

SOCIALISM'S NEW START
THE SECOND CONGRESS C.I.

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



June 1st, 1934

VOLUME XI

COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL No 11

THREEPENCE
CONTENTS
OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number II

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

1. DEFEND COMRADE THAELMANN

(See page 415)

2. THE LAST "NEW WORD" OF GERMAN
SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

(*"Socialism's New Start."*) A. MARTYNOV.

(See page 426)

3. THE TURNING POINT IN POLAND

By G. LENSKY.

(See page 431)

4. ONLY THE SOVIETS CAN SAVE CHINA

By P. MIF.

(See page 440)

DOCUMENTS OF THE STRUGGLE OF THE COMINTERN

5. THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(See page 450)

6. "THE BLACK SEA REVOLT"

By ANDRE MARTY.

(See page 456)

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

7. THE DEVELOPING STRIKE WAVE IN
ENGLAND

(See page 459)

DEFEND COMRADE THAELMANN!

DANGER threatens comrade Thaelmann—a danger that he will meet with bloody “justice” at the hands of the Extra-Ordinary Court.

The German fascists are enraged at the failure they are meeting on the internal front.

On their own admission, the elections of the “Trustee councils” in the factories and enterprises were an “insult to the national-socialist idea.” In the factories and enterprises two thirds of the workers and employees demonstratively abstained or openly voted against the fascist list, and of the remaining one third, some only voted under the pressure of terror and the threat of being thrown out of work. The indignation of the working class against the fascist régime is growing. The disappointment of the petty-bourgeois masses of town and country is growing, and in spite of the fact that thousands of revolutionists have been murdered and tens of thousands have been thrown into concentration camps, the Communist Party of Germany is alive and is continuing persistently to gather its forces for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

No high flown phrases and no parades have succeeded in hiding the fact that all the promises of the national socialists are lies and deception, that class contradictions are being sharpened to a far greater degree in the third empire than in the Weimar republic, and that coupled with unheard-of terror, the impoverishment of the toiling masses has grown still further and is still continuing to grow.

While the income of the capitalists under the fascist régime has increased by 3.3 billion marks as a result of the expansion of production, and the incomes of the junkers and kulaks have increased by 800 million marks, due to the rise in prices of agricultural products, the working class have been robbed of 3½ to 4 billion marks. The fascist government, which, under the flag of national unity, promised to liquidate class antagonisms, has exposed itself as the government of the most reactionary strata of robber finance capital.

But this is only the beginning—there is more ahead, German fascism is ferociously preparing for war, is madly arming itself. But to attain this purpose it is not sufficient only to prepare cannon fodder, it is not enough merely to get the proletarian youth ready in the forced labour camps. Feverish preparations for war require money, money and more money and the sources of the treasury are being exhausted. Under Hitler’s regime, Germany’s gold reserves have decreased by 800 million marks, the trade balance continues to be passive, and the prices of the raw materials which have to be imported are increasing due to the transition of the crisis from its

lowest point to depression. In addition the deficit of the state bank is rapidly increasing and has already reached an enormous figure, in excess of 7 to 8 million marks. Germany is faced with the danger of inflation. Under such circumstances, German fascism is compelled, in order to continue its policy of plunder, to resort to a new drive so as to plunder the working class and the toiling masses. But the string has already been stretched to its breaking point. The new drive entails the threat of a revolutionary outbreak.

So as to save itself from this outbreak, so as to forestall it, to intimidate the workers, to dim the consciousness of the working masses, to inflame the very lowest instincts of the underworld, German fascism has decided once again to resort to its favourite means. It has decided to begin a new wave of terror against the working class, and primarily against the Communist Party, and at the same time against the Jews. In order to revive the sympathies of the petty-bourgeois towards fascism, sympathies which have grown cool, unbridled anti-semitic baiting has already commenced, and preparations for pogroms of Jews have begun which, under the Hitler regime, as was the case during the Tsarist autocracy in Russia, are the things which necessarily accompany the struggle against the revolution, a sort of lightning conductor against the revolution.

The first wave of fascist terror which was let loose by the Reichstag fire did not accomplish its purpose. It proved itself helpless to liquidate the Communist movement. The fascists themselves have now been compelled to admit this. But they hope to straighten things out by doubling their terrorist onslaught on the masses. This has been announced by the fascist-sadist Minister-President Goering. In his speech on April 22, he stated that he had decided “to adopt still more Draconic measures against the Communists.” “Now,” he said, “the firebrands are threatened . . . with imprisonment which is by no means sufficient to frighten them off, as representing a risk for those elements. *Now it will be different.*” “Now,” said he—he is not shy—*“we shall show an example of how to smash the head of the Bolshevik snake, how to put these elements up against the wall who to-day are still continuing to slander the empire, and who are preparing a revolution. Shall we, who are responsible for the preservation of the state and of our beautiful empire, hesitate to crush these creatures, who want to overthrow the empire? No, we will not waver, we will mercilessly crush them, we will torture no one, but we will shoot them.”*

A few hours after the announcement that mass shooting would be resorted to, the words were trans-

formed into deeds. Within a few hours after Goering's pogrom speech, ten workers were sentenced to death at the trial against the Hamburg "red fleet."

So as to legalise this *mass terror and mass murder* the Fascist government passed a Draconian law before Easter changing the criminal law and criminal law proceedings regarding crimes involving treason to the state. According to this law, the death sentence can be passed against those among others who undertake to alter the constitution of the empire through force or "by the threat of force." According to this law, sentence of death, penal servitude for life or hard labour for not less than two years may be imposed for "actions, directed *towards creating or maintaining any kind of organised association* with a view to preparing treason against the state, also for "actions directed towards influencing the masses by printing or distributing any kind of leaflets, or radio, records or pictures," or "importing these from abroad." This law adds that the word "commit" a crime must be understood to mean not only to "put it into practice" but any attempt to do so.

A new, so-called "people's court" is to be established in order to try these offences against the state, consisting of five people, only two of whom have to be lawyers, the remainder to be appointed from among people who "have special experience in the struggle against anti-state offences." In other words, the trial and punishment in this place called a "people's court" by the fascist demagogues is to be administered not by professional lawyers, but first and foremost by professional fascist terrorists. And it is before this extraordinary court, which is called on to legalise mass political murder for crimes which are proved or not proved even including the distribution of leaflets, such "crimes" as the attempt "to interfere with a member of the government fulfilling his constitutional functions in general, or in any particular sense," that Comrade Thaelmann, leader of the German Communist Party and other outstanding revolutionary proletarians in Germany will have to appear; and it is this law which the government has decided to apply retrospectively to Comrade Thaelmann and the others.

The trial against Dimitroff ended in a shameful fiasco for the Fascist government, which is now trying to make up for this by a trial against Comrade Thaelmann.

In spite of the framed-up perjurers used at the trial against Comrade Dimitroff, Tanev, Popov and Torgler, the fascists failed to collect any evidence against the prisoners. The new terrorist law relieves the court of the necessity of fabricating such proofs. According to the new terrorist law, the axe may fall on the heads of prisoners even though there are no proofs whatever of the application of force. In order to receive sentence of death, it is

now sufficient to distribute any kind of anti-government leaflet. The "Deutsche Wochenschau" (German Weekly) published an article entitled "Thaelmann is to be Sentenced to Death" in which it quotes, as material for the prosecution, the minutes of a meeting of the Plenum of the E.C.C.I. at which Thaelmann in his speech praised the Altona defence against the fascists and thanked the Comintern for its assistance in Bolshevising the Communist Party of Germany.

At the trial of Comrade Dimitroff, due to the fact that some legal formalities were maintained, Comrade Dimitroff was able to defend himself, in spite of the numerous objections of the chairman. The composition of the new extraordinary court guarantees in advance that Comrade Thaelmann and the other proletarian revolutionaries who are to appear before this court will be deprived of all and any possibility whatever of defence. The Fascists are afraid of the defence speech of the revolutionary Thaelmann.

The trial of Comrade Dimitroff was a political contest out of which Comrade Dimitroff came out victorious. The Fascists dare not repeat the experiment of such a political contest. The agitational pamphlets which they are issuing now in preparation for the trial against Thaelmann, the pamphlet of the spy, Schwartz, entitled "People Listen to the Central Committee," and Zimmerfeld's booklet "Communa," as well as the evidence collected through the medium of the provocateurs Katner, Lass and other spies, prove that the fascist government intends to turn the forthcoming political trial into a criminal trial, and to bespatter Comrade Thaelmann with a whole concoction of dirty mud, at the same time indirectly trying to tack on to him the case of the murder of certain fascists in order in such a way to discredit him in the eyes of the masses, and especially the petty-bourgeois masses, and this way to prevent an outbreak of indignation against his being condemned.

The fascist government is preparing to commit a new monstrous crime. It is preparing to strike a blow against the working class of Germany and the working class of the whole world in the person of Thaelmann and the other best proletarians of Germany. It is not without reason that it regards itself as the pioneer of world reaction, an example which the bourgeoisie of the other countries who are becoming fascised are trying to follow. The proletarians of all countries, and not only the proletarians, but all those who honestly oppose fascist barbarism, must raise a mighty protest against the foul sentences which are being prepared against the flower of the German proletariat.

Comrades, protest against Comrade Thaelmann and the other imprisoned Communists and workers being brought to trial before the extraordinary court, and against the retrospective application of the

unheard-of terroristic laws against them. Demand that they have freedom to defend themselves. Demand that citizens of other countries who enjoy the respect of wide circles of the people be admitted to the court. Demand an open trial. Develop a

wide united front anti-fascist campaign in defence of Thaelmann and the other prisoners.

Demand the release of Comrade Thaelmann and the other imprisoned Communists and revolutionary proletarians. EDITORIAL BOARD.

ERNST THAELMANN

By R. GROETZ.

THE city of Hamburg, where Ernst Thaelmann was born, has been from time immemorial a city of the most acute class contradictions. The grandfathers of the present shipowners took advantage of the convenient situation of the Hamburg port to secure themselves stupendous super-profits at the expense of the hinterland, at the expense of the localities far removed from the sea. The Hamburg patricians competed with the Dutch in the African slave trade, and in supplying alcohol to the colonial peoples, and in robbing them, and the Draconian regulations regarding naval service, the Draconian system of fining, which remained valid in the Weimar Republic even after the November Revolution helped them to exploit the sailors. Their most usual deal was to send good-for-nothing heavily insured "floating coffins" to sea precisely in anticipation of their loss at sea and the subsequent receipt of high insurance premiums. These exploiters of hired slaves at the same time speculated in real estate: the proletarians of the port were stifled in slums near the wharves, which attained a sad world fame for the terrific cholera epidemics which broke out there.

The Hamburg exploiters tried on one hand to bribe and subject the army of trading employees to their arbitrary will by means of the delusive prospect that they might become merchants, or reach the highest office posts. On the other hand, it was with ruthless force, that these exploiters used the entire apparatus of the free city of Hamburg against the struggling workers.

After the bitter struggles lost by the workers due to the reformist trade union leadership—in 1896, 1906 and 1911, the shipowners and the metallurgical magnates established a monopoly in the hiring of labour power, which the exploiters throughout the whole of Germany took up as a model. This system was established for the purpose of purging the enterprises of class fighters and of attracting a reserve army of labour, which beats down wage-rates.

Hamburg was proud of its long time traditions as "bulwark of the labour movement." Such names as Weitling, Heib, York, Hasenklewer,

Ignatz Auer, Jakob Audorf, and others, and later on Bebel, were connected with the history of the Hamburg working class movement. But the house decorated with the old and faded laurels has long since become a house contaminated with the ulcer of reformism. Fossilised old men dominated in the Party, and strange as it may sound, they were still regarded as left fighters in many parts of Germany. They were so regarded despite the fact that, for instance, after serious clashes with the police, they disrupted and reduced to naught the struggle against the brazen offensive upon the suffrage (1906) by their declarations that, in principle, they respected all the laws of the bourgeois state.

The squabbles and bickerings between the social-democratic bureaucracy and the bureaucrats of the trade union and co-operative movements were settled in secret, as far as possible. Efforts were made to wash their dirty linen at home. All attempts to spread discussion on burning questions were very rapidly suppressed, as obnoxious infringements of order. The far-famed "party education" section disposed of shoddy wares at classes and in talks. The publication of a series of pamphlets, including "the Mass Strike" by Rosa Luxemburg and the "Path to Power" by Kautsky, which the Lefts in Germany credited so undeservedly to the Philistines in the Central Committee bore no fruitful influence over the mass of members, in so far as the scornful name of "literary bickerings" was permanently and regularly attached to the controversies and disagreements in the country which prevailed between the Lefts, the centrist bog and the revisionists in Hamburg. The standard was very low.

When war policy exposed the German Social-Democratic Party as the social insurance of the bourgeoisie against the proletarian revolution, the organ of the Hamburg social-democrats became the central organ of the "re-educators": social-patriotism and social-imperialism raged in its columns.

This cursory review of the history of the labour movement in Hamburg explains why the factors,

which during and after the war handicapped the formation of the Communist Party, had a particularly strong influence precisely in Hamburg, and shows how great are the merits of Ernst Thaelmann in solving this problem.

* * *

Ernst Thaelmann was born in Hamburg on April 17, 1886. Even during the period of the anti-socialist law his father belonged to social-democracy. At the age of 16 already Ernst Thaelmann became a member of the Social-Democratic Party, and at the age of 17 joined the German workers' transport union. Ernst began work first in the port, then he was a sailor, and later on he worked on transport. He began to fulfil responsible functions in the Party and in the trade union movement early on in life. When he had to fulfil military service he already had the reputation of being a "politically unreliable fellow," who did not recognise his fatherland. As a revolutionary social-democrat, he had to suffer all the mockery of Prussian militarism.

When he finished his military service, Ernst Thaelmann became a member of the transport workers' Committee, and later on a representative of the Hamburg council of free trade unions. At the same time he was successively the first worker in the section for the distribution of linen, member of the all drivers' branch committee, leader of the dockers' branch and a reporter of the Hamburg Bureau of the trade union.

In 1912, the Hamburg transport workers delegated Ernst Thaelmann to the Eighth Congress in Breslau, where he made a speech against the reduction of the trade unions to the rôle of relief agencies and against the growing pretensions of the upper trade union bureaucracy.

"It has been mentioned further, that district fees are to be raised from 5 to 10 Pfennigs. I consider this excessive. The district leaders should try to cut down their expenses. . . . As regards doles, I would point out that our organisation is becoming more and more a relief organisation than an organ of struggle. This should not be so."

Resolution No. 27 called for a further curtailment of the rights of trade union members and proposed that in definite cases the right of settling questions should be given to the "local Committee," regardless of the "decisive" character of the meeting of the members of the local organisation." Ernst Thaelmann declared (see the Congress minutes):—

"I move that motion 27 be turned down as the local Committee cannot enjoy such confidence and the members of the organisation sometimes have a quite different opinion to the Committee."

It was not the political acumen of the Social-Democratic and trade union leaders that created the youth organisation in Germany, but exclusively the initiative of the exploited youth, who received support from Karl Liebknecht and other representatives of the Left wing. And it was only later, that the Social-Democratic leaders began to interest themselves in the youth in their own way, their only care being that they should not perpetrate any political "stupidities." It was only under the pressure of the mass of the members that the trade union leaders proceeded to create youth sections in the trade unions. Ernst Thaelmann and the revolutionary youth of his circle rallied to the general meetings of the transport workers' union at first 300, and later about 1,800 young workers. Finally the reformist bureaucracy resorted to repressions against this revolutionary youth section. At the Breslau Congress in 1912 Ernst Thaelmann stated:—

"We have youth sections only in Berlin and Hamburg. And we still need to plough this field. The young people in our trade are left to their own devices more than in the qualified trades. This is the reason, why much more should be done for the youth. . . . I consider it unjust that, despite higher membership fees, the youth should be given less rights than the adults, and I move that this point be rejected."

At the Ninth Congress of the transport workers' union in 1914, held in Cologne, Ernst Thaelmann again speaks in favour of the election of trade union officials by the members of the union, in favour of the elective principle in the trade unions, against transferring discussions and decisions to the narrow bureaucratically limited circle of functionaries and against the neglect of the masses of the members and for short-time wage agreements.

The reformist trade union bureaucracy, who for the sake of appearances, waged a sham struggle against the employers, attempted to bribe the young revolutionary, and so did the employers. The owner of a large laundry establishment for example offered Ernst Thaelmann a permanent position if only he ceased his "undermining work" in the capacity of the chairman of workers' committee. By his rejection of this dirty transaction, Ernst Thaelmann gained the honour of being included in the employers' black list, and was "rewarded" with a long period of unemployment. The bureaucrats of the transport workers' union made plans to somehow "gag the mouth" of this inconvenient leader of the revolutionary opposition by providing him with a soft job in the union. But they soon learned how hopeless it was to attempt such things.

After the betrayal by Social-Democracy at the outset of the war, Ernst Thaelmann passed into the ranks of opposition, which forced the leaders of Hamburg Social-Democracy to place their treacherous policy for discussion at a number of stormy delegate meetings. In 1914 already Ernst Thaelmann was called to the army. Not a day of furlough did he get for two and a half years; and the only interruption was a period of imprisonment following a war tribunal sentence. During the whole of this time Ernst Thaelmann maintained his connections with the revolutionary circles in Hamburg and received opposition newspapers, and illegal propaganda material. While spending his short furlough in Hamburg in 1917, he became a member of the newly founded Independent Social-Democratic Party. He used his furlough to discuss methods of illegal activity in the army.

When the November Revolution broke out, a strong independent social-democratic party was already in existence in Hamburg alongside of the old social-democracy, as well as an illegal numerically much weaker Left-radical grouping, which was exceptionally imbued with syndicalist elements. Anybody who wanted to join the Left-radical "organisation of unity," was asked to resign from his trade union. Participation in parliamentary elections was rejected "in principle." This sectarian line excited sharp discussions in the Left-radical organisation, which joined the Communist Party of Germany (at that time the Spartacus Bund), until its split in March, 1920. Laufenberg, the leader of the Left radicals, who gained revolutionary prestige during war-time, was acting chairman of the Soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies (composed on a parity basis (!) of representatives of three parties and of the trade unions) and carried on a menshevist policy in the Soviet. Under such confused circumstances, it was no wonder, that the attractive power of the Communist Party of Germany in Hamburg was not particularly great among the best sections of the working class.

Upon his return from the war, Ernst Thaelmann intentionally remained in the ranks of the Independent Social-Democratic Party, with the idea of going over to the Communist Party of Germany not by himself alone, but of drawing with him as many comrades as possible. He did not limit himself to the systematic and stubborn struggle against the right leaders of the Independent Social-Democratic Party, and together with other revolutionarily inclined functionaries constantly became involved in struggle, often above the heads of the Central Committee elements who were afraid of struggle in accordance with the course of events. We quote a few examples:—

In the middle of January, 1919, in Bremen, Noske's agents were kicked out of the Soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies, and workers' armed "hundreds" were set up. In vain did Noske threaten and in vain did he send a division to the lower Weser at the end of January. The revolutionary workers sensed, that after the January massacre in Berlin, it would constitute the beginning of a counter-revolutionary drive throughout the country. Telegrams of protest showered in volleys on Ebert-Scheidemann-Noske. The Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies of the Twelfth Army Corps, which had its seat in Hamburg-Altona, threatened to come and render armed assistance to Bremen. The miners of the Ruhr threatened a strike.

With the determined armed support of Hamburg, the "Hersternberg division" sent by Noske to Bremen could easily have been crushed. This example would have kindled the fire of revolutionary struggle throughout the country. And it was precisely for this reason, in order to avert this decisive step, that the Hamburg social-democratic leaders transformed the Soviet of soldiers' and workers' deputies into an endless talking shop. The leaders of the Independents (Right) and Laufenberg swallowed the bait. While debates and controversies were renewed on February 3, debates which lasted until late at night, about 1,000 workers, independents and Communists, under the leadership of Ernst Thaelmann proceeded to the barracks, and armed themselves so as to go to the aid of their brothers in Bremen. The news of such an "independent" act exploded like a bombshell at the session of the Soviet. The session was adjourned. In the meantime the armed workers were already marching to the railway station. But Noske's agents sabotaged their departure by all possible means. Thus only part of the workers succeeded in reaching Bremen, and their action failed in its purpose. Despite the heroic resistance of the workers, Noske's troops seized Bremen on February 4.

Bremen was followed by Central Germany, then by Berlin once more, then by the Ruhr, Wuerttemberg and Bavaria. Noske's white bandits gradually restored bourgeois "peace and law and order," after brutally murdering 15,000 German workers. In Hamburg in June, 1919, the guard detachments, the last bearers of the arms of the November Revolution, were replaced by absolutely reliable police officers. The voluntary detachment composed of the sons of the bourgeoisie was brought to full readiness. The exposures of the vile doings in the Hamburg Food Supply apparatus gave rise to big workers' demonstrations. It was then discovered, that the

guard detachments, who were threatened with dissolution, were unfit for struggle against the workers. The voluntary detachment attacked the demonstrators, but was smashed by the workers who promptly procured arms. Then the Social-Democratic government of the free city of Hamburg called in the help of the imperial executive power, i.e., of Noske.

The revolutionary circles of the workers firmly rejected the idea of immediately accepting the challenge to fight Noske's white gangs, which had in the meantime grown stupendously. Then, news was received one day, that a regiment of North-German troops was marching on Hamburg. When the regiment entered the city, the alarmed workers with their wives and children filled the streets, and closely followed the troops, conducting talks with them in the local dialect, and explaining the real state of affairs in Hamburg to the soldiers who had been deceived by all kinds of fables about the horrors being perpetrated there. Ernst Thaelmann was busy right among the workers. He himself entered into conversation with the soldiers, and gave instructions at the same time to the active workers who kept continuously going and coming. The soldiers had not expected such a reception. They began to waver. Their train got stuck near the Main Station, and soon the arms voluntarily surrendered by the soldiers found their way to the hands of the workers (men and women). The officers were helpless, and they left the city with the almost completely disarmed soldiers. Then Noske drew a great number of troops to Hamburg, and in a week's time these troops seized the city at sunrise.

Under the leadership of Ernst Thaelmann, the Hamburg workers, independents, almost without exception, joined the Communist Party of Germany in 1920. Only a handful of petty-bourgeois elements remained outside, who very soon dissolved in the Social-Democratic Party. Ernst Thaelmann was a member of the Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Germany and chairman of its Hamburg organisation.

