

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 39

7<sup>th</sup> July 1927

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

## CONTENTS

**M. Tomsky:** The International Situation and the Anglo-Russian Committee. Report to the Extraordinary Plenary Session of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union on the 28th June 1927.

**Declaration of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union.**

**Hands off the Soviet Union.**

Comrade Rykov's Answer to Lansbury, Maxton and Brockway.

**China.**

**N. Bucharin:** The Position of the Chinese Revolution.

**Politics:**

**G. K.:** The Indian National Congress and the Workers' and Peasants' Party. (Bombay).

**Economics.**

**Léon Delhaye:** The Customs Policy of the French Imperialists.

**The White Terror.**

**Koms:** The Trial of the Members of the Young Communist League of Bulgaria.

**Plenum of the E. C. C. I.**

**N. Bucharin:** The Results of the Plenary Session of the E. C. C. I. Report given at the Plenum of the Moscow Committee of the C. P. S. U. on 4. June 1927. (Conclusion.)

**In the International.**

**Smolan:** The Party Conference of the C. P. of Sweden.

**Ten Years Ago.**

**N. Lenin:** The First Soviet Congress and the War.

## The International Situation and the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Report to the Extraordinary Plenary Session of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union on the 28th June 1927.

By M. Tomsky.

### The Efforts to Convene the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Comrades, I take it for granted that all of you have read the exchange of correspondence between the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union and the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress relating to the convening of the Anglo-Russian Committee, which has been published by us in the press. It was published not merely to acquaint the members and candidates of the Central Council with the contents of the correspondence, but also that the workers of Great Britain and the Soviet Union might have the opportunity to learn from first hand. The correspondence shows that the Presidium of the Central Council fought a long fight to obtain a meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee (A. R. C.) and that this fight ended in Berlin with a meeting of the representatives of the Central Council (C. C.), Tomsky and Melnichansky, and the representatives of the General Council, Citrine and Hicks.

Before I deal with the happenings at the meeting itself and the events which followed up to it, I wish to explain in a few words why we conducted such a long drawn out correspondence in connection with the convening of the A. R. C., for the workers have a right to ask. Was there any use in conducting such voluminous correspondence? Would it not have been better

to report to the Presidium of the C. C. immediately after the first exchanges that the A. R. C. did not want to meet? Does it matter very much whether the A. R. C. meets or not? And finally, what is the significance of its refusal to meet?

Those are the questions with which we all are faced. First of all I will deal with a few of these questions, the others will be dealt with later.

### The VII. Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union and the A. R. C.

The first question: Why did we attach such extreme importance to the convening of the A. R. C.? First of all, because in our work we consider it our duty to be guided by the decisions of the Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union. The VII. Congress thoroughly discussed the activity of the A. R. C. and expressed opinions concerning the A. R. C. itself. The VII. Congress condemned any attempt to break up the A. R. C., approved of our honest and open criticism of the policy of the General Council of the T. U. C. and pointed out the great importance of the Anglo-Russian Committee and also the fact that the possibility of a dissolution of the A. R. C. from the British side had come within the realm of the immediately possible.

In order to bring these facts more clearly to your minds, I will read a number of passages from the decisions of our VII. Congress. First a section of the resolution of the Congress upon the report of our Central Council. Paragraph 17, the first paragraph, approves of the policy of the Central Council and the second approves of the formation of the A.R.C., and our honest and open criticism of the errors of the General Council. It then says:

"Similarly, the Congress considers it correct to reject the policy making for a dissolution of the A.R.C., from the side of the Central Council, but the Congress cannot avoid pointing to the danger of a dissolution of the A.R.C. from the side of the leaders of the British General Council. The following facts point to this danger..."

Three facts are then enumerated: 1. The refusal of the General Council to call a conference between the representatives of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union and the Amsterdam International (I.F.T.U.). 2. The proposal of the General Council of the 30th November directed to limiting the functions of the A.R.C.; and 3. the refusal of the General Council to send a fraternal delegation to our Congress. The Resolution then goes on:

"Whilst pointing to the danger caused by this very incorrect policy of the General Council of the T.U.C. to the struggle for the international unity of the trade union movement, the Congress is of the opinion that the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union must do everything in its power to carry out the declaration of the A.R.C. and to pursue the declaration in which both parties undertake to fight against the dangers of a new imperialist war, against the economic and political offensive of capitalism against the working class, for the unity of the international trade union movement and for the organisation of all trade unions into one united class-conscious trade union international."

The Congress expressed its conviction again and again that no errors of the leaders could break the fraternal bonds existing between the workers of the two countries. The VII. Congress was therefore not feeling in the dark as some comrades appear to think. The Congress was aware of the danger of a dissolution of the A.R.C. by the General Council and recommended our representatives to oppose this danger by all possible attempts to make the A.R.C. more active than ever, i. e. to do everything possible to extend the work of the A.R.C. to turn it into an organ capable of action in the struggle against the offensive of capital and against the danger of imperialist war and into a real organ for the international unity of the trade union movement.

#### What is the Anglo-Russian Committee?

From this, two tendencies resulted inside the A.R.C., which, as you know, is composed on a footing of equality. One must not forget that the A.R.C., like every arbitration court, is composed of two groups, of two different voices. The two tendencies inside the A.R.C., of which I have just spoke, could only exist side by side on the basis of compromise. Whoever believes that a compromise under such circumstances can be one-sided, or that a compromise can be concluded without mutual concessions, is in error. When we founded the A.R.C., we were well aware of this, and we knew every well that compromises would be necessary and unavoidable, however not such compromises as would surrender our principles and abandon our convictions. The A.R.C. has never made decisions of its own, it has simply formulated decisions for its respective Councils, for all and every one of its decisions only then became valid after it had been ratified by the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union and by the General Council of the T.U.C. There could be no doubt, but that any decision of the A.R.C. would be the result of a struggle and a compromise between the two sections of the Committee, the communist and the reformist.

I wish to point out this obvious fact, because some people are now speaking of it as though a new America had been discovered. But it is a very old story. What a discovery! Look, the members of the General Council are no Communists! When the representatives of the General Council came to the Soviet Union, we received them and honoured them in a way worthy of the representatives of the trade union movement in a country

with the greatest working class in the world, although we knew perfectly well that they were reformists and knew perfectly well what reformist and its leaders meant. Anyone who was not aware of these things, is to be pitied.

The delegates wrote a book about their journey to the Soviet Union, and we did our utmost to spread this book. But what did the book contain? Could we have undersigned every page? The book said in one place that in reality we were transforming and that Communist principles only remained in words, that we were going in a quite different direction, that our economic system was that of State capitalism and a number of similar and politely offensive statements. Did we not know that this book had nothing in common with the book of Communists, that it had been written by reformists? Of course we did, but apart from their political petty-bourgeois prejudices and errors, the rest concerning their stay in the Soviet Union represented a very important progressive factor which played a very great role in the minds of the Western European workers and their attitude towards the Soviet Union. And this fact outweighed all the negative sides of the book.

That they were reformists, was a fact known to us during the whole period of the existence of the A.R.C., we have not forgotten this fact and are not likely to forget it. We know, a reformist is a person who does not lead the workers correctly, he strives to span the bridge between capital and labour, in the decisive moment he vacillates, he weakens the pressure of the working class and from time to time he goes directly over to the capitalists. To lead the working class in this style however, means to betray their interests. That is what a reformist does. We knew perfectly well the type of person with whom we had founded the Anglo-Russian Committee, and nevertheless, no one will be able to deny that the A.R.C. has played a great role in the history of the working class movement.

There is no doubt that the two tendencies in the A.R.C. the communist and the reformist, have crossed. The reformist tendency feared the development of the A.R.C., feared its growth into an International, feared rough formulations, feared collisions with the Amsterdam International, feared that it might wound the bourgeois press, annoy the right-wingers, that its left-wing attitude might attract unpleasant attention, might turn public opinion against it. That is an attitude which is in the final resort bourgeois. That is the standpoint of the venal yellow press. The other tendency was ours, it was opposed to half-measures, to lack of logic and urged the A.R.C. to take decisive steps, to make it into a really active factor in the struggle for international trade union unity, urged its partner towards left and persuaded the General Council to adopt resolutions which in general did not mirror the political physiognomy of the General Council. This tendency expressed itself clearly in all the documents of the A.R.C.

I regret that I must repeat to this Plenary Session the same theses which I have already dealt with in my previous reports upon this question. No matter, there are at the present time a number of theses which have to be repeated rather often.

At the last session of the A.R.C. in Berlin (with regard to this session some people have spread fairy tales about our "defeat" etc.) the compromising nature of the A.R.C. and the struggle of the two tendencies showed themselves rather clearly. Our line was for the extension of the functions of the A.R.C. and an increase of its activity. Their tendency, however, was directed to obtaining a guarantee from us as a concession, that any criticism from our side of their actions, similar to our criticism of the British General Council during the General Strike, would be abandoned. They also strived to avoid dealing with any immediate political questions such as the question of the oppression practiced against the Chinese people by British imperialism. I must say that upon our part it was the greatest concession we ever made that we did not take them by the throat so to speak, there and then and demand: "Deal with China, make a clear statement about the situation in China!", instead we contented ourselves with a reference in the general resolution to China.

We have never concealed the fact that we made the British delegates very considerable concessions at the Berlin session of the A.R.C., but on the other hand, one must not forget that they on their part did not vote with a light heart for such decisions as for instance the following:

"Anglo-Russian trade union unity is, as the latest events prove clearly, of the very greatest importance and

urgency in order to beat off any attempt at an armed attack upon the Soviet Union, the bulwark of the first workers republic. Any such attempt would bring with it the danger of new great wars coupled with suffering and privations for the workers of both countries."

Or the following:

"Similarly, the A. R. C. declares that the most important condition for the success of the struggle for the international trade union unity of the workers and against capitalist exploitation, is the firm and fraternal unity of the trade union movements of Great Britain and the Soviet Union. The A. R. C. declares itself prepared to do everything possible to develop the existing friendly relations between the two trades union movements. These friendly relations must be developed in the direction of greater joint activity and mutual assistance and support."

We happen to know that these resolutions passed the General Council with the very greatest difficulties.

#### The "Interference" in the internal Affairs of the General Council.

The Berlin Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee resulted for us formally speaking in an undertaking to treat the General Council carefully whilst the General Council undertook to develop the activity of the A. R. C. in particular with regard to the struggle against the danger of war. But nowhere and at no time have we abandoned our right of criticism, the right to express our opinions freely. No one of us ever thought of such a thing. In private conversations individual members of the General Council said to us: "You must moderate your abuse a little; it makes a very bad impression upon 'public opinion' in Great Britain when you abuse us and mention names." But it never occurred to any of us to abandon our right to criticise.

Differences in the interpretation of the Berlin resolution soon showed themselves. Shortly after our correspondence with them had begun, on the 14th May, our first demand for the convening of the A. R. C. was sent to them. On the 19th May after the formal agreement had been made that the A. R. C. should be called together, Citrine approached me personally by letter with regard to the interview I had given the press in connection with the Anti-Trade Union Bill. I think that all of you will be able to remember the sense of this interview.

What was the significance of this interview? Was it an interference in the internal affairs of the General Council? I have a right to express my opinion about what goes on in Germany, France etc., and in the international working class movement in general, why then should I sacrifice this right with regard to the working class movement in Great Britain? I have sold my soul at no time. I can say that honestly to this Plenary Session.

I gave my opinion to the press concerning the attack of the Conservative Government upon the British trade unions, for this attack was the most obvious proof of the indissolubility of the economic and political struggles, a fact which completely corroborates the correctness of our policy in this connection and proves that any limitation of the forms and methods of the class struggle to parliament must result in defeat after defeat for the working class, as can be seen in Great Britain at the present time. When we declared at the sessions of the A. R. C. that an economic offensive of capitalism would inevitably be accompanied by a political offensive, one of the representatives of the General Council said: "Well, there may be an economic offensive, but hardly a political one." That was why the expression of my opinion as the chairman of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union was of such importance for the workers of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union in this very important question of the class struggle.

The letter of Citrine to myself reads as follows:

"London, 19th May 1927.

To Mr. Tomsky,

Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union,  
Moscow.

Dear Tomsky,

re your interview with the 'Workers Life'.

An article published in the 'Workers Life' of the 13th May referring to an interview given by you to the press in which you severely criticise the action undertaken

by the General Council and the trade unions in connection with the draft Bill of the government against the trade unions, has come to my attention.

I hardly need to remind you that the policy pursued by the General Council is in accordance with the considered instructions of the conference of trade union executives, and that no one is better able to judge the important questions raised by the unjust draft Bill in question, or to decide the question of the methods to be employed in the struggle against it, than this body.

Having regard to this fact and to the contents of the resolutions adopted at the Berlin sessions of the A. R. C., we cannot believe that you as the responsible leader of the Russian trade union movement have made such declarations as are imputed to you in the article mentioned, and we can only come to the conclusion that the article mentioned misrepresents your actual utterances. I wish to mention that the 'Times' and other newspapers have quoted this article with great satisfaction with the obvious intention of utilising the article as a new opportunity to mislead public opinion with regard to the relations existing between the working class movements of our respective countries. Further, such articles must inevitably increase the difficulties met with by trade union leaders well-disposed towards Russia in their struggle against those prejudices which are zealously encouraged even in certain circles of the working class itself.

For this reason, I would like to learn from you whether the article in the 'Workers Life' really represents your statements. Please be so friendly and answer my letter as quickly as possible, as the General Council wishes to discuss the article mentioned.

Enclosed is a copy of the article.

Yours sincerely,

Walter Citrine, General Secretary."

I handed the English text of the article to experts for examination and I was informed that instead of the words "deserters from their camp", the words "traitors from their camp" had been used. But such insignificant errors are inevitable in translation and do not play a very great role in such an important matter.

Basing myself upon my infrangible right to criticise and express my opinion, I sent the following reply to Citrine:

"Dear Mr. Citrine,

I have received your letter of the 19th May. This letter of a semi-official character concerned my interview of the 8th May which was published in Soviet newspapers and transmitted by the Soviet Telegraph Agency abroad.

In your letter you express your personal opinion on the interview, question me as to the authenticity of the interview as published in the 'Workers Life' and inform me that this interview will be discussed by the General Council.

I do not wish to question your right to form an opinion like a citizen of any other country, about my political interview as published in the 'Workers Life' and inform to inform me of your opinion, express my fear that the 'Times' has exercised considerable influence upon the forming of your opinion with regard to the interview given by me.

The English text of the interview sent to me by you differs, as examination by translators here has shown, here and there from the Russian original, but in general the text represents the basic ideas of the Russian original, differing only in shades. I cannot conceal my astonishment at your communication that the General Council intends to discuss my interview. It seems to me that for the moment there are much more important and urgent matters of interest to all working class organisations to be discussed, for instance, China, the diplomatic breach between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, the preparations for war etc. I must request you however, not to interpret this remark as attempt at any 'interference in the international affairs of the General Council'. Although the discussion suggested would deal with my humble person to a certain degree, I do not wish to question the right of the General Council to discuss anything it likes, even including my pamphlets.

However, I must very definitely reject any assumption of right, no matter from what side it may come, to limit my personal freedom to express my opinion or to control my words. Such attempts can only end in fiasco. For all my statements I am only prepared to answer to the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union, to my Party and to the working masses to whom it is my duty to tell the truth whether the truth is pleasant or not.

In my personal utterances, I do not feel myself bound by any resolutions of the A. R. C., for it would be naive to believe that I could recognise any resolution that demanded from me the abandonment of my convictions. It would be monstrous to give the Berlin resolutions any such interpretation, that would really be an 'interference' in my personal affairs. You write that no one is better able to judge in connection with the Anti-Trade Union Bill than the General Council and the conference of trade unions. Without wishing to question the competence of these institutions, I nevertheless permit myself to doubt the political effectiveness of a number of the decisions of these institutions for I do not believe in infallibility of any kind, not even of the Pope.

Similarly, I consider it my duty in my relations to the workers of the Soviet Union, and my absolute right to criticise any action which seems to me damaging to the interests of the working class movement, no matter from what institution the action may proceed and quite without consideration to what the 'Times' may write about the matter. Without going once again into the essence of the questions dealt with in my interview, I wish to express the opinion that the intervening events have corroborated the correctness of the opinions expressed in the interview in question. I take it that this letter will create the clarity requested by you on the subject.

Yours faithfully,  
M. Tomsky."

That was the exchange of correspondence regarding my interview which preceded the exchanges concerning the convening of the A. R. C., and which, although it is to a certain extent of a private character, touches without a doubt upon the right to criticise. I presented my letter to the members of the Presidium of our Central Council and obtained their approval. Under other circumstances I would not have considered it necessary to read this half-official correspondence if the following events had not lent a special significance to it and transformed the whole correspondence into a political question.

That was the situation before the Berlin conference, these were our relations, that was our attitude to the various questions including the question of the right to criticise and the freedom of speech. If one examines our correspondence with the General Council it will be seen that in the beginning there was a very moderate tone used upon our part, which nevertheless grew more energetic as our request met with growing resistance from the other side. Our first letter contains a discussion of the situation in principle, however, it is very mildly formulated, without roughness and without reproaches even without pretension with regard to the convening of the A. R. C. In answer to the Anglo-Russian breach, the General Council contented itself with extending an invitation to Comrade Rosengolz to take breakfast in the House of Commons. Admittedly, for certain people with a certain psychology and under certain conditions, even a breakfast is to a certain extent a revolutionary act. It is possible that for some people a breakfast with Comrade Rosengolz is a very definite revolutionary action, but in any case, it is not an action which demands any very great sacrifice from the participants.

#### The Negotiations in Berlin.

The document formulated by them against the raid upon Arcos was a toothless and ambiguous affair which ended by expressing the conviction that the Soviet Union was superior to all desire for revenge and that it would concentrate in its international relations upon winning the confidence of the peoples of the whole world. That was the reason why our excitement grew and we increased the pressure upon the General Council, but we gave them no excuse, and indeed, we

did not think it possible for them to find an excuse, to avoid calling the A. R. C. upon formal grounds, which they might have the opportunity to interpret as a wish upon our part for the dissolution of the A. R. C. or provocation.

I do not wish to conceal the fact that there were members of the Presidium of our Central Council who hesitated and who were not sure whether it was worth while to attend the preparatory conference of the secretaries and the chairmen, having regard to the fact that the General Council so obstinately refused to convene the A. R. C. One could be of the following opinion: The A. R. C. has not been convened, but the chairman and the secretaries have been together and have done something or the other and now it is no longer necessary to convene the A. R. C. There were such opinions in our ranks, but we decided nevertheless to attend this private conference with the declaration and the reservation — and that can be seen from our correspondence — that we retained our original opinion that the A. R. C. should be convened, but that we would not therefore refuse to attend the preparatory conference.

