

**WORKERS OF THE WORLD
UNITE!**

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



No.

11

Price

10¢

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published twice a month in English, Russian, German, French, Chinese and Spanish.

VOL. XI

JUNE 5, 1934



No. 11

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
DEFEND COMRADE THAELMANNI	347
LETTER TO THE AUSTRIAN WORKERS	350
<i>By</i> GEORGE DIMITROFF	
THE TURNING POINT IN POLAND	357
<i>By</i> G. LENSKI	
ONLY THE SOVIETS CAN SAVE CHINA	366
<i>By</i> P. MIF	
THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL	376

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, P. O. Box 148, STA. D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year, \$2; six months, \$1.

DEFEND COMRADE THAELMANN!

DANGER threatens Comrade Thaelmann — a danger that he will meet with bloody “justice” at the hands of the so-called “People’s 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 regime 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 regime 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 has 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 labor 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 against to resort to its favorite 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 bourgeoisie 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 today 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 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 transformed 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 legalize 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 labor for not less than two years may be imposed for "actions directed towards creating or maintaining any kind of organized 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 offenses 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 offenses". In other words, the trial and punishment in this place called a "People's Court" by the fascist demagogues are to be administered not by professional lawyers, but first and foremost by professional fascist terrorists. And it is before this "emergency court", which is called on to legalize 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 Comrades Dimitroff, Taneff, Popoff 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 defense against the fascists and thanked the Comintern for its assistance in Bolshevizing 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 "People's 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 defense. The fascists are afraid of the defense speech of the revolutionary Thaelmann.

The trial of Comrade Dimitroff was a political contest out of which Comrade Dimitroff came 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 Zommerfeld'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 in 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 fascized 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 "People's 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 defense of Thaelmann and the other prisoners.

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

EDITORIAL BOARD.

TOOLS

which can help us snatch Ernst Thaelmann out of the hands of the fascist beasts

ERNST THAELMANN—The Leader of the German Workers—by R. GROETZ	3c
DO YOU KNOW THAELMANN?—by HENRI BARBUSSE	3c
DIMITROFF ACCUSES!—Dimitroff's Speech in the Reichstag Fire Trial	3c
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY LIVES AND FIGHTS—The Banned Literature Distributed Under the Fascist Hitler Terror	5c
THE SONNENBERG TORTURE CAMP—by <i>An Escaped Prisoner</i>	5c
WOMEN UNDER HITLER FASCISM—Prepared by the Commission Investigating Fascist Activities	3c
WHO BURNED THE REICHSTAG?	3c
THE FIGHT FOR COMMUNISM IN GERMANY	1c
FOUR WEEKS IN THE HANDS OF HITLER'S HELL-HOUNDS—The Nazi Murder Camp at Dachau—by HANS BEIMLER	10c
MURDER IN CAMP HOHENSTEIN—by JOHANNES R. BECHER and Others	25c

FASCISM, THE DANGER OF WAR, AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES—Report to the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. by O. W. KUUSINEN	15c
WE ARE FIGHTING FOR A SOVIET GERMANY—Report to the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. by WILHELM PIECK	15c
FASCISM, SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY, AND THE COMMUNISTS—Speech at the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. by V. KNORIN	10c
REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS, FASCISM, AND WAR—Speech at the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. by D. Z. MANUILSKY	5c
THE PRESENT SITUATION IN GERMANY—by O. PIATNITSKY	10c
SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY—STEPPING STONE TO FASCISM—by D. Z. MANUILSKY	5c

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D

(50 East 13th Street)

New York City

LETTER TO THE AUSTRIAN WORKERS

By GEORGE DIMITROFF

DEAR COMRADES:

I have before me a letter dated December 7, 1933, which I received in the Leipzig jail only on January 15, 1934, from a group of workers in the Karl Marx House, which now—after the February events in Austria—has become known to the whole world.

Here is the text of the letter:

“Karl Marx House,
Vienna, Dec. 7, 1933.

“Dear Comrade Dimitroff:

“On behalf of many we give you our warmest greetings. Millions are listening to your courageous words.

“You give new strength to millions. Your struggle shall not be in vain. It is also our struggle. The great army of the class-conscious proletariat stands behind you in serried ranks.

“We ask you, Comrade Dimitroff, to send us a few lines in reply. With greetings for freedom,”

*(A number of signatures follow) **

I read and re-read the letter from the Austrian workers many times while in the dungeons of Goering's secret police in Berlin, when I learned from the German fascist press about the heroic battles of the Austrian workers. With a throbbing heart I followed the development of events and the outcome of the armed battles between the Austrian proletariat and fascism, feeling great joy over the manifestations of proletarian heroism and deep hatred for the treacherous policy of the leadership of social-democracy.

After arriving in the U.S.S.R., although I was still ill as a consequence of the hardships of imprisonment and the tension at the trial, nevertheless, as soon as my health permitted, I tried first of all to acquaint myself with the Austrian events and the historical lessons which followed from them, not only

* On the very same day that I received this letter I tried to send the following short reply through the strict police censorship:

“Today I received your friendly letter of Dec. 7, last year, and read it with great joy and thankfulness. As far as my conduct at the trial is concerned, I was only trying to fulfill my proletarian duty and to remain faithful to my heroic class right to the very end.

“With militant fraternal greetings.”

I do not know whether even this short reply reached its destination.

for the workers of Austria, but also for the workers of all capitalist countries.

I would now like to share my impressions and some of my thoughts about the Austrian events with those comrades who wrote to me, as well as with all the Austrian fighters for the proletarian cause.

I.

I do not know how many of those who wrote this letter are still alive. But now every Communist feels that in the struggle for the common cause of the workers he is linked up by indissoluble bonds with the Austrian workers who remained alive, as well as with those who have fallen in the battles.

We Communists feel drawn still closer to the workers who have fought and are still fighting, now that Austrian reaction is celebrating its sanguinary victory over the working class. Thousands of slain and wounded workers, thousands of prisoners, terror raging throughout the country, a regime of tyranny for the proletariat, comparable only to the fascist regime in Germany—this is the result of the hangman's work of the Dollfuss government.

The bourgeoisie is covering with glory the Dollfusses and the Feys, who used howitzers to shoot down the workers and their wives and children. The Papal Nuncio sends these hangmen his blessings. And at the same time the cowardly leaders of Austrian social-democracy read the workers a lesson, telling them that it was not necessary to take to arms, that the working class committed an error by answering with an armed struggle the general offensive of fascism which threatened to sweep away not only all the economic and political gains of practically half a century of struggle of the Austrian working class, but even threatened its bare existence.

But would capitulation without struggle have saved the Austrian proletariat from reaction? No, it would only have made the reactionary forces more arrogant and more sure of their strength.

The Austrian proletariat was right in its determination not to betray its own class, in refusing to submit without struggle, to a fate resembling that of the working class of Germany which was betrayed by German social-democracy. The armed struggle of the Austrian proletariat served as a clear warning not only for the Austrian bourgeoisie but also for the bourgeoisie of other countries. It showed that the proletariat will not reconcile itself to the reign of fascism.