Severing's offensive against the workers of Central Germany received a rebuff from the revolutionary workers of Hamburg as well. The police were on the point of cutting off the road being taken by the workers who were marching from the wharves and opened up machine gun fire on the masses. But, in spite of the obstacles which barred the streets, tens of thousands demonstrated in the very heart of the city. An officer shouted the order to disperse, from the turret of an armoured car which cut straight into the masses. But the workers did not retreat. And it was Ernst Thaelmann who was marching

in the front ranks, who coolly deliberated on how to repulse this police provocation.

Ernst Thaelmann indisputably came to the forefront in all the economic and political fights of the Hamburg proletariat. He represents the type of proletarian leader, who has grown up in the process of revolutionary struggles, and who is always closely bound up with the thoughts and feelings of his class comrades. The great confidence which the class conscious workers had in him far beyond the confines of the Hamburg organisation of the C.P.G., helped him in his struggle to transform the C.P.G. into a true Bolshevik mass party.

"The tragedy of the German revolution in 1918, of the January battles of 1919, of the battles in 1920 after the Kapp *putsch*, of the March battles of 1921 and up to the last upsurge of the acute revolutionary situation, of this first period in October, 1923, consisted in the lack of co-ordination between the objectively matured revolutionary situation on one hand, and the subjective weakness of the German proletariat, due to the absence of a purposeful Bolshevik Party—on the other hand." (Thaelmann, "Militant speeches and Articles").

The fact that he understood this already determined *Ernst Thaelmann's action* in the years 1921-1923 against Brandler and the then opportunist policy of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany on one hand, and against the "Left" deviations of Urbans, who was then the chairman of the Maritime organisation of the Communist Party of Germany, on the other hand.

From the period of the unity congress of 1920, Ernst Thaelmann was the representative of the Hamburg organisation in the Supreme Control Commission in the Communist Party of Germany, whose duty it was to check the work of the Central Committee in the intervals between the congresses. In June, 1921, Ernst Thaelmann came as delegate to the Third Congress of the Comintern, and as he did later at the Jena Congress of the German Communist Party, took an active part in the discussions and in the preparation of the resolutions, which separated the policy of the Party both from the renegade Levi group, and from the "theoreticians of the offensive" of that time, Thalheimer, and others.

The increasing inflation, the growth of the cost of living and of the burden of taxation in 1922 not only revolutionised the working class ever more and more, but also assisted the first onslaught of the fascist wave. On the night of June, 19, 1922, the Hackenkreutzers* attached

* Nazis.

two hand grenades to the window of Ernst Thaelmann's living quarters which were situated on the ground floor. Part of these apartments was destroyed by the explosion of the grenades, but the main blow failed to affect the inside of the apartment. The plot to destroy the leader of the Hamburg proletariat failed. The social-democratic press was brazen enough to assert that the attempt was staged. However, when the fascist culprits were discovered after further attempts upon the Communist Party headquarters and the Communist book store, and were formally sentenced to imprisonment, the Social-Democratic government of Hamburg attenuated the sentences they received and soon released them altogether.

The events of 1923 were approaching. At the Tenth Congress of the Transport Workers' Union already in 1919 in Stuttgart, Ernst Thaelmann declared that "it was impossible to eliminate political questions from the trade unions." The Hamburg transport workers elected him in 1924 to represent their union at the Eleventh Congress of the union, which was convened in Berlin. Among other things, Ernst Thaelmann stated the following at this Congress :

"It is true, that in the present circumstances the economic struggles and strikes for wages are the surest means to prevent the further worsening of the conditions of the working class, but the character of the trade union struggle must be extended and changed. The struggle against the impoverishment of the masses cannot be confined to economic struggles alone. We have every reason to state outright at the trade union Congress that it is no use expecting any measures in the interests of the proletariat from the capitalist governments. We have seen these last few days that Stinnes, as the representative of capitalism and the big bourgeoisie has approached the government with a firmly outlined programme, while the A.D.G.B. (All-German Alliance of (Reformist) trade unions—Ed.) replied to this with modest proposals and feeble suggestions, which do not give the proletariat the required practical improvement of their conditions. In the last paragraph, the memorandum demands from the German government, *i.e.*, from the capitalist government that a law or a decree be issued forbidding all kinds of speculative transactions, and establishing rigid control of prices fixed by concerns and syndicates. But who ever believes that a capitalist government is in a position to do so has learned nothing since 1918."

In this speech Comrade Thaelmann expressed himself for a revolutionary policy in the trade

union movement, which does not stop before the artificial obstacles of paragraphs and clauses, piled up by the reformist bureaucracy, as was called for by the legalist theses of Brandler and his adherents,—but on the other hand, recognised the full importance of struggle for the every-day interests and needs of the proletariat. Ernst Thaelmann fought against the absurd contention of the Brandler leadership in 1923 that it was necessary to put a brake on the partial struggles of the proletariat who were up in arms against the ruinous consequences of the tempestuous inflation, and that it was necessary to put such a brake on them so as to concentrate their revolutionary energy, as against attempts to evade struggle altogether. October of 1923 soon proved how correct was this estimate of the Party leadership of that time. This is what Ernst Thaelmann wrote about October, 1923 :—

"It was with incredible rapidity that in October, 1923, we approached the moment when the movement burst through its narrow framework with irrepressible elemental force and generated the supreme form of struggle, the uprising. An outright revolutionary situation was present. All the conditions requisite for the victory of the revolutionary class were at hand, with the exception of one, namely the existence of a clear, iron, serried, Communist Party, bound indissolubly with the widest masses, and ready and capable of embracing the spontaneous struggle of the working masses, of organising and leading it.

At the decisive hour, the leadership of our party proved to be bankrupt.

Our party, as a whole, was too unripe as yet to prevent the mistakes of the leadership. Thus, in the autumn of 1923 the revolution suffered defeat due to the absence of one of the most essential prerequisites, namely because there was no Bolshevik Party."

And Thaelmann was able to add with full justice :—

"But does this exhaust the whole history of October, 1923? No, not by any means! Later, again, errors were committed in resolutions and articles, and even in the speeches made before the bourgeois tribunal, in that reference was made to Saxony alone, when it was a question of October, 1923. But not only Saxony existed. There was Hamburg as well.

"Hamburg corroborated the Leninist thesis on a very large scale, to the effect that the movement bursts through its narrow framework with irrepressible elemental force and—generates the supreme form of struggle, the uprising! As stated in the theses of the January Executive Committee in 1924, the

Hamburg uprising was the opposite, the pole to Saxony."

Those, who see nothing but bankruptcy, treachery and opportunism in the history of the whole of our Party up to Frankfurt, forget the great lessons of the Hamburg struggle. They forget that the rank and file of our Party by no means remained in a state of passive impotence, but were ready to stake their lives in the struggle for power. And the Hamburg workers, more than all others, can declare that not only the Hamburg workers, but the Berlin, Saxonian, and all other Communist workers in Germany expressed their readiness for the struggle.

And we can add, that the heroic October battles of the Hamburg proletariat would not have been possible without the many years of struggle by Ernst Thaelmann for the introduction of Bolshevik clarity, for internal and external consolidation of the forces of the Hamburg organisation of the Communist Party of Germany.

The Hamburg example made it possible to rapidly overcome the spirit of depression and dejection, which prevailed in connection with the October defeat. The illegal Communist Party persistently called for a change of the opportunist Party leadership. And from this period Ernst Thaelmann takes his place at the head of the Communist Party and strives for the realisation of the point which he formulates as the "Lessons of the Hamburg Uprising," in one of his programmatic articles. We quote herein below the following lines from his article:—

"In order to gain victory in the inevitably impending repetition of the Hamburg battles, but on a much larger scale, we must embed ourselves among the masses, and bind ourselves to them by thousands of threads, creating a genuinely proletarian united front with the millions of workers. A great revolutionary wing must grow up in the trade unions, and in all the non-party organisations of the working class, which jointly with the Communists will become the bearer of the oncoming battles.

"The seizure of power by the proletariat is not an act of a single moment. It consists not only of a military struggle against the army of the bourgeoisie, but must be prepared by years of work carried on by the Communist Party and the whole proletariat. The future conquerors of the bourgeoisie must be educated, trained and organised in countless partial struggles. Such is our chief task at the present period."

"The Hamburg fighters enjoyed the full sympathy of the workers in their enterprises, but they had no organisational links with these workers. The entire unfitness, the fatal back-

wardness of our old social-democratic organisation according to the territorial principle, stood revealed. The election machine is no use for the barricades. The grossest gap in the Hamburg fighting front was the absence of Communist cells in the factories and mills."

The bolshevisation of the Communist Party of Germany soon called for struggle against the Ruth Fischer and Maslov groupings, these petty bourgeois, who hid behind "Left" phrases, and who by their sectarian life prevented the Party from waging a struggle for the majority of the working class. Ernst Thaelmann's great merit lies in the fact that, in the full consciousness of his purpose, he struggled firmly and stubbornly against this sectarian group, thus ensuring its rapid liquidation. In his fight on two fronts, against the "Left" and the right deviations, Ernst Thaelmann succeeded in consolidating the bolshevisation of the C.P.G. to an ever greater degree. In 1928 he successfully repulsed the attempt of the Brandlerites, who had the support of the conciliatory elements, to gain influence in the Party leadership with a view to reducing the rôle of C.P.G. in the class struggle of the German proletariat and to forcing the C.P.G. to follow the lead of social-democracy and the trade union bureaucrats.

Thaelmann, the pilot of the Communist Party of Germany, took the helm ever more firmly in his hands, and elevated the C.P.G. to the level of a mass party for which 6 million German working men and women voted at the elections. It was only under his leadership that the Communist Party of Germany grew into a Bolshevik mass party, and found its way to the Leninist policy of the united front, to the policy of the revolutionary trade union movement, of the independent leadership of the struggles of the working class. It is only under his leadership that the Communist Party of Germany has fought against the treacherous policy of Social-Democracy, and with ever growing success has fought for the winning over of the social-democratic workers, our class comrades, and has learnt ever more and more to master the problems of correctly estimating social-fascism, and fascism, and of the alliance of the workers and peasants.

On Ernst Thaelmann's proposal, the Central Committee issued a fervent programmatic declaration in August, 1930, for the social and national liberation of the German people, a platform which proved to be a terrible weapon in the struggle against the national demagoguery of Hitlerite fascism, as well as against the entire nationalist policy of the bourgeoisie and of social-democracy. And even now this platform serves again and

again in the underground publications of the C.P.G. as a guide showing the masses the road to emancipation through the establishment of Soviet power.

The very fact that whenever Thaelmann undertook a tour, tens of thousands always gathered to hear Ernst Thaelmann, the leader of the C.P.G., and the leader of the Red Front Fighters, the organisation prohibited by Severing (but nevertheless still continuing to exist)—is proof undoubtedly in the first instance of their confidence in the Communist Party of Germany, of the sympathy for Soviet power, of their desire to follow the great revolutionary example of the workers and peasants of the U.S.S.R. At the same time, the workers knew, or understood by instinct, that the leader of the German Communist Party is one of their own, in the best sense of this word, flesh of the flesh of the working class, bound closely and directly to the working masses. Thaelmann perceived and caught on to every least little movement among the masses, and this political sense of his, his understanding and knowledge of the life of the workers clearly combined with theoretical clarity, as well as his intrepidity and bravery in the political struggle, made Ernst Thaelmann the leader of the German proletariat.

In 1928 and 1929 the German Communist Party took a most determined course for the independent waging of economic struggle in ruthless struggle against social-fascism.

The Comintern and the Profintern in those years anticipated the forthcoming world economic crisis. Bourgeois "scientists" and the reformists, blinded by the prolonged "stabilisation" of market conditions started to talk about "crisisless economy." At the Kiel Congress of the Socialist Party of Germany Hilferding spoke of the period of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism, of the growing stability of economic conditions, declaring that the economic crisis was of less danger, and that due to the greater planfulness of capitalist economy the workers were being less and less affected by it. At the Hamburg Congress of trade unions, Naphtali sang the praises of "economic democracy," as a form of the peaceful co-existence of the employers and the workers.

In contrast to these prophecies the Communist International predicted the oncoming crisis, and orientated the tactics of the Communist Party for this period of crisis.

The Brandlerites and the conciliators on the other hand, inside the C.P.G., were up in arms against the theses of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern regarding the shattering of, and the approaching end of the temporary stabilisation.

They also turned down the tactical conclusions drawn, particularly in the sphere of trade union work.

Despite the strongest opposition of Brandler and Thalheimer, and ignoring the personal attacks made by the Brandlerites and conciliators, Ernst Thaelmann fought both these groupings without mercy. The C.P.G. came forward with red revolutionary lists at the elections of the factory committees: the revolutionary trade union opposition came into being.

When success was attained in firmly consolidating the revolutionary trade union opposition under the leadership of the C.P.G., the trade union bureaucrats of the central transport workers' union seized this opportunity on March 18, 1931 to expel Ernst Thaelmann from the union to which he had belonged for 29 years. But if it was formerly considered the greatest disgrace among the workers to be expelled from a workers' organisation, the reformist defenders of the capitalist order have long since turned the disgrace into a supreme honor by expelling revolutionary workers in masses. And in his reply to the letter, informing him of his expulsion, Ernst Thaelmann wrote among other things that the

"Bureaucracy now dominating and violating the gigantic organisations of the German proletariat has been forming in the trade unions for decades. This bureaucracy feels itself independent of the will of the wide masses of members. These bureaucrats have secured their well paid jobs for life; they have blood-bonds with capitalism, with the capitalist state.

"But anybody who does not want to fight against this system, must also oppose the economic strike and must become a scab on principle. Such is the iron logic of capitalist development. Such is the course of German reformism.

"The revolutionary trade union opposition springs up as a force, which will restore the stronghold against exploitation which has been destroyed by the trade union bureaucracy. A new force is springing up from factories, from the mines, from construction jobs, and landed estates which makes it its object to create powerful organisations against the employers and fascism. The revolutionary trade union opposition is once more regenerating the best traditions of the trade union class struggle in Germany which is over sixty years of age. The revolutionary trade union opposition wishes to and must, and this is its duty before the German working class, restore the class front, which you have destroyed."

Those who expelled Ernst Thaelmann have long since been thrown overboard, after having

cleared the road for fascism. This has only been the case if they did not promptly and openly rush to the fascist "ground of real facts" and did not become Hitler's chained dogs, in the same way as when they wagged their tails before all former capitalist governments of Germany, wearing dog-collars with the legend of the "lesser evil." As an organised parliamentary party they were thrown overboard together with all the forms of bourgeois-democratic parliamentarism, which once yielded plenty of advantages to the bourgeoisie, and have now become a hindrance to it. But the masses of social-democratic workers, who long before Hitler's advent to power were torn with doubts, but could not decide to make an organisational break with their party, are learning now from their own experience, that the liberation of the working class is possible by revolutionary means alone. This was pointed out to them by the Communist Party of Germany headed by Ernst Thaelmann, and is the path which the Party will pursue in the future as the vanguard of the German proletariat, until victory has been secured over the fascist dictatorship and until Soviet Germany has been established, despite all stupendous sacrifices.

The first big electoral victory of the National-Socialist Party in September, 1930, signalled the growth of the fascist danger in Germany. The social-democrats, Brandlerites and Trotskyists declared the fascist dictatorship to be the dictatorship of the petty bourgeoisie. What was wanted here was to introduce complete clarity as sharply as possible. In his report to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany on January 15, 1931, Ernst Thaelmann said:—

"Wherein lies the class content of the idea of the fascist dictatorship? If we examine this problem we discover that the class content of the fascist dictatorship is undoubtedly the dictatorship of finance capital, just as bourgeois democracy is. That is to say, it is not the class content that has changed, but only the methods. The forms of domination are changed, and not the content of this domination."

How to struggle against fascism? There is only one force that can beat down and smash fascism, and this is the force of the working class united under revolutionary leadership.

"In our resolution we point out that the revolutionary policy of the united front represents the main link in proletarian policy in Germany. Comrades, this formulation is of great weight. We have chosen it after ripe deliberation, so as to stress the ever growing importance of the revolutionary policy of the

united front from below for the development of the mass struggle and to strengthen the prerequisites of the revolutionary crisis in Germany."

(Thaelmann. "The Revolutionary Way-Out and the C.P.G.").

The national and social demagoguery of the National Socialists had to be exposed with the greatest energy. The masses had to be shown that the N.S.D.P. is the party of finance capital, establishing a régime of bloody terror against the working class in the interests of the moneybags. And Ernst Thaelmann stated in the same report:

"It is only by bringing to the consciousness of the masses of the employees, petty bourgeoisie, officials and rural population, who are the main mass of adherents of Hitlerite fascism, that it is not national-socialism, but we, who are the only party, in which millions of fighters are struggling for the emancipation of Germany from the Versailles yoke and capitalist bondage, and from the enslavement of the Young plan, that we will become their deliverers, and win them to the side of the class struggle."

But the German working class will be able to struggle successfully against fascism only in so far as the C.P.G. will succeed in destroying the mass influence of social-democracy. The following excerpt from the same report still remains a practical guide for immediate action:—

"We must create a clear understanding of the fact that it is impossible to smash Hitler's party, without smashing the mass influence of social-democracy, particularly among the proletariat. We must achieve a clear understanding of the fact that it will be impossible to overcome a possible future government of Hitler, unless we direct the main blow against social-democracy in good time, for the purpose of winning over the most important strata of the working class, for it is precisely social-democracy which is catching, or is already holding the wide masses of the working class captive in the interests of the bourgeoisie, and is thereby evading the class struggle, or coming out directly against it."

In the spring of 1932, three candidates were nominated for the post of president of the German Republic: Hindenburg, Thaelmann, Hitler. In this election Thaelmann embodied the united fighting front of the German proletariat. Even the workers, who for one or other reason gave their votes to Hindenburg, were forced to see in Ernst Thaelmann the candidate of the German proletariat. His tour throughout Germany during the electoral campaign was only a

special kind of triumph of the idea of the united front.

During the first days and weeks of Hitler's advent to power all the Welses and Leiparts did all possible to betray the gigantic organisation of German workers to the arbitrary will of fascism and thus to secure for themselves a warm spot in the sun of the third Empire. The Welses and Leiparts negotiated with Goering and Frick. This was the time when Ernst Thaelmann was arrested.

There is not a single workers' dwelling in Germany, not a single enterprise, where the terrible tortures and mockery exercised by the fascist hangmen over near friends, comrades of each worker, have not sown indelibly fierce hatred against the fascists, and where the proletarians are not suffering qualms about the life of one dear and near to them.

During the whole of these fourteen months that the fascist beasts have held our Ernst Thaelmann in their clutching talons, the anxious question as to what is the latest regarding Ernst Thaelmann never ceases to be uttered. This question is asked not only by Communists who are alarmed about the fate of their beloved leader. This question is being and has been asked with no less sympathy by members of the Reichsbanner, with whom we have chanced to discuss the joint anti-fascist struggle or their joining the Communist Party of Germany. This question has been asked by the social-democratic comrades, workers, in whose apartments we have frequently found shelter, and felt ourselves safest, when hiding from the fascist police. Nor did this question cease to sound even when the brave speeches of Comrade Dimitrov at the Leipzig trial, made the hearts of millions of German toilers beat faster. In this question we hear the alarm not for the life and health of one man, but the alarm for the true genuine leader of the Communist Party of Germany, reflecting the fact that both the social-democratic workers and the millions of all the toilers who are not inclined towards

fascism, place their only hope in the Communist Party of Germany, which no brutal bloody terror will ever succeed in throttling.

When speaking about Bolshevik cadres at the Wedding Congress of the Communist Party of Germany, soon after the blood-bath, organised by Zoergibel, Comrade Ernst Thaelmann called for the

"greatest readiness in our own ranks to make sacrifices not only in the political but also in the material sphere. In the struggle against our class enemy, we must defend our positions to the very end. Not a single Communist should leave the post assigned to him by the Party. Even in the conditions of the most bitter struggle we must fulfil our revolutionary duty without hesitation."

The Communist Party of Germany has given proof in letters of blood, written in the annals of history, that these prerequisites for the fulfilment of the tasks of the Bolshevik Party are still alive within it. And the merit of having forged the steeled and tempered Communist Party of Germany belongs in the first place to Ernst Thaelmann, who by his conduct in the torture-chamber of the secret police as well sets an example to the revolutionary workers. The fascist henchmen of German monopolist capital, overcome with the lust for revenge on the heroic struggle of German Communists against the Hitlerite dictatorship, which is more and more losing ground in the midst of political and economic difficulties, wish to make an end of Ernst Thaelmann, to wreak their vengeance on him. In the person of the leader of the Communist Party of Germany they want to deal a blow at the Communist Party of Germany and to sow despondency in the ranks of its heroic fighters. Only the further development and intensification of the anti-fascist mass struggle and the protest of the many millions of the proletariat throughout the world can save the life of Ernst Thaelmann and of all the revolutionary workers pining away in the fascist jails.

Back Numbers of the "Communist International," prior to 1931, are urgently required by important Libraries and Educational Institutions and will be allowed for at the usual rate.

THE LAST "NEW WORD" OF GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

FOREWORD.

The allegedly Marxian (?) leaders of the "N.C.L.C." Publishing Society have seen fit to undertake the responsibility of circulating a counter-revolutionary document in England under the title of "Socialism's New Start," complete with preface by H. N. Brailsford. Since this document was dealt with in an article by A. Martynov, entitled "The Leninist Slogan of the Struggle for Soviet Power in the Present Situation," in the Russian Edition of the "Communist International" (No. 3, dated Jan. 20, 1934) we take the opportunity of reprinting the relevant part of the article, dealing with this precious document, in the English Edition, under the title of "The Last 'New Word' of German Social Democracy."

Editorial Board.

AUSTRIAN social-democracy, the Russian Mensheviks and the German social-democratic emigrants represent social-fascism at the present time. They have not as yet shaken off their old democratic rags, which still decorate their new "left" speeches. A far greater indication of the present period is the new generation of German social-democratic leaders who, according to their own words, are at present working underground in Germany, and who have better adapted themselves to the régime of the open fascist dictatorship and who correspondingly have learnt to combine the most "left" phrases with the *most real and direct assistance to Hitler's fascism*. For this reason they deserve our especial attention.

One of the old leaders of German social-democracy, Frederick Stampfer, wrote an article on "self-criticism" in the August, 1933, issue of the "Der Kampf," in which he stated the following:

"We can, however, say that the old generation of leaders is dying off, so that more than enough room has been left for the new generation. This new generation is growing out of the masses who are now living under the oppression of a régime of force, and who want to offer resistance. Most likely this generation will have very little in common with the old . . ."

The rôle of representative of this new generation of leaders of German social-democracy is being sought by one Miles (a pseudonym under which most likely not one, but an entire group of new "leaders" is hiding itself*), who in August, 1933, published a discussion pamphlet under the

title of "Socialism's New Start" This pamphlet, according to the statement of the author, was written "in haste and under the oppressive conditions of Fascist illegality." This pamphlet is a complete "manifesto."

