

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Published twice monthly).

Vol. VII. No. 13.

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

December 1st, 1930

CONTENTS

	Page
THE FIVE YEAR PLAN AND SOVIET "DUMPING"	270
COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY PLOTS IN THE U.S.S.R.	276
THE ROAD TO PROLETARIAN HEGEMONY IN THE INDIAN REVOLUTION	282
By R. Palme Dutt	
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY AFTER THE ELECTIONS	289
By E. Thälmann	
THE DEVELOPING CRISIS IN GERMANY AND THE WORKERS' COUNTER-OFFENSIVE	296
THE ARAB "LEFT" NATIONALIST MOVEMENT	301
By Mustafa Sadi	

FIVE CENTS

THE FIVE YEAR PLAN AND SOVIET "DUMPING"

ON the first of October, 1930, the proletariat of the Soviet Union in the factories and workshops took note of the termination of the economic year, the termination of the second year of the Socialist Five Year Plan. This date was marked not only by proud consciousness of successes achieved, but also by solicitude regarding the course of the further struggles for the Socialist reconstruction of the whole country.

The workers of the Soviet Union realised to the full that the third year of the Five Year Plan now beginning represents to a very considerable extent the *decisive* year for the realisation of the task which the Soviet proletariat has set itself, namely, the completion of the magnificent *Five Year Plan in four years*. In estimating the successes achieved, in laying bare with proletarian resolution mistakes and defects committed, in weighing up the factors of the situation now facing them, the workers of the Soviet land at the same time subjected to valuation and analysis their *own* services, their *own* mistakes, their *own* efforts, their *own* struggle.

It is this which constitutes the most essential and decisive feature of the present stage of the struggle for Socialism. Each new step forward in this struggle, each new factory put into operation, each new success in the collectivisation of agriculture is being achieved as a result of the activity, élan and Socialist emulation of millions of workers and peasants who are taking part in Socialist construction. On the threshold of the third year of the Five Year Plan it can be said with absolute definiteness that the work of building Socialism is successfully going forward and that there is being carried out in practice the directive formulated by Lenin already at the Eighth Congress of Soviets:—

"Taking into account the experience of science and practice, it is necessary on the spot to strive unremittingly for the fulfilment of the Plan earlier than the appointed time. That depends on us. Let us investigate the economic process in every workshop, in every dépôt, in every sphere, and then we shall shorten the period."

At the present time, it is already not a matter of shortening the period for the reconstruction of industry, but of shortening the

period in the course of which the whole national economy will be reconstructed on new foundations, in which there will be laid down the fundamental bases of Socialist economics, and in which there will be created the prerequisites for an unprecedented raising of the cultural level of the masses and for the establishment, not only of Socialist economy, but also of Socialist culture.

How does the question of the fulfilment of the Five Year Plan now stand? In the course of the last months of the second year of the Five Year Plan, the Party and the working class have had to devote special attention to the gaps in the fulfilment of the control figures. Success was not everywhere obtained in increasing the productivity of labour and in extending production in the measure which was laid down in the control figures calculated for the fulfilment of the Five Year Plan in four years.

It was not everywhere that the construction of new large-scale factories was developed at the rate which was recognised as essential for the working out of these control figures. In connection with this, the Party mobilised all its forces for making good the gaps, and the masses of workers who had already given an example of the greatest intensity of effort (for without this the fulfilment of the enormous tasks facing us is not possible), redoubled their energy and their readiness for self-sacrifice. It is a fact of the deepest significance that in this situation enormous reserves of the creative initiative of the working class still remain unutilised. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its Manifesto of September 3rd, 1930, declared:—

"The chief and decisive defects of the economic work remain the inability to organise and stand at the head of the rapidly growing activity of the working class."

In other words, even at the present moment when we find ourselves on the crest of the wave, there still remains unutilised, enormous reserves of initiative and activity of the working masses. This circumstance, however, can serve as a guarantee that the tasks facing

the Soviet country will be finally achieved by the Party and the working class.

What one can be assured of in the realisation of the Five Year Plan in four years, is to be seen from some of the figures illustrating the general course of economic construction in the U.S.S.R. For the first two years of the Five Year Plan the fulfilment has considerably exceeded the Plan. The general growth of the production of planned industry for these two years constitutes about 53 per cent. of the Plan laid down for five years, being 5 per cent. more than the amount estimated for. For the same two years, the volume of capital invested in industry constitutes approximately 5,000,000,000 roubles as against 3,879,000,000 laid down in the Plan. Thus, the total for *the two years of the Five Year Plan completely confirms the fact that the Five Year Plan, thanks to the activity of the masses, will not only be fulfilled but can be exceeded.* It can be fulfilled in four years.

This is completely confirmed, not only by the growth of industry, but also by the development of agriculture. The gross production of agriculture from the harvest of 1930 has increased by 17.5 per cent., as against 13.6 per cent., mentioned in the control figures. It is also very characteristic that the growth of agricultural production is indubitably determined by the rate of development of collectivisation. Precisely those regions which have specially pushed forward the rate of collectivisation (*e.g.*, the steppes of the Ukraine and the Northern Caucasus) have in the Autumn of 1929 sown an area far exceeding that sown in pre-revolutionary years or during the years of revolution. The progress in the development of agriculture is characterised by the fact that on the basis of collectivisation, big victories have been achieved in the production of industrial raw materials and in the development of technical cultures (the area under cotton has increased by more than 50 per cent., the area under sugar-beet by approximately 50 per cent., etc.).

The fulfilment of the Socialist Five Year Plan already now on the conclusion of its second year signifies a simultaneous economic, cultural and technical revolution. Every one of the figures quoted above testifies pre-

cisely to this universal historical significance of the Five Year Plan.

With regard to the economic year just concluded, at the end of which certain gaps have been noted, which must now be liquidated by energetic work throughout the country, this second year all the same represents

“a year of enormous achievements of Socialist industry. Large-scale Socialist industry, during ten months has increased its gross production by 27 per cent., showing a record rate of growth for the whole reconstruction period. Heavy industry, this basis of Socialism, for the same period increased the extent of its production by 39.5 per cent.” (*Manifesto of the E.C. of the C.P.S.U.*, September 3, 1930.)

In order to estimate the rate of development of Socialist construction, the successes of the Soviet country and the achievements of the fighting masses of the proletariat, it is necessary to bear in mind that all these data on the growth of popular economy in the U.S.S.R. even taking account of the gaps in process of liquidation, signify a guarantee for the fulfilment of the Five Year Plan in four years. A number of the chief branches of industry (*e.g.*, oil, paper, leather and some others) have exceeded the control figures which anticipated the fulfilment of the Five Year Plan in four years.

In the sphere of agriculture and collectivisation, the proposals of the Five Year Plan, as is well known, were left far behind. At the same time, even though there was revealed some non-fulfilment of the control figures in regard to certain branches of industry, nevertheless, the actual production considerably exceeded the estimates of the Five Year Plan. It is sufficient to recall that the general growth of planned industry in the U.S.S.R. for 1929-1930, according to the maximum variant of the Five Year Plan, had to amount to 21.4 per cent., while the control figures for 1929-1930 fixed the growth of industry at 31.3 per cent., and this rate was, in fact, realised.

