union organisations. Alarmed at the workers' growing sympathy for the Independent Federation of Labour Unions (I. F. L. U.), the worthy heirs of Tsankoff resorted to the well tried repressive measures of the fascists. Premises of the unions, workers' clubs, and meetings were raided by the police up and down the country. Officials were manhandled, archives and lists of readers of "Unity" the trade union organ, etc., were "lifted". In several towns the executive bodies of the independent unions were arrested, while meetings and all trade union activities were vetoed.

To justify these outrages and unlawful measures against legal organisations, the authorities are making use of provocative measures that have already received full citizenship rights in all bourgeois countries throughout the world. The Government press is circulating rumours that "compromising documents" and "secret instructions", etc., were discovered during the raids.

The Headquarters of the Independent Unions and affiliated organisations have categorically refuted these lying rumours. There is no doubt that repressions were commenced chiefly because the I. F. L. U. at its recent congress dared to denounce the reactionary Bill proposed by the Government on Safeguarding the State, which deprives workers of the right to organise, and had defiantly discussed the struggle against fascism and the new war danger. The independent T. U. organisation, not affiliated to any of the existing Internationals, was thus crushed and punished for this "political crime".

This outrageous move of Bulgarian reaction is just a part of the furious onslaught that world capital is making on working class organisations. We do not doubt that the reformists, true to their treacherous policy, will not give this act of police violence the attention it deserves. The broad working masses, however, must categorically protest against the exploits of these Bulgarian blackguards. The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions appeals to all affiliated organisations to demonstrate their international solidarity with the workers who have fallen victims to Bulgarian reaction, by commencing a broad campaign in the press, by arranging meetings and demonstrations of protest, etc. The international proletariat must resolutely counter insolent fascist reaction which is being silently supported by the treacherous reformist leaders.

Down with the Fascist Blackguards!

Long live the proletariat of Bulgaria and its working class trade unions!

Executive Bureau  
Red International of Labour Unions.

January, 1928.

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

## Work in the Village.

### Report of Comrade V. H. Molotov.

(Full text.)

Comrades, the question of work in the village is at the present time bound up with a number of practical conclusions. For this reason I should like to emphasise from the beginning that the term "village" comprehends many multifarious aspects of the life of our peasantry.

There is no village pure and simple. The village reveals a great number of varied characteristics — social, economic, national etc. We need only remember that we are still engaged in wiping out the last remains of feudalism and of the patriarchal mode of life. In Central Asia and Caucasia these systems have not by a long way been entirely abolished, and it will still take some time before this has been accomplished.

Another example: We speak a great deal of the activation of the village Soviets. But in a number of districts, especially in the East of the Soviet Union, it is not yet a question of activating the Soviets, but of first calling Soviets into being, which will still require a considerable time. It will certainly take some years before a real Soviet power has been created here.

But there is one point which is common to every district and to every national republic of the Soviet Union, and that is the fact that advance is being made on lines fundamentally different from those possible in the pre-revolutionary period. The power of the proletariat has directed the economic, social, and cultural-political prerequisites for the development of the village into channels differing essentially in principle from the old channels, and opening out completely new possibilities for the Soviet village.

Under the conditions thus created, it is the line of the Party and the line of the working class which determines the manner in which the village develops towards socialism. With this the main forms of development are laid down: the Soviets and the co-operatives. The uniformity of system thus imparted to the development of the village is at one with the general economic plan organised for the whole of our economic life, of which the village is becoming an increasingly important part.

#### I. THE MAIN POLITICAL RESULT (OR: THE FATE OF THE PETTY BOURGEOIS PARTIES IN OUR COUNTRY).

We have become so accustomed to the fact, that we scarcely notice any longer that the petty bourgeois political groups of the type of the social-revolutionaries, the Mensheviks, etc., have ceased to exist among us as mass groups, even in the weakest form. Even if we give full credit to the activity of the G. P. U. — and this body fully deserves that we do so — still it cannot be said that this progress is entirely due to the G. P. U. The G. P. U. has been, and continues to be, an invaluable aid in this direction, and we must depend on its further aid in the future. But the shrinkage of these petty bourgeois parties, a fact of the utmost importance for the political development of the Soviet Union, must be regarded as the actual result of the successful advance of the working class, whose power is reinforced by the alliance with the main mass of the peasantry. We must ask ourselves the question:

How is it that the middle peasantry, of whom Lenin rightly said in 1918 that they "form the economic basis for petty bourgeois democracy", that this middle peasantry has become our "central figure in agriculture", and that the alliance between the working class and this middle peasantry has become the means of securing the most important of the successes of the revolution, the collapse and extermination of the petty bourgeois parties (not to speak of the liquidation of all other parties)? It seems to me that we have never fully appreciated this, although it is one of the most important successes of the proletarian dictatorship, that is, of the successes which are not only political, but do much to further the whole struggle of our proletarian power for the realisation of Socialism.

This result of the political development of the Soviet Union is very instructive in many respects.

We now see that with the defeat and annihilation of the bourgeoisie and the landowning class the roots of the Menshevik and social revolutionary party in our country were destroyed. This is the sole logical conclusion to be drawn from the indisputable facts.

Our blow dealt at the bourgeoisie and large landowners removed the ground from under the feet of the social revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, that is, of the petty bourgeois parties, the faithful servants and skilful agents of the bourgeoisie and the landowners. We have here the proof that in our country the working class is the leading political power, enabled to retain its leading rôle by its enormous achievements in the ideologically political leadership of the working masses in town and country.

The extermination of the petty bourgeois parties has proved one of the most important prerequisites for the work of building up Socialism. These parties, no matter what they call themselves, whether social democrats, socialists, revolutionaries, etc. were invariably rooted in the bourgeois landowning stratum, were closely bound up with the ruling classes of the past, and we could only clear the path for Socialism by first sweeping them away. This shows that one can now speak at present of a growth, however slight, of the bourgeois-capital elements only in so far as the first roots of these petty bourgeois tendencies gain somewhat in strength. It is not by accident that the reappearance of openly anti-proletarian trends and currents has found expression in the form of the Trotskyist Opposition even in our Party itself.

#### II. THE CLASSES AND THE PECULIARITIES OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE VILLAGE UNDER THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

The revolution brought fundamental changes in the social and economic conditions in the village.

The data issued by the Central Statistics Administration, in which for instance the separate class groups of the peasantry are not taken into account, give an entirely wrong impression, both statistically and politically, and I replace these by the data given by Comrade Smirnov, People's Commissar for Agriculture. Comrade Smirnov takes as a basis the data for the

pre-revolutionary period. Lenin's article on "The agrarian question at the close of the nineteenth century" contains statistics on the distribution of the land among the three main groups of the peasantry. Lenin names the first group that of the impoverished peasantry, ruined by feudal exploitation. The second group is that of the middle peasantry, and the third that of the agricultural bourgeoisie, that is, the kulak.

If we take this classification of Lenin, referring to the pre-revolutionary period, we find the land distribution at that time to have been as follows: The poor and middle peasantry possessed approximately 60 million hectares of the territory of the present R. S. F. S. R. (without Siberia, the Far East, and some districts in North Caucasus), as compared with 40 million hectares possessed by the agricultural bourgeoisie.

What is the distribution of land among the three main social groups of peasantry now, after the changes brought about by the revolution?

It must first of all be taken into account that in consequence of the agrarian revolution the total area of the land in the hands of the peasantry has increased, according to Comrade Smirnov's statements, by 40 million hectares, representing land formerly possessed by those who did not cultivate the land themselves.

The middle and poor peasantry have therefore not merely 60 million hectares of land at their disposal, as at the time before the revolution, but now possess in the same territory over 136 million hectares, thus doubling the area of land which they cultivate. And what difference has the revolution made to the area of land in the hands of the kulaks? We find that in this territory of the R. S. F. S. R. the rural bourgeoisie possesses only something over 4 million hectares in place of the former 40 million, or approximately one tenth of the land in its hands before the revolution.

I am not of the opinion that the tables and data submitted by Comrade Smirnov represent a complete and scientifically established statement (nay more; I have no doubt that the actual share of the land in the hands of the kulaks must be one and a half times to twice as much as estimated by Comrade Smirnov). But the general outlines of his survey give a perfectly correct answer to the question of the results of the agrarian revolution.