The Conference itself, which was of an unofficial character and very short — we experienced great delays in obtaining our visés — began with an attempt of the representatives of the General Council to turn the whole affair into a matter of my interview. On our part however, we turned the discussion into another direction, namely, the danger of war and the meaning of the delays with regard to the convening of the A. R. C.

And really, in a time when the whole world is faced with the danger of war, when the war is threatening the working class of the world and in particular the proletariat of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, not in words, but in brutal reality, it is astounding to see an organisation whose main plank is the struggle against war, postponing its sessions, whilst the representatives of the unions concerned on both sides meeting together for the purpose of discussing the convening of the A. R. C. in an extremely responsible moment, waste their time discussing an interview of Tomsky, whether this expression was correct or not, whether the interview as a whole was desirable etc. No matter how flattering it may be for me to place my interview on the plane of a world event, the people who do so must either be dull or very much interested in avoiding other unpleasant questions. For what can any sort of interview be worth in comparison with the tremendous questions which are now facing the working class in the whole world?

Upon our part, we took up a different attitude. We protested against the delay in calling the A. R. C. and demanded an explanation. The representatives of the General Council on their side pointed to the difficulties in the way of a meeting, saying that the majority of the General Council did not want a meeting being of the opinion that there was nothing to discuss, but that they did not withdraw anything that they had previously said about the war, not even that war was an evil and must be opposed.

We then went to the root of the question. It is time that we ceased to say that war is an evil and that this evil must be opposed, or that we adopt another resolution declaring that war — is an evil. It is time that we speak about what the A. R. C. which embraces the two greatest trade union movements in the world, is prepared to do, and what it advises the workers to do to fight against war. They answered: "Of course, but for the moment there is no war. Why continually cry Wolf! Wolf! when there is no sign of a wolf?"

We answered that it would be too late to cry Wolf! when the fangs of the wolf were already in our throats. We may not fold our hands and call this a struggle against the danger of war. It is high time that we told the workers what practical measures they should fight against the war danger. It is high time that the proletariat were mobilised against this danger. We very definitely rejected all attempts to push the conference on to a discussion of the tone of our telegrams or the tone of my interview.

I merely repeated what I had said in my letter, that no one had the right to limit my freedom of speech and that I did not feel myself bound by any decisions of the A. R. C. in my personal actions. It would be silly and ridiculous after twenty years of political life to permit one's hands to be bound for the sake of the beautiful eyes of the A. R. C. I am responsible above all for my actions to my Party and to the Central Council of Labour Unions of the Soviet Union.

We summed up the situation saying that in the present moment a further postponement of the meeting of the A. R. C. would be more damaging than a direct refusal to call it. We declared, either you say the A. R. C. is to be called for such and such a day and time, in that case we would perhaps wait here in Berlin, or you say, that you do not want to call the A. R. C. now, or you say, you do not wish to call the A. R. C. at all. The attempt to avoid a direct answer however is a sign of dishonesty. We declared that we could then only interpret their action as a camouflaged intention to break up the A. R. C. The workers, we said, needed clarity; is there an A. R. C. or not? Why is the A. R. C. inactive? Whose fault is it? To our demand for a straight answer we received no answer whatever, neither yes nor no. We received the impression that our partners tended to the opinion that because we refused to withdraw anything which we had said, the A. R. C. would not be called, although they personally wished it to be called.

We declared that this would be a great mistake, people would suppose that it was their wish to abandon the workers of the Soviet Union in a difficult and dangerous moment, despite the fact that they had undertaken various things with regard to the Russian workers, in various decisions and declarations of the A. R. C. We declared that we would be compelled to regard further evasive answers and a further postponement of the meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee as a direct intention to abandon the Russian workers in the hour of their need, to disrupt the A. R. C., to show loyalty to the Conservative government and to bow before bourgeois "public opinion".

After this, the representatives of the General Council addressed themselves with the following letter to Comrade Melnichansky:

"Berlin, the 19th June 1927.

Dear Mr. Melnichansky,

Referring to the conversation between Mr. Hicks and myself on the one hand and you and Mr. Tomsy on the other on the 18th and 19th June, I hereby confirm our declaration that your telegram of the 11th June was held in such a tone that the General Council could regard it as challenging and dictatorial and that any such impression could produce unnecessary discussions and misunderstandings. We consider that this point should be cleared up.

With fraternal greeting, Yours,  
Walter M. Citrine."

We answered this letter with the following letter signed by Comrade Melnichansky:

"Dear Mr. Citrine,

I was very surprised at your and Mr. Hicks' declaration that our telegram of the 11th of this month could be interpreted as a challenge and an attempt upon the part of the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions to dictate its will to the General Council. I am deeply convinced that this telegram contains nothing insulting for the General Council and that it can by no means be interpreted as you interpret it in your letter of the 19th of this month. The telegram of the 11th June only expresses our justifiable fears with regard to the postponement of the meeting of the A. R. C. in such an important and responsible moment as the present, and our determination to do everything possible to mobilise public opinion and all the forces of the working class for a struggle against the obviously approaching war.

We are of the opinion that it is within the power of the A. R. C. to do something in this connection, therefore we insist upon the calling of the Anglo-Russian Committee and protest against its postponement. We are in favour of the maintenance of the A. R. C. and for an increase of its activity in the struggle against war. It would be an error to interpret our exchange of correspondence, in particular the telegram mentioned above as anything very terrible.

I think that all this is so clear that under normal circumstances it would not have been necessary for me to make any written explanations. However, under existing circumstances, I considered it my duty to do all in my

power to clear up the misunderstanding which might complicate or adversely affect the relations of the trade union movements of the two countries.

With fraternal greetings,  
Melnichansky.

Berlin, the 19th June 1927."

#### The Further Course of Events.

We then received the following telegram:

"The question of the relation of the General Council to the Anglo-Russian Committee has been handed over to our International Committee for discussion. Letter follows.

Citrine."

We then received a telegram of the Tass according to which the question of the convening of the A. R. C. had been handed over to the international committee with the instructions to report concerning its decisions to the session of the General Council in July. That was the cynical postponement against which we had protested so energetically at the Berlin conference. Further the Tass reported the following:

"London, 28th June 1927. Reuter reports:

The following resolution was adopted at a joint session of the General Council of the T. U. C. with the Executive Committee of the Labour Party in the House of Commons yesterday:

"The General Council and the Executive Committee of the Labour Party recognise the extreme difficulties and the dangerous situation of Soviet Russia and understand completely the justified indignation of the Russian Soviet government at the assassination of its Ambassador in Warsaw Voykov. They consider themselves nevertheless bound to protest against the policy pursued by the Soviet government of executing persons innocent of the murder of Voykov as reprisals for this murder. The General Council and the Executive Committee of the Labour Party are of the opinion that to answer murder with murder is a political method below the level of civilised life and can only damage the Soviets. Therefore they express the hope that the practise of shootings without trial in the Soviet Union will cease."

Those are the two documents which we received as answer to what has passed. Can we simply ignore these two documents? What is the meaning of the first document? And what is the meaning of the second document? It would be a political error to regard these two documents separately. We must declare before the whole of the working class and particularly before our own and the British working class, that we have done everything possible to maintain the A. R. C. and to avoid giving any excuse that we ourselves wished a dissolution of the A. R. C. And I believe we have acted correctly.

#### The Efforts of the Central Council to increase the Activity of the A. R. C.

We believed and still believe our policy to be correct which made for an increase of the activity of the A. R. C. during its whole history, which made for the transformation of the A. R. C. into a capable organ of the class struggle, into a centre for the mobilisation of all organisations dissatisfied with the policy of the Amsterdam International — quite apart from whether they belonged to the one International or the other — and into a platform for the unification of these forces upon the three elementary conditions for a correct class policy, a platform of struggle against imperialist war, against the offensive of capitalism and for the struggle for international trade union unity. We believe that this policy was correct. We believe that our policy which made for the maintenance of the A. R. C. despite not only the flagrant errors but also the crimes of the leaders of the General Council, was correct. It would be silly to speak of a united front, of the creation of united trade union front and then to disrupt this front at the first treacherous move of the reformists. Such a way cannot lead to the winning of the masses.

We have never surrendered our right to criticise our partner. We have subjected his errors to severe criticism, we have remained silent about none of the great political errors which he has committed, and nevertheless, we considered it to be our duty to maintain the A. R. C. Perhaps it is a poor band,

but it is nevertheless a band between our labour movement and the trade union movement of Great Britain and we considered it our duty not to tear this band, but to do everything possible to consolidate it. We did not conceal the fact that our partners had not stood the first test, the test of the struggle against the economic offensive of capital, the test of the political offensive of capital and the General Strike. We did not conceal the fact that they betrayed the struggle of the miners, we did not abandon our right to criticise. Many people waited hopefully for our first meeting with the British, thinking that they would exert pressure upon us and we would then withdraw our remarks.

We have withdrawn no single word. We considered and still considered, however, that we have the right to demand the meeting of the A. R. C. in any decisive political moment and to raise our voice in warning to the international working class when the working class is endangered by the erroneous or openly treacherous policy of its leaders.

We are now in a situation when we must tell the international proletariat and above all the proletariat of Great Britain and the Soviet Union the full truth about the double policy of the General Council. The policy of the General Council is directed to disrupting the A. R. C. and to breaking off the alliance with the workers of the Soviet Union. The secretary of the General Council will probably seek for some paragraph or other, he will examine whether our declaration violates this or that decision of the A. R. C. etc. It would however be stupid in this important historical moment to interpret this or that politically necessary step upon formal grounds and leave its essence out of consideration.

The A. R. C. was founded to fight against the danger of war. The A. R. C. must show its face to-day, it must not hide it like a coward. And when our partners forget the aim of the A. R. C. and think only of formalities, or are simply frightened of their bourgeoisie and fail to carry out the undertakings with regard to the struggle against war and are afraid to mobilise the proletariat as a counterweight to bourgeois public opinion, and are afraid to tell the workers what they should do in face of the approaching war, with what practical measures they should fight against war, then it is our duty to tell our workers this clearly and definitely.

What does that mean to-day, a cowardly attitude? It means that all the fine words of the officials of the British trade union movement to the effect that they would always support the workers of the Soviet Union, that they were the friends of the Soviet Union etc., were nothing but empty phrases. It means that when the Conservative Government after having beaten down the half-starved miners, shed the blood of Chinese revolutionists and formulated a law to throttle the trade unions, now attempts to organise the forces of the bourgeois world and all the forces of predatory exploiters for an armed attack upon the Soviet Union, in this moment all the fine words turn into thin air. The leaders of the General Council have sounded the retreat because they are afraid of compromising themselves in the eyes of "public opinion" i. e. the bourgeoisie and its venal yellow press, by an alliance with the Russian workers, because they are afraid to be accused of disloyalty to the conservative government of His Majesty. That is equivalent to the worst form of treachery against the workers of the Soviet Union. But what is the Conservative government doing at the present moment?

### The Moral Block with the Bourgeoisie.

In answer to our campaign against the new imperialist war and against the robber attacks which are being prepared upon the Soviet Republics, in answer to our campaign for the mobilisation of millions of proletarians against the plans to plunge the world into a new slaughter, the Conservatives are conducting a counter-campaign, they are howling: "In Moscow the Bolsheviks have executed 20 White Guardists!" Of course, the bourgeois press takes this cry up willingly and sighs sentimentally: "The murder of the innocents!", "Hostages were shot", "The executions were reprisals for the murder of Voykov".

The block of Conservatives, the block of all those who are in favour of war and violence, is being formed against our block of labour, of all proletarians upon the basis of a struggle against war. The petty-bourgeois Socialists are being drawn into the Conservative block, those Socialists who are incapable of conducting an active struggle against the danger of war

(that means a struggle against capitalism in general), who are only capable of being dragged along in the tow of the infamous "public opinion" of the yellow press. This block is being formally created under the slogan of a struggle against the executions in the Soviet Union, in reality however for a struggle against the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, for the possibility of a new imperialist war. The great question, the question of war is being camouflaged by the Conservatives by the question of the execution of the twenty White Guardists proved guilty of espionage, terrorism and a conspiracy to overthrow the workers and peasants republic by force of arms and attempts together with foreign robbers to re-establish the old and hated monarchy which forced our workers and peasants into a hated war.

All the tried and trusted servants of the bourgeoisie, all the representatives of pacifism and petty-bourgeois Socialism are rallying to this united front. And all those are joining this front who are in favour of the Soviet Union in words but who in reality serve the bourgeois press and the Conservatives. By their protest against the shooting of twenty White Guardists they have all joined the front of the reactionaries organised by the conservatives. No wonder that the Second International after having heard a speech of a Russian Menshevik immediately adopted a resolution about Russian "prisoners" and a protest against the shootings and placed itself for the thousandth time not on the side of the workers fighting against the coming imperialist war, but on the side of the capitalists who are preparing this war.

This noise, this chorus of sighs from sentimental opium smugglers, sharks on change and heroes of the Second International etc., about the "innocent" counter-revolutionaries who have been shot in Moscow, is nothing but a cover for the war preparations against the Soviet Union, for new acts of terrorism, for new acts of arson etc.

And now the leaders of the General Council have joined this company by their resolution against the shootings. All the members of the General Council from the right-wingers to the "left-wingers" and on the extreme "leftists" of the I. L. P. The most important question at the present time, the question of the calling of the A. R. C. they avoid with the excuse that they have no time. They avoid this question in order to avoid a direct answer to the question of war and in order to conceal this question altogether.

They say nothing about the fact that in China hundreds and thousands of workers and peasants are being executed at the pleasure of the bourgeoisie. But when in Russia, generals, landowners and monarchists are executed as open enemies of the working class for crimes against the working class for attempting to revive the old order abolished by the workers, then their sentimental tears flow. That is direct treachery to the working class, that represents a moral block with the bourgeoisie.

We cannot ignore such a disgusting action, we must show the workers of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union the truth. We must tell them that the attempt to postpone the calling of the Anglo-Russian Committee at this moment by formal excuses is nothing less than a policy directed towards the dissolution of the A. R. C.

We received the following letter dated the 22nd June:

"Mr. Melnichansky,

Secretary of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union.

Dear Mr. Melnichansky,

Re the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The report upon the meeting of Mr. Tomsy and yourself with Mr. Hicks and myself in Berlin on the 18th and 19th of this month together with our correspondence including your letter written in Berlin on the 20th June, have been placed before our General Council in its session to-day. Following upon the session of the General I wired you the following:

"The question of the attitude of the General Council to the Anglo-Russian Committee was handed over to our International Committee for consideration.

Letter follows. Citrine."

The General Council decided that its representatives should attend no further meetings of the Anglo-Russian Committee until after the report of the International Com-

mittee upon the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee and after the discussion of the report by the General Council.

I will communicate with you again on the subject as soon as the General Council has discussed the question.

Yours sincerely,

Walter M. Citrine, General Secretary."

All this sounds as though there were no such things as undertakings, as though the Berlin Conference had adopted only a one-sided resolution upon some sort of non-interference. The following however was said in the Session:

"4. The Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee appeals in the name of almost 15 million organised workers in Great Britain and the Soviet Union to the organised workers of all countries once again to unite their forces with those of the British and Soviet unions in an endeavour to prevent new fratricidal strife, to defend the standards of living and the rights of the workers and to overcome all hindrances and difficulties in the way of the formation of a united all-embracing world federation of trade unions."

It is as though that declaration had never been made, as though there had never been any joint declaration of the Anglo-Russian Committee, as though the struggle against imperialist war had never been one of those aims for which the A. R. C. was formed. Now a danger of war exists. Point 4 of the Berlin Resolution, we will say nothing about the previous resolutions, must be put into action, developed and added to by practical measures. But these are hiding themselves behind formalities and they will probably complain again about the roughness of the tone in which we speak, they will complain that we have insulted them, injured them, embittered them.

Now that the General Council has not fulfilled the undertakings it gave itself, we have the right to appeal openly and directly to the British and the Russian workers. Let the workers of Great Britain and the Soviet Union say whose policy was correct. Of course, if one permits oneself to be dominated by "feelings" and if one wishes to approach all important political questions which concern 10 million workers from the point of view of "feelings", and of indignation, then the only intelligent recommendation would be to dissolve the A. R. C.

We say however: Despite the fact that the leaders of the General Council are very bad leaders, despite the fact that they have not stood the last test in connection with the danger of war, and that the danger of a still greater piece of treachery on their part exists, despite all this, we shall not take the initiative to disrupt the A. R. C. because it was founded to give an organisation expression to the fraternal alliance between the workers of Great Britain and the Soviet Union and we are in favour of the all-round development of the friendship, the solidarity and the mutual assistance of the workers of both countries.

On the contrary, we say to the British workers, your leaders are pursuing a criminal policy making towards the disruption of the A. R. C., they want to betray you once again, they are pursuing an anti-Soviet policy. The policy of a disruption of the A. R. C. at the present moment is not only a policy damaging to the interests of unity, but it is policy of direct treachery to the workers of the Soviet Union. Can the British workers approve of a policy which is directed towards betraying the Russian workers at a time when the whole world is faced with the danger of war and the bandits are only awaiting a favourable moment to fly at our throats? Will the British workers approve of the policy of the General Council which is directed towards the disruption of the A. R. C., towards a direct betrayal of the workers of the Soviet Union, the workers of the Soviet Union can only place this interpretation upon the policy of the General Council?

**The British Proletariat will be with Us.**

Let the General Council answer our declaration openly before the masses. Let it not hide itself behind formal considerations and declare that our declaration is a violation of the Berlin Resolution. We declare that the policy of postponement of the meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee at the present moment represents a disruption of the Committee. It is a mockery of all the resolutions which have been adopted, it is a disruptive policy. Such a disruptive policy at the present moment however means a betrayal of the Russian workers.

The British workers should remember the fraternal assistance which the Russian workers rendered to the heroic and self-sacrificing British miners despite the General Council and which the Russian workers will still render in the future whenever it becomes necessary.

May the masses of the workers of Great Britain and the Soviet Union estimate this as it is. We have the right to demand that the General Council answers us: What is the reason for the confusing of two questions, the tremendously important question, how are millions of workers to prevent the capitalists from plunging the world into a new war, how are the workers of two great countries to unite their forces and rally new millions of workers around them to prevent the attempts of the robbers to cause a new world war, what is the reason for the confusing of this question with the question of the well-deserved execution of White Guardists?

They dare to accuse us of shooting our enemies, the White Guardists, but they are silent when the imperialists are committing their horrors in the colonies. They who have no word to say about these ferocities in the colonies dare to raise their voices and join the ranks of our class enemies when we workers settle just revolutionary accounts with our class enemies.

