

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Published twice monthly).

Vol. VIII. No. 9.

Workers' Library Publishers,
35 East 125th St., New York.

May 15th, 1931

CONTENTS

	Page
MAY DAY, 1931	254
THE TREACHERY OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS AND THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE IN INDIA	258
By G. Safarov	
THE WORLD AGRARIAN CRISIS AND THE PEASANT MOVEMENT	265
By V. Kolarov	
WEAK POINTS ON THE COMINTERN FRONT	273
By O. Kuusinen	
THE ORGANISATIONAL WORK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY	277
By A. Creutzburg.	

TEN CENTS

MAY DAY, 1931!

TWO years have passed since May Day, 1929, which, because of the events in Berlin, marked an historical turning point in the development of the class struggle in Germany. The barricade fighting, with which two years ago the Berlin proletariat (despite the decree of the Social Fascist President of the Berlin police forbidding demonstrations on the day of the world struggle) crowned its struggle for the streets, and the working-class blood of the thirty-three who were struck down by the bullets of the police soldiery during the days from the 1st to the 5th of May, 1929—that struggle became the starting point for a wave of revolutionary energy in Germany.

In certain respects the significance of these barricade struggles for the further development of the class struggle resembles that of the bloody massacre and armed struggles at the Lena Gold Mines in 1912, whose historical importance for the development of the revolutionary movement in Tsarist Russia Lenin considered to be extremely great. Lenin immediately recognised that after those revolutionary events the entire class struggle had reached a higher stage at which every strike and every demonstration had a considerably greater revolutionary character than formerly. Equally, in Germany after the barricade fighting of May, 1929, after that violent impact of class forces, the class struggle along the whole line became more acute. There, too, every strike, every demonstration, every Communist Party campaign necessarily assumed a more significant character.

The Party, which successfully led the struggle for the streets, renewed its own revolutionary traditions built up in the years of civil warfare, and at one blow gained a new position at the expense of Social Democracy. This growth in the authority of the Party was due to a large extent precisely to the fact that, not flinching from an encounter with the bourgeois State power, the Party resolutely led the masses along the path of revolutionary class struggle which corresponded to the conditions of the situation. The Communist Party understood how to lead the masses along the road which avoided both submission to bourgeois legality and the danger of a premature, isolated, armed conflict.

This increase in authority was not, of course, an isolated phenomenon, but had its effects in all the further development of the class struggle. From this point of view the barricades of May, 1929, marked the starting point of that advance which in the autumn of 1929 made the Communist Party the strongest Party in all the working-class quarters of Berlin, and in the Reichstag elections of 1930 the strongest Party in Berlin as a whole; it was at the same time the starting point of that Communist Party offensive

which began in the summer of 1930 in connection with the elections under the slogans of the emancipation programme, and which has not yet ceased.

It can with truth be said that if the Communist Party of Germany is at present able to put to the masses the question of the proletarian dictatorship, the question of a Soviet Germany, as the only way to social and national emancipation for Germany, as it did with the Emancipation Programme of the C.P.G., and as it has been doing since that time, it is able to do so only because in the past revolutionary struggle it has convinced the German working-class that at the decisive hour the Party knows how to fight for the cause of the proletarian revolution.

Why is it necessary, in examining the political significance of May Day this year, to recall so forcibly the events of May Day in Berlin two years ago? Such a review is necessary because the political effects of the May Day struggles in Berlin in 1929 have contributed largely towards making May Day a vital point in the conflict of class enemies, a point around which current questions of class struggles gather and revolve. This close connection between the day of world struggle for the proletariat of each country, was always required by the revolutionary movement, but it was precisely barricade May Day in Berlin which revealed clearly and unambiguously to the international proletariat this connection between the May Day tradition and the daily struggle.

If May Day, 1929, signalled the beginning of the revolutionary advance in Germany, May Day, 1931, will be celebrated in the midst of the most profound and grave economic crisis which capitalism has ever experienced within the general crisis of the capitalist system. Consequent upon the crisis, and the rapid advance in the U.S.S.R. which is occurring simultaneously, the political life of practically all capitalist countries has been profoundly shaken and the basis for revolutionary crisis in Germany and Poland is becoming more marked.

If one makes up the balance sheet of successes and failures on both sides, in the camp of the bourgeoisie and in the camp of the proletariat, the result inspires complete confidence as to the good prospects of the revolutionary class struggle.

It is true that a tremendous wave of social reaction has spread over almost all the world. Wage reductions, the loss of the social and political achievements of the working-class, a decline in the standard of living, worsened conditions of labour, the robbery of all working sections of the population by the monopoly price policy of capitalism—these measures, by which the bourgeoisie in practically every country hopes to transfer the burdens of the crisis on to the shoulders

of the workers and to maintain capitalist profits, mean greater impoverishment and burdens for the proletarian and working masses, but at the same time they deepen their indignation and their determination to fight against the whole capitalist starvation system.

It is true that the methods employed by finance capital and the bourgeoisie in exercising their class rule and in attempting to defend themselves against the political consequences of the crisis, take on a more and more reactionary character. The prisons of the capitalist countries have a growing population; the dictatorship of finance capital exercised by the bourgeoisie avails itself to a growing extent of fascist methods. In Germany, where Brüning's bourgeois Government is putting across the fascist dictatorship, attack after attack is being made on the working-class. Political reaction and fascist terror are items which must not be omitted from the balance sheet of the class struggle.

It is true that the danger of an imperialist war, particularly of a counter-revolutionary war of intervention against the Soviet Union, is increasing, threatening the proletariat with the suffering of another period of imperialist mass murder. Feverishly the imperialist powers are piling up their armaments. More and more clearly counter-revolutionary diplomacy reveals its endeavours to build up an anti-Bolshevik war front on firm foundations. More and more cynically the bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats conduct their campaigns against the country of proletarian dictatorship, supplying the ideological weapons while their generals and engineers push forward the construction of strategic railways, munition factories and other necessary preparations for intervention.

And, not last, we have to take account of the colonial crises, the militant terror and suppression by the help of which the imperialist powers are trying to drown in blood the colonial peoples' aspirations towards and struggles for freedom, and to assist their desperate search for a way out of the crisis.

The lash of hunger, the chains of political oppression, machine guns, bombs and poison gas—these are the items of which the bourgeoisie's balance sheet is composed. Now let us consider the contra-account of the world proletariat.

On every front of the class struggle the revolutionary advance is making headway. To the starvation offensive of capital, the plundering of the masses, the employers' campaign of wage reductions, the workers are answering with strikes, with revolts among the impoverished peasantry, while the urban middle classes are growing more and more radical: the strike of the South Wales miners in January, the French miners' strike in March-April, the Berlin metal workers' strike last October, the miners' strike in the Ruhr and Upper Silesia in January—all these

demonstrate the increasing militancy of the working-class and their increasing power to struggle.

Political reaction and fascism have evoked a wave of anti-fascist mass struggle in which, in particular, the German proletariat led by the C.P.G. has achieved tremendous successes.

Against imperialist war-mongering there is developing the passionate interest of the proletarian masses of all capitalist countries in the wonderful successes of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and their determination to defend the Soviet power against the imperialists, to change any imperialist war into a civil war against their own bourgeoisie.

To colonial oppression answers the colonial revolution; the struggle of the oppressed colonial peoples for emancipation is making irresistible headway. The beacons of the Chinese and Indian revolution, the revolutionary risings and battles of the Indo-Chinese proletariat, bear witness that the enslaved peoples of imperialism are breaking their chains, despite the armoured cruisers and the bombing planes of MacDonald, Hoover and Briand.

With the progressive development of the crisis, revolution and counter-revolution are developing their forces, but the historical decline of capitalism, its inevitable decay, are day by day bringing the scales down heavier in favour of the proletariat and its cause. What are the decisive achievements and successes that have been won by the world proletariat and its leader, the Communist International? What are the historical facts expressing clearly and convincingly the high stage of revolutionary advance that has now been attained?

If the general staff of the proletarian world army were to publish, for the coming May Day, a review of the achievements of the masses, a victory bulletin of Communism, there are *four* great successes for the cause of the proletarian world revolution that would have to be included: the success in carrying out the Five Year Plan in four years, the progress of Communism in Germany, the successful maintenance and extension of the power of the Soviets in China, and the development of the revolutionary crisis in India.

Where to-day are the prospects of the International bourgeoisie and Social Democracy who foretold the failure of the Five Year Plan of Socialist construction and announced daily the inevitable collapse of the Soviet power? Nobody any longer doubts the carrying out of the Five Year Plan; to-day the international proletariat is thoroughly convinced that the slogan of accomplishing the Five Year Plan in four years will be translated into reality.

The weak misgivings of the former leaders of the right, Bukharin and others, their fear of the "catastrophic consequences" of pursuing the general line of the Leninist Central Committee under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, have already been refuted by history. The Soviet Union has entered upon the

period of Socialism, the tremendous successes of Socialist construction have struck the ideological weapons of struggle against Socialism from the hands of the enemies of the Soviet Union.

German industrialists who a few months ago listened, like the rest of the world bourgeoisie, to the mercenary exponents of bourgeois economic science predicting the breakdown of the Five Year Plan, have now gone to Moscow to request contracts from the Soviet Union, from the despised Bolshevik rulers. Monsieur Trotsky, who has for years been singing his one song, the "capitalist degeneration of the Soviet Union," has admitted in the British capitalist press that unfortunately he was mistaken. Otto Bauer, the centrist "knight of the mournful countenance," the feeble light of the Second International, has suddenly rediscovered his liking for Socialism in the Soviet Union, while the Independent Labour Party, aware of the feeling of the masses, passes a hypocritical resolution in favour of defence of Soviet Russia and against the war-mongers. The last man to continue to sing, in senile obstinacy, the old litany of the speedy collapse of the Soviet Union, is Kautsky.

Thus, in fact, then, Socialist triumph has made the Soviet Union and the Bolshevik Party the shock brigade of world Socialism. The revolutionary way out of the capitalist crisis indicated by the Communists has here taken on a tangible form, appearing as a living reality in the eyes of the world proletariat. The reality of the Soviet Union—there is the historical proof of the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The second historical success for the revolutionary movement, which to a certain extent determines the character of May Day in Germany, and also internationally, is the advance of Communism in Germany. The howl of triumph that went up from Hitler's fascist bands last autumn has been silenced. The National Socialist wave which broke against the German proletariat has ceased to advance. The hopes of the German capitalists to ensnare the petty bourgeoisie and the former bourgeois adherents of labour with the help of the national and social demagogy of the Hitler Party, to find a substitute for the mass influence of the Social Democrats, are one by one fading away.

The ideological and defensive mass struggle of the German Communists against fascism has in large measure contributed to break the wave of National Socialism. The stagnation in the fascist movement is already giving rise to disintegration and crisis; the first signs are clearly visible. The revolt in the Berlin National Socialist storm detachment and in other districts against Hitler merely reflects the fermentation proceeding within the National Socialist movement which, with the energetic and systematic struggle of the Communist Party to win, not only the majority of the working-class, but also considerable

sections of the petty bourgeoisie, is bound to lead to the decline of fascist mass influence.

The success of the C.P.G. in its anti-fascist struggle is an indication of the Communist advance. It is closely connected with the wide breach made by the Communists in the Social Democratic camp. The mass basis of German Social Fascism has become much smaller in comparison with past years; to an increasing extent the S.D.P. is relying on the petty bourgeoisie. The growing influence of Communism, which on the 14th September attracted a million proletarian adherents from the Social Democratic camp into the ranks of the proletarian revolution, continues to attract the masses away from reformism. A severe crisis is maturing within the ranks of German Social Democracy.

It is precisely in this mass struggle against fascism and Social Fascism that the proletarian united front of Communist and Social Democratic workers is being strengthened and extended. But every step taken by the Social Democratic workers towards the Communists in the struggle against fascism, or, in economic disputes, against capital, widens the distance between them and Social Democracy, places them in opposition to the bourgeois State power and the principal social pillar of the bourgeoisie, Social Fascism. The daily experience of the class struggle guides the masses to Communism, so long as the Communist Party really fulfils, in every phase of the mass struggle, its role as the only anti-capitalist and anti-fascist force.

To-day the Communist Party of Germany is exposed to the continuous fire of reactionary attacks, police trickery and serious attempts at suppression on the part of the bourgeoisie and their Social Fascist lackeys. Bourgeoisie and Social Democrats are seriously considering suppressing the C.P.G. But the strength of the Party, its hold among the masses, is great enough to ward off these attacks. A million-headed Party which every day wins new adherents from the ranks of Social Democracy and National Socialism, and which is more and more coming to be recognised as the leader and the embodiment of the national and social struggle for emancipation, cannot so easily be suppressed. It is no accident that the bourgeoisie and the Social Democracy have given up their plan of repeating on May Day, 1931, the bloody game of two years ago and have withdrawn their prohibition of a May Day demonstration. This admission of the bourgeoisie's weakness intensifies among the workers the consciousness of their strength and the strength of their revolutionary vanguard.

It is clear that the rising revolutionary wave in Germany, the increasing maturity of the conditions making for a revolutionary crisis which may present the C.P.G. with the immediate task of organising the proletarian revolution, is not merely a German question, but an international question affecting the

working-class movement of the whole world. For the workers of France, Poland, England and Czecho-Slovakia, for the proletariat of all capitalist countries, the advance of Communism in Germany supplies a powerful impetus to their class struggle against their own bourgeoisie and a source of strength to defend their own class interests.

It also implies historical responsibility of great significance. The defence of a proletarian revolution in Germany against all intervention plans of the imperialists—this duty of proletarian solidarity, of revolutionary internationalism may, in the not very distant future, become the most important problem of the revolutionary class struggle, particularly for the French and Polish workers. It need scarcely be mentioned, therefore, that on May Day, 1931, this question is one of the most important which must be taken into consideration in determining the political content of our day of world struggle.

The third decisive item on the side of the world proletariat and the Communist International in the historical balance sheet of revolution and counter-revolution is the Soviet revolution in China. The past year witnessed the defeat by the Chinese Red armies of Chang-Kai-Shek's first counter-revolutionary offensive. The Soviet power is growing and extending its territory. The spirit of the Canton insurrection lives among the working masses of China despite the counter-revolutionary terror of the imperialists and the Chinese bourgeoisie. The Chinese revolution which the Social Fascists have announced as dead almost as frequently as they have prophesied the end of the Soviet Union, is advancing under the slogan of Soviet power and wide prospects of development are opening for it.

The fourth factor to be included in our balance is the Indian revolution. Its burning torch, uplifted

against world imperialism, mingles its flames with the torch of the Chinese revolution. In the experience gained by the working masses of India in their bloody collisions with British imperialism, the counter-revolutionary rôle of Gandhism has been revealed and the conditions created for the development of a revolutionary Communist movement in India. The slogan of the political general strike issued by the Communist International in accordance with the particular conditions and forms of the Indian struggle for emancipation will give the revolutionary movement among the proletariat a powerful impulse and help to establish proletarian hegemony in the Indian revolution.

Socialism in the Soviet Union, the Communist advance in Germany, the Chinese and Indian revolutions, these are the four hammer-blows directed against the edifice of world imperialism. May Day, 1931, will be celebrated in the light of these great successes in the revolutionary movement.

The world working-class day of struggle, May Day, will, in 1931, be celebrated by the workers of all countries in the spirit of a bold revolutionary offensive against the capitalist system. Socialism's world-historical superiority to capitalism, expressed in the contrast between the profound crisis of the capitalist system and the victorious construction of Socialism in the Soviet Union, fills the heart of the working masses in all capitalist countries with the proud consciousness of triumph. The advance of Communism in Germany, the flaming signals of the Chinese and Indian revolutions, coupled with the shining example of Socialist construction, will demonstrate that international solidarity of the working masses, that militant spirit of proletarian internationalism, which will make May Day a real day of proletarian world struggle among the workers of all continents.