Finally, I give the general data supplied by Comrade A. P. Smirnov on the changes brought about in landowning conditions by the October Revolution in the R. S. F. S. R., without the autonomous republics. We find that, as result of the revolution, a total area of 110 million hectares has passed into the hands of the poor and middle peasantry, of which area no less than 50 million hectares have been confiscated from the estate owners, the so-called private land owners, and the church. About 10 million hectares were given to the peasantry from State owned land and by the forests administration. The "large land-owning" (kulak) stratum of the village was deprived of about 50 million hectares, and this was distributed among the peasant group owning little or no land. We must impress these figures on our memory, and bring them to the knowledge of the peasantry. After a careful re-examination of the actual state of affairs, we shall correct inaccuracies, but as they are these figures give a clear and correct (if not complete) idea of the results of the agrarian revolution.

These are the fundamental facts characterising the present economic situation in the village, as compared with the pre-revolutionary situation. It need not be said that these results of the agrarian revolution force us to emphasise the fact that the nationalisation of the land, which has given over 110 million hectares of land to the masses of the middle peasantry and the village poor, is the most essential and important question of our agrarian revolution. Those who attack the nationalisation of the land, directly or indirectly, are the bitterest foes of the masses of the peasantry and the working class. The Party, the working class, and the whole mass of the peasantry, must safeguard with all possible means the achievements of the agrarian revolution and the nationalisation of the land.

What happened in our rural districts during the revolution?

I need not prove to you, comrades, who know it already,

that what happened as result of the agrarian revolution was that the village became "middle peasant".

At the same time we must not forget that the process of social and economic development in the Soviet village has had special features of paramount importance.

These special features are characterised as follows in the theses on work in the village:

"The peculiarities of this re-stratification have their origin in the changed social conditions. These peculiarities consist in that, contrary to the capitalist type of development, expressed in a weakening ("washing away") of the middle peasantry and the creation of extreme groups of poor and rich peasantry, with us there is to be recorded a process of strengthening of the middle peasant groups, and although at present the kulak groups continue to grow at the expense of the better situated middle peasantry, at the same time the number of poor peasants is diminishing; one section of the poor peasantry is proletarianised, but the greater section is rising gradually into the middle peasant stratum."

In these theses we read further:

"Hence the process of differentiation peculiar to our type of development increases the numbers and strength of the middle peasantry, once more confirming Lenin's thesis on the middle peasant as the "central figure of agriculture."

This is the fundamental process of social development to be observed in our village. An enormous amount of data might be adduced as proof.

With reference to the specific weight of the middle peasantry, I shall only deal briefly with a table showing that in 1924/25 the proportion of the middle peasant group was 64.7 per cent., in the following year 65.8 per cent., and during the last economic year 66.4 per cent.

The commission which has compiled this table has also issued another extremely useful table recording the numerical changes taking place in the poor peasant group. In these same years the proportion of the poor peasant group changed as follows: 1924/25 24 per cent., in the following year 21.6 per cent., last economic year 20.4 per cent. The group of the village poor decreases visibly. The process of strengthening of the middle peasantry and of a certain decrease in the proportion of poor peasantry is here clearly expressed and substantiated by figures. This is the trend of that type of social and economic, cultural and political, development of our village brought about by the fundamental changes resultant on the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the **new principle** in the development of the Soviet village, distinguishing it from its pre-revolutionary past.

Hitherto we have only been able to support our assertions in the main by general Leninist conclusions and separate facts, but we have now at our disposal statistical proofs confirming our theses, and the indisputability of our facts can only be attacked by persons who have no idea of real life or of Marxism.

I pass on to the question of our agricultural proletariat.

There is no doubt that the agricultural proletariat has grown of late years. The rough calculations already made on this subject give the following results: Three years ago there were 2,700,000 agricultural labourers in the Soviet Union. The Central Statistics Administration is of the opinion — and the assumption appears to me sufficiently objective — that the number of agricultural labourers had increased to about 3,200,000 in the past economic year 1926/27.

We must above all remember that only about on half of the agricultural proletariat works on the individual peasant farms, whilst the other half is engaged in Soviet undertakings, co-operatives, and other State and socialised organisations. This is an important point, and its chief significance lies in the fact that our supporters in the village — the rural proletariat — are in direct contact with the Soviet, co-operative, and public organisations.

In conclusion, the kulak question.

Although many calculations have been made, it is in reality totally impossible to calculate, with even an approximate hope

of correctness, the actual proportion of the agricultural bourgeoisie over the whole Soviet Union. We have, however, material which enables us to gain a sufficient idea of the specific weight of all the social groups of the village. The best means of forming a judgment on the specific weight of the kulak is a comparison of the figures on wage labour in the village, on the development of land leasing, and on the commercial activities of the different elements in the village. It will be seen that during the last few years there has been a considerable increase of wage labour in the village. The percentage of farms employing paid labour varies; in accordance with the economic conditions in the various districts, from 2.9 to 7.8 per cent.; this enables us to form an idea of the development of wage labour in the Soviet village.

I need not quote any special figures on the land leasing question.

There is a distinct increase in the number of lease agreements made, and it is chiefly the middle peasants who lease additional land. If we compare the area of leased arable land with the total area of arable land, we find this to be 6.7 per cent., an extremely low figure compared with pre-war conditions. The percentage of farms both leasing additional land and employing paid labour, that is, of farms which are to be reckoned as a rule to the kulak farms, is 3.7 per cent. in the R. S. F. S. R., 2.4 per cent. in the U. S. S. R., 4.4 per cent. in the Caucasus, and 3.7 per cent. on an average for the whole Soviet Union. I give only a few figures, but these serve to characterise the development of the capitalist element in the village.

Although these data and figures bear eloquent witness to the fact that the capitalist elements are making very slow progress indeed in the village at the present time, still it must be observed that the process has been noticeably more rapid during the last few years. And although a number of districts, for instance North Caucasus, are able to record a definite decline in the process of growth of the uppermost stratum of the village (falling specific weight of its arable land, livestock, and agricultural machine equipment in comparison with the total agricultural population of the district in question), still it cannot be denied that on the whole the process of the growth of the capitalist elements in the village has been much strengthened of late years (the hiring of agricultural equipment by the economically weak peasants plays an increasingly important part in the economy of the village).

We have already data from various districts which show plainly that the percentage of kulaks is considerably greater than the characteristic features mentioned above (paid labour and land leasing) would lead us to suppose. The North Caucasian district committee, for instance, informs us that the percentage of kulaks in this district, according to the statements of a special commission, exceeds 6 per cent. at the present time, this signifying an increase of over 100 per cent. as compared with 1923. In South Siberia the percentage of kulaks at the present time is 6.3 per cent. (again according to the statements of a special commission appointed by the Siberian district committee of the Party). A special inquiry made in one of the districts of the government of Samara, where the process of differentiation is proceeding with unusual rapidity, shows the kulak percentage here to be over 8 per cent. On the other hand there are districts, such as those in the north eastern area for instance, where the percentage of farms employing paid labour for brief terms does not amount to more than 2.5 per cent. These districts are obviously developing under different conditions with respect to social differentiation.

All this shows the necessity of according increased attention to the question of the differentiation of the village.

### III. THE COURSE OF THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE

We know that the process of growth of capitalist elements in our village is continuing. This has been sufficiently demonstrated, and is not disputed by the Party. But we know too that during the last few years the socialist elements in the village have grown to a much greater extent. And we further know that this struggle between socialist and capitalist elements has not been going on for only a year, but for much longer, and that it will continue for some years to come, in many cases

in acuter and extended forms. But the preponderance of forces is distinctly to the disadvantage of the capitalist elements.

We know that the course of development of the individual farm to Socialism is bound to be slow and tedious. Many years will have to pass before the system of the individual farm passes into the system of the socialised (collective) farm. The development of the individual farm will take time, and meanwhile we must work at the same time to accomplish the increased specific weight and growth of the socialist elements in the village, and to find the right way to strengthen Socialism among the peasantry. One of our tasks with regard to the small peasantry is the promotion of the development of the productive forces of the peasant farm. The Soviet power is adopting all possible measures to promote this development of the productive forces of our village. We are well aware that the N. E. P. itself — the "New Economic Policy" — was a concession to the middle peasant, to the small owner who still prefers the individual to the collective undertaking. We have adhered to this policy, and shall continue to adhere to it so long as the small peasant undertaking continues to exist.

The Party has done everything to further the development of the productive forces of the small farm, but the Party cannot in any circumstances agree to that interpretation of this furtherance which is made by the groups hostile to the Party and to the working class, by the whole of the big and petty bourgeoisie, and by the Opposition following in the wake of the bourgeoisie.

