

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 30

19th May 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.

CONTENTS

R. Palme Dutt: What Lies behind the London Coup?
"In the Footsteps of Chang Tso-Lin."

Politics.

P. L.: The Conference of the Little Entente.
Albert Treint: The Imperialism of the United States in Central America.
J. B.: The Changes in the Egyptian Government.

League of Nations.

Speeches of Comrades Lapse and Ossinsky in the Industrial Commission of the World Economic Conference.
Comrade Sokolnikov on International Cartels.
A Labour Voice in Geneva.

China.

A. Platonov: Under the Flags of the Revolution.

The Balkans.

N. Dragatchevatz: The Political Development in Yugoslavia.

The White Terror.

The Trial of Stefanov and Comrades.

Rescue Sacco and Vanzetti.

The Protest Action on Behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti must be Continued.

Against the Imperialist War.

D. Marezky: The Future War and the Working Class.
In the International.
Decision of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. with Regard to the Attitude of Comrade Zinoviev.
The Moscow and Leningrad Committees on the Speech of Comrade Zinoviev.
Speculating on Difficulties.

The Children's Movement.

International Children's Week.

Book Reviews.

J. G.: A Farmers and Peasants International Correspondent.

Ten Years Ago.

The Miljukov Government Tottering.
Resignation of Gutchkov, the War Minister.
The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.
Lenin: The Question of the Control of the Provisional Government.
The April Conference of the Bolsheviks.
Lenin: The Crisis of Power.
Resolutions of the "April Conference".
Chronicle of Events.

What Lies behind the London Coup?

By R. Palme Dutt (London).

The lawless bandit coup of the London Tory Government on the Soviet Delegation offices is the most flagrant act yet of violent aggression in the "unproclaimed war" which the British Government is conducting against the Soviet Union. Chamberlain no longer hides behind his confederate brigands and murderers, the Chang-Tso-Lins and Pilsudskis, but comes into the open himself (complete with burglar's tools and modern safe-breaking paraphernalia) as the Chief Brigand and leader of the campaign. With this act the lawless aggression of the British Government is openly proclaimed to the world.

This coup is an attempt to force a situation of war by violent and desperate measures, in face of the continued pacific attitude of the Soviet Union, and of the growingly critical character of the situation at home and abroad. It is a continuation of the policy, already initiated with the Note to the Soviet Union in February, and continued with the diplomatic outrages, arrests and murders at Peking, Tientsin and Shanghai. It is part of the same policy that is training the naval guns on Hankow to smash the Chinese National Government, and forcing the Trade Union Bill through Parliament at breakneck speed to throttle the British workers.

The combination of this attack on all three fronts at once means that British Imperialism is throwing all questions of expediency, caution and discretion to the winds, and fighting and striking without concealment on every side, like a raging wild beast, against the rising forces on all sides that threaten it with decline.

What are the immediate factors behind this attempt to cut the Gordian knot with a sword, and smash all the enemies of British Imperialism at once by open violence?

The answer is that the British Tory Government is faced with a situation in which the only alternatives are rapid action or failure.

In China the temporary disruption of the national forces and triumph of repression in Peking, Shanghai and Canton is artificial in relation to the real forces of the situation, and can only be short-lived, unless confirmed and established by the decisive victory of the forces of Counter-Revolution all over the world.

In Europe, the plans for the encirclement of the Soviet Union and united war for "civilisation" have continually hung fire, and been delayed by conflicting interests and forces, while

the sands of the Tory "Die-Hard" Government are running out. The provocations to a break have been defeated by the pacific policy of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the peaceful progress and consolidation of the position of the Soviet Union, and advance in socialist construction, have continued without interruption. The Franco-Soviet negotiations, on the point of reaching settlement on all questions and close economic relations; the Swiss-Soviet settlement, reflecting French influence and in opposition to previous British influence on the Swiss Government; and the influential participation of the Soviet Delegation in the Geneva Economic Conference, with the prospect of further development of economic relations and breaking of the economic boycott: all these combined to make a situation in which the forces were gathering in the direction of peace and against the British plans, and could only be broken by sharp action.

Not only in Europe, but even in certain British financial circles, the movement towards a possible accommodation with the Soviet Union was gathering. The *Matin* of May 14th publishes an alleged "official" information that on May 11th an agreement was reached between the Midland Bank, whose Chairman is the Liberal ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, MacKenna, and the Soviet Trade Delegation for a credit of ten million pounds to the latter for the development of trade between Britain and the Soviet Union. What lies behind this obviously tendentious information is not for the moment so important as the situation of Franco-British rivalry and suspicion as to possible moves towards an economic bargain with the Soviet Union which is revealed. It is noticeable that on the day following the alleged move to an agreement on the part of liberal financial circles, took place the police coup, under the direct guidance of the extreme Die-Hard, Joynson-Hicks, to compel a rupture of relations.

The home political situation is equally driving the British Tory Government to desperate measures. The discredit and unpopularity of the Government is confessed and unconcealed. In the series of bye-elections since its return to power on an original minority vote, the Government vote has in the aggregate decreased from 20 to 25%, while the Labour vote has increased in the aggregate some 10% — an almost unprecedented rate of turnover. The Trade Union Bill will tremendously increase this unpopularity. At this rate a continuance for the remaining two years of its full parliamentary mandate will make certain a heavy electoral defeat and the probability of the consequent problems of an absolute Labour majority. In consequence every effort will be made to change this position. There are many indications of an early General Election. Not only are the usual rumours current, but other signs point in this direction. Thus it is noticeable that the Budget was in every sense a makeshift Budget, making no attempt to meet the deficit or impose any important new taxation, but postponing everything to next year. A franchise extension is announced to be hurried through — the traditional British Conservative device in times of stress. But such a "rush" General Election will need to be carried through on some rousing "patriotic" slogan, to drown the discontent and work the old electoral machine of trickery and deceit. For this purpose the war-cries, lies and agitation against the Soviet Union will be used to the full, and

revelations of "Red plots and conspiracies". To carry this out, a war atmosphere is necessary. During the last few months the agitation of the capitalist press has been working more and more incessantly and violently to raise hostility to the Soviet Union, in which task the reformist leaders have busily helped (only two weeks before the coup, on April 30th, MacDonald was writing in the liberal capitalist "Daily News" a venomous attack on the Soviet Union — "the pressure of foreign Governments should be close and insistent... the internal conflict thus kept up can be ended only in one way... Russia as a menace, as an influence present wherever there is un-settlement, will cease to exist").

The coup is the attempt to force this situation to a head, to turn off the growing discontent into war agitation against the Soviet Union, to create the atmosphere — and the "documents" — for a war policy and a war General Election. For this reason the coup was so sensationally and melodramatically staged, with hordes of armed police to descend at the busiest time upon an ordinary commercial office. And, while no explanations of the alleged purpose of the violation have yet been made at the time of writing, it may be taken for granted that the "discovery" of documents will play a principal part. It may be noted that the English legal system is devoid of the most elementary checks or guarantees for the "finding" of documents by the police.

The propaganda character of the aim is indicated by the suggestion thrown out for popular consumption in the millionaire press that "stolen British naval and military documents" are involved. Such a suggestion stamps the character of the enterprise; since it is obvious to anyone in the least conversant with the facts of the situation that a fantastic suggestion of this sort is fit only for the public of William Le Queux. The forces of world liberation, against which British Imperialism is trying to strike in striking at the Soviet Union, are forces whose weapons are more serious than those of military espionage. Those weapons are the enlightenment and organisation of the masses in Britain, in China, in India, in the Empire and in the Soviet Union. And the brutal aggressions, lies, forgeries, and lawless violence of the British ruling class in defence of their threatened domination will only convince the working masses under their yoke more and more widely that their rulers are bandits without law or conscience, whose power must be overthrown by united and resolute struggle as the sole condition of liberation and advance along the path of peaceful progress.

The guilt of the London war-makers is by their actions made clear to the whole world. It is for the workers in every country to demonstrate their will against the threat of war and against the reckless criminal attack and provocation on the Soviet Union, whose existence and peaceful progress is the most treasured possession and victory of the international working class. Above all, it is for the workers in Britain to fight with all their power, to agitate, protest and demonstrate, to awaken resistance and to organise action, against the Tory Government, the centre of international reaction, in order to force them from the path on which they have entered, and smash the attack on the Soviet Union, on the Chinese masses and on the British workers' own rights and organisation.

"In the Footsteps of Chang Tso-Lin".

The "Pravda" on the Raid on the "Arcos".

Moscow, 14th May 1927.

The leading article of the "Pravda" this morning entitled "In the Footsteps of Chang Tso-lin", points out that the events in "Asiatic" Peking have repeated themselves in a town with a thousand years of "European" culture. The laurels of the bandit Chang Tso-lin, declares the "Pravda", have been captured by Joynson-Hicks.

The connection of the raid with the general intensification of the international situation and the events in China is beyond question. The raid on the "Arcos" is nothing but a link in the chain of Chamberlain's provocative game, in the swash-buckling policy of sabre-rattling which might have such fatal consequences for the peace of the world. The British imperial-

ists are provoking and challenging the Soviet Union. The provocation in Moorgate Street was perpetrated because the provocation in Peking had failed in its object. The Conservatives are not satisfied with the hanging expedition to China alone. They are doing their utmost to provoke an artificial conflict between Great Britain and the Soviet Union although neither the people of Great Britain, nor the people of the Soviet Union are interested in such a conflict. The conservative robbers have not even been able to think of any half-way reasonable grounds for their action. The only excuse is that a search is being made for some "document" or other. This excuse could be used to justify any sort of meanness. If the police spies have been given instructions to find documents, then they would certainly find them, for such things as forgeries are not unknown to the world.

It is clear that the raid had been carefully prepared. According to the reports of the British press many conservative leaders knew previously of the intended raid. The raid was proceeded by a furious anti-soviet campaign on the part of the reactionary press. The events in London clearly show the difference between the robber policy of British imperialism and the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, the State of the workers. We, declares the "Pravda", conclude treaties of peace and non-aggression; they military conventions and criminal military blocks. We are in favour of a better life for the workers of all countries; they suppress the Working Class Movement and pass anti-trade union laws. We are in favour of the emancipation of the oppressed peoples; they charge the international situation with explosives. We want peaceful trade relations, and they do their utmost to undermine this peaceful work with their bandit raids. We are in favour of a policy of consolidation of friendly relations, and they are step by step preparing a break with the Soviet Union. We are for peace and they are for war! The workers of the whole world must recognise this. The British conservatives are sowing the wind, they must not be astonished if they reap the whirlwind.

POLITICS

The Conference of the Little Entente.

By P. L.

The actual purpose of the Conference of the Little Entente which has just been held in Joachimsthal in Czechoslovakia, was disclosed in an article written by the Czechoslovakian Foreign Minister, Benes, which was published in the "Journal de Genève" and in the Vienna "Neue Freie Presse" immediately before the Conference. The whole article of Benes consists of phrases which are intended to show that it would be "wrong to conclude that the Little Entente must come to an end", and that in particular the attitude of Hungary "does not alter the importance of the Little Entente". Rather does the Little Entente set itself the aim of bringing about a Central European Locarno. In this way Herr Benes tries to conceal the fact of the bankruptcy of the Little Entente.

The whole object of the Conference of the Little Entente was to demonstrate to the outer world the existence, as well as the justification for the existence of the Little Entente. For this purpose there was issued a joint communiqué which affirms the "loyal co-operation" of the States of the Entente with one another and with their neighbours. Yet the results of the Conference completely refute all these beautiful lying phrases.

The Little Entente, ever since its existence, has formed the tail of the Big Entente in Central and Southern Europe. The development within the Big Entente necessarily had its counter-effects on the Little Entente. Originally, the Little Entente was mainly the instrument of the French imperialists, who, thanks to the peace treaties, had secured for themselves a dominating position in Europe. Under the protection of the Little Entente, Yugoslavia, Roumania and Czechoslovakia could make sure of their spoils. But in the course of time the relations of power in Europe considerably altered; France was unable to maintain its hegemony. As a result the character of the Little Entente changed. To the extent that British imperialism, and along with it Italian imperialism, pushed back France in the struggle for the hegemony of the Mediterranean and the Balkans, a decomposition set in in the Little Entente.

While Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia continued to seek their main support in French imperialism, a support which it is true became continually weaker, Roumania attached itself to Great Britain and Italy. Roumanian imperialism, the robber of Bessarabia, obtained from Great Britain and Fascist Italy the guarantee of its final possession of Bessarabia, and in return allowed itself to be drawn in the wake of these two powers.

But what could Yugoslavia offer British imperialism? British imperialism had every reason to secure for itself the help of Italy. This could only be done at the cost of Yugoslavia. England, therefore, secured Italy the hegemony in the Adriatic and gave it above all a free hand in Albania. As a matter of fact this last named Balkan country, which is of so much economic and political importance, is well on the way to becoming a

colony of Italy. As a result, however, Yugoslavia, which had the same desire to possess Albania, became involved in a sharp conflict with Italy, a conflict which promises to lead to a new robber war in the future. In this conflict there is revealed the complete impotence and bankruptcy of the Little Entente. This is fully confirmed by the decision of the Conference of the Little Entente, according to which Yugoslavia alone will endeavour to settle as soon as possible the conflict with Italy, in order thereby to prevent the break up of the Little Entente. In other words, this means that the maintenance of the Little Entente, which was formed for the common defence of the vital interests of its members, can only be bought by the abandonment of these interests by one of its members.

Great Britain and Italy are successfully working to destroy Yugoslavia's hegemony in the Balkans and to isolate it by awakening among the bourgeoisie of Bulgaria and also of Greece, hopes of the extension of their power at the cost of Yugoslavia. The two great Powers wish to fling with a generous hand the Macedonian territory belonging to Yugoslavia into the claws of their obedient servants as spoils. An object of special concern in this connection is reactionary Bulgaria. This is also shown very clearly in the results of the Conference of the Little Entente. For Great Britain, obviously against the will of Yugoslavia, succeeded in bringing about that the Little Entente will offer no resistance to the abolition of inter-allied military control in Bulgaria. The official communiqué has now to acknowledge this rebuff with thanks. A strange method of prolonging life by committing suicide.

Czechoslovakia has a special interest in the Little Entente, it wishes to see in it a guarantee, on the one hand against the strengthening of Hungary and on the other hand against the strengthening of Germany, above all by the union of Austria with Germany. But in these points also there is shown more and more the impotence of the Little Entente. The new German imperialism does not, as hitherto, allow the idea of a Union of Austria with Germany to appear as a mere agitational phrase. The more so as Great Britain wishes to include Germany in the Anti-Soviet Bloc and does not definitely oppose such a possibility. Obviously things are not yet so far that Great Britain considers it necessary to carry this out. In this point, therefore, the Czechoslovakian government, as the outpost of French imperialism, can record an outward "success" at the Conference by the decision that Roumania, as a semi-permanent member of the Council of the League of Nations, pledges itself to oppose the union of Austria with Germany.