Let the worker masses of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union judge our policy and the policy of the General Council. We do not fear the judgment of the masses for we believe in their healthy class instinct. The worker masses of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union are in favour of a fraternal alliance, they are in favour of a decisive struggle against war, for a struggle against the offensive of capital, for a strong and capable A. R. C., for the unity of the workers against the capitalists. We have no confidence in the leaders, but we believe in the masses and we are convinced that in the decisive moment the British proletariat will justify our confidence. Therefore I propose to adopt the necessary declaration to the British and Russian workers. (Applause.)

## **Declaration of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union.**

Moscow, 29th June 1927.

An Extraordinary Plenary Session of the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions of the Soviet Union has taken place here. At the session Comrade Tomsky made a report upon the negotiations in Berlin between the representatives of the Central Council and the representatives of the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress concerning the activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Upon hearing the report the Plenary Session unanimously adopted the following

### **Declaration addressed to the Workers of the Soviet Union and of Great Britain:**

The dangerous international situation, the ever more threatening danger of war and the vicious attack of capitalism in Great Britain have up to the present produced no decisive action upon the part of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The Anglo-Russian Committee, however, was formed to fight against the offensive of capitalism, against the danger of imperialist war and for the international unity of the trade union movement. The attempt of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union to convene the Anglo-Russian Committee in Berlin in June was met by the General Council of the T. U. C. with evasions, postponements and sabotage. Therefore the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union considers it its duty to direct the following declaration to the workers of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union.

The Central Council believed and still believes that the Anglo-Russian Committee which was formed as the organisational expression of the struggle of the working class movement in Great Britain and the Soviet Union against the offensive of capitalism, against the danger of imperialist war and for the international unity of the trade union movement, could and should meet to consider the existing situation and to fling its whole authority into the scales for the protection of peace and against the preparations being made for war. In such a

moment, silence and inactivity on the part of the Anglo-Russian Committee would be a crime in the eyes of the working class. This is our firm conviction.

The Central Council has therefore made repeated proposals in this spirit to the General Council of the T. U. C., as can be seen from the correspondence with the General Council which has been published in the press, and from the Berlin preparatory conference between the representatives of the Central Council, Tomsky and Melnichansky, and the representatives of the British General Council, Hicks and Citrine.

The British General Council is attempting to evade the convening of the Anglo-Russian Committee and is causing delays under various excuses. It systematically avoids placing the most important questions which interest the British and the Russian workers, before the Anglo-Russian Committee for examination. In its correspondence with the General Council, the Central Council exhausted its whole arsenal of persuasion upon the leaders of the General Council with a view to causing a conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee and thus fulfilling loyally the undertakings to the workers of both countries. The Central Council cannot conceal the fact from the workers of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, that the obstinate refusal of the British General Council to convene the Anglo-Russian Committee can only be interpreted as a deliberate policy towards the breaking up of the Anglo-Russian Committee which justifies the fears of the 7th Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union. The 7th Trade Union Congress declared that:

"the rejection of the policy making for the breaking up of the Anglo-Russian Committee upon the part of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union was correct. Nevertheless, the congress cannot avoid noting the growing danger of a dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee upon the part of the leaders of the British General Council."

The Anglo-Russian Unity Committee is an organisation representing the labour union movements in both countries. The very fact of the existence of such an organisation consolidated the bonds of friendship between the proletariat of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union. The formation of the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee was a decided forward step upon the way to international proletarian unity. The Anglo-Russian Committee was to be a centre for the mobilisation of the proletarian organisations independent of their membership of this, that or no International, upon the basis of the elementary principles of the class struggle already mentioned. The fact that the Anglo-Russian Committee embraced the two greatest trade union movements in the world, i. e., the trade union movements of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union, caused it to become an important factor in the international proletarian class struggle, and all the efforts of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union and their leading body, the Central Council, were directed towards this end. In their work the representatives of the Central Council showed great initiative and attempted in every possible way and with all the means in their power to urge on the activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

However the consistent proletarian class initiative of the Central Council met with systematic attempts at sabotage, resistance, procrastination etc., from the British side, that is, from the General Council of the T. U. C. The workers of the Soviet Union followed the struggles of the British workers against the capitalists, against the coal barons and against the iron and steel magnates with the greatest sympathy. In the name of the workers of the Soviet Union, the Central Council offered fraternal assistance to the workers who took part in the General Strike in May last year. But the General Council refused the assistance of the workers of the Soviet Union and thus assisted the capitalists to defeat the General Strike. The General Council sabotaged the convening of the Anglo-Russian Committee during the heroic struggle of the British miners against the mineowners, that is to say, at a time when the calling of the Anglo-Russian Committee could have played a great role in the international campaign to support the miners. Whilst the workers of the Soviet Union applied all their energies in support of their fighting comrades, the General Council isolated the miners and thus assisted the coal barons to with the fight.

Did the General Council take measures to mobilise all proletarian forces into a united front against the offensive of

capitalism, to strengthen the class resistance of the British workers and to use the most heroic and decisive fighters in the front ranks? No. It did exactly the opposite, it expelled the supporters of the Minority Movement and the Communists from the unions.

Did the General Council do anything to utilise the international authority of the Anglo-Russian Committee in support of the British proletariat which was attacked along the whole line by the capitalists? The General Council did nothing of the kind.

With the support and the assistance of the right and "left" wing leaders of the General Council, the British working class was flung into the chains of the Trades Union Bill, a police and fascist bill, which has stolen the minimal rights of the British workers.

Has the General Council taken any serious steps to stop the hangman's offensive of British Imperialism against the Chinese revolution, or to stop the despatch of British troops to Chinese harbours, in order to break the alliance between the British soldiery and hangmen of the type of Chang Tso-lin? No. The General Council has not taken any such steps.

Did the General Council condemn the challenging Note of Chamberlain to the Soviet Union which was, as is now clear to the whole world, nothing but the preparatory step for the breaking off of diplomatic relations? Did the General Council interfere in the raid upon Arcos? Did it do anything to hold up the activity of the robber Hicks? Did it call the Anglo-Russian Committee in the days of the breach between Great Britain and the Soviet Union? No. The General Council did nothing of the sort and obviously did not consider it necessary to do anything.

Such a policy on the part of the General Council was aimed in fact at the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee as the organ of the British and Russian proletariat. On the other hand, the whole policy of the Central Council was aimed at the preservation of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the encouragement of its activity. The delegation of the Central Council was deliberately prepared to make the delegation of the General Council concessions in a number of questions. The delegation of the Central Council was of the opinion that its duty was to do everything possible to maintain the Anglo-Russian Committee for joint actions of the British and Soviet working class, without abandoning criticism of the incorrect actions of the General Council.

The delegation of the Central Council believed and believes that the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee would be damaging to the struggle for the unity of the international trade union movement and that it would supply grist to the mill of the leaders of the Amsterdam International and their disruptive policy, particularly now, at a moment when the Conservative Government has commenced a decisive offensive against the proletariat and has broken off relations with the Soviet Union. It is therefore necessary to do everything possible to maintain the connection between the proletariat of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the Central Council, which openly criticised the policy of the General Council, made concessions in a number of important questions dealt with at the last session of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Holding the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee to be damaging to the struggle for the international unity of the working class, the Central Council considers the present open or masked disruption of the Anglo-Russian Committee by the leaders of the General Council to be direct treachery to the class interests of the proletariat of the Soviet Union and of Great Britain.

The only political answer made by the General Council to the proposal of the Central Council to call the Anglo-Russian Committee and discuss the important questions, was contained in the telegram of protest in connection with the reprisals of the proletarian State against the White Guardist spies who had drawn the sword of terror against the proletarian dictatorship. The resolution of protest adopted by the General Council condemning the shooting of open and obstinate enemies of the working class, the shooting of incendiaries and terrorists who shot down representatives of the proletarian power from behind, who were actively engaged in preparations for the restoration of the regime hated by the workers and peasants, was in effect a direct mockery of the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union and a shameful



participation on the part of the leaders of the General Council in the campaign against the Soviet Union made by the venal bourgeois press.

To ignore the danger of war, to conceal the real significance of the Anglo-Russian breach from the workers, not to condemn publicly the foreign policy of Chamberlain, to evade the convening of the Anglo-Russian Committee and at the same time to make common cause with the black hundreds in the question of the so-called "Red terror", that is the real policy of the General Council. Such tactics can not be regarded as anything but treacherous and aiming at the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

In the name of 10 million organised workers in the Soviet Union, the Central Council considers it its duty to announce publicly the dangers which are threatening the world. The Central Council is of the opinion that all workers and all honest representatives of the workers must condemn with all possible energy, the criminal, insolent pogrom policy of the Conservative Government of Baldwin and Chamberlain, the government of the robbers (Pekin, London) the government which abolishes the rights of the trade unions (Strikebreaking Bill), the government which seeks to re-establish the Middle Ages (Reform of the House of Lords), the government of intriguers and provocateurs of a new world slaughter.

Only the blind can fail to see that Great Britain is arming for a war against the Soviet Union, coming to an understanding with the Fascist Mussolini, mobilising the dark forces, recruiting allies, seeking to bring about a repetition of the horrors of the intervention, of the blockade for the free workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, striving to burden the Workers State with new confusion and suffering. Only a traitor to the cause of the proletariat could justify such a policy in face of the growing danger of war.

The carrying out of the terrible plan to crush the Chinese revolution and to commence a campaign of blood against the Soviet Union must be prevented at all costs! The struggle against war is the urgent duty of the British and the world proletariat. War must be prevented! The proletariat must not permit itself to be taken by surprise. All measures must be adopted to mobilise the proletariat as an answer to the mobilisation of the bourgeoisie and the imperialist reaction.

The Central Council repeats, it considers it impermissible for the Anglo-Russian Committee to be silent, to be passive in such a situation. The Anglo-Russian Committee can and must raise its voice against the danger of war and against the reaction. The Anglo-Russian Committee must become a central point for the mobilisation of proletarian public opinion, it must place the question of the practical measures to adopt in the struggle against imperialist war and against the offensive of capital, on the agenda. The Central Council places the full responsibility for the policy of sabotage towards the Anglo-Russian Committee upon the shoulders of the General Council and appeals to the British and Russian workers to fight energetically for real proletarian solidarity, for a real struggle against capitalism, for a real defence against the incendiaries who seek to cause an imperialist war.

**A proletarian front against the front of capitalism!**

**Fight against imperialist reaction!**

**Proletarians, prepare yourselves for the struggle against the danger of war!**

## HANDS OFF THE SOVIET UNION

### Comrade Rykov's Answer to Lansbury, Maxton and Brockway.

Moscow, 29th June 1927.

Comrade Rykov, the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars has received the following telegram from Lansbury, Maxton and Brockway:

"We appeal to you to put an end to the executions without legal trial. Such executions shock British public opinion, in particular the friendly opinion of the Labour Party. We oppose the anti-Russian policy in Great Britain, however the executions have made our activity very much more difficult. We therefore request you to put an end to the reprisals."

Comrade Rykov has despatched the following answer:

"Your telegram is obviously the result of the publication of the sentence of the State Political Administration upon twenty White Guardists found guilty of organising espionage against the Soviet Union and terror acts against leading personalities in the Soviet Union.

Although this sentence was passed upon White Guardist counter-revolutionaries whose guilt was documented, the sentence is being used abroad to excite public opinion against the Soviet Union. In connection with this sentence, numerous lies and slanders are being spread through the foreign press hostile to the proletarian State.

The immediate aim of this newspaper campaign is to detract attention from the danger of war which threatens the Soviet Union and from the new adventures which are being prepared against the Soviet Union with the moral and material support of the Conservative Cabinet of Great Britain. All these things together have caused me to answer your telegram in some detail.

The sentence of the State Political Administration is termed in your telegram 'executions without legal trial'. This is not the case. According to the law of our State, the Collegium of the State Political Administration is competent in all cases when it is necessary to take energetic action against the counter-revolution; in these cases it then has all the rights of the Revolutionary Tribunal. In this case therefore, the State Political Administration is an extraordinary court which is formally analogous to those extraordinary and exceptional courts which exist in all bourgeois countries.

There is, it is true, a great difference of principle: The Soviet tribunals punish the counter-revolutionaries, whilst the courts in the capitalist countries punish the revolutionary workers. I wish to remind you of the fact that the Extraordinary Commission which existed in the time of the intervention and the civil war, was dissolved as soon as the Soviet State was able to overcome the intervention organised and financed by Churchill and to win victory from the counter-revolution. By this act the Soviet State proved that it considered it possible in the present situation to use the earlier methods of the struggle against the counter-revolution and for the protection of the Soviet power, only in extreme cases i. e., when one is forced to do so by new attacks of the White Guardist conspirators.

You write in your telegram that a section of public opinion in Great Britain has been 'shocked' by the sentence of the State Political Administration. I am of the opinion that those who are 'shocked' do not realise the conditions under which the working class of the Soviet Union is compelled to fight for the right of existence of the proletarian State and for freedom for the building up of Socialism. The working class of the Soviet Union is compelled to perform its constructive work surrounded by a ring of hostile capitalist States.

At the present moment, the Conservative government of Great Britain after having broken off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, is carrying on a furious campaign against the latter in the whole world and preparing for new military adventures against it. Every bourgeois State utilises all the power of its State apparatus in the struggle against the first proletarian State, it utilises its financial power and the power of its press. To-day the question of using its military forces against the Soviet Union is even being considered.

In this situation which is characterised by such a bitter struggle against the Soviet Union, a decisive action of the workers government against the active conspirators, the counter-revolutionaries and the supporters of the monarchist and bourgeois State order within the Soviet Union is a compulsory and unavoidable necessity. When our opponents use all means, from corruption and bribery, the organisation of conspiracies, of murders, provocations, arson and the preparation of military attack, then it would be a crime on our part not to take decisive measures to protect the interests of the workers and peasants, and the workers of the Soviet Union would have regarded it as treachery towards the revolution and consideration towards the counter-revolution had we not done so.

Bourgeois public opinion is of course 'shocked' at the execution of nobles, landowners and monarchists found guilty of active counter-revolutionary activity. But the same bourgeois public opinion countenances every execution of workers and peasants applauds it and supports every reprisal against the oppressed classes and peoples. This can be understood as the point of view of the bourgeoisie, the nobles and the capitalists. However, the working class cannot share this point of view.

You request us to cease the reprisals. The Soviet Union respects and values the opinions of the British working class to a great extent. But I believe that the interests of the working class of the whole world are best served by supporting the State of the toilers in the face of the hatred and the attacks of the class enemies. The Workers State has been forged in the struggle, it is the first workers State in human history and it is pursuing its tremendous task of organising the socialist order under extremely difficult circumstances.

The campaign which is at present being carried on against the Soviet Union in connection with the sentence of the State Political Administration, is not aimed to protect any persons condemned. It is simply part and parcel of the general campaign of the Soviet Union. In order to further this campaign, the circles interested in it, above all, the British diehards, are trying to detract attention from the fearful crime they are committing by preparing for a new war, an attack against the working class and the suppression of the emancipation movement in the colonial countries with the greatest brutality in the whole world.

The first and most important duty of the real representatives of the working class is to protect the interests of the proletarian revolution against the counter-revolution and all its consequences, and not the countenancing of the White Guardist robbers, the monarchist organisations and their agents. I hope that wide sections of public opinion in Great Britain, not to speak of the masses of the workers, will not be deceived by the policy of provocation and deception by which the British Government is steering to a new war."

## CHINA

### The Position of the Chinese Revolution.

By N. Bucharin.

The Chinese revolution is in the most difficult stage of its development. The armed forces of the national bourgeoisie are combining more and more, are carrying away with them sections of the Wuhan Army and are directing their spearhead against the mass movement of the lower social strata, against the workers and peasants, against the "plebeians" who have been roused by the great agrarian revolution and are storming against the "enlightened" intriguing politicians of the possessing classes in town and country. Behind the chequered curtain of political groupings, of personal conflicts, of combinations of Generals, behind the screen of military and official diplomacy, behind the confusion of solemn declarations and equally solemn execution parades, of insinuating gossip about the "three principles" and the throttling of revolutionaries, of "Chinese ceremonies" and orders of execution, behind this chequered and manifold mixture it is easy to see how the sword of the wildest class-war is being drawn, behind all this a desperate class struggle can be clearly seen, about the elementary forces of which some are not yet clear.

The block between Feng Yu Hsiang and Chang Kai Shek is giving expression to a great differentiation of the class forces in the country. The special peculiarity of the situation is that the three social class camps (roughly speaking) have three organised national centres. It is true that rash enquirers of the type of Comrade Radek ("All the worse for the facts!") have denied the existence of feudalism in China. These comrades have indeed built up their conclusions on the basis of this "analysis", and Radek's colleagues in the Opposition have not wasted any words on this error. (This is called an "honest Marxist investigation"!.) Nevertheless facts remain facts. The camp of the Northern Army with Chang Tso Lin at its head is the camp of feudal reaction. This camp is entirely in the service of the imperialists and thinks of no "reforms" but the one, that of founding a new dynasty by crowning the "Marshall". At the present moment this camp is obviously approaching its downfall.

The second camp is the camp of the Liberal bourgeois counter-revolution.

It is characteristic of the present moment that this second camp, at the present stage of development of Chinese events represents for the present a victorious force and holds a very special place in the class-war.

The class foundations of the revolutions of the generals against the people has been sufficiently elucidated; this class foundation is the going over of the Liberal bourgeoisie into the counter-revolutionary camp. Here we must add however that the agrarian revolution of the Chinese peasantry with its tempestuous rise, which dealt a destructive blow at the Liberal bourgeoisie and caused it to fly into a furious rage, must also be apprehended in its specifically Chinese peculiarity. Whereas in Russia the seizure of the land at first united almost all the strata of the peasantry against the landowners and ranged the whole mass of this peasantry against our Russian "landlords", a class between which and the peasantry there is a sharp dividing line, in the Chinese village, where the land is, too limited, where also there are but few large landed proprietors and very many small landowners who are interwoven with the Kulak elements, the class-war takes much more desperate forms. The strata against which the agrarian revolution is fighting are very much larger and thus come into contact with the urban Liberal bourgeoisie over a much wider surface.

The class differentiation was responsible for the overthrow of Chang Kai Shek. Chang Kai Shek was responsible for the treachery of Feng. Feng, on his part will cause the treachery of other generals. This is a source of very serious danger to Wuhan. Chang Kai Shek plus Feng, plus other generals, plus (possibly Left) "Mukdeners" — this is the military aspect of the bourgeois block. This block is at present the strongest among the camps which are at war. Its forces will inevitably continue to grow in the immediate future.