Comrades, I shall quote to you a passage from Trotzky's report on "Our new tasks", published after the XIV. Party Conference, and pronouncing an estimate on the development of agriculture. Trotzky, the leader of the Opposition, formed at that time the following estimate of the decisions of the XIV. Party Conference:

"Until we can give the village highly developed techniques we have two possibilities: Either we apply the methods of War Communism in the village and retard the development of productive forces there, which would lead to a shrinkage of the market and thereby to a simultaneous retardation of the productive forces of industry, or we must permit, until (delightful, this "until" W. M.) we can collectivise agriculture with the means of our industry, the development of the productive forces of the village with the aid of capitalist methods. This is the essence of the present period of our policy." (L. Trotzky, "Our new tasks". Report at the conference of the Party organisation of Saporoshye. 1st September, 1925.)

According to Trotzky, the "essence of the present period of our policy" is that we promote the productive forces of the village "with the aid of capitalist methods". Anyone who can speak of our policy, and especially of the decisions of the XIV. Party Conference, in this manner, is already standing with both feet on the basis of bourgeois ideology, and is already involuntarily expressing that ideology, just as we often find professors of the People's Commissariat for Agriculture, and various organs which in themselves do valuable special work, endeavouring to pursue a line of policy with regard to the general questions of village politics which will be found on examination to be in reality an anti-Soviet economic line, a kulak line, a bourgeois line.

Our appraisal of the New Economic Policy and of the decisions of the XIV. Party Conference is of course entirely different. The policy of the N. E. P. and the policy of the XIV. Party Conference is a policy of certain permissible concessions, sanctioned by the Soviet State, to the small peasant farm, the small producer of goods, forming the main mass of our rural population, but not representing any capitalist element. Therefore a confusion of these limited concessions to the small peasant, even though he be at the same time a small owner, means the confusion of this policy with the policy of developing the village "with the aid of capitalist methods", that is, such methods as have been plainly described by Marx as "sucking the blood from the heart and the brain from the head of the peasant". To confuse these two ideas is to fail to understand the ABC of Marxism, and to go over in principle to the camp of the bourgeois ideologists.

It has been, and still is, our constant endeavour to promote the development of agriculture and its productive forces. This is

our main task, and we must never lose sight of it. We have already achieved much towards the fulfilment of this task. But the level which we have attained is still extremely low in comparison with the agriculture of the leading capitalist countries.

The question of the regulation of the distribution of land is the most important question of our work in the village. This regulation is the most elementary prerequisite for the further serious development of the productive forces of the village. At the present time the land regulation is literally everywhere insufficient, and quite untenable. We need only take the question of land regulation within the village itself. It has been carried out in the R.S.F.S.R. to the extent of 12 per cent., in the Ukraine to 15 per cent. This is entirely inadequate.

I need not deal in detail with our successes in the cultivation of land, livestock breeding, etc., but must make one observation with regard to this. All signs go to show that the proletarian revolution is bound to exercise great revolutionary influence during the next few years on the huge growth of the productive forces of the entire national economy, including agriculture. An article which I recently read by the well known livestock breeding specialist Professor J. A. Bogdanov ("The course of agriculture", published in the periodical "Putyi Selyskovo Chosyaystva"), appears to me symptomatic.

Professor Bogdanov speaks of "revolutionary factors in livestock breeding and its technics". When reading his article, we obtain the impression that his enthusiasm is aroused by the mighty advance which has been made in livestock breeding and livestock technics since the October Revolution, which liquidated large land ownership, and opened out the wide co-operative path to the development of agriculture. He states that entirely new spheres of activity have been made possible to the technics of the breeding and maintenance of livestock; that new branches of science have sprung up, new methods of applying these sciences, etc. And all this, says the professor, is the result of the October Revolution, which has opened out hitherto unknown possibilities in this most important branch of agriculture, and not only in agriculture, but in the whole of our national economy. We have, however, as yet accorded but little attention to this subject, a further proof that we know much too little about the village and the actual needs of the peasantry.

The next point to be considered is the advancement of the productive forces of the village under the given conditions.

This advancement consists at the present time in the growth of the productive forces of the small producers, and this again results in the growth of the capitalist elements in the village. The whole policy of our Party, directed to the raising of the productive forces of the small undertaking of the middle peasants, and the poor peasantry, can only be properly understood if we remember that this policy is inseparable from a number of permanent, systematic, and ever-extending measures for restricting the growth of the capitalist elements. Every step taken to advance our productive forces must be accompanied by measures for suppressing the growth of the capitalist elements. This restriction of capitalist elements can be accomplished by various ways and means. Among these may be numbered our measures restricting land rents, hired labour, etc., which I need not go into here. The theses submitted to the Party Congress give a number of new and directly applicable restrictions on the capitalist elements of the village.

But however efficiently the policy of restriction of capitalist elements may be carried out, it is and remains only a palliative. The policy of restriction is unavoidable so long as we have neither the strength, nor the possibility to take radical socialist measures for the advancement of agriculture. And we see that of late the Party has been intensely occupied with the question of what is to be done next, now that the pre-war level has been attained. What course must be taken by the economic development of our village under the given conditions?

Many articles have been published of late, dealing with this question from different aspects. Some articles have set us the task of liquidating within a definite time, for instance ten years, certain untenable conditions with respect to lack of equipment, farms without horses, etc. Others again lay the greatest emphasis on the question of the struggle against the differentiation of the village. I myself am of the opinion that

the views here taken of the most urgent of our village questions (lack of equipment and differentiation) are incorrect, and not in accordance with Marxism. It is not correct to separate the task of liquidating the shortage of equipment from our general fundamental tasks in the village. Nor is it correct to advance the question of the struggle against differentiation in the village separated from all other questions.

Both standpoints are wrong, and cannot lead to any result. They are wrong because they ignore the fundamental, scientific Marxist class conception of economic facts.

To adopt these standpoints is to lose sight of the main point, that is, the social and economic conditions of village development on the one hand and the connections between this development and that of the city (industry, etc.) on the other. The only right way to tackle this problem is to overcome the capitalist elements in the village.

Since the introduction of the N.E.P. the Party has been pursuing a persistent policy of restriction of the growth of the capitalist elements by means of progressive taxation, of limitations on land leasing, of increased demands in the interests of hired agricultural labour, and of aiding the economically weak undertakings by means of credits and by the whole policy of the Soviet power, including powerful support lent by State industry. It is our task to pursue a course which will lead to the complete abolition and liquidation of the capitalist elements both in the village and in the city. In a word, this task is nothing more nor less than the task of building up Socialism. This brief formula sums up the fact that neither the question of deficient agricultural equipment nor the question of differentiation in the village can be solved if isolated from the general and fundamental task of abolishing the capitalist elements in the village, and from the general task of socialist construction. It is our task to call upon the working class to induce the peasantry to join them in overcoming and liquidating the capitalist elements of the village. This is the only way, the Marxist and Leninist way, for the communist to set about his task in the village. This means that from the moment when the development of the productive forces of town and country regained the pre-war level, or even passes it slightly, the whole policy of the Party in the village must consist of those steps best calculated to secure, most effectively and most advantageously for the peasantry, the transition from the small individual undertaking to the large socialised undertaking. This is in principle the practical task now before us. This is the only possible way for us to liquidate the lack of equipment and the differentiation in the village.

#### IV. CO-OPERATION AND COLLECTIVE LARGE SCALE AGRICULTURE.

Comrades, as I have already remarked, it is very easy to set fine tasks and aims. But here we have to make ourselves familiar with the realities and the actual life of the village, in order to be able to answer the question of how to proceed to the realisation of these tasks. Where are we to look for support for the accomplishment of the most important task of the Party in the village?

At the present time the goods supply to the village is already more than 50 per cent., in the hands of our co-operative system, and almost two thirds of all agricultural products reaching the markets pass through the hands of the State and co-operative organs. These two facts alone, showing as they do the rôle played by State and co-operatives in supplying the village and in selling agricultural products, are sufficient evidence that at the present time economic life in the village is developing on very different lines from those of the first period of the N. E. P.

The regulation of economic relations between town and country depends chiefly on us, the Soviet State.

We must realise that this increases our responsibility towards the village.

But this we have not yet grasped sufficiently; we have not fully realised the enormous responsibility resting upon every communist, and upon all those who are working in the Soviet or co-operative apparatus.

It is most important to remember that the peasant grasps and understands this very well, whilst we communists are just beginning to realise it. But we must realise it as rapidly as possible and take up the matter very seriously, for upon this depends the whole economic and social development of the village and with this the development of industry itself. The prices of the industrial goods supplied to the villages are fixed for the most part by us; the same applies to the purchase prices for agricultural products. Do you think the peasant is not fully aware of this? He is. He knows very well that we regulate the prices. This point is perfectly clear to him, and he reacts speedily to serious errors of which we may be guilty, as any small owner reacts when the interests of his property are at stake.