With regard to Hungary, here also the weaknesses of the Little Entente have come to light. Reactionary Hungary, like Bulgaria, has two strong protectors in Great Britain and Italy. Naturally, the Little Entente cannot do anything against these protectors. It therefore has not uttered a word against the abolition of military control over Hungary. In spite of this the gentlemen of the Little Entente will not hear anything of a "Locarno on the Danube" — until they are forced to do so.

Taken all in all, it can be said that this last Conference proves beyond doubt that the Little Entente is completely disintegrating and only has a formal existence. The Little Entente can no longer be regarded as a bloc of States acting together, except as part of an anti-Soviet bloc.

The Imperialism of the United States in Central America.

By Albert Treint.

At the Congress of the Pan-American Union, Coolidge, the President of the United States, recently made a speech in which he pointed out that Europe had completely withdrawn from Central America, that the United States were almost exclusively the country for imports and exports for the States of Central America, and that the relations between the United States and the Central American States were regulated according to the principles of "mutual support".

What this "mutual support" is worth is shown by the armistice, brought about through the intervention of the United States, between A. Diaz, the President of Nicaragua and the Liberals who, under the leadership of Dr. Sacasa, rebelled against Diaz, the puppet of the United States. Even before the conditions of the armistice were made known, General Moncada, the military leader of the rebels declared that he was "compelled

to stop fighting" by a stronger power, the United States, and that his troops must hand over their arms to the American troops. American marines, who had been landed, then disarmed the Nicaraguan soldiers. The terms of the armistice contain the following points amongst others: complete disarmament of both parties; organisation of a non-party police in Nicaragua which will be permanently officered by Americans; supervision by the United States of the elections which are to take place in 1928; the American forces to remain in Nicaragua until the police-troop is formed.

The United States have thus advanced another step towards the subjugation of Central America to their power; for this armistice makes Nicaragua almost as much a colony of the United States as are Haiti and St. Dominique.

Central America and Mexico play a leading part in the gigantic struggle which the imperialism of the United States is carrying on in a world-wide measure.

In order to get from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, three cuttings, three waterways, come into consideration: the Panama Canal, the Nicaragua Canal, which is nearing completion and which will be the simplest waterway, and the isthmus of Tehuantepec in Mexico, which has the advantage of lying nearest to the naval base of the United States.

In this way, Central America and Mexico command the maritime ways which come into consideration for commercial traffic between the two sea coasts of North and South America as well as the direct commercial route between Europe and Far East. This explains their decisive strategical significance in a future world war. Mexico, which is rich in mineral wealth and overflowing with petroleum, is at the same time, an extremely desirable prey for the capitalists. Furthermore, it is a dangerous military land base opposite the southern frontier of the United States.

These are the most important reasons why the United States are indefatigably and with increasing success trying to lay their hand on Central America and the Antilles. They have already almost completely established their supremacy over the district known as the American Mediterranean. In the course of the last twenty years, the United States have taken possession of the most important naval base, the telegraph cables and the wireless stations in this "inland sea" which lies between Central America, Mexico and the Antilles. In this way they have the ways connecting the two oceans under their control.

They have made an economic conquest of Cuba, a political conquest of Portorico and a military conquest of St. Domingo.

The chief way by which they have insured their position, is that of importing capital on a gigantic scale. In 1926 alone, they invested 115 million dollars in Central America. The total amount of capital which they have invested in the Mexican petroleum wells, amounts to more than 600 million dollars. Apart from the capital which they have invested in industry, they have used their dollars to stir up disunion and strife in the small neighbouring republics and have made the parties pliant to their wishes through bribery.

The history of the five small republics of Central America, Guatemala, Nicaragua, San Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica, which at one time formed an independent Central American union, is the history of their subjugation to the influence of the United States after long years of struggles and intrigues.

The Central American Union, which was dissolved by the United States, was re-established under their hegemony in December 1922.

At the end of 1921, after many sanguinary fights, which they themselves had stirred up, the United States placed the power in Guatemala into the hands of their lackey, General Orellana.

The Republic of Honduras is, so to speak, a fief of the powerful "United Fruit Company" which has the monopoly of the banana export in America.

The United States, having their hand on the Panama Canal, are now exerting every effort to get the Nicaragua Canal into their possession.

Mexico, in the meantime, by its Constitution of 1917, has started out on the path of a fight for independence. The Constitution prohibits foreigners acquiring land or mineral wealth. Mexico is trying in this way to shake off the Wall Street financiers who have got hold of her petroleum wells as well as the Spanish clergy who own large domains. Since that time the United States have contrived all kinds of intrigues and have stirred up revolts in order to compel Mexico to give way in the petroleum question.

At the same time, the United States concentrated their forces against Nicaragua, where they have placed their puppet, President A. Diaz, in power. The Liberal party, led by Dr. Sacasa, revolted against him. At the end of 1926 there was open rebellion. The insurgents were victorious. Thereupon the United States landed their marines in Nicaragua and forced the insurgents to retreat. At the same time, the United States threatened the Mexico Government which sympathised with the insurrection in Nicaragua by assembling 60 warships in the waters of Cuba, and intimidated Sacasa's party by announcing the military occupation of Nicaragua. When the Republic of Costa Rica offered to mediate between Diaz and Sacasa, Diaz, at the advice of the White House, declined.

While this was going on, revolts against the Central Government took place in the eight Northern provinces of Mexico, led by generals who were equipped and subsidised by the United States. The revolts were suppressed, so that, for the time being, the United States are trying the method of compromise.

In Nicaragua however, the United States have not given way. They have now finally established their protectorate in Nicaragua. They have landed troops of occupation and disarmed the Nicaraguan troops. Furthermore they control the financial administration of the country.

The United States are thus, before our very eyes, continuing their policy of spoliation.

The Changes in the Egyptian Government.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The ten months of the government of Adly Pasha, which came into office in June 1926 as a result of the compromise between the Zaglulist majority in the Egyptian parliament and the British government, has not brought any benefit to Egypt. In the sphere of politics, not one of the questions vitally important for Egypt — evacuation of the British troops, union of Egypt with the Sudan, abolition of the capitulations — have been solved or brought nearer to a solution. In the economic sphere, the outbreak of the cotton crisis led to the impoverishment of broad sections of the population; and the government did not succeed in doing anything to reduce the high food prices. On the other hand there were a great number of inner political difficulties; disturbances in the religious university of El-Ashad, labour conflicts and unsuccessful attempts to carry out reforms.

The government was in a constant state of embarrassment: Parliament with its Zaglulist majority, which in general is much more radically inclined than the leaders of the Party, and in particular of those moderate elements who were sent as representatives of the party into the Adly Ministry, insisted in every question on definite decisions, and overwhelmed Adly and his Ministers with awkward questions, which the government in most cases answered evasively or were unable to answer at all. The reason for this humiliating position of the government is that the independence of Egypt is, in the last resort, only a fiction. Without the sanction of the British no Minister is able to carry out any measure. While, however, Adly Pasha and also the Zaglulists in his Cabinet always tacitly yielded to the desires of the British, the parliamentary deputies would hear nothing of this.

Conflicts between Parliament and the government became more and more frequent: The question of the discharge of British officials, which parliament demanded to be carried out thoroughly while the government, responding to British pressure, sabotaged; the question of the British Supreme Command in the Egyptian army, on the liquidation of which parliament insisted; the constitutional problem, whether local authorities shall be elected or appointed (Parliament demanded that they be elected, while the British adviser insisted on the retention of the system of appointment) — all these provided material for conflict which rendered the position of the government impossible.

Finally, it came about that the constant intervention of Parliament hindered the government in its work. The Liberal Constitutional Party, whose programme demanded that co-operation with Great Britain which the Prime Minister Adly Pasha carried out, wished to show the Zaglulists that they are

not to be regarded as a mere facade of the Cabinet, behind which the Zaglulists could proceed with their attacks in order to preserve their popularity as friends of the people and consistent nationalists, but that they are just as indispensable to the Zaglulists as the Zaglulists are to them.

Precisely at the moment when the British and a portion of the Egyptian press again published news regarding direct negotiations between Zagful Pasha and the representative of Chamberlain (the result of which would be to render the mediation of the Liberal Constitutionalists superfluous), and when the Zaglulist majority in Parliament again undertook an attack in order, if possible, to bring into power a purely Zaglulist government, Adly Pasha made a clever manoeuvre in order to render possible the resignation of the entire Cabinet: he used as a pretext the chance rejection of a vote of thanks to the government on the occasion of a financial transaction.

The fact that this action of Adly Pasha precipitated the crisis clearly shows that a Ministry formed by Zagful or consisting only of Zaglulists would meet with just as much opposition on the part of the British as it would have ten months ago. There remained only the choice; open conflict with Great Britain, which would have immediately led to the dissolution of Parliament and to a new period of an "unconstitutional" Ministry (the "Ittehad" Party is only waiting for a "favourable moment" in order, with the aid of the British and of the king, to come to power again), or fresh compromise, acceptance of persons agreeable to the British.

Although the Nationalist Party and some radical Wafd organs recommended an open conflict (there were even hints that in view of the China adventure it would not be possible for the British Foreign Office to proceed drastically against Egypt), Zagful Pasha, with whom this time also the decision lay, again decided on a compromise: Adly Pasha was thrown overboard and his place taken by Sarvat Pasha, who was hitherto Foreign Minister in the Adly Cabinet and is even more closely connected with the British. In addition to this the Zaglulists had to give up the two most important posts in the Ministry, which were the cause of frequent conflicts with the British advisers on the one side and Parliament on the other, namely the Finance Ministry and the War Ministry, to Liberal Constitutional candidates. As a result the Liberal Constitutional Party, even though numerically unchanged, emerges politically strengthened out of this Cabinet crisis. The only compensation the Zaglulists received was the office of Foreign Minister, which is to render it possible for them to continue direct negotiations with Great Britain.

The changes in the Cabinet do not in any way alter the main problems of Egypt. The Cabinet was received very coldly by Parliament, and the vote of confidence was granted with considerable reluctance. It is clearly perceived that it is only a question of a temporary solution in order to give Zagful Pasha the opportunity of arriving at an agreement with England. Should Zagful Pasha, in view of the obdurate line of British policy, not succeed in this, then the government of Sarvat Pasha will result in a considerable strengthening of the forces of the Left wing of the Zagful Party which are in favour of the Anglo-Egyptian differences, which are continually concealed and glossed over, being fought out in the open.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Speeches of Comrades Lapse and Ossinsky in the Industrial Commission of the Geneva World Economic Conference.

Geneva, 10th May 1927.

Comrade LEPSE

of the Metal Workers Union of the U.S.S.R. explained the class standpoint of the workers as follows:

The previous speakers endeavoured to avoid giving the thing its proper name: They do not wish to admit that capitalism is in a chronic crisis. For me however, as a revolutionary trade unionist, this fact is of primary importance because the whole weight of the crisis is being placed on the shoulders of the working class.

Everyone is in agreement that the diminished purchasing power of the masses is responsible for the crisis; in plain language, that is an admission that mass unemployment and mass poverty exist. As more than half of the population of the industrial countries is made up of wage-workers, it would seem a matter of course to raise the question of increasing wages in order to increase the purchasing power of the masses.

The question of unemployment should also be raised in this connection, for even according to the figures issued by the League of Nations, over 20 million people in Europe are suffering from unemployment, that is to say more than the total population of London, Paris, Berlin and Brussels.

Up to the present however there has been no reference to these matters either in the Memorandum, in the speeches or in the proposals. On the contrary, new sacrifices have been demanded of the workers, they have been told to be patient and to co-operate in the efforts to raise capitalism out of its difficulties. The representative of the French capitalist class here demanded that the working class abandon the class struggle, abandon the defence of its own interests to assist the capitalists.

But whilst this conference recommends the working class to accept the principles of class-collaboration and class harmony, and paints an idyllic picture of industrial peace, in reality the working class in all capitalist countries is being subjected to an ever stronger economic and political pressure. I will recall only a few facts.

Eight years have passed since the Washington Conference. But the Eight Hour Day Convention has not yet been ratified. On the contrary, in most capitalist countries the eight hour day has been abolished by governmental decrees, lock-outs and other measures of the employers. In Italy the nine hour day officially exists. In Germany certain categories of miners work a ten and a half hour day. In Great Britain the miners have been compelled by hunger to work seven and a half and eight hours a day instead of seven hours a day whilst at the same time their wages have been reduced and the general unemployment has risen. This capitalist policy can only lead to a further reduction in the purchasing power of the masses.

In order to carry out these measures against the working class, the trade unions have been abolished in many countries and in others their rights have been limited. I will mention only Bulgaria, Roumania and Italy. In Belgium the government has limited the rights of the unions and the right to strike by its trade union legislation. In Norway a law has been introduced to establish compulsory arbitration and to limit the right to strike. In Hamburg and Leipzig German courts have prohibited strikes of the textile workers proclaimed by the trade unions. These are facts, and gentlemen, these facts are hard things. They are no idyllic discussions about industrial peace and class harmony. Nothing of the sort follows from these facts.

The question of rationalisation has also been mentioned here. What does capitalist rationalisation mean for the working class? It means only increased exploitation, diminution of the share of the workers in the total production and increase of unemployment. For this reason it is the duty of the working class to be on its guard against this capitalist rationalisation and to counter its effects by demanding the introduction of the six hour day, and wage increases.

The question of the international cartels is also to be discussed here. This cartelisation leads inevitably however, to an increase of prices. For me this cartelisation is a form of monopolist capitalism with all the dangerous social and political results which characterise it. The employers carry on their struggle against the workers through these cartels.

What is to be done in the face of this crisis and these facts? The only solution I can see is the nationalisation of the most important branches of industry. Only in this way could European industry be developed in the interests of the masses of the population. I regard the following measures as indispensable:

1. The re-establishment of the normal eight hour day, and the introduction of the six hour day for miners and the workers of the trades, injurious to health.
2. General increase of wages for all workers.
3. State insurance for the unemployed to such a degree that the unemployed support reaches at least 50% of the wages of a skilled worker.
4. Complete freedom for the trade unions and free right to strike.

The markets and the buying power of the masses cannot be increased in any other way and thus the economic crisis cannot be overcome in any other way.

I am speaking here as the only representative of the revolutionary trade union movement at this conference. The difference between me and Jouhaux and his friends is that they recognise the capitalist system in principle and wish to "persuade" the employers to grant wage increases because this would lead to a diminishing of the crisis and is in the interests of the capitalist system. We are, however, of the opinion that no employer raises wages on his own in order to increase the purchasing power of the masses. "Persuasion" is useless, whether exerted by bourgeois or social democratic economic theoreticians.