The style of this pamphlet, written by the new leader, or new leaders, is distinguished by its pretentiousness—bordering on impudence—and a *Messiah tone à la Hitler*.

Regarding the Soviet state, he declares that it is carrying on a heroic struggle which is especially difficult, due to "the lack of adequate Marxist qualifications (!) on the part of the revolutionary party in power (inadequate theoretical basis, (!), false directives for action, tendency towards bureaucracy, etc.)" (page 47).

The author further speaks of two tendencies in the modern world. One tendency is towards war and fascism, the other, the opposite tendency, is revolutionary. The latter "reached its first stage in the Russian October Revolution . . . which is associated with a false theory. Based on imperfect knowledge, it is bound to become involved in greater and greater contradictions, unless the proletariat of Western Europe guides it politically and intellectually into new paths. With these attempts on the part of the proletariat of Western Europe to develop and put into action the *theory and practice of socialist revolution*, on the basis of its own conditions and of its own experiences and defeats, is being ushered in the *second stage of the proletarian revolution*" (page 83).

Thus, the first stage of the socialist revolution began with Lenin who suffered from "incomplete knowledge" and from a "low Marxian qualification," while the second stage begins . . . with the educated Western European, with . . . Mr. Miles.

This newly arrived prophet, draping himself in a "left" cloak, declares:

"The Communists and the Social-Democrats have shown themselves to be incapable of organising the masses for action against the prevailing system. They have, each in their own way, been reduced to utter bankruptcy" (page 36).

"In view of the anti-Marxist campaign of the fascists and the revisionist tendencies within the socialist labour movement, we declare *most emphatically in favour of Marxism* . . . A revival of the German socialist labour movement can come about in the spirit of Marxism alone" (page 87).

* Mr. Millar states in his prefatory note to the English edition that "this book is the work of a group of Socialists."—Ed.

“We will never again return to ‘democratic socialism’” (page 56).

Let us take a look at the contents of this regenerated “revolutionary Marxism.” It starts with an attack on the foundations of Marxism, an attack odious in purpose and stupid in form, an attack precisely on the question of the theory of the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions. The teachings of Marx and Engels, says the author, which were elaborated in the epoch of the great bourgeois revolutionary struggles, must now, in the epoch of decline of capitalism, be “critically worked out” (page 69). The critical “working-out” of Marx begins with the reconstitution of his theory of the bourgeois revolution. The epoch of the bourgeois revolution in Germany, according to the words of the author, which began in 1813-1814 with the reforms of Stein and Hardenberg, finished in 1924 (1). The November revolution of 1918, and the revolutionary struggles which took place after this, until 1924—“all these,” according to the author, were only “manifestations of the bourgeois revolution” (page 74).

By the epoch of the bourgeois revolution, the author understands the entire lengthy epoch of the transformation of feudal into bourgeois society. Although all the spontaneous-revolutionary movements of the proletariat may have had the character of proletarian uprisings against the bourgeoisie, and though they may have taken place under the flag of Communism, yet (according to the new “Marxian” theory of Mr. Miles) in so far as they took place in the “epoch of the bourgeois revolution,” they lawfully constitute only a form of the expression of the bourgeois revolutionary process and cannot be anything else.

“All these expressions of militancy appear to be the first, as yet imperfect, expressions of a spontaneous proletarian movement. Appearances are, nevertheless, deceptive, for these expressions of militancy are, in reality, only special manifestations of the bourgeois-revolutionary process” (page 74).

In exactly the same way the November revolution in Germany, which was in reality a spontaneous proletarian revolution taking place under the slogan of soviets and the demands of socialism, which incidentally overthrew the monarchy, and which was betrayed by social-democracy, was, according to Miles, a purely bourgeois revolution in so far as the “epoch of the bourgeois revolution,” according to his theory, came to an end only in 1924. In exactly the same way, the Spartacus uprising and the other proletarian revolutionary struggles in Germany during the post-war period were, according to the author’s

deceit, only forms of the expression of the “bourgeois-revolutionary process.”

Why did Mr. Miles need to think up such a stupid “law” for the epoch of the bourgeois revolution, and to decree such periods for it in Germany (the end of the “epoch” in 1924)?

Because this makes it possible for him to justify the betrayal committed by German social-democracy in 1918, and throw the responsibility for the defeat of the German workers in the November revolution on the Comintern.

Miles, as a “left,” recognises that—“the political objective of the German socialists is a bourgeois republic, and not the socialist state, and that its social objective is a ‘reformist’ capitalist system” (page 91).

In acknowledging this, he goes so far as to even slander the remote past of social-democracy when he says that “its objective has *always* been (this means, even in the time of Marx and Engels—A.M.) at the most a bourgeois-democratic republic” (page 91).

But he does not in the least blame the social-democratic leaders, because “these leaders are merely representatives of the reformist outlook which pervades the masses” (page 97). It is true that these masses very often were so revolutionary and disagreed with the social-democratic leaders to such an extent that, as the author himself agrees, social democracy “disarmed the proletariat in a series of sanguinary struggles and armed the officers’ leagues in order to protect this bourgeois republic from the impetuosity of the masses and the advance of the revolution” (page 90).

It is true that these masses were so responsive to revolutionary ideas that the Communist Party in Germany was able, in an historically short period, to almost catch up with the social-democracy and win six million votes, but this does not disturb the author one bit. All this does not prevent him calling the German Communist Party “an insignificant sect” (page 93) and—considering social-democracy as the lawful expression of the allegedly bourgeois-reformist strivings of the entire German working class.

This is how he makes such a base distortion of historical reality, and introduces such an infamous theory to the effect that, until 1924, not only there was not, but could not be, a proletarian revolution, nor even offshoots and rudiments of such. According to Mr. Miles, this is due to the bourgeois character of the entire working class in Germany, a characteristic which he says is inevitable in the “epoch of the bourgeois revolution . . .” and he therefore comes to the conclusion that the Comintern committed a crime when it split from social-democracy.

"This historically entirely erroneous estimate of proletarian spontaneity is also one of the real causes of the absurd 'splitting' policy of the Comintern" (page 75).

The author, of course, is absolutely deliberately silent regarding the fact that none other than social-democracy has split the working class.

Secondly, just as infamous as it is stupid is the trick which Mr. Miles plays under the flag of Marxism, and which consists of the way he portrays the distinction between the character and destiny of the bourgeois revolution, and that of the proletarian revolution.

This trick, by the way, is closely linked up with the first.

"Bourgeois revolution," says Miles, "was a revolution of bourgeois *society* against the absolutist state" (page 76).

This is true, but when he underlines the word "society" the author further gives the impression that the rôle of the different classes and parties within this new society, which existed in embryo in the womb of feudalism, was of no importance for the progress of the bourgeois revolution:

"In . . . bourgeois revolutions, the revolutionary parties engaged in the struggle are, at the most, parties which represent the *result* of revolutionary development and which are quite unaware of their historic function in the whole process of the revolution" (page 77).

According to this philosophy of history propounded by this newly-hatched "genius," Lenin, for example, and the Bolshevik Party were *blind* weapons during the bourgeois revolution of 1905 and in the February revolution of 1917, and *could not influence the outcome* of these revolutions (page 77). According to Mr. Miles' philosophy of history, subjective factors do not play any rôle in a bourgeois revolution, and *only* blind objective historical necessity acts.

According to this theory of Mr. Miles, in the proletarian revolution, as distinct from the bourgeois revolution, the subjective factor (rôle of the Party) operates, and for this reason it is a "cultural process" (!) (page 78), but the subjective factor hangs in the air in the proletarian revolution, because it has no *firm* economic base. For Mr. Miles the growth of the *objective economic prerequisites for the proletarian revolution* are absent. The author recognises that on this point he is revising and "correcting" Marx's teachings on the basis of the "latest experiences." Marx and Engels, says he, considered that the socialist revolution must also inevitably take place on the basis of the developments of the contradictions in capitalist society. He, Miles, on the basis of the "latest experience," has come to the conclusion that:

"In reality socialist revolution and socialist remodelling of society are not historically inevitable, but are, rather, a *great historical opportunity* placed within the reach of the human race. It is for us to use it" (page 81).

Now, at least, it is clear to us why all Mr. Miles' philosophy of history, why all his "dialectics," i.e., sophistry, was necessary, regarding the laws of the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions. He needed it in order to bury Marx's theory of the inevitability of the socialist revolution, and to substitute in its place his subjective theory, according to which the socialist revolution is only a thing of *chance*, is only a lucky *accident*, is only a "problem," as the bourgeois liberal-revisionist of Marxism, Mr. Peter Struve, said in Russia at one time.

This "scientific discovery" accomplished by the new leader of German social-democracy is already "a big achievement" from the point of view of the interests of the bourgeoisie. But this is not sufficient for Mr. Miles. Now he has to serve not only the bourgeoisie in general but especially his present master, Hitler's fascist dictatorship, and this, in reality, is his main "final aim."

This "final" aim pursued by Miles predetermines his further reasoning. It would be incorrect to conclude from what has been said that, in general, Miles denies the objective regularity of development in modern capitalist society. He only denies the growth of the sum-total of the objective economic-prerequisites for the proletarian revolution. But he recognises the objective regularity of the growth of fascism on the basis of the laws of the decline of capitalist society. He recognises the inevitability of fascism as the product of the law of this decline. When he asserts that the socialist revolution in the present epoch is only a "chance," in so far as it allegedly depends *only* on the subjective factor and has no *firm* objective basis, he at the same time states that the victory of fascism, on the contrary, is now an *historical inevitability* in so far as it has deep roots in the objective process of the downfall of capitalism, and that for this reason fascism is extremely long-lived.

"It would be an absurd illusion," says he, "to believe that the Nazi seizure of power in Germany was merely an episode, interrupting, for a longer or shorter period, the post-war history of German democracy (even 'for a longer period' is an illusion, that means for ever—A.M.). The historical events through which we in Germany have lived since the Spring constitute a change amounting to a revolution. They constitute a *fascist revolution*. . . . It has, however, something in common with bourgeois revolution in that it tends towards a radical reorganisation of the *political*

superstructure of society; and with proletarian revolution, in that its ultimate cause and its driving forces are to be found in the contradictions of the capitalist system . . . It is a political revolution springing from profound social causes and forces. The ever-sharpening contradictions of declining capitalism radicalise the masses, but under the influence of bourgeois ideas and ideologies of a reactionary nationalist type" (page 118).

"The fascist revolution is, to a certain extent, the proletarian revolution turned upside down by the adoption of bourgeois ideology, i.e., the inverted image of the proletarian revolution" (page 142).

"Final success in the fight against fascism can only be the result of years of hard struggle. Even the severest crisis of the system would only lead to a change in the exponents of fascism, but not to the downfall of the régime itself," etc., etc. (page 132).

And so the new leaders of German social-democracy begin their "revival" by striving to deal a double ideological blow in the back of the German revolutionary movement, and the German proletariat. Firstly, they are trying to deprive the workers of their belief in, and conviction of, the inevitability of socialism. Secondly, they are trying to instil in them a belief in, and a conviction of, the indestructibility of fascism and of the extraordinarily long period of time that fascism is to exist and at the same time of its inevitable (?!) victory all over the world, a point which Mr. Miles enlarges on in detail. His (their!) servility to Hitler reaches such a point that he (they!) repeats after him that his advent to power means a "revolution."

What is the full *essence* of Mr. Miles' "new word"? Miles (i.e., he or those who are hiding behind this pseudonym) knows that it is absolutely senseless to come to the workers with such a "new word." And their social-client also understands this quite well. For this reason Mr. Miles has invented a new "left" cloak for his baseness. For this reason he tries to place some new perspectives before the workers, but in the *far distant future*. He draws these perspectives in beautiful colours so that they have some external resemblance to the October revolution (for he knows how strong is the urge of the workers towards soviet power), and at the same time, as an educated Western European, standing, so to speak, many hands higher than the Russian "barbarians," he so "corrects" the Bolshevik method of building socialism that it becomes transformed into a method for immortalising capitalism. And in doing this, he tries at the same time to discredit,

slander, calumniate and defame the Soviet Union and the Comintern.

We, so he says, will also be reds when "chance" helps us to take power. We will never again return to "democratic socialism" (page 56). The revival of the parliamentary democratic régime is "only possible for a short, transitory period" (page 59). Bourgeois democracy has been buried for ever.

"The transformation of the machinery of government of the capitalist states into that of a centralised party state . . . whether it is fascist or socialist . . . is inevitable" (page 59).

"The setting up of a socialist state means that the socialist party must concentrate the whole power of the state exclusively in its own hands. It must use this absolute power to thwart all counter-revolutionary attempts at mobilisation," etc. (page 56).

Historical "chance," is his argument, will help us to take power if we are successful in carrying on "a successful campaign for the restoration to the wage-earners of an *unrestricted* (our revolutionist Miles will not agree to anything less—A.M.) right to combine in the fascist countries." And if we utilise this "unrestricted right to combine" (under open fascist dictatorship!—A.M.) for carrying on a bold strike struggle, then the capitalist system will come to "a crisis" (page 55), then a "crisis must inevitably occur within the capitalist system" (page 55). (In Miles' opinion, the capitalist system is not, of course, undergoing any crisis now—A.M.). And when all these miracles take place (in the far future!—A.M.) Messrs. Miles will immediately form a centralised state, headed by one party, "our party."

This delirium is to convince the workers, who have become disillusioned in the social-democratic party, that its old mistakes will never be repeated again, and that when some lucky "chance" some fine day creates a revolutionary situation again, they, under the new social-democratic leadership, will establish some kind of a "dictatorship of the proletariat."

This "left" cloak donned by Miles is an *actual apology for fascism*. However, as soon as Miles begins to speak of what his quasi (so-called) "dictatorship of the proletariat," his centralised socialist state, headed by the one party, will do, he immediately hastens to explain that this socialist state will have nothing in common with that which the Bolsheviks have done, and are doing now. His remote perspectives of "socialist" construction are a story which repeats all that the Mensheviks advised the Bolshevik Party to do, and which the Bolsheviks rejected with scorn as the "advice" of the class enemy. As to what the Bolshevik Party has done and is doing in the

U.S.S.R., Miles paints a picture in exactly the same base and infamous colours as Kautsky does. As an example we will give only one quotation regarding the Five-Year Plan.

"This 'new soviet planned economy' has nothing whatever to do with either planning or efficient economics, let alone with socialism. It represents, rather, a bureaucratie economic system controlled by decrees such as that which once before, in the period of War Communism, resulted in catastrophe" (page 109).

Miles estimates the Comintern in the same way. Considering the Comintern to blame for the split of the working class, he says:

"We must demand its liquidation and the incorporation of its organisations in the Labour and Socialist International, in order that they may merge with the parties of the latter" (page 137).

A summary of Miles' philosophy:—

1. A fascist "revolution" took place in Germany. The fascist dictatorship is an historical inevitability. It is obtaining victory all over the decaying capitalist world. Its existence is to be extraordinarily long. The unlimited "epoch of fascism" has started.

2. The socialist revolution is not inevitable. It is only a "chance," that is, a lucky accident.

3. If this lucky accident takes place, then neither bourgeois democracy, nor "democratic socialism" will come about, but a "party state." Generally speaking, a party state is now inevitable, but at the present time it is assuming the form of the fascist state as in Germany. In the far distant future, if a lucky chance takes place, it will be possible as a socialist state.

4. This "party state" will, however, not do what the soviet state is doing, but what the counter-revolutionary Mensheviks advised the soviet power to do.

5. That which the soviet power has done has nothing in common with socialism, and has only led to economic catastrophe.

6. The Comintern is also leading the socialist movement to catastrophe, and for this reason it has to be liquidated.

In recommending this plan, and painting these "perspectives," the new leader (or new leaders) of German Social-Democracy has most significantly addressed himself to the foreign social-democratic emigrants as follows:—

"It certainly does no harm to spread informa-

tion abroad about the German fascist terror. This is done even by bourgeois elements, but it is in the interests of the struggle in Germany only in so far as it proceeds from the standpoint of Marxism" (page 130).

This means, you may say in foreign countries, that a régime of force holds sway in Germany, that will do no harm; the fascist government itself does not hide it, but, on the contrary, advertises that it has restored the virtues of the ancient teutons, with the "teutonic fury" which is inherent in it. But when you say this, prove "in Marxian fashion" that this régime is stable and firm, that it has deep roots, i.e., prove just the thing that Hitler wants most of all. Further, the author, in addressing himself to the foreign social-democratic officials in emigration, once again most significantly utters the warning that:

"If, however, those exiled members of the party which was destroyed by fascism wish in the future to put forward a claim to be considered members of the revived German socialist movement, they must fulfil its conditions. They must not only subscribe to its programme, but they must also be aware that any false step of theirs, any journalistic or other political activity which is opposed to the interests of the German struggle, may result in the death of many German fighters for freedom and is equivalent to a denunciation (to the police!)" (page 131).

This means—behave in such a way that the fascist Hitler government will have no cause to be dissatisfied with you, or with us.

If we think over all that is stated in the "manifesto" of the "new generation" of leaders of German social-democracy which we have dealt with in its totality, then the question arises involuntarily: if Hitler wanted to purchase reliable assistants in the ranks of social-democracy, for money or for other favours, with a view to strengthening his fascist dictatorship, could he find anyone better than Messrs. Miles, who make pretensions to discovering a new epoch in the world socialist movement? And at the present moment these Mileses are the "advance detachment" of international social-democracy! Can there be any doubt of the oncoming victory over this social base of the bourgeoisie, which is rotten through and through, if we learn to master well that powerful weapon which the great Lenin gave us?

CORRECTION.

No. 8, article of R. McIlhorne, entitled "The Economic Situation in Ireland and the Tasks of the Communist Party in Ireland," page 321,

column 2, bottom, should read: "Farmers who received 4.4d. per gallon for milk . . . in 1932, in 1933 received 3.9d."

THE TURNING POINT IN POLAND

By G. LENSKY.

THE revolutionary movement in Poland is at a turning point leading towards *developed political struggles*, while overcoming the ever-growing oppression of the fascist dictatorship.

The strength of our leadership always lay in its ability to determine the immediate perspective and in its skill in making practical deductions therefrom. This perspective is closely linked up with the great upheavals which have been taking place lately in the development of the international revolutionary upsurge. The first thing to do is to find out what place is occupied in these events by the proletariat of Poland and its communist vanguard.

I.

Like all the other sections of the Comintern, the Communist Party of Poland should not close its eyes to certain symptoms of the livening up of capitalist production, which signify the transition to a specific kind of depression which, according to Comrade Stalin, "leads neither to a new improvement and flourishing of industry nor does it return it to the point of maximum decline." This tendency does not, of course, manifest itself to an equal degree at all points. In such weak links of capitalism as Poland, the signs of economic revival are very insignificant.

In such countries, the following fact is doubly decisive for the revolutionary perspective, namely, that the partial economic revival, achieved not only through the war-inflationary situation, but also through the influence of the inner economic forces of capitalism, involves an unprecedented and monstrous exploitation of the toiling masses. The ever aggravating *consequences* of the economic crisis, which push the masses of workers and peasants into the abyss of terrible destitution and hunger is the decisive point. The fact that here the decay of the capitalist system becomes most glaringly salient, due to the indissoluble intertwining of the economic crisis with the general crisis of capitalism is also a decisive point. So is the fact that the disintegration of capitalism is accompanied by the mighty growth of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, which points out to the toiling masses the only way out of the crisis. To sum up, the decisive point is the fact that the revolutionary crisis is rapidly maturing, and this faces the proletariat ever more acutely with the problem of power and of the ways which lead to the conquest of it.

We have entered the period of profound fissures in bourgeois power and of spontaneous outbursts among the masses who do not want to live any longer in the old way. These fissures face the Party with most responsible tasks.

The perspective of sharp turns was revealed with all clearness during the general strike of the French proletariat and in the heroic armed struggle of the Austrian workers. Both these actions were the response of the working class to the fascist offensive of the bourgeoisie, which in France found its expression in the mobilisation of the forces of military reaction for the preparation and realisation of fascist dictatorship, whereas in Austria it assumed the character of open civil preventive war of fascism against growing revolution. The general strike in France brought a great upheaval in the class struggle. In France the forces of fascism are on the offensive and are increasing, but due to the powerful counter-offensive of the proletariat, the correlation of forces changed in favour of the latter. In contradistinction to the Germany of the epoch of the tempestuous overflow of the Hitlerite wave, the struggle of the proletariat in France excited sympathy from among the broad masses of the petty-bourgeoisie. The general strike in France increased the influence of the proletariat over these masses, and strengthened its hitherto weak hegemony in the general revolutionary movement.

The Austrian example clearly revealed the instability of the fascist regime under conditions when the relative stabilisation of capitalism has come to an end, when fascism creates additional obstacles in the way of the revolutionary development, and at the same time prepares the ground for mass outbursts which undermine the capitalist system ever deeper. This same Austrian example clearly demonstrates that mass outbursts alone are not sufficient to achieve victory, but that in addition it requires the leadership of the Communist Party itself. Such are the dynamics of the ripening of the revolution, not only in the countries where fascist dictatorship has already been in existence a long time, but also in the countries where the fascist regime is but newly born.

The underestimation of the reverse side of fascism, which is shaking capitalism, leads to the perspective of capitulation and retreat in the face of difficulties.

The comparatively high stage of the instability of the fascist dictatorship in Poland creates the conditions under which each mass outburst may provoke a sharp turn towards a revolutionary crisis, and the Party must be in readiness for this.

The general strike in France and the armed struggle in Austria became the lever for a profound revolution in the consciousness not only of the non-Party, but also of the social-democratic masses. The unleashing of civil war by fascism, which undermines the ideology of the democratic "growth into

socialism" while capitalism continues, creates the opportunity for our Party to themselves accelerate the transfer of these masses to the position of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviet power. Everywhere, where fascist dictatorship is already in existence, or where fascism is raising its head, where bankrupt parliamentary democracy is growing into fascist dictatorship, the working masses impressed by the world historic victories of the U.S.S.R., and influenced by the activity of the Communist Party are becoming supporters of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of which the Soviet Union has given them an example.

It is only the Trotskyist hangers-on of social fascism who are still capable of contending that the "political problem facing the consciousness of the working masses does not assume the form of the decisive alternative of either the dictatorship of fascism, or the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the considerably more primitive and vague alternative of either fascism or democracy" (Trotsky, "Problems of To-day," Bulletin of the Opposition, February, 1934).