These indicators of record progress, these unprecedented figures might seem likely to have a slackening effect on our fighters for Socialism. These figures, indeed, already constitute a proof of the historical victory of Socialism. But the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. is continuing to make sacrifices, is refraining from the satisfaction of many of its needs, is putting off for a certain period the realisation

of many of its needs, demands and expectations (*at the present moment already capable of realisation*) in order to guarantee further progress at the rate laid down.

The Soviet proletariat is demonstrating a high example of class-consciousness and Socialist enthusiasm. Naturally, no kind of compulsion or "terror," such as is mentioned in the lies of our enemies, could induce the workers to achieve such record rates of progress, and *a fortiori* could not compel the workers to *exceed* those rates and to continue the intense struggle and labour. This struggle and this labour is possibly under the conditions of an enormous revolutionary élan.

It is precisely this revolutionary élan which gives the possibility for overcoming difficulties and the desperate resistance of class enemies and opportunism in our own ranks. In characterising the possibilities which have been created for Socialist construction, and in pointing out the path for their realisation, Comrade Stalin, in his Report to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., remarked:—

"It is a fact that Socialist competition among us covers not less than 2,000,000 workers and that more than 1,000,000 workers have been drawn into the Shock Brigades. The most significant feature of this competition lies in the fact that it produces a radical transformation in people's views about labour, for it converts labour from a degrading and grievous burden, as it was formerly considered, into a matter of honour, a matter of glory, a matter of renown and heroism. There is nothing like this and there cannot be anything like it in the capitalist countries."

The proletariat is building Socialism, not in a vacuum, but in circumstances of intensified class struggle. The proletariat is surrounded by enemies who will not for a single minute lay down their arms. This truth only recently received a new, clear confirmation. The sabotage on the part of the counter-revolutionary elements in the country might have inflicted serious damage to the cause of Socialist construction if it had not been for the faithful guardian of the proletarian dictatorship, the O.G.P.U., and the activity of the masses, which were able to scotch these intrigues.

It is in the highest degree interesting to note on what the counter-revolutionaries were basing their activities in these recent attempts.

The conspiracies of the saboteurs which have been revealed show that our enemies realise very well what constitutes our greatest strength and the greatest guarantee for the fulfilment of the Five Year Plan. Our enemies understand that it consists in the activity and the enthusiasm of the masses. Accordingly, the saboteurs set themselves as their task, not only the destruction of the productive apparatus, not only the damaging of machinery, but also the organisation of famine in order to damp the enthusiasm of the workers and to sow distrust among them in regard to the Soviet power and even resentment against it.

There is nothing remarkable, in fact, that the decisive years of the Five Year Plan have evoked the mobilisation of anti-Soviet forces throughout the world. The bourgeoisie cannot limit itself to the organisation of conspiracies within the U.S.S.R. and the preparation of war against the U.S.S.R. among the General Staffs and at International Congresses. Capitalism understands very well that it is a question not only of the necessity of making an attempt by armed force to break Socialist construction, but also of preventing the growth of Communist ideas among the workers in capitalist countries. At the present time, the news of the success of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. has already gone round the whole world and there is no proletarian centre where there has not arisen a body of conscious workers who understand the necessity of following the example of the Soviet Union.

Accordingly, at the present moment when the Soviet proletariat in stern struggle and with accelerated tempo is entering the third year of the Five Year Plan, the bourgeoisie and the social-fascists are attaching special significance to distorting the information and news as to how the Five Year Plan is being put into effect. When it became impossible any longer to refute the fact of the fulfilment and more than fulfilment of the Five Year Plan, when it became impossible to deny the realisability of the Socialist Plan, these enemies are attempting to distort the *methods* of the carrying out of the Plan and represent the Soviet workers as "unwilling serfs."

Naturally, the campaign in regard to "compulsory labour" in the U.S.S.R. and "Soviet

dumping" represents an essential weapon for forging a united anti-Soviet bloc of the imperialists. The latest decree of the French Government, dated October 4th, practically establishing an embargo on the import of a number of Soviet goods, is a witness to the fact that under the flag of struggle against "Soviet dumping" there is being organised an economic boycott of the U.S.S.R. The imperialists wish to utilise this campaign for the renewal of the actual blockade of the Soviet land, and this blockade, if it were to succeed (which is very much open to doubt), can only be the prelude to an armed attack. However, the stories that in the U.S.S.R. goods are produced with the aid of "compulsory labour" are put into circulation with something very far from the idea merely under this pretext of creating obstacles for Soviet export. These inventions, in the intention of the bourgeois politicians, should sow confusion among the supporters of the proletarian revolution in capitalist countries and hinder the acceptance of the reports of rank and file workers concerning the actual position of affairs in the U.S.S.R.

The attempt is made to instil into the workers the idea that, even if the Five Year Plan is realised, it is only possible on the basis of compulsory labour. Is it possible to conceive of a more fantastic lie, is it possible to put into circulation a more idiotic invention than this slanderous agitation of the bourgeois and social-democratic press? To dub the Soviet enthusiasts of our shock brigades "unwilling slaves," to call the conscious revolutionary proletarians "unthinking cattle," is only possible for such blind and evilly disposed haters of the revolutionary proletariat as the fascist bourgeoisie and the social-fascist traitors who feel that the ground is slipping from under their feet.

Of course, the bourgeoisie cannot expect to achieve very much with the aid of such inventions. It cannot conceal the fact that the Five Year Plan is being fulfilled; it cannot refute the fact that it is being fulfilled thanks to the magnificent revolutionary enthusiasm of the toiling masses.

Failing in the hope of convincing even the most backward workers that the Five Year Plan is doing damage to the interest of the

proletariat in the Soviet Union, the bourgeoisie tries another dodge. It attempts to convince the workers of the capitalist countries that the fulfilment of the Five Year Plan deals a blow at *their* interests. To this end it makes use of the "learned" theory of Soviet dumping (exports at cut prices). It is declared that the Soviet State, obtaining goods for next to nothing owing to compulsory labour, sells them cheaply abroad and thereby incessantly undermines the basis of capitalist industry and deprives the proletariat of the capitalist countries of their employment. The attempt is made to put the blame on the Soviet power for the fact that an economic crisis is raging throughout the world.

It cannot be doubted that in its anti-Soviet agitation, the bourgeoisie calculates on a very low level of development among the workers. The absurdity of the assertion that the economic crisis arises as a result of Soviet exports must be obvious to even workers with the least experience of economics. For a start, it may be mentioned that the Soviet Union does not export at all a whole number of commodities the prices of which have sharply fallen during the period of crisis (it is sufficient to mention rubber, coffee, cotton, etc.). There has been an unprecedented fall in prices of these materials on the world market owing to the capitalist crisis and Soviet exports here can have nothing to do with the matter. The industry of big industrial countries has been compelled to destroy its production owing to lack of sales. What are the chief objects of trade of these big industrial groups? They are machines, electrical groups, metal products, chemicals, etc., none of which are exported by the Soviet Union; on the contrary, the Soviet Union is purchasing machinery and equipment for its new factories. Thus, the fables that are being spread that the structural unemployment which has resulted from the deep-seated capitalist crisis is in fact due to Soviet exports are fables which can be refuted by the aid of the most elementary and generally known facts.