Jouhaux who is a very capable assistant as far as the work for the establishment of class collaboration is concerned, has made a speech here and painted an illusory picture of industrial peace between capital and labour. He called for unity between the working class and the employers and declared that this unity is possible. He only forgot to say at whose cost this unity is possible. Who must give way, who must pay, and who will win? If the attempts of the past are considered without prejudice, then one must recognise that the class-collaboration has always been in the class interests of the employers, whilst the workers received as their reward only a systematic worsening of their situation.

After listening to the speech of the French capitalist representative yesterday, one can only come to the conclusion that behind these mutual politenesses there is a new offensive against the working class in preparation. In my opinion, the speeches about co-operation and industrial peace are nothing but a mask for a new offensive of capitalism. My conclusions from the situation is that not class harmony is necessary, but the unity of the trade union movement and the working class upon the basis of the class struggle. Only with this slogan will the working class be able to improve its situation.

Comrade Ossinsky Replies to Jouhaux.

Geneva, 13th May 1927.

In this morning's session of the International Economic Conference here, Comrade Ossinsky made his expected answer to the question of Loucheur and to the attacks of Jouhaux:

"The expected telegraphic detailed information has not yet arrived from Moscow, but I will answer upon the basis of the material at hand. I reserve the right, however, to answer all the questions relating to the Soviet Union in a special session for this purpose.

"The information of Jouhaux, according to which a working day longer than 8 hours is normal in the Soviet Union, is based deliberately on the inclusion of the rest pauses which vary from half an hour to two hours. The statistics were based on the broadest possible basis. The working day of certain categories is even from 4 to 6 hours. The 8 hour day is the normal working day in the Soviet Union and it is strictly observed.

"An unemployed worker in the Soviet Union lives rent free and receives 15 Roubles a month from the State as unemployment support and in addition to this receives about 10 Roubles from his trade union.

"The average monthly wage of a worker is 54 Roubles" (The reformists listened to this information with obvious embarrassment).

Comrade Sokolnikov on International Cartels.

In the debate upon the international cartels and syndicates, Comrade Sokolnikov presented the standpoint of the Soviet Delegation:

The international amalgamation of capital is by no means a cure-all for the existing crisis. It leads only to an immense increase of power in the hands of certain capitalist groups. It represents a fact which is characteristic for the present stage of capitalist development. Not to recognise this would be as utopian as to refuse to recognise technical improvements.

But the proposals of Jouhaux and his friends for the 'control' of these capitalist organisations, are utopian. For instance, a so-called free press is to control the cartels, whereas in reality, this press itself is under the control and protectorate of the cartels. A real control of these international capitalist organisations is only possible through a strengthening of the workers' organisations, the consolidation of the trade unions and the establishment of the trade union unity for which we have always fought.

If the workers and the small consumers band themselves together to resist the attacks of the capitalist cartels, and if the small States, the colonies, the agrarian countries and those countries with a weakly developed industry which are threatened by the cartels, join in the struggle against the latter, then it will be possible to palliate the damaging effects of the cartelisation.

The extension of the capitalist cartels and trusts will by no means, despite all statements to this effect, further social and economic peace. On the contrary, it will intensify the already existing class contradictions and can only end in the establishment of socialism.

It is also an illusion and completely false to contend that the Cartels, Trusts and Syndicates will result in a lowering of prices and an extension of production. On the contrary, the purpose of cartelisation is to maintain high prices and thus to limit production. We, on the contrary, contend that an extension of production in all branches of industry would be in the interests of humanity. And we therefore base our whole policy on this. For this reason we are opposed to all forms of cartelisation which aim at maintaining high prices and limiting production.

With regard to the relations of the Soviet Union to the already existing international cartel organisations, and those still to be formed, the Soviet Union was and still is prepared to enter into connection with them for practical purposes. But in all such connections, it will always act in accordance with its principles, that is to say it will stand for the interests of the workers, the small consumers and the exploited small countries.

A Labour Voice in Geneva.

At the World Economic Conference in Geneva, Jouhaux, after Comrade Ossinsky's speech, in all haste sent a telegraphic report throughout the world which was intended to create the impression that M. Jouhaux and his reformist co-delegates to the Geneva Conference were, in their economic demands, in no way behind the Russian delegation, but were indeed just as radical as they.

In order to give a graphic demonstration of what this statement of Jouhaux is worth, we give, side by side, in the following columns, the concrete proposals of the Soviet delegation, as they were formulated in eleven points by Comrade Ossinsky, and the demands of the Geneva declaration of the combined session of the Amsterdam Trade Union Federation and the Labour and Socialist International held on May 2nd at which, among others, Jouhaux, Renaudel, Mertens, Pugh, Hilferding, Diamand, Pohl, Emmy Freundlich, Graber, Oudegeest and Friedrich Adler were present.

The Demands of the Soviet Delegation.

1. Cancellation of all war debts, war indemnities and reparation obligations as the only means of settling the contradictions which have resulted from the war of 1914 to 1918. This cancellation would be a great step towards the restoration of world commerce.

2. An increase of the wages of all industrial workers.

3. Re-introduction of the eight hours' day and intro-

The Demands of the Reformists.

1. Prohibition of imports and exports should be removed by international conventions. Freedom from custom tariffs should be demanded for all raw materials of industrial and agrarian production and for foodstuffs. Customs duties on manufactured goods should be gradually cut down, the inter-European customs especially should be removed, as a preliminary for the restoration to health of European economics. The first

duction of six hour shifts in all mines and all occupations which involve particularly hard work or injury to health.

4. Complete freedom for the trade union organisations of the working class and unrestricted right to strike.

5. Introduction of real assistance for the unemployed, especially for the victims of "rationalisation". In order to put this assistance into effect, the taxes on property and businesses should be increased and, at the same time, all forms of unproductive expenditure on militarism, bureaucratism, articles of luxury etc. should be restricted.

6. A fight against the raising of prices in the industrial markets, caused especially by the cartels.

7. Removal of all frontiers which restrict the immigration of surplus population from one country to another.

8. Abolition of the system of protectorates and mandates, withdrawal of all troops from the colonies, recognition of the complete political and economic right of self-determination of all peoples.

9. An end should be put to military intervention in China; China should be given complete economic and political freedom in order that normal economic relations between China and the rest of the world may be re-established.

10. Cessation of every kind of economic and political boycott of the Soviet Union. Establishment of relations based on the recognition of the differences arising from the existence of two different systems:

a) The Soviet Union shall receive credits to strengthen its purchasing power.

b) Concessions will be granted to foreign capital in the Soviet Union.

c) Establishment of technical collaboration.

d) Cessation of attacks on the institutions which are organically and inseparably bound up with the socialist economic system and especially on the foreign trade monopoly.

11. Complete and actual disarmament on land, on the sea and in the air, complete abolition of standing armies. The liquidation of all institutions intended to serve military purposes shall be con-

step towards this should be the establishment of a uniform scheme of customs tariffs and an agreement regard to introducing uniformity and milder administrative regulations in the goods traffic. Further, uniform principles must be agreed upon for the general terms of commercial treaties. The principle of most favoured nations should be maintained.

The conclusion of a customs union may serve as a preparatory step towards the progressive removal of customs barriers; but the organisation of international economic co-operation will lead to their being removed in favour of a general organisation of economic solidarity, just as separate political treaties between the peoples must disappear in view of the general organisation of the League of Nations. Any encouragement of dumping should be condemned.

2. The representatives of the workers and employees regret that they cannot, at present, enter into the details concerning the problems of conditions of work either in the mandatory and concessionary districts or in the colonies, but they would draw attention to the memorandum presented to the World Economic Conference by the English working class, which contains a chapter on this question.

3. The desire to close the markets to unfair competition based on the low social position of the workers, is to be removed by improving the conditions of labour and adapting them to the international standard. For this reason, international agreements with regard to hours of work, the protection of workers, unemployment insurance etc. are urgently necessary not only from the social-political, but also from the economic-political point of view. This is why it is, above all, imperative to ratify and strictly carry through the Washington Agreement regarding hours of work and the other agreements for which the way has been prepared by the International Labour Office.

4. The representatives of the workers and employees call attention to the great danger for workers and consumers arising out of the uncontrolled international combinations of capitalist undertakings, and emphatically de-

trolled by workers' and peasants' organisations. The Soviet Union considers world peace imperatively necessary and rejects the capitalist-imperialist system which is the cause of wars.

mand effective protection of the general interests against this danger. They therefore recommend the establishment of an international bureau to carry out general investigations into such international combinations and to exercise permanent control over all international agreements and their effect on the conditions of production and markets. Control bureaux on a similar basis should at the same time be established in every individual State. The first duty of this control is to ensure adequate publicity to all agreements concluded and to the whole policy of these combines. Its second task is to interfere against a policy which is recognised as being contrary to the public weal in the domain of determining conditions of work, the fixing of prices and in the field of different markets receiving unequal treatment.

The workers are not on principle opposed to rationalisation; they can however only approve of rationalisation and of the progressive organisation of industry under certain conditions: the workers must be protected from increased physical and mental exhaustion by corresponding cutting down of their hours of work; the result of rationalisation must benefit the workers and consumers in the form of better wages and cheaper prices; unemployment arising from rationalisation must be combated.

5. As means of increasing agricultural productivity, the following come chiefly into consideration: Promotion of technique and credit, increase in the sale of agricultural products, particularly through co-operation between the agricultural co-operatives and the co-operative stores, better international division of labour.

A comparison of the two sets of demands as set out in parallel columns above shows beyond all doubt that the demands of the delegation of the Soviet Union are workers' demands, which are dictated by the requirements of all countries and give short and precise expression to these requirements, while the Amsterdamites, in their pompous and bombastic conglomeration, voice all the commonplaces of the economic and financial columns of the Liberal daily papers, in addition to pleading for a few crumbs for the workers. The demands of the delegation of the Soviet Union proceed from the standpoint of the building up of a socialist system of economy, whilst the demands of the reformists are directed towards the consolidation of the capitalist system of economy.

That Jouhaux, Hilferding, Friedrich Adler and Co. in their platform have not even mentioned the Soviet Union and China, is quite in keeping with their whole programme.

CHINA

Under the Flags of the Revolution.

(A Military Survey.)

By A. Platánov (Moscow).

The latest telegrams, which were greatly delayed, bring news of successes by the revolutionary army of the national government of Wuhan in the province of Honan. One can safely assume, therefore, that the Northern expedition against Peking, which was held up for a time owing to the treachery of Chiang Kai-Shek, is again being undertaken by the revolutionary government of China.

This circumstance serves as a means of judging the relation of the political and military forces at the seat of war in China. The fact of the complete bankruptcy of the idea of the dictatorship of the reactionary bourgeoisie, which was promoted by Chiang Kai-Shek, and the collapse of the armed forces in the camp of the counter-revolution which has become clearly evident, sufficed to enable the government to undertake further operations against the militarists of North China.

A whole number of reports which have arrived in Shanghai since the recent treachery of Chiang Kai-Shek prove beyond doubt the lack of any solid foundation to and the adventurous character of the coup carried out by the Right wing of the Kuomintang. The British press at first endeavoured to create the impression that the counter-revolutionary upheaval had involved a whole number of provinces, such as Chekiang, Fukien and Kwantung.

The three weeks which have elapsed since the shootings in Shanghai were sufficient in order to refute by the facts themselves the phantastic inventions of the West European bourgeoisie. As a matter of fact it became evident that the military puppets of Chiang-Kai-Shek succeeded only with the greatest efforts in retaining in their hands the most important administrative positions in those provinces which, it was alleged, recognised the reactionary coup. The whole of the remaining territory of Chekiang, Fukien and Kwantung is in the grip of an elementary insurrectionary movement of the peasantry.

In this way the dictatorship lacked the support of the great mass of people which could serve as a sure foundation for increasing the army to that numerical strength which Chiang Kai-Shek needs in order to secure the front against the militarists of North China on the Yangtse and at the same time to fight against the Wuhan government.

Things are no less hopeless with those fighting forces which are already under arms and which are to serve as a support of Chiang Kai-Shek both at the front and the rear of the front. Since Chiang Kai-Shek became a typical Chinese militarist, his army has been subject to an inexorable process of disintegration and decay. The broad masses of the soldiers immediately expressed their true political sympathies, and compelled the dictator to introduce the disarming of the unreliable portion of the army as a regular feature of the administration of the army.

It suffices to point out that within a short period Chiang Kai-Shek has in this manner liquidated three divisions of the sixth army corps near Nanking, not to mention the disarming of small military units in Chekiang, Wuhu and even in the centre of the counter-revolution and intervention in Shanghai.

These are the characteristic features of the general condition of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie of South China. It is perfectly obvious that with such a situation in the vicinity of the central provinces which are in the hands of the revolutionary government, the supreme command of the Wuhan government is in a position to send relatively small fighting forces against Chiang Kai-Shek and to concentrate its chief attention upon the expedition against Peking.

This offensive against the North of Sinjang is not only secured by the relations of forces in the South of the Yangtse, but also by those strategic possibilities which are opening up in the province of Honan. The people's army of Feng-Yu-Hsiang at present dominates the district of Shangchow and two provinces, Shensi and Sujujan. The position of the troops of Chang Tso-Lin which are in Honan and Chili is such as to permit the Wuchang army to advance quickly against Tchengchow and, with the support of the attack of Feng Yu-Hsiang from Baotau on Kalgan-Peking, to force the Mukden troops out of North China into Manchuria. Such an operation will be all the more

certain if further events confirm the rumours regarding the going over of the province of Shensi with an army of 80,000 men to the side of the national government.

As regards the role of Chaing Kai-Shek in the next period of the successes of the Wuchang army, the solution of this question will finally depend upon whether the treacherous general will be supported by an open, armed intervention of the imperialist Powers. As, however, the antagonisms between Great Britain, Japan and the United States are too great, and as the interference of foreigners in the inner affairs of China would lead to regular military actions against the Wuhan government, the existence of the dictatorship in South China will probably be destroyed from within under the influence of the centrifugal forces of the disintegrating counter-revolution and under the elementary pressure of the insurgent masses of the people of the coastal provinces of China.

THE BALKANS

The Political Development in Yugoslavia.

By N. Dragatchevatz (Belgrade).

On April 17, 1927, the government of Usanovitch, which consisted of representatives of the Pan-Serbian radical Party and of the autonomist Slovenish Clerical Party Korosec, resigned. Its place was taken by a government of the Radicals and Democrats under the leadership of the Radical Welya Vukitchevitch and with the Democrat Woja Marinkovitch as Foreign Minister. The new allies of the Radicals in the government, the Democratic Party, which along with the Bosnian Mohammedans is described as the "Parliamentary Democratic Union", form after the Radicals, the strongest Party in Parliament and likewise have a purely Serbian character.