No, it was not the armed struggle of the Austrian working class that was a mistake; the mistake was

that this struggle was not organized and led in a revolutionary Bolshevik way.

The fundamental weakness of the February struggles of the Austrian workers who succumbed to the pernicious influence of social-democracy was that they failed to understand that it was necessary, not only to defend themselves from the attack of fascism, but also to turn their armed resistance into a struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and for the seizure of power by the proletariat. The armed resistance of the Austrian proletariat to fascism did not grow into a genuine armed insurrection. This was the main mistake.

Reaction has triumphed in Austria. But this victory is temporary; it is of such a nature that it even now contains elements of the future defeat of the bourgeoisie. What is necessary at present is that the Austrian workers should not despair, should not lose confidence in the strength of their class, but, on the contrary, should draw all the necessary political and organizational conclusions from the lessons of the February battles, especially with regard to social-democracy.

Remember 1905 in Russia, comrades. At that time tsarism quelled the heroic uprising of the Russian workers. But who, however, does not know that it was just this uprising that was the historical prerequisite for the victorious October in 1917? In 1923, the September insurrection of the Bulgarian proletariat was suppressed. But just as in 1905 the Russian proletariat, under the leadership of Lenin, was able to benefit by all the lessons of the insurrection, gain confidence in its cause and carry its struggle to final victory, so the Bulgarian workers, with their Communist Party at the head and under the leadership of the Communist International, after the bloody suppression of the uprising, became even more steeled, strengthened their Party, and are now unwaveringly carrying on the struggle against Bulgarian fascism. After the experience of the September insurrection, the Bulgarian proletariat clearly perceived the roots of its weaknesses and the correctness of the theory and practice of Bolshevism. The Bulgarian proletariat and its Communist Party, which was driven underground, accepted the doctrines of Bolshevism as the foundation for their activity and struggle and converted the defeat of the September uprising into the prerequisite for the victorious development of the revolutionary proletarian movement in Bulgaria. And now, even the class enemy is compelled to admit that the Bulgarian proletariat and its Party have become much stronger than they were before the September insurrection in 1923.

The Austrian workers should take these historical lessons to heart. And as in 1905 in Russia and in 1923 in Bulgaria, so now in Austria, as a result of the sanguinary suppression of the working class com-

batants, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie have become separated by an unbridgeable gulf, which is one of the conditions necessary for the future victories of the proletariat.

II.

Otto Bauer speaks of the catastrophe in Austria. Yes, there is a catastrophe, but it is the catastrophe of the whole Second International, of its theory, policy and tactics. It is the catastrophe of the social-democratic theory of the peaceful, painless growing of capitalism into Socialism through bourgeois parliamentary democracy; the catastrophe of the reformist policy which tries to patch up disintegrating capitalism; the catastrophe of the tactics aimed at averting the proletarian revolution.

After the collapse of German social-democracy, this is the second catastrophe, a catastrophe, towards which the Social-Democratic Parties of other capitalist countries are similarly heading. It is in vain that Otto Bauer, in order to prove that the coming to power of fascism was inevitable, refers to the example of Germany where, upon Hitler's coming to power, as he says, neither the powerful Social-Democratic Party nor the strong Communist Party offered any resistance. But if the German social-democracy had not throughout this entire period conducted a sanguinary struggle through its Severings, Zoergeibels, and Grzezinskis against the anti-fascist front which was rallying under the leadership of the German Communist Party; if it had not sabotaged the numerous proposals made to it by the Communist Party, including that of January, 1933, to form a united front against fascism; if it had not rejected the proposals made at that time by the Communist Party for immediate proclamation of the general strike; and if it had not broken up the joint actions of the Communist and the social-democratic workers against fascism, then we can confidently assert that the German proletariat would have been able to prevent the fascists from coming to power, and the German people would not have become victims of the fascist orgy. The Communist Party of Germany was not at that time strong enough, unfortunately, to overcome the sabotage and betrayal of social-democracy and to lead the German workers to an open, armed fight against the Hitler bands. It is clear that in Germany, just as in Austria now, social-democracy bears full responsibility for the victory of fascism.

The events in Austria and Germany and the victorious construction of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., constitute the greatest historical test, based on the experience of millions of people, of the two policies—the policy of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the policy of the Comintern, on the one hand, and the policy of Austrian and German social-democracy, the policy of the Second International, on the other. The first

policy, the policy of the proletarian revolution, has already brought the working class in the U.S.S.R., as well as the basic masses of the peasantry which are under its influence, to Socialism. The second policy, the policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie, as has been strikingly shown by the events in Italy, Germany and Austria, has led to the victory of the counter-revolution, to the triumph of fascism.

The U.S.S.R., the great creation of the Bolsheviks, stands firm like a rock—the bourgeoisie and the landowners have been crushed, the power of the working class has been established, a strong proletarian State has been set up, a powerful workers' and peasants' Red Army has been formed, a new, Socialist, economic system has been built up, unemployment and pauperization in the villages have been abolished, and there is a steady rise in the material and cultural level of the toiling masses in town and country. But in Austria and in Germany there is not a trace of "democratic socialism" left. There, Dollfuss and Fey, Hitler and Goering, hold absolutely sway. The working class have had all rights taken from them, arms are in the hands of the bourgeoisie, the Vienna "Commune" (Gemeinde) is occupied by the Heimwehr, and the communal workers' houses which social-democracy held up as a symbol of the "peaceful growing into socialism", have been partly destroyed by artillery fire and are being taken away from the Austrian proletariat.

But, comrades, in 1918 you had everything in your hands. You had arms, you formed your Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. You were flanked on two sides by the Soviet Republics of Hungary and Bavaria. The bourgeoisie lost their heads. They were afraid that you would deal with them as the Russian workers dealt with their bourgeoisie in 1917. They were afraid that *you* would confiscate their houses and palaces for the workers. Now *they* bombard your workers' houses with artillery and give them to the murderers of your wives and children to live in. They expected that *you* would disband all their political parties; now *they* have suppressed your organizations. They expected that *you* would close down the whole bourgeois press, now *they* have closed down your press. They were afraid that *you* would fill up the prisons with the Dollfusses and the Feys, the Starhembergs and the other hangmen of the workers; now *they* fill them with workers and execute the revolutionaries.

If the Austrian and German proletariat had in 1918 followed the policy of the Russian Bolsheviks, there would now be no fascism in Austria, Germany, Italy, Poland and in the Balkan countries. And there is no doubt that the working class and not the bourgeoisie would have been master of the situation in Europe.

But Austrian social-democracy, with Fritz Adler

and Otto Bauer at the head, misled the working class. It made an alliance with the bourgeoisie against the revolution. It tried to frighten the Austrian workers by the difficulties of the heroic struggle of the Russian workers and peasants; it promised the workers to establish Socialism without revolution, without bloodshed—solely by means of the ballot and parliamentary stratagems. It urged the workers not to fight the bourgeoisie, but to compromise with them on the basis of small, temporary concessions, and by this means the bourgeoisie saved themselves from the revolution. You, comrades, unfortunately, did not listen to the voice of the Communists who were trying to convince you of the fatal effects of this policy. For years you submitted to the treachery of the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party which, with its policy of capitulation to reaction, led the working class from retreat to retreat and from defeat to defeat. For fifteen years reaction and fascism had been organizing their forces systematically and unhindered under the very nose of the Social-Democratic Party.