THE TREACHERY OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS AND THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE IN INDIA

By G. SAFAROV.

In the Footsteps of Simon.

THE agreement between Lord Irwin and Mahatma Gandhi has been signed. This agreement means nothing less than a counter-revolutionary bargain between the Indian National Congress and British imperialism. Even the staid *Times* cannot disguise its satisfaction.

"The advantages of the settlement can hardly be exaggerated. Civil disobedience is abandoned; the Congress Party agree to co-operate, in a critical spirit it may be, but nevertheless to co-operate, with the Government; law and order are upheld by the maintenance of the penalties imposed on political violence and the withdrawal of the proposals for an inquiry substantially vindicates the police." (*Times*, March 6, 1931.)

British imperialism is jubilant at the treacherous step taken by the Indian bourgeoisie. It is enough to acquaint oneself superficially with the Irwin-Gandhi agreement in order to be convinced that they have a basis for their jubilation. What are the basic points of this agreement? The agreement says:

"As regards constitutional questions, the limits of future discussions, in agreement with His Majesty's Government, will be limited to a review of the future scheme of constitutional Government for India as discussed at the Round Table Conference. In the above mentioned scheme, federation is the most important thing; the matter is exactly the same with the responsibility of India and the reservations or guarantees on the part of India in such questions as, for example, defence, foreign affairs, the position of minorities, the financial obligations of India and the fulfilment of these obligations.

British imperialism has not taken the slightest essential step towards giving India even the smallest rights of a dominion. It promises Indian capitalists and landlords to continue the aimless conversation on the Constitution, stipulating for itself the unchangeable and irreducible right of domination. British imperialism displays, indeed, a grim humour, when it declares in the agreement with Gandhi, that the main point of the future Indian Constitution is the "federal" organisation of India. It would hardly be possible to give a more correct and exact interpretation to this point than that given by the quarterly entitled "*The Round Table*." This magazine represents business Conservatism. Here, in its pages, the Conservatives feel at home and do not think it necessary to hide their real intentions behind a mass of words. Speaking of the federal organisation of India, *The Round Table* remarks:

"It has been shown that the chief consideration in favour of this decision was the desire of Great Britain to consolidate and strengthen the central legislative and executive power by the presence of a conservative element

in the person of the native princes, at the same time preventing the transfer of any significant power of decision without the essential control of the central power. It is undoubtedly correct that the representatives of the Indian States represent a force which may be counted on in the sense of resistance to revolution and separation from the Empire; in such a quality they will be an element enabling constitutional stability to be maintained. However, the decisive consideration in favour of working out a constitution on the basis of the federation of all parts of India was the conviction accepted in common both by the native princes and the representatives of British India as well as the British representatives, that it was impossible to put British India on the path of responsible government without including native India in the limits of the constitution, without which forces would have been set in motion which, in the last resort, would inevitably have disrupted India into fragments. The delimitation of the relations between the autocratic States and native India and democratic British India cannot be an easy matter and no one can say in advance whether the traditional system of native India is more powerful than contemporary Western methods of British India, whether the latter would be more adapted to Indian conditions or whether it would be possible to create a compromise between both these systems."

The Conservatives give a completely frank and unequivocal evaluation of the bargain made. British imperialism has, in its time, not without cause, broken up India into a number of small sections and, including the provinces of British India, cut out almost 560 native States. The Middle Ages rule is almost untouched in these native States. There the feudal-landlord rule has been preserved in all its inviolability. There feudal lords serve as the direct basis of British sovereignty. These feudal dregs understand perfectly that they retain their autocratic rule only because they support British imperialism. An independent India would be the inevitable and irrevocable end of their own rule. The revolutionary wave which developed with particular force in 1930 forced them to bind themselves even more closely and more directly to British rule. The "Round Table" Conference could probably not have taken place, had the gilded satraps of the native States, who were looked upon in London not only as a circus curiosity, but as the most faithful and devoted assistants, not been attracted to it.

The "Round Table" Conference was begun with the definite calculation of pushing into the foreground this vanguard of the wholly corrupted and degenerated feudal dynasties. Although there was much ado on the question of Simon's participation in the "Round Table" Conference, although MacDonald tried in every way to avoid the suspicion that the Simon Commission report would be the basis of the dis-

cussion at this Conference, nevertheless, this report actually became the core of the future Indian "Constitution," one-tenth promised and nine-tenths already butchered.

It was the Simon Commission which, refusing to discuss the question of giving dominion rights to India, suggested a federal reorganisation of India on the basis of a bloc between British imperialism, the feudal princes, and the landlords. The time-honoured English tradition consists in not stinting verbal promises when some trickery of particularly wide scope has to be carried out. The policy of British imperialism was built up on this basis in the course of many decades. Formally, the Simon Commission report was not accepted as the basis for discussion at the "Round Table" Conference. In essence, however, it was precisely within the framework of this report that the representatives of British imperialism and the moderate envoys of the National Congress coming to London incognito as representatives of Indian moderate policy, sought a "common language," repudiating even passive resistance to British despotism.

The core of the agreement between Lord Irwin and Gandhi was the Simon Commission report. The Indian National Congress on its knees declared its own bankruptcy, its own inability "even in its baseness to preserve a shade of nobility." Is it so long since the members of the Congress boasted that they were on the streets when the Indian people shouted indignantly at Simon: "Simon, go back!"? Is it so long since that the Indian bourgeois-landlord press declared with satisfaction that passive resistance had already converted to ashes the fruit of Simon's and his colleagues' bureaucratic perseverance? Actually Simon emerged as conqueror, that is, the die-hards of British imperialism, who never change their slaughterhouse principles of administration although they also never refuse to take advantage of liberal garrulity. Baldwin emphasised this with sheer Conservative clumsiness. He said:

"The idea that the ("Round Table") Conference would be something that in its basis contradicted the Simon Commission, that the Conference would not be completely in accord with the conclusion of this Commission, represents the greatest foolishness."

Baldwin pointed out—and undoubtedly correctly—that the basis of the Simon report was the idea of a reorganisation of India on a federal basis. Of course, when they speak of "federation" it is to be understood as more or less a caricature and distortion of the term. In his time, the great Russian satirist, Schedrin, said that the Russian feudal-landlords, who could scald the peasants to death, complained that all they lacked for complete power was "self-government." Under "self-government" they understood the granting to

them of the rights of a State power within the limits of their estates.

It is approximately such a "free" order that the lords of British imperialism are ready to dispense to India. They interpret "federation" in such a way as to mean that every feudal prince will, as formerly, rule despotically over the life and property of his subjects. The inclusion of these feudal princes within the federation means that they will decide the affairs of British India with their own satrap yardstick. The Conservative quarterly magazine, *The Round Table*, is absolutely correct when it affirms that the essence of the Irwin-Gandhi bargain is the special organisation of "free" competition between feudal-landlord despotism and liberal complaining under the high protection of the British Crown. The new Viceroy of India, Lord Willingdon, with that lightness of thought which is inherent in the majority of English lords, declared, not so long ago, that coming to the administration of India he is firmly convinced that "it will continue to remain not only the greatest bulwark of the British Empire, but the finest diamond in the imperial crown." The stupidity of English Viceroys of India reflects not only their subjective qualities, but the objective-servile position of India as an "ornament" of the British Crown.

The base treachery of Gandhi and the Indian National Congress involuntarily forces us to recall the betrayal of 1921-1922. As is well known, the prophet of the bourgeoisie and landlords of India and the National Congress then also tripped up on the rights of the feudal-landlords. When the peasants in Bardoli refused to pay rent to the feudal exploiters, Gandhi and the Congress made a bargain with British imperialism and put a stop even to passive resistance.

Now, once again, Gandhi and the National Congress, on the very same point, but on an incomparably greater scale, carry out their counter-revolutionary betrayal. They conclude a bargain with British imperialism not only on the basis of an acknowledgment of its rule, but also on the basis of the acknowledgment of the sovereign position of the feudal satraps and feudal-landlords within the framework of a "constitution" which is promised "after the lapse of a number of years." The barest nod of the head from London sufficed to set these fighters for national independence racking their brains and vying with each other in putting forward the best and most certain recipes for crushing the popular mass revolutionary movement.

Simon has conquered! Such is the first deduction from which there is no escape. The Indian National Congress, with Gandhi at its head, did not carry on a struggle against British imperialism. It only speculated with the mass revolutionary struggle trying to haggle at least a slight concession for itself, at least a bit of the bear's ear. However, even within

the limits of this counter-revolutionary trade with the imperialists, they could not secure a minimum concession for themselves. They could not gain even an externally visible success. Simon has conquered—this denotes that the clash between British imperialism and the mass revolutionary movement threw the Indian National Congress into the arms of British imperialism.

The sly son of an even more sly father, now deceased, Jawaharlal Nehru, still tries to play the clown and loudly affirms that "this is only a truce." This can serve as a warning. Not only actually, but formally as well, the Indian National Congress has gone over to the side of imperialism and counter-revolution and is continuing its policy of openly mocking and betraying the struggling masses. More than that, it strains all its forces in order, having struck from behind, to break and scatter the army of fighters.

"Purna Swaraj" or the Chameleon in the Service of Imperialism.

Base treachery and compliance is conducive to talkativeness. Mr. Gandhi, once having concluded the bargain, comes obligingly to the assistance of the English correspondents and explains to them both the peculiarities of Indian pronunciation and the strangeness of his conduct :

"It is not possible in the English language accurately to explain the meaning of the word 'Swaraj.' Literally, its translation is—disciplined self-government and self-control. 'Purna Swaraj' does not exclude association with any nation, least of all Britain. But this association must be free and based on mutual advantage. 'Purna Swaraj' only puts forward complete independence in order that popular imagination in our country will not in any way be able to reconcile itself with the idea that the British governing class will honestly propose something different. I look at it differently. The British people is a practical race, loving its freedom. It is only necessary to go one step further in order to love the freedom of another nation."

These arguments are the most disgusting hypocrisy, and Mr. MacDonald, having only recently hung four textile workers of Sholapur for rebelling against the British yoke, must applaud Gandhi. The British Labour Party can boast that through the medium of a "Labour" Government a shameful bargain has been concluded between British imperialism and bourgeois landlord India. Gandhi's manner is in complete conformity with that of MacDonald and Co. In order to push through the plan of the Simon Commission, British imperialism found it necessary to stage the "Round Table" Conference. In order to find a common language with Gandhi, it could not get along without bringing in MacDonald as mediator. British social-imperialism, adopting Fascist outlines more and more in its struggle against the British working-class—is an irreplaceable weapon where it is

necessary to demonstrate the "unity of the whole British nation" in the struggle for the suppression of colonial revolution. On the other hand, it is as irreplaceable as the lackey who transmits a letter from the lord to his agent with whom the lord himself does not deign to talk.

The chameleonlike transformations of "Swaraj" are no new thing.

The constitution of the elder Nehru, which saw the light in 1928, already exposed the general line of the counter-revolutionary betrayal and its subservience to imperialism, the real line of conduct of the Indian National Congress. The Congress removed the slogan for national independence. However, by the end of 1929 there had to be more subtle hypocrisy in their betrayal in Lahore. The waves of the revolutionary movement were too strong to permit of plain speaking. The working-class of India, having passed through the heroic strikes of the Bombay textile workers of 1928-1929, proved that it was fast becoming an independent revolutionary force, that it was maturing not daily, but hourly.

Already, by the end of 1929, amidst the revolutionary petty-bourgeois masses of the cities, particularly among the students, cries resounded which portended no good : "We do not want to fight for the 'Swaraj' of Sassoon and Birla." "Independent India must be a republic of workers and peasants !" It is true that in these demonstrations of the revolutionary youth, there was much of the aimlessness and spinelessness of the "beautiful soul" of the petty-bourgeoisie. It is true, young Nehru and his partner, Subhas Bose, took advantage of the growing revolutionary unrest with extraordinary skill, trying through roundabout paths and "left" manoeuvres to secure the support of the masses for the Congress.

None the less, these "left" manoeuvres would have been quickly cancelled had not the session of the Congress in Lahore adopted the decision on "the struggle for independence" under the flag of non-violence. The period of the Lahore session up to the wide mass anti-imperialist movement of the spring of 1930, was the period of vanguard skirmishes and battles between the Indian National Congress and its agents on the one side, and the proletarian vanguard which had begun its independent political struggle with the considerable sympathy of the revolutionary youth on the other.

In the spring of 1930, the mass anti-imperialist movement suddenly, seemingly unexpectedly, acquired the force of a spontaneous revolutionary torrent and aroused many millions to the struggle who had until then been sleeping the sleep of eternity. In the cities and in the villages, tens, hundreds of thousands and millions felt a burning, insistent demand to bring to an end the rule of British imperialism at once, with a *single*, powerful eruption. But they were drawn into the struggle together with

all their prejudices and backwardness, with patriarchal trustfulness frequently not only toward the bourgeoisie, but to the landlords as well.

The powerful outbreak of anti-imperialist unrest united millions of workers, petty artisans, the city petty bourgeoisie and the toiling peasants. *Many millions of the masses felt the strength of their union for the first time.* But they were drawn into the movement as a solid mass not having been stratified according to class relations. Its official signboard, not covering it by one-tenth, was the "struggle" of the Congress. They did not participate in the campaign of passive resistance because they believed in the all-saving efficacy of non-violence. *Millions rose to the struggle and grasped at the first occasion which arose in order to give battle to British imperialism.*

Only on this basis could the movement of the Afridis develop, only such a setting could give rise to the uprisings in Sholapur and Peshawar and the number of terrorist acts against the predatory English. The mass anti-imperialist movement was such under the Congress leadership only in a very conditional and limited sense. As the movement of many millions of the toiling masses, it could not remain within the limits of passive resistance. The very thought of the possibility of restraining revolutionary elements within this framework is equivalent to a complete ignoring of the very essence of mass struggle. However, the Congress succeeded in disorganising the movement in the sense that all the heroism and all the self-sacrifice of millions of masses could not lead to a decisive conflict with the oppressors.

Further, the Congress succeeded to a certain extent in warding off the revolutionary criticism of the proletarian vanguard owing to the national character of the movement. The Indian National Congress, which had always been contemptuous of the workers' quarters, penetrated their territory by preaching the "union of the whole nation" in the struggle with British imperialism. The wave of petty-bourgeois trust in the bourgeoisie and landlords enveloped considerable strata of the workers. Wide masses who felt the strength of their union in the anti-imperialist struggle, were, at first, suspicious and on their guard against the attempt of a general class survey.

They could not believe the Communists, who were few in numbers, who declared that the National Congress was a gathering of the bourgeoisie and landlords who steadfastly shun struggle, who disorganise and make it impotent and are preparing a base treachery. They could not all at once believe that the Congress was only interested in seeing that the Bombay manufacturers had a good market, that the landlords were not threatened with a peasant revolution, that the moneylenders got their interest punctually. The fact that millions were drawn

spontaneously into the struggle gave unexpected support to the Congress since, in a situation of intense struggle of the masses, there was not set up in opposition to the leadership of the Congress on a sufficiently wide mass scale, *a political leadership about which the millions of workers and peasants would have known.* In the course of the movement—the more the movement developed so the gap widened between the words and deeds of the Congress and the mass practical struggle.