The new government of Vukitchevitch means the continuation of the policy of Usanovitch. Both the head of the present and also the head of the former government belong to the so-called Centre of the Radical Party, i. e. to its Pan-Serbian Right wing, which represents big capital and is allied with the court and the militarists.

What are the characteristics of the Cabinet of Usanovitch?

While Pasic sought to concentrate all power in the hands of the Pan-Serbian bourgeoisie and would not share it with the court and the militarists, the court and the military circles had pushed forward Usanovitch as their spokesman and as the representative of that tendency of the Pan-Serbian bourgeoisie which is ready to share power with the court and with the militarists, and in fact would be content with the smaller share of the power. The aim of the court and of the militarists was to split the strongest bourgeois party, the Radical Party, and at the same time to compromise the other parties which bear a national character by drawing them into the government in accordance with the Pan-Serbian centralist Vidovdan Constitution, and in this way to convert them into allies of the monarchy.

With every new government combination the court circles grew in importance, and Parliament was more pushed on one side. The new government was formed directly by the court without any consultation with the Parliamentary fractions. Both according to its composition as well according to its plans and aims, the new government shows that it is a government of the transition to the open dictatorship of this governing group, which is throwing aside the last semblance of democratic parliamentary regime.

The necessary preparation had already been made by the late Cabinet of Usanovitch. Upon the express demand of the court, generals were given the posts of Ministers for War and Minister for Transport. In addition, a creature of the court received the position of Minister for Finance. The budget was passed by means of promises to the strongest oppositional Parties that they would be taken into the government; and in this way the necessary "Parliamentary form" of State administration was kept up. But everyone knew that, in addition to the budget, a finance law was decided on which constitutionally conferred on the government full powers, and for this purpose there was set up a so-called "State Committee" consisting of 22 persons, of whom three quarters belonged to the govern-

ment parties. In place of Parliament this Committee will have full powers to carry out "economic and restoration measures".

According to this "financial law" the Minister for Finance receives full powers to introduce, by means of decrees, every kind of tax and duties; to solve the question of the funding of the State debts, and in addition to take measures with regard to the reorganising of the Ministry for Finance, the reform of the law regarding State officials, the reorganising of the army etc.

What prospects confront the working population of Yugoslavia? This becomes clear if one only bears in mind the economic position of the country and the obvious intentions of the regime.

The economic crisis has already assumed sharp forms. The disparity between the prices of agricultural and industrial products amounts to 50%. As a result the purchasing power of the peasant masses is reduced to a minimum. To what extent the paying capacity of the working masses is exhausted is shown by the deficit in the taxes in the last half year, which is expressed in the budget by the lack of at least a milliard Dinars. The trade balance, which in the past year was balanced in a most irrational and, for agriculture, disastrous manner, shows already in the first month of this year an unfavourable balance of 13%.

The government was not in a position to grant even a single Dinar for the promotion of agriculture and industry. The construction of railways ceased altogether. For the improvement of the roads, which are in a terrible state of disrepair, the government had only the trifling sum of 500 million in the form of an internal loan. The budget could not disguise the unhealthy proportion between the expenditure for salaries for Ministers and officials and the expenditure for other purposes, which stood at 60% and 40% respectively. The ruling clique, however, secures in the budget the interests of the capitalists by raising 80% of the revenue by indirect taxes and monopolies which are paid by the poor masses of consumers.

The new government does not think of governing with the aid of Parliament. In defiance of the Constitution it has postponed Parliament to the 1st of August; if by this time it is not in a position to create an obedient majority in Parliament, it will resort sooner or later to new elections.

The results of this policy are clear: Speedy introduction of a dictatorship; conversion of the country into an instrument of the imperialist policy of the Great Powers.

The only means by which the working masses of the people can be saved from their fate is to form a workers' and peasants' bloc with the collaboration of the national revolutionary organisations. The workers and peasants' bloc must, in this situation, more than ever emphasise its Republican character, and energetically raise the slogan of the "Federation of the workers' and peasants' Republics in the Balkans".

THE WHITE TERROR

The Trial of Stefanov and Comrades.

On the 13th of May there commenced in Bucharest the trial, which had already been postponed four times, of the Communist member of Parliament, Boris Stefanov and of Zaharescu, Lisa Dijour, Iliescu and Lascio. They are all accused of propagating Communist ideas.

The accusation is directed especially against Stefanov, a leader of the revolutionary masses of the whole country, a member of Parliament representing the peasantry of the Dobruđja.

Boris Stefanov is charged in the indictment, together with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Roumania, with having created an atmosphere of constant nervousness and excitement, by — just imagine! — an agrarian programme published in the year 1924, which called for the confiscation of the whole of the land in the possession of the big landowners and its distribution among the peasants.

The military prosecutor, Major Cotineano, a well-known bloodhound of Avarescu, demands life-long imprisonment for Stefanov and 5—20 years imprisonment for the other accused.

The accused are being defended by the President of the Roumanian League for Human Rights, C. G. Costa-Foru and the peasant member of Parliament Joanicescu.

More than 300 witnesses have been summoned to give evidence at the trial. The overwhelming majority of them are agents of the police and *siguranza*.

The Defence have a great number of witnesses, including political prisoners from 29 penal institutions, the participators in the Roumanian and Bessarabian peasants revolts, the leaders of the general strike of 1921 and also Ministers in the Avarescu Cabinet.

The Roumanian government is afraid of this trial, and it has every reason to be, for it knows that nothing very agreeable will be said about it during the proceedings. No cards of admission to the proceedings have been given out; and the representatives of the press were summoned before the Minister of the Interior who informed them that they would be severely punished if they published in the newspapers anything more than the official reports. The entire quarter of the town in which the military court is situated is guarded by a strong force of police.

The Trial again Postponed.

According to a telegram from Bucharest dated 17th of May, the trial of Stefanov and Comrades has again been postponed indefinitely.

RESCUE SACCO AND VANZETTI

The Protest Action on Behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti must be Continued.

The day on which Sacco and Vanzetti are to be executed by the electric chair is drawing nearer. Governor Fuller has not yet moved a finger in order to annul the shameful sentence.

In the meantime, a storm of protest is sweeping over every country. Not only the workers, but also broad sections of intellectuals, scholars, scientists and artists are day after day sending radio telegrams to Coolidge and Fuller in order to hold back the wheel of bloody class justice in the United States.

In Belgium and France and in other countries Defence Committees for Sacco and Vanzetti are being formed which are organising protest actions. Numerous organisations, not only of the Communist Party, but also of the Social democracy and the trade unions, forced by the pressure of the masses, have joined the movement for saving Sacco and Vanzetti.

In Paris, Brussels, Prague, London, Vienna, Stockholm and Oslo huge meetings have been held, the resolutions passed by which have been dispatched to the United States. From the factories demands are pouring in to the Embassies and Consulates of the United States in order to make it clear to them that the international working class will not permit the blood-thirsty Yankées to murder Sacco and Vanzetti.

In the meantime there has been made public the petition which Vanzetti has addressed to governor Fuller of Massachusetts asking for an open investigation of the whole proceedings against himself and his comrade Sacco. Although Vanzetti does not by a single word convey the idea that it is a question of a request for pardon or that he would in the slightest way abandon his convictions, Sacco has refused to sign the petition. Sacco, after seven years of torment, of the most brutal and open violation of right, has lost all hope of "justice" and has declared that he must refuse to sign any writing which is addressed not to the people but to the judicial authorities. The Defence thereupon handed over the petition to the governor without Sacco's signature. In the long statement Vanzetti writes, among other things:

"We are asking not for mercy but for justice, and this is the reason why we have not used the printed form provided for petitions of this nature. It contains the word 'pardon', which we are unwilling to use, although our counsel has assured us that it does not necessarily mean forgiveness or convey the idea of a confession of guilt. But we wish the utmost possible clearness and precision on this point and are unwilling to risk being misunderstood."

"The only guilt we were conscious of was the guilt of being radicals in danger of arrest, detention and torture, or death, as had happened to our friend Salsedo, and other friends at the hands of Mitchell Palmer's agents."

"Gov. Alvan T. Fuller, we have been in prison seven years, charged with a crime we did not commit, awaiting the fate that every day came nearer and nearer. Perhaps you can imagine what this has meant to us. And do you realise what this has meant to Sacco's wife and children, and to Vanzetti's father and mother and family at home in Italy? And yet we ask you not for mercy but for justice."

The storm of protest on the part of the international proletariat must be continued. Sacco and Vanzetti must be saved.

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

The Future War and the Working Class.

By D. Marezky (Moscow).

I. The Augmentation of Armaments and the Development of War Technics.

The imperialists are consciously heading for a new war. The finale of the first imperialist war was Versailles. But real peace was not concluded at Versailles nor could it have been, for the sole reason that from the hour of its birth it was only a new armed "peace". The feverish arming after the war is taking place quite openly; it is quite plain that militarism is more powerful at the present time than it was in pre-war days, and still there are pacifist fools and idiots who prate about disarmament and strive to see in the present reality tendencies towards peace on a bourgeois basis.

It might be well to mention a few facts and figures to illustrate how the imperialists are preparing the war and what kind of war it is they are leading us into.

The official military budgets in the most important States (France, Great Britain, Italy, Germany, the United States of North America, Japan) amounted in the year 1913 to 1400 million dollars; in the year 1926 they amounted to 2140.5 million dollars, an increase of nearly 70 per cent. The respective figures for the individual countries are as follows: France (1913) 349 and (1926) 310.8; Great Britain 430 and 605; Italy 80.9 and 192.5; Germany 345.8 and 163; United States 133.1 and 659.6; Japan 60 and 209.1. The changed relations of one budget to another show an interesting feature: the economic hegemony of the United States in the world has brought with it the military hegemony.

The present footing of the land forces is far in excess of pre-war dimensions. According to the data gathered by Comrade Woroschilov for the Fourth Soviet Congress of the Soviet Union, the land forces of the four world powers (England, France, Italy and the United States of North America) total at the present time 1,821,000 against 1,413,000 men in 1913.

From year to year the naval forces of the imperialist States are also growing. The Washington agreement of 1922 by no means put an end to, nor even "curtailed", but only regulated, the construction of dreadnoughts. In addition, the agreement applied merely to battleships and aircraft carriers. The construction of cruisers, destroyers and submarines was not limited and has, in fact, developed greatly since 1922. The present tonnage of the battleships of the United States of North America aggregates 525,850 tons, of Great Britain 580,450; Japan 301,320; France 194,554; Italy 133,670.

As far as the building of aircraft carriers is concerned, it must be stated that Washington "curtailed" their construction in such a manner that the Powers will have to "work" very hard in order to reach the "norm" prescribed. The United States of North America has built 12,700 tons of aircraft carriers, while it is Washington's "task" to bring this tonnage up to 135,000; England has 67,290 tons, and according to Washington it should have 135,000; Japan has 9,500, while the agreement provides for an increase up to 81,000 tons; so far France

and Italy do not possess any aircraft carriers; according to the Washington agreement they together may build 120,000 tons¹⁾.

Ships of other types (submarines and others) are also being built at a similar tremendous pace, so that according to the existing programme for the decade 1922 to 1932 their strength will be increased in the case of the leading naval Powers by several dozen per cent., and in the case of the backward powers by hundreds per cent.

The rate of increase in the air fleets is far and away greater than that of the navies. This is due to the progress made in aviation, to the circumstance that within the last few years the mass-production of aeroplanes has commenced and also to the attention which has been devoted to aviation by the "military science of the future". Just the few countries bordering on the Soviet Union — Finland, Esthonia, Poland, Roumania, Latvia and Lithuania — have four times as many warplanes as there were in the whole world in 1913. The total airfleet of the four most important countries has been strengthened more than 20-fold since 1913. (150 units and 3550 units). Even in the last three years, 1923 to 1926, the numerical strength of the airfleet has been more than doubled²⁾.

An extended and previously unknown employment of aviation will be combined in the war of the future with an appalling use of chemicals. A gas attack from the air, the dropping of deadly gases from aeroplanes — as far as possible unexpected (at night), and preferably in the industrial districts behind the enemy's front and in the largest quantities — will doubtlessly constitute the most horrible surprise of the imperialist war which is in course of preparation.

It would be too exaggerated and fantastic to assume that the war of the future will be exclusively a gas war and that infantry and artillery will be abolished by the military science of the future. It is not for nothing that the imperialists are creating these tremendous land forces; it is not for nothing that they are doing everything to perfect long-range artillery with the utmost power of destruction. But still there can be no doubt that the tendency of modern science of war is to make the war of the future a gas war. It is quite possible that in the war of the future the same leading roll will be given to gas-attack aeroplanes as was played by artillery in the 1914/18 war.

The experiences of the world war have already indicated this. The mass-production of gases began only towards the end of the war; and it is a significant fact that the United States, for instance, which entered the war later than the other belligerents, lost more than 70,000 of its total of dead and wounded (271,000) through gas poisoning. Altogether, more than half a million people were poisoned with gas during the last war³⁾.

The intensity and extent of the use of gas in the next world-war will unquestionably be much greater. It suffices to say that the United States is already in a position to produce in one day 3000 tons of Yprit ("Gold Cross"), which in its poisonous and caustic effects was the most terrible of all the gases used in the war of 1914 to 1918. The ordinary gasmask is useless against Yprit, as also against Levisite, which possesses the terrible properties of Yprit but in a more pronounced degree. Diving-suits might possibly serve as protection against gases of this kind, and consideration is being given to the issuing of diving-suits for artillerymen during the next world slaughter. Such protection is, however, unsuitable inasmuch as it would greatly hamper the mobility of the troops and diminish their fighting capacity.

The preparations for the gas-war are being made for the greater part in secret by the imperialists. But they are nevertheless being carried on incessantly, feverishly and persistently. It is true that several resolutions concerning the inadmissibility of the production of poison gases and their use in future warfare have been adopted, but it is obvious that these resolutions are absolutely worthless while the fate of the nations lies in the hands of the imperialists. The voice of profits is heard much more clearly by the imperialists than the piteous entreaties of the pacifist saints. Marx used to say that there was

¹⁾ The data are taken from a collective work concerning the "Tendencies in the Construction of the Armies" in foreign countries, published under the general editorship of Shigur.

²⁾ See Paul Kéri's article in "Der Kampf", Vienna, October 1926.

³⁾ See the American monthly "Foreign Affairs" of April 1927, pages 425 to 426.

no crime to which a capitalist would not resort, even at the risk of his neck, if tempted by high profits. For what reason, therefore, should the imperialists feel compunction when their criminally prepared war threatens to become the scaffold of the nations?

(To be continued.)

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Decision of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. with regard to the Attitude of Comrade Zinoviev.

Moscow, 12th May 1927.

The decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with regard to the speech of Comrade Zinoviev on the 9th May in a non-Party meeting devoted to the press day and the 15th anniversary of the foundation of the "Pravda", has just been published:

"In his speech Comrade Zinoviev attacked the Central Committee of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R., its decisions and the "Pravda". The C. C. of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. regards the attitude of Comrade Zinoviev as a violation of all the undertakings of the opposition, including Comrade Zinoviev, as impermissible and intolerable in the ranks of the Bolsheviks. The C. C. has therefore decided to hand the matter over to the Central Control Commission for examination."

The Moscow and Leningrad Committees of the C. P. S. U. on the Speech of Comrade Zinoviev.

Moscow, 12th May 1927.

The resolutions adopted by the Moscow and Leningrad Committees of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. with regard to the speech of Comrade Zinoviev declare that the attitude of Comrade Zinoviev makes for disorganisation and is calculated to undermine the confidence of the proletarian masses in the C. C. of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. and in the editorial board of the "Pravda". Comrade Zinoviev who, declare the resolutions, speaks of the necessity for the maintenance of unity in the ranks of the Party, is actually undermining this unity. His action is a step towards the commencement of a new struggle of the oppositional block against the Party in the most impermissible forms. To place questions concerning internal Party differences before non-Party workers is an attempt to obtain the support of the non-Party workers for the bankrupt oppositional block inside the Party. This is a step towards separation from the Party.

The resolutions demand that Comrade Zinoviev be punished for this breach of Party discipline, particularly as he is not merely a Party member, but also a member of the Central Committee of the Party.

The Party conference of the Moscow Garrison which is at present sitting has also adopted a resolution demanding that the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission put an end to these breaches of discipline on the part of bankrupt leaders of the opposition.

Speculating on Difficulties.

(Leading Article of the "Pravda" of May 14, 1927.)

On May 9th, Comrade Zinoviev, at a meeting devoted to the Press Day and the 15 years existence of the "Pravda", undertook a fractional attack on the Party. Comrade Zinoviev came forward with the modest claim to "correct the faults" of the central organ, of the Central Committee, of the entire Bolshevik Party and at the same time of the whole Leninist International. The "world historical" trick of Comrade Zinoviev consists in making use of the festival day of the "Pravda", in order, in passing, to bring International Communism "on to the path of truth".

It must be clear to the whole Party what the action of Comrade Zinoviev means. This action is unworthy of a member of the Party, and all the more of a member of the Central Committee, and is not only directed against the Leninist staff but against the whole Party. This is a monstrous appeal, unexampled in the history of the C. P. S. U., to the non-Party workers against the Party, which appeal, by the way, aroused the indignation of the entire meeting. This is an attempt by means of a "trick" to arouse a discussion, a Party discussion at a non-Party meeting. This is a fresh deception of the Party, a downright violation of the pledges undertaken with regard to the Party on the 16th October 1926. It is impossible to justify such an anti-Party proceeding. The Central Control Commission of the C. P. S. U. must examine the matter with bolshevist strictness.

The Party must warn the knights of the order of bankrupt "leaders" not to demand too much attention for themselves, which is by no means in accordance with the real importance of the Opposition within the ranks of the Party. The Party, which is burdened with tremendous tasks, cannot allow itself the luxury of endless polemics with the chaff of the Opposition Bloc. The misunderstood prophets and the unbidden "advisers" who have been condemned by Party Conferences, who have played within the proletariat with craft prejudices, who have juggled with "milliards", who fraternise with Ruth Fischer and Ossovsky, who change their "principles" like a shirt, the oppositional ploughers of lonely furrows have the audacity from time to time to knock at the door of Party history, although history every year more plainly passes them by. The political strength of the Opposition of the Party is now the "strength of a gnat"; this is what the oppositional comrades who live in a world of dreams and illusions will not realise.

The Party perceives quite clearly on what the present opposition is staking its cards, what game it is playing. The Opposition, which wishes to be the mouthpiece of the discontented elements in the country, is systematically speculating on the difficulties which are unavoidable with that tremendous work in which the C. P. S. U. and the Communist International are now engaged.

Speculation on the difficulties of the building up of socialism is one of the infamous ways which the oppositional "leaders of armies" without armies are endeavouring to follow. The kulak, the nepman and international capital will prevent the building up of socialism in one country; that is how the Opposition tried to frighten the Party. Our growth and the developing advance of socialism along the whole front have overthrown the house of cards of the luckless prophets. The successes of socialist economy have provided the deep-reaching foundation upon which the Leninist Party has succeeded in putting an end so quickly and easily to the liquidatory deviations.

Now we have entered on a new phase of development and inevitably encounter the difficulties of the new epoch. The main difficulties are the rationalisation of our whole work, without which it is impossible to build up economy, and the price policy. The Opposition, which in the question of prices has provided itself "in secret" with new weapons, which is playing with the "scissors" between the prices of industrial and agricultural products, which is playing a game with the interests of the peasantry, is now striving for new political gains. But we are advancing with a plus for socialism, and the Opposition will not succeed in drowning the fighting spirit of the builders of socialism in the black waves of scepticism and doubt.

Speculation on the difficulties of the international revolution in the present period, on the difficulties of the fight in revolutionary China is another sphere of work of the Opposition.

All members of the Opposition — one can easily count them on one's fingers — have suddenly become expert "authorities on China". Therefore they think they can indicate to the great Chinese Revolution, from Moscow, with the Opposition staff, the unalterable line of march. Without principle, vacillating from one extreme to the other — today the philosophy of "nothing is easier than this!" and tomorrow "all is lost!" — such is their estimation of the Chinese events. All the failures and temporary defeats, the difficulties and betrayals, the windings and zigzag paths of the magnificent struggle for freedom are ascribed by the Opposition to the leadership of the Comintern, the discrediting of which they openly make their

main slogan. But here also the Opposition fall short. The difficulties of the Chinese revolution are great, but its forces are mighty also; the mass movement has made a tremendous advance. A new page of world history has been turned; the Chinese Revolution is marching forward, and nobody will succeed in making capital out of its difficulties.

Speculation upon the difficulties of the international situation is in no way a point of attack of the emasculated forces of the Opposition. Here the attitude of the Opposition is particularly unprincipled and hypocritical. The Black Hundreds of the whole world are inciting against the Soviet Union. The bourgeoisie are provoking war with the bloody claws of Chang Tso-Lin. The entire international situation is strained. And now the Opposition jumps up, and in face of the serious international situation and the danger of war gives such "recipes": The situation is difficult, let us therefore shake the discipline of the Bolshevik Party! It is difficult, let us therefore start a great discussion! It is difficult, let us commence again the oppositional waltz and let us discredit the leadership of the C. P. S. U. and of the Communist International! Is not such an attitude shameful? Is it worthy of those who claim to be Bolsheviks?

The Party once again proposes to Comrade Zinoviev and others who are estranging themselves from Leninism, that they review their "tactics". The whole Party, like one man, again calls the Opposition to order. **Enough of juggling!** Behave more decently! Do not hinder the Party in its work! Do not provoke the Bolshevik workers! The speculation on difficulties will be brought to nought!

THE CHILDREN'S MOVEMENT

The International Children's Week.

May, 15—22, 1927.

To the Workers' Children of all Countries!

The VII. International Children's Week is approaching.

During this week every worker's child should be thinking about his own life and about the lives of his brothers in other countries.

During the year which has passed since last International Children's week, much suffering and unhappiness has been the lot of the workers' children in the capitalist countries.

The proletarian children of England went through unprecedented hardships during the miners' strike; the children of Germany suffered deeply as a result of capitalist rationalisation and unemployment; the French, Czecho-Slovakian and Polish children have been accustomed from early years to drilling for the army, in order to defend the welfare of the capitalists; and words fail to express the unfortunate position of the workers' and peasants' children in Fascist Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary and Roumania.

In all countries, the bourgeoisie is intensifying military and religious training, in order to use the young workers as cannon fodder in wars of plunder.

But the worst experience has fallen to the lot of the Chinese children.

Far away in China, where the people are fighting hard for freedom, in the streets of proletarian Shanghai, Nanking, Peking, Canton, and other towns and villages of this densely populated country — how many children have fallen victims to the bullets and shells of the hired army of the reactionary Chinese generals and foreign imperialists!

How many thousands of children have perished in the factories and rice-fields of China from hunger and from the intensified exploitation of the English, American, Japanese and French capitalists!

Nowhere have these sacrifices been reported. The rich people and oppressors of all countries keep silent about them.

But the workers' children of the whole world must know about them, they must never forget them!

In only one country of the world — in Workers' Russia — does the position of children improve from day to day. There new schools and hospitals are opening; children's clubs and creches are being built; children's playgrounds are opened; and apprentice workshops, cinematographs, and theatres are being introduced into the daily life of the waifs and strays. With cheerful steps the two-million army of Young Leninist Pioneers

march forward. Following their example, too, children's Communist organisations are being formed in 22 countries of the world, which support the grown-up workers in their struggle against exploitation.

But, comrades, a great danger is threatening revolutionary China and proletarian Russia. The rich people of all countries, and particularly of conservative England, are preparing for war against the Soviet Union and have already begun war on China!

Workers' children and Young Comrades — this means that your brothers and fathers will be mobilised and sent to death!

War means hunger again, tattered clothes and boots, no fires at home and terrible hard work.

Think about this!

In all the countries of the world, you Young Comrades must carry on a campaign in the schools, the streets, at home and in your children's organisations against this war of plunder; you must work together to help the children of revolutionary China.

At the same time you must not forget to put forward your demands for better conditions of life, against corporal punishment in schools, for the struggle against the Fascists and bourgeois children's organisations.

Remember that the children's Communist units under the leadership of the Young Communist League and the Communist Party are defending your interests in every country of the world.

Join their ranks under the red flag of the proletarian struggle!

Down with the war against revolutionary China and proletarian Russia!

Children of England and Young Pioneers of the Soviet Union, unite!

Improve the conditions of the workers and children in town and village!

Down with corporal punishment and reaction in the schools!

Down with military education among children!

Long live the VII. International Children's Week — the Week of Solidarity and Struggle of the Workers' Children!

In the struggle for the Workers' Cause, be ready!

International Children's Bureau.

Executive of the Y. C. I.

Moscow, 5. V. 27.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Farmers' and Peasants' International Correspondent.

By J. G.

The process of organising the working peasants on a national and an international scale, which has been accelerated by the results of the world war, is making considerable progress.

Evidence of this progress is furnished by the appearance of the "Farmers' and Peasants' International Correspondent*).

Of this journal of the working peasants the first four numbers (January, February, March and April, 1927), are to hand. In the first number the Editorial Board sets forth the aims and objects of the paper. The chief aim is announced to be, "to defend the real interests and to conduct a struggle for the complete emancipation of the working farmers and peasants". Attention is called to the processes which have developed within the peasantry, and to the necessity of organising the working peasants on a national and international scale, with the final aim of establishing workers' and peasants' governments. The Farmers' and Peasants' International, it is stated, will make a speciality of informing its readers about the activities of farmer and peasant organisations in other countries, and in addition will publish activities of organisations and parties which are hostile to the farmers' movement in general and will point out

*) The Farmers' and Peasants' International Correspondent. Verlag "Neues Dorf", Berlin W. 10. Lützow-Ufer 1. Annual Subscription one dollar, single numbers 10 cents.

the mistakes of farmer and peasant organisations and their leaders in order that the former may be properly resisted and the latter corrected in good time by the wide farming masses.

The various articles contained in the first four issues, and in particular the many-sided chronicle of events relating to the peasantry and the peasant movement in all parts of the world, are evidence that the Correspondent is well calculated to fulfil its aims. It would require too much space even to enumerate all the noteworthy articles by national and international organisers and experts. Suffice it to say that this Correspondent is really world-embracing, and publishes valuable material from a number of capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries as well as from the Soviet Union. At the same time equal attention is given to the questions of the Peasant International (Krest-intern) and the International Agrarian Institute in Moscow as to the questions of the Co-operatives, Agricultural Credits, the position and the organisation of the peasant women and other important questions. A considerable portion of space is of course devoted to the questions of China and of the Far and Middle East; but at the same time other parts of the world and other races receive due consideration.

TEN YEARS AGO

The Miljukov Government Tottering

Rotterdam, May 15. According to the "Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant", the "Manchester Guardian" reports from Petrograd: The socialist parties are inclined to participate in the government, but they first demand that the cabinet be purged of elements which do not agree with the democracy regarding the war aims. Thus the question of Miljukov remaining as Minister for Foreign Affairs is placed on the agenda. The democracy has nothing against Miljukov remaining in the Cabinet, but wishes to give him the position of Minister for Education.

* * *

Petrograd, May 16. (Report of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The conditions under which representatives of the Socialist Party would be prepared to enter the bourgeois government, contain, according to the decision of the Executive Committee of the Workers and Soldiers Council, besides its programme of foreign policy, the following principles:

Decisive measures in order to democratise the army and to strengthen the military power at the front for the defence of Russian freedom. In addition there are a number of social, economic and financial reforms. The Executive Committee will form a special committee, which will be entrusted with the task of negotiating with the Provisional Government.

* * *

The Decree of the Provisional Government regarding the Factory Councils.

Petrograd, May 6. The Provisional Government confirms the "decree regarding the factory committees in the industrial undertakings". Factory committees are to be set up in private as well in State undertakings of every kind (in factories, mines etc.). They can be united in a head committee. The committees consist of members who are to be elected by the workers in the undertaking on the basis of general, direct and secret vote, excluding neither women nor young workers. The members of the committees can be dismissed by the management of the undertaking only with the consent of the arbitration commission. The sphere of activity of the factory committees include: 1. to represent the workers before the management of the undertaking in questions of the relations between the employers and employed (wages, working hours etc.); 2. the settlement of questions of the mutual relations of the workers in the undertaking to one another; 3. to represent the workers before authorities; 4. to care for the cultural and enlightenment work among the workers, and other measures serving to improve the condition of the workers.

Resignation of Gutchkov, the War Minister.

Petrograd, May 14th. (Reuter telegram.) Gutchkov, the War Minister, has resigned.

* * *

Petrograd, May 14th. (Report from the Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) At the meeting of the representatives of the front, Gutchkov, the War Minister, announced his resignation and read the following:

In view of the circumstances in which the power of the government, especially the official power of the Admiralty is placed as regards the army and navy, circumstances which I cannot alter and which threaten to have fatal consequences for the defence of the freedom and even of the very existence of Russia, I can no longer exercise the office of a Minister for Army and Navy nor share the responsibility for the serious mistakes which have been committed against our country.

Miljukov also Retires.

Petrograd, May 16th. (Report of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) In the night session, Miljukov, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, communicated to the Provisional Government his final decision to retire from the Cabinet. The reason for his resignation is the difference of opinion between Miljukov and the Provisional Government with regard to the question of the reconstruction of the Cabinet.

The Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet in Favour of Peace.

Berne, May 14th. According to the Petrograd correspondent of the "Stampa", the Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates will send committees of its members to the various countries in order to prepare for the international peace conference, which it intends to call, of all the socialist parties, both majorities and minorities, in the belligerent and neutral countries. At the same time, a commission in Stockholm is to make preparations for the peace conference itself.

The Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet in Favour of Joining the Government.

Petrograd, May 16th. (Report of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) At its meeting on May 14th, the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet, by 41 votes to 19, one abstaining from voting, pronounced itself in favour of the socialist parties taking a representative share in the Provisional Government.

The Reconstruction of the Government.

Kerensky, Minister for Army and Navy.

Petrograd, May 16th. (Report of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) The members of the Provisional Government discussed the question as to whether the management of foreign affairs should be taken over by the Prime Minister; Prince Lwow, however, expressly declined it, saying that he did not consider himself qualified for the post, that he preferred to remain Minister for Home Affairs. Thereupon the majority of the members of the Government declared that it would be best to transfer foreign affairs to Terechshenkov, the Finance Minister. Kerenski, the Minister of Justice, was appointed Minister for Army and Navy.

The Reactionary generals against the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet.

Petrograd, May 13th. (Report of Reuter.) General Kornilov gives as the reason for his resignation that some organisations claim to control the garrison and that the representatives of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. (Delo Naroda of May 4th should be submitted to the Soviet for confirmation.

Berne, May 14th. According to a report received by the "Stampa" from Paris, General Russki was removed from the chief command on the demand of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet, because Russki had proposed to the Provisional Government that, in its defence, troops should be marched to Petrograd.

The S. R. in Favour of the Coalition Government.

Petrograd, May 16th. A general meeting of members of the party organisations of the Social Revolutionaries was held in Petrograd; it pronounced itself in favour of members of the party joining the Provisional Government; the voting was 172 for, and 37 against the resolution, five persons abstaining from voting. The minority brought in a resolution of its own, stating that the only issue from the present critical situation was the creation of revolutionary power in the form of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. (Delo Naroda of May 4th (17th) 1917 (No. 40).

Fraternisation on the Russian Front.

Letter to "Pravda".

("Pravda" of May 17th, 1917.) Soldiers and officers of divisions of troops from the trenches often come to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Deputies from the garrison in Suczava and report as follows with regard to "fraternisation":

At Easter time, whole regiments in full force "visited" one another, sometimes ours going to the Austrian regiments, sometimes theirs coming to us — sometimes even accompanied by the band; there were also small feasts, not in the form of drinking-bouts but in the form of "treating". After Easter, the fraternisation took the form of meetings which were held on neutral territory between the two rows of trenches. Among other things, the enemies agreed not to fire on one another and not to occupy any other positions. When, by order of the Commander in Chief, an Austrian regiment of Lancers was to be moved, it refused to carry out the order and remained in its position. It is also rumoured that the Austrians do not get on very well with the Germans.

Lieutenant Ossmov.

Kerensky will not allow Fraternisation at the Front.

Moscow, May 15th. According to the "Daily News", Tcheidse presided at a meeting of the Moscow Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet, which pronounced itself, for the time being, opposed to the formation of a coalition Cabinet, and at which Kerenski warned the troops against fraternisation on the Eastern front when serious fighting was going on in the West. He said: "We are on the way to peace. I should not be a member of the Provisional Government, were it not the aim of the whole government to carry out the will of the people that an end should be put to the war. This aim can be achieved in various ways."

The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

Strike of Munition Workers in England.

Berne, May 9. It appears from an interpellation in the English House of Commons that 30,000 workers in the munition works in South Lancashire have downed tools, following on disputes between the management of a munition factory and 500 striking workers, which had been disregarded for six weeks by the munitions arbitration court.

The First of May 1917 in France.

Paris, Beginning of May. The Russian Revolution is having a big effect in France, and for several weeks past has been in the forefront of general interest.

On May 1, 1917, The "Committee for the Resumption of International Relations" organised a meeting which was attended by ten thousand people. On the Place de la Republic there took place, in spite of the presence of a strong police force, a demonstration at which 5000 were present. Manifestoes were distributed, declaring that the war, which is seriously threatening the Russian Revolution, must be opposed.

"The day of universal emancipation is approaching. Not a drop of blood of the people must have been spilt in vain, but must be converted into revolutionary energy, in

fierce hatred of the murderous regime of capitalism. Everywhere the enraged peoples must rid themselves and of their class governments in order to put in their place delegates of workers and soldiers who have common cause with the people. The Russian Revolution is a signal for the general revolution, and the general revolution will secure the final success of the Russian Revolution. The war of the peoples will be answered by the world revolution."

Strikes of Workers and Mutinies of the Soldiers at the Front in France.

Already during the weeks before the Russian Revolution strikes of the greatest importance had broken out in France. Thus the metal workers of St. Denis and the workers in the other metal workers' trade unions demanded an increase in their ridiculously low wages and ceased work. The same thing occurred in a number of other factories, such as Vedovelli and Priestleg Mehicet and Blin, Panhart etc.

In the course of the month of May, serious mutinies broke out at the front; at the same time the number of strikes increased in the provinces as well as in Paris.

But the strikes which broke out immediately after the Russian Revolution no longer bore a purely industrial or economic, but a revolutionary and anti-war character. The strikers no longer contented themselves with demanding higher wages; they insistently demanded peace and an end of the massacre of the people. Even those who had opposed the trade union movement and had refused to recognise the strike as a means for putting through their demands, namely the bank clerks and the female clerks, joined the revolutionary masses, and there were to be heard in all the streets of Paris fierce fighting cries against the government.

The front was to a great extent seized by the revolutionary spirit. Soldiers went in compact bodies to their officers, who delivered plaintive speeches and promised them all sorts of favours. Many soldiers sang the International and red flags were hoisted. In the trenches petitions were drawn up against a winter campaign and manifestoes were circulated demanding the formation of workers and soldiers committees. Unfortunately the socialist leaders left the masses in the lurch, and the number of internationalist and revolutionary-minded leaders was all too small. The suppression on the part of the government was pitiless: a great number of soldiers were shot without any court martial, and the mutinous regiments were sent to Limoges and disbanded. In addition, many revolutionary fighters were arrested in Paris and the meetings of the groups organised round the paper "What must be said" were prohibited.

(From H. Guilbeaux: "Le mouvement socialist et syndicaliste français pendant la guerre".)

Strike in the English Machine Factories.

Rotterdam, May 15th. As the "Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant" reports from London, a further section of the workers in the Manchester machine-shops returned to work yesterday. To-day there is a general expectation that the rest of the strikers will soon resume work. In London, the attitude of the workers on strike has become undecided because they are meeting with so little sympathy from the population. Work has been partially resumed in the munition works in Surrey. The "Daily Telegraph" reports from Sheffield that there is little prospect of the dispute being settled.

Rotterdam, May 16th. The "Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant" reports that the National Conference of the delegates of the machine workers took place yesterday. It was decided to enter into negotiations with the Ministry of Munitions.

Consternation in Paris owing to the Resignation of Gutchkov and Kornilov.

Basle, May 15th. ("Frankfurter Zeitung"). The resignation of Gutchkov, the Russian War Minister and of Kornilov, the Military Governor of Petrograd has — as can be seen from yesterday's evening papers — caused great consternation in Paris. Gutchkov's resignation means an open conflict between the Provisional Government and the Committee of Workers and Soldiers. The Paris Press consequently regards the situation as very serious.

The Question of the Control of the Provisional Government.

By N. Lenin.

From the political report at the National Conference of the Bolsheviki. Given on May 7th 1917.

In the third point of their draft resolution, the Moscow comrades propose that the Government be controlled. This control was to be in the hands of Tcheidse, Steklov, Zeretelli and other leaders of the petty bourgeois Bloc. Control without power is an empty phrase. How shall I control England? In order to control it, I must first conquer its navy. I understand that the unenlightened masses of workers and soldiers can naively and unconsciously believe in control; it is only necessary, however, to think of the essential factors in order to understand that this faith is a deviation from the fundamental principles of the class war.

What is control? When the one writes a resolution, the other writes a counter-resolution. In order to control, we must have power. If the broad masses of the petty bourgeois bloc do not understand this, we must make it clear to them. In no circumstances, however, must we tell them an untruth. If I veil this chief condition by control, I am telling an untruth and bringing grist to the mill of the capitalists and imperialists.

"Please, control me, by all means, but I shall have the guns. Much good may the control do you" — they say. They know that they cannot now refuse it to the people. Control without power is a petty bourgeois phrase which only hinders the development of the Russian revolution. I therefore raise an objection to the third point of the Moscow draft resolution.

The "April Conference" of the Bolsheviki.

(Continued.)

Second Day.

Petrograd, May 10. ("Pravda" No. 41 of 1917.) At the evening session of May 8, the question of the relations to the Soviets of the workers' and peasants' deputies came up for discussion. The debates were specially valuable as they dealt with the rich experiences of the local work of the Party organisations and nuclei, of the workers' councils and the workers' and peasants' deputies. Comrade Nogin in his report recommended a well-considered attitude to the Soviets of the workers' deputies. They must be strengthened, the broad masses gathered round them and their authority increased in the eyes of the population. This can only be achieved by the gradual carrying out of practical measures. Before this preliminary organisatory and political work is achieved, it would be premature to declare the Soviets to be organs of power.

The discussion revealed that the Soviets are much more consolidated in the provinces than in the big towns; that the sphere of activity of the Soviets in the provinces is considerably wider than those in the capital towns. In many places the provision of food is controlled by the Soviets; they represent the real power in the localities, and to some extent they have the control over production and distribution.

It was thereupon pointed out by Comrade Lenin that the Soviets in the big towns are politically more dependent upon the bourgeois central authorities than the provincial soviets. In the big centres, said Comrade Lenin, it is impossible to take over the control of production straight away; while this has already been partly carried out in the provinces. Hence there follows — the consolidation of the local soviets of the workers', soldiers' and peasants' deputies. A step forward in this respect is possible before all from the provinces.

A commission was then elected for the purpose of drawing up a draft resolution.

Third Day.

The morning session of May 9, opened with a report of the Credentials Committee. There are present at the Conference

133 delegates with deciding votes, who represent 76,597 organised Party members; further, 18 delegates with advisory votes from organisations with less than 30 members who represent 2627 Party members. Thus 79,174 persons are represented at the Conference.

After the approval of the report of the Credentials Committee there commenced the reports from the provinces. Interesting data were given from the Moscow district organisation regarding the organisation congress of the peasants of the Moscow government. The representatives for the Congress were elected immediately from the districts, partly, however, by the co-operatives and the committees for public safety. The peasants expressed themselves very sharply against the attitude of the Peasants League, which is very vacillating in the question of the organised seizure of the landed estates before the meeting of the Constituent Assembly. In many localities the peasants have spontaneously seized possession of the estates (e. g. the estates of Prince Galicyn); the rents were reduced to one fourth or one fifth, i. e. from 20—25 roubles to 3—5 roubles. Only those portions of land which could be cultivated by the peasants themselves are being placed under cultivation.

A Comrade from the Volga district called attention to the general character of the district, which is an exclusively agricultural district with a working population in the towns of from 40,000 to 50,000 and nevertheless everywhere had organisations of the Bolsheviki.

In the towns, for instance in Samara, there exist factory control commissions; some factories were completely controlled by workers, for instance the tube factory (22,000 workers). The eight-hour day is enforced everywhere. In Saratov the central food provision committee was elected on the basis of universal suffrage. The mayor opposed this and was in consequence removed.

Fourth Day.

Petrograd, May 12. ("Pravda" No. 43 of 1917.) On May 10, there was discussed in the Plenary meeting the resolutions on the War and the Provisional Government. Comrade Lenin moved the first resolution. He pointed to the necessity of dividing the resolution into three parts: the first containing the class analysis of the war, the second dealing with the so-called "revolutionary defence", and the third giving the answer to the question, how to put an end to the war. The resolution introduced by Comrade Lenin was adopted by all votes with 7 abstentions.

Comrade Zinoviev, who delivered the report of the Commission dealing with the question of the Provisional Government, pointed out that every fresh day exposed the imperialist and counter-revolutionary nature of the Provisional Government; that every concrete question arising out of the increase of the economic crisis showed the incapacity of the Provisional Government to solve these questions thoroughly; to resort to decisive measures, the carrying out of which is impossible without running counter to the interests of capital. Comrade Zinoviev then dealt with our position with regard to the Provisional government. This position consists in explaining the incapacity of the Provisional government; in increasing our influence among the masses which, owing to lack of class-consciousness, are prepared to come to an agreement with this government, and in the organisatory consolidation of this influence by the Soviets of soldiers and workers deputies. In short, in the preparation of the transference of power from the hands of the bourgeoisie into the hands of the proletariat and of the semi-proletarian strata in town and country. The essence of all our agitation is, by making use of every important fact of political life, to point out again and again that the transference of the whole power into the hands of the Soviets of workers and soldiers deputies is indispensable. The resolution was adopted with some trifling amendments by all votes against 7, and six abstentions.

5th Day.

Petrograd, May 13, ("Pravda" No. 45 of 1917). The central questions on the agenda at the session of May 11, were the Agrarian Question and the question of the Coalition Ministry. On the first question Comrade Lenin set forth in detail the reasons for the Resolution worked out by the Commission. He

indicated the estates of the large landed proprietors as being the chief reason for the maintenance of feudal relationships in the country, he pointed to the colossal waste of land which was caused, first by the mismanagement of the village authorities, then by the events of 1861, and finally by the Stolpin officials.

Hence the desire of the peasant "to divide up the land"; to subject the whole of the land to a redistribution. This desire finds expression in the words, "the whole earth is the Lord's". The possessing peasant cannot reconcile himself with those hindrances which have become unbearable for him under the new conditions of capitalist exchange of commodities.

The social revolutionaries have themselves confessed that in this project, "the ideology of the small undertaking" has gained the victory over the "principles of equalisation". The peasant requires land as property; but the land is divided according to the requirements of commodity economy. If, as is alleged, some of the peasants accept the principle of equal right to the soil, nevertheless the peasants mean by this something different from what the social revolutionary intellectuals mean.

The statistics as to the division of the landed estates and peasant holdings in Russia are as follows: 300 peasant families possess together 2000 dessyatines while the same quantity of land is owned by one landed proprietor. It is clear that for the peasants the demand of "equality" means an equalisation of the rights of the 300 and of the one.