Was it possible, however, to hinder this consolidation of the forces of reaction and to hold Austrian fascism in check? There is no doubt that this was possible, but only through revolutionary struggle. Remember, comrades, July 15, 1927, when the masses went out on the streets upon the acquittal of the fascist murderers of Shattendorf. That moment was a turning point in the class struggle and in the relation of the class forces in Austria. It gave the bourgeoisie a great advantage over the proletariat and the bourgeoisie commenced to make vigorous preparations to establish a fascist dictatorship in Austria. If the Social-Democratic Party had had even the least desire to struggle, it could easily have converted the movement of July, 1927, into a proletarian revolution; but even if it had not had sufficient courage to do this, it could still have achieved the defeat of fascism; the only thing that was necessary was not to hold back the workers. But social-democracy broke up this powerful action of the Austrian proletariat against fascism. It surrendered the arms of the workers' arsenal in 1927, it concluded the Huettenberg Pact in 1928, opening the doors of the factories to the fascists, it introduced the law of Julius Deutsch on discipline in the army which permitted the government to clear the army of proletarian elements; it commenced to reform the constitution of December 8, 1929, in accordance with the demands of the Heimwehr. Since 1930, through the agency of Seitz, it permitted fascist demonstrations and banned Communist demonstrations.

Social-democracy had its military organization (the Schutzbund), stores of arms, two-thirds of the entire population of Vienna behind it and held almost undivided sway over the working class of the whole

country. And yet the fascists killed one worker after another with impunity, and every time social-democracy retreated, it threatened that at the next murder it would compel the bourgeoisie to put a stop to the terror "by the force of the organized working class". The Dollfusses, the Feys and the Heimwehr went on with their work, knowing the worth of such statements. By endless retreat you do not demonstrate the strength of the organized working class.

III.

And yet the Austrian proletariat could have won in February, 1934, too, if you, social-democratic workers, had refused to follow the social-democratic leaders, who from the very beginning demoralized your struggle by their policy of capitulation and defeatism, if you, together with the Communists, had taken the organization and the leadership of the struggle into your own hands at the proper time.

An armed struggle is not an act which is separate from the general policy of a party. A party which is constantly retreating, which in the course of fifteen years calls on the workers to evade the struggle, cannot in the course of twenty-four hours politically and organizationally adopt the line of armed struggle.

Otto Bauer, in his pamphlet, *The Uprising of the Austrian Workers*, is now complaining that the general strike was not successful. But did social-democracy take pains to prepare it? No, on the contrary, the social-democratic leadership tried beforehand to clear itself in the eyes of the bourgeoisie from all responsibility for the strike, declaring that under the four conditions (violation of the constitution, suppression of the Social-Democratic Party, suppression of the trade unions, appointment of a commissar of Vienna), the workers would themselves take the initiative of declaring such a strike.

Otto Bauer himself relates in his pamphlet:

"In the mills and factories and in the party organizations, ever more numerous became the voices of those who were impatient for a fight, who wanted to hasten matters and repeatedly declared: 'Don't let us wait any longer! When one of these four conditions is carried into effect, we shall find that we are not fit for a struggle. Let us strike now while we are still fit for it. Otherwise we shall meet with the same fate as that which overtook our comrades in Germany.'" (Otto Bauer, *The Uprising of the Austrian Workers*, p. 14.)

These workers were a thousand times right.

Bauer himself now affirms that during the February days the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party was opposed to struggle, but could no longer hold back the spontaneous movement of the workers. Otto Bauer drags in the crisis to justify the treachery of the railway union officials who broke the strike on the railways and thus allowed the government to

bring in artillery from Burgenland while the workers of Floridsdorf were shedding their blood.

He tries to whitewash the printers' union officials, who on February 13, on the second day of the armed struggle, called on the printers to end the strike and return to work.

In his pamphlet, Otto Bauer relates that the social-democratic leaders allowed themselves to be arrested so that they might not be obliged to join the workers in the fight, and precisely those leaders were arrested "who did not take the least part in the struggle, and on Monday, as on other days, sat in their trade union offices, in their offices in the Vienna Rathaus, in their regional, district and municipal offices". (*Ibid*, p. 3.)

Yes, it was so. That is how the traitors to the working class always act. But is the secretary of the Second International, the leader of Austrian social-democracy, Friedrich Adler, who shamefully stole away from the struggle, and who, at the time when the Austrian workers were fighting with arms, publicly declared that he could not take part in their struggle "because he was busy with current affairs"—is he any better than these cowardly deserters who call themselves leaders of the working class?

Comrades, can we go into struggle with such deserters in our ranks? These deserters are people who before the battle already wail about defeat, who attempt to bring panic into the ranks of the combatants at the first shot. These people do not want the victory of the working class; they are afraid of it. They only want to frighten the bourgeoisie a little, to make it more ready to come to terms with them. Thus, they first hold the workers back, and then deliberately limit the scope of their action, trying to keep the broad masses out of it. To the workers who wanted to support the *Schutzbund* in its struggle their reply was: "Go home and cook your dinners while there is gas; armed struggle is the business of the *Schutzbund* and doesn't concern you". They refused to give arms to workers who wanted to fight.

One's heart aches at the thought of the sufferings which the Austrian working class is now enduring as a retribution for the crimes of the social-democratic leadership.

My conscience, as that of a soldier of the revolution, cannot reconcile itself to the fact that the glorious fighters of the Karl Marx House were members of the same party as the members of the Carinthian and Vorarlberg organizations of social-democracy, who deserted to the camp of the Heimwehr at the first shot in Linz. It is hard to realize that the social-democratic proletarians who fought and died with so much heroism were for many years led by such miserable political philistines and

cowards as Otto Bauer, Adler, Deutsch and Seitz.

* * *

Your armed struggle was in fact a struggle for the reestablishment of the constitution which Dollfuss had violated, and it did not go beyond these limits, it did not turn into a struggle for power. And yet in the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, when the bourgeoisie is no longer able to govern by the methods of parliamentary democracy and enters upon the road of fascism, the fundamental question of the struggle of the working class is not the reestablishment of bourgeois democracy, which has outlived itself historically, but the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only the slogan of Soviet power brought to the consciousness of the broad toiling masses could have cemented the ranks of the fighters and created an indissoluble bond between the workers in action and the rest of the proletarians and peasantry. Only if the Austrian workers had set themselves the aim of fighting for Soviet Power could their armed action have grown into a genuine armed uprising.

Yes, comrades, unfortunately, your armed struggle was not a struggle for power, and thus, as Marx and Lenin have taught, it was not a genuine armed uprising. The fact that your armed struggle lacked this aim—the seizure of power—was the fundamental defect of your heroic action.