If such had been the case, then the parties of the Second International would not have been compelled to give a verbal renunciation of bourgeois democracy and to launch the deceptive slogan of the "dictatorship of the toiling classes." Social-fascist "programmes" to reconstruct the social order are springing up everywhere like mushrooms after the rain, their purpose being to divert the attention of the masses from the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and from the tremendous achievements of socialist construction in the Soviet Union which have a world historical importance. The leaders of the Second International are anxious to carry through a broadly planned manoeuvre which is to help the social-democracy of fascist countries to play the rôle of the last reserve of the bourgeoisie in the new round of revolutions and wars.

Polish social-fascism has taken up one of the foremost places as regards manoeuvres involving "re-armament," the February Congress of the Socialist Party of Poland being eloquent proof thereof. It was no accident that the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat was the central point of the discussion at the Congress. As Stanchik, one of the "lefts" of the Polish Social Party confessed, this central point was hammered into the discussion by the masses themselves, who are now discussing the problem: democracy or dictatorship. "We put our Stake on democracy so many times and have always lost. We will now put our stake on dictatorship. . . ." This is how, according to Stanchik, the lower strata of workers in the Polish Socialist Party are talking. This is the reason why the Socialist Party of Poland, whose leaders have backed up bourgeois democracy until recently,

have switched over from "democracy" to "dictatorship." The delegates to the Congress connected with the lower strata commented with sorrow on "the shrinking of the Party apparatus" (Gorlitsky), on the decline of its influence upon the masses, who refuse to listen any longer to the laudatory hymn of the Nedzialkovskys addressed to bourgeois democracy and the democratic way out of the crisis. "Nobody believes in the democratic way any longer . . . (Scherkovsky). "The masses listen attentively and we must not strain their moods" (Kvaninsky). This is the principal reason why the Congress of the Socialist Party of Poland put forth the slogan of the "dictatorship of the toiling masses" to serve as a lightning conductor from the growing proletarian revolution and as an antidote against the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviet power, which is penetrating deeply among the masses.

"In order to realise the programme of Socialist reconstruction in Poland"—reads the resolution of the Congress—"the Socialist Party of Poland is striving to create a workers' and peasants' government, which will base itself on the masses and will be under their control. This government will bear the character of a dictatorship, which is imperative during the transient period for the purpose of suppressing in embryo all attempts at counter-revolution. It will serve as the expression of the will and the interests of the toiling masses and will be built on bases, which secure the masses decisive influence over state life."

This vague formulation can at any moment be filled with an obviously counter-revolution content. Not a word is said about the dictatorship being that of the proletariat, or about the mass organisational basis of this "dictatorship," or about the concrete Soviet form of the Workers' and Peasants' government, or about the trend of the so-called struggle against counter-revolution (the words: "suppression of all attempts at counter-revolution" will be deciphered at the opportune moment, as meaning the chastisement of communism, of course). It is no wonder therefore that all the zealous and open adherents of bourgeois democracy, who have preserved their positions in the leadership of the Socialist Party of Poland (Nedzialkovsky, Zhulavsky, Pezhek, and others) have been able to reconcile themselves to this resolution.

The manoeuvring nature of the "re-armament" of the Socialist Party of Poland (P.P.S.) was revealed in the speech of one of the delegates who commented on the resolution of the Congress.

"Of two members of the Central Committee," stated Ksheslavsky, "one contended on the basis of this resolution that everything has remained unchanged, while the other stated that a revolution had occurred in the views of the Party."

The truth, of course, is that a change has taken place in the method of fooling the masses, in the form of agitation, and in their tactics, while their counter-revolutionary essence remains.

The slogan "Dictatorship of the toiling masses" accepted by the Congress, does not prevent the P.P.S. from praising the "constructive" plan of the Belgian social-fascist de Man, who preaches social reconstruction within the framework of the bourgeois regime and state. On the basis of this plan, which in fact maps out the development tending towards state-monopoly capitalism, or rather the rescue of bankrupt private enterprises at the expense of the state, Belgian social-democracy promises to realise the nationalisation of the commanding heights of finance capital" by all constitutional means," and appeals for aid to all classes and parties. The plan of de Man which is calculated to catch the petty-bourgeois and unemployed masses, represents an attempt by social-democracy to fascise the bourgeois state, and the whole of social life in the most painless fashion.

The task of the Communists now consists in the following: to wedge in skilfully into the discussion about power which is going on among the P.P.S. rank and file, and to expose the slogans issued by the Congress of the P.P.S., as a pseudonym for fascised "democracy," which is to save the bourgeoisie from the dictatorship of the proletariat. While counterposing to the slogans of social-fascism, which are meant to fool the masses, our programme of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we must convince the masses by their experience in the everyday struggle, that there can be no workers' and peasants' power without a soviet government, and that the only way to socialism lies through the destruction of the whole apparatus of the bourgeois state, into which international social-democracy has been growing for many decades.

To the great sorrow of the social-fascists, the masses are now thinking not so much as to whether they will overthrow the capitalist system, as to *how* to overthrow it. The consciousness is growing, even among the masses who follow the P.P.S., that there is no other way, but the one pointed out by the Communists. The fright at this awakening of the consciousness of the masses was evident in all the speeches made at the congress of the P.P.S. Thus, for instance, the "left" charlatan Zaremba, while standing for revolution in words, was compelled to warn the delegates that they should not suspect him of recognising the integrity of the Communists.

This is the reason why the P.P.S., along with the entire Second International, are trying by all possible means to utilise the heroic armed struggle of the Austrian workers as the proof of their ability to carry on a revolutionary struggle against fascism.

"Social democracy is capable of fighting with arms in its hands" say the leaders of the P.P.S. to the masses. Their "militant" declamation does not frighten the Polish bourgeoisie who are perfectly aware of the necessity of the manoeuvred re-arming of social fascism. "We are threatened with no danger from your side," declared the representative of the government *bloc*, Medzinsky in the Diet in reply to the Austrian masquerade of the P.P.S. deputies. "In the future as well," said he, "we will fight against you, if the necessity should arise, with our tongues, but not with machine guns." This very same Medzinsky was forced to admit that the Pilsudski government did not have the broad masses on its side. But he stated regretfully that neither has social-fascism a firm support among the masses, who are now moving towards proletarian revolution. Let the P.P.S. retain the leftward moving masses by means of any phraseology, without fear of being threatened by the fire of Pilsudski's machine guns, for the latter are designed for the masses who are going over to the camp of Communism. Such is the real meaning of Medzinsky's declaration.

However, it would be a mistake to underestimate the fact that the social-fascists have earned a certain moral capital from the struggle of the Austrian workers. The general half-hour strike of solidarity with the Austrian proletariat which they declared, met with a broad response among the working class of Poland. This strike undoubtedly raised the authority of the P.P.S.

The Communist Party of Poland immediately gave a correct appraisal of the armed struggle of the Austrian workers and gave the slogan of the general strike their own political content. In contrast to the P.P.S., which preserved silence regarding the rôle of Polish fascism, the Communist Party of Poland in its agitation linked up the strike with the struggle against the fascist dictatorship of Pilsudski. However, with the exception of Warsaw, the Communists failed to unite the strike with demonstrations, and to develop it into a mass political action which would break the framework of social-fascist legalism. It was only several days after the general strike that the Lodz organisation of the C.P.P. succeeded in organising a demonstration of one thousand workers in front of the Austrian consulate.

The struggle against the speculation by international social-democracy with the heroic feat of the Austrian workers must ensure that we explain to the masses our formulation of the question of power and that we expose the treacherous rôle of social-democracy. It is to become a bridge to the social-democratic workers.

Messrs. the Nedzialkovskys present Austrian social-democracy and its Vienna municipality as

being the successor of the glorious traditions of the Paris Commune. This is a swindling counterfeit. The social-fascists are trying to conceal, to hide from the masses, the historical fact that the fighting legacy of the Paris Commune has been embodied in life only by the October revolution in the U.S.S.R., and that the heroic struggle of the Austrian workers and rank and file members of the Schutzbund, as distinct from the Paris Communards, and failed to result in the seizure of power by the proletariat, failed for the following reason. It failed just because of the fact that though they did take up arms in spite of their social-democratic leaders, nevertheless, since they were under the influence of social-democracy they failed to pass from the defensive to the offensive, and did not even set themselves the goal of the fight for power.

The ideological and political struggle around the armed struggle of the Austrian proletariat is only just beginning. It must be developed to the proper extent.

II.

The working class of Poland has entered on a period of political struggles which are growing ever into a counter-offensive against the fascist dictatorship. The revolutionary movement in Poland is overcoming one of the greatest weaknesses, which we pointed out at the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. A definite forward move has taken place in recent months in the strike struggle, which remains as hitherto the basic link of the revolutionary upsurge; *there has been a wave of political strikes directed directly against the Pilsudski government.*

The development of the strike movement has all the time followed a rising undulating line with intervals, indicating the mobilisation of forces for new battles on a much broader front and with considerably greater tension. The upsurge of economic strikes assumed an unprecedented scope last year. It was combined with glaringly expressed elements of political struggle, with stormy demonstrations, with separate strikes of protest and solidarity.

The correct tactical line of the Communist Party played a great rôle in the development of political strikes. The January Plenum of our Central Committee not only foresaw, but even gave the Party the thesis of the possibility of developing mass political struggles in the nearest future. In the centre of attention the Plenum placed the question of the preparation and organisation of the general strike against the liquidation of social insurance and compulsory arbitration.

The December campaign of the Party, which embraced tens of thousands of workers, was already conducted in this direction. In spite of the P.P.S. and its Trotskyist hangers-on, who like the Russian

Mensheviks in 1913, shouted about the "hazard of the strike," our Party succeeded in organising a number of strikes and demonstrations on December 20 in such centres as Lodz and Warsaw.

The wave of protest strikes was accompanied by a new upsurge of economic struggles in different factories and in entire branches of industry. Even the most backward sections of the proletariat, and those who had remained passive for a number of years, joined the struggle. To the latter belong the metal workers of Warsaw, Lodz, Upper Silesia, as well as the printers of Poznan and the Maritime District. To the former belong the semi-proletarian strata of Western White Russia (the heroic strike of forest workers).

The liquidation of social legislation has roused the entire working class of Poland. Their last achievements (social insurance, half-day work on Saturdays, payment for holidays), are seriously threatened.

The tactics of the Communist Party were to lead the proletariat to the general revolutionary strike by means of all possible forms of struggle depending upon the concrete tension of the masses.

Taught by the experience of the general strike of March 16, 1932, which the Communists gave a revolutionary character in a number of places, the leaders of the P.P.S. have tried by all means to split up the struggle, and to reconcile the working class gradually to fascist decrees. "Action should be conducted within the framework of the obligatory decrees," declared Zhulavsky, the general secretary of the reformist trade unions immediately after their promulgation (at the beginning of December last year).

As against the social-fascist tactics of adaptation to the new laws, put into operation in instalments by the Pilsudski government, the Communist Party has counterposed the maximum extension of the front of struggle for the abolition and disruption of these laws. We were fully aware of the tremendous difficulties connected with the carrying out of a *one day* general strike under the leadership of our Party, in opposition to all the legal organisations of the social-fascists and the fascists. For this reason, at the end of December, 1933, our Central Committee gave the instruction to proceed immediately to the organisation of just a *one-hour* general strike, which it fixed for the first days of February, having in view the extension of the same, should the course of events make it necessary. We bore in mind also that where there is a high tension among the masses, our organisations could organise strikes of longer duration, without limiting ourselves by any schemes. A general strike of this type would have strengthened the confidence of the working class in its own power, and being the forerunner of further struggle, would have exerted pressure upon the government and

capitalists. Such a strike would have facilitated the transition to a one-day general strike, under suitable conditions, without, however, being a *necessary stage* to such a general strike.

Favourable conditions for the realisation of our instructions were created sooner than we expected. On January 3 already a conference of factory delegates in Lodz influenced by the "left wing" section of the trade unions, decided to declare a general strike of textile workers on January 10. The P.P.S. was forced to join them. The strike covered the textile proletariat of the whole country (120,000 workers), as well as other detachments of workers in the Lodz region, in Petrokov and Chenstokhov. Fearing simultaneous action by the proletariat throughout the country, the P.P.S. postponed the protest strike of the Warsaw metal workers until January 11.

The Communist Party missed the opportune moment for an all-Polish action of the workers. A call should have been made to the whole proletariat to declare a one-hour protest on January 10 together with the textile workers, and forces should have been concentrated in the most important centres to accomplish this.

The example of the textile workers aroused the militant spirit of other detachments of the proletariat, although the growth of this spirit, like the offensive of the government and of the factory owners, was rather unequal, alternating with waverings which were increased by the tactics of the social fascists. After January 10 the working masses waited to hear what the government had to say. The attempt of the Lodz and Warsaw factory owners to annul the half-day Saturday rest received a decisive rebuff.

As a result, the government declared that the realisation of the decrees depends upon agreement between the factory owners and the workers. The government hoped by means of this manoeuvre to divert the hatred of the working masses from itself, and to blunt the political edge of the struggle and to fritter away the strike mood. The offensive was postponed in Upper Silesia and in the Dombrov regions. In the oilfield of the Borislav region, the employers retreated in face of the threatened strike.

In order to gain time, the Central Commission of the reformist trade unions instructed all its sections to undertake negotiations with the factory owners regarding the Saturday half-day and payment for holidays.

At such a moment it was the task of the Communist Party to overcome the hesitation of the masses, to spur on the expectant detachments of the proletariat, to expose the social fascists and to organise a mass united front. The district secretariat of the Central Committee, however, suddenly announced a one-day general strike for January 24, without considering all these conditions, without even a minimum of preparation, and overestimating the

tension existing among the masses. The Party organisations which had only 3 to 5 days at their disposal for preparation, did not even succeed in carrying out factory and trade union meetings, or in setting up a network of strike committees. The P.P.S. jointly with the Bund did their utmost to paralyse the strike. Fascist terror also operated in the same direction. The strike of January 24 ended in failure. It embraced only 30,000 workers.

This typical improvisation was due to the dizziness from success of January 10, and to the *under-estimation of the power of social-fascism*. The error of the secretariat consisted in overstepping the concrete development of events, and in the artificial forcing of such a tremendous action on to the working class. The secretariat chiefly counted on the spontaneous desire of the masses for a general strike, which was to substitute the preparations, indispensable in the given situation.

Exceptional situations, it is true, do arise sometimes, when the Party can proclaim a general strike, without any lengthy preparations. Such a situation, for instance, existed in Germany after the advent of Hitler to power. A similar situation occurred in Austria on the eve of the armed struggle. In both these cases the immediate call for a general strike was the correct step, though due to the sabotage of social-democracy the Communist Parties of Germany and Austria failed to realise the slogan they launched. But in Poland there was no such political necessity at that time. Nor was there the priming of the masses which preceded the general strike in France, where the Communist Party succeeded in placing itself at the head of stormy demonstrations, and where the Communist Party contrived to lead considerable circles of social-democratic workers by employing united front tactics. Furthermore, the Communist Party of France had at its disposal such legal possibilities and such a force as the Unitary Confederation of Labour, while the Socialist Party and the Reformist Confederation of Labour were also compelled to declare a general strike, though of course they tried to limit its scope and to give it a peaceful character.

Having subjected the gross political error of the secretariat to decisive criticism, our Central Committee at the same time emphasised that self-criticism should result in the maximum utilisation of the growing opportunities for the development of the further struggle.

A new attempt of the factory owners to force the fascist decrees upon the workers in Warsaw and in Lodz gave rise to deep indignation among the masses, and once again placed the question of a general strike on the order of the day. This question now needed to be transferred to the factories and to the trade unions, and the united front from below needed to be organised around it. At the beginning

of February the Communist Party addressed a concrete united front programme to the proletariat of the whole of Poland and to the reformist trade unions. It linked up the demand for the immediate abolition of the anti-working class regulations, including the decree about compulsory arbitration, with demands which mobilise the unemployed and state employees for struggle, and with slogans uniting the workers and peasants. Our appeals stressed that there should be no repetition of March 16 when the Socialist Party of Poland excluded railwaymen, state employees and workers of all war enterprises from the strike.

"The whole proletariat must take part in the general strike, actively supported by the broad masses of the exploited peasantry. This cannot be a quiet demonstration with folded arms, but a powerful militant demonstration of the forces of the proletariat and of the workers' and peasants' alliance throughout the country." (From the appeal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Poland.)

Under the pressure of our initiative, the Polish Socialist Party decided to change its tactics. On February 15, the Central Commission of the reformist trade unions instructed its secretariat to proceed to prepare for a general protest strike, without fixing either the date when it was to be declared, its duration, or finally its programme. But at the same time the chairman of the Central Commission, Zhulavsky, declared that the question of the Saturday half-day and payment for holidays could be regulated through the medium of the trade unions themselves, without the necessity of violating the decrees. The tactic of the Polish Socialist Party is now aiming at facilitating the gradual operation of the decrees, by delaying the strike, and by facing the workers with the accomplished fact to deprive further struggle of all practical sense.

The Communist Party exposed this game of the social-fascists by bringing them face to face with the masses. The address of the trade union "left" to the local commissions of the reformist trade union in Warsaw and Lodz was supported by tens of factory meetings, delegate conferences and gatherings of 15 trade unions belonging to the Central Commission. Fermentation set in among the rank and file of the Polish Socialist Party and the reformist trade unions. Expressing the will of the masses, the Central Committee of the trade union "left" addressed an open letter to the Central Commission at the end of March, proposing that they proceed immediately to the joint organisation of a general strike.

Then the Polish Socialist Party began to speak about the impossibility of having an united front with the Communists due to "the dictatorship of Moscow in the Comintern." "The only remaining way is a direct appeal to the Communist masses over the

heads of their leaders"—wrote Nedzialkovsky in the "Rabotnik" of March 27. In practice this appeal signifies not a united front with the Comintern, but conscious purposeful and systematic work tending to extricate the masses from under the influence of the Comintern. It is best to call the things by their proper names.

It is difficult now to fix the moment of the completion of our campaign. Placing itself in opposition to all kinds of frivolous experiments, our leadership is directing its main emphasis upon the further development of the united front from below and on serious organisational preparations. In April this was linked up with the May 1 campaign, at the head of which the Central Committee of our Party placed the organisation of the general revolutionary strike, which paves the way for the mass struggle for the streets.

The fascist government which was forced to suspend the realisation of its anti-working class decrees, is proceeding to a frontal attack against the working class. After Warsaw and Lodz, the liquidation of social insurance has inflicted a blow upon the proletariat of Upper Silesia and the Dombrovsky region. The railwaymen and state employees are threatened. Simultaneously the factory owners are waging an offensive on wages, provoking strike action on the part of the workers. The political atmosphere is getting red hot. The disastrous famine prevailing in the villages not only in Southern Ukraine and White Russia, but even in Poland itself is leading to new spontaneous outbursts similar to last year's peasant insurrection in Central Galicia.

In the event of a further aggravation of the situation, every more or less important action of the proletariat, every strike in one of the most important branches of industry is liable to create the conditions suitable for the declaration of a general strike. So much the wider, therefore, should the scope of our preparatory work be, and all the deeper must our slogans therefore penetrate the masses. All the more rapidly must the mass united front of struggle arise, and so much the wider must the network of the strike committees be.

III.

We have dwelt so long upon the question of the general strike of protest, because this question reflects both the increased difficulties of the turning point which the revolutionary upsurge of Poland has reached, and the weaknesses of our Party.

The unleashing of political struggles is more difficult than the organisation of the everyday economic struggle. It is particularly difficult for an illegal party to extend these struggles so that they become actions on a nation-wide scale. Here the Party encounters not only the rabid debauch of

fascist terror, but also the powerful opposition of social fascism.

Under the pressure of the revolutionary upsurge Polish fascism of all shades has started feverishly to fortify its positions. An important advance has been made in the peculiar Hitlerisation of fascist organisations and of the entire fascist régime.

Pilsudsky's government is accomplishing the re-organisation of its mass basis, the "Streletz," along the line of Hitler's storm detachments. The diminishing ranks of the "Streletz" are being replenished by new elements from the petty-bourgeois strata, as well as by the unemployed from the villages and towns. New "Streletz" detachments are being formed at war plants and state enterprises. Feverish activity prevails in the creation of a network of Pilsudskyite organisations among the youth. A whole chain of different unions has sprung up, acting under the cover of anti-capitalist phraseology, and skilfully combined with Great Power nationalism.

After five years' procrastination, a fascist constitution has been hastily passed through the Diet, which in "legislative fashion" allots full power to Pilsudsky's ruling party, and which with still greater power enchains the toiling masses with the shackles of fascist arbitrariness. This constitution which secures exceptional privileges for Pilsudsky's military clique, facilitates the militarisation of the whole of social life, and the operation of military plans behind the scenes.

The mass basis of national democracy, the chief rival of Pilsudskianism, has been extended. The National democratic "camp of great Poland" has become a militant organisation of the counter-revolution, of a pogrom character. National democracy intercepts the petty-bourgeois masses who are leaving Pilsudsky. It is gaining influence among the state employees, at whose expense budget economies are being made by the Pilsudsky government. National democracy is also penetrating into the village, and worming its way among the backward ranks of the proletariat. The gamut of social demagogy is becoming ever wider. National democracy now represents a large and growing danger for the revolutionary movement.

The populist-fascist organisations are also fortifying their front in the countryside. By making use of a special mixture of national-democratic and social-fascist demagogy, the kulak "Stronitstvo Ludove" has embraced under its influence hundreds of thousands of peasants who have been attracted into political life for the first time. It has become a most serious handicap preventing the movement of the million masses of the peasantry who hate the fascist Pilsudsky dictatorship from developing towards proletarian revolution.

In West Ukraine and West White Russia we see

taking place the further counter-revolutionary activation of the White-Russian and Ukrainian bourgeois parties, which are the agents of Polish and German imperialism.

Finally, as we have already seen, an additional difficulty facing the Communist Party of Poland is provided by the "revolutionary re-armament" of social-fascism, which is manoeuvring skilfully before the masses. As before, the speed at which the social-fascist parties are decaying does not correspond either to the tension of the political situation, or to the revolutionary activity of the masses. The growing discontent of the rank and file is being directed by the left charlatans into the channel making for the ideological rejuvenation of these parties. Notwithstanding the considerable influence of the Communist Party among the rank and file of the workers in the Polish Socialist Party and the Bund, the Communists have not yet succeeded in creating a broad movement in the social-fascist party organisations. The "shrinking of the party apparatus" referred to at the Congress of the P.P.S. is compensated to a certain extent by the expansion of the trade union base of social-fascism.

