

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 55

29th September 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, Schliesfach 213, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

C O N T E N T S

A. Andreyev: The Break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the Tasks of the Soviet Trade Unions.
D. Manuilsky: The "Fourth of August" of the Austrian Social Democracy.

Politics.

Michel Hollay: The Day of the American Legion.
A. S.: After the Crushing of the Revolt in Bolivia.
A. Busiam: British Intrigues in Arabia.

China.

J. Mamayev: The Military-Political Situation in China.

The White Terror.

Guido Saraceno: A Monster Communist Trial before the Italian Fascist Special Court.
P. Bergsma: The Persecution of Revolutionaries in Indonesia.

Union of Soviet Republics.

A. Lunatcharsky: The Working and Peasant Women's Conference.

In the International.

Expulsion of Eight Oppositionals from the C. P. S. U.

Workers' Sport Movement.

Fritz Kaufmann: The Fourth Congress of the Lucerne Sport International in Helsingfors.

Ten Years Ago.

The "Democratic Conference" for the Stabilisation of the Bourgeois Order.

The "Democratic Soviet".

Chronicle of Events.

Ten Years of Soviet Power.

L. F. W.: On the Way to Socialism.

P. F...r: Co-operatives in Socialist Construction.

The Break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the Tasks of the Soviet Trade Unions.

Report Delivered to the Meeting of the Functionaries of the Railway Workers' Union in Moscow.

By A. Andreyew.

Comrades. The break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee is today already a fact. It is necessary to explain to every English worker and to every worker in the Soviet Union the full significance of this fresh act of treachery which the present leaders of the English trade union movement have committed.

When the Anglo-Russian Committee was formed, the fact of its formation was regarded as an increase in the forces of the working class of England and of the Soviet Union, as well as an increase in the power of resistance in face of aggressive capital. At that time our enemies, in particular the English bourgeoisie and the leaders of the Amsterdam International, estimated the fact of the formation of the A. R. C. quite otherwise. They were displeased at the founding of the A. R. C.; they felt that their positions had to some extent been rendered weaker by this step. Today every worker must be clear as to why the A. R. C. has been broken up, how it came about that this A. R. C. has not fulfilled the original task which it had set itself at the time of its formation.

The A. R. C. had to fulfil three main tasks: The first was to enforce by joint efforts the actual establishment of international trade union unity. The second task was the fight against the new war which the imperialists are preparing. The third task was the fight against the offensive of capital, and mutual support in this fight. Now, when the A. R. C. has been smashed as a result of the fresh treachery of the leaders of the General Council, our workers and the English workers must receive a clear answer to the question why the A. R. C. has not fulfilled those tasks and that programme which it had set up at its inception. In the same manner our workers and also the English workers must grasp the full significance of the fact of the liquidation of the A. R. C. itself.

The A. R. C. was broken up at a moment when the united efforts of the various armies of the international proletariat appeared to be most necessary. Just at the present time the imperialist war danger is greater than it has ever been before; just now bourgeois diplomacy, and in particular the leaders of

English policy are striving as never before to prepare a new world war. It is now, therefore, that the existence and the activity of the A. R. C. and similar organisations would have been most necessary. Just now, when in addition to the increasing danger of war an offensive is being conducted against the economic position of the working class in almost every country, especially in England, when the English workers are being robbed of their hard-won trade union rights, when an exceptional law with a prohibition of strikes has been adopted against the English working class, when at the same time the economic position of the English working class is becoming worse—just now, at the moment of this capitalist offensive the necessity for the existence of the Anglo-Russian Committee becomes particularly obvious. Just now, in view of the danger of war and the offensive of capital in almost every country the unity of the international trade union movement is specially necessary.

Meanwhile, precisely at such a time, the leaders of the English trade union movement adopted at the Edinburgh Congress a decision to break with the trade unions of the Soviet Union. It is therefore particularly necessary for our workers, and also for the English workers, to examine on the basis of facts the attitude of both parties within the A. R. C. This examination on the basis of facts of our actions, as well as the actions of the General Council, can reveal better than any agitation the truth, the real character of our policy and the attitude of the General Council.

It is clear that the leaders of the English trade union movement will try to make out to the British workers that the breach with us accomplished at the Edinburgh Congress was due to the fact that it has been quite impossible to make common cause with us, with the trade unions of the Soviet Union, with the A. U. C. T. U., as we had criticised them, interfered in their inner affairs and written them rude letters. It is obvious that the leaders of the General Council will pursue such tactics in order to conceal the truth and the real meaning of the break-up of the A. R. C. They are attempting everything in order to obscure the truth by all kinds of fairy tales, in order to begot the heads of the English workers and to justify their attitude. It is our task, on the other hand, to prevent the leaders of the General Council doing this and to help so that every English worker grasps the real truth, the real reasons for the breach by the General Council with us, the real reasons for the smashing of the A. R. C. by the General Council.

Who has Defended the Interests of the Proletariat, and How?

Of course it is not a question of the letters we have written. They are not prudish young ladies who cannot stand the tone our letters. It was not a question of our letters nor that we had interfered in their inner affairs. We have made use of our right to support the English working class in certain matters in the fight against the capitalists; we have made use of our obvious right to criticise the leaders on account of their treachery towards the English working class, but otherwise we have not interfered in their affairs. Nobody has at any time deprived us of this right, nor will anybody be able to deprive us of it. That however, is not an interference in the inner affairs of the English trade union movement. The fact of the matter is that that which took place at the last Congress of the English trade unions was the carrying out of a previously laid down plan. It was not an accident, it was not a chance decision.

The smashing of the A. R. C. was only the completion of that policy which the General Council had pursued in regard to the A. R. C.

When did the complications in our relations with the General Council begin? They began at the moment of the general strike and of the miners' struggle in England. From this moment onwards the General Council begins to feel itself embarrassed by the existence of the A. R. C. and by its connection with our trade unions.

What did we propose in the question of supporting the English miners, and how did the leaders of the General Council reply to our proposal?

We proposed that in view of the great struggle between capital and labour in England the A. R. C. should initiate an energetic action, that the A. R. C. should throw into the scale its whole authority in the international labour movement in order to help the struggling miners. Our proposal was, in the name of the A. R. C., to do everything in order that the English miners should receive material aid by means of collections. Our proposal was that the A. R. C. should do everything necessary

to induce the miners and the transport workers of other countries not to allow any coal to come to England, as this blackleg coal was delivering one blow after another at the miners' struggle.

What was the answer of the representatives of the General Council to our proposal? They replied that this was not the task of the A. R. C., for this purpose there exists the Amsterdam International, moreover the General Council had adopted every measure in order to care for the miners etc., and that the A. R. C. could do practically nothing for the support of the English miners. That was the answer to our proposal to rescue the miners' struggle and to help the miners to victory. These were their and our respective policies in the question of the miners' struggle.

What was their policy and what was our policy in regard to that question for which the A. R. C. was created: the question of the fight for unity?

We proposed that the A. R. C. should take energetic action in the question of the fight for unity. We proposed that the A. R. C. should take the initiative in calling an international trade union Congress. We proposed that the English trade unions should exert pressure upon the Amsterdam International in order to force the latter to accept the proposal of the A. U. C. T. U. in regard to the convocation of a conference without preconditions. The answer and the tactics of the other side consisted in veiling this question by non-committal phrases. In response to our concrete proposal that the English trade unions should exert pressure upon the Amsterdam International because they have a great influence in Amsterdam, the General Council did nothing. It seems to us now that in the question of unity the General Council have acted rather in agreement with the Amsterdam International, and not in agreement with us.

The General Council has therefore not fulfilled its main task; it has not fulfilled that obligation which it undertook when it entered the Anglo-Russian Committee. Thus the policy of the General Council in the question of international trade union unity was a policy of deception. Whilst we made quite concrete proposals to the effect that the A. R. C. should throw its whole influence into the scale for really organising international unity, the representatives of the General Council were endeavouring with all their power to prevent the A. R. C. from undertaking a single step in this respect, they were endeavouring to convert the A. R. C. into an ordinary talking shop.

The third question is the question of the Chinese Revolution. When English imperialism set into movement its warships against the Chinese revolution and caused its guns to fire on the insurgent Chinese people in Nanking, the representatives of the A. U. C. T. U. proposed at the meeting of the A. R. C. that the latter should appeal to the international proletariat to support the Chinese revolution, and that it should declare a determined fight against the attacks of the imperialists on the Chinese revolution. What have the representatives of the English General Council done in this question? They attempted to evade the question by various pretexts, as for instance that they were not sufficiently informed in order to justify an action of the A. R. C. in this question etc. What is the meaning of that? It means protecting the chief enemies of the Chinese revolution, the English imperialists. It means defending the policy of Baldwin, Chamberlain etc.

And the chief question is the question of the preparation for war. Every honest proletarian perceives quite clearly the preparations for war on the part of the imperialists. That which the English imperialists are doing with regard to the Soviet Union in the League of Nations and in various countries only indicates that a persistent work is being done in the sphere of preparing a military attack on the Soviet Union, that a persistent work is being conducted for preparing a new war, which in actual fact has already commenced in China and which according to the intentions of the English imperialists shall extend to us. All the chief tasks of the foreign policy of the English imperialists are at present directed towards this aim. That is clear to everybody.

And when we proposed to the General Council that it should come into action through the A. R. C., that the A. R. C. be convened at once to discuss the situation, as one of the chief tasks which the A. R. C. set itself at the time of its formation was the fight against the danger of war, when we demanded of the General Council in a number of letters that it agree that the A. R. C. meet together and adopt all necessary measures and that it appeal for the rallying of all forces to combat the danger

of war etc., what answer did we receive from the General Council? It refused to give its sanction to the summoning of the A. R. C. At that moment the leaders of the General Council, instead of throwing the entire influence of the A. R. C. into the scale, could not think of anything better to do than first to send the A. U. C. T. U. a letter of complaint, which was published in the press and only provoked the disgust of every honest proletarian, and in addition, in the moment of the danger of war, to smash the A. R. C.

And finally, the fifth question. The policy of the A. U. C. T. U., of our trade unions consisted in regarding the A. R. C. as a practical organisation, in regarding the A. R. C. not as a talking shop but as an active organisation of the trade union movement of both countries, that they endeavoured that the A. R. C. should not pass over any single essential question of the international labour movement.

And what have the leaders of the General Council done in order to activate the A. R. C.? They conducted a policy diametrically opposed to this task. They went so far that they converted the A. R. C. into a debating club, meeting on very rare occasions; that the A. R. C. did not do anything (except adopting resolutions now and again); that although now and again friendly conversations took place the A. R. C. did not represent any active force. That was the whole line of policy of the General Council.

These were our and their policies respectively in the essential questions. I have already mentioned that they will justify the breach with us by saying that it is impossible to work together with us, that we are a quarrelsome people, that we abuse the leaders of the English trade unions on every occasion, interfere in their affairs, send them disagreeable letters and so forth. That, apparently, will be the chief motive in justifying their latest treachery. These pretexts, however, are nothing else but empty talk, nobody will give credit to them. There are documents on our activity and on the activity of the General Council. We have published them in part already; we will endeavour to publish them in popular form in order to enlighten every proletarian as to the attitude of the General Council, that it conducted a policy of sabotage in the A. R. C. which converted the A. R. C. into an empty body. The smashing of the A. R. C. will cost them dear.

Wherein lies the Chief Significance of the Breach?

What importance has the fact of the smashing of the A. R. C., and how must it be estimated by our workers and the English workers? I have already said that the General Council, since the general strike, began to find the existence of the A. R. C. to be a burden. At this period the relations between the A. U. C. T. U. and the General Council begin to become strained; at this moment there appears in the General Council a fairly strong wing which openly stands for the break-up of the A. R. C. At the head of this wing there stands Thomas. From this moment the so-called Left wing, with Purcell, Hicks, etc. at the head, begin going more and more to the Right and to speak of the impossibility of continuing friendship with our trade unions. At that time the leaders of the General Council began to make plans as to how they could most conveniently smash the A. R. C., or finally convert it into nothing, to bring it into such a position that it can no more disturb the General Council and that it die a natural death. That was the plan of the present leaders of the General Council. And that which took place at the last Congress is only the consummation of this plan.

The break-up of the A. R. C. is of importance also in another respect. It is the carrying out of the plan of our open enemies, the imperialists, the plan of encircling us from all sides: both in the sense of isolating us from the foreign workers and in the sense of facilitating the plans of Baldwin and Chamberlain, whom the A. R. C. has naturally disturbed a little in their work. This link, the A. R. C., had to be destroyed somehow; this connecting link between us and the English workers had to be broken in order that it should not prevent the imperialists from fettering us with the chain of the danger of war. For this reason the smashing of the A. R. C. by the present leaders of the General Council is at the same time an expression of their open going over to the side of those people who are preparing war against the Soviet Union.

We now know (and we must make this plain to every English and Russian worker) that Hicks, the Chairman of the English General Council, as well as Purcell and Thomas and their like are objectively in one front with Chamberlain and Baldwin, and

along with them are preparing war against us. The breaking-up of the A. R. C. at a moment when an open military attack against us is being prepared cannot have any other meaning. Every English worker must realise that not only Baldwin and Chamberlain are preparing a war, but that also the present leaders of the English trade unions are taking part in these preparations by their breaking-up of the A. R. C.

How otherwise could one understand that unbounded joy and that satisfaction which the English bourgeoisie displayed on the occasion of the dissolution of the A. R. C.? It transpires that not only we have estimated the A. R. C. as an obstacle to the carrying out of the plans of Baldwin and Chamberlain, but that the bourgeoisie also regarded it in the same manner. Just recently the newspapers announced that the Stock Exchange is pleased at this breach. A financial newspaper of the English bourgeoisie wrote in its leading article:

"This Congress can be described without exaggeration as the most satisfactory of all congresses of the past few years."

According to the "Economist" it was said in the City that the proceedings at Edinburgh were responsible for the brighter tone of certain sections of the stock market.

The most remarkable decision of this Congress was, however, the breach with us. It is for this reason that the English bourgeoisie are now applauding the leaders of the English trade unions. It appears that the break-up of the A. R. C. has exerted a favourable effect on the Stock Exchange. That is how the bourgeoisie reacts to the decisions of the English trade union leaders. What the attitude of the English workers to these decisions will be remains to be seen. When the English trade union bureaucrats decided the question of the breach, they did not ask the workers, although they gave their votes in the name of the workers. The General Council cannot point to a single resolution passed at meetings of workers in England, demanding the breach with our trade unions. The English trade union bureaucrats voted at this Congress not in accordance with, but against the will and against the desires of the English workers. That is how the question was decided at the Congress.