The necessity of a nationalisation of the land, as a complete bourgeois and in the highest degree progressive measure, has been created by the whole past land policy of Russia as well as by the world market. The war brought a further intensification of the contradictions. And at the present moment the immediate transference of the land into the hands of the peasants is a demand which is imperatively dictated by the deprivations of the war time. Shingarov and Co., who advise the peasants to wait until the meeting of the Constituent Assembly (but the seed has to be got sown at once) simply increase the crisis by threatening to convert the shortage of corn into an actual famine. They forcibly impose on the peasants a bourgeois decision regarding the agrarian question. It is impossible for the peasants to wait for the legalising of their property in the land, because the crisis is advancing with gigantic steps. The peasants have made a commencement with the revolution; in the gouvernement of Pensa they are taking from the landowners the live and dead stock for public use. Our Party, of course, stands for an organised seizure of the land and of the stock, because this is necessary in order to increase production; any damage to the stock injures above all the workers and peasants themselves.

On the other hand we are in favour of a separate organisation for the agricultural workers.

The resolution approved by the Commission and the agrarian section was adopted by all votes, with 11 abstentions.

The report on the question of a coalition government was given by Comrade Zinoviev.

The idea of a coalition Ministry arose as a result of two tendencies: a tendency from above and a tendency from below.

From above — under the pressure of the international situation. The Anglo-French imperialists, influenced by disturbing rumours regarding the condition of the Russian army, are exerting pressure upon the government in order to prolong the war at any price. And they thereby hit the Achilles heel of the petty bourgeois social patriotic strata by endeavouring to get the latter to undertake responsibility for the prolongation of the war. The imperialists now require Russian Vanderveldes and Thomases.

From below there comes the tendency from the petty bourgeois camp for the formation of a Coalition Ministry. At the Congress of the workers and soldiers deputies a proposal was brought in by 250 representatives that some Ministers from their midst go into the government. The politically untrained sections of the workers and soldiers believed that a change in the composition of the Ministry, a swing of the Cabinet to the "Left", is indispensable for them. "If instead of one Kerensky we have five Kerenskys, then things will go on better."

Our Party cannot do otherwise than adopt a negative attitude to this proposal. No "special" conditions can justify

entry into the ministry; such special conditions were pleaded in France when Guesde, Sembat and Thomas entered the government of National Defence. Our slogan of the transference of the whole power into the hands of the Soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies is more than ever proving to be right. This slogan must become the main line of our entire agitation.

The resolution moved by Comrade Zinoviev is adopted by all votes with two abstentions.

Comrade Lenin speaks of the question of the revision of the Party programme.

Sixth Day.

Petrograd, May 15. ("Pravda", No. 46 of 1917.) The session of May 12th began with a report by Comrade Schmidt on the activity of the C. C. Thereupon Comrade Zinoviev read out the resolution of the Commission "on the uniting of Internationalists against the petty-bourgeois social patriotic bloc", and gave the necessary explanation. The resolution was adopted without discussion by all votes with ten abstentions.

Comrade Nogin gave the report of the Commission for the relations to the Soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies. The resolution adopted in the Commission was adopted by the Plenary meeting by all votes with 3 abstentions. After the list of candidates for the C. C. was set up and the candidates discussed, the election took place by secret vote, with the following result: Nine comrades were elected to the Central Committee, namely: Lenin (out of 109 — 104 votes); Zinoviev (101 votes), Stalin (97), Kamenev (95), Milyutin (82), Nogin, (76), Sverdlov (71), Smilga (53), Fjodorov (48). The elections of the last two was ratified by the Plenary meeting because they did not receive the necessary number of votes.

A fairly lively debate arose on the nationality question, in which two sharply divergent standpoints were to be seen. The report of the commission was delivered by Comrade Stalin. He pointed to the diverse character of the national suppression which prevails in the various countries in Europe, each according to the measure of the democratisation of the State power. The more democratic a State is, the weaker, generally speaking, is the social pressure, or stated more concretely, the more the landed-aristocracy is in power, the greater the national suppression. In addition to the factors of medieval feudal origin, there play a certain role in increasing national oppression those factors which have arisen in the process of the development of capitalism from free trade to imperialism. This fact causes the Party of the proletariat, which owing to the conditions of the time becomes the only protector of the rights of the suppressed nations, to champion in the most energetic manner the right of the suppressed nations to self-determination. The right to self-determination includes the right to complete separation from the oppressing State. Without the recognition of this last right the right to self-determination is a hypocritical phrase in the mouths of its advocates. The approaching conflict between the Finnish people and the Provisional Government shows that this is not a question of an empty declaration, but that the Russian workers are faced with the choice; either to support the Finnish workers, or to support the Russian bourgeoisie, which is an out and out imperialist bourgeoisie.

For nations who desire to remain within the borders of a given State, we defend the right to provincial autonomy, so far as the peculiarities of the economic life and of language demand it. We are for the abolition of a State language and of control from above. All these measures, however, do not protect the national minorities from abuses on the part of national majorities. We are therefore in favour of a law which legally forbids the introduction of any national privileges in the provinces or in the centre.

Comrade Pyatakoff then spoke in the name of those comrades who had a different standpoint from that of the resolution committee.

He called attention to three factors which render the realisation of the right to separation illusory. 1. In the economic sphere; the development of world economy has rendered impossible the separation of small national State organisms from the general system; 2. in the sphere of class relationships: the class struggle excludes the possibility of a nation having a unanimous will, and the right to national self-determination in the framework of bourgeois society means the subjection of the socialist minority to the will of the bourgeois majority.

3. in the sphere of politics: the modern State monopolist organisation prevents the possibility of a political and economic self-determination on the basis of the bourgeois order of society.

The draft resolution submitted by the section points out that socialism alone is capable of putting an end to national suppression. Comrades Lenin, Djerzhinsky, Zinoviev and Macharadse took part in the discussion. Comrade Lenin stated that the Russian socialists must aim at the right of separation of the suppressed nations, whilst on the other hand the socialists of the suppressed nations must support the right of freedom to unite. The one as much as the other must approach the common aim — the international organisation of the proletariat — along formally divergent but, at bottom, similar ways.

Those who maintain that the question of nationality can be solved in the framework of the bourgeois order of society forget that the question has been solved only in Western Europe (and even there not everywhere), where the purity of the population has been achieved up to 90%, but not in the East where the purity of population exists only up to 43%. The example of Finland proves that the question of nationality practically stands on the agenda, and that one must choose between supporting the imperialist bourgeoisie and the duty of international solidarity, which does not permit any violation of the will of the suppressed nations. The Mensheviks, who proposed to the Finnish social democrats that they "wait" until the Constituent Assembly, where the question of autonomy will be solved in common, have, in fact, spoken in the spirit of the Russian imperialists.

Comrade Djerzhinsky repeated some of the objections of Comrade Pjatakof and partly concretised them. The separation at a certain moment can be of advantage only to the bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy. In Poland, for example, the agrarian revolution is knocking at the door; should Poland be isolated from the Russian revolutionary stream, then this revolution would not take place, as it cannot be carried out with the forces of the Polish proletariat alone. The extended interpretation of the right to national self-determination places weapons in the hands of the separatists against the internationalists of the suppressed nations. The same views were also put forward by Comrade Macharadse. Comrade Zinoviev shows in his speech how those who propose that the suppressed nations of Europe, and in particular of the colonies, shall wait until the social revolution, in no way place the question of the socialist revolution on the agenda but push it into the background. As Comrade Stalin expressed it in his concluding speech, the national movement of the suppressed peoples forms the reserve of the social revolution.

The resolution of the Commission was adopted by 56 votes against 16 with 18 abstentions; the resolution of the section was rejected by 48 votes against 11 with 19 abstentions.

The speaker for the commission which drew up the resolution "on the situation in the International and the tasks of the soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies, was comrade Zinoviev. He dealt with the process of the decay of the Second International under the influence of the growth of its opportunist wing, its collapse and the attempt to unite the oppositional elements of the old parties during the war. In the Zimmerwald Bloc there undoubtedly predominates the "Centre", which advocates unity with the social chauvinists. This circumstance is responsible for the half and half character of all its decisions and actions. Zimmerwald has proved bankrupt all along the line: the acceptance by R. Grimm, its president, of the decision to take part in the preparation of the Stockholm Conference is a new proof of this. A split is inevitable. It must, however, be an organised breaking away of the whole of the Zimmerwald Left. Comrade Lenin proposed that a declaration be made that the Soviets of the workers' and soldiers' deputies remain in the Zimmerwald bloc only for informative purposes. Experience has proved, he said, that it is futile to remain longer in the bloc. In many countries Zimmerwald has even become a drag on the forward movement. It serves only to cover the social chauvinists. The proposal of Comrade Lenin was rejected and the resolution adopted by all votes with 6 abstentions.

Finally, after a short report by Comrade Lenin, the resolution on the situation was unanimously adopted. (58 votes with 8 abstentions).

The Conference closed with the singing of the International.

The Crisis of Power.

By N. Lenin.

(Published in "Pravda" on May 15th 1917.)

The whole of Russia still remembers the days of April 19th to 21st when civil war threatened to break out in the streets of Petrograd.

On April 21st the Provisional Government issued a new, appealing note in which it tried to explain its aggressive note of April 18th.

Thereupon the majority of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies declared that "the incident was closed".

A few days passed, and then the question of the coalition government cropped up. With regard to this question, the Executive Committee was divided into almost exactly two halves: 23 votes against the coalition government and 22 for it. The incident was "closed" only on paper.

Only a few days passed again before we were faced by a new "incident". One of the great guns of the Provisional Government, Gutchkov, the War Minister, sent in his resignation. Rumours are abroad that the whole Provisional Government has resigned (at the moment of writing, we do not know whether the resignation has actually taken place). Another "incident" has happened — one which puts all the others in the shade.

What is the reason for all these "incidents"? Is there not a fundamental cause which inevitably leads from "incident" to "incident"?

There is such a cause. That cause is the so-called dual power, the absence of equilibrium, the result of the compromise between the Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the Provisional Government.

The Provisional Government is the government of the capitalists. It cannot renounce conquest (annexation), it cannot put an end to this predatory war by a democratic peace, it must protect the gentlemen of its class (the capitalist class), it must protect the property of the feudal lords.

The Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies represents other classes. The majority of workers and soldiers in the Soviet do not desire the predatory war, they are not interested in the profits of the capitalists nor in the privileges of the landowners. But at the same time, the Soviet places confidence in the Provisional Government of the capitalists, it wishes to come to an understanding with it, it wishes to maintain its connection with it.

The Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is a nucleus of power. The Soviets are making efforts to bring their power to bear in various questions, at the same time as the Provisional Government. The result is a dual rule, that which is now called a crisis of power.

This cannot drag on for long. In these circumstances, we shall have a new "incident" and new complications every day. One can write on paper: The incident is closed — it is easy to write it. But in real life, these "incidents" are not closed, for the simple reason that they are not "incidents", not coincidences, not trifles. They are the external symptoms of a deep internal crisis. They are the consequence of the whole of mankind having been driven into a blind alley. The only possible way to extricate ourselves from this predatory war is to adopt the measures suggested by the internationalists.

Three ways of solving the crisis of power have been proposed to the Russian people. One group says: Leave things as they are, place still more confidence in the Provisional Government. Possibly it is only threatening to resign in order to induce the Soviet to call out: We will place more confidence in you. What the Provisional Government is fighting for, is to be begged: Come and govern us, for we cannot get on without you...

The second way is that of a coalition government. Let us divide the ministerial seats with Miljukov and his colleagues; we will send some of our people into the Government and then the wind will blow in another direction.

The third way is the one suggested by us, a transformation of the whole policy of the Soviets. No confidence in the capitalists! The transference of the whole power into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. A change of persons leads to nothing, we must change our policy. It is

necessary that the power should be exercised by a different class. The whole world will place confidence in the government of the workers and soldiers, for everyone understands that workers and poor peasants do not wish for conquests. This alone can bring the end of the war nearer, this alone can help us to resist economic ruin.

All the power to the Soviets of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies! No confidence in the Government of the capitalists!

Every "incident", every day, every hour will prove the wisdom of our slogan.

Resolutions of the "April Conference".

The Resolution on the Situation.

Drafted by Lenin.

The world war, which began as a war of world trusts and bank capital for the control of the world market, has already led to a wholesale annihilation of material values, to the exhaustion of productive forces and to such a growth of war industry that even the production of the absolutely necessary minimum of articles of general use and of means of production has already become impossible.

Thus, this war has led mankind into a situation from which there is no issue and to the edge of an abyss.

The objective preliminary conditions for the socialist revolution, which undoubtedly existed in the more highly developed countries before the war, matured at a precipitous speed in consequence of the war. Small and middle industries are being superseded and ruined more and more rapidly. The concentration and internationalisation of capital is advancing with gigantic strides. Monopolist capitalism is turning into State monopolist capital; under the pressure of circumstances, the social regulation of production and distribution is being introduced in a number of countries, some countries are adopting the conscription of labour.

If private property in the means of production is maintained, all the steps towards the monopolisation and nationalisation of production on a large scale inevitably lead to exploitation being strengthened, to the subjugation of the working masses being increased; they make it more difficult for the exploited masses to resist, strengthen reaction and war despotism and lead at the same time to an inevitable growth of the profits of the large capitalists at the expense of the other strata of the population, so that the working masses will, for many decades, be the slaves of the capitalists by having to pay milliards as interest on war debts. If, on the other hand, private property in the means of production be abolished and the power of the State pass into the hands of the proletariat, the same preliminary conditions act as a pledge for such a transformation of society that an end is put to all exploitation and the wellbeing of every individual is ensured.

Events indeed confirm what the socialists of the whole world foresaw when, in the Basle manifesto of 1912, they unanimously declared the inevitability of the **proletarian revolution**, just in connection with the imperialist war which at that time was imminent and is now raging furiously.

The Russian revolution is only the first stage of the first of the proletarian revolutions which are an inevitable consequence of the war.

The irritation of the broad masses of the people against the capitalist class is growing in all countries, and the proletariat is recognising more and more that only the transition of power into its hands and the abolition of private property can save mankind from ruin.

In all countries, especially in the progressive ones, England and Germany, hundreds of socialists who have not sided with "their" bourgeoisie, have been thrown into prison by the governments of the capitalists. These persecutions are clear evidence of the dread the governments have of the growing proletarian revolution. The maturing of the revolution in Germany is further made evident by the mass strikes which have intensified especially during the last few weeks, and by the fraternisation of the German soldiers with the Russian soldiers at the front.

In this way, the fraternal confidence and the fraternal alliance between the workers of the various countries — the workers, who are now destroying one another in the interest of the capitalists — will be gradually restored. This is however

the prerequisite for united revolutionary action on the part of the workers of the various countries. Such action alone can guarantee the most systematic development possible and the best possible results for the socialist world revolution.

The proletariat of Russia is working in one of the most backward countries of Europe among the masses of small peasant population; it is no good setting ourselves the aim of realising socialist transformation at one blow.