None the less, even the shutting down of factories and mills, the dismissal of tens of thousands of workers, the industrial crisis and unemployment, the agrarian crisis and the beginning of peasant unrest to a heretofore unknown degree did not completely expose the National Congress in the eyes of the masses. The Congress succeeded in bringing about a split in the textile workers' union, the Girmi Kamgar Union. The Bombay manufacturers made extensive use of the boycott of foreign cloth for setting their enterprises into motion again and were able to make political capital out of this also.

The Congress made use of the fact, in its entirety, that the Indian proletariat, in a setting of a mass revolutionary upsurge, did not have its political and organised Communist Party. The Congress could not set aside the spontaneously developing struggle of the working-class for its class self-determination and for its political leading rôle. But it succeeded, for a short time, to a certain extent, in isolating the vanguard of the working-class, who were even more definitely starting on the path of independent Communist policy.

The spontaneous outbreaks of peasant revolt from end to end of the country deprived the Congress of the further possibility of manœuvring in order to haggle for some slight concession from British imperialism as well as to fool the masses under the blind of a "struggle" with it. The peasant masses came out, not against the National Congress, but against the landlords and the moneylenders. Seized by the throat in the deadly grip of the agrarian crisis, the peasantry were compelled to rise against taxes, against rent to the landlords, against usurious interest rates. This was a blow to the National Congress because it always tried to set the "struggle" for national liberation against the struggle for the everyday interests of the workers and peasants.

The growth of the peasant movement forced Gandhi and company to hurry with the working out of the conditions of a bargain with British imperialism. When the Mohammedan peasants of Kishoriganj rose against the Indian moneylenders and began to take away from them their debt accounts and to threaten them, the local National Congress Committee hurried to the British Governor with the abject request not to delay sending of detachments to suppress the rebels. This precedent could not remain without a sequel.

When the National Congress saw that *an animated workers' and growing peasants' movement* threatened to upset all its calculations, it sent Gandhi to the Viceroy. Gandhi and Irwin together decided to cease:

- (a) organised disobedience to any laws ;
- (b) refusal to pay land taxes and other legal dues ;
- (c) publication of appeals for support of civil disobedience ;
- (d) attempts to influence civil and military servants or village officials for agitation against the Government or to instigate them to desert the service.

The British Conservatives, seeing the Indian counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie crawling at their feet, could not resist a contemptuous kick as an advance for the future. Baldwin declared that he refused to participate in a continuation of the Conference of the "Round Table" in India. At the present stage, the promise even of the feudal-imperialist constitution has been transformed into a kick in "advance." Such is "Purna Swaraj."

Demarcation of Class Forces and the Revolutionary Upsurge.

"The overthrow of the democratic regime in Russia by the Bolsheviks and the destruction of parliamentism in China due to the militarists and the party quarrels can repeat itself in India,"

so declares *The Round Table*.

Due to the intensification of the industrial and agricultural crisis on the one hand, and the mastering of certain lessons of the struggle on the other hand, the masses of workers and peasants, as well as wide strata of the urban petty-bourgeoisie, are becoming more and more conscious of the necessity of *independent* revolutionary struggle. The peasant movement took on a wide scope during the second half of 1930. It is enough to point to the uprisings in Bengal and Sind, in Berar and Burma, and to a number of isolated peasant revolts in all parts of India. While in the first half of 1930 the peasant masses joined the campaign of passive resistance, *refusing to pay taxes and cutting trees illegally in State forests*, during the next period the struggle took on a much more definite form. The uprising in Kishoriganj was the turning point in this. The peasant movement broke out with greatest force precisely in those regions where special cultures predominated, in the cotton and jute regions, and in the region which grew crops for export. The mechanism of these movements cannot be a source of any doubt whatever. To take at least the last uprising in Buldan of December, 1930, and January, 1931:

"The revolt was directed against the Brahmins and Marwaris. The primary cause was that for a number of years the Brahmins and Marwaris have held in their hands economic domination over the peasantry of Berar. Thanks to their actions the dissatisfaction against them accumulated more and more . . . Another cause of the

revolt was the system in virtue of which the agricultural workers in Berar always receive a portion of their wage in kind. Recently, taking into account the fall in prices, the Marwaris and Brahmins attempted to transfer their losses to the workers by causing the latter to accept their whole wage in kind." (*Times of India*.)

Thus *The Times of India* writes. This was a peasant movement and a movement of agricultural workers against the landlords and moneylenders. It was conditioned by the fact that the *agrarian crisis, entailing a catastrophic fall in prices for colonial raw materials brought into the movement—against the workers and pauperised peasants—the whole machine of the Middle Ages, of feudal-moneylending exploitation*. This crisis displayed the real core of Indian economy and showed how the feudal-landlord order still retains its sovereign position, serving as a support and conductor for imperialist exploitation.

Even in Punjab, which one is accustomed to regard as the district of petty-peasant holdings, 16½ million acres of the 29.7 millions of land under cultivation was leased for rent or rent in kind. In Agra, out of 28½ millions of acres, 21.9 were rented out. In Oudh, of 10 million, 8.4 millions were leased. Approximately three-fourths of all the land under cultivation in Bengal was rented under semi-feudal conditions. In Mysore, according to a most modest calculation, 51 per cent. of all the loans were made in order to absorb debts contracted earlier.

From December 31, 1928, the price of rice from Burma on the London market fell almost by one-fourth, the price of cotton decreased by more than one-half. A ton of jute, which cost at the end of 1928 £32 5s., by December 31, 1930, cost only £15 12s. Oil seeds fell from £145 a ton at the end of 1929 to £22 at the end of 1930. The Madras Association of Producers of Oil Seeds wrote in its memorandum of January, 1931:

"Southern India exports yearly to Europe ground nuts to a maximum amount of 10,000,000 sacks. The foreign price for this product has been £20-£25 per ton during the course of the last ten years. But prices have now fallen terribly and reached £12. This catastrophic fall signifies terrible losses for the cultivators. In the Madras Presidency, ground nuts represent the most important product of dry soil cultivation—about 3,000,000 acres. The fall in prices for agricultural production has increased more than two-fold the indebtedness of the ryots."

Indian papers are filled with reports like the following:

"Abnormal fall in prices for grain, it is stated, has brought about much dissatisfaction among the peasants of the Allahabad region and the tenants almost daily in large masses come from their villages to Allahabad with petitions demanding a change or a reduction of rent."

A telegram of December 22 says:

"A strong movement in the form of the robbing of harvests which have not been removed from the fields belonging to the Marwaris and other moneylenders and to large landlords, has arisen in the Buldan region."

“According to the information from the Aligahr police, on Thursday, December 18, a large crowd of textile workers from Budge-Budge declared to the vegetable merchants that they must sell their products at decreased prices. A refusal followed. Then the textile workers looted the shops and cleared out.”

The movement in Burma is still continuing and the British have not been able to crush it. The peasants have organised according to separate villages, elected their leaders and organised detachments. They rose at the call of the “king of the dragons.” *The Times* (January 9, 1931) lamented over the failure :

“It is quite improbable that this ‘king’ could receive such widespread support if it had not been for the heavy crisis in the rice trade on which almost the whole well-being of Burma depends. This unfortunate situation was strengthened by the almost general conviction that the united European mill-owners were to blame for it. This conviction evoked a specially sharp outbreak of hostility on the part of the rebels in the Tharavaddy region against Europeans. Another cause of the revolt was the unwillingness of the Government to postpone the collection of taxes and make it possible for the peasants to wait for more favourable prices. In so far as this delay was refused, the peasants were compelled to sell at whatever prices they could get in order to pay the taxes.”

MacDonald carried through the separation of Burma from India at the “Round Table” Conference following the traditional maxim : “Divide and rule.”

A real civil war on a small scale is going on in the Indian villages with the English tax collectors, landlords and moneylenders. Here is an eloquent communication from Madras of February 4 :

“The local police organised an expedition against the villages which refused to pay arrears. . . . The police did not find anything of the slightest value since the Honds had hidden all valuables beyond the confines of the village. The police arrested the village elder.”

On the following day, the peasants attacked the police. The police opened fire. The entire district of the rebels, including 350 villages, has been occupied by the police. “*Communications between villages have ceased, no one from one village can go into another until he has paid up the arrears.*” Such is the “free” régime which is now reigning in India.

The peasants in Ahmedabad who have not paid their land taxes are prohibited from gathering their harvest. Toward the end of January, four villages decided to collect their crop from the fields. As a result, there was a clash with the imperialist hirelings.

The slow-moving Indian peasants, the heavy reserves of the Indian revolution in the upsurge, are being set into motion. The agrarian crisis had to reveal the class springs of the poverty of the masses and the rule of English despotism. The Indian National Congress now tries to strike a blow in the back of the struggling masses because their further awakening threatens the interests of the Indian landlords and moneylenders, and, at the same time, the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie who are to a considerable degree united with the feudal-moneylending exploitation.

The growth of the class-consciousness of the workers after the events of Peshawar and Sholapur was irrepressible. The members of the Congress tried to split and to disorganise the foremost ranks of the working-class. They tried to terrorise the workers in the name of a “united action.” The Indian capitalists, throwing the workers out of the factories and mills and depriving them of every relief, at the same time, jeeringly declared that “the workers remain too far behind the national movement.” The anti-imperialist struggle of the masses, to the extent that it was under the control of the Congress temporarily drove back the strike movement. Only with November, 1930, did the strikes begin anew, first in Bombay, embracing from 3,000 to 5,000 workers. In 1931 the most significant event on the strike front was the demonstration of the jute workers of Calcutta. Forty thousand workers were threatened with dismissal due to the shutting down of the jute mills as the result of the crisis. Twenty thousand workers struck, half of them striking for almost two months.

An even more significant sign of the working-class being aroused is shown by its increased political activity. *Mass meetings and demonstrations* take place almost every week. The workers fight for their rights on the streets. The working mass begins more and more to realise that only the independent struggle of the working-class in a union with the basic masses of peasantry, with the revolutionary youth and petty-bourgeois elements of the town, can bring essential revolutionary successes.

Before the betrayal of the Congress was effected, the activity of its “left” agents was significantly increased. Petty-bourgeois politics seized with joy the slogan of the “democratisation of the Congress from below” which had been hatched by the renegade Roy and other people of his sort. The “left” agents of the Indian bourgeoisie and the landlords spread that treachery in order to draw the workers away from the struggle for its hegemony against the bourgeoisie. There was no point in destroying the Congress which enjoyed “authority” in the country. It was necessary to correct its leadership, avoiding a sharp clash of class interests. “Manifesto 100” led some astray and this hesitation undoubtedly helped Gandhi and the National Congress, imperceptibly, surrounded by figures of speech, to make its way to a treacherous bargain with English imperialism.

This aim also characterised the manoeuvres of Kandalkar, who everlastingly plays himself up as an “independent” leader and actually is but a marionette in the hands of the Congress. Kandalkar, when he cannot hide behind the back of the Congress, announces his “opposition” to it and . . . hides behind the back of the Yellow Amsterdam International and the Geneva Bureau of Labour under the League of Nations. This counter-revolutionary centipede has in reserve hundreds of manoeuvres for

dissipating the force of the proletariat. It is a pity that the vanguard fighters of the Indian working-class do not expose such chameleons with sufficient firmness and consistency.

The treachery of the Congress and Gandhi is the heaviest blow to the petty-bourgeois illusions of millions of masses who could not, until now, orient themselves in the struggle of class forces in the Indian revolution. These masses have, until now, not understood the inseparable bond between anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. The British joke of a "Constitution" will teach them now how to orient themselves in the basic questions of the class struggle. The British attempt to stifle the struggle of India for its independence through the mobilisation of the forces of the feudal Middle Ages and the attracting of the bourgeois-landlord bloc, in the form of the National Congress, to its side, will force the workers to come to the defence of their own interests and unite the struggle against the landlord, the moneylender and the predatory police with the struggle against imperialism.

At the same time, the task of organising the mass struggle in the city and the village, stands forth particularly vividly. "Non-violence" has been exposed as it had never been heretofore. "Non-violence" means crawling on one's knees before imperialism, feudal-princes, and landlords. *We must answer the treachery of the Congress with a general counter-attack against the counter-revolutionary bloc of the bourgeoisie and the landlords, which supports imperialism and is being supported by imperialism.*

More than ever before, the time is now ripe for a demonstration by the weak, and still insufficiently formed Communist vanguard, as the pioneers and

organisers of the revolutionary counter-attack against imperialism and its aids. *Not a minute must be lost in exposing the Congress and its "left" wing which will now, more than ever, creep out of its skin in order to screen its black treachery and help English imperialism to avenge itself on the mass revolutionary movement.* A blow from behind must be answered with a direct blow at the enemies of the Indian revolution. The objective grounds for the struggle to bring the mass revolutionary movement on to a higher level is present. The workers' movement again moves uphill, drawing new strata of the working-class into the struggle. When the base traitor Gandhi dared to appear before the Bombay workers, he was driven away by them. At this meeting the workers tore down the Congress banner and set up its own red flag. The peasant revolution comes ever closer and becomes more and more an obvious fact. The petty bourgeois youth and wide masses of the small city traders cannot follow the National Congress. The path of "conciliation" with British imperialism is not for them. The preaching of preparation of mass political struggle, of preparation and organisation of general strikes has now become particularly important and urgent.

Down with the feudal "constitution" of Simon !

Down with British imperialism in India !

Down with the base bargain between the National Congress and the oppressors of India !

These slogans must mobilise the national masses under the leadership of the Indian proletariat who have already undergone no little experience, have accumulated revolutionary experience and cannot make peace with the bourgeois-landlord betrayal of the Indian revolution.

THE WORLD AGRARIAN CRISIS AND THE PEASANT MOVEMENT

V. KOLAROV.

The Agrarian Crisis and the Upsurge of the Toiling Mass of the Village.

THE present world agrarian crisis is a striking manifestation of the general crisis of capitalism. Coinciding with the tempestuous growth of agriculture in the U.S.S.R., the agrarian crisis emphasises the irreconcilable contradictions of the two systems — capitalist and socialist, showing at the same time how deeply the process of decay has entered into the capitalist system of production. Its singularity consists in the fact that the agrarian crisis is intertwined with the industrial crisis, aggravating and complicating it and in its turn being aggravated and complicated by its influence.

The penetration of powerful monopolist capital into agriculture, which first of all won control over the production of bread and the trade in bread products, but which gradually drew into its sphere cattle breeding as well, resulted in the *strengthening of class differentiation and the sharpening of class contradictions*. This is best illustrated in the trans-oceanic countries. During the last few years, there has been a tremendous mechanisation of agricultural industries and a widespread use of advanced agricultural technique in the U.S.A., Canada and other countries. However, this took place at the expense of the ruin and expropriation of a considerable number of petty and middle households.

Under capitalism, and the private ownership of the land, the basic mass of the peasantry were *involved* in the "technical revolution" only in the sense that the complex system of credits, "pools," etc. fell into the hands of the powerful bankers who won, at the expense of the exploitation and impoverishment of the masses, tremendous profits. The differentiation of the peasantry went on rapidly in Europe as well. The unequal development of capitalism in this case showed itself in the large scale agriculture of the European countries, particularly as regards production of bread, lagging very much behind the colossal success of American large scale agriculture.

But mechanisation and advanced agrarian technique was even less accessible to the petty and middle peasantry of Europe than to the peasantry of the trans-oceanic countries. The so-called "policy of the protection and improvement of national agriculture" (protective tariffs, export premiums, cheap credits, agricultural co-operatives, etc.) introduced by all capitalist Govern-

ments of Europe, actually resulted in the support of the powerful agriculturists, and the wealthy kulak class and, at the same time, in the ruin and enslavement of the petty and middle peasant. American competition on the world market hastened the process of the pauperisation of the basic masses of European peasantry.