But it was by no means an accident that in that struggle the Austrian workers did not go beyond armed resistance. It followed from all the political principles of the Austrian social-democracy. "We do not intend to overthrow either capitalism or the bourgeoisie", the political thesis of the social-democratic leadership declared. In other words, in that concrete situation it meant: You, the fighting workers, must not attack the enemy, you must only defend yourselves against him in your communal houses. Guided by such principles the workers let the initiative in this struggle slip out of their hands—they surrendered it entirely to the enemy.

What was the fate that overtook the workers who followed this principle of social-democratic leadership? Locked in their houses, isolated from each other, they were held as if in a mouse-trap. They did not secure possession of either the approaches to these houses or the hills from which the enemy's artillery could with impunity bombard such positions of the workers as the Karl Marx House. By advising the workers to stay at home and wait for the outcome of the struggle of the Schutzbund, the leaders of social-democracy cleared the streets of the working class districts of the city for the government troops, which moved over them completely unimpeded. The government troops had the opportunity of

taking one stronghold after another from the workers who were on the defensive, whereas offensive tactics on the part of the workers could have brought confusion among the troops and drawn the wavering elements among them to the side of the proletariat.

The bourgeoisie did not stand on ceremony in requisitioning privately-owned means of transport for the struggle against the workers, nor in taking prisoners as hostages, whereas the fighting workers, trained in the school of Austrian social-democracy, starved but would not violate private property by requisitioning provisions. It did not occur to them that they must also take hostages from the bourgeoisie. And now Otto Bauer and the leader of the Schutzbund, Julius Deutsch, are flaunting this petty-bourgeois lack of stamina as a model of civic virtue. If the Russian workers in their time adopted this sort of tactics, they too, would now have the Dollfusses and the Feys riding on their backs.

What heroism, what self-sacrificing fortitude on the part of the workers, and what a criminal waste of workers' blood on the part of the social-democratic leaders!

IV.

What is to be done now, comrades? The first thing to do is to analyze seriously the experiences of the period beginning with 1918 and ending with the armed struggle of February, 1934, to use the lessons of this struggle, which like a mirror fully reflects the bankruptcy of the social-democratic policy. And the sooner this is done the better it will be for you and for the whole of the Austrian working class, the nearer it will bring this working class to decisive victory.

As against Bauer's "criticism" in which he glosses over his own crimes and those of the whole social-democratic leadership, you must, in my opinion, subject to the severest and most ruthless criticism the system of views with which the social-democratic leadership poisoned the workers. You must cast a glance back on the road which you traversed under the leadership of social-democracy and ponder over it; you must remember what the social-democratic press wrote, what the social-democratic leaders said in defending the choice of this road, and compare these with the inexorable facts. You must critically think over the pamphlet of Otto Bauer, which is in fact an indictment against the author himself and against the whole social-democratic policy. You must recall what the Communist International said to you during these fifteen years. And you must tell your class the whole truth, however bitter it may be.

And this truth will bring you to the conclusion that the Communists have proved to be right, and not the social-democrats,—the Comintern and not the Second International. The Communists were right

when they said that Austrian social-democracy was leading to the defeat of the revolution of 1918. They were right when they warned you that the policy of social-democracy was leading to the strengthening of the bourgeois dictatorship. The Communists were right when they said that social-democracy was safeguarding the rule of capitalism instead of leading the workers to Socialism. They were right when they said that unless the bourgeoisie was deprived of its power all the economic, political and social concessions which the working class wrested from the bourgeoisie, all its communal houses, and so on, were in constant danger of being taken away again. The Communists were right when they said that the interests of the proletariat would be safeguarded not by compromising with the bourgeoisie, but by an irreconcilable class struggle against it.

The truth will further compel you to admit that Austrian social-democracy is now politically bankrupt. The party to which so much was given, and which lost and ruined everything, has no more right to exist. Such a party only deserves the hatred of the working class. Only after overcoming the political and organizational influence of social-democracy will the Austrian proletariat get onto a new road which will lead it to victory over the Dollfusses and Feys, over the Heimwehr and over fascism.

You must break with the social-democratic organization, and together with the Communist workers establish a genuine fighting unity of the working class of Austria. This fighting unity is possible only on the basis of revolutionary struggle. This unity will increase tenfold the strength of the working class, will make many times weaker the offensive of fascism, will increase the revolutionary influence of the proletariat on the peasantry, and creates the conditions for the victorious struggle against the bourgeoisie and capitalism, for the struggle for Soviet Power.

At the present time the greatest danger for the revolutionary unity of the working class of Austria would be to attempt to resuscitate and save Austrian social-democracy, even on the basis of a new "Left" program. Such attempts would bring nothing but the disruption of the working class movement of Austria. For are there not among you people who in the course of these fifteen years did nothing but "straighten" the policy of social-democracy in a "Leftward" direction? You see the results.

For the workers who are disappointed in social-democracy, it would be an equally fatal delusion if, in the struggle against Dollfuss fascism, they were to think of seeking support in Hitler fascism. Remember that the Austrian national-socialists were on the side of the slaughterers of the workers during the armed struggle of the Austrian proletariat. Now

like "brown" ravens they flock to the field of battle and, using the sacrifices and sufferings endured by the proletariat for their demagogic ends, attempt to draw the Austrian workers, who are disappointed in social-democracy and are at the parting of the ways, to the side of Hitler fascism.

We, Communists, look with the greatest confidence to the future of the Austrian working class. We are firmly convinced of the final victory of the proletariat throughout the world. This firm conviction gave me the strength during the Leipzig trial to look the ferocious enemy straight in the face just as the glorious fighters of the Karl Marx House looked into the face of death. Beyond the incendiary fires and ruin, beyond the slavery and misery, which fascism is bringing, we saw in the east the U.S.S.R.—the gigantic stronghold of the working class of the world. There is no force which can stay the historic march of humanity to Socialism. One of the battles is over, the fighters count those who have fallen, but their strength is not broken; the great proletarian army is marching onward to its final victory.

* * *

Perhaps, comrades social-democratic workers, the thoughts expressed in this letter may seem to you difficult to accept. Nevertheless, I hope that this letter will help you in your critical evaluation of the past, to draw the proper conclusions. But if anything in this letter is not quite clear or gives cause for doubts I should be very glad if you shared them with me.

GEORGE DIMITROFF

Moscow Hospital,
March, 1934.

* * *

This letter had already been written when at the end of March, I received from one of the authors of the first letter, the following letter written on March 1, 1934:

Karl Marx House,
Vienna, March 1, 1934

Dear Comrade Dimitroff:

I hear with joy that you and the other two comrades—Popoff and Taneff—have escaped from the Brown hell and are already in the Soviet Union. Thousands of proletarians heaved a sigh of relief when they heard this news, for we need such heroic fighters as you in our ranks. If we had had them, the working class of Austria would not have suffered such a shameful defeat through treachery. It was a sanguinary lesson for us. It was the same as 1905 in Russia and we hope that we shall not have to wait too long for the establishment of a Soviet Austria, when we shall be able to extend a fraternal hand to Russia and

jointly build a new State, a pure workers' State,* in which only proletarians will be permitted to live.