We must weigh the situation quite without prejudice; it would be a short-sighted policy to underestimate the strength of our opponent who is already taking his stand as executioner of the workers and peasants.

The strength of this Liberal-counter-revolutionary camp consists firstly in the numerical superiority of its armed forces and secondly in its political position as compared with the political situation of the feudal camp.

We have written several times that the bourgeois camp is already shooting workers and peasants but that it has not yet amalgamated with feudal reaction and imperialism. It has a tendency to amalgamate with that camp. The more this camp is threatened by the revolts of the workers and peasants the more clearly will this tendency come to the fore. For the moment however an amalgamation has not taken place. It still possesses a certain independence and a still greater apparent independence, and that ensures it a still greater political force in the country.

This fact is most clearly evidenced by the programme announced by the leaders of the bourgeois counter-revolution, — as far as its "ideology" is concerned — and by its battles against Mukden as far as the "facts" of the civil war are concerned.

The tenth thesis of Chang Kai Shek's declaration (of the "Programme of Action" of the Nanking Government) runs:

"Three paths lie open before China:

1. Subjugation to militarism and imperialism.
2. To follow the path of Communism.
3. To carry out in reality the three principles of the Kuomintang and to create a stronger government."

The Liberals are turning this point of view to account most cleverly. They pose as genuine liberators of China and contrast themselves with the Communists, whom they treat as agents of the "Russian State", using for this purpose all the lies of Poincaré, Chamberlain and the "international" Social Democrats. A paragraph of the fourth thesis of the declaration referred to formulates the standpoint in a very cunning and perfidious way though at the same time, viewed from the standpoint of stupefying the masses, in an extremely clever way, in the following words:

"The Kuomintang (needless to say the right clique of Chang Kai Shek. N. B.) holds to the standpoint of the right of self-determination of the peoples and of joining the world revolution (do not make jokes! N. B.) on the basis of equality between the nations, whereas the Communists kow-tow to the manipulations of Russia."

The masses will of course, from day to day, see the mendacity of these statements more clearly. This lie is contra-

dicted and will be contradicted by the language of steel and iron spoken by the executions. This language is being used more and more frequently by the Liberal "liberators" towards the Chinese workers and peasants. This lie will be contradicted by the reprisals employed by these strange adherents of the "world revolution" against the agrarian movement and against the majority of the Chinese nation. In the end moreover, this lie will not be helped by the shameful speeches of our Opposition which, in a criminal way, calumniate the policy of our Party representing it as a policy which is "nationally restricted" or as the incorporation of "national conservatism" and which are grist to the mill of the declared enemies of the revolutionary help of the Soviet Union (that is, if the opposition is right in this question, for then Chang Kai Shek must be right with his clamour about "Russia's manipulations"). Nevertheless we must acknowledge that the combination of a real fight against the North and of the exploitation of the traditions of the national fight for freedom represent definite political capital which for the time being still bears political interest.

For the moment we will not concern ourselves with the other points of the Nanking "programme" which are based on a clever exploitation of the unemployment in Wuhan (whence the capitalists have fled, having stopped the work in their factories), on promises with regard to the introduction of the eight hours' day "in the future" etc. We will only for the moment bring into relief another strong point of the Liberal counter-revolution, the fact that it has its agents in the third camp, the Wuhan camp, while the opposite is not possible.

Where then does the weakness of the third camp, the Wuhan camp lie? It lies chiefly in the fact that this camp and this centre of government has not a sufficiently reliable armed force at its disposal. Its army is melting away. Feng's treachery deprived it of its (from the military point of view) best division. The part which has remained, with Tan Shen Shi at its head is equally unreliable. It is not even possible to rely on the personal enmity between Chang Kai Shek and Tan Shen Shi. The voice of class blood is stronger than personal enmity, and the logic of the class-war is stronger than the logic of personal conflict. The few troops which are to be relied upon are obviously insufficient.

A second weakness of Wuhan is that in that camp, (both in the C. C. of the Kuomintang and in the Government) there are direct informers of Chang Kai Shek's and vacillating typical petty-bourgeois politicians of the worst brand who, at a moment of crisis, would be certain to side with the Liberals. Their terrible fear of the agrarian revolution may drive them into the arms of the Liberal adherents of Chang Kai Shek. When we recall that even leading Communists have made opportunist mistakes, we can easily understand that the extremely weak and variegated political leadership in Wuhan, which is in direct contradiction to the growth of the lower strata, is the most vulnerable spot in the Wuhan camp.

If the instructions of the Komintern had been carried out; if the agrarian revolution had not been checked; if the arming of the workers and peasants had been effected with energy; if the faithful divisions of troops had been brought together; if a clear political line, comprehensible to the masses, had been pursued; if the instructions with regard to the democratisation of the Kuomintang had been properly executed etc., etc., then the situation would not be so dangerous for Wuhan. The chief fault of the Wuhan camp is the misunderstanding, nay, even to some extent the existing opposition between the upper stratum of the Kuomintang and the mass of its members, between the lead and the actual movement.

The strength of this third camp is the forceful movement of the workers and peasants. The revolution repels the vacillating gas-bags and the vacillating intimidated "leaders" who sympathise with the enemy. The revolution sifts these leaders through the sieve of heavy trials. The mass movement is so mighty, involves the advance of a so gigantic mass of people, that in the long run it will sweep away all obstacles.

This is the position of the chief strength of the separate classes.

It is not difficult to see that the present situation brings up in all intensity the question of the two paths of development of the Chinese revolution. Theoretically we have faced this question from the beginning. Life has, as it always does, proved richer, more significant, more "cunning" than dull theory. The practical value of this way of putting the question is nevertheless completely confirmed.

The camp of the bourgeois counter-revolution is, for the time being, fighting against the feudalists and partly against the imperialists, contradictory as it may sound. (Even though it consents to compromises, agreements etc.) On this side of its "work" it still has in tow remnants of the traditions of the fight for freedom. At the same time however it is waging a furious fight against the workers and peasants of its own nation and is becoming its worst executioner; in this way it is becoming (and this overbalances everything else), the worst and most murderous counter-revolution.

This however is just the concrete personification of the question as to the two paths open to the class forces and the fight between them. The first path is that of a Liberal compromising solution of the question, a union of China on the basis of a "permanent" bourgeois order of justice under an economic protectorate of imperialism (with corresponding concessions on the part of the latter) and of a compromise with the feudalists within the country. The second way of solving the question is that of a "plebeian" solution of the tasks of the democratic revolution, of a decisive extermination of all remnants of feudality, a decisive fight against imperialism, the dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry, the prospect of following a socialist path. Or, in other words, a fight for the hegemony in the bourgeois democratic revolution between the working class and the Liberal bourgeoisie. This struggle for the hegemony, or, which amounts to the same thing, the struggle between the liberal and the plebeian line of development of the Chinese revolution, is the very gist of the present class conflicts.

The more dangerous the situation is at present, the more energetically must the third camp be supported, the more completely must the masses of workers, peasants and petty bourgeois be mobilised. The "plebs" must be organised and put on its feet in this great historic battle against the forces of imperialism, of the feudal and bourgeois counter-revolution, who all together, "on parallel lines" are shooting and executing the workers and peasants, setting on fire whole villages and working-class districts, and who are howling in chorus against the Communist Party of the Chinese proletariat, against the agrarian revolution, against the "terror" of the working class.

It is obvious that the policy of the Communist International is to mobilise the masses, to let loose the agrarian revolution, to unchain the labour movement, to fight to the death against traitors and renegades. One of the chief slogans must be: "Workers and peasants, trust in your own forces alone! Do not trust the generals and officers! Organise your armed troops!" The fight is developing now along all the lines; very clear thinking is demanded. It is necessary to reject with great tenacity all attempts to come to an understanding on the part of the semi-agents of Chang Kai Shek and Feng. It is imperative to steer towards purging the leading section of the Kuomintang of these vacillating elements. It is essential to consolidate the real "Jacobin" plebeian cadres which are capable of holding out in the fight, in spite of all dangers and defeats. Feng has gone over to the camp of the opponents of the people's revolution; we must declare merciless war on him.

It would be absurdly naive to imagine that the Communists, the workers and peasants, are now under an obligation to pursue tactics of compromises with Feng & Co. Such tactics could only be based on an attitude of absolute abandonment of the agrarian revolution and of the fight for the plebeian way of Chinese development.

There is however no reason to adopt such an attitude. Even supposing that Wuhan were to be surrounded by the enemy and to fall, the struggle would have to go on in another form. It is by no means an easy task to effect a military occupation of the whole of China, the China of the people, of the workers and peasants. The desperate forms which the fight is taking are proved by the very fact that more than 3000 peasants were murdered in the province of Hupeh in the months of May and June; the troops of the landowners have murdered about 2000 functionaries of the Peasant Union in the territory of the National Government.

However furiously the rabble of officers and nobles may rage, even large armies cannot occupy vast territories in which the flame of the peasant revolt will inevitably flare up. The objective tasks which the revolution has set itself, will not be promoted an iota by the shooting of hundreds or thousands, nay, of tens of thousands of peasants. The Liberal counter-revolutionaries are not capable of finding even a half-solution

The present leadership of the Congress has tied itself and the Congress machinery to a programme of work which is of benefit only to an insignificant section of the people, the big capitalists and their allies, the intellectual and professional upper classes. As a consequence, on the one hand, Congress circles are divided by personal ends, and on the other, the masses are allowed and even encouraged to express their indignation against their hard lot in the form of communal fights (i. e., so called religious riots between Hindus and Mussulmans).

In the interest of the vast majority of the people it is urgently necessary to free the Congress from the narrow shackles of (bourgeois) class interests, and to yoke it to the task of attaining national freedom from the imperialist bondage, as a step towards complete emancipation of the masses from exploitation and oppression."

The resolution of the W. P. P. demands a change in the Congress Programme in the following terms:

"This meeting of the All-India Congress Committee therefore resolves that

1. The aim of the Indian National Congress is the attainment of complete national independence from imperialism, and the establishment of a Swaraj based upon universal adult suffrage.

2. It reiterates its faith in civil disobedience, i. e. Direct Action as the only effective weapon that will ultimately free the people of India from their subject position, but realises that a great general awakening will have to be brought about before this weapon of Direct Action can be effectively used."

The W. P. P. resolutions lays down further that

"All efforts must be directed to the attainment with the least possible delay of the general awakening and for this purpose the Congress adopts the following programme:

a) 70% of the population which is engaged in agriculture is to be organised into Peasants' Societies, by districts, Talukas (sub-district) and Village, on the lines of Village Panchayats, (Councils of Five), based on universal suffrage aiming to secure control of the economic life of the rural areas."

The further parts of the resolutions repeat the programme of the W. P. P. Also with regard to the industrial proletariat the present resolution of the W. P. P. demands that the Congress should adopt the workers minimum demands as given in the W. P. P. programme itself. These demands, it may be recalled, are:

"Eight hour day. A minimum living wage, Abolition of child labour under the age of 18, A scheme of old age, health, and unemployment insurance. Employers liability and compensation Laws. Full freedom for trade union activity, and provisions for housing."

The other important parts of the W. P. P. resolution are formulated in the following terms:

"While distinctly reiterating the opinion that the reforms and the Political Machinery created thereunder are unsatisfactory and inadequate, this Congress holds that whatever advantage could be secured from existing Political Machinery must be utilised in the interest of the Masses.

This Congress further holds that the above-mentioned Programme of actual work among the Masses alone will ultimately emancipate them and therefore all possible efforts have to be made to create all favourable circumstances for the actual working of the same. In the elementary and initial stages of the above work all legal protection and conditions of direct help will have to be created under the existing Political Machinery, and with this definite purpose alone the (Legislation) Councils and all other Political Bodies will be worked and utilised by all Congressmen whenever and wherever possible...

While utilising the existing Machinery for the furtherance of the cause of the control of the Masses over the same, Congressmen will continue the policy of continuous, consistent and uniform obstruction to all Government measures whereby the Bureaucracy intends to, or is likely, to strengthen its position. All possible tactics will be

used by Congressmen to foil Government interests, as opposed to above aims, whenever and wherever possible...

Therefore to successfully checkmate the Government which is essentially entrenched behind its scientific resources, this Congress is of the opinion that the Railway, Posts, Telegraphs and all other Transport Machinery such as Steamship, Docks, Motor Services and other means of Transport and Conveyances must be effectively controlled by building up strong Trades Unions in these Trades and attempts must be made at the point of threat of General Strike to bring the Government to book to release further Political Reforms from its unwilling hands. It is therefore resolved to make systematic attempts Province by Province to effect this Organisational Work at the direct initiative of each Provincial Congress Committee and under the instructions of the All-India Congress Committee.

This attempt at a General Strike of all Transport and Conveyances will be strengthened and supplemented by creating a general atmosphere of General Strike on other Trades as well, and for this purpose the Congress resolves primarily to yoke itself to the task of Trade Unionism in all possible spheres."

## ECONOMICS

### The Customs Policy of the French Imperialists.

By Léon Delhayé (Paris).

In May the French Parliament commenced the discussion of a Bill concerning a revision of the customs tariff. This discussion, which was adjourned as a result of a manoeuvre on the part of the Left Cartel against the Ministry of "National Unity", is shortly to be resumed.

The discussion anent an alteration of the French customs laws is in connection with the entire reorganisation of the economic apparatus of French capitalism, the object of which is a successful fight against its imperialistic rivals. Stabilisation of the currency, rationalisation of production, a protective tariff, and reorganisation of the army are all the utterance of a common policy on the part of the French bourgeoisie.

The economic policy of the French imperialists during the war was solely actuated by the urgent necessities of the war itself. From the very beginning of hostilities, decrees appeared forbidding the importation of goods of foreign origin. On the other hand, the entire commercial policy was directed towards a reduction of imports. In the year 1917, the State remained the sole purchaser on foreign markets; thus a virtual State monopoly of foreign trade came into being.

After the armistice, the import prohibitions disappeared. But by virtue of the fact that the prices of commodities in France had trebled, the relative portion of the taxes, dues, and customs had sunk in proportion to the value of the goods from 15 to 5 per cent. The industrialists and the financiers, whose influence on the Government had constantly grown throughout the imperialistic war, demanded provisional measures for the protection of the home market. Two systems of measures were envisaged, the system of "coefficients" and the augmentation of the general customs tariff.

After the coefficients of increase had been established in regard to the individual categories of goods, the old customs, dues, and taxes were multiplied by the respective coefficients. A commission for establishing the coefficients, comprehending representatives of the great associations of industrialists, was charged with the execution of relative alterations of the system in operation in the different periods.

But the constant alteration of the dues and taxes rendered the international exchange of commodities so difficult that the French wholesale merchants brought about the repeal of the system in December 1921.

The Government was consequently obliged to have recourse to another means, liable to ensure customs protection for French products. The general raising of the tariff rates was therefore taken in hand, the general tariff being increased by 400 per cent by virtue of the decree of March 1921. This ensued by reason of the pressure brought to bear on the Government by the industrialists, who desired to close the French market to German

to the peasant question, the agrarian question, and this fact leads them on to an inevitable defeat, however great may be the partial victories they carry off against the revolutionary people.

The following fact necessarily belongs to the picture; the more desperate the fight of the bourgeoisie against the masses of the people becomes, the sooner will the bourgeoisie throw itself into the arms of the imperialists and implore them for help. The more rapidly, on the other hand the bourgeoisie squanders the remains of its political capital, the faster it will rush towards its defeat, the more rapidly will it become evident that a consistent national fight for freedom in China can only be waged against the bourgeoisie.

Another question may arise, that of the policy of the Soviet State. The question may be asked: Is it essential that the Soviet State should renounce all connections with the Nanking Government?

This question must of course be answered in the negative. None but the poorest politicians and extremely "naive" persons imagine that the nature of the proletarian State is such that it has absolutely no connections with capitalist milieu. Certain relations are indeed desirable. No reasonable person has suggested "abolishing" completely the institutions of Soviet diplomacy and the Foreign Minister for the sake of the so-called "purity" of our principles. If however this Soviet State has its representatives in the bourgeois countries of the West and East, if it maintains relations with the feudal State of Marshall Chang Tso Lin, if it has its representatives in the Fascist "Paradise" of Signor Mussolini, there can be no reason why it should forego relations with the Nanking Government. These customary forms of connection should be kept up.

Still more! If Soviet diplomacy is obliged to take into account the relative contradiction of interests of the imperialist powers in certain directions, it is all the more bound to take into consideration the antagonism between the Liberal claimants to the unity of China and their imperialist partners, both of whom, it is true, plunder China without regard to the "form of government".

The practical distinction between the Comintern and the Soviet Government is so absolutely clear in this respect, and we believe we have explained it in so popular a way, that even Chamberlain could understand it. In its diplomatic and trade relations the proletarian State refuses to be guided in any way by the point of view that it should "approve of" the policy of the capitalists or the feudal exploiters. The Communist International however conducts neither diplomatic nor trade relations with "other Powers". It directly organises the revolution.

Let us return to the question of the policy of the Comintern. Our violent Opposition who all the time has been "indignant" and "enraged" and has protested against the slogan of secession from the Kuomintang being unjustly attributed to them, now openly declares that it demands this secession.

The question is why? Is it possibly because those at the head of the Kuomintang vacillate? And the mass of the members of the Kuomintang — is that of no account? Since when has the attitude towards a mass organisation been determined by what happens at its very "summit"?

All the forces of the Liberal counter-revolution are at the present moment concentrated on driving the Communists out of the Kuomintang and on surrounding them. All the forces of the counter-revolution are piping to the same tune. It is a well-known fact that the influence of the Communist Party in the Kuomintang is steadily growing. It is a matter of common knowledge that the inferior organisations of the Kuomintang, especially the worker and peasant organisations, are under the leadership of the Communists. It is known that the very reason why Chang Kai Shek and his clique fight against Wuhan is that they regard the Left Kuomintang as an "agency" of the Communists. Finally, it is well known that the slogan of the arrest and execution of Borodin, the slogan of the removal of the Communists from the Wuhan Government and from the C. C. of the Kuomintang are Chang Kai Shek's slogans. And at a time like this it is suggested that we ourselves fulfil the wishes of these gentlemen from the "revolutionary" standpoint!

We must not let ourselves in for such tactics. We must strengthen still more our work in the Kuomintang, must cleanse it from the bourgeois elements and the renegades of every species. To secede voluntarily however, just when the block of our opponents demands it, would indeed be strange tactics.