At the moment it is of the utmost importance to lend such aid to the peasant as will enable him to increase his agricultural production. Given stable prices for agricultural products, there is only one way of furthering the interests of the peasant and the profitability of land cultivation, and that is by increasing the quantity of products produced and the agricultural production.

How can we improve the position of agriculture? What means have we at our disposal for increasing agricultural production?

We must first of all bear in mind that at the present time our agriculture is split up into a huge number of small peasant farms, and that the number of small farms has increased with the revolution. We have about 24 million small peasant farms. As the People's Commissariat for agriculture calculates, under present conditions it is unprofitable for one third of the small peasant farms to keep even one horse. This is the first fact. But it is not the only one, for practically the same applies to the use of agricultural machinery.

In our towns we have the fundamental advantage that the means of production of our large scale industry are in the hands of the proletariat, so that it is easy for us to beat the remnants of the bourgeoisie in this field, but in the village the economic situation is precisely reversed. In the village it is the kulak and the rich peasant who have the advantage of production on a large scale. We are doing our utmost to help the poor and middle peasantry, we erect firm barriers of progressive taxation, fixed lease rates, and rent conditions, holding back the capitalist elements, but we have not abolished the economic ascendancy of the large farm over the small; up to now we have not even seriously attacked this profound inconsistency in the village.

This means that the struggle between the Socialist and the capitalist elements in the village is going on under conditions in which the middle peasant and the village poor, the main mass of the village, conducting miserably poor individual peasant farms, are in an almost hopeless position; their progress is but slow, although ten years have passed since the revolution, and it might have been supposed that in this time they could have made huge strides forward. The advantages enjoyed by large and well-to-do peasant farms, in comparison with the small and often primitive farms of the middle and poor peasantry, forces us to devote more serious thought to this problem. It must be made perfectly clear to the peasantry that this is the main ill of the village, that there is a fundamental economic contradiction here and that therefore this is the point around which our work in the village should be focussed.

The attitude of the peasants themselves to this question may be seen from the following passage from a letter from Comrade Grandov, editor of the newspaper "Byednota" ("Village poor"). Comrade Grandov writes:

"In the course of the past year we have noticed a certain category of letter, which, though not very numerous, throw an interesting light on one standpoint held with regard to the Soviet farms. The import of these letters, stated briefly, is approximately as follows: 'Take our land, organise large farms, and let us work on them. We are tired of all the bother and worry of our dwarf farms.'

In our opinion these letters are an indirect reflection of the perfectly incredible difficulties encountered by the ordinary small farm in its efforts to work its way upwards.

Up to the present, letters of this kind are few and far between. But what do they signify? As Comrade Grandov very rightly says, they mean that the peasant has wandered into a blind alley, since in agriculture all advantages lie on the side of the well-to-do kulak elements. This is the pivot upon which the present situation in the village turns. To overlook this fundamental economic fact is to fail utterly to grasp the situation, is to ignore the pressing need of our middle and poor peasant farms, which are seeking more and more urgently a means of escape from their difficult position. We, comrades, the Party of the most advanced workers, must fully understand the situation, and must seize upon this awakening desire of the working peasants for large collective undertakings. We must support initiative in this direction in every possible way, and work for the accomplishment of this task. We must concentrate our efforts in the village on the utilisation of our co-operative and state organs in the task of solving the fundamental economic problems confronting the middle and poor peasant strata of the village.

Of late we have devoted much attention to the conclusion of contracts for the supply of agricultural products, that is, contracts between various branches of industry and the corresponding branches of agriculture. The high degree of importance attained by this question is due to the fact that it has not been derived from books, but has originated in the actual practice of economic and co-operative work in some of our most important districts. This question of contracts is another example of the new ideas maturing in our village, and leading to an entirely new standpoint with regard to agricultural production. Contracts between sugar manufacturers and kulak farms, under which the latter supplied certain undertakings with beet-roots, are nothing new. And contracts have often enough been made by which a certain factory was supplied with a certain quantity of sugar beets at a certain price. But these have been agreements between sugar capitalists and kulaks, that is, village capitalists.

The agreements now being made are of an entirely different character.

A contract will be made, for instance, between the sugar industry and the agricultural co-operatives of some district, ensuring the supply of a certain quantity of products.

Such progress has already been made in this direction that agreements (contracts) for the supply of beet-roots have been concluded with nearly 900,000 peasant farms. Almost 100 per cent., that is, almost one million peasant farms growing sugar beets, are not only organised in the co-operatives, but sell their products to our industry by means of these contracts.

Let us take another example, cotton growing.

Here conditions are similar: Here again almost three quarters of a million peasant farms are supplying their cotton to our corresponding undertakings on the basis of contracts.

Further. Similar contractual relations are developing between the flax-growing and the linen industry. Here the figures are not quite so high, but nevertheless nearly 150,000 farms are working on such contracts. In the same manner the agreements for the supply of sunflower seed embrace about 150,000 farms.

These, comrades, are the most important facts showing that the elements of planned economy have already penetrated far into agriculture. About 2 million peasant farms have already been included in our planned system in this way. Regarded from the standpoint of laying down the lines of development of planned action on agriculture, from the standpoint of the combination of agriculture and industry, and of the formation of the elements of large collective farms, the question of these contracts is of immense importance. For it is clear that when the sugar trust, for instance, or the cotton committee supplies the districts with which it has concluded contracts with complicated agricultural machinery (through the co-operatives), or with machines unattainable by the small separate farms, and the advantages of the collective use of these is practically demonstrated to the peasants, then the peasant farms will speedily realise the advantages to be gained by collective agricultural production, and will indeed be forced to the collectivisation of production. For this reason the contract

system is invaluable for the introduction of a planned system into agriculture, and for strengthening the elements of extensive collective production in the village.

Further, there is the question of agricultural industry, that is, of that village industry, chiefly co-operative, which works up the agricultural raw materials. There are 600 small oil mills and cheese making dairies, working up the products of 960,000 co-operated peasant farms. Here again about one million peasant farms are organised in one co-operative system, in which agricultural products are worked up on co-operative lines (without amalgamating agricultural production itself). The higher demands hereby placed on the producers induces these to resort to collective cultivation of the land with the aid of efficient agricultural machines, and prepares the way for collective harvesting, collective livestock breeding, etc. A further fact demanding serious attention is that the agricultural products of about one million farms are being worked up in the dairies and oil seed undertakings. This is a valuable starting point for the preparation of the requisite conditions for the organisation of collective production on a large scale in the village.

Let us call to mind what Lenin said on this point in his article on co-operation: "With us the co-operative undertakings differ both from the private capitalist and the collective undertakings. But they do not differ from the socialist undertakings (the emphasis is mine, W. M.) if they are based on the land, and belong to the State, that is, to the working class". We have not yet sufficiently grasped these words of Lenin, or at least we have failed to give them adequate consideration in our practical work. These comrades are the most important factors paving the way to large collective production in the village, through the agency of the co-operatives.

The progress which I have above described shows that we have not only discovered the road to the collectivisation of the millions of our peasant farms, but that we are really advancing, step by step, by means of the gradual development of the separate elements of agricultural large scale production, towards inducing the peasants to take up the collectivisation of agriculture. But we must devote considerably more attention to the great collective agricultural undertakings thus developing, for they require our utmost efforts and all round support and endeavours on the part of both our Party and the whole working class.

I must now pass on to the collective undertakings. As a rule it is assumed, when speaking of the formation of great collective farms, that the means and ways hitherto employed for their organisation are the only possible ones. This is, however, not the case. We must of course not forget that the chief means for the mass transition from the individual small peasant farm to the large collective farm has been, and will be, the co-operative. But at the same time we must not forget that the means hitherto adopted for the formation of village collective undertakings — communes, group farms, etc. — is of great importance to us, and will be of even greater from now onwards in the work now beginning for the wholesale collectivisation of the village.

Whatever the estimate which we may form of the rôle and importance of the collective farms in our country, there is one fact which cannot be disputed: That one million human beings are already organised in our collective undertakings. When we add together the various descriptions of collective agricultural undertakings, we find that about one million persons (not undertakings, but persons) have already been gathered together in these collectivised undertakings. A fact of no inconsiderable significance.