Under the cover of a slanderous campaign against alleged "Soviet dumping" and against the so-called use of "compulsory labour," the bourgeoisie and land owners of all countries resurrect semi-feudal methods of exploiting agricultural workers and petty peasants and organise a savage orgy of repression and punishment in the colonies, preparing simultaneously for armed intervention against the U.S.S.R. That is the real contents of their "struggle" with the crisis. The introduction of this policy by the bourgeoisie provokes impetuous growth of indignation among the toiling masses of the cities and the villages and points to a strengthening of their opposition.

In answer to the wholesale reduction in wages and the worsening of the conditions of work, strike waves are growing among the hired workers in agriculture, frequently taking on the most embittered class struggle forms. The terrible unemployment in the village, which cannot be estimated because there is no State insurance whatever for the village proletariat and semi-proletariat, has already led to stormy demonstrations and bloody clashes with representatives of the Government in a number of countries. More and more frequently the huge army of the impoverished peasantry join the movement of the unemployed. In a number of countries the spontaneous movement of peasants against the payment of rent, taxes, debts to banks and money lenders, resisting the officials and gendarmes, is so extensive that not infrequently authorities are forced to make concessions. The march of the starving peasants into the city, the robbing of bread trains and granaries is not a tale of former times but a live reality, not only in the colonies and agrarian capitalist countries of Europe but in the North-American republic, until recently, "flowering." The conditions of a most galling landowner-capitalist yoke, of national oppression and fascist terror (as for example, in the Western Ukraine) resulted in the appearance of the "red cock" in the villages. The *peasant Committees of Struggle*, which arose in a number of countries on the basis of the dissatisfaction and indignation

of the workers in the village, is witness to the fact that, together with the growth of the revolutionary activity of the village masses, the consciousness and the organised character of the movement is growing stronger.

The rapid growth of the menace from the village alarms the ruling classes exceedingly and centres their exclusive attention on what is happening among the peasantry. In order to avert a revolutionary movement of the peasantry, the bourgeoisie in all countries is hastily mobilising all the forces of Fascism. Waves of fascist demagoguery sweep through the village. The agrarian parties, the kulak-fascist unions and co-operatives, uniting with finance capital, make every effort to preserve the private property illusion of the poor and middle peasant, to isolate the impoverished peasant masses from the growing influence of the revolutionary proletariat.

The Social-Fascists also turn their "Face to the Village" but with the aim of disrupting the revolutionary union of the workers and peasants under the leadership of the workers. The peculiar fascist "peasant" parties and unions are growing like mushrooms. Their task is, by means of most unrestrained demagoguery, including "revolutionary" slogans, to retain the village, which is growing revolutionary, in the power of capital. However, the deepening crisis and the rapid growth of the class contradictions, create unfavourable conditions for the consolidation of the methods of Fascist demagoguery and deceit. Therefore the bourgeoisie, in addition to demagoguery and deceit, let loose violence and terror and suppress the revolutionary peasant movement with incredible brutality.

II.

The Work of the Communist Party in the Village.

The question of the relation of the proletariat to the revolution was raised in principle and decided clearly and precisely in the well-known theses of Lenin on the agrarian question, adopted at the Second Congress of the Communist International. In later decisions on this question the Communist International worked out the basic line of Lenin's theses. Finally, at the IV Congress these same formulations and decisions of Lenin were made the basis of the programme of the Communist International.

Therefore now, when the whole international setting and the internal situation of individual countries raises the agrarian and peasant question as a problem of first-rate importance, while the Communist Parties, as a general rule, continue to underestimate its significance, we must recall the following paragraph from Lenin's theses:

"The proletariat is the really revolutionary, really socialist-acting class only when it comes forward and acts as the vanguard of all the toiling and exploited, as their leader in the struggle for the overthrow of the exploiters, but this cannot be accomplished without introducing the class struggle into the village, without a union of the toiling masses of the village around the Communist Party of the city proletariat, without the education of the first with the last."

In this paragraph Lenin gave the *briefest and most exhaustive formula of the essence and content of the Leninist peasant policy*. The point of departure of the Leninist peasant policy is the thesis that not only the city proletariat but the toiling masses of the village are directly and vitally interested in the overthrow of the exploiters. There is no salvation for the toiling masses of the village from the landowning-capitalist yoke and from imperialist war, inevitable under a capitalist order, except by the overthrow of the yoke of the powerful landowners and bourgeoisie. Under the conditions of a world revolution, the toiling masses of the village can act in a revolutionary manner not only against the landowners but against the bourgeoisie as well. Therefore the victory of the proletarian revolution is objectively assured not only in the city but in the village.

The point of view which denies or underestimates the revolutionary rôle of the toiling masses in the village in the struggle against *capitalism* is profoundly mistaken and anti-Leninist. This is the view of the counter-revolutionary Social-Democracy, of the rights and the "lefts," which sees in the peasantry as a *whole*, and consequently in the *part of the village exploited by capital*, a bulwark of the bourgeois order against the struggle of the revolutionary proletariat for Socialism. In accordance with this view, the proletarian revolution is doomed to failure in the countries where the proletariat has not an absolute majority, i.e., in all the countries of the world with the exception of England.

Fundamentally, the Trotskyist conception of the peasant question, denying the possibility of building Socialism in one country (in the U.S.S.R.) without the victory of the international proletarian revolution and declaring the slogan of complete collectivisation an "economic absurdity," comes to the same conclusion. The Leninist policy in the village demands that the revolutionary proletariat come forth everywhere as the vanguard of all the toiling and exploited, that the vital interests of the toiling masses of the village be reflected in the demonstrations and activity of the revolutionary proletariat, and that these demonstrations be directly united with the struggle of the village masses against their exploiters. An indifferent attitude to the toiling peasantry, to its urgent needs, and its struggle, divests the pro-

letariat of the quality of a "really revolutionary, really Socialist functioning class." *The objective possibility of drawing the toiling peasantry or a considerable part of it into the international revolution can be transformed into a vital revolutionary work, into a powerful support of the revolution only if the proletariat pays the greatest attention to, works continuously, steadfastly and intensely along the lines of the Lenin theses. Every opportunist passivity of the Communist Party in the village dooms the proletarian revolution to the most serious defeat.*

However, the proletariat can act as leader of the toiling masses of the village only if the class struggle is introduced into the village, rallying the toiling masses of the village around the Communist Party and subordinating the revolutionary struggle of the peasant to the basic political tasks. Only in this way can the city proletariat establish a firm bond with the village, rally the toiling peasantry around the Communist Party and re-educate the peasant masses on the basis of the experience of their struggle and their own examples, into conscious fighters for the overthrow of the landowners and the bourgeoisie.

How does the Leninist policy work out in the practice of the Communist Party?

It is the most backward, neglected part of the work of the Communist Parties—a part where ignorance of the concrete conditions of the village is amazing and where the incorrect, sometimes Social-Democratic, setting competes with the opportunist passivity of the parties. Only a few of the large Communist Parties (for example, German, Polish) are an exception from this general rule in the sense that there, in connection with the agrarian crisis and the sharpening of the situation in the village, some, though far from sufficient, moves toward a concrete investigation of the agrarian problem of the given country and a practical presentation of work among the agricultural workers and peasants, can be noticed. (We do not refer here to the Communist Parties in the colonies and semi-colonies which hold a special position in regard to the peasant question.)

The agricultural workers constitute a considerable portion of the proletariat, exceeding numerically the most important category of the industrial workers, and in some countries they exceed the whole industrial proletariat. At the same time they are the most oppressed stratum of the working class, subjected to the unrestrained exploitation and arbitrariness of the landowners, kulaks, and the village power—a stratum which in many places lives in veritable slavery.

They are the pariahs of the proletariat. Boiling indignation is accumulating among them, the concealed unrest bursting out sometimes in spon-

aneous strikes and movements — unorganised, without leadership or a clear aim, ending, as a rule, in disorganisation and defeat, in spite of extraordinary persistence. Due to the agrarian crisis, the mass unemployment and the unbelievable poverty of the starving village proletariat and semi-proletariat in pursuit of work and bread menaces the "social order" in the villages. In most cases, however, the backwardness, lack of organisation, employers' and Fascist terror, the lack of a bond with the industrial proletariat, prevents an external display of the boiling indignation of the workers.

All this is practically foreign to the Communist Parties. The Communist press discusses very weakly or even completely ignores the situation on this important front. The Communist Parties, campaigning for the victory of the majority of the working class, ignore completely, in a most amazing way, the numerous detachments of the agricultural proletariat and the semi-proletariat. The strike movements of the workers, the leadership of this movement and its organisation, is the most important link of the class revolutionary struggle at the given stage. But the mass strike struggle of the agricultural workers has, according to Lenin's words, still that exceptionally important significance that "only" it "is able to cut short the village sleep, arouse the exploited mass in the village to class-consciousness, and to an understanding of the need of class organisation, expose before them the whole practical significance of their alliance with the city workers." Therefore Lenin demands that the Communist Party pay "particular attention to the strike struggle in the village, increased support and thorough development of mass strikes of the agricultural proletariat and semi-proletariat."

In spite of this, the Communists do not raise at all, or only verbally, without taking the slightest step to practical work, the question of the organisation and the leadership of the mass strikes of agricultural workers. The peculiarity of the strike struggle of the agricultural workers, the strategy and tactics of economic struggles in agriculture, are completely untouched problems. The Communist Parties have not yet raised these problems and have no accumulated experience or any collected factual material for their correct solution.

The active attacks, the increasingly frequent outbursts of the impoverished peasant masses, petty peasants and tenant farmers, partial and middle peasants, due to the low prices on agricultural products, taxes and rent extortions, etc., are, as a general rule, also torn away from the struggle of the city proletariat and take place without the participation of the Communist Parties. These

outbursts, spontaneous expressions of mass dissatisfaction and indignation of the village workers, just because they are torn away from revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and due to the lack of leadership of the Communists, cannot turn into a really revolutionary movement, organised and directed toward the overthrow of the exploiters and oppressors.

Only the conscious, revolutionary proletariat can lead the toiling peasantry on to the path of the class struggle, introduce the class struggle into the village. Without this the proletariat cannot become the real leader of the exploited masses of the village. Class-hostile elements, adapting themselves to the aggressive temper of the peasant and deceiving them by even advancing "revolutionary slogans,"* can become, and in many places actually do become, the leaders of the peasantry.

The toiling peasantry is bound by a thousand threads to the landowners, the kulaks, the capitalists. Together with the church and various kinds of "cultural" and "educational" organisations, which inoculate the peasants with the landowner-bourgeois ideology, kulak agricultural credits and other co-operatives, agrarian parties and unions, trying to chain the peasantry to the exploiter classes, still hold sway in the village.

It is impossible to think of a conquest of the leading rôle in the village without a persistent, prolonged and systematic struggle against these organisations within them, without the creation of independent mass unions of the toiling peasant, including, above all, within them the agricultural workers and the petty peasants, without the creation of mass peasant committees of struggle. But very few Communist Parties are concerned with these most important problems of Communist policy in the village and even a more insignificant number actually do anything about it. Even the peasant movement in a number of countries around the *Committees of Action*, leading to the creation of a *European Peasant Committee*, went on for the most part without the actual leadership and participation of the Communist Parties.

The exploitation of the toiling peasantry and the enslaved regions is aggravated by national oppression. Here the outbursts of the revolutionary movement of the peasant masses against imperialist robbery and violence of the landowners and the capitalists of the oppressed nations become exceedingly acute.

The mastery and leadership of these movements by the Communist Parties demands, besides what was enumerated above, that the oppressive influ-

* In the agrarian programme of the German National-Fascists there is the demand for the "confiscation" of the landowners' land.

ence of national enslavement on the exploitation of the peasantry, on its economic, political and social conditions, be taken into account. It demands the undivided support of the struggle for complete national self-determination, not verbally, but actually, with real work after the Bolshevik manner, within the mass national organisations of the peasantry. A passive attitude to the struggle of the oppressed nations and the national minorities can only thrust the peasantry away from the revolutionary proletariat and strengthen the position of the bourgeoisie.

On the whole, the Leninist peasant policy formulated in the Agrarian Theses of the Second Congress of the Communist International more than ten years ago, has still not been mastered by the Communist Parties. They, as a general rule, have manifested and continue to manifest passivity and apathy to the living conditions of the village workers and to their revolutionary struggle. Their passivity is actually nothing but an opportunist under-estimation of the rôle of the toiling peasantry in the struggle for the overthrow of the landowners and the bourgeoisie.

The German and Polish Communist Parties have already effected a move toward the introduction of a correct Leninist policy in the village. But the experience of the two best (next to the C.P.S.U.) sections of the Communist International must serve as a warning to all Communist Parties. The sharpening of the crisis of capitalism and the prospect of decisive class struggles demands that all Communist Parties re-arm themselves most rapidly in the field of peasant policy, and the actual introduction of a decisive change in the attitude toward mass work in the village.

III.

The Most Important Questions of the Work of the Communist Parties in the Village.

The basic tasks of the Communist Parties of capitalist countries in the village which, if carried out according to the theses formulated by Lenin, should establish a union of workers and peasants, are the following:—

1. The introduction of the class struggle into the village.
2. Union of the toiling masses of the village around the Communist Party of the city proletariat.
3. Education of the toiling masses of the village with the class-conscious industrial proletariat.

But the execution of these tasks raises a number of different questions and problems before the Communist Parties. We will point out here those which, at the given moment, must be decided first of all.

1. *The organisation and leadership of the strike struggle of the agricultural workers.* It is impossible to think seriously of the class struggle in the village in general, of the strike struggle of the agricultural workers in particular, without a most detailed *investigation and attentive observation of the living conditions and the life of the agricultural workers*, in spite of the tremendous practical difficulties which lie in the path of the solution of this task. Furthermore, particular attention must be given to the study of the *remnants of the feudal forms of exploitation and dependence*, forms of the coercion of the workers, fining them, etc.

One must study, in all its details, the *experience of strikes*, preferably the elemental ones, in the village; the demands presented by the workers themselves, the methods of struggle, forms of leadership, etc. This must serve as the basis for the preparation, organisation and introduction of strike struggle. On the basis of this it is essential to work out the questions of *strike strategy and tactics in the village*, taking into account all the *peculiarities* and the tremendously *diversified* conditions of agriculture in the village; the diversified conditions of individual provinces and branches, the presence of different social-economic types of economy, the seasonal character of the most important agricultural work, hired work, the presence of semi-proletarians and petty peasants as well as real proletarians, etc.

To work out the demands of the workers presupposes a most accurate knowledge of the concrete setting and the conditions existing in order to avoid unsubstantial, unreal demands. The peculiar methods of disrupting strikes, their demoralisation by Social-Fascists, Fascists, kulak-peasant leaders, local authorities, demands a most detailed working out of the questions of the *struggle with strike-breakers, treachery, arbitration*, of the question of the organisation of defence against Fascist terror and police violence. Under the conditions of the village feudal and landowner-capitalist bondage, the strikes of the hired farm worker inevitably gain *political significance*, as Lenin specially emphasised. They can serve as a powerful impetus for the attraction of all the labouring masses into the struggle against the landowners and capitalists.

The world agrarian crisis particularly favours the transformation of the strikes of the agricultural workers into *political strikes* and their being developed into the channels of the world proletarian revolution. The problem of attracting the agricultural workers for *mass political strikes*, in the struggle against unemployment, etc., is of tremendous significance at the present moment. At the same time, the question of the *thorough*

(material, political, organisational) *support of village strikes by the city proletariat*, of the actual development of *class solidarity* between the city and the village detachments of the proletariat on a national and international scale, arises in a most acute form.