It is known, comrades, that the representatives of the Minority Movement at the Congress voted against this decision to break off relations with us. The railwaymen's delegation also voted against the breach, although there stand at the head of the railwaymen's union the reactionary leaders Thomas and others. Even Cramp, one of the most reactionary of the railwaymen's leaders, the secretary of the Executive Committee of the N. U. R., was compelled to declare at the Congress that the break-up of the A. R. C. constituted supporting Baldwin and Chamberlain and will be made use of by the imperialists in their fight against us. Even such thorough-going reactionary leaders were compelled, under the pressure of the masses, to use such language. In addition the miners' delegation withheld their votes. And in spite of this the trade union machinery obtained the majority for the acceptance of the decision to dissolve the A. R. C.

After all this the English workers and our workers may know that the responsibility for the dissolution of this organisation which connected us with the English trade union movement rests fully and entirely with the present leaders of the English trade union movement. We, the trade unions of the Soviet Union and the A. U. C. T. U., have, in spite of the treacherous tactics of the leaders of the General Council towards the A. R. C., done everything possible down to the last moment in order to maintain the A. R. C. We have done everything in order that the A. R. C. shall perform useful work for the international labour movement, and especially for the labour movement of England and of the Soviet Union. We have consistently carried out right up to the last day this policy of maintaining the A. R. C., while the policy of the General Council was one of deception. It consisted in efforts to convert the A. R. C. into a nonentity and finally to destroy it.

Was Our Policy Correct?

Was our policy with regard to the A. R. C. correct? Have we really not taken such steps, not committed such errors in our policy which have facilitated the breaking-up of the A. R. C.? Have we, then, not committed such errors which would have helped the English trade union bureaucrats to

smash the Anglo-Russian Committee? That is the first question which we must face in view of all that I have said. And the second question which we must also naturally put is, would it perhaps have been more correct if we ourselves had taken the initiative in dissolving the A. R. C. and not left it to the English? These two questions naturally arise when we wish to examine our own policy. Let us consider the first question:

As we stood for the maintenance of the A. R. C. we could have only two lines: the one line consisted in not sharpening the relations with the General Council, to behave somewhat more quietly, not to write any sharp answers, not to make speeches which castigated the errors and the treachery of the leaders of the English trade unions. Perhaps we ought to have pursued such a course in order to maintain the A. R. C. at any price.

With such a line it is easily possible that the break-up of the A. R. C. would not have occurred; it is possible that the present leaders of the General Council would not have carried out the break-up of the A. R. C. The question arises, however, would such a tactic have been correct? Of course it would not have been correct. That is not our tactic, that is not a Bolshevik tactic, that is not the tactic of our revolutionary trade unionists. That is only the tactic of the reformists who endeavour to smooth over everything in order not to leave any sharp edges, in order to preserve appearances. This tactic, however, is not our tactic. We do not need the appearance of the A. R. C. A nominal, formal existence of the A. R. C. is equally injurious for us and for the whole movement.

We have therefore pursued the second line, the line of another policy, of an honest proletarian class policy. Our tactic was to do everything in order to convert the A. R. C. into a real fighting organ for defending the class interests of the proletariat. Our line was not to conceal all the faults, the whole treachery, the whole deceitfulness of the standpoint of the leaders of the English working class, but to help the English labour movement to correct errors, to free it from treachery in the leading organs of the trade unions. That was our line, and our trade unions could not and cannot have any other line towards the A. R. C.

The second question is whether it would not have been better to seize the initiative in dissolving the A. R. C. and to declare: We do not wish to have anything more to do with you traitors, we are done with you. Would not such a tactic have been better? Some oppositional hot-heads in our Party have continually proposed these tactics to us: "Break with the English traitors! Break with the General Council! How can one sit and negotiate at one table with traitors? Seize the initiative in dissolving the A. R. C.!" etc. But, comrades, it is to be clearly seen from the whole estimate of the situation that such a tactic would have been a blatantly sham revolutionary gesture. The English workers would not have been able to understand it. In addition this gesture would only have facilitated the carrying out of the plans of the General Council with regard to the A. R. C. It would have meant helping Thomas, helping all those leaders of the General Council to break away from the A. R. C. It would have meant, on the other hand, helping the English bourgeoisie, Chamberlain and Baldwin, to clear away this obstacle to their policy. To seize the initiative in dissolving the A. R. C. would have been a quite incorrect policy.

It is good that not we, but the General Council seized the initiative. The A. R. C. was not founded in response to the wish of the leaders, nor because the leaders needed such an institution, but it was formed by the will of the working class of both countries. Therefore those who have taken the initiative in dissolving the A. R. C. will have to render an account to the working masses. Those who are guilty of destroying this alliance of our workers with the English workers will inevitably be called to account. Perhaps it is very hard at present for the English workers to call their leaders to account as the English workers are now, after their defeat, in a very difficult position. This latest treachery of the General Council leaders will not, however, be forgotten. The English worker knows what is what, he knows who is in the right and who is in the wrong. Therefore, Comrades, we must say in examining our policy in regard to the A. R. C. that our policy was correct, because it was a proletarian class policy.

(To be Concluded.)

The "Fourth of August" of the Austrian Social Democracy.

By D. Manuilsky (Moscow).

The occurrences in Vienna on July 15th have left an indelible stigma on the Austrian Social Democrats, whose treachery on that day constituted a new "Fourth of August" for the Austro-Marxists, being a greater crime against the working class than the incident which led to action on the part of the Vienna proletariat, i.e. the acquittal of the Fascist murderers. The interests of an insurgent class were here betrayed, and the revolutionary movement of the Austrian working class was suppressed by one of the best organised parties of the Second International.

As a result of Social Democratic policy, the masses went unarmed into the streets; they remained unarmed even when the police, many of whom carried Social-Democratic membership books in their pockets, fired with impunity into their midst. The Republican Defence Corps, consisting mainly of Social Democratic workers, was placed in the service of the police. Such a policy cannot be justified. Such lack of organisation, such weakness of will, such toadyism, and such pronounced treachery as was displayed by the Austro-Marxists last July, cannot be forgotten, can never be effaced from the memory of the working class. Otto Bauer will never succeed in wiping out this shameful blot. The hardened villains of the Second International, all the Renaudels and Boncours that voted for the new military law in France, all the international Noskes

and Scheidemanns have every reason to burst into homeric laughter at the former "fronde" of the Austro-Marxists of the Second International. The leaders of the Austrian Democracy know this full well, and it is now their endeavour to cover up their traces, both in the Austrian press and in international organs, and to justify their attitude before the working class.

Following upon his lamentable speech delivered at a time when blood still stained the Vienna pavements, the leader of the Austro-Marxists, Herr Otto Bauer himself, now prefers to preserve silence. His place is now taken by others who have nothing to lose. In addressing the "select body" of Social Democratic party functionaries at Leipzig, Herr Julius Deutsch quite recently extolled the historic merits of the Austrian Social Democrats, who had held back the masses from a revolutionary fight. It is with the greatest cynicism, too, that this treachery is treated, in the columns of the old "Sozialistische Monatshefte" of Bernstein, by Dr. Renner, that not unrenowned theoretician of the Austrian Social Democracy. Finally "Der Kampf", the central organ of the Austro-Marxists, publishes an article by Kuntz, who draws the balance of the events of July 15th and attempts to cull therefrom some lessons for the benefit of Socialist party-members. It is difficult not to experience a feeling of the deepest disgust when reading these reflections of the leaders of Social Democracy in Austria,

so full are they of the most hackneyed philistine cant. The subjective sentiment of responsibility on the part of the Social Democratic leaders and their fault, so patent to the entire working class, are here drowned, by means of the most miserable sophistry, in a sea of objective obstacles, which, it is alleged prevented the proletariat from the further development of its action of July 15th. The Communist press of all countries, and before all that of our own small Austrian Communist Party, which behaved most gallantly in the July days must overcome a very natural feeling of nausea at the despicable efforts of the connivers at the July murders and unmask the subterfuges of Messrs. Kunfi, Deutsch & Co. step for step. It is now the foremost task of the Austrian comrades to follow close on the trail of these traitors, to harass them, leave them no peace, and at the same time to impart a clear form to those tendencies which are now gaining ground among the Austrian workers as opposed to Austrian Social Democracy. The fight against Austro-Marxism, that most dangerous and most pernicious variety of opportunism, which has hitherto managed to veil its reformist actions by radical phrases and has for several years made a very clever show of revolutionary Marxism, is now becoming one of the most urgent tasks of the entire Communist International. In all countries there is some form or other of "practical" Austro-Marxism. In the Soviet Union it is Trotzkyism, which under cover of a fight for democracy within the Party has opened the door to bourgeois democracy, and which in the war of the capitalist world against the Soviet Union adopts in practice the centrist standpoint of a conditional defence of the latter. In Germany this movement is represented by the sanctimonious Left Social Democrats of Saxony and the group of Maslow and Ruth Fischer, in Great Britain by men like Purcell and Citrine who at times utter "Left" phrases but betray the general strike and the miners' strike, and neither move a finger to defend the first proletarian revolution of the world against the attacks of British imperialism nor even protest against the strangulation, by the same imperialists, of the Chinese revolution. A true fight for the masses can be waged only if all varieties and practical forms of present-day "Austro-Marxism" are unmasked in the most ruthless and energetic way.

In its specifically Viennese edition, Austro-Marxism is an outcome of the unhealthy conditions obtaining in Austria. Before the war Austria-Hungary was one of the weakest links in the chain of capitalist States. Torn by internal national dissensions and split up by a policy of playing off one nationality against the other and of systematically corrupting the upper strata of each individual nationality, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was thoroughly decayed even prior to the war. In view of the threatening disintegration of the Austrian bourgeois State, the Austrian Social Democratic school of pre-war days founded a theory according to which it was only the working class that could possibly save such a patchwork State as Austria, by remodelling it on the basis of a democratic national autonomy. At a time when the German colleagues of Renner and his friends did not yet dare to revise the old Marxian standpoint of Social Democracy in its relation to the bourgeois State, and were still kowtowing at their official party meetings to the traditional Social Democratic principle of "not a penny, not a soldier for the capitalist State", the Austro-Marxists were already beginning a cautious revision of this thesis. The bourgeoisie enhanced the chaos of its policy and drove the old "nationality State" into the abyss, so that there was but one party which could extricate Austria from a condition of permanent crisis, and that was the Austrian Social Democratic Party. In this case the proletariat declared in favour of this one and only heir to the bourgeois State, without making any attempt to make clear the class character of this State. On the other hand, the idea of revolution was deliberately put aside, while the principle of the destruction of the entire bourgeois-capitalist State machinery was replaced by that of its reformation.

The Austrian bourgeoisie was impressed by such a peculiarly super-patriotic theory and by such a tame form of Social Democracy which set out to accomplish what the Government of old Francis Joseph had never succeeded in doing. The working class in Austria was deceived by high-sounding phrases as to its messianic role towards the "Fatherland" which was cracking at every joint. It had at that time not yet experienced the revelation of the Russian October revolution, which by the

methods of proletarian dictatorship saved a whole country, with millions of active workers and peasants, from ruin and dismemberment. The working masses had not yet seen through the theories of Austro-Marxism nor yet found out what they were destined later to learn by experience to their own cost, i. e. the difference between the proletarian solution of the problem, the salvation of the masses from want, hunger, and cold, and the bourgeois system of saving capitalism.

The outbreak of the world war opened the festering sore within international Social Democracy. What had accumulated without being noticed for many years in the way of changes in the ideology and the tactics of the Second International, now appeared suddenly in horrifying nakedness. On August 4th, 1914, the Social Democrats of all countries assumed the standpoint of an open and unashamed support of the capitalist State. The standpoint of the Austro-Marxists towards the capitalist State was thus internationalised; Austro-Marxism became the precursor of the entire new direction. It is generally known in what manner the Austrian Social Democrats reacted to the ultimatum to Serbia and what their central organ, the "Arbeiter-Zeitung", found to say during the first few days of the war on the subject of their tasks and aims. Expressions of the most servile feelings towards the effete Hapsburg dynasty alternated in its columns with a wild chauvinistic outcry for the defence of "German humanity". Among all the varieties of Social patriotism, the Austrian was the most revolting, being in defence of a State which had not even the slightest trace of the "national State" character about it.

Without any programme of its own, it followed like an obedient dog cringing behind its master, German imperialism. The latter's final defeat was at the same time a defeat of the policy of August 4th, which thus failed to preserve Austria-Hungary from ruin, failing, too, to create on the site of the old Monarchy that Danubian Federation which Herr Renner so ardently advocated and which was to have continued the rôle of the old Austria-Hungary as an agent of German imperialism in Eastern Europe. In reality the Austro-Marxists had aided the ruling classes in Austria to place the country in its present position, that of a parasite State at the mercy of the victors, a State placed under guardianship by international capitalism, something like a child or an imbecile. This was the first historical test to which Austro-Marxism was ever put, and this test sufficed to show its bankruptcy.

The second test was not long in following, in the shape of the so-called "sanitary reconstruction". The defeat of the two Central European empires created an objectively revolutionary state of affairs in Germany and Austria-Hungary.

Never has history presented the proletariat with better conditions for the seizure of power than in 1918 and 1919. Capitalism was disorganised to an extent never known before. The ruling classes were demoralised. The masses had weapons in their hands. The Social Democrats constituted the strongest party in Austria. The degree of ripeness of capitalism in Austria and Germany for a social revolution was such that the Russian proletariat in 1917 could not even dream of. In the stormy revolutionary days of 1918 and 1919 history confronted the Austrian Social Democrats with the clear cut question: Either save capitalism, reconstruct it, artificially prop its decayed apparatus, persuade the masses, as Otto Bauer does, that herein lies the one path to "Socialism", convince them of this by means of the bullets of Noske and the bullets of Otto Bauer himself in Vienna in July; or else you must give the deathblow to a perishing capitalism, smash the political and economic machinery of the bourgeois State, and erect a proletarian administration, strangle the bourgeoisie and set up a proletarian revolutionary socialism, which alone can save the masses.

This is how the question stood in 1918 and 1919. There could be no two answers to such a question, just as little as there could be a third possible way out of the difficulty. Everywhere the Social Democrats chose the former way, that of stabilising capitalism. In all countries they were an active factor of such stabilisation. At a time when capitalism was staggering like a drunken man and when all objective premises of a revolution were present, at the very moment when the masses hurled themselves into the fight, the Social Democrats did their utmost to save capitalism.

And in this respect Austro-Marxism was no exception to the rule. The Austrian Social Democratic leaders persuaded the masses to eschew revolutionary methods, as involving great expense and sacrifice. They frightened the workers with accounts of the sufferings of the Russian working class. They guaranteed that the way of Democracy was the cheapest way to the salvation of the working class from misery and starvation. No one did so much for the success of the capitalistic reconstruction programme in Austria as the Social Democrats did. And the outcome of this policy is now apparent. The misery of the broad masses is at present assuming more gigantic dimensions in Austria than in any other European country, as is now admitted even by the most recognised leaders of the Social Democratic Party. Unemployment is rampant. Since the stabilisation of the currency the number of unemployed has ranged from 15 to 25 per cent. of the total of Austrian workers. So as to retain the possibility of competing on the world markets, the Austrian capitalists have reduced their production costs exclusively at the cost of the workers' wages. There is not a single capitalist country of Central Europe in which wages are so low as is the case in the land of Herr Bauer's "Socialist experiment". In relation to the degree of their organisation, the lack of rights of the Austrian workers is monstrous. This is the outcome of the capitalist programme of reconstruction.