Even if we turn to those branches of popular economy which produce goods exports by the Soviet Union, even in this case it is ludicrous to assign the blame for the growing crisis to the Soviet exports. First of all, it is necessary

to bear in mind that the amount of goods exported by the Soviet Union takes a very small place in the whole trade turnover of the world. The Soviet Union is compelled to meet the colossal needs inside the country and it exports, even if it requires the greatest efforts, a portion of its production in order to buy machinery for the equipment of Socialist enterprises. This export, of course, cannot have any serious effect on the level of prices, not to speak of the fact that the stories of special low prices of Soviet exported goods have no foundation in reality.

The lying character of this agitation against Soviet exports and Soviet dumping is so obvious that even the bourgeois organs of the press, not being able to count on demagogic propaganda among the masses, are compelled to recognise the lack of basis for this campaign. The organ of the Paris Corn Exchange recently published a leading article in which it said:—

“The fall in grain prices is said to be a consequence of Soviet dumping. It is generally known that the Soviets are employing a special tactic in regard to foreign trade. But in the last analysis they are not actually making a gift of the grain, but they are selling it on a level with the price in the protected countries; this competition of the Soviets on the market of the protected countries must of itself lead to a certain fall in prices. From a narrow technical point of view, the five to six million hectolitres of Soviet grain which have been sold cannot cause a sharp fall in prices; there are other causes of the price fall. Moreover, Russia only widens the breach already created by the Argentine. On the other hand, if the Soviets have developed their export trade without any other aim than that of obtaining cash, it is understandable that they will not get the cash they want by selling grain at the cheapest possible price. The world market is loaded with grain as a result of the over-production last year and of the abundant harvest this year.”

The conclusion cited above of the Paris commercial paper can be applied in its entirety also to other branches of trade in which Soviet dumping is alleged to exist (*e.g.*, timber). The fall in prices, the contraction of production and the growth of unemployment are the results of the anarchy of capitalist economy and attempts to explain these phenomena by means of Soviet dumping are only designed to conceal the real cause of the capitalist crisis. The newspaper of the Paris Corn Exchange, which makes its analysis of the state of affairs

for the benefit of business men, gives a sober account of the real position. The bourgeois and social-fascist press, however, having as their object the deception of the masses, cannot afford to indulge in such a luxury. Consequently, such newspapers as, for instance, the corrupt and lying *Vorwaerts* chatter about Soviet dumping and the harm done by Soviet exports. The agents of the bourgeoisie want to kill two birds with one stone; they hope to distract the attention of the masses from the real causes which lie at the root of their poverty and at the same time they are striving to weaken the growing sympathy for the Soviet country and the Soviet system.

All these attempts are destined to collapse in the end. The mechanism of the capitalist crisis operates independently of what is written by the bourgeois and social-democratic slanderers. The international proletariat will, in the course of its struggle, find the path towards emancipation and will find it in the proletarian revolution. This process will be not a little assisted by the further successes of the construction of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. and, in particular, by the fact that this Socialist construction, as is becoming clear to the whole world, is based on the revolutionary activity of the masses.

The workers in every country must and will learn of the new forms of Socialist labour which have been created by the Soviet proletariat:—Socialist competition, the organisation of shock brigades, the fulfilment of the industrial and financial plan, these are to-day real achievements of Socialism. When the shock-brigaders struggle for increasing the productivity of labour and for an achievement in excess of the control figures, when they call upon their comrades in the workshops to follow their example, they are throwing a challenge at the same time to the workers of all countries, calling upon them all to liquidate the capitalist forms of production and to create for themselves a Socialist industry.

In every German, British or French factory, the workers who are fighting against capitalist exploitation should know how Socialism is being built up by the workers in the Moscow electrical factories, in the Leningrad factories named after Karl Marx and Stalin, how the miners of the Don Basin are mechanising the

obtaining of coal, how the new collective farming system of the Soviet Union is being constructed. The German, British and French workers ought to know that in coming out for the defence of the Soviet Union they are struggling not for an abstract idea, not for an empty Socialist scheme, but that they are defending living proletarian workers who every day are increasing their achievements and expending their energies in the construction of Socialism.

The international proletariat will struggle for the inviolability of those workers of the Stalin factory in Leningrad who on their own initiative and outside the Plan increased the productive programme from 576,000 kilowatts to 800,000 kilowatts, and in their industrial and financial Plan worked out a project for the complete technical reconstruction of their factory.

The Communist Parties and the revolutionary vanguard of the international proletariat who are defending the U.S.S.R. are struggling not merely that the Five Year Plan can be carried into effect, but also that the mass of workers in the factories of the Soviet Union may be able to continue their unprecedented work in the creation of new forms of emancipated labour. The whole world proletariat is interested in seeing that there can be further deepened and developed methods of Socialist construction, that Socialist competi-

tion among the masses can be strengthened, that the shock brigade tactics can transform the workers in the Soviet country and make of the worker not only an active agent in the construction of Socialism, but a new human being.

The greatest significance of the approaching years of Socialist construction consists precisely in the fact that we are struggling not only for the conquests of the revolution already made, not only for the Socialist transformation of national economy, but that we are struggling for new forms of labour, for new forms of being, for a new Socialist culture.

In such a situation can the tasks of the international proletariat be limited merely to defence of the Soviet Union? No. This great task coincides with another which is even greater; the struggle for the Socialist revolution in every country in the world. The Communist Parties are leading the working class towards this goal, the Communist International is mobilising around itself the revolutionary workers for the achievement of this task. In the present period of the decisive years of Socialist construction, every revolutionary worker must be inspired by one idea, one endeavour; forward to the attack against the bourgeoisie for the Soviet power throughout the world!

COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY PLOTS IN THE U.S.S.R.

AFTER the October rising, the *majority* of the bourgeois intelligentsia, being hostile to the October Revolution, engaged in open sabotage, while the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries collaborated with the Denikin and Koltchak forces in an armed struggle against the proletarian dictatorship. That was the first counter-revolutionary offensive of the bourgeois intelligentsia against the victorious proletariat.

When N.E.P. was introduced in the Soviet Republic, the majority of the bourgeois intelligentsia who remained in the U.S.S.R., routed in open struggle, changed tactics and began to collaborate with the Soviet régime, calculating on its transformation from within. When, however, these calculations did not materialise, when the Soviet Government got down to the direct Socialist reconstruction of economy, and particularly when it started the collectivisation of the countryside and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class; when, moreover, a considerable part of the intelligentsia honestly went over to the side of the Soviet, while the other part remained "in the mire," the *remnants* of the S.-R., People's-Socialist, Cadet and Menshevik intelligentsia who had not emigrated but found shelter in the Soviet apparatus, seeing that the ground was finally slipping from beneath their feet, once more organised themselves and started a second counter-revolutionary attack against the Soviet régime.

Recently, one year after the liquidation of the industrial engineers' organisation, led by Paltchinsky, which was plotting sabotage in many branches of industry and aimed at intervention, the overthrow of the Soviet Power and the establishment of a military dictatorship based on the big bourgeoisie, the O.G.P.U. discovered a counter-revolutionary organisation headed by the former S.-R. Kondratiev, the former Cadet Yurovsky, the "People's-Socialist" Makarov, Tchayanov and others employed in the Commissariat for Agriculture, the Commissariat for Finance, the Institute for Studying Economic Conditions, the Timiryazev Academy, the agricultural co-operatives, etc.