In connection with the strike struggle, exceptional attention must be paid to the question of the *organisation of agricultural workers* and the revolutionary trade union strategy and tactics in the village, and here all the peculiarities and the diversities of the conditions in the village must be taken into account. To copy, to carry over mechanically to the village, the forms and methods used in industry would be a grave mistake. In considering the question of a *revolutionary opposition* in the existing reformist and other trade unions, one must at the same time take up the *question of the creation of class, aggressive trade unions of agricultural workers*. Such questions as the inclusion of the seasonal, *hired workers* as well as the minors, in an organisation as well as the attraction of the semi-proletariat, the *peasant poor*, who are of tremendous importance for the trade union movement in the village, into a union, must be decided most concretely.

The leadership of the work among agricultural workers (leadership of strikes, trade union movement, etc.) possesses the peculiarity that the *initiative and the direct participation* of the Communist Party is *much more essential* here than among the industrial workers. This work must be regarded as the most important part of the *general work of the Communist Party in the village*.

2. *The revolutionary struggle of the toiling peasantry.* Most serious problems which demand immediate and correct clarification arise in connection with the drawing of the toiling peasantry into revolutionary struggle. The basic question is the *differentiation of the peasantry* from the point of view of its relation to the proletarian revolution. This is a question of the *allies and enemies* of the revolutionary proletariat in the village.

The general criteria for determining which groups in the village are to be counted as proletarian, semi-proletarian peasantry, petty peasantry, middle peasantry, large peasantry and large landowners, have been set out by Lenin in his Agrarian Theses. But each Communist Party separately has a most important question to solve—to adapt these criteria to its own country, even to separate regions of the country, to determine concretely all these strata and establish what are the real relations of class power in the village, to determine who is the objective ally and who

the enemy of the revolution and what their relative strengths are.

It is essential to present the question of the *middle peasant* concretely, of how to *neutralise* his influence or to draw him on to the side of the proletariat, keeping in mind that the process of pauperisation is now reaching to a considerable degree the middle peasant strata of the villages in capitalist countries. The agrarian crisis, increasing the capitalist tendency of the development of the village and the sharpening of class contradictions, makes very much simpler the solution of all these questions on the basis of a concrete analysis of the situation of every country.

The Communist Parties must make the question of the *basic slogan in the village, viz., land for the toiling peasant and agricultural workers without purchase*, completely clear, contrasting it with the collective agrarian policy of the landowners and the bourgeoisie. This slogan must be set up particularly against the bourgeois and petty bourgeois land reforms, connecting it with the struggle of the proletariat for power, for the Workers' and Peasants' Government.

The *collectivisation of agriculture* cannot take the place of the struggle for land without compensation in capitalist countries. Collectivisation must come on a plane with the exposition of the lies and slanders concerning the U.S.S.R., contrasting the successes of agriculture in the U.S.S.R. on the basis of its socialist reconstruction to the agrarian crisis of capitalist countries, and an explanation to the peasant masses of the superiority of the socialist system of agriculture for the working peasant as a condition for its realisation.

Most serious attention must be paid to the question of the *partial demands* of the peasantry. Here one finds most frequently right opportunist deviations as well as "left" tendencies. The question of the *criteria* by which the Communist Parties are to be led in establishing concrete slogans for the struggle must be completely clear.

We must expose, once and for all, the reformist essence of such demands as a bread monopoly under capitalism, the Fascist slogan of cheap credits, the development of agricultural co-operatives, etc., which nourish the illusion among the toiling masses that they can be prosperous under capitalism.

The Communist Parties must, depending upon the concrete conditions in a given country, determine what partial demands can, at the given moment, during an agrarian crisis, become the *main links* in the development of the movement of the toiling peasantry on to the path of a struggle for the basic slogans, for the overthrow of the landowners and the bourgeoisie. With

this in mind, increased attention must be paid to the question of the struggle against *taxes and other dues*, against *rent*, and in connection with this—"against the *compulsory exaction of payments*." At this point, right opportunist deviations are possible and actually exist (for example, under-estimation of the anti-tax struggle, demands for the deferment of payments, their decrease, change of the forms of payments, etc.), as well as "left" tendencies and jumps (for example, demands for a complete and universal boycott of taxes, not taking into account the degree of the ripeness of the peasantry for revolutionary struggle).

In countries under national oppression, the *national problem*, as the problem which is essentially and predominantly a peasant one, must be worked out very concretely, keeping in mind the tremendous significance which the national question has for the revolutionary mobilisation of the peasantry, harmonising it with the partial demands of the peasants as well as the demand for the right for complete self-determination up to separation.

The mastery of the Leninist national policy, developed by Stalin, must lead, in the practice of the Communist Parties, to a resolute struggle with right deviations (under-estimation of the national question, the slogan of "cultural autonomy" and others) as well as with "left" tendencies (*compulsory* separation into independent States, etc.), isolating the Communist Parties from the masses of enslaved peasantry.

The crumbling of the peasantry and the whole combination of the conditions of the social and political life of the village, makes it difficult to draw the toiling peasantry into the revolutionary struggle. All the greater, then, is the need for an exhaustive discussion of the questions of the *methods and organisational forms* of the struggle of the masses in the village. The problem of the *mobilisation of the semi-proletariat and the petty peasantry for participation in the strike struggle of the agricultural workers* against the landowners and Fascists, against the interference of the authorities on the side of the masters, etc., is of tremendous significance.

We must study the methods of the struggle of the *petty tenant* against the landowners, the methods of the mass answer of the petty producers to the robbing and arbitrariness of the kulaks, the traders, the expropriation of the land and possessions of the poor, etc. The methods of the mass struggle against taxes, against exactions of debts, the boycott and opposition to compulsory exactions has acquired actual significance at the present moment. Therefore it is essential to consider carefully the conditions and forms for

adopting them, without opportunist hesitation, and sectarian deviations. The mass hunger marches, the robbing of bread provisions, burning of landowners' estates, etc., when they assume a mass character, are proof of a growing revolutionary activity of the masses. Therefore the Communist Parties must pay exceptional attention to them.

The establishment of bonds between the mass demonstrations of the workers of the village and the city proletariat, as well as their joint demonstrations, with the city workers participating in the meetings and demonstration of the peasants, the organisation of the peasant marches into the city for participation in mass demonstrations, etc. has special significance.

The problem must also be raised of the *mass defence* of the peasantry against Fascism.

The Peasant Committees for Action, as the organisational forms, elected by the masses, and speaking at mass meetings, deserve the most serious attention. Created to carry out a definite concrete campaign, they are particularly useful weapons for effecting an aggressive *united front from below up* of all the labouring masses, regardless of its organisational attributes, but only on the condition that the class-conscious proletariat and Communists take in them a leading and active part.

The Permanent Peasant Committees are the embryo forms of open mass organisation of the peasant poor. However, the Communist Parties must raise the very important question of the creation of mass non-party *peasant unions* as well, either according to regions, or according to separate categories of the workers (petty, tenant, petty settlers, etc.) and secure, without fail, the carrying out of a really revolutionary line by way of a ruthless struggle with bourgeois and fascist influence, and with wavering elements through the actual *leadership* of these unions, avoiding the *methods of command*.

3. *The struggle with the war danger and militarism* raises a number of very important questions concerning the work of the Communist Parties in the village, since the peasantry is the chief recruiting source for the rank and file of soldiers of imperialist armies. Most serious attention must be paid to *carrying out anti-imperialist propaganda* among the peasant youth and peasant women, and especially among the recruits. The village must serve as the place for establishing a bond with the barracks.

The great campaigns of the imperialists for the preparation of an *anti-Soviet war*, in the nature of a crusade, the campaign against so-called Soviet "dumping," and against "compulsory labour," among other aims, has that of tricking

and befuddling the peasant masses. To-day, the exposure of the true aims of these campaigns before the eyes of the peasant has exceptional political importance. Most extensive popularisation of the Socialist construction of the U.S.S.R. in the village—particularly of the *success of agriculture* on Socialist foundations, on the basis of collectivisation, and the contrast with the agrarian crisis and the impoverished position of the peasant in capitalist countries—must become the central point of mass agitation against the preparation of an anti-Soviet bloc and anti-Soviet war. A thorough clearing up of the peculiar rôle of Social Democracy in agrarian and in kulak-peasant parties, as the weapons of imperialism, is essential. The question of the rôle of the *native imperialist bourgeoisie* must be set very clearly before the peasantry. We must develop the campaign for sending *peasant delegations to the U.S.S.R.* and push forward all forms of demonstrations of the solidarity of the peasantry of capitalist countries with the workers and peasants of the U.S.S.R. The rapidly approaching danger of war makes the question of the specific forms of struggle with this danger in agrarian countries an actual one.

4. *Class-hostile organisations in the village.* There are a number of political, economic and cultural-educational organisations, reaching out over all fields of village life for the economic and political enslavement of the peasantry by the landowners and bourgeoisie. Besides the national bourgeois parties, special agrarian land-owning and kulak parties and unions, pretending to represent the interests of "agriculture" as a whole, the interests of "all strata" of the peasantry, have taken root in the village soil. Their number is enormous.

A real struggle with the land-owning-capitalist influence in the village is impossible without an exact knowledge of the influence, programme, and methods of action of these organisations. The necessity for the demoralisation and destruction of their influence over the toiling peasantry raises the task of the organisation of work *within those organisations*, which have a mass character. The formation of a left opposition, its leadership, etc.—all these are most important tactical problems.

The penetration of Fascism into the village by way of the Fascisation of the kulak parties or the cropping up of obviously Fascist organisations represents a great danger and, therefore, demands a most serious and attentive attitude to the activity of these organisations in the village, to their programme of action and tactical manoeuvres among the peasantry. The chief point is the turning of the Social Fascists of their "face

to the village"; all Social-Fascist parties are re-arming themselves for the struggle for the village, working out special agrarian programmes, adopting new methods of action. The struggle with aggressive Fascism and Social-Fascism is the chief task of the Communist Parties in the village to-day. Success in this struggle guarantees the hegemony of the revolutionary proletariat in the village.

Coalition agreements and various right and "left" blocs of the bourgeois and Fascist parties and unions in the village, whose general aim is to strengthen the power of the landowners and the bourgeoisie and to stifle the revolutionary movement of the peasantry must be confronted by *worker-peasant blocs* and a struggle for a Workers' and Peasants' Government, formed by the Communist Parties.

With this in mind, a struggle must be carried on in all mass "cultural-educational" organisations of the village. In determining the relation of the Communist Parties to the agricultural co-operatives, the growing fusion of these organisations with large banks, and their increasingly important rôle in the work of enslaving the peasantry to powerful capital, must be taken into account.

5. *The education of the toiling peasantry by the city proletariat and its party.* The most powerful means of the class, revolutionary-educational influence of the proletariat on the peasantry is giving concrete organisational and material assistance to the peasants. Only by deeds, by live examples, will the proletariat win a leading rôle in relation to the peasantry. Lenin pointed this out in the Agrarian Theses. Therefore the most important problem of revolutionary pedagogy is the *organisation of all the forms of real assistance* to the peasantry by the city workers in the struggle for his urgent needs.

The toiling peasantry will be convinced of the solidarity of their interests with the interests of the city proletariat, only if the Communist Parties everywhere (at meetings and demonstrations, in parliament and municipal administrations, at party congress, in the press, etc.) *will come out as the representatives of all the revolutionary strata of the toiling workers of the city and the village, giving most serious attention to the struggle of the workers of the village.* The press must play a tremendous rôle in this. *A clear reflection of their tendency must be found in the official organs of the Communist Parties.* The widest possible

net of agricultural organs must be organised and a living bond established between the periodicals and the village. *Popular literature for the peasant* must be published relating to all important questions not only of the peasant, but of the general international revolutionary movement, while the adaptation of this literature in form, language, and exposition to the political level of the peasant masses is of very great significance.

6. *Questions of organisations and cadres.* The tremendous tasks confronting the Communist Parties in the village demand the introduction of a number of organisational measures as well as the creation of cadres for the village. The acknowledgment of the importance of the work in the village must find its expression, above all, in the creation of *departments according to work in the village*, under the Central Committees of the Communist Parties as well as district committees, and in the separation and preparation of *special cadres* at the disposal of these departments. The calling of special conferences of these workers, and their regular instruction, is a necessary means for the development and leadership of the work in the village.

The basic question which must be solved if the work of the Communist Parties is to be set on a stable basis, is the development of the network of lower links of the Communist Parties in the village, the creation of Communist nuclei able to fight, first of all, in large estates, as well as in the villages. The social composition of these nuclei must guarantee the worker element a leading rôle in them. The district committees must carry on the daily leadership of the work of these nuclei by setting them concrete tasks and giving all the assistance possible. The development of Bolshevik independence and initiative of the village nuclei in mass work, the correct work of the Communist fractions in the mass organisations permits a more rapid and stronger mastery of the actual movement of the toiling masses of the village.

However, in order to attain this aim, we must *overcome the right and "left" opportunist passivity of the Communist Parties in their relation to the workers of the village*, for

"No programme or triumphal declaration has any value if in practice it is not shown that the Communists and leaders of the workers can place the development of the revolution of the proletariat and its victory above all else in the world, can make the greatest sacrifices for it because there is no other way out of hunger, ruin and new imperialist wars." (Lenin.)

WEAK POINTS ON THE COMINTERN FRONT

By O. KUUSINEN.

IT is high time that attention be paid to the controlling and consolidating of the situation of our front in regard to the nationalist question in capitalist countries.

Why is this necessary ?

Primarily, because in several countries—Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia, Rumania, Greece and also in France (Alsace-Lorraine), the question of the position of oppressed nations is very serious, and the fight of our Communist Parties in this sphere very weak. There have been not a few mass demonstrations and even insurrections in this group of countries during the course of the last nine years. For instance, we have the following picture in these countries :

In *Poland*. Autumn, 1922, in Western Ukraine, a mass insurrection ; in 1924 in Western White Russia, a mass boycott of taxes and a partisan movement among the peasants ; Spring, 1925, in Western Ukraine (Volyn) a mass partisan movement, amounting in some places to insurrection ; since 1926-27 in Western White Russia, a high wave of the national-revolutionary movement "Gromady" ; and in Autumn, 1930, in Western Ukraine, again mass insurrection.

In *Rumania*. In the Dobrudja from 1922 to 1925, continual activities on the part of partisan groups of Bulgarian peasants ; in 1924 in Bessarabia an uprising of Ukrainian peasants ; in Bukovina the "Vysvolenia" national-revolutionary movement since 1928.

In *Yugo-Slavia*. In Croatia after the 1918-1920 insurrections, a period of intense national unrest in 1923-25 ; a whole series of group and mass partisan demonstrations in Macedonia, Chernogoria and Kossova (which continue to the present day).

In *Czecho-Slovakia*. After the war, right up to 1923, constant conflicts between the Slovakian peasant masses and the Czecho-Slovakian gendarmes ; in the Carpathian Ukraine, until 1925, uprisings of the peasantry, a continuation of the conflicts with the Czech gendarmes and mass demonstrations.

In *France*. In Alsace-Lorraine, in 1924-25, an upward surge of the national liberation movement, mass demonstrations of protest, the Workers' and Peasants' Congress and so on.

It is absolutely essential that we seriously learn the lessons of all these movements, and also the causes leading to the fact that none of our parties rallied sufficiently to solve the tasks involved in any one of these movements ; moreover, one must admit that the actual rôle of our parties everywhere in these movements, with the exception of West White Russia and Alsace-Lorraine, was most insignificant.