Whereas the proletariat of the Soviet Union is developing its economy by its own unaided efforts, while the standard of living of the proletariat in the Soviet Union is constantly on the rise, while the working class of the Soviet Union feels itself the master of the country, the Austrian proletariat must row pay dearly for its confidence in the "Socialist experiment" of Herr Bauer, i. e. in the construction of "socialism" without a proletarian revolution, an experiment of which the Austro-Marxists were wont to boast down to quite recent times.

To the methods of the Bolshevik revolution in the Soviet Union, the Austro-Marxists opposed its method of bloodless revolution, a gradual growing of democracy into socialism, a gradual dying out of the capitalist order, ousted from its position by instalments of Socialism. "Red Vienna" with its Social Democratic Mayor, Herr Seitz, Vienna where every third, or possibly even every second citizen is a Social Democrat, Vienna which constructs new workers' dwellings, is looked upon by the Austrian Social Democrats as a living embodiment of the advantages of a peaceful development of Socialism within the framework of the capitalist State without the danger of a civil war, which might entail the victory of reaction. The bourgeoisie of the world may sleep in peace.

For the time being this social reformationism, which at a snail's pace is growing up through the thick layer of capitalism spread over the small territory of Austria, does not in the very least disturb the capitalist order either within the country or outside it. The Austria of Otto Bauer can shake the main pillars of international capitalism just as little as Monaco can. The weak Austrian bourgeoisie has preferred to carry out the capitalist work of sanitation by buying off the Austrian proletariat. The social reformationism of Messrs. Seitz and Bauer was the price paid by the Austrian bourgeoisie for its salvation from revolution. It merely formed a part of the capitalist restoration.

This forbearance on the part of the ruling classes towards Otto Bauer's social reformism, in view of its complete harmlessness for the bourgeoisie, is looked upon by the Austro-Marxists as a particular achievement. They profess to have forced the Austrian bourgeoisie to its knees in face of the working class and placed it in its service. In reality, however, a revolutionary labour party, even if only one quarter as numerous as the party of Otto Bauer, might long ago have put an end to Fascism, to the power of the bourgeoisie and that of the Catholic Church, turning Vienna into a real stronghold of the proletariat.

How came it however that, in spite of their disgustingly opportunist policy, the Austro-Marxists should have had the reputation in the Second International of a pronouncedly "Left" party? The explanation lies in the specific international and inner-political conditions obtaining in Austria just after the war. The Austrian Social Democrats could allow themselves the luxury of being more pronounced pacifists than any other

section of the Second International, their pacifism resulting from the fact that the military breakdown had, so to say, drawn the teeth of Austrian imperialism. Austria could no longer aspire to any active international policy. It had become the object, rather than the subject, of imperialist politics. There remained but the dream of a union with Germany, the dream of being able one day to tread the broad path of imperialist policy thanks to a revival of German imperialism. This explains the sympathy awakened in Austria by any project to form "United States" of Eastern Europe or of Europe as a whole.

At the Marseilles Congress Otto Bauer allowed himself to be persuaded to coquette with the colonial movement, while the attitude of the Socialists of such countries as possessed colonies was rather one of colonial satraps. Otto Bauer naturally has nothing to lose in Morocco, Tunis, or China. In this respect his opposition goes no farther than the "love of freedom" of the small German bourgeois, who views not without malicious joy the ill-success of British policy in the colonies. But even this small evidence of "oppositional" feelings on the part of Austro-Marxism was defeated on the occasion of the first practical test of a colonial revolution. Thus, after the defection of Chiang Kai Shek, the Austro-Marxists not only declared openly against the Communist movement in China, but also pointed to Chiang Kai Shek as the only man capable of fulfilling the objective tasks of the Chinese revolution, which, in the eyes of the Austro-Marxists, consist solely in the victory of the bourgeoisie and the triumph of capitalism.

The fact, finally, that the Austrian Social Democrats are even more reserved in their attitude towards the Soviet Union than are other sections of the Second International, is also an outcome of the internal industrial conditions of development in Austria.

The tiny territory of present-day Austria is proportionate neither to the dimensions of the industrial apparatus nor to the productive capacity of Austrian industry. After the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Austria found herself deprived of four fifths of her home market.

Austrian industry has an interest in various markets, but it has not the means at its disposal for their development in the same degree as the large capitalist States have. It is therefore obliged to pick up the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table. The only country in which it can appear as an equal participant in the commercial turnover of the world without being made to feel a mere beggar among the nations, is the Soviet Union. But since the Austrian Social Democrats have indissolubly associated their policy with the capitalism of their own country, their relations with the Soviet Union express rather the market policy of the Austrian bourgeoisie than the interests of proletarian solidarity. It should also be borne in mind that the big Soviet Republic represents one of those factors tending to hamper the predatory efforts of the imperialists. The entire "independence" of Austrian hangs on the thin and worn thread of the "balance of power" created after the war. Secondly, the blatantly extolled "bloodless" achievements of the Austrian Social Democrats were not the outcome of its power or of its readiness to fight for their possession, but the result of the victory of the Russian revolution, which after the war called forth a new proportion of power in the relations between capital and labour. The Austrian Social Democrats know this very well, despite their innate hatred of Bolshevism. Therein lies the root of those particular ambiguities which, contrary e. g. to the "Vorwärts", have been used by the Austro-Marxists in their relations with the Soviet Union.

This attitude long deceived the Austrian workers, among whom the impression obtained that there was a qualitative difference between their party and that of Noske in Germany. The hands of the Austrian Social Democrats were not stained with the blood of workers like those of their German comrades.

The significance of the events of July 15th lies in the fact that they finally tore the mask from off the face of Austro-Marxism. What we Communists had already seen prior to these occurrences became clear to the broad masses of the Social Democratic workers by reason of the sanguinary lessons of that day. Once more, the Austrian Social Democrats saved

the Austrian bourgeoisie from ruin. But this time not without bloodshed. Several hundreds of dead and crippled Vienna proletarians — that was the price which the Austrian proletariat had to pay for the severe lesson it learnt. The fairy-tale of a bloodless revolution which the Austro-Marxists upheld for years while the bourgeoisie was quite openly arming its Fascist auxiliaries, has now been drowned in the blood of workers. The Austrian Social Democrats have led the workers systematically from one capitulation to another, until they landed in the sanguinary inferno of the 15th of July, 1927. Millions of workers the world over burn with wrath when they think of this tragedy of the betrayed and defeated Vienna proletariat. They ask the honest Social Democratic workers who still continue to believe in their party "Who is to blame?" Here it is of no avail to employ the usual falsehood that the Communists incited the masses, led them out into the streets, and exposed them to the fire of the police. Neither Kunfi, nor Bauer, nor Renner, dares to say that. At the time in question the Vienna Communists were with the masses, and the bullets of Seipel and Bauer made no distinction between Communist and Social Democratic workers. The blood shed cries for atonement.

The new programme of the Austrian Social Democrats contains a passage according to which in the event of the bourgeoisie violating legality and proceeding to employ force, the Social Democracy must answer force with force, the means to be adopted at a time of civil warfare being that of the dictatorship. We Communists have always regarded this item of the Austrian programme as a manoeuvre to facilitate the task of duping the workers. Hundreds of thousands of Socialist workers, however, honestly believed that their party would really answer violence with violence and would not allow the bourgeoisie to shoot down workers like rabbits. We have a different opinion of the past to that cherished by our comrades, the Social Democratic workers. We have believed and still believe that every bourgeois Government is the Government of a capitalist dictatorship, i. e. the Government of organised force over the workers. We have believed and still believe that it is the most elementary duty of the workers party to enlighten the workers as to this character of the bourgeois Government and to imbue them with the idea that it is only by force that the bourgeoisie can be brought to its knees and be induced to abandon the use of violence in its fight against the working masses. And now, after the carnage of July 15th, we are more than ever convinced of the accuracy of our estimation. But we have at the same time all the more reason to ask the Social Democratic workers whether Seitz, Otto Bauer, and other leaders have fulfilled this item of their programme. The events of July 15th represent a civil war, but an altogether one-sided civil war, waged on unarmed workers by the armed forces of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie started this war when the police proceeded to annihilate the working masses. That this was the case is sufficiently proved by depositions as to the course of events on July 15th.

"From 3 p. m., there began a savage fusillade in all streets of Vienna, a blind fusillade without discrimination between peaceful passers-by and demonstrators, a fusillade, not merely intended as a warning, but well-aimed at any one not wearing a white collar, a fusillade which lasted until the latest hours of the night and was continued next day in the suburbs." (Renner: "The Forensic Tragedy of Vienna", p. 606 of the "Sozialistische Monatshefte".)

That is how Herr Renner describes the action of Herr Schober's police myrmidons. A fusillade at any one "not wearing a white collar", a fusillade at "passers-by in the working districts", such is the sanguinary practice of civil war, as waged all the world over by men like Schober, ever since the days of a Cavaignac and a Thiers. Thus it was in Hungary, in Finland, in Germany, everywhere where armed conflict arose between the working class and capital. But whereas in these countries the workers had at least arms with which to defend themselves, Messrs. Bauer, Renner, and Seitz took good care in Vienna that the workers should be deprived of any such possibility. It is a downright insult to common sense that Kunfi and Renner should speak of the Social Democrats having been obliged to call on the masses to fall back, so as to avoid a "civil war".

"It was a most tragic and distressing moment when, in face of the carnage instituted by the organs of law and

order, thousands raised the cry for arms. The Social Democratic Party, however, had most resolutely opposed the call "to arms".

"When the carbines of the police were directed on the workers of Vienna, many a worker must have thought: 'If Seipel and Schober are allowed to order workers to be fired at, Bauer and Seitz ought not to keep the workers from taking up arms'".

Emphatically and instinctively as this cry was raised, and hard as it appeared to have to withstand it at such a moment, compliance would have meant a capitulation of the Social Democratic Party to an undoubtedly motley throng brought together by the demonstration; it would have given rise to civil war and have finally doomed the Austrian proletariat to the same fate as that of Hungary and Italy." (Kunfi: "The 15th of July and Its Lesson", p. 349/50 of "Der Kampf".)

Can anything more despicable be imagined than this vindication of the treachery of the Austro-Marxists last July? The workers are hunted like hares; they are chased into the working districts; dozens lie dead on the pavement; thousands raise the cry "To arms!" The Social Democratic Party has 365,000 members in Vienna alone; at the elections it has two thirds of the votes of the entire Vienna population behind it — and yet this party does its utmost to prevent the masses from defending themselves; it mobilises its Defence Corps to protect the police and the judges from the "excesses" of the indignant workers under the pretext of an endeavour to prevent civil strife. The shooting of workers is apparently not civil war, but if the arms were directed against the white-collar men, against the habitués of the expensive restaurants and fashionable brothels, that would constitute civil war without a doubt. How low must he have sunk who can dare calmly to offer such an explanation to hundreds of thousands of organised workers. Men like Kunfi and Bauer try to terrify the workers with the fate of the Hungarian and Italian proletariat. But did the Hungarian or the Italian workers, though never enjoying an organisation comparable with that of the Austrian Social Democrats, ever permit themselves to be fired at while they themselves remained without weapons?

The Hungarian working class was defeated in the fight, but it never capitulated. As for the Italian working class, it is now suffering the consequences of the same tactics that were practised by the Austrian Social Democrats in July last. If we recall the movement among the Italian proletariat in 1920, the spontaneous occupation of the factories at a moment of disorganisation in the bourgeois State; if we recall the criminal rôle played at this juncture by the Italian Social Democrats, who called upon the Italian workers to refrain from seizing power which literally lay in the gutter, frightening them with pictures of the obstacles in their way and the spectre of reaction and civil war, we can readily understand, in view of the subsequent experiences of the Italian working class, betrayed in 1920 by the Italian Social Democrats, whither the policy of Messrs. Bauer & Co. is leading the Austrian workers. By its capitulation of 1920, the Italian working class not only failed to save itself from civil war and from Fascism, but greatly facilitated the accession to power of the Italian Fascists.

At the moment when the Social Democrats withdrew the working class, the only power capable of withstanding the Fascists, from the field of battle, the success of Mussolini's Roman "campaign" was ensured. Is it not fully patent that the Austrian Social Democrats are leading the workers of their country in the same "Italian" way? This has been sufficiently proved since July 15th by the rapid development towards the Right of the Austrian Social Democrats, a development accompanied by the blows of reaction. Since July 15th, the Fascist organisations have been steadily growing, in collaboration with the provincial authorities. The bourgeoisie, moreover, is busy preparing to deprive all State employees, and in the first place the railwaymen, of the right to strike; at the same time the draft of a new law has been submitted for the purpose of increasing the duties on the most important commodities of daily use. Furthermore, the bourgeois parties are preparing a new reactionary press law; a draft regarding the 'diminution of tenants' protection legislation is likewise in preparation and a marked decrease in unemployment relief is sure to follow. After the capi-

tulation of July 15th, the bourgeoisie has a free hand in all directions.

Such are the political consequences of Austro-Marxism after the sanguinary events of July 1927.

Possibly, however, the Austrian Social Democrats will endeavour after the carnage of July 15th to explain to the workers that there is a difference between the methods by which the Fascism of Mussolini's sort suppresses the working class and the methods of the Democracy of Seipel. The Austrian Democracy has turned out to be neither better nor worse than the Italian Fascism. This truth, which the Vienna proletariat has learnt to its cost, is not even denied by Kunfi, who characterises the Austrian Democracy as follows:

"The decay of bourgeois democracy is apparent everywhere, but there is hardly a democratic country (!) from which it has so completely disappeared as from Austria. In a social and economic sense there are middle classes in Austria too, but politically they have ceased to exist. There is no gradual transition from "red" to "black", the "uniform reactionary bloc" having become a reality in the case of Austria.

"In Austria there is no ideological bridge connecting to one or the other section of the bourgeoisie, and if we were to inquire into the case we should see that it was the bourgeoisie that broke down all these bridges behind it and identified itself with the worst form of reaction. Thus the relation of the classes in Austria to one another is characterised by an unparalleled acuteness." (Kunfi: p. 348.)

Here Kunfi may be said to have "cooked his goose" with a vengeance. In the first place he has been stupid enough to reveal the social-political function of the Austro-Marxists. It is no matter of chance that there are no "bridges" in Austria between the working class and the bourgeoisie, that there is a lack of intermediary parties. The Austrian bourgeoisie has no need of them. There are no such parties, because their functions are sufficiently supplied by the "mass party" of the Austrian Social Democrats. It is they that form the ideological bridge between the working class and the bourgeoisie. This party not only comprises workers but has a constantly increasing influx from the ranks of the petty-bourgeois population.