In alliance with this organisation, which operated chiefly in Soviet institutions connected with *agriculture*, was another one discovered by the O.G.P.U.—the Menshevik counter-revolutionary organisation — *Sukhanov, Groman, Bazarov*, who had established themselves in the organs planning *industry*. This counter-revolutionary bloc of Gromanites and Kondratievites, having set themselves the aim of restoring capitalism, was in contact, on the one hand with the Paltchinsky engineering sabotage organisation, liquidated last year, and on the other hand with a counter-revolutionary organisation, only quite recently discovered, engaged on sabotaging the workers' food supply.

This latter sabotage organisation, having penetrated into our food-supply institutions, carried on the planned organisation of famine, receiving money for this from foreign capitalists. Its aim was to disorganise the raw-material basis of the chief cattle and meat-supplying regions; also to create periodical crises on the meat market and disorganisation of supplies to the working class centres. It had the same aims in the sphere of the vegetable, fish and preserves industries. They passed out conserved meats which contained entrails, offal, eye-balls, hair, teeth, *à propos* of which they remarked: "Never mind, the comrades will eat it . . . And in August they won't even ask for this . . . We'll be feeding endless numbers of crows with them."

The degree of vileness to which these scoundrels stooped is seen from their cynical evidence. The former Intendant-General Ryazantsev said on being cross-examined:

"I considered that the proletariat as a class, with its Communist ideals, could not organise and improve the economic and cultural life of the country to a position of complete prosperity, and, what is more, *I did not want it to*. Hence I considered that the chief class *sponsoring culture* (!!!) is the bourgeoisie."

And in accordance with those theories so he acted:

"I had to prove that the proletariat could not restore and improve the economic life of the country and I could only do this with the aid of a counter-revolutionary organisation that would undermine all measures for improving the cold-storage and

meat supply systems, so that, by depriving the country of meat and *bringing about a famine*, the possibility of changing the existing régime would be enhanced."

This same Ryazantsev related how they were incited and paid by Mr. Fothergill, representative of one of the biggest British meat trusts:—

"After the first interviews, he, Mr. Fothergill, proposed to me to form a counter-revolutionary organisation, which, while ruining the meat-supply and storage systems, would combat the Soviet authority and at the same time assist in the granting of meat and cold-storage concessions."

And it is with such scoundrels as these—who have already been shot by the O.G.P.U.—that the Kondratievites, the neo-"Populists" and the Mensheviks maintained contact.

That the Kondratievs, the Yurovskys, Makarovs and their fellow conspirators, having secured responsible posts in Soviet institutions, *ideologically* steered a course for the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. and that accordingly, they endeavoured (within legal bounds) to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet apparatus, was nothing new to the C.P.S.U. They had long since been exposed by the Party, their views criticised in the Party press (in the "Bolshevik," both in 1924 and 1927)—also at various Departmental meetings and at the First Conference of Marxist agrarians, held last year. The word "Kondratievism" had become a proper-noun in the C.P.S.U. That the Kondratievites, as skilled experts, had wielded a certain influence over the Right opportunists in the C.P.S.U. was also known to and exposed by the Party. Finally, the Party also denounced the fact that from time to time the Kondratievites even succeeded in carrying out their policy in practice, in places where our comrades had not displayed sufficient vigilance and firmness.

At the first All-Union Conference of Marxist agrarians, held in December, 1929, many facts of this nature were disclosed in the discussions, and the reporter at the Congress, Comrade Miliutin, in his concluding remarks as speaker, said:

"We mustn't forget that in our country even the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theoreticians are not the same as the armchair theoreticians you find abroad; in the U.S.S.R. they are also practical workers. In the U.S.S.R. everybody is working. . . Kondratiev worked not only in theory, but also in practice. The 'neo-Narodniks' (People's Socialists)

not only voiced their ideas in their books, but tried to put them into practice in our practical work. . . . We have here a number of facts regarding the actual distortions in our land-distribution policy in a number of districts. This shows that in this sphere hostile hands have been at work, hands that are hostile to our policy, and these hands have distorted our policy."

It is thus clear that *the C.P.S.U. had not overlooked the existence of Kondratievism*; it had given timely warning as to the danger, and combatted it, at the same time overcoming the strong resistance of the Right opportunists who had shown diffidence to such "indispensable skilled experts." But *what is new* is seen in the facts revealed by the O.G.P.U., showing that the Kondratievites formed an illegal counter-revolutionary organisation, aiming at a systematic struggle for power, that the petty-bourgeois People's-Socialists *Chayanov* and others, who talked of a "third path of development," participated just as actively in this organisation as did the more or less open ideologists of the bourgeoisie, that the Mensheviks *Sukhanov*, *Groman*, *Bazarov*, also formed a counter-revolutionary organisation which formed a bloc with the Kondratievs, that this counter-revolutionary bloc was in contact with the Paltchinsky and Ryazantsev sabotage organisations, that this bloc placed great hopes in the Right opportunists in the C.P.S.U., banked on their victory in the Party, which would serve as a stepping-stone to bourgeois restoration.

These facts cast a bright light on the contemporary methods of the counter-revolution and in so far as they do that they deserve most serious attention on the part of the entire Communist International.

What were the economic views of *Kondratiev*, *Yurovsky*, *Makarov* and the rest which they propagated in a disguised form in the legal press and which they also tried to put into practice through the organs of the Soviet system?

Yurovsky, a prominent financial expert in the U.S.S.R., wrote in his book in 1928, *The Currency Policy of the Soviet Régime* (1917-1927):

"Soviet economy is creating a *special form of commodity—currency economy*. . . the Soviet State . . . cannot depart from the law of markets and prices. . . . The existing economic system is of an extremely peculiar nature. . . . After several years of

the New Economic Policy, it is still difficult to say what exactly does really belong to this system and what constitutes a chance anomaly in it."

Although "it is difficult to say," M. Yurovsky nevertheless explains in a cautious way what are the "temporary and painful anomalies" that are disturbing the "equilibrium" in Soviet economy :

"These include the plan to transport goods to the various regions where there is a commodity shortage . . . Here must also be included the distribution of the limited housing fund among claimants for accommodation, for here also there is absence of equilibrium between demand and supply . . . Here should also be included, to some extent, credit plans . . ." etc.

In short, according to M. Yurovsky's conceptions, under "N.E.P.," all those financial measures of the Soviet aimed at strengthening the positions of the Socialist sector of Soviet economy and of the proletariat are "temporary anomalies." Quite openly the Yurovsky gentlemen stated that excessive regulation contradicts "N.E.P." and disturbs the "equilibrium" of economy, and our Right opportunists in the Party fell into this trap (Bukharin). Secretly, however, these gentlemen naturally said to themselves: "Such a policy cuts across our plans for restoring capitalism." Kondratiev wrote in his theses entitled, "Aims in the Sphere of Agriculture, in connection with the general development of National Economy":

"In carrying out industrialisation, it is necessary : (1) to limit the tempo of industrial capital construction, reducing the extent of same by about 15 per cent. (2) It is simultaneously necessary to modify the correlation of the amount of capital expenditure, as between the amounts spent on heavy industry and on the light manufacturing industry, so as to raise the specific gravity of the latter."

Openly, Kondratiev stated that the "extremity of industrialisation, above all, lay in the fact that we had adopted *too quick a tempo* for the development of industry" and the Right opportunists fell into that trap. *To himself*, however, he said: "This policy strengthens the position of the Soviet régime, makes the U.S.S.R. independent, and strengthens the Socialist sector of economy in the Soviet Republic; it is thereby harmful to us and spoils our counter-revolutionary plans.