We know that the communes, and in part the "artels" (agricultural productive co-operatives) passed through a crisis during the first years of the N. E. P., and their number declined somewhat. The number of communes has not increased noticeably during the last few years, but the number of artels is again increasing. The co-operatives working for the common cultivation of land have made even greater progress. In view of all this it is impermissible for us to devote so little attention to collective undertakings as we have done hitherto. We must take into account the fact that there has been an advance from the more complicated forms of the collective undertaking in the village, the communes, to a greater growth of the agri-

cultural productive co-operatives. It is extremely characteristic that the middle peasant in particular inclines to these forms of the collective undertaking, for he is beginning to come to the conclusion that there is not much prospect for the development of small individual peasant farms. This is a sign that the peasant, with his "sense of touch", is really beginning to feel his way towards the sole exit from the sphere of the backward individual peasant farm.

There are other forms of combines among the peasant undertakings which must also be mentioned in this connection, which acquire importance in view of the reorganisation of agriculture on the collective basis. These are the so-called simple co-operatives, i. e. machine co-operatives, soil improvement co-operatives, horse breeding co-operatives, etc. These descriptions of co-operatives are again means towards the gradual collectivisation of agriculture on a broad scale, for they serve to unite certain elements of the peasant undertakings (for instance, the use of agricultural machinery, a point of special importance for collectivisation). These co-operatives also already comprise about one million peasant farms, and have thus already attained a position of considerable importance. More than 100,000 farms are organised in machine co-operatives, 700,000 in soil improvement co-operatives, and several tens of thousands in each of the groups belonging to the horse breeding co-operatives, seed supply co-operatives — a new and particularly difficult form of organisation. It is deserving of note that these organisations are growing rapidly from year to year, at an almost incredible rate. In the course of about two years (from 1924 to 1926) their number has increased almost sevenfold, and the number of their members sixfold!

All this shows us the enormous importance of the position already gained by the various forms of collectivisation in our agriculture. The examples I have cited give an idea of what is new and socialist in our agriculture. They form a guarantee of the really socialist direction of our collectivised agricultural development, in spite of the many mistakes which we still have to record.

The Soviet farms in their totality have already emerged from the period of unprofitable work, and are now earning profits. (A voice: "Hear, hear!") Two years have already passed since they began to work at a profit. Their earnings are small, but of a characteristic nature. We have still many inefficient Soviet farms, working at a loss, but the system of the Soviet farm itself stands on a firm basis, is advancing steadily, and is beginning to furnish here and there proof of the advantages of the large agricultural undertaking, larger crops, etc. This is a great asset, and one which we could not record until just recently. At the same time it is something new in the development of agriculture. This fact shows that State agriculture is advancing side by side with the development of the elements tending towards large collectivised agricultural undertakings.

The conclusions to be drawn from all this are the following: The Soviet farms must receive every possible support. The network of Soviet farms must be extended in those districts where there is no shortage of land. Even under present conditions we must aim at making our Soviet farms models of what the large agricultural undertaking should be, showing the peasantry the advantages of the large collective farm. These are our tasks with respect to the Soviet farms. At the same time the Soviet farms must take up the task of helping the farmers in their neighbourhood, especially the village poor and the economically weak peasant farms, by means of the organisation of tractor services, agronomic information centres, loaning of agricultural machines, etc.

Another important question is that of agricultural credit.

Here I shall only refer to a few of the most important figures. In this economic year, 1927/28, we are granting from State resources 704 million roubles to the different branches of agriculture, the distribution being mainly effected through the system of agricultural credits. This sum suffices in itself to show what effective weapons we possess for influencing the development of agriculture.

We give the peasantry these State means in order to aid the advancement of agriculture. Last year about 37 per cent. of the total sum expended by the State for this purpose was granted to the socialist section of our agriculture, and for

1927-28 we intend that 39 per cent. of the total sum falls to socialised agriculture. The distribution of these sums are thus made to further the aims of the collective agricultural undertaking. Is it not incumbent on us to support more strongly than ever the co-operatives and the collective farming undertakings? Of course we must and can do this, and the state aid thus given is of the utmost value. And can the sums invested in agriculture by the State not serve to increase the inflow into the co-operatives and collective undertakings of means raised by the peasants themselves? The co-operatives and the agricultural credit system, properly organised, can contribute greatly to bring this about.

Let us cast a glance at the prospects of state investments for the next five years. We find that even according to a minimum calculation (maximum 2 milliard roubles) 1650 million roubles will be expended by our government for this purpose during this time.

I need not deal in detail with the influence exercised by our state industry, not only our sugar and cotton undertakings, but our tobacco and other industries working up the products of agriculture. The Five Years' Plan drafted by the Supreme Economic Council assumes an expenditure of 850 million roubles (from state resources, beyond the sum mentioned above) for the advancement of the cultivation of agricultural raw materials required by our industries. Much depends upon the manner, through what organisations, etc., this fresh milliard of state money is to be invested in agriculture.

Finally, the question of the electrification of agriculture. I can add nothing to what Comrade Kschichanovsky has already reported to you on this subject. He has presented us with a very vivid picture of the great network of electric works provided by our Plan, which will link up the most important agricultural regions of the Soviet Union at the close of the ten years' period and enable us to supply every peasant farm with at least 3 to 4 HP. This gives us a fair idea of the gigantic prospects of development opening out before our agriculture.

## V. THE COLLECTIVISATION OF AGRICULTURE, OUR TACTICS, AND THE CULTURAL QUESTION.

What are the tasks set the Party by the above, and what are the tactics to be adopted?

We have now seven years of the N. E. P. behind us, and have gained much experience during this time for use in the work of socialist construction. It is clear to us all that these seven years of the N. E. P. have proved that we have chosen the right path towards building up Socialism, and that we, together with the working class, know not only our goal but the road to that goal.

Along what paths should we continue to advance towards Socialism? On this there is no longer any possible doubt for our Party. The path to be taken is that of the N. E. P. and the alliance with the peasantry. We have, however, been obliged to contend against the prejudices of the Opposition with respect to the N. E. P. and to our relations with the peasantry. It will be remembered that at the XIV. Party Congress speakers came forward on this platform and maintained that the N. E. P. was nothing more nor less than a policy of retreat. The obvious absurdity of this assertion has been completely refuted, not only theoretically, but by the whole course of our advance towards Socialism in town and country. We were, and are aware that with the N. E. P. we made a concession to the small peasant owners, but as early as the XI. Party Congress the Party, headed by Lenin, declared: The retreat is ended. The retreat was ended, and already at that time we began to push forward on a broader front. Since that time, a period of about six years, we have advanced, the socialist elements taking the offensive against the remnants of capitalism.

When so much is now said about a "sharper attack" on the kulaks and the capitalist elements of the village, it seems to me that this formula does not contain anything new. There can be no more decided and effectual attack on the capitalist elements than the building up of Socialism in town and country. The whole of our work is directed towards strengthening and developing our socialist elements at the expense of the capi-

talist. An intensified attack on the kulaks and the capitalist elements of the village — this is what the building up of Socialism in our country represents. The development of the co-operative system and of the collective elements in our agriculture, the whole of our economic, cultural, and other work — this is the attack on the capitalist elements of the village; and it is an attack which has not only been taken up this year. The question is not whether it is necessary or not to make a "sharper attack" on the kulak, etc. It is obvious that we must, and there is nothing to dispute about here. What we are concerned with is the best method of conducting this attack, and at what point this attack must be launched. This is the decisive question, the only question. The Party must find a new answer to it.

Up to a few days ago we have had to combat the anti-middle peasant deviation of the Trotskyist Opposition, and we are still combating that lack of faith in the possibility of our building up Socialism, under the given conditions, with the co-operation of the middle peasantry. We could not regard the anti-middle peasant deviation as anything else but a bourgeois prejudice. At the present moment, at the time of the XV. Party Congress, we have practically left this part of our struggle behind us. Should it prove necessary, however, then we are still prepared to inflict severe raps, and when necessary even boxes on the ear, on all who attempt to bring up the anti-middle peasant deviation for renewed discussion.

But this is not everything.

We must never forget — and our seven years' experience with the N. E. P. must surely impress it on our memory — what Lenin said as early as 1919: No undue haste, no hurry, on the part of the Party and the Soviet power in the middle peasant question. That we have learned this lesson fairly well may be seen in the complete collapse and dissolution of the Trotskyist opposition.

But it is now necessary to understand something else, and that is that we are logging behind actual life, and not keeping pace with all that is new and Socialist in the development of our village.

Look at our press, our agitation, our literature, our Party, Soviet, and co-operative organs. Do we devote much attention to the fresh impetus towards Socialism in the village, and above all to the elements of collective agriculture now springing up everywhere? We ought to send out many agitators for the cause of the great collective undertakings. We should have newspapers following up with the utmost care every trend towards social economy in the village. (A voice: "Hear, hear!"). We need literature, trained communists and non-Party agitators, actual experts in the organisation of the large collective agricultural undertaking. But how often we lack all these elements. Here is our weak point, it is here where we are found wanting.