In the second place, this admission on the part of Kunfi completely upsets the assertion of the Social Democrats that a further development of the action of July 15th would have led to a blow at democracy, that democracy which Kunfi considers non-existent.

If finally, we assume the standpoint of the Austro-Marxists, that in Austria the working class is the sole exponent of democracy, the question arises as to why, prior to July 15th, the Austrian Social Democrats did not do all in their power to strengthen the position of the working class in its struggle against the Austrian reaction. Why did this largest party in the State not arm the workers or at any rate effect the disarmament of the Fascist detachments? Is it not obvious that a party truly desirous of defending democracy against reaction must attempt to deprive the latter of its fangs? It is not indisputable that, had the Social Democrats acted thus, the events of July 15th would not have come about, since the reactionary parties would never have dared to provoke the working class and to direct the weapons of the police against it. The entire attitude of the Austrian Social Democrats prior to July 15th helped to prepare the carnage of that day. They permitted the reaction to seize the arsenal with impunity shortly before the date in question. They receded step by step as the bourgeoisie prepared for the sanguinary issue, systematically depriving the Social Democrats of all influence over the police. Without a struggle they abandoned the hold the Austrian proletariat had on the army. The Federal Army, though developing out of the revolutionary "people's army" of 1918, gradually changed its proletarian character by reason of a systematic replacement of the proletarian elements by representatives of the wealthy peasant class from the reactionary districts, such as the Tyrol. None of these measures met with any resistance on the part of the Social Democrats.

The leaders of the Austrian Social Democratic Party shirk answering these simple questions, which are absolutely clear to any worker, preferring to hide behind vague phrases in regard

to the absence of a revolutionary situation and the danger of intervention. The question of the international situation is undoubtedly one of the most significant factors in solving the problem of capturing power. No one could reproach a really revolutionary party for temporarily shelving the question of capturing power under unfavourable international premises in view of the absence of an objective revolutionary situation or of the immaturity of the entire movement. When the Russian Bolsheviks retreated in July 1917, they were acting quite rightly. They remained a revolutionary party and proved it four months later, in October.

But how about the Austrian Social Democrats? Was there ever in their history, or in that of the Social Democrats of any country, a case in which the Social Democrats recognised the existence of a revolutionary situation and were ready to profit by it for the purpose of overthrowing the power of capitalism? Such cases did not, nay, could not, occur in their history, for the Social Democrats are not a party of revolutionary Marxism, actively fostering the historical process of the proletarian class struggle, but a party of historical fatalism, merely registering what occurs without their participation. They are like gardeners who merely gather such fruit as falls, when over-ripe, from the trees. Everywhere the Social Democrats are an impeding factor in the development of revolutionary occurrences. Ebert openly declared at the Congress of Magdeburg that he had frustrated the strike of the German proletariat against the Hohenzollern Monarchy in January 1918, just as Kunfi and Renner are not ashamed of relating how in July last they proclaimed the general strike as a means of "diverting the masses from the streets":

"Quite naturally and automatically, all factories, workshops, and offices stopped work on the Friday itself. The party leaders and the trade union committees proclaimed the general strike, at the same time limiting it to a duration of 24 hours. This measure was intended to divert the workers from the street-fights and assemble them in the centres of economic activity, thus giving the entire demonstration a different character." (Renner: p. 606 of the "Sozialistische Monatshefte".)

The leaders of the Austrian Social Democrats deliberately lie when they assert that there was no revolutionary situation existent in Vienna in July. The very fact that the masses reacted so energetically to the acquittal of the Fascists shows what inflammable material had accumulated in Austria in July 1927.

Lenin once laid down three main conditions to characterise a revolutionary situation, viz., firstly, an abnormal deterioration in the situation of the broadest working classes, causing them to realise the "impossibility of continuing existence in such circumstances", as e. g. by reason of a great increase in the number of unemployed and the deterioration of the international position of the State in question, condemning it to disintegration and leading to a permanent crisis of the ruling upper class; secondly, the will to fight on the part of the broad masses and their capacity to undergo great sacrifices in the interest of the struggle; and, thirdly, the existence of a revolutionary party ready to lead the masses into the fight without bearing a risk of defeat and not shrinking at the seizure of power.

Were these premises existent in Austria? The first two were, without a doubt. The masses threw themselves into the fight; they acted over the heads of the Social Democrats and in spite of the Social Democrats. Immediately after the Schattendorf murder, indeed, it was only with difficulty that the Social Democrats could persuade the workers to return to their work in the factories, as Renner himself relates. And if the movement of July 15th broke out against the will of the Social Democrats and despite the tremendous apparatus they had got ready to suppress it, it is a sign how far the masses had outstripped their incompetent leaders.

What was lacking in Austria was a party imbued with a revolutionary will and capable of leading broad masses into the fight. Our Communist Party of Austria is still too weak definitely to wrest the leadership of the working masses from the hands of the Social Democratic cowards and bourgeois lackeys. It is obvious that so long as the masses do not sever themselves from their incompetent staff, the third necessary condition for a revolutionary situation will fail to obtain.

The reference of the leaders to the absence of an international situation favourable for the seizure of power is altogether wrong and only intended to mislead the workers. The Austrian Social Democrats have eschewed the seizure of power by the working-class even at moments when the international situation was extremely in their favour. Therefore the argument about the international situation cannot be employed in reference to the state of affairs in July; it is merely the habitual method of the Social Democrats to hold back the masses from a fight. From year to year, the Austrian Social Democrats have systematically trained their forces in the spirit of fear of this "international situation", endeavouring to destroy altogether their will to fight. This readiness to capitulate on the part of the great Social Democratic Party is taken into account by the Austrian bourgeois. The callousness with which the bourgeoisie proceeded on July 15th is the outcome of this fatal Social Democratic propaganda. Why should the bourgeoisie not shoot down the workers, if convinced beforehand that it may do so with impunity and knows quite well that, in their slavish fear of international capital, the Austrian Social Democrats will not venture to resist? Why should this parasitical bourgeoisie not take the initiative in upsetting the "legal" state of affairs and venture to set up an already existent Fascist dictatorship, if it is placed in a position to profit by this attitude of the Social Democrats? The principle that it is wrong to be the first to break through the imperialistic front is altogether fallacious. It always starts from the presumption that the international proletariat will leave the workers of the country in which the revolution has begun in the lurch. Such an attitude is tantamount to a denial of the idea of international solidarity and is a continuation of the policy of the Social Democrats throughout the world during the war. Then, too, the Social Democrats of the capitalist countries called the workers to arms in the interests of the capitalism of each particular State, endeavouring to prove that whoever was first to oppose the war would run the risk of being isolated.

If in October 1917 the Russian workers had adhered to this principle under the same pretext of being opposed to the imperialism of Germany and Austria-Hungary, they would never have achieved the revolution. It has often been said that Austria could not be likened to the Soviet Republic, and there is undoubtedly some truth in that. For the defence of our revolutionary country against the imperialism of the world, we had a far larger basis than any other European power; we were saved, as Lenin even then pointed out, by our tremendous territory. On the other hand, we did not enjoy those advantages which would to-day be at the disposal of the proletariat of any capitalist country, were it to resolve on a further breach of the imperialist front. In the Soviet Union, now established for well nigh ten years, such a proletariat would in the first place have a firm and reliable hinterland, such as we had not in 1917. This hinterland extends for thousands of miles and borders of China, another point representing the greatest difficulties for world imperialism. The attack of world capitalism on a proletarian Austria would remain no isolated matter, it would bring all classes to the international field of battle. The fate of a proletarian Austria would in such circumstances undoubtedly be linked to that of the Soviet Union. If the bourgeoisie ventured to start a war against a revolutionary Austria, it would rouse up millions of workers against it. What happened in Europe in connection with the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti is as nothing in comparison with the revolutionary movement which would be awakened everywhere were the attempt made to suppress a revolution in Austria. He who fails to see that at present any revolutionary movement, even in so small a country as Austria, inevitably leads over into the channels of all international relations, of the class-war of the world's proletariat against capital, of the approaching war, of the revolt of the colonial peoples, of the capitalist differences among the greatest imperialist States, of the gigantic struggle between Great Britain and the United States, already looming on the horizon, of the fight against the Soviet Union, the Chinese revolution, and so forth, will naturally judge of the situation like a rustic whose horizon does not go beyond what may be seen from his church-spire. During the French revolution, at a time of conspiracies on the part of the Royalists and aristocrats, of the offensive of foreign armies against the French revolution, and of great internal difficulties with which that revolution had to contend, the French bourgeois revolutionary

Danton said to his friends: "Courage, again courage, and once more courage!"

What the proletariat of the world, and especially that of Austria, needs to-day — nurtured as the latter has been by the Social Democrats with ideas of its own weakness and the necessity of self-effacement and self-sacrifice for the benefit of the bourgeois State — is courage, revolutionary vigour, belief in its own strength, faith in the idea of international proletarian solidarity in the great class-war against world capital. And if the sanguinary lessons of July 15th teach the Austrian workers and their vanguard, the proletariat of Vienna, to emancipate themselves from the idea of obedience to capital, to hold their heads more erect, to be conscious of their class-strength, and to place their confidence in that party which was so shamefully abused by the Social Democrats in July, to the one and only party of revolutionary struggle, the Communist Party, then the victims of this carnage will be avenged and the blood shed on July 15th will not have been spilt in vain.

POLITICS

The Day of the American Legion.

By Michel Hollay (Paris).

With tricolours, triumphal arches, lines of bayonets and fireworks there was to be held on the 19th September the "National festival of franco-American fraternisation". The million of fallen "fighters for civilisation" were to be honoured by the relighting of the eternal lamp on the grave of the unknown warrior, by the unveiling of a memorial at the cemetery of Douaumont, by militarist-patriotic speeches in Verdun, by military fascist parades in the elegant quarters of Paris etc. Commerce and industry, officials and schools were to observe a holiday in order to give a fit reception to the American guests. No less than three millions of the taxpayers' money was to be squandered on the reception of the American legion.

The decision to hold this "national festival" in spite of the hostile attitude of the French working population towards these representatives of dollar justice, was an insolent provocation by the Poincaré government of the whole of the workers of France. Nay more! The Minister of the Interior and the Prefect of the police wanted at the same time, in the most abominable manner, to lay a trap for the working class. Should the population of Paris come to the military parades in order to demonstrate their indignation, then they would experience even more plainly than on the 23rd of August on the big boulevards, what "democracy" means. Whole regiments of young soldiers, the entire police and the Republican Guards were held in readiness and supplied with ball cartridge. Even two regiments of the Sengalese were stationed near Paris. The French fascists, the royalist and reactionary leagues made ready along with the American "Heroes" to show their military prowess to the French working population.

In order therefore to prevent a terrible and deliberately prepared blood bath the Communist Party of France and all revolutionary organisations called upon the people of Paris to boycott this chauvinist demonstration and to keep away from these reactionary fascist festivities. They called upon Paris to give this 19th September a really proletarian character by mass participation in the inauguration of the Place de Sacco et Vanzetti which had been decided on by the Communist municipal council in the great Parisian suburb of Clichy. All the Communist municipal councillors, who were also joined by the socialist councillors, as well as all the municipal councillors of the environs of Paris decided not to take part in the "fraternisation festival", not to display flags, not to observe a holiday in the public services and in the schools, but to make the 19th September a day of mourning for all victims of international class justice.

Further, the C. P. of France proposed to the French Socialist Party to organise a great demonstration. The Socialist Party of France rejected this proposal and confined itself to

the slogan of the boycott, for which however it did not make the least propaganda.

The 19th September is now past. It was converted into a fiasco equally for the bourgeoisie, the government and their American guests; it became a powerful demonstration day of the revolutionary proletariat, a day of honour for the working population of Paris.

Paris observed a day of mourning. It refused to welcome and cheer those who "rescued" it ten years ago. It still saw on their hands the blood of Sacco and Vanzetti, on their star-spangled banner the shadow of the electric chair. The Paris population at the same time expressed their disgust and indignation at their own government. Paris did not respond to the appeal of its government, which is now trying to overtake with giant strides the model countries of reaction, which is increasing threefold, even fourfold the former penal laws against revolutionary workers and soldiers and is heading for a breach with the first workers' State in the world.

At Clichy, however, over 100,000 working men and women voiced their hatred against international bourgeois class justice. In spite of police provocation, the demonstration was carried out with perfect discipline and order. The fighting slogans were: For complete amnesty, against the bad treatment of civil and military prisoners, for the cancellation of all war debts, for payment of wages deducted for 19th September, for increase of wages and the retention of the eight hours' day' against unemployment and capitalist rationalisation, for defending the Russian revolution and the Chinese workers and peasants in their fight against imperialism.

This powerful demonstration in Clichy on the occasion of the inauguration of the Place de Sacco et Vanzetti, this last tribute of the French proletariat to the two martyrs of the working class, and finally the demonstrations in all the big towns of France serve to indicate the inner political situation in France. On the one hand the French government and the reactionary parties, fraternising with the American fascists — that means grovelling before their creditor, American capital. On the other hand, "anti-France", as the "Temps" expressed itself towards the Communists and all those who refused to take part in this "national festival" and its anti-working class aims. This "anti-France" is the great majority of the French people.

After the Crushing of the Revolt in Bolivia.

By A. S. (La Paz).

The revolt of the Indians and small peasants in Bolivia has been drowned in blood by the government of President Sile. American capital and the Bolivian big landowners have proceeded with monstrous brutality against the desperate plantation slaves, the small holders weighed down with debt and the landless peasants who had attempted by means of an armed revolt to obtain more endurable conditions of existence and a grant of land. The brutality of the government found even more cruel expression by racial suppression.

In spite of everything the government of Bolivia does not feel sure of victory. The indignation among the broad masses of Indians and peasants has in fact only increased. The leaders of the rural proletariat and of the workers are continuing to fight at the cost of the greatest sacrifice for the improvement of the unbearable conditions under which the workers and peasants are toiling as slaves on the great plantations and in the mines.

In order to exonerate itself from responsibility for the revolt and at the same time to find a pretext for intensifying the attacks on the Communists, the Bolivian government is now proceeding to make the Soviet government and "Moscow gold" responsible for the revolt. The revolt of the Incas was incited by Moscow. The Bolivian government is proving itself to be an apt pupil of the British imperialists. It "discovers" documents and "Zinoviev letters" which it fabricated itself. These

are impudent forgeries which are intended to expose the red conspiracy.