Kondratiev, in one of his open statements said : (See "Planned Economy," 1925, p. 20) :

"Only contact with the world market can bring about a rapid improvement in the conjuncture of Russian agriculture . . . That is why it is necessary to remove the obstacles impeding this contact. *We see these obstacles in the conditions of the present nationalisation of foreign trade.*"

Openly he made out that his fight against the foreign trade monopoly was dictated by the interests of the development of productive forces, and the development of agriculture; and certain Right opportunists fell into this trap and also said that we should retreat from this position as we could not hold it. *To himself, however*, Kondratiev naturally said: "The Foreign Trade Monopoly strengthens the position of the Soviet régime, and therefore it is unacceptable for us."

At the crucial moment of the change over to the reconstruction period, summing up the results of the economic year 1926/27 and outlining the prospects of the future, the Kondratievites on pp. 11-12 of the "Economic Bulletin of the Institute for Studying Economic Conditions," edited by Kondratiev, developed the following programmes for the "industrialisation" of the U.S.S.R. :

(1) In the sphere of markets, abandon the policy of regulating prices, which is a cause of the goods famine, thereby allowing freedom for the establishment of "equilibrium" in the market. (That is one of the sources of Bukharin's equilibrium theory!)

(2) Curtail the dimensions of capital construction.

(3) Slow down the tempo of industrialisation.

(4) Delay increases in wages.

Such a programme requires no comment.

Let us turn to their land policy. Speaking at the 1922 Agricultural Congress, Kondratiev said :

"In accordance with the *principles of free economic activity*, and the guarantee of such freedom, land legislation, which is of extraordinarily great importance for the development of agriculture, should be revised with a view to *establishing a firmer connection between the proprietor and the land*, with a view to greater freedom of activity in land transference and in the choice of forms of land-utilisation."

Kondratiev and the Kondratievites thus conducted a direct attack against the nationalisation of the land. And, in the localities, the Right opportunists were shutting their eyes to the fact that the Kondratiev agents were distorting our land policy, as was recorded at the Conference of Marxist agrarians. Kondratiev wrote in his theses :

"(1). It is necessary that the definition of 'the kulaks' be made exact by legislation. (2). Except from inclusion in this definition, in practice, cases of renting land or hiring agricultural labour within the dimensions permitted by law for working farms. (3) Rectify the taxation policy in those cases where the existing assessment, owing to the sharply raising progression and the methods of accounting for income is too heavy a burden on the *developing* (read 'Kulak'—Ed.)—strata of peasant farms and thereby retards growth of intensity and of the marketable yield of agriculture. (4) Bring about a real change in co-operative and credit policy, by recognising the unconditional liberty of co-operative unions in the sphere of agriculture, by ceasing to assert outside *pressure on the co-operatives*, by the abandonment of *protectionism* in co-operative-credit policy and of *philanthropy in regard to weak enterprises and unbusinesslike forms of co-operation.*"

Kondratiev wrote thus, while consciously striving to strengthen kulak economy, to kulakise the co-operatives and to restore the capitalist system. And in practice the Right opportunists went to meet them half way on the basis of the theory of "the merging of the kulaks into Socialism." Kondratiev wrote: "Instead of conducting a policy of assistance to the poor peasantry, in practice, we actually *place absolutely everything on the poor peasantry, i.e.,* the success of our work in developing agriculture is bound by the potential possibilities of developing poor-peasant economy." Thus Kondratiev, who always spoke on behalf of the kulaks, falsely interpreted the Party slogan—to get "the support of the poor peasants"—as meaning the perpetuation of poor-peasant economy.

But the Kondratievites, while continually defending the interests of the kulaks, did not remain content with this; they had in view a more far-sighted objective,—the restoration of big capitalistic agriculture, *i.e.,* the restitution of the power of the landowners. Kondratiev's companion-in-arms, Litoshenko, wrote in 1918 in his article, "The Socialisation of the Land":

"Let us leave aside the question of the fate of the landowner's farms, although much could be said theoretically in their defence, but in practice they are already almost non-existent, and the harm done to national economy by their violent destruction in any case cannot be compensated. . . It is all the more timely to raise a voice in defence of the semi-working or big-peasant farmers."

(From which, according to Litoshenko, there could grow up new landowners' farms, the loss of which he so mourns).

During the first stage of N.E.P., the Kondratievs, Chayanovs and Gromans, who occupied responsible posts in the Soviet apparatus as "experts," adopted the position of "collaboration" with the Soviet régime, endeavouring to make use of the "legal opportunities" for carrying out their policy in practice. Accordingly, they tried, though *unsuccessfully* to assert the influence of their own views on the general planning of economy and on the finance and credit policy of the Government. They endeavoured, *here and there with success*, to transform agricultural co-operation into a kulak organisation, to turn experimental farms into kulak strongholds, and direct agronomical measures so as to be of benefit only to the wealthy or kulak farms.

They even tried to turn measures for combatting drought into an implement for setting up kulak farms. For instance, Kondratiev's collaborator, Professor Makarov, in his work "The Fight for Stable Farms," printed in 1926, wrote:

"Whereas during the transition period one can create a certain stability for *large-scale farms* (read 'Kulak'—Ed.) in the drought regions, the task of the State is, to *help* in the enlargement of such farms. That will be the productive base of the drought regions, on the basis of which farms can be transformed into really stable undertakings. For all this, the State will develop a *social* policy such as will *allow* the farms of the respective group to become strengthened."

The policy of "peaceful collaboration" with the Soviet régime was practised by the Kondratievs, Chayanovs and Gromans in the first restoratory period of N.E.P. while they still cherished the hope for a gradual capitalistic regeneration of the Soviet order. When, however, at the end of 1926 and beginning of 1927 the Soviets entered the reconstruction period and steered a course for direct Socialist reconstruction of Soviet economy, and then for the Socialist transformation of agriculture, these hostile elements in the Soviet apparatus became alarmed and began to form underground counter-revolutionary organisations to prepare systematically for the overthrow of the Soviet system and the restoration of capitalism.

In this, they were of course inspired by the *hope* that the opposition that was *simultaneously* raising its head in the C.P.S.U.—first

the Trotskyist, then the Right Wing—could perhaps be utilised by them as a “third power” for their counter-revolutionary aims. The foundation of the counter-revolutionary organisations of the Kondratievites and of the Gromanites did not by mere chance coincide with the formation of first, the Trotskyist opposition and later the Right opposition. *Both these phenomena, the formation of the counter-revolutionary organisations and the formation of the opposition in the C.P.S.U.,* were the result of the complete change in the internal situation in the U.S.S.R. and in the international situation with the onset of the post-war “third period.” Both these phenomena were a result of the intensified Socialist offensive against the capitalist elements in the U.S.S.R. and, in connection with same, the great difficulties and the vacillations among the petty-bourgeois strata of the population.