A study of these lessons is essential primarily in the interests of the work of *to-morrow*. For there can be not the slightest doubt that with the further sharpening of the international situation, and especially in circumstances of war in Europe, the struggle for the liberation of oppressed nationalities will play a rôle which must in no circumstances be under-estimated.

In the early years after the imperialist war of 1914-18, it may have seemed to many that the question of the liberation of the oppressed peoples of Europe, which played a large part during the war, had lost its previous significance or at any rate its exceeding importance, once and for all. After all, the majority of the oppressed peoples of Tsarist Russia after the October revolution, reached the true solution to their national question by means of the introduction of self-determination and complete equality as members of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As for the rest, a few of them, using the right to separation offered by the Soviet Government, have formed their separate capitalist States. But, in spite of this, actually, as a result of the imperialist war, because of the brute force of the victors, a situation was created in which the national question in Europe could not but become extremely serious. In Versailles, Trianon, St. Germaine, Nieully—behind the smoke-screen of Wilson's exclamations about the "liberation of the little nations"—a characteristic system of double-barrelled imperialist hierarchy of Europe was introduced, whereby the bourgeoisie of certain small nations, for instance, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Serbia, Rumania, at the cost of complete subjection of their State to a particular large Power, received the "right" to imperialist oppression and exploitation of several other weaker peoples. At the same time in order to enslave the latter to the corresponding "vassal imperialists," several of these nations were divided, annexed and broken up among various States, as, for instance, millions of Ukrainians—among Poland, Czecho-Slovakia and Rumania ; a considerable section of the Hungarians—among Czecho-Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia and Rumania ; Macedonians—among Yugo-Slavia, Greece and Bulgaria ; Turks—among Bulgaria and Greece, and so on.

The position of these peoples, subjected in this way to imperialist oppression, soon became much more irksome than was the case before ; for instance, the position of the national minorities in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy or in certain other countries of Europe. Not the old policy of assimilation, but a policy of colonial enslavement and robbery, is now in the majority of cases become ever more obviously the dominating feature in the oppression of the toiling

masses of these peoples—a circumstance which, if not taken into account, will make it impossible to understand the whole depth and breadth of the mass unrest which has already found expression in the above-mentioned series of militant national-liberation movements.

The concrete manifestations of this colonial character of the national oppression in Europe at present must be studied and analysed in detail, and the attitude towards it of the various classes in the oppressed nations—bourgeois, landlord, petty-bourgeois intellectuals, workers and peasants, must also be made clear.

It is necessary much more than ever before to popularise in capitalist Europe the enormous experience of the Soviet Union in the sphere of solving the national question in conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the leading organs of the Comintern for many years now, no discussion has taken place on the European national question. When Lenin in 1920 wrote and published his "Preliminary sketch of the theses on national and colonial questions" for the Second Comintern Congress, he asked all comrades, "with concrete knowledge on any of these most complicated questions" to let him have additions and concrete explanations on several of the countries indicated, including "Austrian experience, Polish-Jewish and Ukrainian, Alsace-Lorraine and Belgium, Ireland, the Balkans, etc. But he obtained almost no additions or concrete explanations. After the Second Congress, the national question in European countries was brought up in the Comintern only at the Fifth Congress in 1924 in connection with the report of Comrade Manuilsky. The resolution of the Fifth Congress is more detailed and elaborated according to countries, but it long ago ceased to satisfy the requirements of our parties in this sphere.

Some sections of the Comintern which are, more than others, in direct contact with the national question have, until now, on the one hand, paid too little attention to this question, and on the other hand, did not come through without mistakes and vagueness in the formulation of the question. Above all, there is a preponderance of purely propagandist slogans and at the same time an under-estimation of the national movement. In this respect even the Communist Parties of Poland were no exception. Undoubtedly the C.P.P. has merit, particularly in the field of the struggle with petty bourgeois opportunism in a number of Western Ukrainian and Western White Russian organisations and its resolution on the national question is on a higher level politically than the resolution of other sections, but at the same time, it has many blunders and deficiencies.

That is why it is time to take up the national question and, above all, begin the preparatory work necessary for it.

* * *

The aim of this preparatory work, I think, is twofold: first, to *check the line* which our parties have taken in the national question, and second, to better arm our sections so that they can *concretise their most immediate tasks and the actual slogans of action* in this field. It is a matter of course that the defining of the correct line and the correct concretisation of the work are two tasks which are bound together in the closest manner.

What must we put at the head of this work? We find most valuable the directions of Lenin on this question in the theses of the Second Congress of the Communist International:

"The Communist Party, as the conscious expression of the struggle of the proletariat to cast off the yoke of the bourgeoisie, likewise on the national question must not base itself on abstract and formal principles. It must base itself on an exact evaluation of the concrete historical and, above all, economic situation; second, on a clear distinction between the interests of the oppressed classes, of the toilers and exploited, and the general concept of the interests of the people as a whole, meaning the interests of the ruling class; third, on an equally clear distinction between those nations which are oppressed, dependent, deprived of equal rights, and those nations which oppress, exploit, enjoy full rights. These distinctions must be made in order to counterbalance the bourgeois-democratic lies, which strive to conceal the colonial and financial enslavement of the overwhelming majority of the population of the earth by an insignificant minority of the richest, most advanced capitalist countries . . ."

We must always remember these three directions of Lenin if we wish to avert confusion and deviations in the working out of "these complex questions." One has only to lose sight of the first direction—an exact evaluation of the historical-concrete, above all, economic setting, to open the door to all kinds of mistakes in all directions. If we lose sight of, or even slightly under-estimate, one of the other two of Lenin's directions, we inevitably have a deviation, but, in one case the deviation is toward *petty-bourgeois nationalism*, and in the other—a deviation toward chauvinism.

These are very actual deviations which are always being reborn. The first—"national reformism"—is akin, for example, to the old idea of the Austro-Marxists, Renner and O. Bauer ("cultural-national autonomy"), while the second is akin to the old well-known mistakes of Rosa Luxemburg, Pyatakov, Bucharin, and others against which—these and others—Lenin and Stalin carried on a resolute struggle already before the war.

A few words in explanation of what was stated above. In the second direction of Lenin, we must, in the national question, place at the head, "a distinct separation of the interests of the *oppressed classes* from the general conception of national interests, generally."

What, under capitalism, are the interests of the oppressed classes of all countries, of the workers of all nationalities? It is above all—the interests of common class struggle, the interests of their class revolution in all capitalist and colonial countries. These interests stand *higher* than all other interests in a really proletarian policy both in all fields as well as in the national question. The common class revolutionary struggle of the workers of the oppressed nation and ruling nations—must not drive back to the second plane any struggle for “national interests”, even the struggle for just national demands. This is clearly emphasised in the theses of the Second Congress :

“ The whole policy of the Communist International on the national and colonial questions must be the uniting of the proletarians and toiling masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the landowners and the bourgeoisie. For only such unity can assure the victory over capitalism, without which national oppression and inequality cannot be abolished.” (Lenin, Collected Works, Russian edition, Vol. XXV., p. 286.)

This loses sight of the fact that he who does not place the distinct separation of the interests of the oppressed classes at the head of the whole conception of the national interests generally, thus loses the leading point of view of the proletarian national policy, trudges at the tail of petty bourgeois nationalism. It can discount excellently the difference between the oppressed and oppressing nations, but since this point of view, i.e., the point of view of a liberating struggle of an oppressed nation, is, for it, torn away from the interests of the common class struggle of the workers of both nations, we thus have a national-reformist setting.

There were, in the history of the Communist International, such cases, for example, as the speeches of Semitch in Yugo-Slavia, Vasilkiv and Turyansky in Western Ukraina, Yuber in Alsace-Lorraine, and others. And danger of such a nature still continues to exist.

Others, on the contrary, do not understand the necessity of placing at the head, a distinct division between the oppressed and oppressing nations, in accordance with the third of Lenin's directions. Since they pay attention only to class inequality, the whole national movement represents for them only a disturbing factor in the class struggle from which it is necessary to rid oneself. They do not understand the significance of the national-liberation movement as a factor of the struggle against imperialism, against the bourgeoisie of the oppressor nations, against the chief enemy of the international proletarian revolution. It follows that they only accept the demands of the immediate liberation of the oppressed nations verbally, of giving them the right of self-determination under capitalism, up to the freedom of separation, but actually try to dislodge this demand with propagandist

slogans of the equal rights of nations *after* the victory of the proletariat. This is the point of view of the Luxemburgists—disguised in a new form, that the “revolution will decide all.” Their practical rejection of actual struggle for the immediate giving to every oppressed nation the right of self-determination, the freedom of separation, their actual refusal to participate in the mass national-liberation movements which are taking place, and in the mass conflicts which relate to the state of the working mass of the oppressed nation—all this objectively quite suits the bourgeoisie of the ruling nations, plays into the hands of imperialism. It is the “Great Power” deviation.

There were also cases in the history of the Communist International—for example, the speech of Kristesko in Rumania, Zhivet Miloikovitch in Yugo-Slavia, Maximosa in Greece, Vinarsky in Poland, and others. And nevertheless danger of a similar nature continues to exist.

Both deviations separate the national question from the question of the revolution*. This is the root of the matter. The national-reformist deviation in the national question eliminates the question of the revolution. The “Great Power” deviation in the question of the revolution eliminates the national question. And quite frequently it happens that in one and the same document, or one and the same speech, both kind of mistakes are combined. We do not get, certainly, in this way, an actual union between the national question and the question of the revolution. What is obtained is only an eclectic opportunist combination.

To link inseparably, to combine, and correctly combine, the question of the revolution with that of the national question, this is the task in checking the line; or, in other words, to subordinate the national question to the question of the revolution, but to subordinate it correctly. In this lies the whole essence, all the difficulty of the task. But this difficulty is practically insurmountable for us without an attentive observance of the first direction of Lenin pointed out above, i.e., “without an exact evaluation of the concrete historical, and above all, economic situation.” Only on the basis of such an analysis can one grasp the correct dialectic combination of the national question with that of the revolution.

For example, a burning question was raised in Yugo-Slavia in 1924 by the Croatian Republican Peasant Party with the demand for a revision of the Constitution. Some members of the Communist

* This was expressed as far back as 1925 by Comrade Stalin at the Yugo-Slav Commission of the E.C.C.I. in his argument against the national reformist position of Semitch. The same is true basically, I think, of the “Great Power” deviation about which Stalin, at that time, had no occasion to speak. The difference only lies in that, in tearing the national question away from the question of the revolution, one deviation is on the national question, while the other is made on the question of the revolution.

Party of Yugo-Slavia, Semitch, for example, spoke for the revision of the constitution on the basis of the theory according to which the national question amounted to a constitutional question. Some other members of the party, on the contrary, came out against the revision of the Constitution, and in general against the Communist Party interfering in this conflict of bourgeois parties of different nationalities.

What was the way out of the blind alley? The Comintern criticised and repudiated the constitutional viewpoint of Semitch, but it also did not take the position of "non-interference," but, counting on the present concrete situation in Yugo-Slavia, decided in the following manner:

"Although the national question cannot be decided by a revision of the constitution, the Communist Party of Yugo-Slavia must, none the less, take an active part in the struggle going on for the revision of the constitution, with the object of overthrowing the existing regime of violence of the Serbian bourgeoisie and of winning the greatest possible guarantees of political rights and freedom of the toiling masses of the oppressed nationalities, steadfastly aiming to unite the working masses in the struggle for the creation of a workers' and peasants' power, explaining to the masses that only a workers' and peasants' power can decide, once for all, the national question." (Stenographic report of the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, Part II., p. 128.)

This was, undoubtedly, a correct decision. But does it mean that always, as soon as a dispute arises with regard to the revision of the Constitution which touches any oppressed nation, Communists must take part in the struggle for the revision of the Constitution? By no means. The question must be formulated concretely in each case. The imperialist Government of MacDonald, for example, raised recently the debatable question of the "revision of the Indian Constitution," but Indian Communists were absolutely correct in explaining to the Indian masses that to sit with MacDonald "around the Round Table"—is equal to being a traitor or a complete fool.

A really attentive checking of the line is particularly important in view of the fact that in the field of the national question the deviation exists which appears most frequently, not openly, not aggressively, but as Comrade Lenin says, as a *crawling* deviation, able to hide in the baggage of even very good revolutionists, who, for a long time, do not even notice their existence. Therefore, it is necessary to catch these dangerous "crawling" ones and drag them out of their hiding places, certainly not for the sake of hunting for deviators "in general," but in order to avert the danger which is a very real one.

Our sections ought, first of all, to examine their resolutions to see whether or not such kind of mistakes have stolen in and to cut themselves away

most definitely both from the "Great Power" deviation as well as from petty-bourgeois nationalism.

Practical discussions of the national question must result, first of all, in the working out of a new *national programme* for each one of those Communist Parties to which we refer here. The need for this has never been as great as it is now.

As far back as 1925, Comrade Stalin, speaking in the Yugo-Slav Commission of the E.C.C.I., came out against an "under-estimation of the internal power of the national movement and incomprehension of the profoundly revolutionary character of the national movement," emphasising clearly that, on the strength of the sharpening of international relations, "the question of the rights of nations for self-determination must be counted a real and palpitating question," particularly keeping the prospect in mind: "if war begins or when war begins, if a revolution in Europe takes place, or when it takes place."

"And that a war will inevitably begin, and that *they* will certainly fight each other there, is without doubt if we keep in view the nature and the development of imperialism." (Stalin, "Questions of Leninism," Russian edition, p. 247.)

Until now the sharpening of the basic contradictions in capitalism, particularly characteristic for the present "third" period of the post-war crisis in capitalism have been going on at an accelerated pace. A world economic crisis is present and the imperialist camp has begun to prepare for war against the power of the Soviet Union rising rapidly on the basis of socialist construction.

The U.S.S.R. desires peace, but it does not fear war.

But the U.S.S.R. in war is *the saviour and liberator of oppressed nations!*

What Lenin wrote in the theses of the Second Congress is literally being realised.

" . . . All the events of world politics are inevitably concentrated around one central point, namely, the struggle of the world bourgeoisie against the Russian Soviet Republic, which necessarily groups around itself, on the one hand, the Soviet movements of the advanced workers of all countries and, on the other hand, all the national liberation movements of the colonies and oppressed peoples, who are being convinced by bitter experience that there can be no salvation for them except through the victory of the Soviet power over world imperialism." (Lenin, Collected Works, Russian edition, Vol. XXV., p. 287.)

"Consequently," continued Lenin in the theses of the Second Congress, "we must not limit ourselves to-day to the bare acknowledgment or proclamation of the union of the workers of various nations, of the necessity of introducing a policy for the realisation of the closest union of all national and colonial liberation movements with Soviet Russia, i.e. now with the U.S.S.R."

All the sections of the Comintern are profoundly convinced that this is the only correct policy in the

national question. But the fact is that we carry this policy out in practice not only weakly, but that we are weakly armed on this section of the front. Our parties have not even a clear, distinct programme of action, corresponding with the actual needs of Communist national policy in capitalist countries of Europe.