Dear Comrade Dimitroff, do us a favor and write a few lines so that we may know that you really are in Russia, because we have turned into pessimists.

With greetings of freedom,

(Signed.)

Yes, comrades, you are right. If your ranks had been headed by real Bolshevik fighters your heroic struggle would certainly have ended differently. But such fighters can develop only in the process of irreconcilable class struggle against the bourgeoisie. However, social-democracy failed to carry on such a struggle; moreover, the Otto Bauers and Friedrich Adlers prevented this struggle. Only in constant struggle in a united revolutionary front against fascism will new steeled, fearless fighters grow up. Only under the banner of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin will new Bolshevik leaders grow up, and the Austrian proletariat will at last obtain what it needs for victory in its heroic struggle—a powerful Bolshevik Party.

GEORGE DIMITROFF

POSTSCRIPT FROM THE EDITORIAL BOARD

On the basis of the first news received regarding the February events in Austria, the Executive Committees of the Communist International, of the Red International of Labor Unions, and of the Young Communist International, described these events in their manifesto as an armed uprising. This, also, is how these events were characterized in various articles printed in our journal, *The Communist International*.

On the basis of the first information it received, the Comintern was already in a position to assert that the Austrian workers who carried on a heroic struggle resorted to arms *in spite* of their treacherous social-democratic leaders who yielded one position after another to Dollfuss and who endeavored at the last moment to avoid a struggle by negotiations and compromise with Dollfuss. These leaders also agreed to declare a general strike only when the struggle had already begun, and did so under pressure from the masses, but they continued to sabotage the general strike (the reformist railwaymen's union, for instance, refused to participate in the strike, etc.). The Comintern, therefore, exposed the lie spread by the Social-Democratic Parties which at-

tempted to take the credit for the heroic struggle of the Austrian workers and to make political capital out of it. It was for this reason that the Comintern stated that the Austrian events represent "a most important step in the turn of the masses of social-democratic workers to Communism", a statement which has fully justified itself.

At the same time the Comintern pointed out wherein lay the weakness, the error of the workers who resorted to arms. The Comintern manifesto stated:

"But were the Austrian workers prepared for this armed struggle, prepared in accordance with the situation? No, comrades. The leaders of the social-democracy did not allow the workers engaged in the uprising to take the initiative into their own hands. The members of the Schutzbund did not capture beforehand the bourgeois central districts in order to make them the arenas of the struggle; nor did they take beforehand the stations and the important military strategic points. The rebels limited themselves to defense action in the workers' houses of Floridsdorf, Simmering, and other places, and did not take the offensive against the armed enemy. Yet, *'the defensive is the death of every armed uprising'* (Friedrich Engels). The defensive tactic of the Schutzbundists could not prevent the shooting and defeat of the working class population by the artillery of Dollfuss." (See *International Press Correspondence*, Vol. 14, No. 17, March 16, 1934, p. 434.)

But an important question was unclear in the first days of the struggles, namely the question as to the nature of the aims which the Schutzbunders set themselves when they took up arms. Did they, the Schutzbunders, when they defended the rights of their working class organizations, when they defended the workers' dwellings against the onslaught of the fascists, at the same time set themselves the aim—though spontaneously and not fully consciously—of overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie and of establishing the power of the proletariat, which, in the last analysis, in case of victory, could only lead to the establishment of Soviet Power? Or, on the other hand, did they, due to the fact that their social-democratic prejudices were still powerful, fight exclusively to defend the democratic rights which the workers had won hitherto, *i.e.*, did they in essence, carry on the struggle to re-establish the constitution which Dollfuss had violated?

Bearing in mind the tremendous self-sacrifice displayed in the struggle by the Austrian Schutzbunders, and taking their heroism into account, the Comintern was at first inclined to give an affirmative reply to the first question. But to the degree that more complete information was received, it became clear that to the very end, the Schutzbunders did not raise

* There is something wrong here, comrades. Of course, you mean a Soviet State, which is the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But in it there are not only workers but all the toilers, building Socialism under the leadership of the proletariat.

the question of proletarian power, and that therefore it would be more correct to reply in the affirmative to the second question—and this found its expression in oral speeches made in the Comintern and in articles printed. In the speech made by Comrade Schoenau at the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. on February 17, 1934, and printed in No. 7-8 of the Russian edition of *The Communist International*, we read that:

“. . . we know that the main political weakness of the struggle was that it bore a clearly expressed defensive character. *This is no accident.* This is the result of the entire policy of treachery pursued by social-democracy and of its programmatic, strategic and tactical line. It was in this spirit that *it* educated the wide masses under its influence. The sharply expressed defensive character also bears witness to the fact that many of the members of the *Schutzbund*, who fought so heroically, were not quite clear as to the aims of the struggle. The struggle could be victorious only if it became a struggle for Soviet Power; but this was not recognized by the broad masses, and therefore the struggle bore a defensive character.”

Similarly, the article written by Comrade Kurt, and printed in No. 6 (British edition) of *The Communist International*, which subjected the tactics of the armed struggle of the Austrian workers to a detailed criticism, pointed to the fact that the fatal defensive character of these tactics followed logically from the line adopted at the Linz Congress of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, and from arguments put forward by Otto Bauer at this congress when he stated that “only the enemy can compel us to take the path of violence”, when he repeatedly stressed “the purely defensive role of force in our

program”, and when he urged that “civil war must be avoided at all costs”, etc. But if the defensive tactics adopted by the Austrian workers in the February battles were no accident, if they followed from the basic line accepted by social-democracy insofar as it limited the aim of the working class to the notorious “defense of democracy”, then it is incorrect to qualify the February events in Austria as an armed uprising. Bearing in mind, therefore, the line followed by the workers, these events must be qualified as a defensive armed struggle. It was to such a conclusion that the Comintern came, and Comrade Dimitroff’s letter to the Austrian workers is based on this estimate. We must firmly defend this estimate so that the Austrian workers may be able to draw the necessary conclusions and to learn the necessary lessons from their heroic struggle which ended in defeat. It would be supremely dangerous for the further development of the revolutionary struggle in Austria if the Austrian social-democratic workers explained their defeat only by the treachery of their leaders who deserted them in the struggle, and if these workers attempted to correct matters by merely replacing these old leaders by new ones, while retaining their old social-democratic outlook, and failing to understand the following words used by Comrade Dimitroff: “in the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, when the bourgeoisie is no longer able to govern by the methods of parliamentary democracy and enters upon the road of fascism, the fundamental question of the struggle of the working class is not the re-establishment of bourgeois democracy, which has outlived itself historically, but the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for the dictatorship of the proletariat”, *i.e.*, a struggle which only the Communist Party is leading.

THE TURNING POINT IN POLAND

By G. LENSKI

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, “does not lead to a new boom and flourishing industry, but which, on the other hand, does not force it back to the lowest point of 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 point 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 its conquest.