At the conference between Chang Kai Shek and Feng when they met at Sui Chou, a platform about on the following lines was passed:

1. Wuhan shall acknowledge its "mistakes".
2. The Communists shall be excluded from the Kuomintang.
3. Borodin shall be dismissed.
4. The "high contracting parties" shall organise a campaign in common against Peking.

Chang Kai Shek's "informers" are prepared to accept this plan (Wan Chin Wei is not among them, he takes a firmer stand than the others). Those who are in opposition to us however are steering straight for this "platform".

Instead of dealing in detail with such naiveties we must see to it that our position in the Kuomintang is reinforced. We must maintain our position in the national government by throwing overboard and unmasking the "informers". Whilst freeing ourselves from ballast and organising the "real Left" from above we must fight round our banner.

And if we do not succeed? If our opponent gains the upper hand at the present moment? This may happen. It is possible that the central government may, in certain circumstances, be disrupted by its internal dissensions and that it may be impossible to organise a truly Jacobin "Left". But we must fight our way along such a path. We must fight still more valiantly for our positions in the Kuomintang, to maintain and consolidate them, when the overwhelming majority of its members are under the influence of the Communists. The Kuomintang will perish unless it follows the path of giving rein to the agrarian revolution. The Communist party is not interested in that; it is interested in consolidating its influence in these organisations, in developing it rapidly and turning it into a powerful party with workers and peasants as its foundation, into an organ of the democratic plebeian revolution. This possibility exists, and it would be senseless to forego it now.

Let the despairing sceptics croak over the success achieved by the traitors. The Marxists-Leninists know that the elementary forces of the Chinese revolution which have been aroused cannot but break their way through to victory, however imposing be the obstacles placed in their way by the bourgeois counter-revolution, however many revolutionaries feudal reaction may execute, however huge be the guns with which the foreign troops of occupation fire on Chinese towns.

## POLITICS

### **The Indian National Congress and the Workers' and Peasants' Party (Bombay).**

By G. L.

Within the Indian National Congress, the pressure of the Left Wing has been very much on the increase, of late, to change the Congress Programme in the direction of orientation towards the masses. A meeting of the All-India Congress Committee which was to have been held in the middle of May had on its agenda the discussion of the suggestions put forward by Comrade Saklatvala during his campaign.

Meanwhile, we have a projected resolution of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay — resolution which was to have been moved at the meeting of the Congress Committee. The resolution stood in the names of Joglekar and Nimbkar, members of both the Congress Committee and the W. P. P.

The resolution is very important, being as a matter of fact, the first organised attempt in the name of an already existing Workers Party to get the Congress to change its programme in a more revolutionary sense.

The first part of the resolution says:

"The present Congress activity and programme are completely divorced from the everyday life of the masses, and in consequence the bulk of the population, the disenfranchised 98 percent, have lost all interest in and sympathy for the Congress, which has become a feeble body.

imports, at that time favoured by the inflation in Germany. These brutal measures were characteristic of the protectionist policy of the French capitalists. They were in preparation of the law which is at present before the French Parliament and which provides for a wholesale renewal of the customs tariffs, such as was planned in the year 1923 by the Government of the National Bloc.

The customs enactments are in close connection with the commercial treaties, which are concluded on the basis of most-favoured-nation treatment. Since in 1918 all French trade treaties had been cancelled, a number of new agreements had to be concluded by the French Government. Since 1919, negotiations in this regard have taken place with Czechoslovakia, Finland, Esthonia, Spain, and Canada. The most-favoured-nation clause, however, disappeared from the respective commercial treaties. Tariff concessions were made on the basis of the strictest reciprocity.

The most difficult were the negotiations in regard to a commercial agreement with Germany. In this connection the figures illustrating the interchange of commodities between these two capitalistic countries serve to show how important it is that normal conditions should exist between them. In the year 1926, France exported, out of a total export value of 59,000 millions, goods for 4427 millions to Germany alone.

But while the French industrial and commercial capital was particularly favoured in relation to the German capital by the Versailles Treaty, seeing that Germany was deprived for five years of the right to conclude commercial agreements while France could until January 1925 enjoy the privileges of a most-favoured nation without reciprocity, this relation changed altogether in the beginning of 1925. The German negotiators were now on the same footing as the French, and yet it was urgently necessary that a valid understanding in regard to a definite customs tariff be attained. This did not materialise until August 1926. Meanwhile the position of the French exporters on the German market had greatly deteriorated, for Germany had made full use of its right of increasing the dues and custom rates. Thus the exports of France to Germany had developed somewhat as follows:

Year	Cotton (Expressed in Cents)	Silk Tissues	Automobiles	Wine (Hectolitres)
1924	81,500	4,154	43,800	681,000
1925	26,100	1,895	39,700	195,000
1926	6,000	1,368	23,100	180,000

It is only in the case of the French iron industry, that exports were well maintained and even increased. For the finishing industries of France and for the French farmers, therefore, the commercial agreement with Germany is a necessity. The German Government is desirous of waiting to know the result of the customs-tariff discussion in the French Parliament. Even now it is evident that a customs war between Germany and France will be inevitable.

Since the war, the productive factors in France have greatly developed. Many of them, such as the increase and elaboration of great works, particularly those of the chemical and metal industries during the war, the acquisition of the Alsace-Lorraine ore, weaving, and potash industries, the Sarre coal mines, the restoration of the industrial plant in the devastated provinces, and the like, have caused radical changes in the productive apparatus of French capitalism. France has become a great industrial country and had in 1923 more than 4,300,000 kilowatts of motive power at its disposal, whereas in 1913 the corresponding total was no more than 2,600,000 kilowatts.

Before the war France produced six per cent of the world's output of cast iron, in which respect it occupied the third place in Europe; in 1926 its share of the world's output already figured at 12 per cent and it was abreast of Germany. Between 1913 and 1926 the export of finished materials had doubled, advancing from 23 to 47 million cents. The exports of machinery, which in 1922 stood at no more than 51,000 tons, had risen by 1926 to 127,000 tons. The tonnage of the automobiles sold abroad amounted in 1926 to 96,000 tons, while in 1913 it was only 25,000 tons. Particular progress has been made in the exportation of tools, which advanced from 149,000 tons in 1913 to 730,000 tons in 1926.

This accelerated development, which was favoured by the long inflation period, is now at a turning point. While production has increased so greatly, the purchasing power of the

masses has been declining and foreign markets have shrunk. The appreciation and stabilisation of the French franc has brought to light the hidden crisis of French capitalism. Now the French capitalists, who find themselves faced with a Europe traversed by customs boundaries, must seek a new solution for the protection and maintenance of their production. And this solution they believe to have found in a protectionist policy.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### The Trial of the Members of the Young Communist League of Bulgaria.

By K o m s (Sophia).

At the time of International Youth Day in 1926, the Bulgarian hangman government struck a blow against the Y. C. L. of Bulgaria. In Sophia more than 100 young workers, employees, school-boys and students were arrested. They were tortured for a long time. Subsequently, on the ground of mere police information or of "confessions" extracted by the inquisition machine, a case was opened against 35 of the young prisoners. As there were among the accused in this case a number of members of the executive of the League, the case was looked upon as being against the Y. C. L. of Bulgaria itself. The Lyaptshév Government kept these young workmen and students nine months in prison on remand and fixed the trial for the eve of the parliamentary elections in order to cause confusion in the ranks of the toilers, to deliver a blow at the Communist Party of Bulgaria and, to "justify" their unprecedented terror in the eyes of the electorate.

On May 16th the trial of the 35 Sophian members of the Y. C. L. of Bulgaria began and was followed with the greatest interest by the Bulgarian workers, peasants and youths. It coincided with a tremendously widespread movement of the working masses in town and country (fight for amnesty, against emergency regime and State Protection Act; formation of the worker block; legal juvenile associations, labour party), as also with the climax in the election campaign.

The workers, the peasants, the artisans and the brain workers took the side of the organisation to which the prisoners were accused or belonging. The presiding judge was swamped with letters and telegrams from factories, villages and towns, as also from abroad, calling for the cancellation of the trial and the legislation of the Y. C. L. of Bulgaria.

The young workers and peasants, as also the whole of the working class in Bulgaria, expected from the accused not defence but indictment. The accused members of the Y. C. L. of Bulgaria conducted themselves very manfully before the Fascist court and fully justified the hopes reposed in them.

In the very first sitting of the court the members of the Y. C. L. described in the crowded court-room and before the astonished judges the shocking and disgraceful scenes enacted in the dungeons of the police inferno, whereby it appeared that not one of the prisoners had escaped maltreatment. The president of the court stamped his feet, interrupted, threatened; thereupon the members of the Y. C. L. described the methods of inquisition used in the "public security", how they were transported out of the town in motor police-vans, how they were crucified and bound with ropes, etc. etc. When in the file of witnesses for the prosecution the real organiser of, the one who actually administered the inquisitorial maltreatment, Inspector Mtev, appeared, the members of the Y. C. L. got up and shouted excitedly: "Murderer! Murderer!" Then they stormed the executioner-policeman with questions, such questions as forced him, after he had tried in vain to invent lies, to say: "I cannot remember". Finally he became the pitiable accused and left the court accompanied by hisses and protests against his admission to the court.

Many of the accused dispensed with defending counsels and themselves undertook the defence of their person and of the League. Special interest was aroused by the speech of Filipp D. Filippov, who was accused of being a member of the executive of the League. His speech was a thorough defence of the Y. C. L. of Bulgaria. At the very first sitting of the court he declared:

"I was a Communist even in my childhood. My grandfather, my father (his father was a prominent functionary of the party known as the 'Narrow-minded Socialists', Koms.) and my mother were all Communists. At a very early stage of my life I came to look upon Communism as the idea of idea. I was a member of the Y.C.L. while I was still attending school, and.... since that time I have worked indefatigably."

As he was continually interrupted by the president of the court, Filippov gave up his speech but resumed again in the statement of the case for the defence. On this occasion he delivered a lengthy speech in which he depicted the revolutionary-Leninistic character of the Y.C.L.B.

"The emergency laws, the prisons, the scaffolds and gallows merely serve the purpose of prolonging the death agony of the old order of society and of rendering the birth of the new order more difficult, but nothing will serve to rescue that which historic dialectics have condemned to inevitable decay."

Finally he said:

"All friends and enemies should . . . . know that today, at this moment, the Y.C.L. of Bulgaria is taking up its position in the arena of the social fights in this country, and from that position declares unflinchingly, like a brave soldier constantly ready to take up the defensive or the offensive: 'I was, I am, I shall be!'"

Every one of the accused who was incapable of resisting the inquisitional machine and made "confessions", revoked on the very first day of the trial the "confessions" extorted from them in the police dungeons, and displayed extreme distress because they had not been able to remain true to the traditions of the Bulgarian revolutionary movement. These youths described how they were compelled to make their statements. They loudly declared their devotion to the Y.C.L., they admitted that they had not been worthy to bear the standard of the Y.C.L. and exhorted the young workers not to follow their example, but to follow in the path of the revolutionary character which the illegal period of the Bulgarian revolutionary movement had created. As the executive of the Y.C.L.B. had declared before the court that they were expelled on account of their unworthy attitude "they themselves had severed their attachment to the organisation", but they also said "that they would do their best to make good their transgression".

The court, which is only a tool in the hands of the Bulgarian hangman-government, passed the following outrageous judgement, in spite of the lack of evidence other than police inventions and confessions extracted under compulsion: Of the 35 prisoners, 23 were found guilty. Two of these were permitted amnesty, because their action was covered by the amnesty law of February 1926. The remaining 21 who sentenced to an aggregate of 117,5 years' hard labour and to fines amounting to 270,000 levas. This judgment is nothing but an act of vengeance and yet another serious crime on the part of the White Bulgarian government.

From a political point of view, the emergency regime in Bulgaria suffered an extraordinary defeat. The case brought against the members of the Y.C.L. served to unite (just as did the trial of the C.P.B.) our juvenile comrades under the banner of the Y.C.L. and to mobilise them for the fight enlivened by its battle-cries

The Sophian trial of the members of the Y.C.L. constitutes a climax in the new general insurrection of the young workers and gives it a further marked impetus. It can boldly be said that the trial of the members of the Y.C.L. in Sophia opened up a fresh period in the mass-development in the youth movement in Bulgaria. The trial -- as also the Party Press -- liquidated the confusion still prevailing among the young workers as a relic of April, it consolidated the hegemony of the League, it enhanced its authority and consequently facilitated its general activity and its reconstruction. The Sophian trial is a bold step forwards on the way to the fight which will overthrow one of the strongest pillars of international Fascism. This fight, under the leadership of the Communist Party of Bulgaria and supported by the international proletariat, must be entered upon with still greater determination. One link in the long chain is the severe judgment passed upon the members of the Y.C.L.B. For this reason the whole of the Bulgarian and international working class must lend a hand and the greatest assistance must come from the Bulgarian and international young workers and young peasants.

## PLENUM OF THE E. C. C. I.

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

By N. Bucharin.

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

(Conclusion.)

#### The Chinese Revolution.

##### 1. The Regrouping of Class Forces.

It was at the VII. Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. that a resolution was detailed, and contained an analysis of the economic-international came into existence, on the Chinese revolution. This resolution was detailed, and contained an analysis of the economics of China and the rôle played by imperialism, an analysis and estimate of the different class forces in China, an estimate of the relations existing at that time between the various class forces, and a prognosis forecasting the inevitable fresh regroupings arising out of the progress of the Chinese revolution. The VII. Plenum determined the main line of tactics for the Communist Party of China. I begin with the VII. Plenum, in order to emphasise from the beginning that estimate of the Chinese class forces and of the necessary regroupings, which was made by the Communist International long before Chang Kai-shek's renegacy confirmed this estimate

The VII. Plenum took as point of departure for its resolution the consideration that the growing class antagonism, the development of the agrarian movement and of the labour movement, were inevitably bound to lead the liberal bourgeoisie away from the united national revolutionary front, into the camp of the counter-revolutionists, so that at this point the whole Chinese revolution would enter a new phase of development. During this stage the class forces of the national revolutionary front will have to seek support from the bloc composed of the working class, the peasantry, and the city petty bourgeoisie (artisans, small shopkeepers, small intellectuals, etc.).

Chang Kai-shek's change of front was nothing more nor less than a crude expression of that transition of the liberal bourgeoisie into the camp of the counter-revolutionists, long prophesied by the VII. Plenum. Chang Kai-shek's renegacy should not by any means be regarded as the treachery of one isolated general. His traitorous action was merely the military expression of a far-reaching regrouping of the class forces of the country, inevitably resulting from the development of the agrarian movement in the rural districts, and of the labour movement in the towns.

The present Plenum has had to solve the task of observing the lessons to be learnt from the present events, and of determining the tactics to be pursued by the C. P. of China and the Comintern in the new situation. In the first place, Chang Kai-shek's renegacy has had to be accorded its proper place in the estimate of events. The symbol of the desertion of an extremely large social stratum, a group which played a leading rôle in that stage of the Chinese revolution from which we are just emerging, and which actually took the part of leader, during the first stage of the development of the Chinese revolution, in the struggle against Imperialism. The liberal bourgeoisie has gone over into the camp of counter-revolution, and the national emancipation movement has consequently been plunged into an inevitable crisis. This crisis has been accompanied by a partial defeat of the Chinese revolution.

At the present time we are up against another combination of social forces, and any line of tactics or strategic measure based on the former distribution of forces would be of necessity counter-revolutionary, and would be condemned to inevitable defeat. Chang Kai-shek's desertion of the revolution was determined by a number of factors; mainly by the development of the labour movement, the rise of the peasant movement, and the policy of the imperialists. These factors have exercised a mighty pressure on the liberal bourgeois front, and have accelerated the process of desertion of this bourgeoisie from the united national revolutionary front.

## 2. The Agrarian Revolution and the Peasant Movement.

The E. C. C. I is of the opinion that the central question of the Chinese revolution at the present juncture — in so far as its inner driving forces are concerned — is the agrarian revolution. It is becoming more and more evident that the peasant movement, the problem of the redistribution of land, of the confiscation of the land in the hands of the small, middle, and large (but few in number) landowners, and all the tasks and problems entailed by these demands, are at the moment the burning questions of the day. It is scarcely necessary to point out here that the peasantry form an exceedingly important section of the Chinese population; nor is it necessary to characterise in detail the social economics of Chinese rural life. I should merely like to emphasise that the course taken by events in China, and the development of the agrarian movement, completely refute the standpoint (as held for instance by Comrade Radek) that there are no remains of feudalism in China, a standpoint which leaves the extraordinary intensity of the peasant agrarian movement in China entirely unexplained.

The agrarian revolution is the pivot upon which events turn. The peasantry of China appear in their overwhelming numbers on the stage of history. The peasantry, under the leadership of the working class, will develop into the leading mass force behind the development of the Chinese revolution. The Executive has discussed the solutions to be found for the Chinese agrarian question, and the resolution passed by the Plenum expressly emphasises that, from the standpoint of the development of the Chinese revolution, the most essential step next to be taken is the actual confiscation of the land, the actual overthrow of the old apparatus ruling, the peasantry, the actual redistribution of the land from below, by the peasants themselves, the peasant organisations and peasant committees now springing up in ever increasing numbers.

The importance of these steps cannot be too greatly emphasised, for the illusion still exists, even among the Chinese Communists, and to a much greater degree among the Left Kuomintang, that this agrarian revolution can only be accomplished in the form of an agrarian revolution from above, or must be postponed until China is united. This illusion acts a brake on the development of the Chinese agrarian peasant movement. We only need refer to the last speech made by Comrade Tang Ping Shan, the Minister of Agriculture in the Wuhan Government; this speech did not contain one word on the necessity of the actual confiscation of the land. In the circles around the Wuhan government, and even among certain circles of the Chinese communists themselves, tendencies still exist towards going beyond certain limits of present conditions by means of peaceful enactments, and towards attempting to solve the agrarian problem by means of decrees and similar procedures; and this although civil war has already begun in the country. This is something which has never been accomplished in the history of any revolution, and never will be.

We may further refer to a speech held by another leader of the C. P. of China, Comrade Chen Du Siu, who advanced an even more singular opinion at the Party Conference recently. He stated that we must wait with the agrarian revolution until the Chinese revolutionary troops march into Peking and drive Chang Tso Lin out of the capital.

And yet it is perfectly obvious that the fundamental premise for the victorious solution of the problems dictated by the Chinese revolution today is the development of the agrarian revolution. From every standpoint the agrarian revolution is the prerequisite — from the standpoint of the fight against Imperialism, of the fight against liberal-bourgeois counter-revolution, that is against Chang Kai-shek, from the standpoint of the better self-defence, and further development of the Wuhan Government, from the standpoint of the mobilisation of the most powerful of forces possible in the struggle against counter-revolution.