Such, in general, is the distribution of counter-revolutionary forces in Poland. Its peculiarity lies in the dis-proportion between the growth of the importance of the counter-revolutionary opposition groupings, and the intensification of the administrative oppression on the part of the governing party. While allowing as yet the limited existence of these auxiliary forces in the struggle against the revolutionary movement, Pilsudsky's government is at the same time sharpening the point against its competitors, and most of all against the national-democracy and the peasant party. This is one of the basic elements of the ripening crisis of the upper strata, the rôle of which in unleashing the crisis among the rank and file was revealed by the February events in France. It is the task of the Communist Party to skilfully utilise every fissure in the bourgeois *bloc* to undermine its prestige, to intensify the pressure of the masses, and to inflict a blow at the rule of the bourgeoisie.

The distribution of forces in the revolutionary camp is characterised first and foremost by the growth of the leading rôle of the industrial proletariat, despite the tremendous pressure of chronic unemployment. The very development of the class struggle refutes the theory of the degradation of the proletariat, a theory which permeates the programmatic tactical line of both Polish social-fascism, and of the Second International in general. We must not forget, however, a certain receptivity of the unemployed to various kinds of demagogy, by means of which the fascists are trying to create their unions among the masses of the unemployed. Nor should we underestimate the way the fascists are handling

the youth in the compulsory labour camps which have been created. The unemployed have hitherto manifested an exceptional solidarity with the struggle of the employed workers. Stormy mass demonstrations of the unemployed have begun again. An all the more alarming symptom, therefore, is the weakness of our work among the unemployed at the present period of unprecedented chronic unemployment in Poland.

The long duration of the economic crisis renders particularly acute the waverings among the masses of the ruined petty-bourgeoisie, whose radicalisation is intertwined with a spirit of despair which spurs the more unstable elements on to the road of fascist adventurism. Hence the developed danger of a nationalist wave, fed by the aggravation of imperialist contradictions. The aggravation of Polish-Czech and Polish-Lithuanian relations, which is the result of the ever closer rapprochement between fascist Poland and Germany has supplied fresh food for Great-Power Polish chauvinism. Pogrom anti-Semitism has spread widely. The Anti-Soviet badgering which united all the nationalists has assumed the most diversified forms.

The question of the correlation of forces between Communism and social-fascism stands most acutely. The experience of January 24 has eloquently shown the danger of under-estimating our chief enemy among the working class, namely social fascism. This underestimation generates the tendency among our active workers to exaggerate their own successes and to slur over their deficiencies. It by no means follows from the fact that the Communist Party has gained a leading rôle in the strike movement, that the social-fascists have ceased to be a serious handicap in the way of developing strikes.

Some of our Party organisations sometimes take no account of the active role of social fascism, its manoeuvring tactics of sabotage and the disruption of strikes. Hence, by the way, arises the frivolous playing with dates, the frequent proclamation of big strikes at random, and without results, which undermines the authority of the Party. There can be no doubt whatsoever, that our failure of January 24 increased the vacillation among the masses and their anticipation of the initiative of the P.P.S.

The growing activity of social fascism in the sphere of strikes, demands of the Communist Party that it devotes ever greater attention to their proper preparation, not only from agitational, but also from organisational point of view.

The main thing now is a political and organisational offensive against social-fascism, whose struggle against communism is becoming ever more aggressive. The social-fascists often succeed at meetings in driving the Communists to a defensive position.

Our united front action under the slogan of the general strike was a serious step in the offensive

against the positions held by social-fascism. We have succeeded in making the first breach in the reformist trade unions.

In accordance with the decisions of the Second Plenum of our Central Committee the struggle for the mass base of social-fascism is at last being transferred into the reformist trade unions, which embrace the biggest detachments of the proletariat under their influence. The growth of these unions is taking place under conditions of a spontaneous striving of the masses towards organisation, and of the permanent onslaught of the fascist authorities against the revolutionary trade unions. In 1933 the reformist trade unions had 213,000 members as against 190,000 in 1932, whereas the Fascist Syndicate of trade unions had 100,000 members (an exaggerated figure) in the early part of 1933. The reformist trade unions predominate in all the basic branches of industry, with the exception of the war industry, where the trade union monopoly belongs to the fascists.

The main forces of our Party are directed to the reformist trade unions. Great opportunities for our work have been discovered all at once, even as far as the winning over of separate unions. The very first steps have already given good results. Thus, for instance, in Warsaw the trade union "left" has extended its positions in the unions of the Central Commission, particularly among the metal workers. The left opposition operates not only at the conferences of factory delegates, but also at the meetings of the trade unions in Lodz, Warsaw, Dombrov, etc.

Our campaign for the united front has also penetrated into the lower organisations of the P.P.S., particularly in Lodz, where the initiative of the communists at the meetings of the P.P.S., has met with a favourable reception. Our task is to wedge ourselves deeper into the ranks of the P.P.S., to use the experience of the general strike to explain the political treachery of the Second International and its ideological bankruptcy and split, to direct the discontent of the P.P.S. lower strata into the channel of political struggle on principle which will lead to the workers breaking away from the P.P.S. and their passage to the camp of communism. The whole international situation creates favourable ground for a developed offensive against the P.P.S., enabling us not only to deeply undermine the trade union positions of the latter, but also its *Party positions*.

The example of the P.P.S. shows that even in the most favourable objective conditions, the disruption of the mass basis of social-fascism never takes place automatically, without persistent and systematic work being undertaken by the Communists. Not less acute is this task in the village in relation to the populist-fascists.

It is imperative to inculcate into the consciousness of all Communists the seemingly elementary truth, that unless we destroy the mass organisational basis of social-fascism and populist-fascism, then our present main strategical task, namely the winning over of the majority of the proletariat and of the basic masses of the peasantry, who play a decisive rôle in revolution and war, will only remain on paper.

The second basic weakness of the revolutionary upsurge in Poland is the inadequate co-ordination of the struggle of the employed and unemployed workers with the struggle of the toiling masses of the peasantry and of the oppressed nationalities in Poland.

It is easy to imagine how dangerous the position of the fascist government would have been if the strike wave of last year had synchronised with the uprising of the Galician peasants. Of course, such a synchronisation does not depend on our will alone, but by co-ordinating the struggles of the workers and peasants by means of demonstrations and political strikes, we can accelerate their merging into one powerful stream, which it will be difficult for the fascist dictatorship to withstand.

And to-day there is a danger that both these waves will part their ways, there is the danger of a lack of co-ordination which would facilitate the government crushing the movement piecemeal. This is the reason why all the efforts of the Party should be directed towards the creation of a common front of the workers and peasants in the battles that are developing. A successful co-ordination of big

strikes and stormy actions of the unemployed, with mass fights and particularly with insurgent outbursts in the villages, would have considerably accelerated the moment of the passage to the direct struggle for power.

The whole party, from top to bottom, must grasp this outlook. By directing the main fire against opportunist underestimation of the revolutionary perspective, we are at the same time overcoming the under-estimation of the forces of the enemy, and of the rôle of the party as the organiser of the forces of the revolution, an under-estimation resulting from the hurrah-revolutionary perspective.

It is only now that our Party is really beginning to understand that the central link of its activity must consist in raising all campaigns to such a political level, that all the masses see in the Communist Party not only their leader in the everyday struggle, but also a force striving towards power and one capable of winning it. In other words it means such a politisation of our everyday work, as makes clear to the masses that without a revolution, without an armed uprising of the workers, peasants and soldiers, no stable improvement of their living conditions is possible, no way out of the crisis is possible.

The words of Comrade Stalin that only a strong proletarian revolutionary party can prepare and gain the victory of the revolution must penetrate deep into the consciousness of our party.

The Communist Party of Poland is becoming such a Party by overcoming the shortcomings and getting tempered in the struggle against difficulties.

THE Publishers have prepared a suitable Display Card (7in. by 2oin.) advertising the "Communist International"; this, together with a two-colour, double-crown poster embodying the cover design of the "Communist International," may be obtained by agents and booksellers free of charge on application to the Workers' Bookshop, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.2.

ONLY THE SOVIETS CAN SAVE CHINA

P. MIF.

IT is more than five years now since the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang has been waging a stubborn and relentless struggle against the Soviet movement in China, with the support and manifold assistance of the international imperialists. But despite all the efforts of the imperialists and of the Kuomintang, they have not succeeded in throttling the revolutionary-liberation struggle of the toiling masses of China. The Soviet revolution in China steadily continues its development. In spite of the theories and desires of Otto Bauer, Trotsky, Vandervelde and the other henchmen of the imperialist bourgeoisie, who have tried to depict the revolutionary actions of the working and peasant masses of China as "reactionary riots" against the "progressive forces" of capitalism, and who have predicted the speedy and inglorious ruin of the Soviet movement, the workers and peasants of enslaved China are gaining ever newer victories under the banner of the Soviets.

During the course of these years, the Chinese workers' and peasants' Red Army has beaten off five drives of the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang against the Soviet regions. Neither the quantitative supremacy of the armed forces of the Kuomintang, nor the huge monetary gifts presented to the Chinese generals by the imperialists, nor the tremendous stocks of munitions, which the Kuomintang leaders have received from their imperialist masters, nor the presence in the Kuomintang units of several hundred war advisers sent from the imperialist countries to assist the Kuomintang, have been able to ensure the defeat and suppression of the Soviet movement in China. The Chinese Red Army has invariably been victorious in all the most important battles which have decided the fate of the Kuomintang drives. As a result of every drive the Red Army has grown and become consolidated, Soviet territories have extended, ever new million-strong masses of toilers have joined the revolutionary struggle, and the organising and the leading rôle of the Communist Party of China has grown.

The Kuomintang is now waging its sixth drive against the Soviets. At one time it seemed, and not unreasonably so, that it had suffered the same fate as all the preceding drives. But after suppressing the 19th Army in Budshian, it became possible for Chang-kai Shek to continue the sixth drive, which in its scope surpassed all the preceding counter-revolutionary drives by many times. But although the sixth drive has not yet finished, there can be no doubt as to the issue of

the struggle. It is true that the possibility is not to be overlooked of certain temporary and negligible successes by the Kuomintang on certain sectors of the struggle. But the entire surroundings in China leave no room for doubt as to the results of the sixth drive; they will be even more unsightly and more painful for the imperialists and the Kuomintang than all the preceding ones. The prospect of further victories by the Soviet movement in China has been outlined with sufficient clarity.

The Soviets in China have in recent years proven their very deep vitality. It was the developing and victorious anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution in China which called them into being, while this revolutions was in its turn generated by the most acute class contradictions, which cannot find their solution while the bondage of landowners, the militarist yoke and the imperialist enslavement of the country continue to be preserved. The analysis of the prevailing conditions in China, the experience of the revolutionary struggle, the Marxist-Leninist anticipation of the further course of events have dictated the conclusion that only the Soviets can save China. The idea that only the Soviets can save China is becoming the property of ever-broader masses of the Chinese people. The destructive consequences of the economic crisis, the aggression of the imperialists, which has assumed unprecedented dimensions, and the treacherous policy of the Kuomintang could not but accelerate the revolutionising of the workers and peasants of China. Even the bitterest enemies of the Soviet movement in China have been forced to admit the growing might of the Red Army, the growth of the sympathies of the toiling masses for the slogans of the Soviet anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution.

It is true that the columns of the Kuomintang press still exhale the same hatred and ruthless fury against the Soviet movement of the Chinese workers and peasants, led by the Communists. The landlords who have been expropriated and deprived of their age-long privileges, as well as the Chinese bankers and capitalists who are hard-pressed by the Soviet movement and are inspired and supported by the imperialists, and who clearly recognise what a menace this movement is for them, are mobilising all their forces for the struggle against this movement and are using all their efforts to slander it. It is no wonder that the representatives of the Kuomintang bourgeois-landlord *bloc* shower the Soviet movement with

such epithets as "bandits," "counter-revolutionaries," "They have one foot in the grave," and envelop it in streams of lies and slander. But even they are unable to conceal the ever-growing popularity of the Red Army and of the Soviet government among the broad masses of the toilers. They dare not hush up the facts of the Red Army being directly supported by the broad masses of workers and peasants. Moreover, the consciousness of the futility and hopelessness of the struggle of the Kuomintang against the Soviet movement appears ever more frequently in the statements uttered by the representatives of the counter-revolutionary camp, while notes are sounded of the historical doom of the exploiting ruling classes, who have reduced the country to complete ruin and monstrous destitution and who have cleared the road to the colonial enslavement of China by the imperialists.

Let us not leave our statements without proofs. We have before us the report of the Investigation Committee of the Uchan University, published in the Kuomintang magazine, "Chengchi Pinlung" (No. 84-85 of January 11th, 1934). Every line of this report sounds as an irrefutable sentence on the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang régime. But before making any references to this report, we will say a few words about the history of this document. At the beginning of the fifth drive the Kuomintang, which had concentrated tremendous military forces, succeeded in driving back the Red Army in different regions, particularly in the Soviet region bordering on the provinces of Hunan-Hupeh-Anhway, and in temporarily occupying part of the territory of these Soviet regions. The representatives of the Kuomintang, of course, immediately proceeded to restore property to the landlords, and all the former conditions of bondage. The frenzied counter-revolution put the occupied territories to fire and sword. "For the edification of posterity" the toiling population, who had dared to rise against the hateful power of the Kuomintang were wiped out one and all; whole villages were burned down, and the huts and miserable belongings of the village poor were destroyed. The table given in Tai Hain-nung's article, "The ruin of agriculture in China," gives some idea of the number of victims and of the material losses suffered by the Chinese peasants as a result of the militarist wars (beginning with 1927) and the invasion of Soviet territories by Kuomintang troops in recent years.

The representatives of the Kuomintang, who have established a sanguinary terrorist régime, and who have devastated entire regions, have tried to depict the Communists as barbarians who grind down the people, while representing themselves as deliverers, whom the peasants were

alleged to have met with open arms. With a view to discrediting the Communists by all possible means, the Kuomintang organisations have sent their agents to the regions occupied by government troops as "unbiased investigators."

Province	Number of killed	Material losses in Chinese dollars
Anhway	170,270	47,867,500
Hunan	804,436	126,057,023
Hupeh	246,550	477,033,880
Tsiansi	186,000	650,000,000
Hunan	89,000	300,000,000
Total in 5 provinces	1,496,256	1,600,958,403

The author of a report of one of these investigation commissions imparted his impressions about the trip to the southern part of Hupeh province. In the first place the author notes the absence of adult population in the region:

"The majority of the population have either fled or perished, or been carried away by force (!) by the bandits (such is the name for the Communists in the official terminology of the Kuomintang). On arrival in a village, it is not only a rare sight to see the smoke coming out from some human habitation, but among the extremely scanty population who remain in the villages only very old people are to be seen. There are very few people of middle age. It is just as difficult to meet any young people above the age of 12-13 years. Just imagine this sad world. Can the impression produced by it be considered unimportant?"

A considerable number of old people even went away with the Reds, and those who have been forced to remain, lead a sad existence.

"The old people who remain in this region have an absolutely emaciated look, which makes you shudder to look at them. It is enough to look at the colour of their complexion, yellow, grey, shrivelled, looking 30 per cent. like human beings and 70 per cent. like ghosts, they do indeed evoke pity."

We learn further from the report that only very few houses in this region have remained intact; nearly all the houses have been demolished. But even the houses which have remained intact are 90 per cent. empty.

The author was most of all impressed by the abandoned fields:

"In connection with the flight of the majority of the peasant population, most of the fields in the southern part of Hupeh are at the present time overgrown with weeds, for there is nobody to cultivate them. Very seldom is anybody to be seen in the fields. This deserted and dismal

landscape produced the deepest impression upon me."

The author cites his talks with the population of the villages, and on the basis of these talks comes to the conclusion that all the peasants are spies of the Reds. He refers to the different code signals, by which the village population notifies the Reds of the presence of Kuomintang troops. Here is the content of one of the author's conversations with the population:

"While investigating the Tsian-Tsiao-Tsun village for the purpose of clearing up the real state of affairs we repeatedly addressed different questions to the population. We asked some of them: 'Have the bandits been here?' They replied: 'No, there have never been any bandits here.' We would then ask them again: 'Has the Red Army been here?' and they immediately replied: 'Yes, it has been; the Red Army was here a month ago.'"

The author is naturally indignant at the spirit of the population in the regions they investigated. We would recall that the Kuomintang forbids anybody to call the Communists and Red Army men other than bandits, the alternative being penalty of death.

The author of the report shows the influence of the Communists in a number of other examples:

"In the bandit (read Sovietised) regions, even the speech of the population bears traces of influence of the Reds in the majority of cases; for instance, they all know who the 'enemy's troops' are, who are the 'tu-hao' and 'leshen,' they all know what 'Leninism' is. And they all of them know how to sing the 'International.'"

The utmost attention is devoted by the author to the "terrible effect of the intoxicating propaganda of the Reds." The author states correctly that if the Reds used nothing but armed force, without exercising their influence upon the hearts of the population, if, as the Kuomintang bosses are trying to insinuate, the Red Army had destroyed and devastated the regions it occupied, then the Chinese Soviets would not have presented a growing menace to the Kuomintang régime.:

"However, in reality exactly the opposite prevails. The Reds not only possess armed forces, and are in a position to carry on destructive activity, but they also have a political force at their disposal and can conduct constructive work. The most effective political activity of the Reds, as far as can be seen from results, is their propaganda. Their propaganda is of a completely narcotic character. Thus, for instance, in their slogans they use expressions of the following kind: 'Dear peasants and

workers, the Red Army has rid you of the payment of rents and taxes. Everybody has something to live on, but what did the Kuomintang give you?' The simple and clear language of the statements spread about by the Communists produces an intoxicating impression upon that section of the population which has read them or heard their contents. The results of the narcotic propaganda of the Reds produce an extremely terrible impression upon us."

This is the reason why the investigator comes to very pessimistic conclusions regarding the prospects of the further struggle of the Kuomintang against the Soviet movement. He states that the ideological influence of the Reds is so profound that it is almost impossible to remould the people in these regions anew. According to him, "the psychology of the people in the banditised regions has changed absolutely. The poisonous fungus of red propaganda has penetrated deeply into the flesh and blood of the masses." This is the reason why, "as soon the troops are gone, the bandits appear once more, and the longer the struggle is waged the more bandits spring up. We no sooner exterminate those who are obviously bandits, than new ones continue to appear from among the hidden ones. We must say that outright."

Another Kuomintang investigator, a certain Gen. Ya, who visited the border region of the provinces Anhwei-Hunan-Hupeh in February, 1934, writes in the pages of the monthly magazine published by the newspaper "Shenbao," about the broad network of free primary Leninist schools which have sprung up in this region under the Soviet régime.

"The number of pupils in these schools in each village amounts to 92 per cent. of the total number of children of school age."

School premises are used in the afternoon for the tuition of adults. Gen. Ya also had a chance of talking with the population of these regions, particularly with the children attending Leninist schools.

"If you ask them about the past," says he, "they know how to explain everything so simply and intelligently that you feel quite satisfied after hearing them: 'capitalism,' 'proletariat,' 'the line of the Comintern' and all such terms are used so simply and naturally by them as if they were enumerating some domestic utensils."

These forced admissions of our class enemies are of undoubted interest, and are very symptomatic. They reflect the growing split and confusion in the ranks of the Kuomintang, and the growth of influence of the Chinese Communists among ever broader masses. The revolutionary practice of the Soviet regions, the economic and

political measures realised there, which radically improve the conditions of the toiling masses, the heroic work of the Chinese Communists, who stand at the head of the anti-imperialist workers' and peasants' movement in the Kuomintang territories in China, are every day winning over ever new masses of workers and peasants to the side of the Soviet revolution. The authority of the Chinese Communist Party and the sympathy for the Soviet movement which it leads, and which is alone capable of resulting in national independence and the unification of China, are growing not only among workers and peasants, but also among the urban petty bourgeoisie and even among certain strata of the bourgeois intelligentsia, who have hitherto trusted and been the followers of the Kuomintang. A sharp turn is taking place in the consciousness of the toiling masses as a result of the disgraceful treachery of the Kuomintang, and along with the disappointment in the Kuomintang, there is an increase of sympathy towards the Communists who stand at the head of the struggle of the toilers for national and social liberation. At the end of last year one of the editorials of the Chinese bourgeois newspaper "Ishibao" stated:

"Even if there is some kind of a political upheaval inside the country, this is a secondary question. But the transformation of the people into the slaves of foreigners and of the nation into an enslaved nation—is not to be tolerated at all."

It is characteristic that recently, after the defeat of the Futsian government, another very old bourgeois Chinese paper, "Dakunbao," was compelled, though not directly, to say that there are only two roads facing China: the first is the Kuomintang road of the further colonial enslavement of China, and the second one is that of the Soviets, the path of the victorious struggle for the national independence of China. There are no other intermediate ways.

"The results of events deprive us of the belief in the abilities of a third force. The present day shows us already that the third grouping is absolutely incapable of solving state questions." The shattering of the illusion that the 19th Army, or any other "third force" can save China, is attaching to the Chinese Communist Party the rôle of recognised leader of the all-national struggle against imperialism."

It is no accident that in the recent period articles belonging to the most far-sighted representatives of the ruling classes are ever more frequently appearing on the pages of the bourgeois press, subjecting the activity of the Nankin government to the most ruthless criticism, depicting the conditions of the peasant masses in the

darkest colours, and establishing a direct bond between the crisis prevailing in China and the acuteness of agrarian relations.

In an extensive article devoted to Chinese agriculture, Jao Hsin-nung writes that—

"... of all the stirring questions facing the torn body of China the agricultural question stands forth most urgently and acutely. For thousands of years agrarian China has served as the bulwark of the entire national economy. Hence the decline of agriculture means the collapse of the whole country... But rural China is at present undergoing bankruptcy. Millions of peasants have perished. Millions have lost shelter, their land and means of subsistence. Millions are fighting a life and death struggle. Even the luckiest of them suffer incredibly from the ever-growing burdens. The combination of evil and disasters of all these years has reached the acuteness of a volcanic eruption, threatening to turn China into Pompei."*

The growth of destitution and impoverishment among the peasant masses can be illustrated by a series of figures. Thus, according to the data provided by an investigation covering 731 districts in 21 provinces, the percentage of peasant-proprietors has dropped from 50 in 1912 to 45 in 1933, whereas the percentage of landless peasants for the same period has risen from 28 to 32 per cent. The percentage of peasant-semi-tenants has remained almost on the same level (22 in 1912 and 23 in 1933)† According to the investigations of Chiao-Shi-min, the percentage of peasant-landowners in Kvin-Sang district dropped from 16 to 8.31 during the period from 1905 to 1924, while a corresponding increase took place in the percentage of landless peasants (for these years the percentage of landless peasants increased from 57.4 to 77.6 per cent.). In 1905, in the Shuhein district, 59.5 per cent. were peasant-proprietors, 22.6 per cent. peasant-semi-tenants with little land, and 17.9 per cent. were landless peasants. After a period of twenty years, only 44 per cent. were peasant-proprietors, while the number of peasants possessing little land, who were compelled to rent their lands, reached 30.5 per cent., and the number of landless peasants increased to 25.5 per cent. For the same period, in the Nantup district the number of peasant-proprietors dropped from 20.2 per cent. to 13 per cent., while the number of landless peasants increased from 56.9 to 64.4 per cent.