One of the documents is "signed" by Nicolai Bucharin, President of the Communist International. (As is known, the presidency of the C. I. was abolished at the last Enlarged E. C. C. I. in the year 1926. Author) Further, this document is signed by a General Secretary of the name of Zalkind (?). It is addressed to "Comrade Martinez" of the "Latin-American Section", and gives him instructions to proceed at once to Bolivia and to place himself at the head of the organisations and administrations. The clumsiness of this forgery is a plain as daylight.

Another "find" is addressed to "Comrade Daftian" in Paris. "Comrade Daftian" is instructed to pay 1,000,000 Francs to "Comrade Martinez" who is on his way to Bolivia where he is to place himself at the head of the nefarious movement for the overthrow of the Bolivian government.

The "Daftian" letter contains instructions to "Martinez" to set up a business house in La Paz, the capital of Bolivia, for the purpose of conducting successful propaganda among the natives. This instruction has been obviously concocted for the purpose of giving the police a pretext to break into the commercial undertakings of the Soviet Union according to the example of the raid on the Arcos in London.

These and similar forgeries occur at the same time in which the persecution not only of revolutionary but merely of progressive leaders is proceeding. They are nothing else but a pretext to get rid of all people whom the government fears that they could give help to the movement of the Indians and peasants. In spite of everything the movement in Bolivia still remains revolutionary, as the Indians and peasants will not tolerate indefinitely their unbearable conditions of life.

British Intrigues in Arabia.

By A. Busiam.

Events in China compelled England to forget Arabia for some time. Things in China have now resumed their normal aspect and the agents of England are again turning their attention to Arabian affairs with increased zeal. They want to make up to some extent for the precious time they have lost.

And in fact they have lost a good deal.

"After 1916", writes "The Times", "the geography of Arabia has been greatly simplified. Ibn Saud's possessions reach from the Persian Gulf to the Red Sea."

As a matter of fact, these two points are of great significance to British imperialism. The Persian Gulf, the Red Sea — this is the Achilles heel of English supremacy in India. It is a dangerous thing to leave these two extremely important strategic points in the vicinity, nay, almost in the hands of so unreliable an ally as Ibn Saud.

Even though "The Times" finds that there is sufficient reason to count on the friendship of the Sultan of Nedjd who, thanks to the English, has become King of the Hejaz, it holds quite a different opinion of the population, i. e. the mass of the people in these districts. "The Wahabites", writes the same paper, "are very mistrustful towards strangers (towards the plunderers who entered the country), and Ibn Saud is bound to take into account the feelings of the mass of his people. Some way or other must be discovered by which to render harmless a man like Ibn Saud who has the bad and perfectly uncivilised habit of showing some regard for his people; he is not at all like the English lords.

A number of social and political changes have taken place in Arabia. Feely, the famous English orientalist and expert in Arabian questions, who had recently settled down in Djidda where he ostensibly opened an agency for English motor cars, left Djidda quite suddenly and returned to Europe. He reported great changes in the public life of the Hejaz.

The population of Hejaz and Nedjd consisted mainly of nomadic Bedouins.

Cattle breeding, a pastoral life and caravan transport are their only occupations. In Central Arabia some tribes have entirely monopolised the caravan traffic which is the main occupation of these tribes. Thus, for instance, the population of Orosim (Nedjd) founded something in the nature of a joint stock Caravan Transport company.

If we bear in mind that about half a million pilgrims are transported to Mecca and back every year, we have a fairly clear idea of the economic significance of caravan transport.

The War and the post-war years delivered a fatal blow to this occupation.

The War broke off the connections, the pilgrims discontinued their pilgrimages. In 1913, 97,992 pilgrims were landed in Djeda, in 1914, 32,000 and in the last years of the war an even smaller number.

This naturally ruined the economic situation of the Bedouins in the Hejaz and in Nedjd completely. In addition to this, the war introduced the motor car into that remote corner of the world. The Bedouins offered violent resistance to this novelty (the motor car). European travellers attributed their resistance to superstition and inertia; in reality however, it was merely instinctive self-preservation which prompted them.

Ibn Saud is a reformer who adapts himself to new conditions. He is directing economic life into quite new channels.

A new period, the colonisation of the Bedouins has begun. In the first instance, a law has been issued distributing the land among the tribes. Every tribe is settled in a certain territory which it has to work; it is deprived of the right to wander into other territories and forbidden to graze the flocks there. Furthermore, punishment for the robbing of caravans has been introduced. At the same time measures are being taken to promote trade. The pilgrims are relieved from paying "ransom". Ibn Saud introduced these measures not so much from interest in the pilgrimages as with a view to furthering trade. As is confirmed by the agents of imperialism, Ibn Saud is a talented reformer. Slowly but surely Arabia is ascending the ladder of economic development. The transition to a settled mode of living brings up the question of setting up a state structure, a question which encounters the difficulties of tribal feuds and political disunion. Every race, every tribe has its independent organisation. The majority of these tribes possess only a very limited territory. This circumstance made them not only a prey to the sharks of European imperialism, but also the victims of constant raids and attacks.

This is the reason why the question of an Arabian union has become so acute, a question which is passionately discussed in all the provinces of Central Arabia.

England, of course, made every effort to prevent this union.

England's penetration of Arabia presents a chain of the vilest intrigues, intrigues against Turkey, France, the stirring up of Assyria against the Yemen, of the Yemen against the Hejaz, of the Hejaz against the Nedja etc.

In 1911, Mr. Grow, the British Consul in Bosri, carried on negotiations with Ibn Saud; in 1912, an English transport of arms and munition arrived; in 1913, Captain Shakespeare forced Ibn Saud to undertake a campaign against Turkey, which resulted in the Turks evacuating Hothuf and El Dafif; in 1914, England pledged itself to pay 50,000 Turkish pounds in gold to Ibn Saud annually and to provide his army with weapons and ammunition, and in 1916, it concluded a treaty with Hussein of Mecca, Ibn Saud's mortal enemy.

The purpose of these intrigues is evident: England wishes for an ally who is not too strong and who remains constantly dependent on his English benefactors.

This is the reason why "Near East", the official organ of the Colonial Office, raised a cry of alarm.

"At the present moment", the said paper says, "only two Great Powers are influential in Arabia: Great Britain and Ibn Saud."

England's connection with Ibn Saud is a fraud from beginning to end. It is only too comprehensible that English

papers speak of the mistrust and suspicion cherished by the Arabians against foreigners.

Even after the recent service which Ibn Saud rendered England (Ibn Saud helped England to rid itself of King Hussein of the Hejaz, that troublesome, old man), English imperialists did not stop their intrigues against him. Thus, for instance, in spite of the intimate friendship between England and Ibn Saud, the Anglo-Indian Press suddenly raised cries of woe on account of a sacrilege which Ibn Saud was said to have committed; a telegram to the effect that "Ibn Saud wished to destroy the holy sepulchres of Mecca and Medina" was circulated throughout the world.

It was in vain that Twaji Bey Sharif, Secretary to the Moslim Congress in Mecca, contradicted these lying reports. As the said secretary put it, England wished to stifle the fight of the living by a fight for the dead.

The campaign of the Indian Moslims was followed by a conflict between Egypt and the Hejaz (the incident of the "Machmal")*).

At the same time, the Imam of Yemen is being stirred up against Ibn Saud. — Nevertheless all these endeavours were in vain; Ibn Saud's influence is growing, his power is constantly gaining ground.

There is then no other alternative left to the agents of England than to sow feud and confusion by their provocations, their tricks and devices and to get rid of Ibn Saud with the help of hired assassins. Quite incidentally (?) we read of an attempt made on the lives of Ibn Saud and his son; quite incidentally (?) of course the discovery of this conspiracy is followed by the departure of Feelby, Ibn Saud's English friend (whose friendly heart could not bear it!); no less incidentally does the old dynasty of the Husseins revive in the imagination of English lords.

The English imperialists are spinning new nets of intrigues, are kindling fresh wars, fresh civil war. But they reckon without their host; the host, i. e. the mass of the people, think of something quite different.

"It is time to do away with the legend", writes a French imperialist, "according to which the East on the whole and Arabia in particular has fallen into a deep sleep which will last for centuries. The East is not sleeping; or better said it has become awake; it is on its guard and even causes European imperialism, particularly that of France and England to prick up its ears."

The correctness of this assertion does not need to be proved at the present moment. Events in Syria, Mesopotamia and Central Arabia speak a sufficiently clear language.

No longer can the religious discord in India, the feuds between the tribes of Arabia hold down the growing consciousness of the awakening masses of the suppressed Orient.

* * *

Note: The Hejaz cover an area of 300,000 square kilometres and extend from the North of the Arabian peninsula to the South. It has 800,000 inhabitants, 17% of whom are living in towns, while the majority are nomads. The biggest towns are Mecca (70,000 inhabitants), Medina (40,000 inhabitants), Juidda (30,000 inhabitants), Taif (5000 inhabitants).

2. Neidjed: 150,000 square miles, a high plateau in the East of Central Arabia (250,000 inhabitants). The biggest towns are: Riyadh (18,000 inhabitants), Bereida (15,000 inhabitants), Aneisa (10,000 inhabitants), Dilam (8000 inhabitants).

*) A traditional carpet which is taken from Egypt to Mecca every year during the pilgrimages. The transport of the Machmal is usually accompanied by great pomp and rich presents to the inhabitants of Mecca. Owing to a misunderstanding, a conflict arose between the Egyptian guards of the Machmal and Bedouins. Ibn Saud did everything in his power to pacify the Egyptian Government; than to the endeavours of British agents however, the incident has not yet been settled.

CHINA

The Military-Political Situation in China.

By J. Mamajev.

There stands at present in the centre point of the military political events in China the actions of the revolutionary military group, with General Yeh Ting at the head, which is under the general leadership of the Communist Party of China. The provisional base of this group is the Eastern district of the province of Kwantung, with the commercial and trading centre of Tchautchou and with the harbour of Swatow.

This district has about eight million inhabitants with a density of population of 450 to the square kilometre. The actual density of the populated areas is still considerably higher, as the entire population of the district is grouped mainly along the rivers Yun and Han. As a result of its overpopulation the district of Swatow is a permanent source of Chinese emigration to the Malanesian islands, to the Philippines and to America.

The urban population amounts to about one million persons. Of the most important towns there should be mentioned: Tchautchou with 30,000 inhabitants, a big trading and commercial centre (manufacture of jute and working up of raw sugar); Swatow with 100,000 inhabitants, a treaty port at the mouth of the rivers Yun and Han with a foreign colony. Swatow is connected by lines of steamships with Hongkong and Shanghai. The brisk trading activity of this town can be judged from the number of steamers calling at the harbour (3563 units with a tonnage of 4,660,662).

The total foreign trade turnover of Swatow amounted in the year 1923 to 65,523,402 American Dollars.

Exact data regarding the extent of the possession of land and the forms of cultivation of the soil in this district are not available. It must be mentioned, however, on the basis of the experiences of the past revolutionary movement, that the peasants' organisations of Kaifong, Lufong and Hsinning form the supports of the peasant's movement of the Kwantung province. Of the three peasants' organisations mentioned, that of Kaifong is the strongest numerically and is the most firmly established.

The district is weakly developed as regards industry. In Swatow there are two match factories with 400 workers, and an electric power works with 50 workers. The cadre of the railway workers of the two branch lines Swatow-Tchautchou (26,000) and Swatow-Tchenhai (10,000) is not great.

The strongest labour unions are the porters' union and the seamen's union, both in Swatow.

As regards the armed forces in Kwantung which are in the hands of the reactionary generals Li Tsin Sin, Lu Fu Lin and Chen Tao Tsun, their condition can be described as follows: In Kwantung there are, according to the latest reports of the English press, in all 40,000 soldiers. These forces are distributed as follows: The Chen Tao Tsun group with about 25,000 soldiers occupies the district of Chauchou; of the two divisions of Li Tsin Sin one is in South West of Kwantung and the second has the task of protecting the city of Canton. These divisions consist at most of 5000 men. General Lu Fo Lin has under him about 8000 men who are encamped at the mouth of the West river.

We do not know exactly what actions these three generals have undertaken against the group of Yeh Ting and Ho Lun. The reports of the bourgeois press are full of contradictions. The report that Li Tsin Sin has landed two divisions in Amoy in order to attack the Yeh Ting group from the province of Fukien is received with the greatest doubt. Li Tsin Sin has neither sufficient means of transport nor sufficient funds in order to carry out such a complicated landing operation which would be unexampled in the history of Chinese civil war.

The reports that Li Tsin Sin is concentrating his forces in Hweitchang is more credible.

The distribution of troops in the districts of Tchautchou, Canton and Hweitchang does not by any means indicate the intention of the generals to undertake an offensive to the East. There does not prevail sufficient unity among them in order to be able to begin an attack. In addition the march to the East involves great difficulties. Before the Canton troops get into touch with Yen Ting and Ho Lun they will first have to overcome the resistance of the armed peasants troops in a very difficult mountain terrain.

The inner situation in Canton constitutes an obstacle to aggressive actions on the part of the Canton generals. The Communist Party of China is developing an increased activity in this connection. The trade unions of Canton are backing the Communist Party, and it can at any moment come to a revolt. The hostility between Li Tsin Sin and Chen Tao Tsun likewise renders it extremely unlikely that they will be able to undertake any action in Eastern Kwantung. The situation can change in three or four weeks when the troops of Chan Fa Quei, who are at present marching from Kiangsi to Kwantung, arrive in Canton and recuperate. The arrival of these troops will mean the strengthening of the forces of Li Tsin Sin. This respite will, however, enable Yeh Ting and Ho Lun to strengthen their forces, to establish connections with the armed peasants detachments and undertake actions on their part for the overthrow of the Canton reaction. There exists no immediate danger from the province of Fukien. Of the regular troops there are at present in the last-named province at the most one to two regiments of the first corps of General Ho Yin Chen, which as regards their numerical strength do not signify any danger for the revolutionary troops.

How strong are the forces of Yeh Ting and Ho Lun? The English press places the strength of their troops at 8000 men. We believe that it greatly underestimates the strength of these troops. Before the revolt in Nanchang Yeh Ting had at his disposal the 24th and 25th divisions, comprising 9000 men. Ho Lun has under his command about 5000 soldiers. The numerical strength of the entire group amounts therefore to fourteen to fifteen thousand fighters. If one adds to these the armed peasants detachments which have joined forces with Yeh Ting and Ho Lun, then the number of their armed supporters amounts to 20,000.

From the above figures one must before all draw the following conclusion: The success of the operations of the revolutionary group of Yeh Ting and Ho Lun depends wholly and entirely upon the sweep of the peasant movement and upon the correctness of the policy of the C. P. of China both in regard to the land question and the question of power, as well as the question of building up a new and really revolutionary army. The troops of Yeh Ting and Ho Lun can become armed forces of the workers and peasants if they definitely break with the policy of the bloc with the generals, if they add proletarian elements to the Commanding staff and increase the ranks of their armies by drawing in workers and peasants.