Not one problem can be solved today unless an agrarian revolution, carried forward by the masses of the peasantry, is an accomplished fact. Even such an elementary problem as the organisation of armed forces leads us inevitably to the necessity of promoting the agrarian revolution, for the simple reason that the Wuhan Government will otherwise not be in a position to win the confidence of the peasants, will not be in a position to gather troops of really reliable soldiers around it, and will not be in a position to give its further successes military security. The central problem, the central task, the

central slogan, the slogan of **awakening the agrarian revolution**. And to accomplish the agrarian revolution the land must be confiscated by the peasants themselves, the ground rents must be abolished, the peasants must rule their own affairs by means of their peasant committees and peasant associations, the masses of the peasantry must be armed, the land taken from the large landowners must be secured by armed defence, etc. etc.

## 3. The Mass Organisations, the Kuomintang, and the Communist Party.

All this leads us naturally to the problem of organisation. Having seen the necessity of promoting the agrarian revolution to be more important than all else, that is, having recognised the importance of a mass movement, it is obvious that we turn our attention at once to the tempestuously energetic growth of every possible description of **mass organisation** — the peasants unions, the peasants committees, the workers trade unions, the unions of the artisans and small shopkeepers, etc. It need not be said that here the basis must be the mass organisations of the working class and the peasantry.

In connection with this orientation it is natural and comprehensible that the Executive found it necessary to raise the question of the **reorganisation of the Kuomintang**. The Kuomintang, at the time when it came into being, had an extremely original social and class structure, and at the same time an exceedingly original organisatory structure. It contained not only purely bourgeois elements, forming the social class basis of the so-called right wing, but workers, peasants, petty bourgeois, and intellectuals. The Kuomintang, which was organised in Sun Yat Sen's time on the basis of the most multifarious military combinations, was an organisation about which almost anything might have been said, except that it was built up on a foundation of inner party democracy. A large number of leaders not only held all power in their hands, but were actually perfectly independent of the local organisations of the Kuomintang. No proper meetings were held nor proper elections organised. This state of affairs will have to be fundamentally changed, the more that the Kuomintang, without a radical alteration in these respects, will never be able to play its part in history, but must inevitably fall into decay.

The split in the national-revolutionary front, the desertion of the bourgeoisie into the camp of counter-revolution, was accompanied by a split in the Kuomintang. This split in the Kuomintang has led to the formation, by Chang Kai-shek, of liberal bourgeois right Kuomintang. The Left Kuomintang now consists of the petty bourgeoisie, the workers, the peasants, and some groups of the bourgeois radical intelligentsia with a few residual elements from the radical strata of the large bourgeoisie; these last play a comparatively secondary role.

What is first to be done, if we are to steer our course towards the agrarian revolution? Our most imperative task is to render proletarian and peasant influence decisive in the Left Kuomintang; not only must this party be a proletarian and peasant party as regards its membership, but this influence must be felt in all its **leading organs in town and country**.

Yesterday a comrade came to us, a member of the delegation sent to China by the Communist International. He maintained that the relations existing in the leadership of the Kuomintang of the Left Kuomintang do not by any means correspond with the inner structure of the Kuomintang from the standpoint of the real class relations among the masses of its members. He reported that the Communists exercise a strong influence among the most important mass organisations affiliated to the Kuomintang or formally under its influence.

This means that Communist influence is growing in that mass force which is playing an increasingly important rôle in the development of the Chinese revolution. And it need not be said that the Chinese Communists are not hundred per cent Bolshevik; this we must not forget. It would be an illusion to expect even the Communists to be hundred per cent Bolshevik. Our Party, when it came into being, was a group of intellectuals and workers which had absorbed the whole Marxist experience of the West European Social Democratic movement. The founders of Russian Social Democracy were thoroughly educated Marxists. In our Party the Marxian principles were ours from the very beginning. Our Communist Party in China has been founded on an entirely different foundation. It arose out of Sun Yat Sen's "Narodnikism" without any knowledge



of the principles of Marxism. It is only of late that contact with the Soviet Union and the Communist International has afforded the opportunity for the formation of a Marxist cadre. We must not lose sight of this peculiarity in the history of the C. P. of China.

The necessity of developing the agrarian revolution, the necessity of developing the labour movement and ensuring the growth of the mass organisations, the necessity of utilising the positive traditions of the Kuomintang as an organisation in which the working class comes into immediate contact with the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie and is able to assume the leadership of these forces, all this has brought the Plenum to the decision that it is most decidedly necessary to reorganise the Kuomintang on the basis of the collective membership of all these forms of mass organisations, that is, the trade unions, the peasants' union and committees, the soldiers' organisations, the organisations of the small handicrafts, etc.

In this connection the Executive drew attention to the special tasks falling to the Communist Party, and to the special forms of its relations to the Left Kuomintang. The Executive pointed out that the Communist Party has frequently showed itself afraid of a development of a mass movement, especially of an agrarian movement. This superfluous caution, and the vacillations in the leadership of the Communist Party itself, are closely related to the superfluous "caution" exercised in criticising the vacillations and half-hearted methods of the Left Kuomintang. The resolution of the E. C. C. I. states clearly that the Communist Party, in so far as it forms the vanguard of the proletariat, must assert its claim to independence as the Party of the working class, that it must not hesitate to criticise the vacillations and half-heartedness of the petty bourgeois Kuomintang, that it is indeed its plain duty to criticise the vacillating attitude of the Kuomintang leaders, and that this is the only possible way to push forward the Left radical petty-bourgeois revolutionists in the direction of a consistent mass struggle of the combined peasantry, artisans, and workers.

#### 4. Armed Forces and Revolution.

The problem of the army, and the whole problem of armed forces, is a highly complicated one. It must be admitted that even the Left Kuomintang does not yet represent a bloc of the workers and peasants. It has still a number of bourgeois radical leaders. The same applies to the Wuhan government. The Wuhan government is still far from being a dictatorship of the workers and peasantry. It can however develop in this direction. It still contains bourgeois radical leaders who may possibly go over to the enemy, and very probably will do so. And if we have to reckon with this possibility in the case of some of the leaders of the Left Kuomintang, and of some of the members of the present Wuhan Government, then we must admit that the possibility is even greater in the case of the army apparatus.

With regard to the Kuomintang, I am not of the opinion that it is liable to any split of appreciable dimensions, likely to cause the falling off of a great many of its members. This is impossible, because the great mass of the Kuomintang (I differentiate between the masses and the heads of Kuomintang) actually represent a bloc of the workers, peasantry, and petty bourgeoisie. But it is characteristic of the present situation that the army, the generals and officers' staff, do not by any means represent an absolutely reliable force.

The peculiarities of the position must be fully realised. We are of course fully aware that it is possible to make use of the old generals, but only provided certain conditions are fulfilled, that is, provided that the revolutionary power accomplishes a firm establishment of its position, provided that the economic basis of the old regime (feudalism) is undermined, and provided that these generals are deprived of all possibility of an independent political existence.

But all this cannot yet be asserted of the territory under the Wuhan Government. Can it be maintained that the position of even the bourgeois revolution is firmly established here? No, for the landlords and the semi-landlords, with their gendarmerie and police, have not yet been driven away. Generally speaking, even the Wuhan Government is not yet strong enough. And where its military strength is being improved, the footing is by no means secure, since the number of faithful leaders within the army itself is still insufficient. This is very important. In this sense the structure of the Wuhan army has little simi-

larity with the structure of our Red Army. The army in its totality still stands with the Wuhan Government. But no guarantee exists that this will continue to be the case, without more or less considerable conflicts and treachery. Treachery is indeed more than probable, and in a certain sense inevitable.

#### The Chinese Revolution and the Opposition.

The gist of comrade Trotsky's utterances is as follows: Chang Kai-shek has caused the Chinese revolution to suffer a defeat, and this has happened because the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. and the leaders of the Comintern have pursued a "criminal", "treasonable, and "shameful" line of tactics. In Trotsky's opinion the tactics of the C. C. and of the Comintern deserve these designations, for the C. C. and the leaders of the Comintern have insisted on a Menshevist and not a Bolshevik standpoint with respect to the liberal bourgeoisie. Trotsky reminds us of the attitude taken by Lenin and the Bolsheviks with regard to the liberal bourgeoisie in the bourgeois democratic revolution of 1905, and quotes from Lenin approximately as follows:

The revolution is a bourgeois one, and therefore we must support the bourgeoisie — thus speak the Mensheviks; the revolution is a bourgeois one, and therefore it is necessary to fight against the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie — thus speak the Bolsheviks.

This passage from Lenin is absolutely correct. The differences of opinion between us and the Mensheviks in the revolution of 1905 were along the line of our relations to the peasantry and to the liberal bourgeoisie. We confronted Tsarism and bourgeoisie, including the liberal bourgeoisie then become counter-revolutionary, by a plebian bloc of workers and peasants; the Mensheviks, on the other hand, supported the liberal bourgeoisie, and failed to grasp the importance of the peasantry. This was the main line of schism between us.

If Lenin had written nothing more than this, if China were a part of the Russian Empire of 1905, and if the Chinese bourgeoisie from 1911 to 1926 had been similar to our bourgeoisie, then indeed we would deserve the title of "Mensheviks". But the truth is that Trotsky and our whole Opposition understand neither Lenin's standpoint in this question nor the facts, and bring confusion into the whole question.

We must differentiate between a revolution such as the Russian of 1905, and a revolution of an anti-imperialist character in the semi-colonial and "independent" countries. Lenin's writings point this out with the utmost clearness. Lenin has told us that we may make not only agreements with the bourgeoisie, but may form actual alliances with them (this Lenin wrote and said at the II. World Congress of the Comintern), though of course under the indispensable condition that the independence of our Party, the independence of the workers' organisations, etc., is secured. Not merely agreements, but even "alliances". Why? For the simple reason that in such countries the part played by the liberal bourgeoisie is not the same as its rôle in Russia in 1905. In 1904 the bourgeoisie still opposed Tsarism, but after the October Strike of 1905 the liberal bourgeoisie had already become an openly counter-revolutionary force. The fact that the liberal bourgeoisie had never once lifted a finger against Tsarism, that it was entirely unable to do so, and that it was bound to go over into the counter-revolutionary camp with the utmost rapidity, was the basis upon which we laid down our line of tactics towards the liberal bourgeoisie.

And now, since Chang Kai-shek has betrayed the revolution, has the Chinese bourgeoisie become counter-revolutionary? Yes, it has become counter-revolutionary. But did it play a counter-revolutionary rôle between 1911 and 1926? Who is in a position to assert this? Now, indeed, it has gone over to the counter-revolutionary camp, but for many years the part it played made it our duty to support it. We were obliged to utilise it, we were obliged to form a bloc with it. The Communist Party had just been born, the labour movement was making its first steps forward, and the liberal bourgeoisie was fighting against the feudal lords and the imperialists, fighting even with arms. A comparatively short time before Chang Kai-shek's desertion, his troops undertook the "Northern campaign". The question is: Was it our duty to support the Northern campaign or was it not? Was it our duty to support the Northern campaign, that Northern campaign which Radek has described as a brilliant revolutionary action?

In China the liberal bourgeoisie has played an **objectively revolutionary rôle for many years**, and has exhausted itself. It has however been by no means a political mayfly, living one day only, of the type of the Russian liberal bourgeoisie in the revolution of 1905. The fact that the bourgeoisie has played this **particular rôle** is due to the special combinations of social forces ruling in China, to the anti-imperialist national emancipation character of the Chinese revolution; it has been due to a **number of causes which had no parallel** in the Russian revolution of 1905. It is true that Lenin stated the difference between us and the Mensheviks to consist of the fact that the Mensheviks supported the liberal bourgeoisie, whilst we were opposed to any sort of an agreement with them. But when Lenin said this, he was speaking of the **Russian revolution of 1905**. He spoke very differently of the **revolutions in the East**.

The Opposition, in advancing the thesis of the unallowability of an agreement with the liberal bourgeoisie in China, is therefore guilty of a distortion of Lenin's teachings. A method is fundamentally wrong which makes no difference between Russia and China, between 1905 and 1927, between the Russian liberals and the Chinese national revolutionary bourgeoisie, etc., and which states categorically that all cats are grey. Here we find no analysis, no comprehension for the peculiarities of Chinese development.

We see therefore that the thesis is **wrong** which insists that we cannot enter into any agreement whatever with the Chinese bourgeoisie.

There is however **another** question to which we may fairly be called upon to reply. It may be said: Good, up to a certain period we could co-operate with the national bourgeoisie, but you yourselves admit that in the end it was **bound** to desert into the camp of counter-revolution. The VII. Enlarged Executive itself admitted this. And what have you done to defend the proletariat and the peasantry? What have you done to prevent their defeat? Are you not being carried along in the wake of events? Were you not taken by surprise at Chang Kai-shek, change of front? Was this not a consequence of your having permitted yourselves to be drawn into a "bloc" with Chang Kai-shek? This is a fair question, and one which must be put.

Let us inquire into the matter. The cheapest argument against us has been: The workers have suffered a defeat in Shanghai; **this shows** that your tactics were not worth a penny.

But this is a conclusion which must be decidedly rejected. In our revolution of 1917 we pursued a **correct** policy. Could we judge, before the events of July, whither developments were moving? Yes, we were able to judge of this. And yet we were **beaten** in July. Is this a fact or is it not? It is a fact. And why were we beaten? For the simple reason that, despite the correctness of our policy, we were not able to collect our forces sufficiently to defend ourselves adequately against the enemy's fire. We were **not ripe** for the situation, **not sufficiently prepared**. The comparative proportions of class forces at that time were such that we were not strong enough, in spite of the fact that our policy was entirely right, to beat the enemy.

In China our comrades have committed **many** mistakes, some of them very serious faults, which can and must be discussed whilst we are dealing with this question. There is no doubt that much has been left undone which should have been done towards the development of the mass movement in town and country. There is no doubt that the leaders of the C. P. of China, in face of the instructions received from the Comintern, have actually hindered the development of the agrarian revolution at times.

But **one** thing I must assert quite categorically, and that is: **Even if everything** possible had been done, at our present stage we could not have been victorious in a direct battle with Chang Kai-shek. The VII. Enlarged Executive issued its directions: development of the mass movement, expulsion of the Right elements from the Kuomintang, conquest of strategic positions in the army, arming of the working class and the peasantry, formation of mass organisations among the workers and peasants. **This** line of policy, the **sole** one offering a political guarantee, was laid down by the Comintern. But even if everything had been accomplished which it would have been possible to accomplish, there still remains an actual state of affairs which we must recognise. Shanghai is the central point of events.

The following forces were assembled in Shanghai: 1. The forces of the imperialists, armed to the teeth, 2. Chang Kai-shek's forces — the whole army (with the exception of some few divisions more or less in sympathy with the workers and peasants). And here Chang Kai-shek possessed an immense authority, gained during the previous stage of the revolution. Besides this, there was the front of the North troops, etc.

In spite of these facts, Comrade Zinoviev suggested in his theses the following "excellent" guarantee: The Shanghai proletariat should have set up an **insurrection** against Chang Kai-shek. In our opinion this policy would have been **highly absurd**. What would have happened, if the proletariat of Shanghai had attempted to rise against Chang Kai-shek? The insurrection would have been crushed as soon as begun. It is perfectly obvious that in the case of such a rising there would have been an immediate amalgamation, against the rising, of every anti-working class force, of every force opposed to the further development of the Chinese revolution. **The forces of Chang Kai-shek, of Chang Tso Lin, of the foreign imperialists, and of every anti-revolutionary tendency**, would have combined to exterminate the vanguard of the Shanghai proletariat, root and branch.

We are told that our tactics are not Leninist. But Lenin never supported tactics demanding that an insurrection should be risked on **every possible occasion**. Anyone who asserts this is talking nonsense. I cannot think that the comrades of the Opposition believe their own assertions to this effect. And when Zinoviev tries to console himself with the idea that the European and American working class would have "saved" the Shanghai proletariat in the case of an insurrection, then that is again **utter nonsense**. In America there is only a very small Communist Party. All the reformist cadres of labour leaders are mere paid hirelings, traitors to the cause of the working class. And you expect this riffraff to "save" the Chinese working class? You expect that they will defend the Chinese revolution, these "leaders" of the American proletariat, who have been the first to recommend that the Soviet institutions, cultural institutions, should be searched? You must be aware that **the masses** of the American proletariat are unfortunately still backing up these worthless leaders.

It must be recollected that even the **European** proletariat is not so quickly stirred. It is simply a **perversion** of truth to present such an absurd proposition as an argument. We know very well the way in which help really comes. It does not come in one day, nor in two, but in **months and years**. But in an armed conflict the imperialists could have completely crushed the workers of Shanghai in one day. To spread abroad such illusions of rapid aid, to erect a political platform on this assumption and to support this platform in place of the tactics proposed by us, to accuse us of treason because we have rejected such adventurous tactics, all this signifies a sinking into the deepest bog of demagoguery, and the loss of the last remnant of Marxist conscience and sense of proletarian responsibility.

The next question upon which the opposition attacks us is that of the **Soviet** slogan. This slogan sounds extremely radical, and our heroes therefore cling to it with special energy. They have issued a slogan demanding that Workers', Peasants', and Soldiers' Councils be convoked immediately, and since we do not think that our purposes would be well served by proclaiming this slogan at the **given** moment, they again accuse us of treason.

A remark: In 1923, on the eve of the great events in Germany, on the eve of a **proletarian** revolution (not such a revolution as that in China, nor in such a country as China, but in **Germany**) in a country where the **working class is in the majority**, in a country with mighty industrial centres and enormously developed industries, in a country which had already passed through the revolution of 1918 and had once even had Soviets, here Comrade Trotzky was decidedly **against** the Soviet slogan. At that time he opposed this slogan with arguments which subsequent experience has proved to be wrong. But there was nothing "treasonable" about this. At that time he expressed himself as follows: The movement has spread to broad masses of the people, it is being expressed in the organisation of the works councils, the mass movement is being shown in the elementary growth of these works councils; therefore the works councils are that **form** of organisation definitely given by the course of events. We should work for the utilisation of our

forces, etc. on the basis of the peculiar mass organisation of the works councils, and then we should see whether the Soviets grew out of the movement, or whether they would prove unnecessary.

Thus Trotsky. Lenin was of the opinion that the revolution, even a proletarian revolution, was not inevitably bound to pass through the Soviet form. And on the other hand the Soviet form was not bound to signify the dictatorship of the proletariat. With respect to England in particular Lenin believed that the dictatorship of the proletariat might take the form of trade union power, or some other special form. Lenin was extremely cautious.