The new and really socialist tasks set us by our present work in the village require new people, a new comprehension on the part of new communists and non-Party workers, and a new attitude towards the experience gained in large scale agricultural undertakings abroad (America and Europe). In this respect we accomplish too little, and must endeavour to accomplish more.

How shall we go about our new tasks in the village?

It is not difficult to work out the most wonderful plans, but the following reservation must be made at the very outset: The facts mentioned above show that elements tending towards the formation of great collective undertakings already exist in our village. These are growing, and all that is required is to encourage them; there is no need first to call them into existence.

Our work for the fulfilment of our tasks in the village must always keep one rule in view: No vain imaginings with regard to the village, nor with regard to the development of great collective agricultural undertakings; no "inventions" on this matter on the part of municipal, Soviet, Party, and other organisations; here we will find much that is useful in the experience won in the first seven years of the N. E. P., especially the realisation that the work of socialist construction in the village requires care and caution, no hasty leaps and bounds.

Our chief shortcoming at present is a lack of boldness and perseverance in the promotion of the collective undertaking in the village.



The reason for this shortcoming is that we are too little familiar with the subject.

The path to Socialism in the village leads from the small individual farms to the great collective farm, equipped with the latest technical achievements.

What methods can be applied in this connection?

At the VIII. Party Congress Lenin showed that the first prerequisite is the entire renunciation of compulsory measures in our relations to the middle peasantry. This applies equally to the present period. Those who employ compulsion in order to get the middle peasantry to adopt large scale methods of production are the enemies of the workers and peasants, and undermine the alliance between the workers and peasants.

What are our methods? In the first place we have our conviction, but this is in itself very insufficient. What we require is not conviction alone, but **conviction plus stimulation** of the developing elements of collective agriculture with the aid of the proletarian State — **this is our method for the collectivisation of the village.** Our chief task in the village is to convince and urge on the peasantry, to show them ways and means of escape from their difficult economic position. The combination of conviction with practical stimulation is the right method of developing collectivisation in the village.

From this there naturally arises our conception of the main slogan to be issued for our present work in the village.

I should like here to refer to the Communist Party of the Ukraine, which has just issued its formulation of the main slogan for village work. I shall read you the passage in which the Party Conference of the C. P. U. just ended lays down its slogan for the present juncture. In the theses on the work in the village, passed by the Party Conference, we read:

"The main slogan for the period immediately before us is the struggle for the multiple field system and for the transition to the rotation of crops."

After all I have said in these reports on our future tasks, it can scarcely be maintained that the promotion of the rotation of crops plays any "main rôle in the period immediately before us". Does it not seem to you, with conditions as they are, that this slogan is somewhat tinged with liberalism? (A voice: "Hear, hear!") The transition to the multiple field system and rotation of crops is the dream of every good agronomist. I am fully convinced that this "main slogan" has only crept into the theses of the C. P. U. for the reason that the members of the People's Commissariat for Agriculture took an active part in the debate, and the C. C. of the C. P. U. underestimated the serious importance under present conditions of such an expression as the "main slogan" for village work. Nobody wishes to deny that the transition to the multiple field system and rotation of crops is of the utmost importance, or even that it is one of the prerequisites for the advancement of agriculture and in part for the advancement of the collectivisation of the village. But we cannot for a moment agree to its assuming the place of "main slogan". To me it seems that the transition to the multiple field system and rotation of crops is a matter of the greatest importance and necessity. But this transition alone would accomplish nothing. This is not our main task in the village. If we are to issue a slogan for the present moment, then this must be: **Forward to the collective big undertaking.** That is the slogan for the present moment. (A voice: "Hear, hear!")

What is lacking most of all in the village, especially in connection with our new tasks?

Culture, culture, and again culture.

In our village today every shortcoming originates in the lack of culture. In whatever direction we look, it is always our lack of culture, our backwardness, which deprives us of the possibility of developing the new forces springing up in the village.

Lenin said that the cultural revolution is now all important for us. "This cultural revolution will enable us to become a completely socialist country". Is this true? It is perfectly right. Now we understand this better than ever. Without a real raising of the level of culture we shall not be able to stride rapidly forward, although we have already attained a firm economic basis and many of the first prerequisites. Cul-

ture means rapid advance along the path on which we have as yet proceeded but slowly.

There can be no thought of an easy leap from the individual to the great collective farm. Step by step we must progress to the large scale collective agricultural undertaking.

We must realise this down to its last consequences, and must work for the propaganda of the collective idea in the village as the sole possible means of really developing the productive forces of agriculture, and of encouraging the elements already tending towards collectivisation in the village. The bureaucracy and lack of culture of the Soviet and co-operative organs, and even of the Party organs, are a serious hindrance. The bureaucracy and the lack of culture of our organs hamper our development to an extent often rendering it impossible for us to support, strengthen, and develop effectually the new and socialist tendencies arising in the village.

It is now clearer than ever that the backwardness of the masses is chiefly to blame for the many shortcomings of our work in the village and represents the greatest stumbling block in the way of the development of the village.

It would, however, be entirely wrong to say: We are backward in culture, and therefore we cannot organise collective agriculture. This would be foolishness; it would be Menshevism, it would be a bourgeois ideology hostile to the working class and the peasantry.

Our cultural level will rise **simultaneously** with the reorganisation of village economy on the principle of mass co-operation, simultaneously with the improved work of the leading organs, and simultaneously with the increased participation of the masses in the work.

When we look at this question from the standpoint of the broad masses, culture and the ability to work in a leading position are closely bound up with one another.

How are matters in this respect at the moment?

A few figures on the cultural status of our village will suffice to give you a fright. 43 per cent. of the male population and two thirds of all the women of the Soviet Union are illiterate.

The work of political enlightenment makes little progress in the village. Only listen to the complaints of those Party comrades who are sent to the rural districts to enlighten the peasants politically! Our peasant literature is not growing, on the contrary, it has fallen off during the last three years.

Both the number and the editions of the peasants' newspapers have diminished. In comparison with 1925, the number of peasants' newspapers has sunk by 25 per cent., the circulation of these newspapers by 11 per cent. (A voice: "They were supplied gratis at first!"). We did not supply them gratis, even at first. And in any case it is high time to record an improvement and not a decline, even if there were no question of gratis supplies, but of payment. (A voice: "Hear, hear".)

The importance of the cultural demands of the village induces me to make here a practical and independent proposal.

The agricultural tax brings in about 300 million roubles. We exempt 35 per cent. of the peasantry from the payment of any taxes whatever. I am of the opinion that we must continue to do this, that is, that in the coming year no less than 35 per cent. must still be exempt from taxation. But we shall lose nothing, on the contrary, we shall gain in the eyes of the middle peasantry and village poor, that is, in the eyes of 95 per cent. of the total peasantry, if we add to these 300 million roubles an additional 100 million roubles obtained by the increased taxation of the better situated peasantry, and employ these 100 millions exclusively for the erection of schools and the furtherance of village culture. (Applause.)

In my opinion we must put another question, a general one: Is it not time for us to distribute state revenues on a somewhat altered plan, and to expend a larger portion of these revenues for cultural requirements? (Applause. Bukharin: "Hear, hear.") I am in entire agreement with Comrade Rykov's remarks in his report on the Five Years' Plan, in which he emphasises this necessity. This redistribution of revenues must be carried out by the reduction of administrative expenditure.

We must not, however, content ourselves with passing excellent resolutions, but must set to work at once to effect a certain redistribution of the means at our disposal, both state and local means, in the interests of the development of culture.

## VI. OUR RELATIONS TO THE WORKING PEASANTRY AND THE SLOGAN OF "VIVIFYING THE SOVIETS".

At every step we find confirmation of the fundamental idea that we cannot approach the masses of the village poor and middle peasantry as if they were merely some object to be inserted in the Soviet structure, and that we cannot adopt that "lordly" bourgeois attitude towards the peasantry so characteristic of the ideology of Trotzkyism. The village poor and the middle peasantry are not the object, but the subject of our structure. The working peasant is our ally, the subject in the building up of Socialism, the active and increasingly conscious participator in this work of construction. This alone can be our attitude towards the masses of the poor and middle peasantry.

The immediate logical conclusion is the correctness of the slogan of the vivification of the Soviets.

We vivify the Soviets for the reason that it is imperatively necessary to induce the active participation in the work of socialist construction of the millions and millions of poor peasants, agricultural labourers, and middle peasants, the masses forming the main body and the centre of our village of today.