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 strikingly revealed 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 mobilization of the forces of military reaction for the preparation and realization 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 favor 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 stabilization 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 itself 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 Today", *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 "programs" 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 maneuver which is to help the social-democracy of fascist countries to play the role 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 maneuvers involving "rearmament", 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 Socialist 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" (Gorlitski), on the decline of its influence upon the masses, who refuse to listen any longer to the laudatory hymn of the Nedzialkovskis addressed to bourgeois democracy and the democratic way out of the crisis. "Nobody believes in the democratic way any longer" (Sherkovski). "The masses listen attentively and we must not strain their moods" (Kwaninski). This is the principle 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 realize the program 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 transition 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-revolutionary content. Not a word is said about the dictatorship being that of the proletariat, or about mass organiza-

tional 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 (Nedzialkovski, Zhulavski, Pezhek, and others) have been able to reconcile themselves to this resolution.

The maneuvering nature of the "rearmament" 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 Ksheslawski, "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 realize the nationalization 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 fascize the bourgeois State and the whole of social life in the most painless fashion.

The task of the Communists now consists of the following: skillfully to enter 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 fascized "democracy", which is to save the bourgeoisie from the dictatorship of the proletariat. While counter-posing to the slogans of social-fascism, which are meant to fool the masses, our program of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we must convince the masses by their experience in the every-day 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, but rather *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 recognizing 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 utilize 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 well aware of the necessity for the maneuvered rearmament of social-fascism. "We are threatened with no danger from your side", declared the representative of the government bloc, Medzinski, 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 Medzinski 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 Medzinski'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 role 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 organization of the Communist Party of Poland succeeded in organizing 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 role of social-democracy. It is to become a bridge to the social-democratic workers.

The Messrs. Nedzialkovskis 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, failed to result in the seizure of power by the proletariat, and 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 over 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 squarely against the Pilsudski government.*

The development of the strike movement has all the time followed a rising undulating line with intervals, indicating the mobilization 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 role 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 center of attention the Plenum placed the question of the preparation and organization 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 organizing a number of strikes and demonstrations on December 20, in such centers 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, pay 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, to 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 Zhulavski, the general secretary of the reformist trade unions, immediately after their promulgation (at the beginning of December of last year).

As against the social-fascist tactics of adaptation to the new laws, put into operation in installments 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 organizations 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 organization of just a *one-hour* general strike, which was set for the first few 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 organizations could organize 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.

Favorable conditions for the realization of our instructions were created sooner than we expected. Already on January 3 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 centers 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 Łódź and Warsaw factory owners to annul the half-day Saturday rest received a decisive rebuff.

As a result, the government declared that the realization of the decrees depends upon agreement between the factory owners and the workers. The government

hoped by means of this maneuver to divert the hatred of the working masses from itself, 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 Dombrowa region. In the oil-field 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 waiting detachments of the proletariat, to expose the social-fascists and to organize 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 organizations which had only three to five 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 its utmost to paralyze 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 the success of January 10, and to the *underestimation 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 onto the Party of the working class. The Secretariat chiefly counted on the spontaneous desire of the masses for a general strike, which was to take the place of preparation, 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 realize 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 succeeded in leading considerable circles of social-democratic workers

by the employment of 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 Labor, while the Socialist Party and the Reformist Confederation of Labor 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 emphasized that self-criticism should result in the maximum utilization 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 organized around it. At the beginning of February the Communist Party addressed a concrete united front program 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 mobilized 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 its program. But at the same time the chairman of the Central Commission, Zhulavski, 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 tactics of the Polish Socialist Party are 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. Ferment 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 organization of a general strike.

Then the Polish Socialist Party began to speak about the impossibility of having a 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 Nedzialkovski in *Robotnik* of March 27. In practice this appeal signifies not a united front with the Comintern, but conscious, purposeful and systematic work tending to isolate the masses from 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 organizational preparations. In April this was linked up with the May 1st campaign, at the head of which the Central Committee of our Party placed the organization of the general revolutionary strike, which paves the way for the mass struggle for the streets.

The fascist government, forced to suspend the realization 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 dealt a blow to the proletariat of Upper Silesia and the Dombrowa region. The railway men 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 situa-

tion, 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 this 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 organization 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 Hitlerization of the fascist organizations and of the entire fascist regime.

Pilsudski's government is accomplishing the reorganization 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 Pilsudski-ite organizations among the youth. A whole chain of different unions has sprung up, acting under the cover of anti-capitalist phraseology, skillfully 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 Pilsudski'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 Pilsudski's military clique, facilitates the militarization 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 Pilsudski-ism, has been extended. The national-democratic "camp of great Poland" has become a militant organization of the counter-revolution, of a pogrom character. National-democracy intercepts the petty-bourgeois masses who are leaving

Pilsudski. It is gaining influence among the State employees, at whose expense budget economies are being made by the Pilsudski government. National-democracy is also penetrating 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 organizations 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 Ludowe" has embraced within its influence hundreds of thousands of peasants who have been attracted to 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 Pilsudski 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 rearmament" of social-fascism, which is maneuvering skillfully 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 channels 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 as yet succeeded in creating a broad movement in the social-fascist party organizations. The "shrinking of the party apparatus", referred to at the Congress of the P.P.S., is compensated for 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 disproportion 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, Pilsudski's government is at the same time sharpening the point against its competitors, and most of all against national-democracy and the peasant party. This is one of the basic ele-

ments of the ripening crisis of the upper strata, the role 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 skillfully utilize 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 characterized first and foremost by the growth of the leading role 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 susceptibility 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 labor 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 radicalization 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 unites all the nationalists has assumed the most diversified forms.

The question of the correlation of forces between Communism and social-fascism stands out most acutely. The experience of January 24 has eloquently shown the danger of underestimating 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 role 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 organizations sometimes take no account of the active role of social-fascism, its maneuvering 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 the agitational, but also from the organizational point of view.

The main thing now is a political and organizational 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 organization, 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, Dombrowa, etc.

Our campaign for the united front has also penetrated into the lower organizations 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 favorable 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 favorable ground for a developed offensive against the P.P.S., enabling us not only to deeply undermine the trade union position of the latter, but also its *Party positions*.

The example of the P.P.S. shows that even in the most favorable 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 organizational basis of social-fascism and populist-fascism, our present main strategical task: winning over the majority of the proletariat and of the basic masses of the peasantry, who play a decisive role 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 synchronized with the uprising of the Galician peasants. Of course, such a synchronization 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 today 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 underestimation of the forces of the enemy, and of the role of the Party as the organizer of the forces of the revolution, an underestimation 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 politicalization 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 its shortcomings and becoming tempered in the struggle against difficulties.

ONLY THE SOVIETS CAN SAVE CHINA

By P. MIF

IT is more than five years now that 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, Trotzky, 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 advisors 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 been extended, ever new million-strong masses of toilers have joined the revolutionary struggle, and the organizing and the leading role 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 Budsian, it became possible for Chiang-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 revolution 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 revolutionizing 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 recognize what a menace **this movement** is for them, are mobilizing 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 11, 1934). Every line of this report sounds as an irrefutable sentence on the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang regime. 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, suc-

ceeded in driving back the Red Army in different regions, particularly in the Soviet region bordering on the provinces of Hunan-Hupeh-Anhwei, 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 Jao Hsin-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 regime, 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 organizations have sent their agents to the regions occupied by government troops as "unbiased investigators".