One can easily realise how these two allied counter-revolutionary organisations could link up their hopes with the opposition in the C.P.S.U. The Trotskyites, who also had just as little faith in the possibility of building up Socialism in one country as the bourgeois restorators, on another fundamental question occupied a position which was, of course, diametrically opposed to the Kondratievites: they recommended a policy not only directed towards increasing pressure on the kulaks (in which they were at one with the whole Party) but which simultaneously would have led to a breach between the proletariat and the main masses of the middle peasantry. This policy of the Trotskyist opposition, however, could only please the Kondratievites in so far as it promised by another method—that of setting the main masses of the middle peasantry against the Soviet régime—to restore capitalism. When the Trotskyists were defeated, and the Right opposition raised their heads in the Party, this also suited the Kondratievites, in so far as the Right opportunists on many most important practical questions were guided by the Kondratievites. It was quite natural for the Kondratievites to nourish the hope that the Right Wing, after winning inside the Party, would prepare the road for them.

It is thus clear that the Kondratievites placed their hopes both in the Right deviators in the C.P.S.U. and also in the kulaks within the country. Does this mean that the Kondratievites can be regarded as a “Kulak Party,” as the Zinovievites asserted in 1927? Not at all. They placed their main hopes in the kulak because the landowners and big capitalists were already wiped off the face of the earth in the U.S.S.R., by the October Revolution and because the kulaks were the last class in the Soviet Republic whose support still could be gained for the restoration of capitalism—in its fullest sense—for the resuscitation of the landowners and capitalists and their restoration to power. *For them, the kulaks were merely a MEANS, an IMPLEMENT, for the complete rehabilitation of the power of the capitalists and landowners.*

When the C.P.S.U. decided to embark upon the Socialist transformation of the countryside, complete collectivisation and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class,—a policy which has met with brilliant success, despite all the whining of the faint-hearted—this counter-revolutionary fraternity, seeing that the last social base upon which they could rely in the U.S.S.R., was crumbling, and would crash in the near future, seized upon an extreme and desperate method. This method was to co-ordinate their counter-revolutionary work in the Soviet apparatus with open saboteurs like Paltchinsky and Ryazantsev, who are in contact with and financed by the interventionists.

This evolution of the pitiful remnants of the old Parties, the former Cadets, S.-R.'s and Mensheviks remaining on Soviet territory, is highly instructive. What conclusions are to be derived?

In the first place, the second wave of attack of the counter-revolutionary intelligentsia, after the October uprising, is a result not of the weakening of the Soviet régime, but on the contrary is due to the rapid strengthening of its position in the country, to the rapid growth of Socialist construction, to the impetuous spreading of the collective farm movement and the commencement of the liquidation of the kulaks. It was precisely for this reason that the Kondratievites and their allies

the Gromanites *accelerated and sharpened* their policy, parallel with the onset of the Socialist offensive against capitalist elements in the U.S.S.R. It was a case of consistent transition from peaceful collaboration with the Soviet régime to the creation of illegal counter-revolutionary organisations, from the nursing of the kulaks to an alliance with saboteurs and interventionists.

Secondly, it should be remembered that hand-in-hand with the Kondratievites, and in close alliance with them, the whole of this shameful evolution was gone through by Mensheviks and even "left" Mensheviks. Indeed, Sukhanov was such a "left" Menshevik in 1921 that he even formally left the Menshevik Party and tried to get into the C.P.S.U. Now, however, Messrs. the Sukhanovs and Gromans are not ashamed of allying themselves with the Paltchinskys. This shows the path that is being pursued and has already been taken by Social-Democracy not only in the U.S.S.R. but throughout the whole Second International.

Thirdly, the details of the counter-revolutionary work of the former S.-R. Kondratiev and the Menshevik Sukhanov show that they and their organisations *did not have the slightest contact with the masses* in the U.S.S.R.; not merely with the proletarian masses, but not even with the masses of poor and middle peasantry.

The only section in the country with whom they did succeed in establishing contacts was the kulaks. This is an indication of the destiny of the Second International Parties in the more or less immediate future as the revolutionary crisis grows in the capitalist countries. The millions of workers' votes lost by the Social-Democrats and won by the Communists in Germany at the last elections is very symptomatic in this respect.

Fourthly, and finally, the whole story of the inter-relations between the Kondratievites and the Gromanites on the one hand and the Right deviators in the C.P.S.U. on the other, shows that the C.P.S.U. and Comintern were fully justified in characterising the latter as a "mouthpiece" of the kulaks, as also the Comintern was justified in passing the resolution that there was no room for Right Wing opportunists in the Communist Party.

The counter-revolutionary plots of the Kondratievites, Gromanites and the saboteurs engaged in organising famine, were discovered thanks to the vigilance of that faithful watch-dog of the proletarian dictatorship—the O.G.P.U. The published depositions of the famine-organisers caused a storm of indignation among the working masses who unanimously demanded that the supreme measure of Social Defence (*viz.*: the death penalty) be applied to them. This, of course, was bound to evoke the howls of the Social-Democratic lackeys of the bourgeoisie, who stand calmly by while hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants are massacred in China, but whose hearts bleed for a few score vile saboteurs who were bent on organising famine in the U.S.S.R.

The counter-revolutionary attacks of the miserable remnants of the Parties that were swept away by the Revolution, have been repelled. But we must not be satisfied with that. The history of this plot not only shows that the C.P.S.U. must increase tenfold its vigilance in respect of the hostile elements in the Soviet apparatus, but also that the C.P.S.U. and all sections of the Comintern should increase tenfold their struggle against the Parties of the Second International and against the Right opportunists in their own ranks, learning from the lessons of Kondratievism and Gromanism.

THE ROAD TO PROLETARIAN HEGEMONY IN THE INDIAN REVOLUTION.

By R. PALME DUTT

THE problem of the Indian Revolution is to-day an acute problem for the whole advance of the world revolution.

The mass struggle in India has flared up with greater intensity than ever before. British Imperialism in decline, threatened at a dozen points, is revealed at its weakest point in India.

But the mass struggle in India develops under heavy limitations. It has not yet found its own revolutionary leadership or programme; it remains uncertain of the path forward. It is throttled under a leadership that fears it more than it fears imperialism, and is above all concerned to damp it down. The full forces of mass struggle have not yet been released; the peasantry, the decisive force of struggle, are still in great part passive. The whole movement is now in danger of ebbing without having reached a decisive stage, without having reached its full height, without even the alternative revolutionary line and leadership having been manifested.

What is the path forward in the present movement in India? This is the question of concern to the whole international movement. What are the conditions of advance? What must be the character of the next stage? What is needed to carry forward the present struggle, before it dies down, to defeat the attempts of the bourgeois leadership to throttle it, to bring it forward to a new and higher plane?

We must answer these questions in relation to the present struggle to-day, and give a clear lead for the Indian masses. Because the process of formation of an Indian Communist Party is still in the first stages, the responsibility that falls on the brother parties is the greater.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA AND THE GROWING CONTRADICTIONS, 1920-1930

The present struggle in India exceeds in its extent even the previous great revolutionary wave of 1919-1922. It is a noticeable contrast that, whereas the wave of 1919-1922 was

a reflection and echo of a wider world revolutionary crisis which had already developed since 1917 and reached India comparatively slowly, the present struggle in India has reached to great heights when the struggles in the leading capitalist countries are relatively limited, and is itself a stimulating factor of the rising new world revolutionary wave. What lies behind this transformation?

This transformation reflects, not only the enormous advance of forces in India, but also the increasing oppression of British imperialism in India in connection with the development of the crisis of British capitalism, commencing from 1920-21.