We know only too well that the vivifying of the Soviets is often taken up in a very bureaucratic manner.

The form of vivifying the Soviets which we require is one which will gather around the Party, and around the working class, a considerably greater staff of functionaries drawn from the ranks of the non-Party village poor, the agricultural labourers, and the middle peasantry. This is the vivifying of the Soviets which we need in the present emergency; this would be a real vivification of the Soviets! This will help us to sweep away all the old remnants, to clear away the bureaucracy, cultural backwardness, and lack of understanding, which have crept afresh into many of our Soviets, co-operative, and even Party organs in their relations to the peasantry, and to abolish an attitude on the part of these organs which forms a serious obstacle to the advancement of the effectual work of the Party in the village.

Our organs, in actual practice, are guilty of every imaginable distortion of the Party line.

Above all I should like to emphasise the absolute impermissibility of the slightest deviation from revolutionary justice. Of this we have unheard of and amazing examples.

One particularly glaring case may be mentioned, the so-called Ryashsker affair.

In one of the Ryashsker districts (gouvernement Ryasan) of the Borjetzk district a band of bandits, robbers, and thieves held sway for five years, from 1922 till 1926. This band terrorised the whole surrounding district, threatened everybody, robbed and burnt down the farms of the peasantry. And this is a district not far from Moscow, in the gouvernement of Ryasan.

This matter has now been properly investigated and put an end to, thanks to the "Krestyanskaya Gaset" (a peasants' newspaper) and the aid of the G. P. U. (And thanks above all to the efforts of the heroic village correspondent, the young non-Party peasant W. T. Stschelokov, who has paid with his life for his bravery). The leaders of these bandits were captured and convicted of their deeds. It transpired that they had connections not only in the Executive Committee of the sub-district, but in various roundabout ways even relations with some members of the government Committee, the Gouvernement Control Commission, and the Gouvernement Court of Justice. (A voice: "Good gracious!") These criminal elements had even contrived to find weak spots in some of the workers in the Party and Soviet apparatus in the Gouvernement central, where, it appears, they had established some relations. (Bukharin: "Organisatory ones." A voice: "Hear, hear!") The three chief bandits have now been shot, in accordance with the sentence passed upon them. One member of the district committee of Ryashsk, Gavrilov, was sentenced to ten years imprisonment, etc. I know that the peasants in the Borjetzk district consider this entirely insufficient, and I share their opinion. I too consider this entirely insufficient.

Even now banditry has not been completely wiped out in the Borjetzk district. The peasants are still passing resolutions

at their village meetings, begging the higher Soviet organs to protect them from the fresh attacks of the remaining bandits. The peasants in this district are still suffering severely from the incursions of the remnants of the band of robbers, and hope for relief from the increased activity of the police. We cannot, however, content ourselves with this. To us it is not merely a matter of administrative and juridical measures.

We must go deeper than this; we must exterminate banditry once and for all at those roots which reach even into the Soviet apparatus, which make use even of the Party organs, and make our juridical and administrative organs subservient to their ends.

But what is now coming to light during the revision of the judicial apparatus in the Ryasan Gouvernement is perfectly astounding. At times it is almost incredible.

Comrade Krylenko has sent his representative, the deputy public attorney of the R. S. F. S. R., Comrade Friedberg to carry out the revision of the judicial apparatus in the Ryasan Gouvernement. But what Comrade Friedberg is now doing in Ryasan is incomprehensible. Two commissions have been formed for investigating the activities of the courts of law in the Ryasan Gouvernement, one for investigating complaints against individual officials, and a second for investigating the whole work of the administration of justice in this gouvernement. On 3rd December 1927, before he had finished this revision, Comrade Friedberg published in the Ryasan newspaper, the "Rabotschny Klitsch", an interview on the results of the revision, in which he draws the following "conclusions":

"The revision commission is of the opinion that the administration of justice is being carried out satisfactorily, and not only does not lag behind the other courts of law of the Republic in its achievements, but in some cases is ahead of these". (Laughter.) These, pardon the expression, "conclusions" of Comrade Friedberg, published in the press, do not in any way agree with the conclusions drawn by one of the two commissions carrying out the work of revision in Ryasan under the chairmanship of Comrade Friedberg. These "supplementary" and not yet published conclusions are somewhat different: Two deputy presidents of the court of law of the Gouvernement are to be removed from their positions, and called to account for drunkenness and for carrying on drinking bouts in company with accused persons. Two assistants of the public prosecutor are to be dismissed from their posts for a series of serious offences. This gives you some idea of the way in which the most highly respected bodies and personalities have been fulfilling their most elementary duties in the struggle for revolutionary justice in the land of the Soviets! If our revolutionary justice is to develop on these lines, we shall not proceed very far. In the cause of revolutionary justice we must act with the utmost determination, not only in the Ryasan affair, but in a much wider field, and do this in such a manner that the Courts themselves shall feel our action and be forced to take notice. (A voice: "Hear, hear!". Applause.)

The Soviets are now entering on a fresh phase of their development. This new phase must regulate the relations between the village Soviets and the land societies.

Until the land societies have been entirely subordinated to the Soviets, the slogan of "All power to the Soviets" will not be consistently carried out. Up to the present it has not infrequently happened that when we have vivified the Soviets the kulak has turned to the land societies, and sought to find a fulcrum there. (Kaganovitsch: "Hear, hear!") But now we shall drive him from this last entrenchment.

## VII. THE OPPOSITION.

Let us ask ourselves the question: what really practical supplementary proposals has the Opposition added to the Theses of the C. C.? Everything which is new in the Platform and Counter-Theses of the Opposition, everything containing even a glimmer of comprehension for the actual situation of the village, has been taken by the Opposition from our Theses. For the rest it occupies itself with demagogic criticism, with throwing of mud at various Soviet, co-operative, and credit organs, etc., and flies in a panic from the difficulties of work in the village — in which last they retreat into the camp of the Mensheviks.

Our Party has never failed to make necessary criticism of our means and methods, and is fully capable of criticising all our organs without the aid of oppositional demagoguery and calumny.

There is, however, one proposal of the Opposition with which I must deal, one which it obviously brings forward from motives of political speculation. I refer to that nebulous proposal for the organisation, in some vague future, of a "League of the Village Poor".

In my opinion this proposal is entirely wrong and impossible of acceptance. Why? Because at the present time it is the first task of the Party to secure for the village poor a position of decisive influence within our fundamental organisations themselves, and to ensure that they are not isolated, not placed outside of our leading organisations, of the Soviets, the collective undertakings and the general work for the building up of Socialism. This does not of course apply to the meetings of the village poor or to the village poor groups, whose work must be intensified and encouraged.

There is a great difference between the village poor groups and the organisation proposed by the Opposition. The village poor groups are formed on the basis of our organisations. They are immediate auxiliary organisations of our Party. Their forms — and this is extremely important — are extremely elastic, and invariably permit the selection of the most active and competent of the village poor for work in the Soviets and co-operatives.

As opposed to this, a mass organisation including expressly only the village poor would be bound to lead, under the conditions given by the economic progress of the village, to the transformation of a certain proportion of the poor peasants organised in the village poor leagues into middle peasants. And this would alter the social character of the organisation.

Our Theses on work in the village centre around our new tasks with regard to co-operation and collectivisation in the village, to the growth of the co-operatives, the growth of the elements of Socialism. What have the oppositionists to say to this? They simply pass it all by as if they were blind. Like the Mensheviks, they fail to observe anything socialist in our country at all. Like the bourgeois ideologists, they grasp nothing of what is going on around them. They are even proud of seeing nothing, and thereby receive the well-merited "thanks" of the workers and peasants, who refuse to give them any support.

The central question of our struggle against the Opposition is, however, the question of the middle peasant. The political insincerity of the Opposition in this question is well characterised by the fact that it endeavours to justify its anti-middle peasant deviation by twisting various passages from Lenin.

As a rule the Opposition appeals to the following passage from one of Lenin's articles: "We must come to an understanding with the middle peasant, without abandoning for one moment our fight against the kulak, firmly, and relying only on the support of the village poor." This, says the Opposition, is the most exact and best rule for the policy of our Party.

Is this the case, comrades?

No, it is not at all the case; for our present conditions it is entirely insufficient.

We must remember that this article was written in the autumn of 1918, during the period of the village poor committees. This was the period of the so-called neutralisation of the middle peasantry.

And this is the formula which the Opposition now wants to apply as the "most exact" line of policy towards the middle peasant. Is this not a scorning of Lenin?