* * *

As regards to the situation in Central China the following should be mentioned: After some corps of the people's army were withdrawn from South Shantung, Sun Chuan Fang and Tchu Jui Pu, who had received reinforcements from the Japanese, undertook in the middle of July an offensive in two directions: a) along the Tientsin-Pukow railway towards Pukow and b) along the great Canal to Jangtchow-Szekiang. This offensive was beaten back and the Shantung troops of Tchu Jui Pu and Sun Chuan Fang were flung back as far as the river Hwaihe.

The formally united groups of Wuhan and Nanking are preparing a further offensive against the North with the object of capturing Peking. It is an obviously hopeless enterprise. The differences among the various feudal and militarist groupings within the people's army are far too strong to enable them to unite for operations against Chang Tso Lin, who is much stronger materially than Wuhan-Nanking. The victory of the people's army in the Northern campaign in the Summer

and Autumn of last year, in spite of the numerical preponderance and the better equipment of the enemy, is to be ascribed to the wide-scale support given the people's army by the workers' and peasants' movement. The combined Wuhan-Nanking group does not now possess this chief prerequisite for victory. There also prevails no unity between this group and **Fen Yu Hsiang**.

Feng Yu Hsiang, who has betrayed the revolution, has lost the support of the masses just as have the other generals, and is at present compelled to conduct a bitter struggle against **Tsin Jun Ao**, **Lu Chun Hua** and other militarists who, just as he, are laying claim to the rulership in the province of Honan.

Fight for the right to plunder the peasants in Central China, "temporary stabilisation" of **Chang Tso Lin**, thanks to the "positive" policy of Japan in the North, and fight of the peasant masses for land and power in the South — these are the most important features characterising the present military-political situation in China.

THE WHITE TERROR

A Monster Communist Trial before the Italian Fascist Special Court.

By Guido Saraceno.

The Special Court in Fascist Italy, which was set up under the exceptional law which the fascist government issued on the occasion of the last attempt on **Mussolini** in Bologna, was supposed to meet only in exceptional cases in order to pronounce judgement on "crimes" which come within its special jurisdiction. Instead, however, this special court, ever since its establishment, has worked uninterruptedly as an organ of suppression in the service of the fascist State. These judges in black shirts are filled with furious hate against all non-fascists, while the ordinary judges are much more impartial, although the fascist government has used every means in order to purge the courts of all "liberal" and "democratic" elements.

A few examples will serve to illustrate this. The special court has condemned persons who have only been accused of distributing Communist leaflets or of being members of the Communist Party of Italy — and this, be it noted, before the C. P. was declared illegal! — to 10 to 12, and even to 18 years imprisonment. (The case of **Tarozzi** in Toscana.) On the other hand the ordinary court in **Vercelli** (district of **Novara**), after a three days' strike in the rice fields, sentenced workers accused of distributing leaflets calling on the workers to strike, to a few months imprisonment.

In the first half year of 1927 the special court has imposed sentences of imprisonment amounting in all to 874 years, while the ordinary court has imposed in the same period 62 years.

Now, after a short holiday, this court of masked hangmen of brutal fascist careerists has again met. The first trial is that of 16 Communists from **Brindisi** who were arrested in October 1926, that is almost a year ago, on suspicion of being members of the Young Communist organisation. At that time the exceptional laws were not yet in force; the Communist Party was still a legal party with a daily press and a parliamentary fraction. The accused, all of them young people under 21 years of age, were condemned by the special court to 4 to 8 years imprisonment.

There will shortly take place before the special court a monster trial of Communists. About 100 persons are accused. 86 of the accused have been already nearly a year in prison awaiting trial. The rest are in hiding. We give the names of some of the accused: The former deputy **Antonio Gramsci**, who is seriously ill; **Fabrizio Maffi**, a former deputy and well-known doctor; **Umberto Terracini**, lawyer; **Mauro Scoccimarro**, journalist; **Riboldi**, **Molinelli**, deputy, and many others. 70 of the accused have already been conveyed to Rome, the remaining sixteen are still in the prison of Milan. The accused are charged with the "severest crimes". It is now intended to frame up that plot which the fascist government in the year of 1923, at the time of the **Bordiga** trial, failed to concoct. At that time the fascist government tried to accuse the Communist Party of

preparing an armed revolt. The attempt failed, as the fascist government did not find any judges who would commit the accused to trial on the basis of the police reports.

Today the fascist government now possesses in the special court a body of gendarmes which does everything demanded of it. The police, on their part have scraped together all possible "evidence" on the activity of the Communist Party. But in spite of the best endeavours of the police the whole heap of evidence relates to the period in which the Communist members of Parliament still retained their mandates and the Communist press was still legally published. The accused are charged on account of activity in the time previous to the suppression of the Communist Party.

But the special court will not make any bones about that. It has only one aim: to exterminate the Communists. For this reason it prevents all help and relief which the families and friends of political prisoners wish to bring. Therefore it provides a prison regime which endangers the life of the prisoners who are physically less capable of withstanding the severe treatment.

The special court is preparing a fresh and monstrous sentence. A sentence which will surpass all previous ones. It is therefore necessary that in the whole world all proletarians, all people who still have a spark of honour, express their indignation at this new crime of fascism. From everywhere there must be heard the cry: **Away with the special court and its sentences! An end to the arrests and imprisonments carried out by the black shirts! The fascist court must be abolished! Release the Communist Comrades and the politically persecuted from the Italian prisons!**

The Persecution of Revolutionaries in Indonesia.

By P. Bergsma (Amsterdam).

At the moment when millions of masses in the whole world were expressing their horror and indignation at the execution of **Sacco and Vanzetti**, the Dutch bourgeoisie murdered Indonesian revolutionaries who had taken part in the revolt in Java. It was first reported that three Communists had been hanged. Immediately thereafter, on 17th September, it was cabled from Java that further executions of Communists had taken place. Up to the present ten Communists have been executed in a period of eight days.

The carrying out of the death sentences took place in the inner courtyard of the prison. One of the first three comrades who were led to the gallows called out as the noose was placed round his neck: **"Long live Communism!"**

The capitalist press reported these executions with two or three lines. Even the names of the victims were not mentioned. Nevertheless the contents of the bourgeois press betray the great fear entertained by the bourgeoisie for the masses in Indonesia. This is the reason why reaction is applying its measures not only against the Communists, but also against the leaders of the nationalist parties.

The doings of the leaders of the **Sarekat Islam** are spied upon by the authorities. All religious ceremonies are regarded by the government as a Communist plot. The terror is employed directly against the masses, who are deprived of all rights. Even the soldiers are placed under the most strict control. The army is being purged of all those who sympathise with the Communists.

Dozens of revolutionary workers are still pining in prison, awaiting the sentences of the Dutch judicial authorities. Dozens have been banished to the swampy districts of New Guinea where certain death awaits them.

The Communist Party of Holland immediately linked up the action for **Sacco and Vanzetti** with the action for supporting the movement for freedom in Indonesia. This action has been, and is still being sabotaged by the leaders of the Social Democratic Party. The Dutch bourgeoisie is hanging the Communists in Indonesia, and the social democratic leaders

declare that they cannot do anything against these murders. The organ of the social democracy "Het Volk" reprints in a hypocritical manner the bourgeois reports on the executions in a black border.

The Communist Party of Holland has issued an appeal addressed to all workers' organisations and calling for a common fight to save the revolutionists in Indonesia. The reformist leaders have shamefully refused to undertake this common fight. It should also be remarked that the "ultra-Left" sectarians do not wish to take part in any joint action.

The Communist Party of Holland has pilloried this treachery of the Right and "ultra-Left". In spite of everything it is conducting its action with all energy. It has appealed directly to the masses; it has summoned them to take part in mass demonstrations against the bloody regime in Indonesia. It issues the fighting slogan: "Separation of Indonesia from Holland!"

The Dutch bourgeoisie is not content with hanging and murdering the revolutionary leaders. It also wants to bring about the death of those revolutionary leaders who are living in exile. The political spies have discovered the whereabouts of the banished Indonesian leader, Comrade Tan Malakka in the Philippines. He had to leave the Philippines and flee to China. It is now reported from Batavia that on 7th September the Dutch Consul in Shanghai attempted to arrest Tan Malakka. The British authorities gave the Dutch authorities every support in this connection. Thus the life of Tan Malakka is also in great danger.

In its bloody suppression of the popular movement in Indonesia the Dutch bourgeoisie is receiving the support of world imperialism, and particularly of British imperialism. The proletarians of all countries and the suppressed colonial peoples must therefore recognise that the fight of the Indonesian people is a fight against world imperialism. They must come to the aid of the imprisoned revolutionaries whose lives are in immediate danger. It is not only in America that the Fullers are carrying on their criminal handiwork; they are rampant in all capitalist States; they are everywhere murdering the revolutionary leaders.

Protest with all your power against the Dutch Fullers in Indonesia!

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS

The Working and Peasant Women's Conference.

By A. Lunatcharsky.

It was said by Lenin that it is impossible to build Socialism without the aid of one half of the human race, the women. He proudly pointed to the fact that our legislation, from the legal standpoint, emancipates the woman and extends to her full equality with the man, in an intimately higher degree than this is done by the legislation of the most progressive bourgeois countries.

At the same time he pointed out with a note of grief that the legal emancipation alone does not yet mean actual liberty and equality. The proper working of the law is hindered in actual life by three formidable forces: the economic dependence of the women, the social prejudices, and the cultural backwardness of the woman. It is on these three lines that the Soviet and public authorities have to carry on an unceasing campaign.

Whilst the proletarian woman directly employed in production has benefited much from legislation, the effect was considerably less in the case of the housewife, even if she is the wife of a worker. Lenin minced no words in denouncing the slavery of the private kitchen, the menial toil at the washboard, the lack of rational organisation in taking care of the children, and so on. We know quite well that the only complete deliverance from this slavery will come as the result of the organisation of model dwellings for the workers, large public dining rooms, steam-laundries, well-equipped creches and children's homes, and the extension of all these activities from the town to the village.

Next to the economic conditions holding back the woman at the stage of the most petty and worse organised drudgery, are the deep-rooted social traditions which enhance the degradation of the woman as compared with the man.

Our equitable Marriage Laws do not preclude the possibility of the man frequently being a tyrant in regard to the woman, or of unscrupulous men taking advantage of the weakness of women and girls, destroying their lives in the pursuit of carnal lust. The situation is particularly bad among the nationalities where the woman is still considered an inferior being, and is treated as a captive and a slave. It is with tremendous difficulty that the new Soviet views on sex equality find their way through the thick layer of these prejudices that are frequently sanctified by religion.

Finally, it is necessary to make the working woman equal to the man in all respects, to render her equal in regard to earnings, in regard to the acquisition of the means of subsistence; to point out to her her human dignity, to let her understand in what ways she can protect herself against abuse and oppression; to allow her to stand firmly on her own feet and to be dependent on nobody, giving her affection and bearing children only to him whom she likes and with whom she can form a partnership on terms of equality; to extend to her the wide possibility of taking part in the whole of the political life of the country, to progress ever forward, by the side of the progress of the man.

All this will be possible only if the woman, whose average cultural level is still terribly low, is lifted to a higher stage of education. In all the aspects of State legislation, particularly in regard to popular education, we must survey all that has been done and outline the way for new progress, doing this in collaboration with the women themselves.

These were the reasons which prompted the calling of the important All-Union Conference of Working and Peasant Women. Great numbers of them are already active in the Soviets and as delegates on public bodies, and from the fairly numerous ranks of these awakened and open-eyed women there will be elected the hundreds of representatives who will make up the Conference. We lay great hopes on that Conference. We shall hear there the voice of the toiling women themselves, delivered by women who observe the conditions and events of public work. We shall probably hear a good many unpleasant things from these heralds from towns, villages, and hamlets. For we are not unmindful of the mass of darkness and grief that is still the burden of the woman in all the countries of our Union. But we shall probably hear from them also the story of the struggle of the woman for her emancipation, and the testimony how gradually the good seed of freedom and common sense scattered by the Soviet authorities over all the corners of our gigantic Union is bearing fruit. To them we shall submit our further plans, and they will give us the benefit of their counsel.

It is good that the Conference is to be started with a general address on the external and internal situation. Not in vain were uttered those famous, so oft repeated, words of Lenin that "every cook should learn how to govern the State". Let the women appreciate this address of the government, the report of those to whom the whole people have entrusted to manage the affairs of the U. S. S. R., which will be delivered before the working and peasant women.

A good deal of importance is being attached also to the report which it has fallen to my lot to deliver. Material will be gathered not only on the R. S. F. S. R., but also on other countries of our Union, in order to report to the women on what has been achieved in the line of pre-school and school education, technical and higher schools, on political education, craft schools, and so on; on what has been done to pave the road of equality for the woman to enable her to occupy a place of equality with the man. An account will be given as to how much the women, young women and little girls, have already benefited, and what hinders the government and the women from achieving even greater results, what is to be done to speed the progress of the Soviet women in this direction.

The days of the Conference will be days of the closest attention for the whole country in regard to the needs and grievances, as well as the achievements of the Soviet woman.

Let foreigners attentively watch this Conference, let the working and peasant women throughout the world realise what a great boon the October Revolution has been to the women of our country. And may our enemies also take note of this, who resort to calumny in the effort to discourage the October achievements.

On the eve of the celebration of our tenth anniversary of the Revolution it is both wise and expedient to survey the achievements of the campaign for the improvement of the lot of the women, and to cast a glance ahead, at the tasks that are yet to be accomplished in this domain.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Expulsion of eight Oppositionals from the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 21st September 1927.

The "Pravda" publishes the decision of the plenary session of the district Party Committee in Irkutsk expelling eight oppositional members of the Party for fractional activity and the sale of secret Party documents etc.

According to the results of the examination, the Irkutsk group of the opposition commenced immediately after the last plenary session of the Central Committee to spread the speech of comrade Zinoviev at the plenary session and other material amongst the Party members and non-Party workers even before the local Party organisation had received the stenogram of the plenary session protocol. The documents were sold at two Roubles allegedly to cover the cost of copying them. On the 9th September a fractional meeting was called at which the question of a further struggle against the Party was discussed.

WORKERS' SPORT MOVEMENT

The Fourth Congress of the Lucerne Sport International in Helsingfors.

By Fritz Kaufmann, Berlin.

The Fourth Congress of the Lucerne Sport International (L. S. I.) was held at Helsingfors in August. The Labour athletes of the whole world expected that this congress would pass resolutions signifying a further step forward toward international unity in the Labour sport movement. The contrary, however, is the case. In order to demonstrate this with the greatest publicity, Arthur Crispin, as representative of the Second International, was nominated to deliver the address of welcome, while the representative of the Red Sport International (R. S. I.) was barred out on the most trivial pretext.