In 1919-1922 British Imperialism, alongside its violent repression of the revolutionary struggle, pursued a policy of concessions to the rising Indian bourgeoisie (Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, some tariffs, some bounties to industry, promises of assistance to industrial development). These concessions gave rise to the illusion that imperialist policy in India might be entering on a new stage, a stage of large-scale industrialisation of its main colony, in order to intensify the exploitation through new forms, and the utilisation on this basis of the Indian bourgeoisie as a subordinate partner under the control of British finance-capital. In fact, however, the basic policy of Imperialism was necessarily different; and the events of the subsequent years, and especially of the second half of the decade 1920-30, have abundantly confirmed this. The promises and the majority of the concessions vanished; and during the decade 1920-30 the face of imperialist policy in India has continually hardened.

1920-30 have been the years of the prolonged economic crisis of British capitalism. This crisis has had and is continuing to have profound effects on British policy. In 1920 British imperialism still felt at the height of its powers. With its principal imperialist antagonist of the past epoch smashed, with nearly two million square miles added to the Empire, with the artificial post-war boom,

hopes of still further expansion were entertained. The reconquest of the world market and of the temporarily weakened Indian market was judged easily within reach; the British share of Indian imports, which stood at 63 per cent. before the war, and had fallen to 56 per cent. during the war, was already back to 61 per cent. by 1920-21; large volumes of capital flowed out to India; concessions to India seemed to involve little danger; and dreams were indulged of further expansion and new forms of exploitation. The spirit of this period was expressed in the confident, aggressive policy of the Lloyd George Government, in contrast to the timid hesitancy and clinging conservatism of the later years.

Only slowly, as the economic crisis which began in the winter of 1920-21 grew prolonged, did the understanding begin to draw among British statesmen and financial and industrial leaders that the basic position of British capitalism in the world had permanently changed, and that the supposed solutions of stabilisation, rationalisation, etc., were not able to arrest the increasing process of decline. But as this has been realised, the whole trend of British policy has increasingly changed, and there is every sign that it is to-day on the eve of a still more complete transformation.

THE MORE BRITISH CAPITALISM FINDS ITSELF UNABLE TO COMPETE ON THE WORLD MARKET, THE MORE IT TURNS TO CONCENTRATE ON ITS MONOPOLIST PRESERVES IN THE COLONIES. This is the decisive character of the new trend. While total exports have fallen by one-fifth in volume, the proportion of exports going to the Empire has risen from one-third to nearly one-half of the total. To-day, policies for increased concentration on a closed-in Empire are in the forefront of British politics. Expressions of the new trend are found in the recent Bankers' Manifesto for an Empire tariff, the "Empire Free Trade" propaganda of Beaverbrook and Rothermere, the Trades Union Congress Empire economic memorandum, the similar memoranda of the Federation of British Industries and of the Association of Chambers of Commerce, and the declarations of policy of the Conservative, Liberal and Labour Parties.

What lies behind this new trend of policy which becomes increasingly dominant in British capitalism? With regard to the Dominions, much as these are brought forward in propaganda, the measure of achievement possible is limited. The real drive of the policy is thus necessarily directed, as its exponents increasingly admit, to the colonies proper, the subject colonies, *i.e.*, the Crown Colonies and India. Of these, the Crown Colonies, although of great potential future importance from the point of view of British Imperialism, represent to-day, with their fifty millions population, a relatively small base with limited immediate possibilities. It is India, with its three hundred and twenty millions population or three-fourths of the Empire, that constitutes the real base of any drive of Empire policy. **THE ESSENCE OF ANY POLICY OF "EMPIRE ECONOMIC UNITY," "EMPIRE DEVELOPMENT," etc., IS, IN THE LAST ANALYSIS, THE INTENSIFIED EXPLOITATION OF INDIA.** This is the direction to which the forces of British capitalism in its final stages of decay increasingly turn as the indispensable basis for any solution of the economic crisis.

"India," proclaims Lord Rothermere, "is the lynch-pin of the British Empire. If we lose India, the Empire must collapse." And he proceeds to argue the direct connection between the exploitation of India and the material basis of social-fascism:

"Do electors here at home realise that without our Indian trade it would be utterly impossible for the dole and pension services of this country to be maintained?"

The close inter-relation of the national fascism of Rothermere and the social-fascism of MacDonald and Snowden ("our incomparable social services" continually boasted of by them) could not be more significantly brought out. The rôle of the Labour Government in India is no incidental piece of unwelcome work imposed on them by imperialism; it is the essence of their policy.

THE MAINTENANCE OF DOMINATION IN INDIA BECOMES OF GREATER IMPORTANCE THAN EVER TO BRITISH CAPITALISM IN ITS PRESENT STAGE OF ACCELERAT-

ING DECLINE. Despite the weakening of England's economic position in India, India remains far and away the largest market for British goods, and the only market in which executive power opens out the possibility of improving the position. But the increase in strategic importance is no less. The more British policy becomes concentrated in the post-war phase on the Middle East, on China, and above all, on the offensive against the Soviet Union, the more India becomes the strategic centre and reservoir of strength. According to the *Economist's Armaments Supplement* (19.10.29), the armaments expenditure imposed on India has increased from £22 millions to £44 millions between 1913 and 1928 (actually an under-estimate, since it does not include the concealed and indirect military expenditure), or an increase of 100 per cent. in money value as against a wholesale price increase of 41 per cent. In the same period the armaments expenditure of Britain has increased by 49 per cent., and that of the Dominions by 33 per cent. The figure for India, which before the war was already twice that for all the Dominions put together, is to-day four times that for all the Dominions put together. Indian troops have been used wholesale in Iraq, Arabia, China, etc. The proportion of total imperial war expenditure drawn from India was before the war one-fifth; to-day it is over one-quarter. The military burden of the Empire is being shifted in an increasing proportion on to India.

But this drive of imperialism to intensified exploitation and domination of India does not meet with a smooth path. It comes into conflict with continually increasing contradictions and obstacles, inherent in the dynamics of development of the Indian situation.

What are these growing contradictions? Imperialist domination in India throttles economic development, and artificially maintains backward forms, at the same time as it increases exploitation. The agrarian economy of India, already overweighted by the hindering of non-agrarian economic development, is strangled by the double burden of direct imperialism and of the feudal and semi-feudal forms maintained by imperialism as the social basis of its rule.

Imperialist policy requires for the intensified

exploitation of India a rapid expansion, enlargement of the Indian market, etc. But the effects of the whole social system, of the whole system of exploitation on which it is based, produce the exact contrary. India, despite its vast possibilities, lags behind every country in the world. In Imperial Economic Committee's memorandum on the "Trade of the British Empire, 1913 to 1925-28" shows that, on a basis of 1913 as 100, Indian imports for 1927 stood at 100, and exports at 100, *i.e.*, had made NO ADVANCE IN FOURTEEN YEARS; whereas in the same period world imports had risen to 122 and exports to 118, while the imports of the Dominions rose to 126 and exports to 131, and Canadian imports to 152 and exports to 205.