Chen-Han Seng‡ gives interesting data as to

* "The North China Herald," Jan. 24, 1934, "Rural China's Collapse," by Jao Hsin-nung.

† Chunhuaebao, January, 1934.

‡ "The Present Agrarian Problem in China," by Chen-Han Seng, Shanghai.

the ruin and pauperisation of the Chinese peasantry, and the growth of landlords' estates. The landlords appropriated not only all the state, social, clan and church lands, but also the lands put aside for military settlements, and besides monopolising the collection of rents from these lands, they also extended their landed properties from year to year at the expense of the ruined peasantry.

"In 1931 the great flood in several provinces located in the basin of the Yangtse river furnished a new cause for the transfer of a still greater area of lands into the hands of land owners and kulaks."

The example of three villages in the Usi district illustrates the decrease of the dimensions of peasant farms. In 1922 there were 38 farms having a land area of less than 10 mu, constituting 35 per cent. of the total number of peasant farmsteads, while in 1927 the number of such farms amounted to 41.5 per cent. of the total, and in 1932 reached 50.3 per cent.

The same process is apparent in the materials collected in an investigation of the villages Tsin Suihu in Hupeh province, where the percentage of families who had tilled an area below 5 mu amounted to 31 per cent. in 1923 and to 49 per cent. of the total number of peasant farmsteads in 1933. The decrease in the dimensions of the peasant farms is accompanied by a decrease in the total means of production available in these farms, and particularly of working cattle, inventory and fertilisers. Thus, in the Hoyan district (Shangsi province) the number of farms having no live stock increased over the last ten years from 29 per cent. to 47 per cent.

Chen-Han Seng estimates the landlords "as the main factor of decay in rural economy." The ownership of land by the landlords undoubtedly determines the acuteness of agrarian relations in China. At the same time we must point out certain peculiarities in the development of Chinese economics which intensify the acuteness of class contradictions in modern China. When analysing the post-reform economics of pre-revolutionary Russia, and establishing the trend of economic evolution, Lenin emphasised the decrease of land ownership by the gentry (from 73 million dessiatines in 1877 to 53 million dessiatines in 1905), and pointed out the line of development of capitalist land ownership, which consists in the transformation of farms which are small as far as their area is concerned, into farms which are large scale as judged by their volume of production. In China, however, particularly in recent years, years of the deepest economic crisis, we observe a violent process of the parcellisation of farms,

which is accompanied by a very marked growth of parasitic land ownership by the landlords.

This trend of development is due to the combination of a number of factors. An essential rôle is played here by international imperialism. The imperialist policy of the partition and complete colonial enslavement of China, and of the handicapping of industrial development, as well as the entire system of the exploitation of the Chinese people, the pumping out of super-profits, and the support and intensification of Chinese feudal and semi-feudal institutions by foreign finance capital have resulted in an extremely intricate tissue of feudal and bourgeois relations in the Chinese countryside.

The growth of landlords' land ownership and the increased land hunger entailed thereby, the growth of bondage to the landlord cannot but be accompanied by a worsening of the living standard of the peasants, which is bad enough as it is. The Year Book "Shin-Bar" notes the tendency for the landlords' income to grow. The Tsiansu province may serve as a typical example. In 1921 rent receipts there amounted to \$3.50 per mu, while in 1927 they had risen to \$7.86. According to the data of the International Commission of Hunger Relief in China, the yearly income of 76.6 per cent. of the peasants is not sufficient for their subsistence, and even in normal years these 76.6 per cent. of Chinese peasants are forced to contract debts.

High usurious interest is supplemented by the absolutely unbearable burden of all kinds of taxes. The rapid growth of land taxes may be judged from the example of the Tsiansu province. If the land tax in this province for 1915-1923 be taken as 100, then in 1929 the index was 151, in 1931 it had grown to 165, and in 1933 to 189. This is the position with the regular land tax. But in recent years the levying of additional and emergency land taxes has been widely practised. In Shantung, for instance, the total sum of emergency taxes on land is ten times the amount of the usual taxes. Moreover, in the majority of provinces, taxes are collected for many years ahead. The Sychuang militarists exercise particular zeal in this respect. Thus in the Chendu district, taxes have been collected for 1961; in the Tsunin district the taxes were collected in January, 1931, for 1971; in the Benyan district taxes were collected in February, 1933, for 1957, and so forth. Shen-Han Seng announces that in the Tsy chung district during the period 1930-1933, land taxes were collected for 14 years ahead, while in the Nantsun district for the period from October, 1931, to March, 1933, taxes were collected for 11 years ahead.

In addition to land taxes there are other numer-

ous and varied taxes. We will mention only that in the Henan province, where active war operations took place from April to October, 1930, the Kuomintang authorities introduced all kinds of collections and requisitions, which exceeded the basic land tax forty times. This tax exploitation, to which the Chinese peasants are subject, plays a very important rôle in the degradation of rural economy.

After gathering the results of his year's labour the Chinese peasant is compelled to conclude unprofitable deals with middlemen and tradesmen.

Jao-Hain-Nung's article, already quoted above, states that—

“ . . . the selling price of rice at the point of production is everywhere 60 to 70 per cent. lower than the market price. The peasants are, of course, aware of the existing market price, but their extreme want of money for payment of rent, taxes, loans plus interest, farming expenses and so forth, press them to such an extent that they are unable to hold their products until better days. This state of affairs enables the merchants to conclude profitable deals, while the peasant frequently sells his produce at a price considerably below cost. Thus the fruit of the peasant's labour slips out of his hands and he remains in debt all around, in a state of hunger and despair.”

If we consider the number of disasters which overwhelm the Chinese peasantry, and if we bear in mind the consequences of the world economic crisis and the devastations produced by the militarist troops, then it will be easy to form an idea of the stupendous want of the Chinese peasants, of their precipitate pauperisation, and of the degradation of rural economics in China.

The impoverishment of the masses of people leads to a sharp decline in rice and wheat sowing, accompanied by a certain increase in the consumption of the cheaper kinds of grain.

The sowing area (in millions of mus) amounted in 17 provinces of China to :—

Years	Wheat	Rice	Casolian	Millet
1931 ...	—	—	102,9	105,9
1932 ...	334,0	314,0	—	—
1933 ...	296,3	279,8	99,2	108,8

The crisis of the countryside, particularly in such an agricultural country as China, cannot but affect the state of the whole economy of the country. This can be judged from the figures of the foreign trade turnover of China, which continues to decrease sharply, while at the same time preserving the salient unfavourable character of the trade balance. We given below the corresponding table in Mexican dollars.*

	1932	1933
Import	1,634,726,298	1,345,567,188
Export	767,535,334	611,827,990
	Decrease in absolute figures	Decrease in per cent.
	289,159,110	18
	155,709,344	20

When speaking of the present economic state of Kuomintang China, we cannot pass over in silence another very significant process, viz., the drop in the price of land, due to the agrarian crisis, and the unprecedented ruination of the peasant masses, as well as due to the development and victorious agrarian revolution.

In the article by Chen-Han Seng which we have already cited, we read :

“At the present moment, the rapid drop in the prices of agricultural produce, the extreme instability of market conditions, the heavy and unbearable taxes, and the high pressure of usurers, have all led to a general standstill in the circulation of capital, and has created a crisis in the land market. *It is not only the middle and poor peasants or the agricultural labourers who are selling their lands, but even many of the kulaks and landlords are anxious to get rid of their land, in order to preserve their capital in cash and to alleviate their difficulties.*”

The price of land in Fuchou in the spring of 1931 dropped by 33 per cent. as compared with 1929 prices; in Yunchang (Chetsian province) they dropped by 40 per cent.; in Enche (Tsiansu province) by 70 per cent.; in Shangsi province by from 50 to 81 per cent. During the last four years the price of land in Hupeh province has dropped by 33.75 per cent.

Chen-Han Seng gives the following table on the average price per mu of land in Hupeh province in 1929-1933 :

District	Prices in Mexican dollars		Index as compared with 1929	
	1929	1933	1929	1933
Czaosiang ...	90	60	100	67
Intan ...	150	100	100	67
Wanhe ...	100	60	100	60
Kuang ...	50	20	100	40
Tsiansiang ...	100	40	100	40
Solu ...	100	30	100	30
Baodin ...	80	20	100	25

The newspaper “Dagunbao” of December 20th, 1933, when reporting a 50 per cent. drop in the price of land in the Yutian district, writes that in this district—

“ . . . owing to the low price of land and heavy taxation, agriculture is in a state of great decay, and so the peasants have no other way

* “The North China Daily News,” dated Feb. 9th, 1934.

out but to sell their land, a state of affairs which is assuming a general character. At the same time there is no demand for land, since the people who possess capital no longer wish to invest in land."

It is characteristic that in the Kuomintang districts of the Tsiansi province located not far from the Central Soviet Region the price of land has dropped to 15 per cent. of its former level.

The continuing decay of rural economy intensifies the opposition and aggravates the criticism of the Nanking government by the bourgeois press. Jao Hain-nung sees the source of all evil in militarism, which continues to develop, absorbing the material values indispensable for the existence of the Chinese nation :

"Wrangling, concessions, internecine wars and armistices have each year absorbed too many funds. They have absorbed nearly the entire energy and funds of the government, creating impossible conditions for creative work. Instead of following the line of restoring and strengthening of the people, the government has been hiding behind the backs of Shanghai bankers. It has created such a maze of debts that no way out can be found. It has appeared for several years that everything is running smoothly, but as a matter of fact the government has proved to be impotent and helpless. The Yangtse flood, the invasion of the Japanese and the financial crisis have revealed all its weak points in all their bare nudity."

Pointing out that war expenses in recent years have absorbed over 80 per cent. of the total state receipts, Jao Hsin-nung asks :

"But why should China spend so much of her scanty income for war purposes? To protect the nation? In less than two years she has lost a territory of 496,164 square miles. To suppress the bandits? There are now more 'bandits' than ever before. To uproot Communism? Never were the people as ready to become Reds as now."

The people, according to the same author, are against the futile anti-Red campaign, which only leads to the growth of taxes and loans, to repression, exiles, murders and devastation.

"Let us imagine that the Communists are thrown out of their strongholds. Will that mean the success of the campaign? In all probability the Communists will occupy the regions taken from them once again." And further : "At the present moment, though the government has mobilised men and means for this campaign, complete suppression appears to be as remote as the stars in heaven! We do not know how long this campaign can last and what fruits it will reap. We know, however,

that the government is suffering a financial crisis, foreboding defeats in war."

"At the present time Communism is springing up on Chinese ground everywhere, and is spreading with incredible rapidity. Who prepared the soil so well for this marvellous growth? The Chinese militarists, of course, hate Communism, murder its adherents, and persecute Communist literature . . . But it is Chinese militarism which has made the peasants Red by its actions. Let us take Sychuang, for instance. Could the Communists achieve success there without the assistance of the local militarists, who forced the people to cultivate poppies, to pay land taxes in advance, as far ahead as the days of their grand-children, and who have harrowed the people with wars and troops? If anybody thinks that the Chinese prefer death under militarism rather than become Red, such people must certainly have a belief in the patience of the Chinese nation."

The patience of the Chinese people cannot but be exhausted as the result of the rapid aggression of the imperialists and piecemeal sale by the Kuomintang rulers of Chinese territory to the foreign oppressors. It is impossible for their patience not to be exhausted in the conditions of the most bitter crisis, the unprecedented want of the masses and the absolute arbitrariness of the militarists.

The consciousness of the toiling masses of Kuomintang China cannot but become clarified, in so far as the achievements of the Soviet regions, which serve as a striking example of the way out of desperate need and crisis, stand out clearly before them. The Soviet regions represent a complete contrast to the Kuomintang section of China. There all the sore questions have been solved, landlord ownership of the land has been abolished, landlord and usurers' bondage have been destroyed, and the absence of the rights of the masses eliminated. There can be no question there of the hated yoke of the imperialists, of any kind of oppression on the part of militarist adventurers. The peasants, who have received land, and have got rid of the intolerable burden of taxes, the workers who have attained an 8-hour working day and an improvement in their conditions of labour, the women who have been emancipated—all this toiling population is creating a new life under the leadership of the Chinese Communists, and is strengthening its workers' and peasants' soviet power.

We have made use of the evidence of the representatives of the Chinese bourgeois press who have been eye-witnesses, to paint the picture of the heavy and ever-worsening position of the masses in the Kuomintang territories of China.

Out of the mouths of the same authors we have also heard defined the mood of the peasantry. We cannot help juxtaposing it with the present situation in the Soviet regions of China. In this respect we use as material, newspaper correspondence and magazine articles from the periodical newspapers, published on the territory of the free Soviet republic.

Let us begin with the question of the land. Comrade Ko-Yan writes from the Soviet region of North-Eastern Tsiansi:

“Land was divided according to the number of members of the family and the number of workers. Let us, for instance, take the Gueyan region; 1,836 peasant families live there. After the division of the land, 1,703 families received bigger lots than they had before the Revolution, and only 133 families (i.e., less than 7 per cent.) had the same area, or less than before. This is due to two causes: either these families belong to kulaks, or the number of members of the family decreased in the meantime. A precise class differentiation is taking place now as a result of the agrarian revolution, and the class struggle in the countryside is assuming ever more naked forms. The kulaks, who have always tried to represent themselves as middle peasants and even as poor peasants, are being exposed by the toiling population. The militant enthusiasm with which the peasant population beat off the offensive of the enemy was the result of this correct agrarian policy in our Soviet region.”

This picture is typical for all other Soviet regions as well.

But the Soviet government does not limit itself to the confiscation of landlords' estates and this distribution among the peasants. The fact of the land being under private cultivation does not relieve the Soviet organs from the duty of improving the technique of agriculture, the extension of sowing area, the improvement of land cultivation and the increase of the yield. Although the Soviet government has for five years been engaged in a continuous war against the Kuomintang militarists, it cannot at the same time ignore the problems of improving the economic situation, nor can it, if even for a moment neglect the task of economic construction. On the contrary, it is precisely with a view to securing the victorious issue of the revolutionary war, and in the interests of uninterruptedly providing supplies for the growing Red Army, as well as in the interests of improving the living conditions of the masses, that the Soviet government, under the leadership of the Communist Party, is exerting its maximum efforts to improve production, to liven up indus-

try, and to better agricultural economy in the Soviet regions.

Nor do these efforts remain without results. We find the following in Comrade Lian-Ming's article published in No. 62 of the magazine "Huntsi."*

“There can be no doubt that the spring and summer sowing campaigns, the autumn harvesting and autumn sowing campaigns of the current year (1933) carried out following the appeal of our Party, gave considerable results, and although the production of rice throughout the entire Central Soviet region, did not according to the general estimate increase everywhere by 20 per cent. as expected, nevertheless the average increase was more than 10 per cent. Furthermore, the sowing of other cereals (beans, wheat) and vegetables increased considerably this year.”

Mao-Dze-dun, the head of the Soviet government, had reason to report to the conference of the 17 districts of the southern part of Tsiansi, that on the whole “the autumn crops of the current year (1933) increased by 20-25 per cent. as compared with the autumn crops of last year.†

The Soviet organs are developing feverish activity for the further improvement of agricultural economy in the Soviet regions. The assortment of high-grade seeds and the supply of same to peasant farms is being arranged, the production of lime, used as fertiliser in the peasant fields, is being increased, repairs and the production of agricultural implements are being organised, irrigation canals are being laid, the old ones are being repaired and new irrigation constructions are being built. The broad masses are being mobilised for the model realisation of the sowing and harvesting campaigns.

Campaigns for tree planting are being carried out in the Soviet regions, stores for grain stocks are being built; to overcome the difficulties in supplying the population with textile goods, great efforts are being made to extend the sowing area under cotton; the manufacture of textile goods from hemp yarn and rice straw is being arranged.

With the exception of gaps in the supply of salt, the food situation in the Soviet regions may be considered quite favourable, despite the continuous war against the Kuomintang counter-revolution. Special government organs (Bureaux for the Distribution of Grain) were compelled to achieve the increase in price for grain by a number of measures. The regulation of the price for grain in the direction of an increase was achieved by means of arranging export and the organisa-

* Quoted from the Magazine "Huntsi."

† "Red Banner"—the organ of the C.C. of the C.P. of China, published in the Central Soviet Region.

tion of purchases and storage of great quantities of marketable grain in government granaries. Industry is beginning to revive little by little in the Soviet regions. At the conference of 17 southern districts, Comrade Mao Dze-dun reported that

“handicraft industry and the production of agricultural implements and lime are in the course of restoration. It is planned to recommence the production of tungsten ore, and a certain animation is apparent in the production of tobacco, paper and wooden products.

Particular attention is being given to the production of paper and the extraction of tungsten ore.

In his article, “First Results of Economic Construction,” Comrade Lian Ping writes the following in this connection :

“In the conditions of rapid preparations for the war, the imperialists are suffering acute want for tungsten ore, it being a most essential raw material for the manufacture of munitions. Over one half of the world’s supplies of tungsten are located in our Soviet regions, and we must devote our efforts to the development of the production of tungsten ore, in order to break the economic blockade of the enemy by exporting it. At the same time we must use all our efforts to protect such important industrial objects as the tungsten mines.”

We would like to say a few words about the organisation of trade and co-operation. It is a well-known fact that Chang Kai-shek placed tremendous hopes on the blockade of the Soviet regions, counting on undermining and absolutely disrupting the economic life of the Soviet regions. The negative consequences of the blockade, of course, naturally make themselves felt. But the Soviets are succeeding to a certain extent in breaking through the economic blockade. Not only are the peasants of the Kuomintang territories being drawn into goods traffic with the Soviet regions, but so also are the merchants of the White regions, who in their chase after high profits take the risk, despite the Draconic prohibitions of Chang Kai-shek. On the other hand, as a result of the victories of the Red Army, and the lively activity of the partisans, the Kuomintang militarists are failing to establish a steady line of blockade.

There are a number of substantial gaps in the export and import trade of the Soviet regions, which affect the position of the toiling masses. Thus, we see from the report of Comrade Mao Dze-Dun, that the Central Soviet region annually exports about three million dans of grain. Until recently the export of grain was almost entirely in the hands of tradesmen, who earned about 700

per cent. on these operations. The import of salt (approximately 9 million dollars worth yearly) and fabrics (\$6,000,000 worth) was also monopolised by merchants, who in some cases sold these products at prices which were ten times higher than the prices prevailing in the industrial centres of the country. This circumstance compelled the leaders of Soviet China to direct the most serious attention to the development of the co-operative movement. It was the conferences on economic construction in the northern and southern sections of Tsiansi which took place in August, 1933, which provided a considerable impulse to the co-operative movement. There were 406 consumers’ co-operatives in the Central Soviet region before the conference, with a membership of 83,000 and a share capital of 90,000 dollars. There were 513 grain co-operatives embracing 112,000 members. There are no general summarised data regarding the state of co-operation after the conference. But the data from Tshuitsin and Singo districts enable us to form a judgment on the rapid development of the co-operatives. Thus, in Tshuitsin there were 9,000 members of consumers’ co-operatives before the August Economic Conference, while a month later this number had increased to 14,300, and share accumulation had grown by 50 per cent. In Singo the number of shareholders increased 100 per cent. (by 14,600 members) in one month after the conference. Many of the co-operatives show examples of good work. Comrade Lian-Ping mentions, for instance, a consuming co-operative in the Zhentiang region, which has arranged an uninterrupted supply to the population of salt, textile, drugs and other indispensable commodities at prices considerably below market prices, and at the same time has paid a dividend of 70 cents per annum for each dollar of share payments.

Among other decrees, the Economic Conference also passed a resolution to issue a \$3,000,000 loan for economic construction. We can judge of the attitude of the masses to this loan from the following data : 32,000 dollars worth of the loan were disposed of within a month in the Yuntse region. In Hunfun the loan was realised in five days to the extent of \$10,000. In one of the villages of the Tsetsun region the population paid in 4,200 dollars, though the bonds were not yet available. The support of the population has ensured the success of the loan.

We will cite some facts from the sphere of school construction to demonstrate the revolutionary creative work of the toiling masses in the Soviet regions, and the radical improvement of their conditions, and their yearning for education. Whereas in the Kuomintang territories in China the shutting up of schools has become a general

occurrence, throughout the Soviet regions, on the contrary, a wide network of educational and instructional institutions is developing. This, in the Nindu district, where there were formerly only a few schools, 350 primary public schools, 580 night schools, 13 clubs and numerous circles for the liquidation of illiteracy have been organised by the Soviet organs.

The trade unions and groups of the poor play a tremendous rôle in the consolidation of the Soviet régime, in the promotion of the whole of the economic and political transformation, and in the raising of the ideological and political level of the masses. It would have been quite unthinkable to correctly carry out the redivision of land, or to fight all the manoeuvres of the kulaks, without these organisations.

With the help of these organisations, a thorough checking up of the redivision of land was carried out last July in the Central Soviet region. Alien elements who had wormed their way into the Soviets in a number of places were exposed. Many estates were discovered to be still held by landlords' families, and also that kulaks held surplus of land above the norm fixed. Thus, the Commission of the Central Government, which relied in its work upon the trade unions, the groups of the poor and the help of the whole toiling population—

“ . . . discovered 27,000 dans of land in the Zhentian region. Out of over 20,000 peasants in the whole region nearly every one received in addition to one dan of land two douhs of millet crops. An enormous quantity of articles taken from the property expropriated from the tuhao, gentry and landlords was distributed among the peasants.”*

Class alien elements who had wormed their way into the Soviets were cleaned out of them. As a result of the increased activity of the masses, positive improvements were achieved in all spheres of work. Over 700 persons from this region voluntarily joined the ranks of the Red Army.

The trade unions and the groups of the poor are also taking a most active part in the restoration and development of industry and the extension of the co-operative movement. The trade unions systematically assist in strengthening of the Red Army. Thus, in correspondence received from the Hunan-Hupeh Soviet district, we find that :

“ . . . during the last campaign to extend the Red Army, the trade unions gathered together and sent 2,372 workers to the Red Army, some of these workers being the best active workers

in the trade union movement. The group of workers thus sent soon proved in deeds that they could play a leading rôle in the army.”