The chief report concerning the "Relations of the L. S. I. to the Red Sport International" was made by Wildung, the secretary of the German Central Commission for Workers' Sport and Physical Culture. Wildung, who is notorious throughout the German Labour sports movement as an extreme right-wing Social Democrat and anti-Communist, stated that the R. S. I. is a purely Communist party institution in the service of the Soviet Government and that all desires and hopes for union had been completely destroyed by the Communists. These vague assertions he substantiated by referring to a performance of the "Blue Blouses" in connection with the winter sports competitions and during the visit of the German working class athletes in Leningrad, on which occasion the practice of reformist policy on the part of the L. S. I. leaders was sneered at. Wildung declared this to be infamous and a humiliation for the L. S. I. By this lachrymose policy he hoped to be able to deceive the masses of labour athletes in regard to the betrayal by the reformist leaders of the interests of the international Labour sports movement.

At this congress Wildung completely disclosed the cards of reformist game of intrigue played hitherto. He declared that they would not allow the Communists to prevent them from entertaining still closer relations with the Socialist (that

means Social Democrat — author) parties and their internationals, allegedly, in order to seek and find there protection against Communist attacks. After this provoking report and the discussion which followed, and which was made use of by all the Social Democrats to incite against the R. S. I., the following resolution was adopted:

"The Congress confirms the Paris resolutions. Even now it considers fusion with the Moscow international still impossible, as the other side has done nothing at all to mitigate the antagonisms. The fighting methods of the official organ of the R. S. I. towards the L. S. I., and especially the ridiculing of our international on the occasion of the winter sports competitions in Leningrad, have proved that the leaders of the R. S. I. are not serious in regard to the setting up of a united front.

The Congress regards the Spartan Games of 1928 as a Communist party affair in which the associations of the L. S. I. should not participate."

This resolution constitutes a manifest turning-point in the line hitherto taken by the leaders of the Lucerne Sports International. Whereas the Paris resolutions — to foster sports relations with the Russian worker sportsmen — were then made as a concession to the demands of working class athletes for the establishment of international unity, the reformists now believe themselves so strong that they can quite openly display their cards. Another symptom of the movement towards the Right is the removal of the international secretariat to Prague and the election of the extreme right-wing Social Democrat Silaba (Prague) as secretary of the L. S. I.

Silaba has always been known as one of bitterest opponents of the Communists and of the Red Sport International. It is thanks to him that there are in Czechoslovakia two camps in the Labour sport movement, namely, a section of the L. S. I. and one of the R. S. I. It was also through him that at the last Prague Olympic Games of the L. S. I. section a most evil nationalistic spirit prevailed. By electing Silaba as secretary of the L. S. I. the Helsingfors Congress has demonstrated unmistakably that the reformists of all the countries affiliated to the L. S. I. have taken up the fight against the establishment of international unity in the Labour sports movement.

The election of Gellert (Germany) the president of the Workers' Sports and Gymnastic Federation, and of the military expert of the Second International, Deutsch (Austria), as chairmen with equal rights is but a further confirmation of the swing to the right policy pursued by the Lucerne reformists.

The abandoning of the policy of establishing unity and the endorsing of close relations with the Second International finds further expression in the following resolution:

"The sports clubs of the International Socialist League for Workers' Sports and Physical Culture stand on the basis of the class struggle and regard themselves as a portion of organised Socialist working class.

The national associations must, therefore, enter into close relations with the Socialist parties and the trade unions of their respective countries.

The international office has regular dealings with the committee of the Labour and Socialist International, Zurich, with the International Trade-Union Federation, Amsterdam, and the International Co-operative Alliance, London.

The Congress instructs the international bureau to render to the Congress of the Labour and Socialist International (London 1928) a complete report embracing the formation, the rules and the working methods of our international and submitting detailed conditions under which the Labour and Socialist International and the Sports International may join forces for the promotion of Labour sports."

The reformists hope through these resolutions, which amount to ridicule of the demands of working class sportsmen for the creation of international unity, to put a stop to the demands of the working class sportsmen. Their efforts will have the contrary effect, and they will not hinder the preparations which are taking place in every country for the visit to the Spartan Games of 1928 in Moscow. Furthermore, — and this is already quite certain — the working class sportsmen will see to it that the attempts at sabotage perpetrated by right-wing Social Democracy will be frustrated by the mass-will of international working class sportsmen.

TEN YEARS AGO

The "Democratic Conference" for the Stabilisation of the Bourgeois Order.

The Ministers in Favour of Coalition.

Petrograd, September 29th. In the meeting held by the "Democratic Conference", Skobeliev said that the Conference was faced by two tasks, that of establishing a firm power and that of saving the economic position of the country. He advocated the plan of forming a coalition, even a coalition with the Cadets who had not been involved in the Kornilov affair.

Zeretelli pronounced himself in favour of organising a preliminary parliament.

Trade Unions and Factory Committees for the Soviet Power.

Petrograd, September 30th. In to-day's sitting of the "Democratic Conference" Karelin (in the name of the Internationalists) and Miljutin (in the name of the Bolsheviki of the municipal group) spoke against coalition. Rjasanov, in a long speech, expounded the point of view of the Central Council of the Trade Unions. "We suggest that simultaneously with the formation of a substitute for the Constituent Assembly, the Soviets should take the power into their hands and thus more rapidly lead the country towards the Constituent Assembly... For, only if the power is in the hands of such organs which possess the full confidence of revolutionary democracy... shall we successfully settle accounts both with the Germans within our frontiers and those without..."

Petrograd, October 1st. Skripnik spoke in the name of the factory committees. He protested against the composition of the conference, in which the representation of the revolutionary workers and peasants is limited. He laid before the Conference the Bolshevik demands of the factory committees and concluded his speech with the words: "We workers, all of us, march under this banner."

The Bolsheviki Demand the Arming of the Proletariat.

Petrograd, October 1st. At a meeting of the "Democratic Conference", Trotzky made a speech and read the declaration of the Bolshevik fraction. When he came to the point where the necessity of immediately arming the workers is enlarged upon, he was interrupted by cries of: "Why? To what purpose?" Trotzky replied: "In the first place, in order that a real protection against counter-revolution be provided, against a new and more powerful Kornilov affair; secondly, when a definite dictatorship of revolutionary democracy is formed... the armed workers of Petrograd and throughout Russia, will defend the country of revolution against the imperialist troops with heroic enthusiasm such as has no precedent in the history of Russia."

The "Victory" of the Bourgeoisie.

Petrograd, October 1st. The result of votes taken on the question of power was as follows: 86 votes for taking over of power by the Soviets, 97 against it.

766 votes were in favour of coalition, 688 against it, 38 abstained from voting.

When the motion with regard to coalition was passed, the presidium proposed two amendements... The first was worded: "Those elements among the Cadets and other parties who took part in the Kornilov conspiracy are excluded from the coalition." The second supplementary clause was as follows: "The party of 'Freedom of the People' is outside the coalition."

The former was accepted with 738 votes to 139, 196 abstaining from voting.

The "Democratic Conference" further passed the following resolution:

The "All-Russian Democratic Conference" resolves not to dissolve itself until it has established conditions for the organisation and functioning of a power which is acceptable to democracy.

THE WORKERS' STRUGGLE AGAINST THE MAGNATES OF INDUSTRY.

Ivanovo-Vosnessensk, September 28th. A one day's strike took place here under the slogan "peace and bread". Demonstrations of factory workers took place under similar slogans in Orechovo-Sujevo and Likin. The factory hands in Likin are starving in consequence of the factories and mills having closed down, and demand that work be resumed. Prices are rising from day to day.

* * *

Petrograd, September 21st. According to reports received from Kasan, work in the industrial areas in the governmental district of Kasan has almost come to a standstill. Trade is in a lamentable condition. The rise in prices has reached a point which gives every reason to anticipate unrest.

* * *

Moscow, October 4th. The number of workers on strike in the Moscow governmental district during the months of July and August amounted to 13,218, the loss of working days to 95,514. Of these strikes 11 lasted less than 10 days, 3 from 10 to 20 days, 19 for more than 20 days and some of the latter even as long as 46 days. The cause of the strikes was in most cases the demand for an increase of wages, demands with regard to Trade Union rights, protest against the Moscow State Consultation etc. In nine cases, the workers resumed work without having achieved any results.

* * *

Petrograd, September 28th. During the past two and a half months, 43 factories in Petrograd closed down, amongst them big ones with 4000 workers. ("Prometh.")

* * *

Petrograd, October 3rd. The "Isvestija Yuga", reported that the Conference of the Factory Committees of Jekaterinoslav passed a resolution against the policy of sabotage and lock-outs, the policy which has been consistently followed by the industrialists since the July days. The Conference declared that the workers of Jekaterinoslav would take possession of all the factories unless their demands were fulfilled within a fortnight.

The Insurrection in Tashkent.

Petrograd, October 2nd. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) According to telegraphic reports received from Taskent, a revolutionary committee has been formed, taken possession of the town, won over to its side two regiments garrisoned in the town and declared not to recognise the Provisional Government. The Moslem population did not approve of this action and were prepared to oppose it; they were supported in their opposition by students of the Military School who occupied the fortress of Tashkent. All this makes it seem probable that dangerous riots will break out. A telegraphic ultimatum of the Provisional Government, demanding submission, was rejected by the revolutionary committee. The Provisional Government published tonight a manifesto communicating the fact that it nominated Korovitshevo, Commander of the troops in the Kasan district General Commissioner of Turkestan and that it had a sufficient number of troops at its disposal to suppress by force any signs of unrest.

* * *

The "Democratic Soviet".

Petrograd, October 4th. At the meeting of the "Democratic Conference", Voitinsky submitted a resolution on the creation of a "Democratic Soviet" to which all the rights of the "Democratic Conference" should be granted. The "Democratic Soviet" is to draw up its work plan by itself; it is to be elected from the members of the "Democratic Conference" according to the proportional system. Every group, represented at the "Democratic Conference" is to delegate 15 per cent of its members to the "Democratic Soviet". Every fraction can nominate the members of its delegation.

Ustinov demanded in the name of a number of peasants' soviets that half of the number of seats at the "Democratic Soviet" should be reserved for the representatives of the Soviets of workers, soldiers' and peasants' deputies.

Schauman, in the name of the fraction of the Bolsheviks, supported this demand.

The resolution of Voitinsky was adopted by 531 against 244 votes.

The Democratic Conference in Favour of the Programme of the Moscow State Consultation.

Petrograd, 4th October. The Democratic Conference adopted the proposal of Zeretelli regarding the working programme, by which the Conference makes the programme of 14th August its own. The programme is amended by an item on foreign policy, which should make its aim to bring about peace. The slogan should be: peace without annexations and war indemnities.

The Employers Command: Coalition Government.

Petrograd, 7th October (Reuter). The members of the government, under the presidency of Kerensky, had a consultation with Moscow industrialists, members of the Democratic Conference and Cadets, lasting from Friday 5 o'clock in the afternoon until 3 o'clock the next morning. Agreement was arrived at on the formation of a coalition government.

The New Coalition Government.

Petrograd, 8th October. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) Official list of the new Cabinet formed by Kerensky:

Socialist Ministers: Kerensky, Prime Minister and Commander-in-chief; Nikitin, Minister for the Interior, Post and Telegraphs; Maliantovitch, Minister for Justice; Prokopovitch, Food Minister; Avksentiev, Minister for Agriculture; Gvosdev, Minister for Public Works.

Non-socialist Ministers: Terestchenko, Minister for Foreign Affairs; Konovalov, Minister for trade and industry; Bernatzky, Minister for Finance; Salatzkin, Minister for Public Education; Kartachev, Minister for Culture; Kischkin, Minister for Public Welfare; Smirnov, State Controller; Tretjakov, President of the Economic Council in the Provisional Government; Liverovsky, Minister for Transport; General Verchovsky, War Minister; Verederevsky, Minister for the Navy.

The Relations to Finland.

Helsingfors, 7th October (Petrograd Telegraph Agency). The following bills have been published: a bill declaring Finland to be a Republic; a bill regulating the relations between Russia and Finland. Both bills will undergo examination by the Finnish Diet. The second bill will in addition be submitted for approval to the Constituent Assembly of Russia.

The first law declares: the legislative power is in the hands of the Diet and the President of the Republic; the executive power is in the hands of the President with the collaboration of the State Council. Universal suffrage is introduced. The President has the chief command over the Finnish military forces in time of peace. Questions regarding the relations to the Russian government are settled by the President together

with the Ministerial Council. The President nominates the Ministers. Compulsory military service is introduced throughout the country. The present form of government is the fundamental law which abolishes the old government power.

The second law, regarding the relations to Russia, declares: Finland remains united with Russia, but possesses its own constitution, its own government and independent legislative and executive powers. The questions of war and peace are common and binding for both countries; they are settled in accordance with the fundamental State laws of Russia. Treaties with foreign States are made by Russia, if the latter does not renounce her right to the government of Finland.

The Bolsheviks take over the Leadership of the Petrograd Soviet.

Petrograd, 9th October (Petrograd Telegraph Agency). There took place in the Petrograd workers and soldiers' council the new election of the Bureau, which now consists of 7 members, among them being 4 maximalists, including Trotzky and Kamenev, 2 social revolutionaries, including Chernov, and a minimalist social democrat. Trotzky was elected Chairman of the Petrograd workers' and soldiers' council.

The Sailors' Union Refuses to be Dissolved.

Petrograd, 2nd October. The Provisional government has decided that the sailors' union shall be dissolved.

* * *

Reval, 2nd October. A general meeting of the delegates of the fleet and of the soldiers' committees in Reval discussed the decision of the government with regard to the dissolution of the sailors' union and adopted a resolution, declaring that the decree on the dissolution of the sailors' union is contrary to law, as the dissolution of democratic organisations can only take place by decision of their own members. The organisation of the sailors' union will continue its work, maintain its demands towards the government, and should the government reject these demands the sailors will fight for their right with weapons in hand.

* * *

Petrograd, 3rd October. At a meeting of the Central executive committee of the Soviets with the Presidium of the sailors' union it was decided that the central executive committee mediate between the sailors' union and the government. The sailors' union is to renounce its ultimative demands, on the other hand the government is to withdraw its decree on the dissolution of the union.

The Railwaymen also Defend themselves.

Petrograd, 5th October. The Central Executive Committee of the railwaymen replied to the last telegram of Minister Nikitin:

"Dear Sir,

In your telegram of 5th October you designate the strike decision of the Central Railwaymen's Committee as an action which serves the Kornilov conspirators, and you call upon the population to defend the country and the revolution against the army of the railwaymen. By this you have betrayed your complete ignorance of the situation and the action of the railwaymen. The railwaymen never were and never will be the betrayers of the country and the revolution.

The Central Committee of the railwaymen has thrown in its whole authority in order to give the strike an orderly direction and to prevent that the population and the army should suffer from it

Your telegram is an appeal to destroy the democratic organisations, for the army of the railway workers is a part of the general democracy, and the railwaymen's committee is supported in this strike by the Moscow Soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies We consider your telegram to be a provocation, and only reply to it in order to expose this question before democracy and the whole population

The telegram concludes as follows: "Not we, citizens Kerensky and Nikitin, have betrayed the country, the Provisional government has broken its pledges. You cannot express any words or threats against us."