Province	Number of killed	Material losses in Chinese dollars
Anhwei	170,270	47,867,500
Honan	804,436	126,057,023
Hupeh	246,550	477,033,880
Kiangsi	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 color 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 Sovietized) 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 regime:

"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 remold the people in these regions anew. According to him, "the psychology of the people in the banditized 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 as 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 regime:

"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 realized 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 role of recognized 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 Nanking government to the most ruthless criticism, depicting the conditions of the peasant masses in the darkest colors, 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 Pompeii."*

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

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

** *Chunhuaebao*, January, 1934.

(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 ruin and pauperization 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 monopolizing 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 village 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 fertilizers. Thus, in the Hoyan district (Shansi 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 peculiari-

ties in the development of Chinese economics which intensify the acuteness of class contradictions in modern China. When analyzing the post-reform economics of pre-revolutionary Russia, and establishing the trend of economic evolution, Lenin emphasized 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 parcelization 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 role 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 Kiangsu 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 Kiangsu 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 practiced. 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

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

years ahead. The Szechuan 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 Szechuan district during the period 1930-1933, land taxes were collected for 14 years ahead while in the Nantsung 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 numerous 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 role in the degradation of rural economy.

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

Jaο Hsin-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 labor 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 pauperization, 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 unfavorable character of the trade balance. We give below the corresponding table in Mexican dollars.*

1932		Decrease in	
Import	1,634,726,298	absolute figures	per cent
Export	767,535,334		
1933		Decrease in	
		absolute figures	per cent
	1,345,567,188	289,159,110	18
	611,827,990	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 peasant masses, as well as to the development of the 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 have created a crisis in the land market. *It is not only the middle and poor peasants or the agricultural laborers 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 Fuchow in the spring of 1931 dropped by 33 per cent as compared with 1929 prices; in Yunchang (Chekiang province) they dropped by 40 per cent; in Enche (Kiangsu province) by 70 per cent; in Shansi 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		Index	
	in Mexican dollars		as compared with 1929	
	1929	1933	1929	1933
Czaosiang	90	60	100	67
Intan	150	100	100	67
Wanhe	100	60	100	60

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

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 20, 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 peasants have no other way 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 Kiangsi 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 Hsin-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 armistice 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 mobilized 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 marvelous 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 Szechuan, 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 grandchildren, 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 labor, 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 Kiangsi:

"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 country side 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 landlord's estates and their 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 industry, 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 Kiangsi, 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 are being arranged, the production of lime, used as fertilizer in the peasant fields, is being increased, repairs and the production of agricultural implements are being organized, irrigation canals are being laid, the old ones are being repaired and new irrigation constructions are being built. The broad masses are being mobilized for the model realization 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 favorable, despite the continuous war against the Kuomintang counter-revolution. Special government organs (Bureaus 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 organization of purchases and storage of

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

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 organization of trade and cooperation. It is a well-known fact that Chiang 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 Chiang 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 \$9,000,000 worth yearly) and fabrics (\$6,000,000 worth) was

also monopolized by merchants, who in some cases sold these products at prices which were ten times higher than the prices prevailing in the industrial centers of the country. This circumstance compelled the leaders of Soviet China to direct the most serious attention to the development of the cooperative movement. It was the conferences on economic construction in the northern and southern sections of Kiangsi which took place in August, 1933, which provided a considerable impulse to the cooperative movement. There were 406 consumers’ cooperatives 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 cooperatives embracing 112,000 members. There are no general summarized data regarding the state of cooperation after the conference. But the data from Tshuitsin and Singo districts enable us to form a judgment on the rapid development of the cooperatives. Thus, in Tshuitsin there were 9,000 members of consumers’ cooperatives 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 cooperatives show examples of good work. Comrade Lian Ping mentions, for instance, a consuming cooperative in the Zhentian 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 realized in five days to the extent of \$10,000. In one of the villages of the Tset-sun 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 region, on the contrary, a wide network of educational and instructional institutions is developing. Thus, 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 organized by the Soviet organs.

The trade unions and groups of the poor play a tremendous role in the consolidation of the Soviet regime, 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 maneuvers of the kulaks, without these organizations.

With the help of these organizations, 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.”*

Alien class 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 role in the army.”

Very interesting figures, reflecting how the workers are attracted towards the Red Army, are available

* 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.

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 6, 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 pairs of sandals were made by the forces of social organizations and handed over as a gift to the Red Army.

The revolutionizing influence of the Soviet regions upon the surrounding regions is evident from the example of Szechuan. 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 organized 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 recent Second All-Chinese Congress of Soviets was devoted.

Nor have we touched upon the questions 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 strikes 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 role in the struggle of the Chinese people against the imperialist oppressors. Nor have we dealt especially with 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 recognized 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 conclusion 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 suc-

cesses 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 reelection 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 center of attention at the Second Congress, on the other hand, was occupied by the *basic questions of the program, strategy, tactics and organization 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 program and 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 "remarkably abounded 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 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 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

* Lenin, Theses on the basic problems of the Second Congress of the Comintern, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV, p. 634, Russian edition.

** Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV, p. 27, Russian edition.

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

Kolchak, Yudenitch 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 organization of Councils of Action, strikes, and so forth). The victories of the Red Army in their turn influenced the process of revolutionizing the working masses in the capitalist countries.

The slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat, realized 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 *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 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 with great storm in France and England. Parallel with the revolutionary actions in the largest Western 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 Labor Party, the Socialist Parties 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", emphasized 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, organization, 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 organizations, the Congress was attended by representatives of various syndicalist organizations (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 organizations 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 the 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 against *the Right*, against the opportunist centrist elements.

The question of the role of the Party, of the interrelations 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 organizations, but also of a number of Communist Parties and groups, for instance, of the Communist Labor Party of Germany, the Dutch group of Pannekoek-Gorter and others. The "Lefts" did not understand that it is impossible to gain, realize and maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat without the leadership of an iron, disciplined party of the proletariat.

* Lenin, *Report on the International Situation and the Basic Tasks of the Communist International*.

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 of such elements the parties already belonging to the Comintern. 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 purge the parties which had already joined the Comintern (for instance, the Italian Socialist Party, the Left Social-Democratic Party of Sweden, etc.) 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 favorite maneuver 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 Party in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat was rejected. Since then, similarly counterposing "West European socialism" to "specifically Russian" Bolshevism, has become the principal weapon of all the renegades, from Levi to Brandler and Trotzky, 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.