Lenin wrote in 1916 :

"The aim of Socialism is not only to abolish the present division of humanity into small States, and all national separation, not only to bring the nations closer to each other, but to amalgamate them. And precisely to achieve this aim, we must, on the one hand, explain to the masses the reactionary character of the ideas of Renner and Otto Bauer concerning so-called 'national cultural autonomy', and, on the other hand, demand the liberation of the oppressed nations, not by general, nebulous phrases, not by empty declamations, not by 'postponing' the question until Socialism is established, but in a clearly and precisely formulated political programme specially taking into

account the hypocrisy and cowardice of the socialists in the oppressing nations. In the same way as humanity can achieve the abolition of classes only through the transitional period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, so humanity can achieve the inevitable amalgamation of nations only through the transitional period of complete liberation of all the oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom to separate." (Lenin, Collected Works, Russian edition, Vol. XIX., p. 40.)

This means that we will work out the *Leninist* national programme and will, without fail "specially take into account the hypocrisy and cowardice of the socialists of the oppressing nations"—the Mensheviks, the social-imperialists of every individual country as well as in the Second International as a whole.

And the Leninist demand—the *right of all oppressed nations to self-determination up to and including freedom to separate*—must be made the *basis* of the national programme of every Communist Party.

THE ORGANISATIONAL WORK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY

By A. CREUTZBURG.

I.—THE PEOPLE'S REVOLUTION AGAINST FASCISM.

THE bases of Communist organisational activity are : (a) the Leninist principles of organisation, (b) the decisions of the Communist International and of the Party authorities, and (c) the economic, political and social relations obtaining in each country.

In Germany at the present time, when the bourgeoisie is carrying through the Fascist dictatorship through the Brüning Government, it is a question of the realisation of the general slogan of the Communist Party of Germany, viz., the organisation of the People's Revolution against the Fascist dictatorship. The carrying out of this general slogan compels the Party to concentrate its whole work in a much sharper way than heretofore, in the following respects :

(1) The organisation of the economic and political mass struggles of the working-class, starting from protest demonstrations and strikes and leading up to the political mass strike and the decisive struggle for power. This implies the closest attention of the whole Party to factory work and the organisation and politicalising of the revolutionary Trade Union Opposition and the development of new forms of mass struggle for the millions in the unemployed army who have been cast out from the immediate process of production, hastening the realisation of the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and systematic organisation and education of the broad revolutionary cadres.

(2) The organisation of the proletarian mass struggle against Fascism and against political, social

and cultural reaction. This implies progressive politicalising of the work of all proletarian mass organisations, strengthening of the work of Communist fractions in the Social-Fascist and Christian mass organisations, training of the proletariat in defence and an ideological enlightenment campaign for those strata of workers which still remain in the Social-Fascist camp or which have got into the Fascist camp, until their final separation from these organisations.

(3) The creation of a revolutionary army of several millions, the realisation of the slogan put forward at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International for the conquest of the majority of the working-class, at the same time creating a link with the remaining toiling strata, the impoverished and ruined middle peasants, officials and employees, as well as with the urban middle strata.

(4) Making this army mature and efficient enough for the victorious carrying through of the People's Revolution. That is to say, the Party must find for all these strata concrete daily slogans and partial demands which are suitable for setting the masses into motion, must lead the masses from stage to stage of the class struggle for the struggle for these demands and in order to combine it with the struggles of the workers in the factories against the wage-cutting offensive of the employers, and with the millions of unemployed who are left to go down to destruction without mercy. In the course of these struggles the Party must lead the masses ever closer to their class

enemy, for only in the struggles themselves, in partial victories and defeats, will the masses finally become ripe for undertaking the overthrow of the capitalist system and the establishment of their own rule, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(5) This leadership of the broad masses of toilers against the class enemy in the period of the ripening of the Fascist dictatorship demands, however, ever new political slogans, new forms of agitation and propaganda as well as new forms of organisation and methods of work, corresponding to the concrete political tasks.

Only if the Party approaches these tasks with Bolshevik courage and determination will it be in a position really to fulfil the tasks set by historical development. Will the Party be politically and organisationally strong enough to fulfil these tasks? That is the question which is being asked not only by the working-class in Germany, but also in all sections of our Communist world Party, including our victorious comrades in the Soviet Union. The German Party answers this question with a wholehearted affirmative.

II.—WHAT ARE THE IMMEDIATE ORGANISATIONAL QUESTIONS CONFRONTING THE PARTY?

The first task in regard to organisation which stands before the Party is that of accelerating the tempo of development of the forces of the Party, intensified recruiting among the masses of the workers, especially in the factories, for strengthening its ranks and extending its mass basis among the various strata of toilers, and the creation of numerous new factory cells and improvement of our factory work in all spheres.

The most important central task of to-day is the rapid development of the Red Trade Union Opposition and of the revolutionary Unions in the struggle against the employers, the State power and the Social-Fascist bureaucracy. At the same time, it is necessary that the work of the Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition should take on a sharper political character through the strengthening of the fractional activity in the Social-Fascist and Christian trade unions by introduction among them of revolutionary workers and the immediate taking up of fraction work in our own trade union organisations. Further, there is required more rapid working out of our fighting strategy and tactics through complete utilisation of the lessons of previous struggles and the mass education of the lower and middle functionaries in our unions and in the Revolutionary Opposition.

The second task is the strengthening of fraction work in all the other non-Party mass organisations, which occur in such great numbers in Germany and which are under Social-Fascist, semi-Fascist or open Fascist leadership. In connection with this, we must with greater energy than up to the present, organisa-

tionally strengthen the mass organisations under the leadership of our fractions and direct them towards the solution of the newer and bigger tasks corresponding to the ever-sharpening situation with which they are faced, particularly in the spheres of mass policy and of the struggle against the danger of imperialist war and against Fascist dictatorship.

Thirdly, we must develop more rapidly than before, consolidate and improve the work of the various united front organisations such as Peasant Committees, Women's Delegate Meetings, Unemployed Committees, Electoral Committees, Committees of Action and Strike Committees.

Finally, there are to be organised new, still more comprehensive united front organs in and for the struggle against Fascism. These organs are :—

(1) The revolutionary political representatives in the factories.

(2) Local, regional and district Delegate Conferences against Fascism and the Fascist dictatorship.

(3) Local and district Committees of Action against the Fascist dictatorship.

III.—HOW DOES THE PARTY ATTEMPT TO SOLVE THESE TASKS?

Already in 1929, as a result of the increasing radicalisation of the working-class and the growing experience of the membership, the recruiting activity of the German Communist Party began to achieve an increasing measure of success. Masses of workers began to enter the ranks of the Party. However, the Party was only able to keep a small number of these newly-recruited members, the remainder went out again after a shorter or longer period. Consequently, the membership in almost all districts showed a vacillating picture, but the total impression was one of stagnation.

The Party attempted with all its force to struggle against this phenomenon. The first thing that it had to do was to determine the causes of the fluctuation. By means of hundreds of questionnaires sent out to factory cells and local groups, by questioning workers who came into the Party and went out again, material on the subject was accumulated. It revealed a good deal that was not very creditable to the Party, e.g., weak political life in the lower units of the organisation, opportunism and sectarianism, feeble authority exercised by the lower leadership, superior attitude adopted by the older towards the younger members, neglect to draw in the newer Party members into Party work and, to some extent, personal quarrels and bureaucratic distortions which led to the new members not even receiving their membership cards promptly. Such were the complaints which again and again were brought forward by workers as the main cause for the fluctuation.

It was also no easy matter to make a fight against this state of affairs. In the course of a protracted and arduous inner-Party campaign, the leadership in

eight districts and the subordinate leadership in innumerable cases was replaced by new comrades and everywhere new elections were held. A staff of instructors was organised for the Centre, and for the leadership of the districts, sub-districts and largest groups, which, while still comparatively weak, nevertheless furnished valuable work. As was shown later by the development of the membership figures, the carrying through of these measures created the prerequisites for big successes. The defects shown, however, have not been completely removed. It was only the last session of the Central Committee which resolved to do away with the grey membership cards handed out to new members during the first year of their membership and which marked them off as a subordinate class of members in distinction to the older ones who received a black membership card. Since March, 1930, stagnation has been overcome, but not yet fluctuation.

IV.—STRUGGLE AGAINST FLUCTUATIONS.

In spite of the upward movement of the figures of membership, fluctuation has by no means been completely overcome. According to the average figures of entry into the Party during the years 1927, 1928 and 1929, the Party by 1930 ought to have doubled itself.

The following example illustrates how many new members pass through the Party without being politically and organisationally absorbed. In the course of two-and-a-half years, in the Viehhof Cell (Berlin), (it is true, partly as a result of intense inner political dissensions), 225 workers passed through the Party, while the cell to-day only numbers thirty-five. While such a degree of fluctuation is only to be noted in a small number of cells, and its cause is in part to be found in objective circumstances (rationalisation, mass dismissals, etc.), nevertheless there was to be observed in the past a much too great absence of firmness in the composition of the lower Party units.

The following two examples from different districts give an indication of the social composition of the newly-won members.

In the district *Hessen-Waldeck* there were recruited between January 1st, 1929, and March 31st, 1930, a total of 708 members. Of these, 7.4% were women, of whom 11.3% were factory workers. Of the recruits, 16.2% were between the ages of 20 and 30, the remainder were older. In all, 23% were factory workers.

In the district *Pfalz*, 881 new members were recruited between May 1st, 1929, and May 1st, 1930. Of these, 11.5% were women. Only 3% had been in the German Social-Democratic Party, 51.8% in the Communist Youth organisation, while 7.3% came from bourgeois Parties. 20.5% were trade union members and about 80% came from other mass organisations. The composition, according to age,

was as follows: Below 20, 4.2%; 20-25, 18.5%; 25-30, 24.1%; 30-35, 16.8%; 35-40, 14.8%; 40-50, 13.5%; and above 50, 7.8%.

From these figures it is clearly seen that the qualitative side of our recruiting work still leaves much to be desired. The concentration of attention on the decisive strata of the proletariat, viz., men and women factory workers and youth workers, is in no way expressed in the results of the recruiting. The number of unemployed among the new recruits is also strikingly large. The Party is still faced with the task of making a thorough-going change in this respect.

How is the Party attempting to do this? Last autumn, the Party embarked on this task, especially by the organising of great public factory meetings and by activity in the dwelling areas in connection with the election campaign, which was utilised for extensive recruiting for the Party and the press. Experience demonstrated that even this method did not correspond to the demands of the Party. The Party drew the following lessons: *recruiting activity must be a continual, lasting work, it must be made an inseparable part of daily political activity.* This does not mean that there are not special high points for recruiting activity, since every political campaign carried out by the Party naturally must be utilised also for intensive recruiting work.

Revolutionary competition also did *not* bring about the desired success in regard to the qualitative side of recruiting. The results in this direction were only estimated by numerical figures. The Party drew the conclusion that in the future in revolutionary competition it would be necessary to devote more attention to the qualitative side. But even that does not by any means suffice for the removal of fluctuations.

The Party has now adopted the method of setting up a small commission for the separate sub-districts in Berlin and for other districts which is entrusted with the task of planning and controlling for the ensuing quarter the recruiting activity of the Party in the factories. This commission will register not only the newly-entering members but also the members who leave the Party. It will seek out every comrade who leaves the Party and, in a planned fashion, ascertain the causes. The same thing will be carried out in regard to weaknesses and defects which manifest themselves in factory work. All its experiences at the end of the quarter will be embodied in a report which can then be compared with the reports of similar commissions in other sub-districts. In this way, we shall be able to investigate more thoroughly the causes of fluctuation and weakness in our Party work and be able to draw the positive conclusions required for improving the work of the Party and of its sections in these spheres.

Hand in hand with this go the Party's attempts to raise the level of the leadership in the lower organisa-

tions and continually to draw in new forces into the Party work. In this sphere also, the Party has already much progress to record. To-day, 31.9% of the members of the Party are already Party functionaries, and their social composition is shown by the following figures :—

Regions.	Factory Workers		House-wives.	Employees. (in percentages)	Unemployed.	Others
	Men.	Women.				
E. Prussia	31.01	.58	5.0	.75	57.98	4.6
Danzig	10.06	.87	6.1	.44	73.5	9.0
Halle-Merseburg	44.20	2.69	10.7	5.88	30.3	6.2
Thuringia	49.17	1.98	3.3	4.24	37.3	4.0
Mecklenburg	38.11	2.6	6.8	1.3	48.2	2.9
N.W. Ruhr	51.85	.65	13.0	1.1	24.4	9.1
Hessen-Frankfurt	43.54	1.48	6.0	7.4	33.8	7.8
Baden	48.88	2.41	3.3	5.0	33.4	6.9
S. Bavaria	45.54	2.17	4.8	1.4	34.7	11.3

These statistics show that we are still far from the goal of making every Communist an active functionary but progress is being achieved. Through planned development of the cadres of functionaries, together with progressive development and raising of the political level of the entire body of members, going hand in hand with ever more carefully planned organisation of recruiting work, the Party will succeed in reducing fluctuation to a minimum and become more mature and more efficient for the solution of the tasks before it.

V.—THE UPWARD TREND OF MEMBERSHIP.

In 1929, about 50,000 new members entered the Party without any substantial increase in the number of members to be reckoned. In the first three months of 1930, 23,000 new members entered the Party. The Party then attempted to carry out a thorough-going change in the Party development. During the Reichstag elections, recruiting was carried on according to a special plan. Each of the districts according to their importance and size were given a recruiting figure to be attained. In all, it was fixed that 340 new factory cells and 235 new local groups should be brought into existence. Actually, the achievement was 188 factory cells (55.2% of the quota) and 522 local groups (222% of the quota).

This result was a considerable success. At the same time, it was shown that our comrades proceeded along the line of least resistance. In the formation of new local groups the quota was far exceeded but in regard to factory cells only half the quota was attained. This conveyed to the Party an important lesson and the Party accordingly determined to concentrate still more on the factories and the improvement of factory work.

After the Reichstag elections, which, as is well known, proved very successful for the Party, the Central Committee laid down the task of doubling the membership within six months up to April 1st, 1931.

A detailed plan was drawn up after investigation of the forces in each district. Only such members were to be counted as new recruits who had accounted for their membership contributions. At the present time, three months of this recruiting period is over. The result is as follows : For each district, the basic

figure taken was the average membership figure in the second quarter of the year ; this was made equal to one hundred. In October, the membership figure on this basis was to be increased by 25%. The achievement was 27.6%. In November, the membership figure was to have been increased by a further 25%, actually 10.4% was obtained. In December, the quota increase was fixed at 15% and 10.2% was reached. In these three months there were accepted into the Party and their contributions accounted for, 59,429 new members. Reckoning in addition about 10% to 15% of new members who, according to experience, were only taken account of later, it means that in these months the Party recruited from 60,000 to 65,000 new members and kept them firmly in its ranks. This was a great success which justifies even greater expectations for the future.

These statistics reflect not only the great recruiting strength of the Party during these months but also, since these 59,429 new members were completely accounted for on the books, an intensive inner-Party work of organisation and consolidation. Without an immediate allocation of these members into the most varied functions, it would have been impossible to take account of these members either financially, organisationally or politically, and to bind them firmly to the Party. At the same time, it is not concealed that the statistics also reflect still existing defects, especially in a few districts. They show that the districts of Mecklenburg, Middle Rhine, Hessen-Waldeck, the Saar and Württemberg, which in October, together with all the other districts exhibited a marked upward development of the membership, in November remained behind. Since the objective conditions for the continuance of the recruiting activity were in no way more unfavourable in November than in October, it follows that subjective weaknesses must have been present which hindered the further progress of the Party during this month.

For the rest, the statistics show very clearly what great possibilities exist for the rapid strengthening of

the Communist Party in Germany. The Central Committee of the German Party drew the necessary conclusions at the recent session of the Plenum of the Central Committee and once more put forward the slogan of the doubling of the Party membership. At the same time, the slogan was issued for the most intense attention of the whole Party to the factories and, in particular, to the decisive importance of big undertakings as well as the slogan for an eight-fold development of the revolutionary Trade Union Opposition during the ensuing months.