It would be a great mistake, it would, to all intents and purposes, mean going over to the side of the bourgeoisie, were we to conclude from this that the working class should support the bourgeoisie or that the work of the proletariat should be organised within a scope which would be acceptable to the petty bourgeoisie, or that the proletariat should renounce its claim to take the lead, should abandon its task of enlightening the people as to the urgent necessity of taking a number of practical steps towards socialism.

One of the first of these steps is the nationalisation of the land. This measure is not altogether outside the scope of bourgeois construction; it would however be a hard blow for private ownership of means of production and would tremendously strengthen the influence of the socialist proletariat over the semi-proletarian village.

Another such measure would be the creation of State control of all banks and at the same time their amalgamation into one central bank, as well as control of the insurance societies and the large syndicates of the capitalists (for instance the syndicate of sugar manufacturers, the coal and metal syndicate etc.) with a gradual transition to a more just and progressive system of taxation and distribution of capital. Such economic measures are already ripe and technically it is perfectly possible to carry them out; politically, they may find support from the oppressed peasants, who could only benefit by these measures.

The Soviet of the Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies, who are now spreading like a network over the whole of Russia, might, by these measures, begin to put the universal compulsory labour into effect, for the character of these organisations guarantees on the one hand a transition to these measures through the mere fact that the oppressed majority of the population consciously, them grasps — and on the other hand that the measures will not be put into effect after the manner of the police and bureaucracy, and that the organised and armed masses of the proletariat and the peasantry will, of their own free will, take part in the regulation of their economics. We cannot and must not wait until the power is in the hands of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat to discuss the above mentioned and similar measures and to carry them through on a national scale; they can be realised by the local revolutionary organs of the power of the people as soon as opportunity affords.

If the above measures are to be put into effect, we need extreme circumspection and caution; we must win over a solid majority of the people, and must deliberately make practical preparations for this or that measure; the attention of the conscious vanguard of the masses of workers, who are bound to help the peasant masses to find a way to avoid ruin, must be directed to this side of the question.

* * *

RESOLUTION ON WAR.

Drawn up by Lenin.

I.

The present war is, on the part of both groups of the belligerent Powers, an imperialist war, i. e. a war carried on by the capitalists with a view to dividing up the profits resulting from supremacy over the world, the markets, financial (bank) capital and to subjugating the small nations etc. Every day of the war enriches the financial and industrial bourgeoisie and ruins and exhausts the forces of the proletariat and of the peasantry, not only in the belligerent countries but also in the neutral ones. Apart from this, in Russia, the prolongation of the war seriously endangers the achievements of the revolution and its further development.

The passing of the power of the State in Russia into the hands of the Provisional Government, the government of the landowners and capitalists, has changed nothing and can change nothing in the character of the war and its significance for Russia. Special emphasis is given to this fact in that the new government has not only not published the secret treaties con-

cluded by the ex-Tsar Nicholas II. with the capitalist governments of England, France etc., but has, without asking the people, formally confirmed these secret treaties in which permission to plunder China, Persia, Turkey, Austria etc. is promised to the Russian capitalists. In consequence of these treaties being kept secret, the Russian people is being deceived as to the true character of the war.

For this reason, a proletarian party can support neither the present war nor the present government and its loans, without completely breaking with internationalism, that is with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all countries in their fight against the capitalist yoke.

No faith can be placed in the promises of the present Government to renounce all claim to annexations, that is to the conquest of foreign countries, or to keeping any peoples within the borders of Russia by force. For, first of all, the capitalists who are bound by the thousand threads of bank capital, cannot renounce annexations in this war without renouncing the profits on the milliards that are invested in loans, concessions, war undertakings etc. Secondly, the new Government, which disclaimed annexations in order to deceive the people, announced in Moscow on April 9th 1917 through the mouth of Miljukov, that it did not disclaim annexations and, by its note of April 18th and the explanations of that note published on April 22nd, confirmed the character of its policy which is bent on conquest. The Conference warns the people against the empty promises of the capitalists and states that a strict distinction must be made between the renunciation of annexations in words and the renunciation of annexations in deeds, that is to say the immediate publication and revocation of all predatory secret treaties and the immediate granting to all nations of the right to decide by free voting whether they will form independent States or will become part of any particular State.

II.

The ideology of the so-called "revolutionary defence" has now been adopted in Russia by all the more popular parties (the National Socialists, the Trudoviki, the Social Revolutionaries) and by the opportunist Social Democratic party of the Mensheviks (O. K., Tcheidse, Zeretelli etc.) as well as by the majority of the non-party revolutionaries. Owing to its class significance, it, on the one hand, gives expression to the interests and the standpoint of the wealthy peasants and of some of the small landowners who, like the capitalists, derive profits from the violation of the small nations; on the other hand, the "revolutionary defence" is the result of the deception practised by the capitalists on a section of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat in town and country who, owing to their class position, have no interest in the profits of the capitalists and in the imperialist war.

The Conference regards it as absolutely inadmissible to make any concessions to the "revolutionary defence" and would consider it equivalent to a complete breach with internationalism and socialism. As regards the defence of the broad masses of the people, our Party will combat this point of view by consistently propagating the recognition that a subconscious attitude of confidence in the government of capitalists is, at this moment, one of the chief obstacles to a rapid termination of the war.

III.

As regards the most important question which is how this war can be brought to an end as quickly as possible and yet not by force but by a truly democratic peace, the Conference recognises and resolves that this war cannot possibly be terminated by the soldiers of only one of the belligerent parties refusing to fight, by one of the belligerent parties merely refraining from acts of war.

The Conference once more protests against the wild calumny spread by the capitalists against our Party to the effect that we are in favour of a separate peace with Germany. We consider the German capitalists just such robbers as those of Russia, England, France etc., and Kaiser Wilhelm just as much a crowned bandit as Nicholas II. and the English, Italian, Roumanian and other monarchs.

Our Party will explain to the people, patiently but indefatigably, the truth that wars are carried on by governments, that wars are always inseparably bound up with the politics of certain classes, that this war can only be ended by a democratic peace, if the whole power of the State, in some of the belligerent

countries at any rate, passes into the hands of the class of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat which is actually capable of putting an end to the capitalist yoke.

After taking over the power of the State in Russia, the revolutionary class would introduce a number of measures which would undermine the economic supremacy of the capitalists and render them completely harmless in politics; it would immediately and openly offer to all peoples a democratic peace on the basis of the absolute renouncement of any kind of annexations or contributions. These measures and this open offer would inspire the workers of the belligerent countries with perfect confidence in one another and inevitably lead to revolts of the proletariat against the imperialist Governments which would be opposed to the suggested peace.

As long as the revolutionary class has not taken the whole power of the State into its hands, our Party will support those proletarian parties and groups abroad which are actually carrying on a revolutionary fight against their imperialist governments and their bourgeoisie even during the war. The Party will especially support the wide-spread fraternisation of the soldiers of all belligerent countries at the front, which is already taking place and will aim at transforming this spontaneous manifestation of the solidarity of the oppressed into a well-organised movement for the transference of the power of the State in all belligerent countries into the hands of the revolutionary proletariat.

RESOLUTION ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION.

The existence of manorial property in Russia forms a material support for the power of the feudal landowners and a guarantee for the possible restoration of the monarchy. This private property in land inevitably condemns the overwhelming majority of the population of Russia, i. e. the peasantry, to distress, pauperisation, serfdom and dull despair and the whole country to backwardness in all aspects of life.

The ownership of land by peasants in Russia, whether it be allotted land (in the form of communal or private property) or land acquired privately (held in tenure or purchased), is interwoven through and through, from top to bottom, with old conditions and customs, dating from the times of serfdom, such as the classing of the peasants in ranks etc. etc.

The necessity of destroying all these antiquated and harmful traditions, the necessity of "breaking down the fences" round the land and of reconstructing all the circumstances of the ownership of land and of agriculture in adaptation to the new conditions of national economy in Russia and throughout the world, all this is the material basis for the endeavours of the peasantry to nationalise all the land in the State.

However petty bourgeois may be the Utopias in which all the Narodniki parties and groups disguise the fight of the peasant masses against feudal landed property and against all the fetters of serfdom in the ownership of land and the exploitation of the soil in Russia, this fight in itself is nevertheless a complete bourgeois democratic endeavour, which is entirely progressive and economically necessary and which aims at breaking through all these barriers.

The nationalisation of the soil, as a bourgeois measure, means giving the highest imaginable and greatest possible degree of freedom to the class struggle in a capitalist society and means freeing the exploitation of the soil from all bourgeois impediments. Furthermore, the nationalisation of the land, as being the abolition of private ownership of land, would, in practice, be such a blow to private property which extends to all the means of production, that the Party of the proletariat should give every support to such a change of conditions.

On the other hand, the wealthy peasantry of Russia long ago gave birth to the elements of a peasant bourgeoisie, and Stolypin's agrarian reform undoubtedly strengthened, increased and consolidated these elements. At the other pole of the rural population, the agricultural labourers, the proletarians and the masses of the semi-proletarian peasantry are gaining in strength and increasing in a corresponding measure.

The more resolutely and consistently feudal landed property is destroyed and abolished, the more resolutely and consistently the bourgeois democratic reformation of agrarian conditions in Russia as a whole proceeds, the more rapidly and powerfully will the development of the class struggle of the agricultural proletariat against the wealthy peasantry (the peasant bourgeoisie) progress.

Except in so far as the beginning proletarian revolution in Europe exercises a direct and powerful influence on our country, the fate and issue of the Russian revolution will depend on whether the urban proletariat succeeds in carrying with it the rural proletariat and at the same time the mass of the rural semi-proletariat, or whether this mass follows the peasant bourgeoisie which altogether tends to favour an alliance with Gutchkov, Miljukov, the capitalists, the landowners and the counterrevolution.

Basing its views on this class situation and this relation of forces, the Conference resolves:

1. The Party of the proletariat will fight with all its force for the immediate and complete seizure of feudal property in Russia (including the domains, apanages, the property of monasteries and the Church etc.).

2. The Party is decidedly in favour of the land being immediately transferred into the hands of the peasantry organised in Soviets of peasant deputies or other bodies of local self-administration really elected on completely democratic lines and quite independent of landowners and officials.

3. The Party of the proletariat demands the nationalisation of all the landed property in the State. Nationalisation means transferring the rights of property regarding the whole soil to the State and with it the right to distribute the land to the democratic local authorities.

4. The Party must once and for all carry on a decisive fight against the Provisional Government which, through Shingarev and through collective proclamations, is forcing on the peasants "voluntary agreement" with the landowners, i. e. a reform in the interest of the landowners, and which threatens the peasants with punishment for "arbitrary self-help", which means the application of force by the minority of the population (the landowners and the capitalists) against the majority; the Party must also oppose the petty bourgeois vacillation of the majority of the Narodniki and the Mensheviks who advise the peasants not to take possession of the land before the Constituent Assembly has been called.

5. The Party recommends the peasants systematically to take possession of the whole land without permitting the least depreciation of its value, and to see to it that production is increased.

6. In any case, no agrarian reform can be successful and permanent without complete democratisation of the State, that is, on the one hand, the removal of the police and the standing army and of the actually privileged official class, and on the other hand, far-reaching local self-administration which must be quite unmolested by control and supervision from above.

7. Measures must be taken at once and everywhere to establish separate and independent organisations of the rural proletariat both in the form of Soviets of deputies of the agricultural workers (also Soviets of deputies of the semi-proletarian peasantry) and in the form of proletarian groups or fractions in combined Soviets of peasant deputies in all the bodies of local and urban administration etc.

8. The Party should support the action of the peasant committees which, in many districts of Russia, are placing the life-stock and effects of the landowners in the hands of the peasantry organised in such committees, with the object of regulating in common their application to the general cultivation of the land.

9. The Party of the proletariat must recommend all proletarians and semi-proletarians to demand that model farming on a sufficiently large scale be introduced in every estate. Farming must be carried on at the public expense by the Soviets of the deputies of agricultural labourers under the direction of agriculturalists and with the application of the best technical accessories.

Chronicle of Events.

May 6.

In order to solve the food question, the Moscow Soviet demands the introduction of a grain monopoly, maximum prices for articles of general necessity, restriction of capitalist profits, fixation of a minimum wage etc.

The Government confirms the decree as to the election of factory councils in industrial undertakings. The Commander

of the Russian troops on the Roumanian front issues the following order: "We are fighting on the territory of an allied State... Persons who instigate others to overthrow the established order in Roumania are violating the right of the Roumanian people which alone is entitled to determine the order of its State."

May 7 to 12.

National Conference of the Bolsheviki.

May 7.

Opening of the National Conference of the Bolsheviki ("April Conference"). Lenin's speech. Discussion. The resolution passed on to the commission.

The Provisional Government nominates its commissaries in the army.

May 8.

The Party Conference of the Bolsheviki deals with the mission of Borgberg in connection with the Stockholm Conference. After the report by Comrade Lenin a special commission consisting of Lenin, Kamenev and Leshnev is elected in order to draw up a resolution. The resolution is adopted by 140 votes with 8 abstentions. Comrade Nogin reports on the attitude to the Soviets.

The Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviets adopts a resolution on the convocation of an international Conference. A special delegation is to be sent to the neutral and allied countries in order to get into contact with the workers of these countries.

May 9.

National Conference of the Bolsheviki. Report of the Credentials Committee: 133 delegates with deciding votes and 18 with advisory votes, representing together 79,174 members. Report of the provincial delegates, followed by the adoption (with 7 abstentions) of the resolution on the war drawn up by Lenin.

Abolition of banishment as a penalty and its replacement by Fortress imprisonment.

May 10.

Prime Minister Lvov calls upon the President of the workers' and soldiers' Soviet, Tcheidse, to make proposals for the extension of the Provisional government by representatives of the parties represented in the Soviet.

Decree on the freedom of the press.

The National Conference discusses on the basis of the report of Comrade Zinoviev the question of the relations of the Party to the Provisional Government. The proposed resolution is adopted by all votes against 7 with six abstentions.

Conference of the members of the Duma: unanimous for the ruthless continuation of the war.

May 11.

The district Soviet of the Wyborg district resolves to transform the militia into a "Labour Guard".

The district conference of the S. R. calls for active support of the Provisional Government.

The National Conference of the Bolsheviki. Lenin speaks on the agrarian question. Resolution passed, eleven abstaining from voting. Zinoviev reports on the coalition government and recommends that a resolution be passed definitely opposing representatives of the Soviets being appointed to join the Provisional Government. The resolution is passed with all votes, seven persons refraining from voting. After Lenin's report on the change in the Party programme, the conference commissions the C. C. to work out a draft programme for the next Party conference.

The Soviet Executive expresses its disapproval of taking part in the government by 23 votes to 22.

An urban conference of the representatives of the Petrograd factories passes a draft scheme for the organisation of a Red Guard to protect the achievements of the revolution and to fight against the counter-revolution.