It is another question whether it was right to form this judgement on the situation as given in Germany in 1923. I set this question aside for the present. My present object is to emphasise the fact that Comrade Trotsky was opposed to the Soviets on the eve of a proletarian revolution. And yet nobody accused Trotsky of all the deadly sins.

Now, however, Comrade Trotsky permits himself to accuse the Comintern of treason and so forth, because it does not deem the moment suitable to issue the slogan of the Soviets in China. To speak very mildly, does this not show almost too much self-confidence on Comrade Trotsky's part?

Why do we think it wrong to issue, now and immediately, the slogan of the Soviets? We are of the opinion that at the present juncture, during this phase of the revolution, in view of the fact that the Wuhan Government does not yet represent the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, but is only taking the first steps towards this, we must look to that specific historical form of organisation which exists already, and which represents the whole course of development: the Kuomintang. The form of this organisation is extremely elastic, it possesses great revolutionary traditions, it unites workers, peasants, and petty bourgeoisie, and still possesses great powers of expansion in every direction. Are we to throw all this aside and search for something else? This is a question which must be answered.

Here the tactical differences begin. Some such tactics as the following might be proposed: The Communist Party leaves the Kuomintang and organises Soviets apart from the Kuomintang, against it, or even in actual conflict with it. It is obvious where these tactics would lead. It is obvious that the setting aside of the Kuomintang brings with it the setting aside of the Wuhan Government, the abandonment of it to the mercies of the Right. The actual consequence would be the obligation to enter into a conflict with the Wuhan Government, and to strive for its overthrow. This is one line of policy. Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky write, in the first of the theses which they have submitted to us, that it is necessary for us to proclaim the slogan of the Soviets; but at the same time, and in the same document, they impress upon the necessity of supporting the Wuhan Government at any price and with all available means, to the end that it may become an organisatory centre of revolution, "from which the blow may be dealt against the Cavaignacs", that is, against Chang Kai-shek.

Meanwhile it has become clear that the two standpoints are incompatible. Comrade Trotsky now makes the direct proposition, in his "own" theses submitted to the Executive, or rather in his article (exposing all his cards, as the saying goes), that at the present time it is necessary to create a double power by means of the formation of a Soviet power against Wuhan. Wuhan is "nothing", the Left Kuomintang a mere "bagatelle"; we must create the centre for another power, and for this purpose we require the Soviets.

Here we have a perfect entanglement of obvious contradictions. In the first theses (Trotsky plus Zinoviev) we find the following proposals all made in one breath: Wuhan is to receive every possible support, and Soviets against Wuhan are to be formed; Wuhan is to be regarded as the organisatory centre of the revolution, and measures are to be taken for its destruction. Comrade Trotsky's article smoothes out this contradiction by the simplest of magic: The existent Wuhan, and the existent Left Kuomintang, are simply declared to be non-existent. Truly it then becomes incomprehensible when we still speak of a double power. But in any case Comrade Trotsky uncovered his cards two or three days after his proposal for the support of Wuhan, and demanded the steering of a open course for the overthrow of this organisatory "centre" by means the organisation of a double power. With this he reveals the actual import of the Soviet slogan as understood by him.

But we cannot judge of the matter in this way. It is true that we can form varying estimates of the various currents in the Left Kuomintang, but we cannot deny the fact that the Kuomintang is a huge mass organisation. When Comrade Zinoviev was working in the Comintern, he wrote that the Kuomintang had a membership of 400,000. And the Kuomintang has increased enormously since that time. When the Right split off, the Kuomintang lost leaders only, the representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie; the masses of the people have remained in the Kuomintang. The Wuhan Government is now leading the struggle. It is true that its general may betray it, but its existence is recognised even by the whole international bourgeoisie. It is impossible not to take it into account. We believe that Trotsky is committing a grave error here, just as he was in error in 1905 in wanting to spring over the bourgeois democratic revolution and the peasantry. His theory of "permanent revolution" is generally known, and so is his formula in 1905: "Down with the Tsar, up with the labour government!"

In the same way he now wants to spring over the Kuomintang and the Wuhan Government, which he designated two days earlier as the centre dealing the "blow against the Cavaignacs". In our opinion one of our most important tasks at the present time should be the broadest democratising of the Kuomintang on the basis of the development of the agrarian revolution, the organisation of peasants committees and peasant union in the provinces, the arming of the masses, etc. No doubt there can and will be splits. And it cannot be denied that the Wuhan Government may possibly be disorganised or defeated by the enemy. It is not impossible that the resistance made by one part of the Left Kuomintang leaders against the agrarian revolution, from above, may exclude the possibility of support from this side for this Government in its first form.

All this is theoretically not impossible. But that is no reason to conclude that we are to thrust on one side the Kuomintang, a specifically Chinese mass organisation. In 1923 Trotsky did not quite "understand" the peculiarities of German development, when he wanted to replace the Soviets by works councils. And now he again fails to observe the actually existent specific peculiarities of the development of the Chinese revolution, he does not notice its special characteristics.

\* \* \*

In conclusion a few words on the latest events in China. The national revolutionary army of the Wuhan Government can record some great victories. The position of the Wuhan Government is nevertheless somewhat difficult. The military danger is still great. The troops are in the hands of their leaders, and these are frequently not quite trustworthy. The officers and generals are awakening into action against the approaching agrarian revolution. The rising in Changsha has created a seat of counter-revolution which may be followed by others. Besides this, the financial and economic position is extremely difficult. The maintenance of the army alone costs much money. It is politically impossible to take from the peasants what is required for the army, without paying for it. In the district of Wuhan, the centre of the revolutionary movement, there are great textile factories and mines. The big bourgeoisie has closed most of the factories, flown to Shanghai, and drawn its deposits from the banks. A part of the middle bourgeoisie, and even some strata of the petty bourgeoisie, have imitated this flight. Economic life has greatly suffered.

Our resolution states that in such cases the factories and undertakings should be taken over by the state. This is easily said, but its realisation demands such factors as working capital, in order that raw materials may be bought, workers engaged, etc. This situation involves a great number of difficulties, and the Wuhan Government is obliged to manoeuvre against the petty bourgeoisie, and in part against the middle bourgeoisie.

It is decidedly necessary for the Chinese Communists to clear away all vacillations in their own ranks. The course must be directed determinedly towards the development of the peasant mass movement, to the confiscation of the land. Any other tactics would be criminal at the present moment. This is the basis upon which the organisation of the reliable armed troops, and the reorganisation of the Kuomintang must be carried on. This is the sole foundation able to hold its own against all schisms, betrayals, desertions, etc. The Chinese Communists,

whilst maintaining the bloc with the petty bourgeoisie — by guaranteeing to this the security of their property, and of the land belonging to the soldiers of the national army — must at the same time seek to arouse the masses by every available means, to draw them into the struggle, to convert the army into a real people's army, to suppress to the utmost extent of their power all attempts at counter-revolution, and to rely above all on the revolutionary hate felt by the masses towards the landowners, the gentry, and the counter revolutionists.

Our comrades of the Opposition have adopted such a violent tone that — as I must repeat — even the most correct of our comrades, those most opposed to any "quarrelling", have been finally roused to indignation. The great majority has been in favour of much severer measures against the Opposition. After the E. C. C. I. had passed a resolution against the Opposition, Trotsky read a declaration stating that "they" would continue the struggle to the end. Thus the matter stands at present.

Since such serious issues are involved, and our Opposition even goes so far as to state that the question of unity should not be put "as such", but on a "Leninist basis", this Leninist basis being of course theirs, then it is pretty easy to see where we are travelling, and at what station we are likely to arrive. We consider it not only our right, but our duty, to come to a decision on the attitude of the Opposition. This decision has been formulated in the resolution passed by the Executive against one single vote, the vote of Comrade Vuyovitch.

It must be admitted that the Opposition has been given every opportunity to state its case. Its speakers have been given three quarters of an hour or an hour for their speeches, and have been able to speak several times. The whole of the documents of which I have spoken, many hundreds of pages, have been distributed. All the delegates have read them, and have heard the arguments. We decided to take up the fight against the Opposition, for all this music, however comprehensible to us, may easily be beyond the comprehension of many foreign comrades. We have carried the fight through, and at its conclusion it became evident that the whole of the delegates were confirmed in their opinion that this kind of agitation is to be tolerated no longer, and that at least a minimum of the measures decided upon in the resolution of the Executive should be put into actual practice.

We are of the opinion that even that appearance of "dignity", which some comrades believe to have seen about Trotsky, that "knightly" form and pose, the courageous defence of his own opinions, etc. — that even this has been dispersed. Today nobody believes the Opposition. On 16. October the opposition gave a "solemn" promise to have nothing to do with the Urbahns-Maslow group, but today it maintains the most intimate connections with this group, and the central organ of this group has become the central organ of the Opposition. Today the Opposition accuses the C.C. of our Party and the leaders of the Comintern of a betrayal of our cause, they accuse the C.C. and the Comintern of co-operating with the bourgeoisie during a certain stage of the Chinese revolution. But during this period they themselves were members of the leading organ of the C.P.S.U. and of the Communist International, and took part in all the work.

At this latest Plenum of the Executive they fired their last shot. The "knightly" attitude was shown in its true colors, the Opposition was deprived of the mask beneath which it has fought against the leaders of the Comintern and the C.C. of our Party. Therefore the Executive of the Comintern resolved upon a closer contact between the cadres of our Communist Parties. The Comintern will emerge from this stage of inner conflict more united than ever before.

Truly, we must one and all be shaken by the characteristic fact before us: We are confronted at the moment by immense difficulties; British Imperialism, aided by its many vassals, takes up arms against us; we face the forces of Chang Tso Lin; relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union have been broken off, etc.; events are developing with dizzy rapidity — but Comrade Trotsky's theses contain the formulation that: "The most dangerous of all dangers is... the inner Party regime in the C.P.S.U. and in the Comintern!". And if this is the standpoint held, if this is held to be the "chief danger", if the inner Party regime in the C.P.S.U. and in the Comintern are the chief enemy, then on to the attack against this chief enemy! Chamberlain and the other enemies fall into the background, and can wait there for the present.

But although the Opposition has been such a drag on us, and although it has so greatly hindered the work of the Plenum, still the Plenum has been successful in dealing carefully with all the most important questions, and in solving them as best serves our cause, solutions worthy of the Communist International. Hence we permit ourselves the hope that the growth of our Communist Parties, and the increased consolidation of our forces, will exclude more and more the possibility of a second 1914. There will not be a second 1914. In 1927 and 1928 the Comintern will throw the weight of its Bolshevik influence into the decisive battles! (Prolonged and enthusiastic applause.)

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### The Party Conference of the C. P. of Sweden.

By S. Molan.

The Party Conference of the C.P. of Sweden, which was held from the 3. to the 6. June in Stockholm, may be regarded in many respects as an important landmark in the history of the Swedish working people. In the first place, it formed the conclusion of the campaign commenced in April, and bringing considerable successes to the Party. Secondly, the Conference coincided with the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the existence of the organisation as a revolutionary organisation; this anniversary was celebrated in the form of hundreds of public meetings. Thirdly, the Party Conference itself, the work accomplished by the delegates, and the presence of an audience numbering many hundreds during the whole course of the conference, are eloquent witnesses of the rise of the Communist movement in the hitherto so "idyllic" Sweden.

The C.P. of Sweden has developed out of the "Left Socialist Party" formed in the spring of 1917 from the larger and smaller groups splitting off from the old S.P. This Party was a combination of various elements dissatisfied with the old pro-Entente party led by Branting. The utmost lack of clearness reigned in all questions of principles; every "leader" represented his own platform. Many of the leaders had become so under the influence of enthusiasm, and of the deep impression made by the Russian revolution. This was the case with the majority of the intellectuals, the editors, and members of parliament. Though full of enthusiasm for the Russian revolution, they felt the greatest misgivings as to the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship in their own country, where "conditions were essentially different". They found — precisely like the German Independents — severe enough expressions of condemnation when it was a question of pronouncing judgment on the Noske socialists, and even a few weeks before the Right wing left the Party on account of the 21 Conditions laid down by the II. World Congress of the Comintern, one of its best known leaders, Wennerström, declared with the greatest pathos that he "would ten thousand times rather be a member of the Comintern than of the blood stained International of the betrayers of the working people, the Noske socialists".

But even the actual Left were extremely unclear on principles, and built much less on winning over the great masses of the people than on the effort to obtain the support of well known "names"; hence their constant compromises with pacifists, humanists, philosophers, Buddhists, and theosophists. In order to retain in their ranks such persons as these, valuable in their eyes, they made all manner of concessions. For instance, they guaranteed a well-known petty-bourgeois literary critic a high annual salary, solely to ensure his imparting prestige and lustre to the Party by his name!

The nucleus of the new party was formed by the Social Democratic (later Communist) Youth League, which counted among its members, years before the war, many of the older comrades of the opposition, and which carried on consistent opposition, headed for years by its leader Zeth Höglund, against the increasing opportunism of the party leadership under Branting.

Despite the thousand declarations of love for the Russian revolution made by the leaders, the first split took place as early as the winter of 1920, after the acceptance of the 21 conditions by the majority of the party. But now even Höglund and his

satellites, including **Strom**, the Party secretary and belletristic writer, sabotaged Party action in every possible way, so that it came to a second split in the autumn of 1924. **Höglund** — who had the majority in the Central Committee — expelled the minority and formed a new "Communist Party". The minority, which had the central organ of the Party in its hands, replied by expelling, with the agreement of the E. C. C. I., **Höglund** and his adherents. It was then seen that the overwhelming majority of the members were faithful to the world revolution and to the Comintern. Since this last schism, which freed the Party from any further disagreements on matters of principle, the Party has grown steadily.

In spite of the violent attacks made upon the C. P. of Sweden by the bourgeois parties, the Social Democrats, and the Syndicalists, especially since the expulsion of **Höglund**, it has been able to increase its membership by 120 per cent in the two and a half years which have since passed. In the autumn of 1924 the number of members was about 7000. By the spring of 1927 this number had increased to 15,497, and all the members are taking a much more active part than formerly in promoting the movement. Last winter two extremely successful movements were carried out, the "Fleet Campaign", and the "Jubilee Campaign".

The **Fleet Campaign**, involving the holding of hundreds of mass meetings in every part of the country, was directed against the projected enlargement of the naval fleet. The Social Democratic leaders agitated zealously in favour of this project, although they brought themselves greatly into disfavour among the masses by doing so. The Social Democratic leaders took the utmost care to avoid open battle with the Communists, and when forced to it in their own meetings by the Communists, they were almost invariably beaten. This campaign contributed greatly to the radicalisation of broad masses of the people, and to their emancipation from the ideology of Social Democracy.

The **Jubilee Campaign** was being going on during the last two months, so that its final results are not yet known. Shortly before the Party Conference, reports were received from 215 out of the 312 local Party groups, showing that up to now the campaign has resulted in the enrolment of 2463 new Party members, and 3647 new subscribers to the Party newspapers.

In the whole history of the Swedish labour movement, no Party Conference has ever aroused such lively interest among the working people as this one, or has been participated so actively by the members of the Party. And never before has there been such perfect unanimity on all questions of principle, as at this 7. Party Conference of the C. P. of Sweden.

Despite the continuous and widespread unemployment, and the resultant scarcity of money among the Party associations, almost 200 delegates appeared at the Conference, many at their own expense. Besides the elected delegates, an equal number of Party comrades from town and country attended the meetings. Many of these had travelled for several nights, coming distances of 500 to 800 kilometres in motor cars or motor lorries, and although they were not able to take an active part in the debates, every one of them kept his place faithfully in the audience during the ten to fifteen hours of the discussions.

The Party Conference had drawn up an exceedingly comprehensive agenda, and that it proved possible to accomplish the work involved, is solely due to the perseverance and fundamental unanimity of those participating in the Conference. Comrade **Murphy**, the representative of the Comintern, was welcomed by continuous applause and the singing of the "International". His speech was an analysis of the international situation, and a delineation of the tasks falling to the Communists in the immediate future. This report, and the two hours speech held by Comrade **Kilbom** on the inner political question, were the chief events of the Conference, and gave rise to a lively debate, in which, however, no difference of opinion arose on any matter of principle.

Comrade **Kilbom** gave a graphic and easily comprehensible survey of the latest phase of development of Swedish capitalism, the enormous concentration of capital, the growing power of the great banks, and the regrouping of class forces. He pointed out Sweden's increasing dependence from Great Britain, and showed how Swedish industry is being mechanised and rationalised, how exploitation is becoming severer, leading to growing unemployment. He showed how the four largest banks, supported by foreign capital, completely dominate the economic life of the whole country, and how numerous undertakings are being internationalised — the **Iron Ore Company in Grängesberg** for instance, which is co-operating with French undertakings, and

controls 65 per cent of European iron ore production. An equally important combine is the **Match Trust**, supported by large American capitalists, which has formed a monopoly among the manufacturers of matches in many countries, and raised the prices considerably.

Comrade **Kilbom** brought forward numerous actual instances showing the growing acuteness of class antagonisms; he pointed out the firm foothold which has been gained by the **Fascist organisations**, even in democratic Sweden; how these organisations are enabled to arm with the tacit tolerance of the Liberal authorities, to provoke the workers, and to prepare the ground for the establishment of a bourgeois dictatorship and the prohibition of the C. P.

The report contained much valuable material, and the Party Conference decided unanimously that it should be published in pamphlet form and large editions distributed among the masses.

The discussion on the draft for the new statutes took much time, as over 60 speakers, mostly from the provinces, took part in it. Here some traces of federal democracy might still be observed, but after an exhaustive debate the draft was accepted provisionally, until the next Party Conference, with only a few unimportant alterations.

The Party Conference elected the General Secretary and the Chief Editor of the leading Party newspaper; it also fixed the wages of the Party functionaries. Everything else was left to the newly elected Central Committee, consisting of 21 members. After four days of hard work the Party Conference was brought to a close amid enthusiastic applause. At the closing meeting short speeches were given by the foreign representatives delegated by the C. P. s. of Norway and Denmark, the Workers' (Communist) Party of America, and the Comintern.

## TEN YEARS AGO

### The First Soviet Congress and the War.

By N. Lenin.

We publish here the speech made by Lenin at the 1st All-Russian Soviet Congress on June 22nd 1917, with a few omissions which are necessary for technical reasons. Editor.

Comrades, allow me, as an introduction to the discussion of the question of war, to call your attention to two passages from the appeal to all countries which was published on March 14th by the Soviet of Delegates of Workers and Peasants in St. Petersburg. "It is high time" — says the appeal — "to embark on a resolute fight against the annexionist ambitions of the Governments of all countries; it is time for the peoples to take into their hands the decision as to the question of war or peace." Another passage in the appeal is directed to the proletarians of the Austro-German coalition, for it runs: "Refuse to be an instrument of conquest and force in the hands of kings, landed proprietors and bankers." These two passages recur in various forms in dozens and hundreds, nay, I should think in thousands of resolutions of the workers and peasants of Russia.