Very interesting figures, reflecting how the workers are attracted towards the Red Army, are available for the Central Soviet region. In July-September of last year, during the campaign to replenish the ranks of the Red Army, out of the total number who joined, the percentage of workers amounted to 16 per cent in the Tsutsin district, 24 per cent in the Shanli district, 27 per cent in the Kunlue district, 28 per cent in the Vanyan district, 24 per cent in the Kuansiang district, and 29 per cent in the Singo district.

In issue No. 116 dated October 6th, 1933, of the newspaper “Hunze Chzunhus” (“The Red China”), which is the organ of the Provisional Central Government of the Chinese Soviet Republic, we read that as the result of revolutionary competition, 28,850 persons were recruited in 23 districts of the Central Soviet region during September, 1933, alone, and 300,000 pair of sandals were made by the forces of social organisations and handed over as a gift to the Red Army.

The revolutionising influence of the Soviet regions upon the surrounding regions is evident from the example of Sychunag. The successes of the Red Army have contributed to an upsurge of the struggle of the workers and of the peasant movement in the remaining districts of this vast province. A struggle arose in a number of places (Zhuntsian, Lotsian, Minian) against taxes, a wave of peasant uprisings developed (Zhowkow, etc.), the partisan movement began to expand (Tsiu-Czhou-dai). The workers of one of the arsenals in this province organised a stay-in strike under the slogan “Not a single rifle, nor a single cartridge to the militarists for their struggle against the Red Army.” In Chenlu, unemployed workers pawned their clothes so that they could go to the Soviet region to join the ranks of the Red Army. Similar facts are to be observed in many other provinces of China.

The scope of this article does not allow us to dwell upon a whole number of questions. We have not, for instance, mentioned the measures persistently put into practice by Chinese Communists, measures directed towards further strengthening the Chinese Soviets, which are the form of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, the new type of revolutionary state, whose entire activity and practice are directly opposite to those of the Kuomintang, as well as to the activity of all the former governments of China. It was to the task of further strengthening the Soviets and more thoroughly checking the correct and consistent practical operation of Soviet power that the work of the

* See Comrade Mao-Dze-dun's article in the “Huntsi” magazine, No. 61, Oct. 30, 1933, on the results of checking up the redivision of the land.

recent Second All-Chinese Congress of Soviets were devoted.

Nor have we touched upon the question of the conditions of the working class, or the working-class movement on Kuomintang territory in China, though the latter occupies a prominent place in the general national struggle for national and social liberation. In recent years this movement has assumed tremendous scope and tempestuous forms. The numerous actions of the Shanghai proletariat and the heroic strike of the Kailan and other miners in the North of China can serve as the best illustration of this.

We have not referred to the anti-imperialist movement, and in particular to the partisan guerilla struggle in Manchuria, which plays an important rôle in the struggle of the Chinese people against the imperialist oppressors. Nor have we dealt especially on the life and activity of the heroic Communist Party of China, which now numbers about 400,000 members, and has grown up and become a powerful force, a mighty political factor, which has become the recognised leader of the toiling masses of China.

We have not touched upon all these questions, since we did not set ourselves the task of giving a full picture of everything which is going on in China. All we wanted to do was to draw a parallel between Kuomintang and Soviet China. The materials we have cited force us to the con-

clusion that the conditions of the masses in the Soviet regions cannot be in any way compared with the disastrous conditions under which the toilers in Kuomintang China live. Despite the most difficult conditions, tremendous successes have been attained by the young Chinese Soviet power, which has roused the revolutionary creativeness of the masses of workers and peasants. Despite the existence of certain shortcomings, Soviet China is steadily marching upwards, beating off the continuous blows of the international imperialists and of the Chinese landlords and capitalists, whereas decaying Kuomintang China which is doomed to destruction is rolling down ever lower and lower. Kuomintang China must be defeated and it will be defeated by Soviet China.

The leaders of the Soviet movement in China correctly estimate the historical importance of the struggle being waged, under their leadership. In a speech devoted to the re-election campaign to the Soviets, Comrade Mao-Dze-dun said:

“At the present time the proletarians of all countries and the oppressed peoples of the whole world are fervently hoping for the victory of the Soviet movement in China. The toiling masses of China are all vigilantly and with hope following the Soviet flag. They clearly understand that only the Soviets can save China.”

The Communists in China will know how to justify this hope.

THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

The Second Congress of the Comintern, which took place in July-August, 1920, represents one of the most important pages in the glorious history of the Communist International.

The Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) has prepared a new, corrected, and supplemented edition of the minutes of the Second Congress, and its publication is now nearing completion. Below we give the foreword to these minutes “From the Editorial Board.”

THE Second Congress occupies a special place in the history of the Comintern. If at the First Congress “There was only set up the banner of Communism around which the forces of the revolutionary proletariat were to rally,”* the centre of

attention at the Second Congress, on the other hand, was occupied by the *basic questions of the programme, strategy, tactics and organisation of the Comintern*. The decisions of the Second Congress on all these questions, worked out under Lenin’s direct leadership lay at the basis of the programme and of the entire activity of the Comintern, and are of tremendous significance to this day for the Communists of all countries.

The International situation in which the Second Congress of the Comintern met “abounded remarkably with inflammable material and grounds for their unexpected flaring up.”† In response to the intensification of imperialist oppression, a tempestuous rise was taking place in the revolutionary spirit of the masses of the workers, peasants and colonial slaves.

The eyes of the toilers of the whole world were

* Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XXV., p. 370, Russian Edition.

† Lenin, Theses on the basic problems of the Second Congress of the Comintern, p. 634.

turned towards *Soviet Russia*, the working masses in all countries were becoming convinced that "it was here, in Russia, that the fate of the general all-world revolution was being decided."[†] Despite the blockade and the intervention, the position of Soviet Russia became considerably strengthened by the time the Second Congress took place. Under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, the Red Army defeated Kolchak, Yudenich and Denikin, and beat off the intervention of international imperialism. While the Second Congress was in session, the Red Army was approaching Warsaw after having successfully repelled the offensive of the white-guard-Polish troops. The victories of the Red Army would have been unthinkable had it not been for the support which Soviet Russia received from the international proletariat (the upsurge of the revolutionary working class movement in the capitalist countries, the demands put forward by the workers that intervention cease, revolutionary upheavals and uprisings in the armies and navies of the interventionists, the refusal to permit munition shipments to Poland, the organisation of "councils of action," strikes, and so forth). The victories of the Red Army in their turn influenced the process of revolutionising the working masses in the capitalist countries.

The slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat, realised by the Russian proletariat in the form of *Soviets* gained tremendous popularity among the toiling masses of the whole world. The revolutionary movement in all countries was carried on under the banner of the struggle for the Soviets. It is true that the Hungarian and Bavarian Soviet Republics fell under the heavy blows of internal and external counter-revolution. But a revolutionary wave surged up in Germany in connection with the Kapp *putsch*. A powerful movement developed in Italy, which resulted several months after the Second Congress in the revolutionary battles of the Italian proletariat, and in the seizure of factories and mills. The strike struggle developed stormily in France and England. Parallel with the revolutionary actions in the largest West European countries we see revolutions and revolutionary actions in the countries of the East (the uprising in Korea in March, 1919, the bourgeois-nationalist revolution in Turkey in January, 1920, the upsurge of the revolutionary-liberation struggle in China and India.)

Under the pressure of the revolutionary working masses the largest parties of the Second International (the German Independent Socialist Party, the British Independent Labour Party, the Socialist Party of Switzerland, France, U.S.A., and so forth) withdrew from the Second International. The working masses in these parties demanded from their leaders that they affiliate to the Third International.

In his report at the Second Congress Lenin, speaking against the theory of the "automatic collapse of capitalism," emphasised with all force the role of the proletarian Party in the victorious revolution:

"The bourgeois regime throughout the whole world is living through the greatest revolutionary crisis. By the practice of revolutionary parties it must be 'proven' now that they have sufficient consciousness, organisation, links with the exploited masses, resoluteness and ability to make use of this crisis for a successful, for a victorious revolution. It is chiefly for the preparation of this 'proof' that we have come here to this Congress of the Communist International."[§]

Taking as a basis the task set by Lenin, the Second Congress elaborated a strategic and tactical plan of the revolutionary struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The very *composition* of the Congress was an eloquent proof of the difficult and resolute struggle which the delegation of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) headed by Lenin had to wage at this Congress. Representatives from 37 countries participated in the Second Congress; in addition to delegates from Communist parties and organisations, the Congress was attended by representatives of various syndicalist organisations (America, England, Germany) and by representatives of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany and the French Socialist Party who had a consultative vote. The problem was to attract the revolutionary working masses belonging to these parties and organisations to the side of the Comintern, and to convince them on the basis of the experience of the whole revolutionary movement and primarily on the basis of the experience of Russian revolution, of the correctness of Bolshevik principles and tactics. In striving to solve this problem, Lenin and the Bolsheviks developed a relentless fight at the Second Congress against opportunism and centrism, against social-democratic survivals in the Communist Parties, on one hand, and against the "infantile disease of 'leftism' in Communism," against anarcho-syndicalist tendencies, on the other hand. This struggle on two fronts runs like a red thread through all the works of the Congress, the main fire at the Congress being directed by Lenin on *the right*, against the opportunist centrist elements.

The question of the role of the Party, of the inter-relations between the Party and the class was one of the fundamental questions in the work of the Congress. The lack of understanding of the role of the Party was characteristic not only of revolutionary anarcho-syndicalist organisations, but also of a number of Communist Parties and groups, for in-

[†] Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XXIV., p. 27, Russian Edition.

[§] Lenin. Report on the International Situation and the basic tasks of the Communist International, p. 23 of Vol.

stance, of the Communist Labour Party of Germany, the Dutch group of Pannekoek-Gorter and others. The "lefts" did not understand that it is impossible to gain, realise and maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat without the leadership of an iron, disciplined Party of the proletariat.

It was with especial force and acuteness that the new epoch of wars and revolutions placed the question of the creation of a *Party of a new type* on the order of the day, a genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat, of which the Bolshevik Party was a model. The first condition for the creation of such parties was to put up a bar to the penetration of opportunist elements into the Communist Parties, and to purge the parties already belonging to the Comintern of such elements. At the Congress, Lenin developed a most irreconcilable struggle on this point. *The conditions for acceptance* to the Comintern submitted for discussion by the Congress were to facilitate and accelerate the alignment of forces inside the centrist parties, to prevent the penetration of centrist leaders into the Comintern and to help to purge the parties which had already joined the Comintern (for instance, the Italian Socialist Party, the Left Social-Democratic Party of Sweden, and so forth) from opportunists who were only "capable of ruining the revolution 'in the Hungarian manner'." (Lenin.)

At the Congress the demand for an *immediate break* with the opportunists encountered the resistance of individuals, who referred to the "specific" conditions of their countries. This reference to the "special" conditions of the West-European countries, to the argument that "Russian" methods are not applicable to other countries has long been the favourite manoeuvre of all kinds of opportunists. It was under this pretext of the peculiarity of West-European conditions that the *international* importance of the experience of the Russian proletariat and of its part in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat was rejected. Since then it has become the principal weapon of all the renegades, from Levy to Brandler and Trotsky, to similarly counterpose "West-European socialism" to "specifically Russian" Bolshevism in their struggle against the Comintern and its leading Party, the C.P.S.U. The counter-revolutionary estimation of Bolshevism as a "national" phenomenon has been exhaustively exposed by Lenin and Stalin.

"Is not Leninism the generalisation of the experience of the revolutionary movement of *all* countries? Are not the foundations of the theory and tactics of Leninism suitable and obligatory for the proletarian parties of all countries? Was Lenin wrong when he said that: 'Bolshevism can serve as a model of tactics for all'? (Collected Works, Vol. xxiii, p. 386.) Was Lenin wrong when he spoke of the 'international significance'

of the Soviet power and of the foundation of Bolshevik theory and tactics?" (Stalin, Leninism.)

The arguments about the "peculiarity" of the West-European countries, substituted after the Congress by howls about the "dictatorship of Moscow," were nothing but a manoeuvre on the part of the opportunists, who were striving to conceal their irreconcilable contradictions with the Comintern. They need the "Autonomy" of separate parties for the purpose of obtaining room for their opportunist practice. The 21 conditions for acceptance to the Comintern served as the best weapon against such kinds of manoeuvres. The experience of Russia and Hungary, the experience of the preceding revolutionary battles of the proletariat served as a convincing foundation for the theses of the Comintern on the rôle of the Party. This experience was made extensive use of in the debates at the Congress. The Congress proved to be an excellent political school for the insufficiently mature revolutionary elements, the proof being that the resolution on the role of the Party was accepted unanimously.

The second group of questions discussed at the Congress was devoted to the struggle of the Communist Parties *for the masses* (the question of parliamentarism, on the trade unions, on affiliation to the British Labour Party). The task was for the Party, having cleansed itself of opportunist and centrist elements, to win over the masses, particularly by means of working in the reformist trade unions, by taking part in parliamentary elections, and by making use of the parliamentary rostrum in the interests of proletarian revolution.

The Bolsheviks also had to carry on a struggle against centrist and "left" Communist views on the question of *parliamentarism*. The British shop stewards, the German Syndicalist Sukhi, the Italian Bordiga and others expressed their disapproval of the utilisation of legal opportunities. The Bolsheviks, in opposition to the "lefts," insisted on the necessity of utilising the Parliamentary rostrum and developed a stubborn struggle at the Congress against the centrist elements by insisting that the opportunists be removed from the parliamentary fractions, and that the parliamentary fractions be subordinated to the central committees of the Communist Parties, etc. The resolutions of the Congress drew a sharp line of demarcation between social democratic parliamentarians and Communist deputies, demanding from the latter that they subordinate their *entire activity* to the interests of revolutionary agitation and the mobilisation of the masses for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Second Congress insisted upon the utilisation of legal opportunities and demanded from the Communist Parties that they *combine legal work with illegal*, basing themselves in

this respect upon the abundant experience of the Russian Bolsheviks.

At the Congress, the most important question connected with the problem of the inter-relationships between the Party, the class and the masses was that of *work in reformist trade unions*. At the Congress Lenin, and the delegation from the Russian Communist Party which he headed, carried on a struggle against both the social-democratic theory of the "neutrality" of the trade unions as well as against the "left" communists who did not want to work in the reformist trade unions, against the sectarian tendencies to run away from the trade unions. The Congress imposed upon the Communist Parties the duty to work everywhere where proletarian or semi-proletarian masses are to be found. While making it an obligation for Communists to work in reformist and reactionary trade unions, the Congress at the same time established the conditions under which a split in the trade unions was possible and necessary. The question of the British Communists affiliating to the Labour Party is linked up with this problem. Contrary to the opinion of many of the delegates, Lenin in his speech expressed himself categorically in favour of affiliation to the Labour Party, basing his argument on the fact that

"it is not a party in the usual sense of this word.

It consists of members of all the trade union organisations which now number about four million members. It allows sufficient freedom to all the political parties which belong to it."*

The British Communists were to utilise the opportunities of working in this organisation for the purpose of consolidating their contacts with the masses. Since the structure of the Labour Party permitted them to propagate Communist ideas. Later on, in connection with the process of the transformation of the Labour Party "from a special organisation of a federative type, built on the basis of trade unions, into an ordinary social-democratic party," in connection with its transformation into an organisation ruthlessly persecuting Communists and members of the minority movement to an ever growing degree, the Ninth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (February 9-25, 1928) emphasised the necessity for the British Communists to develop a resolute struggle against the discipline forced on the labour movement by the liberal-labour bureaucracy and to convert the struggle for affiliation to the Labour Party "into an offensive struggle against its treacherous leadership."†

The Congress paid extremely great attention to another and not less important group of questions

* See 444 of the volume.

† Resolutions of the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. Published under title of "The Parting of the Ways." Workers' Bookshop.

connected with the problem of the *hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle*, namely, with the problem of the *allies* of the working class in the struggle for proletarian dictatorship, with the problem of the *reserves* of the proletarian revolution. Two items on the agenda were devoted to this problem, namely the national and colonial questions and the agrarian question.

The foundation for the solution of the *national and colonial questions* was the concrete understanding of the epoch of the socialist revolution which Lenin defended in the struggle against the semi-Menshevik views of Rosa Luxemburg, Radek, Pyatakov and Bukharin. According to Lenin, "the most important, the basic idea" of the theses of the Second Congress on the national and colonial questions was "the distinction between the oppressed and the oppressing nations. We emphasise this distinction—in opposition to the Second International and bourgeois democracy." According to Lenin, the second leading idea of the theses lies in the fact that

"in the present world situation, after the war, the mutual relations of the peoples, and the entire world system of the states are determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states, at the head of which stands Soviet Russia."‡

In his report Lenin dwelt particularly upon the question of the non-capitalist path of development of the colonial countries. Lenin raised the question as to whether the capitalist stage of development is inevitable for backward nationalities, and gave the question a negative reply.

"If the victorious revolutionary proletariat will carry on systematic propaganda among them, and if the Soviet governments come to their aid with all the means at their disposal, it will then be wrong to think that the capitalist stage of development is inevitable for backward nationalities."§

The theses on the national and colonial questions provoked sharp objections from Serrati, for instance, who, under a mass of "left" phrases defended the opportunist Lassalean-Trotskyist theory of the "united reactionary mass" and the "isolated proletariat." It is no accident that on another question also (the agrarian question), which is connected with the problem of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle, Serrati defended a similar point of view, speaking allegedly "from the left" against any "concessions to the peasantry." It is significant that at the Congress this "left" position of Serrati received support from the centrist Crispian, the representative of the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany.

Lenin had to wage a resolute struggle at the Congress against social-democratic and Luxem-

‡ See pp. 98-99 of the volume.

§ pp. 101-102 of the volume.

burgian survivals on the question of the fate of big agricultural enterprises after the revolution. In the agrarian commission as well as at the Plenum of the Second Congress there were those who were opposed in principle to the Leninist thesis regarding the division of the land belonging to the large land-owners among the small peasants. As against this attitude, which Lenin characterised as the "most malicious opportunism and wrecking," the Bolshevik Party, which based itself upon the experience not only of the Russian, but also of the Hungarian and Bavarian revolutions, brought to the fore the problem of "ensuring proletarian victory and of its stability" but "no stability of proletarian power is possible without neutralising the middle peasantry and without ensuring the support of a very considerable section, if not of the whole of the small peasantry."*

Lenin's theses on the agrarian question which were accepted by the Second Congress give a concrete analysis of the relation of the proletariat towards the various strata of the peasantry at different periods, before and after the conquest of power. The theses give an exceptionally brilliant outline of the policy of the proletarian dictatorship in relation to the agrarian question, and of the path of transition from small and scattered peasant farming to large-scale collective mechanised agriculture. Together with the theses on the national and colonial questions, Lenin's theses on the agrarian question represent the richest treasury of the strategy and tactics of the Communist International.

All these questions of the agenda of the Congress (about the rôle of the Party, about its relations with the working class, about the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle) are interlinked by a single task, namely, that of *preparing* the working class and its Party for the revolutionary way out of the crisis, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The resolution on the conditions under which the creation of *Soviets of Workers' Deputies* is possible and which gave rise to no debates at the Congress is closely bound up with the remaining resolutions, and is their natural culmination. This resolution raises the question as to the conditions under which there is accomplished the transition from the preparations for the struggle for power to the direct struggle for power, from *propaganda* for the idea of soviets to the direct *organisation* of the soviets. This resolution contains the classic Leninist formulation of the three basic symptoms of a revolutionary situation. The resolution emphasises the importance of Soviets as organs of the struggle for power and as organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and it fights both against any attempt to "curtail" the Soviets and to combine them with

bourgeois democracy, as well as against doctrinaire attempts to create "hot-house" Soviets unconnected with civil war, and in the absence of a revolutionary situation. The Congress stressed with all its force the importance of the slogan of Soviet power in the struggle of the international working class for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the rôle of the soviets as the form of proletarian dictatorship.

The resolutions of the Second Congress, which are connected by an inner unity and are based on the extremely rich experience of Bolshevism, and on the experience of the entire world revolutionary movement, gave an explicit Leninist reply to the question of the basic tasks of the Comintern. Since this Congress it has become impossible for the centrists of the Crispian type to wage a struggle against the Comintern under the flag of "solidarising" with it. The resolutions of the Second Congress have helped the sections of the Comintern to purge their ranks from opportunist elements more resolutely.

Some of the delegates at the Second Congress, who already revealed their social-democratic nature in the course of the Congress, developed an open struggle soon after the Congress against the line of the Executive Committee, and in the course of time safely returned to the bosom of the Second International (Levy). The tasks which Lenin set the Communist International also proved to be too much for some of those who at the Second Congress belonged to the Russian delegation, the entire activity of which was under the direct guidance of Lenin. As is known, Trotsky joined our Party in 1917, and for the time being put his anti-Bolshevik views on one side, but he was at no time a genuine Bolshevik. Soon after the Second Congress, in 1920-21, and particularly in 1923, he renewed a rabid factional struggle against the Leninist line and Leninist leadership in the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern; and when he was exposed by the Party, openly betrayed the Soviet Union and became a sworn enemy of the Communist International. Trotskyism is now the vanguard of bourgeois counter-revolution.

Zinoviev and Radek, who were members of the Russian delegation headed by Lenin, and who actively participated on its behalf in the work of the Second Congress, later on, took on the rôle of Trotsky's henchmen and waged a bitter struggle against the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern for a number of years.

Nor did Comrade Bucharin remain unshaken in his Party position, for he placed himself at the head of the right opposition in the ranks of the C.P.S.U., and attempted to force his opportunist line upon the Comintern, to the joy of all the renegades such as Brandler and others like him.

The Communist International has waged a steadfast struggle against the Second International and its agency, against the right and "left" capitulators,

* Lenin, Theses on the agrarian question.

against renegades and deserters of all shades. Since the Second Congress of the Comintern the Communist Parties of capitalist countries have achieved great successes, and they owe these successes to an enormous degree to the firm Leninist line of the vanguard of the Comintern, the C.P.S.U., and to the ingenious leadership of the great leader of the working class, Comrade Stalin.

In its struggle the world proletariat has based and is still basing itself upon the growing might of the U.S.S.R., which has finally consolidated itself upon the socialist path, and has turned into an invincible stronghold of the international revolution.

In its resolution, the Second Congress enumerated the distinctive features of a genuine Bolshevik Party, as a party "capable of leading the proletariat in the most ruthless, determined and last struggle against all the powers of capitalism."*

The C.P.S.U. is a model of such a Party. Such advanced sections of the Comintern as the Communist Party of Germany, the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Poland are already approaching this type of Party. Other sections of the Comintern are also acquiring these features by persistently working to bolshevise their ranks.