The Opposition is obviously seeking to drag us backwards, away from Lenin's fundamental tenets, away from the permanent alliance with the middle peasantry during the period of socialist construction, back to the period of the neutralisation of the middle peasantry. Herewith it reveals completely its anti-Leninist policy. The Party has long since emerged from the period of the neutralisation of the middle peasantry, and has been realising since 1919 (since the VIII. Party Congress) the slogan of the firm alliance between the workers and the middle peasants for the building up of Socialism.

It is not by accident that the Opposition regards precisely this formula as its main formula. Even today, just before the XV. Party Congress, an opposition leader was to be found, I. N. Smirnov, who knew of nothing better to say about the middle peasantry at a Moscow Party Conference than the following:

"We maintain that we must revise our state budget in such a manner that the greatest part of our five milliard budget is expended on our industry, for it is better for us to fall out with the middle peasantry than to go to inevitable ruin."

These are the conceptions with which the Opposition approaches the question of the middle peasantry: Better fall out with the middle peasantry than go to inevitable ruin. (It sees nothing but the "ruin" and "collapse" of the proletarian dictatorship on all sides, but nothing will collapse as a result of all these outcries.)

We see from this that the Opposition is not thinking in the least of an alliance with the middle peasantry, that it does not believe in it, that it does not recognise this slogan, this principle, this Leninist policy in our Party, and that it is therefore obvious that the Opposition, holding such views, is bound to (Stalin: "collapse") not only collapse, but to put itself outside of our Party. (Applause.)

What is the economic basis of the alliance between the workers and peasants, the alliance between the proletariat and the poor and middle peasantry?

I shall bring forward three significant data, throwing light from the economic point of view on the principles of our alliance with the middle peasantry.

The yearly income of the agricultural labourer in the present year is 81 roubles per head, that of the poor peasant 78 roubles, and of the middle peasant 92 roubles. These are the peasant classes which we have in view when speaking of the alliance between the middle peasantry and the poor peasant and agricultural labourer. These figures show how close these class groups stand to one another, (besides showing the utmost necessity of an alliance enabling them to better the wretched economic situation of which these figures bear witness).

Those who are adventurous enough to advocate, or even to suggest, the destruction of the alliance between the poor and middle peasantry, thereby become the enemies of the workers and peasants, enemies of the October Revolution, enemies of the whole proletarian revolution.

In the co-operative question, too the Opposition appeals to Lenin, and cites passages from an article written on taxation in kind by Lenin in 1921: "Under Russia's present conditions freedom and rights for the co-operatives signify freedom and rights for capitalism." The Opposition, especially its sincerest section (the Saprionov group) takes this sentence as a basis for forming a judgment on the co-operatives under our present conditions.

The Opposition fails to see that the economic and social development of our country has changed fundamentally since that time. This change was recognised by Lenin in his brilliant article on "The co-operatives". Here he says that "under our present conditions the simple growth of the co-operatives is identical with the growth of Socialism".

The Opposition has further ideas of its own about co-operatives. It has even gone so far (in the documents of the Saprionov group) as to demand that we do away with the present co-operatives and replace them by a "state co-operative system". It demands, through the Saprionov Smirnov group, that representatives of the State should be appointed in all co-operative organisations, from the highest to the lowest, in order to control the work of the co-operative organs.

This is nothing more nor less than a plan for the complete bureaucratisation of the co-operatives. It is the most perfectly consistent expression of the bureaucratic distortion. We have in this proposal the "acme" of the ideology of the miserable bureaucrat, who here exposes to general scorn his innermost soul. In this the proposal is at least sincere!

What is meant by this proposal of a "State co-operative system"?

It is proposed to accord the State organs special rights in the co-operatives. Have we any lack, at the present time, of the "right" to improve the co-operatives? Of course we have not. The state and the Party have "rights" in abundance in the co-operatives for this purpose. What we lack, what we really and seriously lack, is co-operative mass activity, the independent and active participation of the masses of the peasantry in the co-operative. And what we lack for the attainment of this object and of every other object in our village work, is elementary culture, the mere ability to read and write, without which the co-operative cannot develop further.

\* \* \*

The essential character of the ideology of the Opposition consists of complete capitulation to bourgeois ideology. (Stalin: "Hear, hear!")

It is characteristic of this ideology that it is incapable of observing anything Socialist in the country of the proletarian dictatorship. The oppositionists see nothing of what is taking place around them, join our class enemies in the one continual refrain of: "The village is far advanced on the road of capitalist development." After all this it is easily comprehensible why the Party is so determinedly united in overcoming the Opposition, so unanimous in striding over the Menshevist Trozkyist Opposition.

With the liquidation of the Opposition we break fresh ground for the work of building up Socialism.

At one time it was our task to overcome the petty bourgeois parties of the S.R.'s and the Mensheviks, and now it is our work to sweep away those last miserable remnants of petty bourgeois political trends which have tried to creep into our Party. This must be done if the road is to be made free before us to march forward to the fundamental tasks of socialist construction. (Voices: "Hear, hear!")

### VIII. WHAT FORCES HAVE WE AT OUR DISPOSAL?

#### The New Duties of the Working Class.

A few years ago we issued the slogan: "The face to the village". This is a good and correct slogan. But many of the Soviet organs have so interpreted it: Turn your face to the village, but keep your hands in your pockets! Or: Turn your face to the village, but do nothing with your whole hand, with one finger at most. It need not be said that such an attitude towards the village cannot be tolerated.

Our Party organisations are particularly fond of repeating the words: "The face to the village. But all the same they continue to regard the village through official spectacles, and do not really know what is going on in the village. Have we many Party organisations which have proved capable of forming a really extensive, active non-Party organisation recruited from the poor and middle peasantry, and of actually and immediately placing itself at the head of the growing mass initiative towards the development of the village co-operative and the collectivisation of agriculture? No, up to the present we have very few such Party organisations.

The slogan: "The face to the village", is right in itself, but it must be carried out in the Bolshevist sense, and not in the way it is often done with us.

It is, however, obvious that this slogan alone is insufficient at the present moment, when we are entering on a fresh stage of work in the village, and when our chief task consists of going over, by means of the co-operatives, to the large scale collectivisation of agriculture. These new tasks impose fresh duties on the working class in its relations to the village. The working class can and must do much more for the village than it has hitherto done.

Lenin was greatly in favour of such new forms of work in the village as for instance the protectorate institutions.

These institutions have developed steadily, though slowly. At the present time about one and a half million workers are organised in the protectorate societies. This form of organisa-

tion is, however, inadequate, and is often too formal in character. We must ensure more rapid progress for the work of the protectorates, countrymen's societies, etc.

But even this is not enough.

Many of the members of our trade unions have connections with the village. A large proportion of seasonal workers, etc. are members of trade unions. Besides this 20 to 30 per cent. of trade union members have relations in the country, and frequently possess land of their own.

This is further evidence of the firm foothold which has been gained by the alliance between the workers and peasants. But it shows at the same time that it is the duty of the trade unions, of all trade unions without exception, to devote immediate and extensive efforts to the cause of organised proletarian aid, to the support of peasant initiative in the development of the co-operatives, and in the transition from the co-operatives to the collectivisation of agriculture.

The political, organisatory, and cultural help given by the workers, especially the help given towards the furtherance of collectivisation in the village, is a work in which the organised proletariat will find itself amply repaid, for it is the most effective possible work for the proletarian revolution, it forms the basis for the real building up of Socialism, the foundation of the final victory of Communism.

We are now entering on a period in which we can seek out for ourselves the paths leading to the removal of all antagonism between town and country.

This antagonism is even now the greatest evil in our country but we have already discovered the ways and means by which the antagonism can and will be greatly minimised. We must do our utmost for the development of these ways and means, we must apply them energetically and determinedly, we must take the lead in this important cause, and then we shall succeed in removing every trace of antagonism between town and country. The economic foundation for success in this aim is the development of the great collective undertaking in the village. We have just realised that this is our next task, we are commencing to work for its accomplishment, and in doing this we are really laying the foundation of Communism, of transition to the classless communist society.

In order to accomplish these tasks the organised working class must show greater perseverance in aiding the more backward working masses in the village. The proletariat will recognise and achieve its new tasks and duties, and will enable the alliance between the workers and peasantry to fulfil its fundamental object: There will be neither workers nor peasants, there will be no classes in our country, we shall be all members of one united socialist state of society. (Enthusiastic, and prolonged applause.)

#### 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 schillings
Norway . . . . .	1.50 crowns
Sweden . . . . .	1.50 crowns
Denmark . . . . .	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R. . . . .	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.

The Business Manager.