VI.—FACE TO THE BIG FACTORIES.

There are in Germany 191,211 factories with a personnel of from 11 to over 5,000. These factories are distributed as follows :—

No. of Workers.	No. of Factories.	No. of Party Cells.
11-50	148,112	118
51-500	40,189	742
500-1,000	1,788	} 664
1,000-5,000	1,051	
Over 5,000	71	

Thus, taking the three groups for which the number of Party cells is given above, it is seen that in the small concerns there are 118 cells, i.e., there are Party cells in .08% of all the small concerns. In the medium-sized factories, 2% contain Party cells, while in the big factories, 24.8% have Party cells.

So far, the Party has had factory cells in 1,524 factories. There must be added 57 cells on big farms. The existence of this number of cells, which, in spite of the most furious terrorism of the employers and the treachery and denunciation policy of the Social-Fascist bureaucrats and factory officials, have been able to unfold in an increasing measure a Bolshevik mass activity, still in no way suffices either in number or consolidation for the big tasks confronting the Party, viz., "organisation and leadership of economic struggles" and "creation of a really powerful Trade Union Opposition embracing millions of workers as a trade union mass organisation."

Consequently, the Central Committee has now put before the whole Party the task of immediately within three months selecting instructors from the ranks of Party functionaries for the 9,000 large and medium-sized factories with a personnel of over 200. With the help of these instructors, and with the support of the active nuclei of the factory and street cells, the factory groups of the Trade Union Opposition and all organisations sympathetic to the Party, we shall create within the framework of the recruiting plan for a whole year Party factory cells and factory groups of the Trade Union Opposition in these 9,000 concerns.

With this development of recruiting activity and with this comprehensive energetic turn of the whole Party to the decisive big factories, the Party will, at

the same time, improve its social composition and will also improve the whole Party work, especially in the factories, by the drawing in of thousands of new functionaries for the lower and subordinate leading organs.

This work is being carried through under the slogan of "*No more factory workers in the street cells*"—"*30,000 new factory workers for the Party.*"

In connection with the carrying through of this intensified recruiting activity and turn towards the big factories, the Party will, at the same time, develop the Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition (which already has a firm paying membership of over 100,000) and the Red Trade Unions into a real, broad, mass Trade Union movement and will improve and politicalise the work of the Trade Union Opposition, enabling it to develop much greater power in the organisation and leadership of economic struggles.

VII.—ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF SYMPATHETIC NON-PARTY MASS ORGANISATIONS.

In Germany, with its old-established traditions of organisation, a great rôle is played outside the Parties and trade unions by mass organisations of the most varied kinds, both in the bourgeois camp as well as in the Labour Movement. The German Communist Party, during many years' sharp struggle against the State apparatus, Fascism and Social-Fascism, has developed fractions and later Opposition groups and a number of independent revolutionary mass organisations. This fraction work in the organisations led by the Social Fascists, in view of the increasing radicalisation of the working-class, which has its effects also in these organisations, has been considerably strengthened. At the present time, the Party is attempting by the introduction of active, trustworthy, revolutionary fighters to develop even more strongly than before, in even those organisations that stand some way off from us, a considerable Bolshevik agitation for the winning over of the masses in such organisations.

Around the fractions in the organisations under Social-Fascist leadership, there is being created a still wider circle of sympathisers for the strengthening of the oppositional movement and in order to develop among these strata political mass work on a more extended front. Further, the Party seeks in the mass organisations which are under the leadership of Communist fractions to develop the political outlook of the membership and to attract to them ever new masses from out of the organisations under Social-Fascist leadership. The prerequisites for this are definitely present and all mass organisations friendly to us showed during 1930 a steady upward development. This is to be seen clearly from the following figures :—

(a) International Red Aid.

Quarterly Period. 1930.	Individual Members.	Collective Members.
1st quarter	157,956	286,511
2nd quarter	164,127	304,558
3rd quarter	171,985	331,602

This shows a total of 503,587 members who pay contributions either individually or collectively. As an indication of the work done by the International Red Aid may be mentioned that between September, 1930, and January, 1st, 1931, 176,983 marks were collected for victims of class justice, 27,678 new members were recruited and 932 new functionaries passed through their training.

(b) Red Sport Movement.

The Red Sport Movement, which after the splitting offensive of the Social-Fascists has developed under our leadership, has to-day in 1,177 unions, 75,108 adult members and 10,044 children, i.e., a total membership of 85,152. These figures, however, only reflect to a small degree the actual influence of our Red Sport Movement among those taking part in sport activity in Germany.

Besides our Sport Movement, there are also thousands of unions with some hundred thousand members which are not put forward as definite members because, at the present time, they still belong to the athletic and sport associations under reformist leadership and carry on revolutionary work in these. But here also development is proceeding rapidly, as is shown by the fact that in the last two months alone, 266 unions which up to then were members of the reformist association came over to our organisation.

(c) Co-operatives.

In the Co-operative Movement, we have in our hands eleven unions with a total of 101,000 members. Our comrades also work as functionaries in innumerable other co-operative bodies and are developing to an increasing degree a broad oppositional movement. Still, there remain great political weaknesses in this sphere which are only slowly being overcome. At the same time, our unions suffer from the economic crisis which is further steadily worsened by the criminal policy of the Social-Fascist Co-operative bureaucracy. Only by the greatest courage and readiness to make sacrifices on the part of the millions of workers in Germany will the Party be able to bring about an improvement.

(d) Workers' International Relief.

The Workers' International Relief, which is particularly active in arousing active solidarity on the part of the working-class in relation to individual struggles, has developed as follows:—

On January 1st, 1930, there were 25,024 members; on March 1st, 1930, this had already increased to 44,226 members, and by December 1st, 1930, there were 83,455 members. The number of local groups existing on these three dates were 446,537 and 766

respectively. Thus, in the course of a single year the number of local groups was almost doubled and the membership figures almost trebled. The circulation of the paper issued by this organisation increased from 80,000 on July 1st, 1930, to 110,000 on December 1st, 1930.

(e) Freethinkers' Movement.

The development of this movement is still in its initial stages. It is still limited to a few parts of Berlin, the Ruhr region, the Rhineland, Thuringia and Middle Germany. In other regions of Germany the opposition for the most part works within the limits of the reformist Freethinking organisations.

Membership figures in 1930 were as follow: In July, there were 84,741 members; in August, 86,377 members; in September, 88,246 members; in October, 91,034 members; and in November, 93,215 members. The circulation of the press of our Freethinkers' Movement increased from 86,300 in July, 1930, to 107,500 in December, 1930.

(f) The International Union.

This organisation, which includes victims of war and industry, has not shown the same strongly marked upward tendency as the other mass organisations. The chief cause for this phenomenon lies in the fact that, owing to the Brüning Emergency Decrees, many war and industrial victims have lost their pensions and, as a consequence, owing to lack of means, have had to leave the organisation.

Nevertheless, even this organisation is making progress, as is shown by the fact that the membership increased from 69,362 in August, 1930, to 81,013 in December, 1930. This organisation is at present making a turn in its policy towards access to a new strata of workers. It is concentrating more strongly on those disabled through industrial accidents who are organised in Germany in a reformist body of more than half-a-million members.

We have dealt with the strength and activity of all these organisations in order to show what valuable aid they can render in the education of the workers towards revolutionary class consciousness. That this work is being carried on along the line of the Party is assured by the fact that their leading fractions on a central, district and also local scale meet regularly every fortnight with Party and Youth representatives to discuss and deal with the special tasks of the Party fractions in these mass organisations. Thus, the fractions become a lever not to be underestimated in the mobilisation of the masses for struggle against Fascism and against the imperialist danger of war.

A special role among the mass organisations falls to the *Union for Struggle against Fascism*. This organisation, which was only founded in October, 1930, is already on the way towards embracing all anti-Fascists in the factories, at the Labour Exchanges and in the dwelling areas. In the middle of December, the national leadership reckoned on over 38,000

members. By the middle of January, 1931, the membership figures were already far above 50,000.

The anti-Fascist Conferences which are now being organised throughout the country by the Communist Party of Germany and to which delegates have been sent from all strata of the working population (factory workers, unemployed, women, officials, employees, artisans, urban petty bourgeoisie, poor peasants and agricultural workers), will be able to accelerate the growth even more considerably and convert the union to a real mass force in and for the defensive political struggle against Fascism.

VIII.—THE UNITED FRONT ORGANS.

The united front organs developed by the Party on the most varied sectors of the world class struggle, for instance among the *peasants, urban petty-bourgeoisie, women, tenants, immigrants and cultivators*, represent another form by which these strata can be linked up with the mass policy of the Communist Party. They are the threads through which the Party is connected with the masses and the organs which, under the steady influence of the Party, are of very great assistance by means of agitation and propaganda among these strata.

In the development of these organs we have so far obtained considerable successes, especially among women and to some extent among the poor peasants. The greatest successes have been among working women and the wives of workers. During 1930, conferences of women delegates took place in almost all districts and sub-districts throughout Germany, attended by many thousands of women delegates and at which women's committees were elected for the leadership of the movement.

The next steps which must be taken by the Party for the development of these committees of struggle must be directed particularly to the *agricultural workers*, poor peasants, employees and the various groups and strata of impoverished urban petty-bourgeoisie.

Further, the Party develops on various occasions (parliamentary elections, factory council elections) special united front organs (electoral committees) which have only a temporary existence as they are dissolved after the fulfilment of their special tasks. In this sphere also the possibilities of development have in no way been exhausted and the Party continues to attempt to develop similar bodies on other special occasions, with new means and methods.

The special rôle of the preparatory committees of action in the organisation of economic struggle, and of the strike committees in the conduct of the struggles will not be dealt with here as they have been firmly fixed by the decisions of the Fifth and Sixth Congresses of the R.I.L.U. and almost all sections have accumulated independent experience in regard to them. It only needs to be remarked that these

bodies are often not fully adequate for their tasks and that only in the daily struggles themselves will they to a greater and greater degree overcome their weaknesses.

IX.—THE REVOLUTIONARY POLITICAL REPRESENTATIVES, THE DELEGATE MOVEMENT AGAINST FASCISM AND THE LOCAL AND DISTRICT COMMITTEES OF ACTION AGAINST FASCISM AND THE FASCIST DICTATORSHIP.

In view of the almost daily sharpening situation, the Communist Party of Germany is not only compelled to pose politically the most varied problems for the mobilisation of the masses for struggle against the employers' offensive, Fascism and the Fascist dictatorship, but it is at the same time compelled so to develop its strategical and tactical measures and its forms of organisation that the struggles of the proletariat are raised on to an ever higher plane and conducted with corresponding higher methods and means of struggle. It is necessary to an increasing extent to succeed in uniting and mutually co-ordinating the struggles of the factory workers with the struggles of the remaining strata of toilers (the unemployed, the poor peasants, the agricultural workers, employees and women).

The close connection of the Party leadership with the leadership of the fractions in the different mass organisations assures on a central, district and local scale, the close inner organisational connection with the already firmly organised masses under our leadership. The Party must now in connection with the higher political, strategical and tactical formulations of its tasks proceed to the creation of new forms of organisation for the purpose of obtaining connection with new strata.

These connections must, of course, in the first place, reach into the factories, even in those factories where so far there was no factory cell either of the Party or of the Trade Union Opposition. That is only possible if, as already mentioned, in the shortest possible time the fixed-on quota of 9,000 Party instructors for the factory cells have been found.

The connecting links with these factories can only be found in the revolutionary political representatives. They must be elected in workshop, labour or factory personnel meetings which are organised from inside or outside by the Communist Party of Germany. These political representatives can at any time be called together alone or in common sessions with the Red factory councils, with the delegates to anti-Fascist conferences, or even, in the case of economic struggles, with the strike leadership, and politically instructed and entrusted with particular tasks within the limits of the execution of Party policy, especially in the factories.

They are not only a valuable aid to the mobilisation of the workers in the factories in which we already have factory cells or Opposition groups, but they

represent a powerful lever in the factories in which such organs do not exist for the creation of these necessary units. In the course of the further radicalisation process among the workers, and in the course of further struggles under our influence, they will accumulate valuable experiences, grow politically and with further intensification of the struggle become capable of carrying out still higher tasks.

The same ends are served only in another form by the delegate conferences against Fascism and the Fascist dictatorship. These delegate conferences arise first of all in the localities in every factory, in workshops, in departmental or factory meetings (depending on the size of the factory) as well as in meetings for other strata of toilers (unemployed, housewives, officials, artisans, poor peasants, etc.), where delegates from these strata are elected.

By this planned election of delegates to conferences we have already the widest mass mobilisation from below against Fascism and the Fascist dictatorship. This can always then be carried further on a higher stage by the reporting of the delegates to those who have elected them. First of all, there take place local meetings of delegates in which is carried out the election of local committees of action against Fascism. In the future, after their election, these committees carry out and lead the delegate movement in the locality. In a similar way, sub-district and district delegate conferences against Fascism are prepared and carried out.

In the election of the committees of action the greatest weight is to be placed on securing the representation of all factories and the most varied strata of other workers. If necessary, smaller executive committees can be formed for directing the work. Naturally, there must immediately be developed in these organs an extremely active Communist fraction. If that is the case, these delegate conferences and committees of action can not only render valuable assistance in the conquest of the majority of the working-class and for the hegemony of the proletariat among the middle strata, but they can also become valuable auxiliary organs for the mobilisation of the masses for economic and political mass struggles.

In the political mass struggles themselves, and in the leadership of them, new and higher forms of these united front organs can be developed. Every special situation of struggle demands new measures in the sphere of organisation. This cannot be determined in detail beforehand without falling into mere scheme-making.

The delegate conferences and the committees of action against Fascism are permanent institutions. This does not mean that the individual delegates must

always remain the same. In the course of the development of the different struggles, new active, revolutionary elements will continually be drawn in and others less active will drop out. The German Communist Party attempts to draw new revolutionary energy from the broad revolutionary mass stream to it far outside its own organisational limits and the limits of the sympathetic mass organisations, and to develop all valuable revolutionary forces for new and higher forms of the class war.

The German Communist Party, which at its last Central Committee session put before the entire membership and all the toilers in Germany the slogan of "The People's Revolution against Fascist Dictatorship" must develop all these forms of organisation if it is to convert its decisions into action. The Communist Party of Germany which, in spite of many defects still shown in its work, is commanding in an increasing measure the confidence of the masses as demonstrated by the organisational growth of recent months; is firmly determined to transform its resolutions into deeds. It will, supported by the growing confidence of the toilers in town and country, carry through its decisions with Bolshevik courage and determination right up to the victory of the People's Revolution and the establishment of Soviet Germany.

LITTLE LENIN LIBRARY.

A series of reprints from the Collected Works of the more important writings of V. I. Lenin. It is hoped to publish these during the summer and early autumn. The series will be added to until it contains all the major works of Lenin in a readily accessible form. The texts are definitive, based on those of the Lenin Institute.

THE TEACHINGS OF KARL MARX
(ready) 15c.; 9d.

THE WAR AND THE SECOND
INTERNATIONAL.

THE STATE AND REVOLUTION.
IMPERIALISM.

TWO TACTICS.

THE FIVE YEAR PLAN of the SOVIET UNION
G. T. Grinko
is still selling fast.

8/6 and 5/- \$3.50 and \$2.00.

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS LTD.,
381 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

MARTIN LAWRENCE LTD.,
26 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON, W.C.1.