Armed with the teachings of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, tempered in the revolutionary fights, and after passing through the school of struggle on two fronts, against the right and "left" opportunists, the parties of the Communist International are now on the threshold of the second round of revolutions and wars, closely approaching the solution of the supreme historic problems which Lenin raised before them at the Second Congress of the Comintern.

* * *

The stenographic report of the Second Congress of the Comintern was published in 1921. At that time the board which edited the minutes itself remarked on all the shortcomings of the edition.† In the present edition, the text of the report has been corrected and supplemented by checking the Russian text of the minutes with two German editions of the same.‡

When working on the text of the *speeches* the editorial board of the present edition adopted the following principles. The edition containing the minutes in the language in which the given speaker made his remarks was taken as the basis of each speech. The greatest difficulties were encountered in studying the speakers who made their remarks in the English language. It was discovered that the

contents of these speeches as published in the Russian and German languages at times differ very much from the English text. This is to be explained by the extremely unsatisfactory way these speeches were recorded, and for this reason it has been found necessary in a number of cases to compile the text on the basis of the two variants of the speech (on each occasion mention is made of the same in the footnotes).

The checking of texts made it possible not only to correct the translation of the minutes but also to supplement them somewhat as compared with the 1921 edition. Some of the gaps in the minutes have been partially filled by minutes records of the Congress secretary (Comrade B. Reinstein), excerpts from which are given in the footnotes. It was impossible, unfortunately, to fill a number of such gaps, and in such cases there is an editorial note to that effect.

The work devoted to Lenin's speeches deserves particular mention. Lenin's report on the international situation and the tasks of the Comintern which was made in Russian, was checked with the stenographic notes of the speech as well as with the galley proof of the pamphlet containing this speech and corrected by Lenin, which is in the archives of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute.* As regards all of Lenin's other speeches, they were all made in the German language, and Lenin evidently did not read through their translation: the translation contains a number of inaccuracies and mistakes. For this reason, the present edition contains some of Lenin's speeches in corrected translation, while a new translation has been made of four speeches (the speech on the conditions of acceptance, on the rôle of the Party, on parliamentarism, on joining the British Labour Party). The translation of all these speeches has been edited by Comrade V. Adoratsky.

As regards the *resolutions* of the Congress, they are being published, after being checked and corrected. As a result of checking the original drafts of resolutions and their final text (in the Russian and German languages) it has been discovered: (1) that some of the amendments proposed by the corresponding commissions and accepted by the Congress, were entered in the German text, but omitted in the Russian text through negligence; (2) that a number of amendments endorsed by the Congress and written originally in German, are given an unsatisfactory translation in the final Russian text of the resolutions; (3) that individual words, and in some places even whole sentences, were omitted from the final text of the resolutions through negligence; (4) that in a number of cases a translation from Ger-

* See p. 470 of the volume.

† See the preface to the 1921 edition, p. 1 of the volume.

‡ Second Congress of the Communist International. Stenographic report. Ed. Communist International, Petrograd, 1921.

* N. Lenin. International situation. (Speech of Comrade Lenin at the first session of the Second Congress of the Communist International, July 19, 1920). Russian Edition, 1920.

man back into Russian was made of some of the items (including some penned by Lenin) which were originally written in Russian. On the basis of this careful check, the Editorial Board has established the authentic text of the resolutions as published in the present edition.

In one case a whole document had to be almost entirely re-translated: it was the additional theses on the national-colonial question, which were published in Russian as translated from the German, whereas the German text was in its turn translated from the English, and translated rather imperfectly. In the present edition, the English text was taken as the basis for the translation of these theses.

Among the *materials* of the Congress, in addition to the resolutions, we print the *Report* of the Executive Committee to the Second Congress, which was distributed among the delegates and published as a separate pamphlet.* As regards the reports of the various parties, which were distributed to the delegates of the Congress and published in a separate collection†, the Editorial Board has restricted itself

* Report of the Executive Committee of the Comintern to the Second All-World Congress of the Comintern. Publishing office of the Communist International, Petrograd, Smolny, 1920.

† "Reports to the Second Congress of the Communist International" publ. Communist International, Petrograd, Smolny, 1920, 407 pp. In the German language: "Berichte zum zweiten Kongress der Kommunistischen Internationale." Auslieferungstelle für Deutschland Karl Hoym, Nach. Louis Cahnbley, Hamburg, 1921.

to giving only a list of these reports. In the same section we publish (for the first time) the minutes of the Mandate Commission, preserved—unfortunately, not completely—in the archives of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute.

In the appendix to the minutes, in addition to the address regarding the convocation of the Second Congress contained therein, we publish the drafts of all the theses of the Executive Committee submitted to the Congress, as well as the theses on the women's and youth movement, which were not examined by the Congress and were approved by the Executive Committee. Furthermore, in the appendix we publish the declaration regarding the organisation of the International Council of Trade Unions, the Letter of the International Council of Trade Unions to the trade unions of all countries and the address to the First International Conference of Women Communists which was in session at the same time ("To the Toiling Women of the Whole World"). In this section we also publish the letter of the Executive Committee of the Communist International to the Central Committee and to all the members of the Communist Labour Party of Germany, published by the Executive Committee on the instructions of the Second Congress. The appendix further contains the report on "Revolutionary Ireland and Communism" published at the Congress. At the end of the appendix we give a list of the organisations which sent their greetings to the Congress.

"THE BLACK SEA REVOLT"*

By ANDRE MARTY.

"Our basic international existence in the chain of the capitalist states has been won. Internal conditions have not allowed a single strong capitalist state to make an attack on Russia. This proves that the revolution has matured within these countries, and that it does not allow them to conquer us with that speed with which they might have been able to. The English, French and Japanese armies have been on Russian territory for three years. *There is no doubt that the most insignificant exertion of the forces of these three powers would have been sufficient for them to attain victory over us in a few months, if not in a few weeks. If we have been successful in holding back this attack, it is only due to the disintegration of the French troops and the beginning of ferment among the English and Japanese.*"†

THIS is the way Lenin noted the significance of the Black Sea revolt, at the Moscow Regional Party Conference on November 20, 1920. Let us recall the facts.

As soon as the Turkish-Bulgarian front fell to pieces in 1918, and the military defeat of the imperialist Central European bloc and the victory of the imperialist Entente (France, England, Italy and Japan) became certain, the latter decided to "*put an end to Bolshevism*," as Pichon the French Minister of Foreign Affairs expressed it. One base for this was already set up in Archangel, in the extreme north. The Japanese troops were advancing in Siberia, and the French general Jeanine was in command there over the allied military forces, including the white guards. Kuban and the Don were in the hands of Denikin, and then the eastern army which was making for Belgrade, Budapest and Vienna, changed its direction and marched towards the Ukraine, supported by the fleet in occupation in the Black Sea.

The Soviet Republics were closely surrounded as

* Reprinted from *Cahiers du Bolchevisme*, No. 8, April 15, 1934.

† Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV., p. 485, emphasised by A.M.

by barbed wire entanglements. The French troops arrived in the Ukraine and Crimea in an atmosphere of a wild campaign of lies and slanders. But the Bolshevik Party was not asleep. Under its leadership a tremendous amount of work was carried on among the French troops, soldiers and sailors, with a view to convincing and awakening the consciousness of the latter.

And, indeed, there is no greater mistake than the legend spread about for years to the effect that the revolt on the Black Sea was an idyllic fraternisation between the Russian workers and the French soldiers. The unity which was to undermine and smash the intervention was accomplished as a result of a fierce struggle between the Russian proletariat and the French bourgeoisie. The proletariat wanted to win the army over to its side, while the bourgeoisie used all its efforts in order to preserve its hold on the army. It was precisely the tireless work of the Bolsheviks and of the proletariat of the occupied cities that roused the class consciousness of the French soldiers and sailors, and the unrest among those troops who were participating in intervention against the Russian revolution was concrete proof of this awakening. The awakening of their class consciousness also drove them on to the revolutionary path with such force that the government was at first compelled to send them back to their home country, and then to immediately demobilise them out of fear that the insurgents would spread the spirit of revolt in France itself.

In order to carry on this sanguinary, difficult and dangerous work among the troops of the interventionists, people were required who were energetic, accustomed to underground work and tested in class struggles, in other words, people of unshakable courage and unusual endurance. For this kind of work people were needed who were members of a strong and tested Party, a party tempered in civil war. It required very fine strategy and daring tactics on the part of people armed with the compass of Marxist-Leninist theory, in a word, it needed Bolsheviks.

It was only due to the members of this steel Party that the Russian proletariat was able, from month to month, to gradually win over the army, and tear it away from the bourgeoisie. Fraternisation began with the refusal of the soldiers to undertake an offensive (the 58th and 176th infantry regiment, 19th artillery regiment, etc.). This was the first period (February-March).

At the end of this period, April 6, one of the companies of the 7th sapper regiment, at the very height of the mutiny, tried to undertake revolutionary action, in this way starting the second period (April-June).

The sailors by now did not limit themselves to simply refusing to assume the offensive. Open

revolts took place ("France," "Jean-Bart," "Justice," "Quichen" and others). And many cases were to be observed of wavering between revolt and passage to revolution ("Waldeck-Rousseau"), and once even an attempt at revolutionary action (Protet).

Finally, during the third period (June-August) not only revolts took place, but attempts at uprising, such as action directed towards opening the prisons (Toulouse, Brest and Toulon), and attempts to connect the movement among the sailors with that going on among the soldiers and workers (Toulon).

This tremendous movement which was supported and drew its strength from the big strikes and revolutionary demonstrations in France itself, compelled the *French imperialists to weaken their attack on the October revolution.*

In order to continue its rôle as international gendarme, French imperialism had to resort to mercenaries, to Denikin and Wrangel, to troops which were in all respects on a lower level than the French army, which at the end of 1918 reached its apogee of powerful technical armament. It had to utilise white guardist troops, which it was a comparatively easy matter for the Red Army to smash up. In this way the uprising of the French soldiers and sailors assisted enormously in achieving the military victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. A splendid result!

We were, however, unable to strike a still stronger blow against French imperialism.

Actually, the uprisings of the French soldiers and sailors in the Ukraine, on the Black Sea and in France may be characterised in two ways.

On the one hand, the movement lacked a clear ideology, and revolutionary theory.

In almost all of the mutinies we meet with the same confusion, the same conglomeration of revolutionary phrases, pacifism and chauvinism, enthusiasm for the Russian revolution and legalism which at that time were widespread among the majority of the French proletariat and which filled the pages of the "La Vague" (a terribly muddle-headed paper, which passed as a Bolshevik production).

On the other hand, there was no serious organisation in existence.

This complete absence of illegal organisation in the army and the fleet enabled the Headquarters Staff to master this formidable movement rather easily. And yet there was a serious urge toward organisation on all the ships, which manifested itself spontaneously in the creation of underground sailors' revolutionary committees.

At any rate, it would have been extraordinarily easy to create one or more illegal cells in every army unit and on every ship in the fleet. Due to the existence of the large number of reservists, it would have been possible to create legal groups of soldiers and sailors everywhere, having concrete aims

(sports, music, dancing, study groups, etc.). It would have been extraordinarily easy for the Communist cells to influence these groups and make mass revolutionary organisations out of them, embracing entire military units or entire crews. But for this, what was needed was that there should be a Bolshevik Party in existence in France.

The consequences resulting from the absence of such a Communist Party which would have led and organised the struggle, becomes still more obvious when we acquaint ourselves with the attitude and the role of the delegates. Full of daring, springing voluntarily from the masses, they did not hesitate to present the demands of the sailors directly to the commanders, without hesitating to break the terrible military war-time discipline.

For example, Vuillemin, a young nineteen-year-old mechanic, who withstood the attacks of an entire staff full of cunning, and who foresaw all their manoeuvres, including, by the way, the trap of April 20, is without question one of the finest figures of the Black Sea revolt. But the sailors' delegates were not Bolsheviks. Faced with the enormous responsibility which rested upon them, almost all of them slipped down to the path of reformism. That is why, in the majority of cases, the masses quickly moved ahead of them, and why from that moment, they began to be a brake on the movement.

Sometimes their attitude even became counter-revolutionary, as for instance when the crew of the Waldeck-Rousseau, who were afire with revolutionary enthusiasm, recalled their twenty delegates less than twenty-four hours after they had elected them, and elected four new delegates.

In this way the mutinies in the Black Sea show much in common with the mutinies of the sailors and soldiers in Russia in 1905. Just as at that time, "the wide masses of sailors and soldiers easily started to revolt, but with the same ease committed the naïve stupidity of liberating the officers under arrest, and allowed themselves to be calmed by the promises and persuasions of the authorities, who thus gained precious time, received reinforcements, and split up the forces of the insurgents, after which there followed the most fierce suppression and slaughter of the leaders" (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. xix, p. 351).

This is why we must apply the same lessons to the Black Sea uprising as Lenin drew from the Moscow uprising of 1905, when he said :

"Another lesson refers to the character of the uprising, the means of carrying it out, and the conditions under which the troops pass over to the side of the people. In the right wing of the Party we find an extremely one-sided view on this transition. 'We cannot,' they say, 'carry on a struggle against modern troops. What is wanted is that the troops must become revolutionary. It is clear that

if the revolution does not assume a mass character, and does not embrace the troops themselves, then there can be no talk of a serious struggle.' It is clear that work among the troops is absolutely necessary. *But we must not imagine this transition of the troops as though it were some simple, single act resulting from conviction on the one hand and from consciousness on the other* (italics by me—A.M.). The Moscow uprising shows us at a glance the triteness and deadness of such a point of view. In reality, it is inevitable that when a real popular movement takes place, and with the sharpening of the revolutionary struggles, the wavering of the troops leads to a real *struggle for the troops*." (Vol. x, p. 50.)

Finally, as in 1905, those who mutinied on the Black Sea did not know anything about the art of insurrection.

"December has clearly confirmed yet another deep thesis of Marx, one forgotten by the opportunists, when he wrote that uprising is an art, and that the main rule of this art is desperate daring, and irrevocably decisive *offensive*. We have not sufficiently mastered this truth. We ourselves have not sufficiently learnt and have not taught this art to the masses, this rule of the offensive at all costs.

We must now make up with all our energy for this negligence. It is insufficient to have groupings in regard to political slogans—a grouping is necessary in relation to armed uprising. Anyone who is against this, and does not prepare himself for it must be mercilessly thrown out of the ranks of those supporting the revolution into the arms of the enemy, and of the cowards or traitors, because the day is approaching when the force of events, when the conditions of the struggle will compel us to use this criterion to differentiate our enemies from our friends. We must not preach passivity, not simple "expectation" till the troops "come over" to us. No, we must shout from the housetops about the necessity for bold offensive and an armed onslaught. . . . and for a most energetic struggle for the wavering troops" (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 10, p. 51).

* * *

At the 17th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin recalled the threat of an imperialist war against the U.S.S.R. and emphasised that "One such war against the U.S.S.R. has been waged, already, if you remember, fifteen years ago. As is well known, the universally esteemed Churchill clothed this war in a poetic formula—'the invasion of fourteen states.' You remember, of course, that this war rallied the toilers of our country in a single camp of heroic warriors who defended their workers and peasants' homeland against the foreign foe tooth and nail. You know how it ended. It ended with the invaders being driven

from our country and the establishment of revolutionary Councils of Action in Europe. It can hardly be doubted that a second war against the Soviet Union will lead to the complete defeat of the aggressors, to revolutions in a number of countries and to the overthrow of the bourgeois-landlord governments in these countries."

But such a victory of the revolution does not come by itself. It has to be organised and led.

That is why at the present moment, when we can observe a weakening of our activity against an imperialist war and in defence of the U.S.S.R., the work carried out among the imperialist armies and fleets in 1919 by the Bolshevik Party should be an example to us.

The uprising on the Black Sea shows us how we can fight against anti-Soviet aggression, how we can turn the imperialist war into a civil and revolutionary war.

In the first round of wars and revolution the entire absence of leadership in the shape of a proletarian revolutionary party, a Communist Party (which at that time did not as yet exist in France) and complete ignorance of the art of uprising, enabled French imperialism, with the aid of the treacherous line of the social-democracy in the General Confederation of Labour to escape very cheaply from the anti-Soviet armed onslaught. Let us not be caught unawares in the second round of revolutions and wars. Let us utilise and apply in action the lessons of the glorious mutinies on the Black Sea.

THE DEVELOPING STRIKE WAVE IN ENGLAND

THE period following the Hunger March in Great Britain bears witness to a serious process going on among the employed workers.

A big movement is going on among the most important sections of workers for the recovery of wages lost in recent years, etc. Thus, for instance, under the pressure of the masses, the reformist Railway Unions have to go forward with the demand for the restoration of cuts made by the National Railway Wages Board in 1931—though the treacherous leaders are side-tracking this by raising the demand to secure the functioning of the very negotiating machinery that imposed the cuts.

Similarly, the reformist leaders of the Woollen Textile Workers have met the employers in connection with the demand of nearly a quarter of a million of wool textile workers to secure the return of wage cuts made in 1931 and also the return of the 48-hour working week.

The miners in the different coal fields are putting forward demands for wage increases. The South Wales miners, for instance, are demanding 15 per cent. increase on standard rates, holidays with full pay, etc.—a demand which the reformist union leaders are treacherously sidetracking into discussions with the employers regarding the personnel of "impartial arbitrators" who are to decide the points at issue. The full delegate Council of the Durham Miners' Association has decided that the Executive be instructed to meet the coal-owners to secure an increase for all workers in and about the mines.

That the Yorkshire miners are seething with discontent and becoming ready for action is clear by the Cadeby strike, embracing over 2,000 men which took place in spite of the sabotage of the leaders of

the Yorkshire miners, Herbert Smith, etc., and by the repeated declarations of 10,000 miners of nearby pits of their willingness to strike in support of their comrades if they receive the word from the Union. Symptomatic too is the ballot vote in a Yorkshire pit when, following a strike of 50 young miners, the adult workers by 478 votes to 142 declared for support of the young strikers.

Among the engineers, we find that the Midland Divisional Council of the A.E.U., which covers such towns as Coventry, Birmingham, Leicester, Wolverhampton and Stafford, has put a demand in to the National Committee of the Union for the immediate revision of the 1931 agreement on overtime rates and conditions, against the York memorandum which restricts the right to strike and demanding local autonomy for the seeking of wage advances. An indication of the feeling may be gauged from the strike that broke out at the Lucas Works, Birmingham, under Communist Party leadership, against the introduction of a new variety of the Bedeaux System and where thousands of workers, mostly young girls, are offering stubborn resistance and refusing to be deluded by wordy promises—and are demanding a written agreement from the management that the new scheme will be withdrawn. There is also tremendous discontent among sections of shipbuilding workers. Strikes have broken out on the Clyde against efforts to reduce the wages of boilermakers—a welders' strike took place which covered the Clyde, Wallsend-on-Tyne, Dumbarton and Scotstoun, later extending to Harland and Wolf's, Govan, as well as to the shipyards and repair shops in Southampton.

It is noteworthy also that the Clyde District

Committee of the Union of Operative Plumbers is demanding a national strike. Characteristic also are the strike of West Bromwich safe makers which has gone for over a month against the attempt to force them to do additional work without receiving extra pay, and the strike of over 500 of the Vince battery workers in solidarity with a number of girls threatened with victimisation for belonging to a trade union. The militancy of the London tram and bus workers has been shown by the recent successful strike which broke out at the Acton and Hanwell tram depots, London, a strike which was not sanctioned by the Union leaders and which was the first strike since the establishment of the New London Transport Board—but which was successful in preventing a speeding up of working conditions. This was followed by an unofficial strike of over 1,000 London dockers, which spread until nearly 4,000 were involved, arising out of the employment of five clerks who were given dock work in place of the work they had recently lost in the office due to rationalisation. A strikers' meeting declared that work would be resumed only if these men were definitely removed, and in view of the defeatist line of the T.U. officials who had come on the scene, it was decided unanimously that "the Union officials were to have no power to negotiate under any circumstances . . . at all." Even the discontent among the teachers has been such as to compel the Executive of the National Union of Teachers to promise "to make an intensive effort to secure the full restoration of cuts" affecting nearly 150,000 teachers.

Almost every day now is bringing news of a strike or wage demand in one industry or other, in one or other part of Great Britain (not to mention strikes in Ireland, India, etc.).

What are the main points to be observed? Firstly, the growing striving for counter-offensive to secure return of wage cuts, etc., coupled with the desire for determined resistance to any attempts to lower wages. Secondly, the more and more open determination of the reformist leaders to split and prevent struggle and tie the workers hand and foot to arbitration. Thirdly, the increasing tendency towards independent rank and file action to secure the remedy of grievances, in spite of the reformist union leaders. Fourthly, the stubbornness which, in some cases, is leading to the long drawn-out character of the strike (Hope Mill,

Darwen, Manchester, waterproof workers, West Bromwich safe-makers). Fifthly, increasing expressions of solidarity (Yorkshire miners re Cadeby strike, Hanwell busmen support Hanwell tram strikes, support for Lucas workers, etc.) which is in some cases expressing itself in strike action.

What is it that is required of the Party? Firstly, that all the Party members be made to appreciate the character of the movement that is developing, and all members be involved in T.U. work. Secondly, that in each region our party members concentrate on the main industries and enterprises, with a view to influencing the workers from within the reformist unions on the basis of a concrete programme. Thirdly, that every effort be made to rally the militant trade union workers to independent struggle under the leadership of the Communists in spite of the leaders, and on this basis to extend the rank and file movements, fighting against legalism, against arbitration, etc. Fourthly, that where strikes take place, every effort be made to rally the widest sections of workers to render aid to the strikers, and also to obtain on this basis the development wherever possible of sympathetic strike action. Fifthly, in view of the increasing activity of the police, etc., against strikers, to aim, though not artificially, at introducing political slogans among the strikers' demands. In this connection special efforts must be made to involve the employed workers in the struggle together with the unemployed against the new unemployment Bill—in all cases concretely explaining to the workers how they are affected. Sixthly, to popularise among the Party ranks and among the workers the cases and concrete examples of good party efforts made by party organisations in connection with strikes, T.U. activity (e.g., Lucas strike, West Bromwich safe-makers' strike, etc.).

The numerous strikes now taking place are indicating which way the wind is blowing—it is up to our party members, not merely as individuals, but as units of the Communist Party, to appreciate this and to ensure that they direct the storm. The task is to co-ordinate the various isolated struggles now taking place into a united working class struggle that will smash the treacherous sabotage of the reformist T.U. bureaucracy and be directed not only against the employers, but also against the Unemployment Bill and the new Sedition Bill of the MacDonald-Baldwin Government.