These two passages show, according to my opinion, better than anything else, the contradictory and infinitely complicated position into which the revolutionary workers and peasants have been driven by the present policy of the Mensheviks and Narodniki. On the one hand, they are in favour of supporting the war, on the other hand, they are representatives of classes which have no interest in the annexationist ambitions of the Governments of all the countries, and they cannot help saying so.

This psychology and ideology, muddled as it is, has made an unusually deep impression on every worker and peasant. It is the consciousness that the war is being carried on because of the annexationist ambitions of the governments of all the countries. At the same time, the understanding remains very blurred or there is an absolute want of understanding for the fact that governments, whatever may be their form, only represent the interests of certain classes, and that therefore the attempt to contrast government and people, which is made in the first quotation, shows that there is a vast lack of theoretical clear-

ness, a deep political helplessness, through which we condemn ourselves and our whole policy to an extremely vacillating and uncertain situation and attitude.

Exactly the same may be said of the final words of the second quotation I read; this magnificent appeal: "Refuse to be an instrument of conquest and force in the hands of kings, apply to your own masters, for if you, Russian workers and landed proprietors and bankers", is imposing; it must however peasants, appeal to the workers and peasants of Germany and Austria, whose Governments and ruling classes are carrying on exactly the same rapacious and predatory war as the Russian capitalists and bankers, as those of England and France, if you say: "Refuse to be an instrument in the hands of your bankers", and at the same time tolerate your own bankers as ministers and place them side by side with Socialist Ministers, you yourselves annul all your appeals, you contradict your whole policy by your deeds.

It is then, in reality, just as though your excellent ambitions and wishes did not exist at all; for you are contributing towards Russia carrying on the same imperialist war, the same war with its lust for conquest. You find yourselves in opposition to the masses which you represent because these masses will never take the point of view of the capitalists whom Milyukov, Maklakov and the rest of them support, when they say that "nothing is more criminal than the idea that the war is being carried on in the interest of capital". I do not know whether this idea is criminal, I do not doubt that it is criminal from the point of view of those who are leading a sham existence to-day and who may disappear altogether to-morrow; it is however the only right idea, for it expresses our conception of this war, it alone voices the interests of the subjugated classes as a war against the oppressors; but if we say that the war is a capitalist war of conquest, we must not allow ourselves to have any illusions, since it is out of the question that the crimes of individual persons, of individual kings could have brought about such a war.

Imperialism is a definite stage in the development of world capital. Capitalism which has matured in the course of decades, has found its supreme expression in that a small group of enormously rich countries — there are only four of them: England, France, Germany and America — have collected wealth to the amount of hundreds of milliards and thus accumulated tremendous power in the hands of the large bankers and large capitalists of whom there are two, or at the most half a dozen, in each of these countries. This group has acquired such vast power that it actually has the whole world in its clutches, that it has literally divided up the whole globe territorially into colonies among its members. The imperialists of all countries have come into collision in every corner of the globe and have divided it up amongst themselves in the economic sense also, for there is no finger's breadth of the globe to which concessions, the tentacles of financial capital, cannot find access. They are the basis of annexations.

Annexations are not the result of arbitrary invention, they have not come into being because persons who were patrons of freedom suddenly became reactionary. Annexations are nothing more nor less than the political expression and the political form of the rule of giant banks, which is a necessary consequence of capitalism, and not the fault of individuals. It is necessarily so, because banks are built up on shares, and Imperialism is built up on the accumulation of shares.

If you make yourselves a clear picture of this, you will understand how ridiculous it is to think of combating war by words, manifestoes, proclamations and socialist congresses. It is ridiculous, because the banks will retain their power to the full, however many declarations are issued, however many political changes are made. You have overthrown Nicholas Romanov in Russia and have, to a certain extent, become a republic. Russia has made a tremendous step forwards, perhaps it has almost, with one leap, outstripped France which, in other conditions, has taken a hundred years to reach its present stage and has not ceased to be a capitalist country. The omnipotence of the banks is unaffected, the capitalists still remain. They may perhaps have become a little less self-assertive, but so they did in 1905. Has this in any way reduced their power? Although it may be something new for Russia, every revolution in Europe has shown that whenever the wave of revolution rises, the workers gain something by it, but the power of the capitalists remains untouched.

The fight against the imperialist war cannot possibly be carried on in any other way than in the form of a fight of the revolutionary classes against the ruling classes, and indeed against the ruling classes throughout the world. It is not a question of the large landed proprietors in general, although there are large landed proprietors in Russia and they play a more important part than those in any other country; but this is not the class which created Imperialism, that was done by the class of capitalists, at the head of which are the great financial magnates and banks. And there is no issue from this war until that class is overthrown by the oppressed proletarians in league with the poorest peasants and the semi-proletarians as they are called in our programme.

Illusions such as the one that it is possible to unite the workers of all countries by proclamations and appeals to other peoples, can only be cherished from the limited point of view of the Russian. Anyone who maintains this point of view, is ignorant of how in Western Europe, where the workers and peasants are used to violent political changes, where they have seen dozens of them, the Press laughs at such phrases and appeals. The workers and peasants of Western Europe do not know that in Russia the mass of workers has actually risen, that, as a mass, it is inspired with an absolutely genuine faith, that it condemns the annexationist ambitions of all countries and wishes to see the peoples freed from the bankers. But, as long as you have not got rid of your bankers, although you possess organisations such as are known in no other country in the world, i. e. the Soviets of Peasants', Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates, in spite of the fact that you are armed, they, the Europeans, cannot understand that you send your Socialists as Ministers into the Government. In spite of all this, you allow the bankers to keep the power.

Abroad, you are accused, not only of naiveté, that would be bearable, but of hypocrisy. The Europeans have ceased to have any understanding for naiveté in politics, they do not realise that, in Russia, millions and millions are awaking to life for the first time, that, in Russia, the people do not know what is the connection between the classes and the Government, between the Government and war. War is nothing but a continuation of bourgeois politics. In war, as well as in times of peace, the class which is at the helm, determines the policy. War is politics from beginning to end, the same classes pursuing the same aims with other means. If, therefore, in your appeal to the workers and peasants, you write: "Turn our your bankers!" every class-conscious worker in a European country will either laugh at you or will weep bitterly and say to himself: "What is to be done when, over there, they dethrone a semi-bestial idiot, one of that kind of monsters of which we got rid long ago, only to support the Russian bankers with their 'almost Socialist' Ministers?" This is just the crime of which we are guilty.

The bankers remain in power and, by means of the imperialist war, they carry on a foreign policy which leaves the treaties concluded by Russia under Nicholas II., almost entirely in force. This is what is particularly striking in our country. The foundations of the foreign policy of Russian Imperialism were all laid, not by the present capitalists, but by the former Government and by Nicholas Romanov, whom we have overthrown. He it was who concluded these treaties; they remain secret, the capitalists cannot publish them because they are capitalists. No single worker or peasant will be able to make head or tail of this confusion, for he will say to himself: If we demand the overthrow of the capitalists in other countries, let us first of all get rid of our own bankers, for otherwise no one will believe us, and no one will take us seriously. They will say to us: You are naive Russian barbarians, you write words which are excellent in themselves, but which have no practical background. Or, what is still worse, they will think us hypocrites.

If the foreign Press in all its shades could get into Russia without any difficulty and were not kept back in Torneo by the English and French authorities, you would find plenty of such views. A small collection of quotations from foreign newspapers would convince you of the crass contradictions in which you have become involved, would prove to you how incredibly ridiculous and mistaken is the idea that it is possible to fight against this war with socialist conferences and with agreements made by Socialists at conferences.

Were Imperialism only the fault or the crime of individuals, Socialism might remain Socialism. Imperialism is the last stage of development of capitalism, which has gone so far as to divide the whole world up amongst it, a stage of development, at which two powerful groups are wrestling with one another in a deadly embrace. You must either serve one or other of these groups or overthrow them both. There is no third way. If you do not want a separate peace, because you say we do not wish to serve the purposes of German Imperialism, you are quite right, neither do we wish for a separate peace. You, however, are actually and against your will still in the service of Anglo-French Imperialism which displays exactly the same annexationist and predatory ambitions as were testified to in the treaties by the Russian capitalists with the help of Nicholas Romanov.

If it is said "Peace without annexations and contributions" and every Russian worker and peasant must speak in this way because life drives them to it, because they have no interest in the bankers' profits, because they want to live — my reply is that your leaders, who are at the head of the present Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates and who belong to the parties of the Narodniki and the Mensheviks, do not know what to make of this slogan. In their "Isvestiya" they have declared that it means the "status quo", i. e. the condition as it was before the war. Is that not a capitalist peace? And moreover a capitalist peace of the first water.

If you issue such a slogan, you should know that the course of events may bring the party into power. In a revolution, this is quite possible; you will have to act in accordance with your words. If at present, you propose a peace without annexations, Germany will accept it, but England will not, because the English capitalists have not lost a single square foot of land, on the contrary, they have stolen new territory in all parts of the world. The Germans also have scraped a good deal together, but they have also lost a great deal, and not only that, they are now saddled with America, the strongest enemy.

(To be continued.)

## The Imperialist Offensive at the Front in Full Swing.

Russian war despatch of July 3rd. Our offensive is effectively developing in the direction of Zloczov. On July 2nd, towards 3 p. m., the Zaraisk regiment, after sharp fighting, took possession of the village of Pressorce, and the brave troops of the 4th Finnish division with the Czecho-Slovakian brigade occupied the strongly fortified enemy positions on the hills to the West and South West of the village of Shorov and of the fortified village of Korkhilov, after having broken through three lines of the enemy's trenches. Our opponent withdrew beyond the Mala Strypa.

The Finnish division captured 1560 officers and soldiers, four trench-guns, nine machine-guns and a bomb-thrower. The Czecho-Slovakian brigade took 62 officers and 3150 men prisoner and brought back fifteen guns and numerous machine-guns, the majority of which were used against the enemy.

We also captured some positions to the West of Yosphorka.

Altogether, in the fighting on July 2nd, in the district of Zloczov, we captured 6300 officers and men, 21 guns, 16 machine-guns and several bomb-throwers. The number of prisoners continues to increase. Fighting is still going on to the South East of Brzezany. In the course of the fighting on July 1st in that district, we took 53 officers and 2260 men prisoner. On the rest of the front, firing is going on.

Kerensky has the Revolutionary Troops Disarmed by Force.

St. Petersburg, June 30th. (St. Petersburg Telegraph Agency.) After all means of persuading the rifles of the 12th and 13th Divisions, who, on June 28th, had refused to carry out an order of re-formation, were exhausted, the village of Yuhov, in which they were quartered, was surrounded by cavalry troops according to instructions received from Kerensky, the

War Minister. After a battery had fired twice into the village, the cavalry began to attack, whereupon about 500 soldiers surrendered, were disarmed and led away. No blood was shed.

## The Revolutionary Proletariat Marches up Against the Offensive.

The Semi-Official Description of the Demonstration on July 1st.

St. Petersburg, July 2nd. (St. Petersburg Telegraph Agency.) A great demonstration at the graves of the victims of the revolution on the Field of Mars was organised by the Soviet of Workers and Soldiers and simultaneously by the Maximilists. The Cadet Party did not join in. The Minimalists and the other section of moderate democracy formed the minority in the processions. As the members of the majority, with their banners, predominated in the processions, the demonstration had an anti-Government and pro-peace aspect. A few armed anarchists also joined in. The majority of the population of St. Petersburg showed complete indifference. Except for a few scimmages in which the Maximilists snatched the banners from the Minimalists, there was no serious incident.

### An Eye-Witness Reports.

The most striking fact is that no single factory, no single regiment supports the slogan: "Trust the Provisional Government..." Only three groups adopted the slogan of confidence and even they had reason to regret it. These were a group of Cossacks, the group of the "Bund" and the group of Plechanov's "Unity". The workers and soldiers, by cries of "Down with them!" forced two of these groups to furl their flags. The Cossacks did not comply with the demand of the workers, and their flag was thereupon torn to shreds.

The overwhelming majority of the demonstrators marched under Bolshevik slogans. This caused great astonishment among the members of the majority of the Soviet Executive.

The serried ranks of the "Moscow Regiment", of the "1st Machine-Gun Regiment", of the "Grenadiers", of the "Lithuanian", "Wolhynian", "Petrograd", "Ismailovsky", and "Finland" Regiments and the 180th regiment of the reserve, marched under a whole forest of red banners and posters, the inscriptions on which terrified the narrow-minded bourgeoisie and greatly disconcerted the Opportunist parties.

(Podvoisky: "The Military Organisation of the C. C. of the Bolsheviks in 1917". — "Krasnaya Letopis", No. 6, 1923.)

## "The Offensive is a Serious Blow to the International Revolutionary Fight."

From the Declaration of the Bolsheviks on the Question of the Offensive at the Soviet Congress.

On the basis of the whole nature of conditions at the present moment, the offensive at the front, dictated by the magnates of allied imperialism is pursuing a purely political aim. The counter-revolutionary wire-pullers of the offensive, who are hidden behind the scenes... are deliberately trying to turn the disintegration of the army to account for their own purposes... It is clear that an offensive of this kind can only disorganise the army completely... The Congress cannot pass over in silence this blow aimed at the international revolutionary fight for peace, which was openly prepared and organised on all sides.

The Menshevik Soviet majority supports the imperialist Offensive.

St. Petersburg, July 2nd. The majority of the Soviet Congress has consented to the opening of the offensive and has passed a manifesto in support of the offensive worked out by the Mensheviks and the S. R. by all votes against the 74 of the Bolsheviks and Internationalists.

### The Bolsheviki Caution against divided Action.

St. Petersburg, July 5th. The "Pravda" writes: "The counter-revolution wishes to defeat the revolution by provocation, the traditional means of all counter-revolutions. The masses are being stirred up systematically. What moment would be the best for the provocation policy of the bourgeoisie? The most suitable moment is when the situation is not clear, when the masses are not enlightened as to the situation, when, as at the present time, Chauvinistic sentiments are most widely spread amongst the masses. All the bourgeois papers are at present carrying on a campaign of this kind. They hope to realise their purpose by confusing the workers and peasants to such a degree that the movement will assume a disorganised and muddled character."

Workers and peasants, do not let yourself be egged on by the counter-revolution! Strict Party discipline must be observed, the directions given the Party must be carried out in every detail in our ranks! Only thus shall we be able to take the wind out of the sails of the provocative tactics of the counter-revolution.

## The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

### The German Court-Martial at Work.

Stettin, July 7th. The Court-Martial has now dealt with the chief cases charged on account of the excesses; only a few postponed cases still have to be settled. Altogether accusations were brought against 220 persons; of these 140 were sentenced, amongst them 72 adults and 68 juveniles; 40 were acquitted and 37 of the accused were handed over to the ordinary courts for judgment. Two cases were postponed and in one case proceedings were broken off.

The Court Martial furthermore dealt with 14 dock-labourers to-day, who infringed the orders given to the corps by downing tools. Of these, 7 were acquitted, one handed over to the ordinary court and 6 sentenced, of whom 2 were sentenced to a fine of 30 marks, 3 to 45 marks and 1 to 60 marks.

### Increased Membership of the German Trade Unions.

Berlin, July 7th. The membership of the Central Unions has again increased by a million. In the first quarter of 1917 the number of male members increased by 300,000 to 780,000, the number of women members increased from 179,000 to 226,000. The sums paid out by the trade unions amounted to over 60,000,000 marks, 24½ million being unemployment benefits and 23 million family benefits.

## Chronicle of Events.

### June 30th.

Election of the National Executive Committee of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets: 35 Bolsheviki, 104 Mensheviki, 100 S. R., and 19 members of various small fractions.

Congress of the Works' Councils of representatives of the textile factories in Central Russia. More than 200,000 workers from 164 factories. Bolshevik resolution passed.

### July 1st.

Many hundreds of thousands of workers and soldiers demonstrate; for the greater part under Bolshevik slogans.

Kerensky reports to the Prime Minister that the offensive has begun.

Anarchists liberate by force the political prisoners in the prison "Kresti".

From another prison, 468 convicts escape, the warders helping them in their flight.

### July 2nd.

Occupation of the Durnovo Palace (head-quarters of the anarchists) by soldiers. Arrest of all those present. The premises are destroyed.

Government manifesto to the navy on the beginning of the offensive.

### July 3rd.

The St. Petersburg Soviet passes a resolution in favour of supporting the offensive by 472 to 271 votes, 39 abstaining from voting.

In connection with the national demands of Finland, the Soviet Congress pronounces against solving the national question "before the Constituent Assembly meets". The Bolsheviki issue a declaration demanding that Finland's right to absolute independence be recognised on principle.

Conclusion of the elections for the Petrograd Duma: 54 S. R., 40 Mensheviki, 37 Bolsheviki etc.

### July 4th.

The "Little Newspaper", in large head lines, demands the arrest of Lenin.

Opening of the National Trade Union Congress. The delegates have not been elected according to proportional representation, but all organisations — large and small — have sent an equal number of delegates. Among the delegates authorised to vote are: 73 Bolsheviki, 36 Mensheviki, 25 S. R., 32 non-fractional Social Democrats, 17 non-party members, 11 members of the "Bund", 6 Internationalists etc.

Strike at the Putilov Works. Twenty thousand workers are on strike in Nijni Novgorod.

### July 5th.

The military organisation of the Bolsheviki cautions against provocative instigation to street demonstration.

Skobelev reports at the Soviet Congress that the Budget for 1917 makes provision for an expenditure of 27 milliards with an income of 13 milliards. Since 1914 the National Debt of Russia has risen from 8.8 milliard roubles to 41.5.

The All-Russian Trade Union Congress demands the immediate promulgation of a decree establishing an eight hours' day, overtime being prohibited. (Except by agreement with the trade unions.)

### July 6th.

The Soviet Congress passes a resolution with regard to the agrarian question.

Several members of the Soviet Executive were thrashed by the soldiers of the 703rd regiment who are opposed to the offensive.

The Trade Union Congress accepts the draft resolution respecting the duties of women workers.

### July 7th.

Conclusion of the National Conference of the Bolshevik Military Organisations.

The Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet of the Vyborg district of Petrograd passes a resolution protesting against "the adventure of the Provisional Government which is carrying on the offensive in the name of the old predatory treaties".

The Soviet of Deputies of the 109th Division passes a strongly-worded resolution against the offensive and demands that the Soviets take over the power.