Intensification of the Strike Movement of the Railwaymen.

Petrograd, 2nd October. The Central Committee of the railwaymen was informed that on the most important railway lines the workers and employees are greatly excited and declare that they cannot wait any longer. Partial strikes have already broken out. The Central Committee is taking all measures to prevent the outbreak of a strike. In spite of this reports of new partial strikes have arrived today.

Thus at the Tula station a strike committee was organised. The same happened in Konotop and Samara. The strike committee of Samara is distributing on the whole line an appeal in which it is pointed out that the Provisional government absolutely ignores the demands of the railwaymen and that the only way to get these demands fulfilled is the strike. The appeal fixes the strike for the 2nd October, should no satisfactory reply have arrived by then from the government.

* * *

In its meeting of 2nd October the government dealt with the railwaymen's question and decided to convene a conference of the Ministers for Finance, Transport, Industry, Labour, Food, for Home Affairs and for the Army and Navy. The conference shall deal with the demands of the railwaymen in the shortest time. At the same time the Provisional government called the attention of the railwaymen to the extremely difficult state of the national treasury and to the disastrous consequences which a strike of the railwaymen would have for the food supply of the army and the urban population.

* * *

Petrograd, 9th October. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The strike of the railwaymen takes the orderly course announced by the strike committee. In view of the strike, the government decided to grant to the railwaymen the demanded wage increase from the 1st of September, which will involve a yearly expenditure of 730 millions roubles. The government decided at the same time to work out a new railway tariff. It will further issue a decree on the special supply of food for the railwaymen. On the other hand the newspapers state that the government will refuse all negotiations with the striking workers until publication of the above-mentioned decrees, and that it even has considered prosecuting the Committee of the strikers. Yesterday the railway regiments declared to the government that they are prepared to support it in order to put an end to the strike.

The Petrol Workers also on Strike.

Baku, 9th October. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The Conference of the workers' committees of all petroleum wells decided, in view of the refusal of the employers not to dismiss workers and employees without the approval of the workers' organisations, to enter on a general strike on the 10th October and at the same time formed a strike committee.

The Soviet of Tashkent at the Head of the Revolutionary Movement.

Tashkent, October 5th. (Report received from the Petrograd Telegraph Agency). After comparative quiet had set in, during yesterday morning, the situation has suddenly become worse

owing to the fact that the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet proclaimed a general strike in order to protest against the dispatch of a punitive expedition. Electric lighting and tramways as also printing works, all stopped work. The Government proclaimed a state of siege.

Chronicle of Events.

September 23.

The National Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in Finland is sitting with a Bolshevik majority. The Soviet proclaims that it would regard every step towards preventing the renewal of the Seim as a counter-revolutionary attack and would act accordingly.

September 24.

The Petrograd Soviet passes the resolution submitted by the Bolsheviks concerning the question of power.

September 25.

The All-Russian Congress of Co-operatives pronounces itself in favour of entering into coalition with those groups of the bourgeoisie which were not involved in the Kornilov affair.

September 26.

The Fraction meeting of the Mensheviks declared itself in favour of a coalition.

September 27.

Opening of the Democratic Conference.

September 29.

At the "Democratic Conference" Zeretelli recommends the setting up of a preliminary Parliament.

September 30.

At the "Democratic Conference" Rjasanov submits the revolutionary demands of the trade unions.

October 1.

In his speech at the "Democratic Conference" Trotzky demands the arming of the workers.

The "Democratic Conference" rejects the taking over of power by the Soviets and declares in favour of coalition.

October 2.

The "Democratic Conference" pronounces itself against a coalition with the Cadets.

Partial strike of the railwaymen.

October 3.

The "Democratic Conference" pronounces itself in favour of the programme of August 14th, supplemented by a clause on active foreign policy towards peace.

The Bolshevik fraction votes against the programme.
General strike in Tashkent.

TEN YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

On the Way to Socialism.

By L. F. W.

The report made by the Presidium of the Commission for Systematic Economy concerning the "control figures" for the economic year 1927/28 has recently been published. Nothing can give a better idea of the gigantic work of construction and of the firm, victorious steps of the first proletarian State than do these apparently dry columns of figures which have, for the past few years, annually appeared in the Soviet Press under the unpretentious title of "control figures". These figures are, in reality, nothing more nor less than an exact military report on the position at the economic front, the front on which depends the fate of all the other fronts. At the same time they represent a strategical plan for the following stage of the economic fight for socialism, the fight against the remnants of capitalist anarchy, the fight for raising the material and, with it, the cultural level not only of a small, privileged stratum, but of the great mass of all toilers numbering millions.

The fact alone that the "control figures" are published, means a piece of socialist work, a step towards overcoming capitalist anarchy by means of socialist planned economy. Only the expulsion of the capitalists and landed proprietors and the concentration of the most important economic supreme commands in the hands of the proletarian State has made it possible in such a way systematically to direct or influence the economic life of a people numbering 150 millions. The actual facts presented by the control figures show how the proletariat is turning to account its October victory and that it is firmly establishing it by an uninterrupted chain of every day's victories at the economic front.

What is the condition of production in the Soviet Union at the end of the first decade of victorious revolution? This is the first question to which we find the answer in the report of the Commission for Systematic economy which has recently been published. On considering the column of figures given below, the following fact attracts our attention: pre-war production is still the standard of comparison. Whereas however, in former years, the aim was to attain the pre-war level, for which we still had to struggle, the results, both of the tenth year which is running out and even more of the commencing eleventh year of Soviet economy, are above that level with regard to the widest branches of production. Let us consider a few examples:

Percentage of production as compared with 1913.

	1926/27	1927/28
Coal	105.2	122.3
Naphtha	109.7	120.7
Cast-iron	70.5	82.3
Metal	76.3	85.2
Woven cotton goods	105.4	112.0
Galoshes	109.6	132.6
Salt	102.0	114.2
Land under agricultural cultivation	95.1	97.6
Extent of permanent way	130.3	132.0

By making use of the means of production inherited from capitalism alone it was not possible even to attain to the pre-war level of production; it is then all the more evident that no step beyond the pre-war level could be made unless fresh capital was invested or rationalisation of production resorted to. This is one of the cards on which the enemies of the Soviet Power stake everything. The fact alone that it will

be possible in the coming economic year to invest the gigantic sum of 3350 million roubles (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ milliard dollars) in the socialised section of economic life by way of fresh capital, shows how ill-founded are their hopes. This is the best answer given to the financial boycott of the Soviet Union by the imperialist States, a boycott which is still maintained. This investment of capital will be distributed as follows:

Industry will receive 1166 million roubles, transport 483.5 millions, electrification 280 millions, the building trade for housing purposes and communal economy 521 million roubles etc. The investment of capital in the next year will exceed the investment in the current year by 680 million roubles. In accordance with the policy of the industrialisation of the Soviet Union, the greater part of the means allotted to industry will fall to the share of heavy industry, being devoted especially to the production of means of production.

The year we are entering upon will bring a noticeable progress in all questions the solution of which is necessary for the successful development of socialism, in such questions as to how to overcome the disproportion between agriculture and industry, between the production of means of production and articles of general use in the domain of industry, between the growing of corn and of technical cultivation in the domain of agriculture and so on.

The greatest importance, however, should be attached to the question as to what is the direction taken by this development considered from the social point of view, the point of view of the classes. Every justification of the new economic policy as a way to socialism (not, as our enemies say, to the "restoration of capitalism") depends on the question whether the socialised sections of the economic life of the Soviet Union develop more rapidly than those worked by private capital. On the basis of the results of the past four years, the statistics (control figures) give a clear answer to this question.

Whereas in 1924/25 the production of the socialised sector amounted to 25.5% of the whole of production (in industry and agriculture taken as one, for in industry alone the socialised section predominates absolutely), this percentage increased to 39.8% in the economic year 1927/28.

As regards trade, the socialised section increased during the same period from 72.6 to 84.5%.

The analysis of the income of the various social strata during the past economic year is characteristic of the class character of Soviet economics.

In the economic year 1926/27, the annual income of the agricultural population increased by 7.2% as compared to the previous year, the income of members of free occupations by 5.3%, of small traders by 7.2%, of wage-earners by 18.1%, whereas the income of private ownership shows a reduction of 0.1%.

This tendency will continue to exist in the coming economic year, all the more as the statistics provide for another increase of wages by 5 to 6 per cent, which, if the programme of the reduction of prices is carried out, will mean an increase of real wages by 11 to 12 per cent.

An increase of production both in industry and agriculture; industrialisation, the ousting of private capital from its positions etc. — these are almost stereotyped results recorded in every single year of Soviet economic politics. The further the Soviet proletariat advances on this path, the clearer will it be that nothing can arrest the construction of socialism except the war policy of the imperialist States against the Soviet Union. Every successful step of the Soviet proletariat in its work of socialist construction will therefore be a spur to every class-conscious proletarian, urging him to intensify the fight against the imperialist, anti-soviet preparations for war.

Co-operatives in Socialist Construction.

By P. F...r.

The data contained in the following article are taken from the pamphlet by W. A. Tikhomirov, the secretary of the Central Co-operative Council, on "Co-operatives in Socialist Construction" which has just been published.

It was Lenin who, right from the commencement, insisted on the enormous importance of the Co-operatives in the work of socialist construction. "The whole of society must be transformed into a united co-operative organisation of workers", hence "the simple growth of the Co-operatives is (with few exceptions) tantamount to the growth of Socialism". It was also Lenin who above all advocated the most energetic support of the Co-operatives by the Soviets, as well as by the Communist Party and the trade unions. He laid special emphasis on this in his testament to the Party. The whole Party has made Lenin's views its own. It has become the chief motive force in the building up of the Co-operatives, a fact which explains the enormous development they have undergone since the capture of State power by the workers and peasants, or more exactly stated, since the liquidation of the civil war and the breaking through of the blockade. The Co-operatives have become the chief means of binding together the town and the country, the most important weapon of the "Smytchka".

The following figures serve to indicate the increasing importance of the Co-operatives in the economic life of the Soviet Union. In the economic year 1925/26 the turnover of the manufacturing and trading co-operative enterprises amounted to 10,468 million roubles, or 31.9% of the total turnover of the manufacturing and trading enterprises of the U. S. S. R.; in the year 1924/25 it was 25%. The network of Co-operatives is extending to ever wider spheres of industrial and agricultural production in the whole of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Power promotes the Co-operatives by granting them taxation privileges of all kinds, by goods credits etc.

On the foreign market the role of the Soviet Co-operatives, especially in the last two years, has become continually larger, both in regard to the purchase and also the sale of goods. At the same time the Co-operatives of the Soviet Union are working hand in hand with the Co-operative organisations abroad and seek to strengthen them. The turnover of all co-operative central unions in the foreign trade of 1925/26 amounted to 145 million roubles, of which 52 million roubles represented imported goods and 93 million roubles exported goods.

The chief significance of the Co-operatives is in the home market of the Soviet Union. The great advance made by the Co-operatives is shown by the membership figures: The number of shareholding members of the Co-operatives of the Soviet Union in 1927 is about 20 million; these are organised in 90 thousand Co-operatives. There is no territory in the vast Soviet Union, no nationality, no branch of industry that is not being brought more and more into the network of the Co-operatives.

At the head of the co-operative movement there stand the Consumers' Co-operatives with 28,656 consumers' societies and 62,736 co-operative shops. These are united in 260 unions, which again have their central body in the Centrosoyuz. With their 12 million members the Consumers' Co-operatives cater for about 50 million people, if we include the members of the families of the shareholders. In the towns and workers' districts already 63.1% of all trade union organised workers are members of the Consumers' Co-operatives; and in the rural districts the Co-operatives include 28.2% of all peasant households. The turnover of the entire consumers' co-operative system in 1925/26 amounted to 6894 million roubles, or 31.9% of the entire turnover. As a result of the position occupied by the Consumers' Co-operatives on the home market a special relationship has

been formed between them and the trading and producing syndicates, who are their biggest customers. By means of the general agreements concluded for six months or a year with the State industrial enterprises (these agreements amount for the year 1926/27 to over a milliard roubles) and also with the handicraft and agricultural co-operatives, the systematising of economy is promoted tremendously. Consumers' Co-operatives have 2184 industrial enterprises of their own, in which 42,216 workers are employed.

The Agricultural Co-operatives of the Soviet Union are accomplishing pioneer work. They are the champions and bearers of the reorganisation of agriculture according to socialist principles. They are developing very favourably. Towards the middle of June 1927, there were 66,839 agricultural co-operatives, embracing over seven million peasant households. The balance of the entire agricultural co-operative system of the Soviet Union in April 1926 amounted to 1059 million roubles. Pioneer work is being done by the co-operatives in the promotion of collective cultivation of the soil and in the collective purchase and use of machines, above all of tractors. In the year 1926 there were already 22,437 collective enterprises, with over 500,000 members. Over three million desatins of land were cultivated collectively at the beginning of 1927. The agricultural credit societies play an important role in the socialisation of agriculture.

Co-operation has made great headway in the sphere of dairy produce. This is particularly the case as regards milk products, 92% of all milk products passing through the co-operative butter and cheese producing dairies.

31 percent of the corn, 36 per cent of the flax and a great portion of the potato crop pass through the hands of the agricultural co-operatives.

The Artisan and Handicraft Co-operatives play a special role. For in Russia, which before the revolution was the most backward agrarian country in the world, there are to-day no less than three million urban artisans and rural craftsmen. They produce 17.2% of the manufactured products of the country. The 13,759 handicraft co-operatives, possessing together 600,000 members, help these workers in the purchase of raw materials and the sale of the finished products. The gross turnover of these co-operatives is about 650 million roubles. In addition they perform enormous cultural and educational work (craft and industrial schools).

As a result of the geographical structure of the Soviet Union, fishing and hunting are of great importance. A great number of fishermen and hunters are organised respectively in the Fishermen's and the Hunters' Co-operatives (488 fishermen's co-operatives with 47,777 members, and 527 hunters' co-operative societies with 370,000 members).

Of the numerous other co-operatives, which cannot be dealt with in this brief sketch, mention should be made of the Invalid Co-operatives, the Housing Co-operatives and the Co-operative banks.

The co-operatives are carrying on a tremendous cultural work and publishing activity. Cultural activity is being developed by means of newspapers, periodicals, books, pamphlets, courses of study, reading rooms, co-operative circles etc. Efforts are being made to attract more and more women to the co-operative movement.

As regards their class character the co-operatives of the Soviet Union are thoroughly proletarian. Workers, poor and middle peasants constitute the great bulk of the membership. Thus the co-operatives are a powerful driving force in the building up of socialism.