"Are we not to regard Leninism as a generalization of *universal* revolutionary experience? Are not Leninist theory and tactic suitable for, is not their adoption obligatory upon, proletarian parties in *every* land? Was Lenin wrong when he said: 'Bolshevism is a model tactic for *all*'? (*Works*, Russian edition, Vol. XV, p. 503). Did he make a mistake in speaking of the *international significance* of the Soviet power and of Bolshevik theory and tactic?" (*Works*, Russian edition, Vol. XVII, p. 116.)*

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 maneuver on the part of the opportunists, who were striving to conceal their irreconcilable contradictions with the Comintern. They needed 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 maneuvers. 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 role 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 about 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, the trade unions, and affiliation to the British Labor Party). The task was that the Party, having cleansed itself of opportunist and centrist elements, must 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 utilization of legal opportunities. The Bolsheviks, in opposition to the "Lefts", insisted on the necessity of utilizing 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 mobilization of the masses for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Second Congress insisted upon the utilization 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 interrelations between the Party, the class and the masses, was that of *work in reformist trade unions*. At the Congress, Lenin,

* Quoted by Joseph Stalin in *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 14. International Publishers, 1928.

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 Labor Party is linked up with this problem. Contrary to the opinion of many of the delegates, Lenin in his speech expressed himself categorically in favor of affiliation to the Labor 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 organizations which now number about 4,000,000 members. It allows sufficient freedom to all the political parties which belong to it."

The British Communists were to utilize the opportunities of working in this organization for the purpose of consolidating their contacts with the masses, since the structure of the Labor Party permitted them to propagate Communist ideas. Later on, in connection with the process of the transformation of the Labor Party "from a special organization of a federative type, built on the basis of trade unions, into an ordinary social-democratic party", in connection with its transformation into an organization 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) emphasized the necessity for the British Communists to develop a resolute struggle against the discipline forced on the labor movement by the liberal labor bureaucracy and to convert the struggle for affiliation to the Labor Party "into an offensive struggle against its treacherous leadership". *

The Congress paid extremely great attention to another and less important group of questions 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 basis 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 emphasize 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 dwelled 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, who, for instance, under a mask of "Left" phrases, defended the opportunist Lassalle-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 Luxemburgian 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 characterized as the "most malicious oppor-

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

tunism 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 neutralizing 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 mechanized agriculture. Together with the theses on the national and colonial questions, Lenin's theses on the agrarian question represent the richest treasures of the strategy and tactics of the Communist International.

All these questions of the agenda of the Congress (about the role 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 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 *organization* of the Soviets. This resolution contains the classic Leninist formulation of the three basic symptoms of a revolutionary situation. The resolution emphasizes 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 "hothouse" 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 role of the Soviets as the form of proletarian dictatorship.

The resolutions of the Second Congress, which are

* Lenin, *Theses on the Agrarian Question*.

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 "solidarizing" 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 (Levi). 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, Trotzky joined our Party in 1917 and for the time put aside his anti-Bolshevik views, 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, he openly betrayed the Soviet Union and became a sworn enemy of the Communist International. Trotzkyism 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 role of Trotzky's henchmen and waged a bitter struggle against the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern for a number of years.

Nor did Comrade Bukharin 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 agents, against the Right and "Left" capitulators, 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 masterly leadership of the great leader of the working class, Comrade Stalin.

In its struggle, the world proletariat has based and still bases 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 decisive 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 Bolshevize 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 recorded by 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.*

Lenin's other speeches 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 about the conditions for admission, about the role of the Party, about parliamentarism, about joining the British Labor 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 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 German 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

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

** *Second Congress of the Communist International*. Stenographic report.—Published by Communist International, Petrograd, 1921.

* 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.

entirely retranslated: 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 to giving only a list of these reports. In the same section, we publish (for the first time) the minutes

* *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.* Published by the Communist International, Petrograd, Smolny, 1920, 407 pp. In the German language: "Berichte vom zweiten Kongress der Kommunistischen Internationale". Auslieferungstelle fuer Deutschland Karl Hoym, Nach. Louis Cahnbley, Hamburg, 1921.

of the Mandate Commission, preserved—unfortunately incompletely—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 organization 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 Labor 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 organizations which sent their greetings to the Congress.

Further Reading on THE PROGRAM AND POLICIES OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL—Together With Constitution and Statutes	10c
THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS—Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Com- munist International	5c
THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE COLONIES—Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International	10c
THE TWENTY-ONE CONDITIONS OF ADMISSION TO THE COMMU- NIST INTERNATIONAL—By O. PIATNIISKY	5c

Order from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

(50 East 13th Street)

New York City

TO CARRY INTO LIFE the revolutionary tasks of the Communist Party and the working class of the U. S. A., read the materials of the

**EIGHTH CONVENTION
OF THE C.P.U.S.A.**

THE WAY OUT—A Program for American Labor <i>Manifesto and Principal Resolutions, with an Introduction by M. J. Olgin</i>	10c
REPORT TO THE EIGHTH CONVENTION, by EARL BROWDER	10c
THE ROAD TO NEGRO LIBERATION, Report by HARRY HAYWOOD	10c



READ ALSO THE MATERIALS OF THE
THIRTEENTH PLENUM
of the Executive Committee of the
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

THESES AND DECISIONS, Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.05
FASCISM, THE DANGER OF WAR AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES— <i>Report by O. KUUSINEN</i>15
WE ARE FIGHTING FOR A SOVIET GERMANY <i>Report by WILLIAM PIECK, Secretary of the Communist Party of Germany</i>15
THE COMMUNIST PARTIES IN THE FIGHT FOR THE MASSES <i>Speech by O. PLATNITSKY</i>15
FASCISM, SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE COMMUNISTS <i>Speech by V. KNORIN, Member of the E.C.C.I.</i>10
REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS, FASCISM AND WAR <i>Speech by D. Z. MANUILSKY</i>05
REVOLUTIONARY CHINA TODAY— <i>Speeches by WAN MING and KANG SIN</i>15
THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE OF THE TOILING MASSES OF JAPAN <i>Speech by OKANO</i>05



Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D.

(50 East 13th Street)

New York City

"LEFT-WING" COMMUNISM: AN INFANTILE DISORDER

By V. I. Lenin

Big questions confront the American workers today. To triumph in great class battles, they must understand the Marxist approach to such key questions as the united front, work in the mass trade unions, revolutionary parliamentarism, the elements of a revolutionary situation. Some of the finest examples of Bolshevik analyses of these salient points of working class theory and strategy are contained in "*Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder*. Perhaps the finest example of Leninism in theory and practice in one volume, this book steered thousands of militants towards Communism when it was first written in 1920. It can be just as serviceable in the tense class struggles of today.

A new translation of "*Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, authorized by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of Moscow, has just been published as Volume 20 of the Little Lenin Library. 25c a copy



Recently Published "INTERNATIONAL" Books

Life and Teachings of V. I. Lenin by R. Palme Dutt

"This is without question the best introduction to the study of Lenin that is available," GRANVILLE HICKS, literary editor of the *New Masses*, declares. "I am amazed at what Dutt has managed to convey in his ninety-two pages. The only pertinent comment is unqualified recommendation." 50c

Dialectical Materialism by V. Adoratsky

The director of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute outlines the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. 50c

A Letter to American Workers by V. I. Lenin

The significance of Soviets, the sham of bourgeois democracy, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the revolutionary traditions of the American people. Little Lenin Library, Vol. 17. 5c

**The Development of Capitalism and Agriculture
in the United States** by V. I. Lenin

(Neatly mimeographed, bound and stitched) 30c



Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D

(50 East 13th Street)

New York City