But the growing contradictions lie, not only in the internal factors, but also in the play of external forces on the Indian situation. The weakening of the economic strength of British capitalism is reflected also in India in the increasing penetration by rival imperialist powers, especially Japan and the United States. The British share of Indian imports has fallen from 63 per cent. before the war to 45 per cent. in 1928. In the imports of cotton piece goods the British share of 97 per cent. before the war fell to 78 per cent. in 1927-28, while the Japanese share of 0.3 per cent. rose to 16 per cent. How can imperialism meet this situation of growing penetration by other imperialist powers? Only by a policy of closing the Indian market, of imperial preference. But this policy necessarily arouses intense Indian opposition. Until a few years ago it was ruled out as impossible (so the Indian Government representative at the Imperial Conference of 1923), and was explicitly condemned as a general policy even by the Majority Report (as well as without reservation by the Minority Report) of the Indian Fiscal Commission of 1922 as involving a too "serious burden" on Indian economy to be borne. Nevertheless, since 1927 this line of imperial preference has marked the new stage of tariff policy in India, and especially in the recent cotton duties.

The increasing intensity of imperialist policy concentrates on an increasing scale the opposition of all the principal forces of the Indian situation.

The world economic crisis, beginning in 1929, hastens forward the whole process.

THE QUESTION OF THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION

It is the characteristic and dominant feature of the Simon Report, as of all imperialist propaganda, to make its whole basis and argument centre on the contention that India is predominantly, as to 73 per cent., a country of agriculture, and of very backward, antiquated agriculture; and to draw from this the conclusion that in consequence any progress "is bound to come very slowly indeed."

This, which is the root of the Simon Report's analysis, is a twofold lie and distortion of the realities of the Indian situation. In the first place, it deliberately conceals the fact that this overweight predominance of agriculture is not an antique, primitive survival, but a very modern, recent development directly consequent on imperialism, the proportion dependent on agriculture having steadily risen under British rule, even since as recently as 1891, from 61 per cent. to 73 per cent. In the second place, it fails in consequence to recognise that this gathering situation, so far from being a bulwark against change, is the direct driving force to revolution.

THE ESSENTIAL FACT ABOUT THE AGRARIAN SITUATION IN INDIA, AS IN RUSSIA PRIOR TO 1917, OR IN CHINA MORE RECENTLY, IS THAT IT IS NOT A SITUATION OF STAGNATION, BUT AN EVER MORE RAPIDLY MOVING, DYNAMIC PROCESS, LEADING DIRECTLY TO REVOLUTION, AND INSOLUBLE WITHIN THE CONDITIONS OF IMPERIALISM.

This continuing destruction of the existing small-scale industry and handicrafts, without corresponding machine industrial development, and additional to the normal factor of natural increases of population, lies behind the ever-increasing over-population.

The land system maintained by imperialism as its indispensable basis, hems in the growing masses driven to agriculture for the means of life. The numbers of these starving masses is increasing, but the cultivated area hardly increases more than a fraction. An immense area three-quarters of the cultivable land is untilled (as opposed to forest, barren or waste

land). The land hunger of the peasants cannot be satisfied within the conditions of the land system maintained by imperialism.

What is the consequence? The growing pressure is reflected in a ceaseless diminution and sub-division of holdings, and consequent economic deterioration and worsening of conditions. Every investigation, even over a short period of years, shows this process at work. The evidence of the Agricultural Commission found that in a Bombay district of a million acres between 1917 and 1922 the number of holdings under five acres increased by 2.6 per cent., those from five to fifteen acres by 6.8 per cent., and those from fifteen to twenty-five acres by 0.9 per cent.; while all groupings over twenty-five acres decreased heavily. And this is only five years! The same evidence reported that only holdings over twenty-five acres could be regarded as representing "the comparatively substantial agriculturist class which can with luck lay by a little capital," *i.e.*, as allowing any margin. Yet for the whole Bombay Presidency 88 per cent. of the holdings were under twenty-five acres, and 48 per cent. under five acres. Less than one-fortieth of the cultivated land area of the whole province was divided between half the peasantry. And from this slender basis heavy taxation, rent, traders' profit, and interest on loans has to be provided.

The consequent increasing impoverishment and starvation is attested by all authorities. The Director of Health for the Bengal Province states in his Report for 1927-28:

"The present peasantry of Bengal are in a very large proportion taking to a dietary on which even rats could not live for more than five weeks. Their vitality is now so undermined by inadequate diet they cannot stand the infection of fowl diseases. Last year 120,000 people died of cholera; 250,000 of malaria; 350,000 from tuberculosis; 100,000 of enteric."

The imperialist organ, the *Observer*, commenting on the report of the Royal Commission on Indian Agriculture of 1927, writes under the title "From Bad to Worse" (2.10.27):

"An unavoidable conclusion from the study of the mass of material the Royal Commission has provided is that the Indian reformers of the past were not wholly wide of the mark in alleging economic declension . . . When all is said, there are aspects

of village life which point to agrarian deterioration instead of improvement."

Similarly the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* reports (1.2.27):

"The health authorities of Bengal assert that the inhabitants are not so well nourished to-day as they were a generation or so ago."

The decrease in the total consumption of cotton goods, from 4.3 million yards in 1913-4 to 4 millions in 1926-7, despite the growth of population, is an indication of the same process.

But this process is not only one of increasing impoverishment and starvation; it is also one of increasing class differentiation and the direct expropriation of the mass of the peasantry. Driven to debt by the increasing burdens, the poor peasantry mortgage their holdings and lose them to the moneylender or rich peasants. In the twenty years from 1901 to 1921 in the province of Madras, according to the Indian statistician Pillai, the number of non-working landowners and tenants, *i.e.*, receiving rent, increased from 2 per cent. to 7.7 per cent. of the agricultural population; the number of working landowners, *i.e.*, small peasant proprietors, decreased from 48.4 per cent. to 38.1 per cent.; the number of working tenants and labourers increased from 49.6 per cent. to 54.2 per cent. "The tendency in the village now," declared the evidence of the Agricultural Commission, "is for people to be partially cultivators and partially labourers." The landless proletariat, working for wages, increased from 7½ millions in 1881 to 21 millions in 1921, as against 74 million "ordinary cultivators," and 3½ millions living on rents. But even of the "ordinary cultivators" it is estimated that an increasing proportion, which has been placed as high as fifty millions, eke out their living by working partly as wage-earners.

All this situation bears in an extreme form all the characteristics of a rapidly intensifying drive to agrarian revolution. And it is on top of this situation that the world economic crisis has fallen with its ruinous collapse in the prices of the peasants' products. The question of agrarian unrest has come to the front with new intensity. Already in the previous revolutionary wave of 1919-1922 the Moplah rising (suppressed with over 3,000 killed), and the Akali Sikh movement, attested the extent

of peasant revolt; while it was the successful attack on the rural police post at Chauri Chaura that led to Gandhi's significant retreat. Between 1921 and 1928, declares the Simon Report, there have been cases of agrarian disturbances in which "opposition to land revenue policy has expressed itself in a form that threatened a complete breakdown of authority." Local disturbances and suppressions with police and armed forces have been ceaseless. But the new intensity of a gathering wave has shown itself since the past two years.

By the beginning of 1929 Professor R. Mukerji, of Calcutta University, reported that the worsening of the peasants' conditions was pointing straight to "catastrophe" and "agrarian revolution" if energetic measures were not taken (*Calcutta Forward*, 17.3.29). Already in the *Indian Economic Journal* for April, 1928, he had described the spread of local peasants' unions all over the country, and their campaigns, in many cases with successes, against the landlords, against forced labour, etc. The *Times* of June 19th, 1929, writes that the conventional peaceful picture of the Indian peasantry is no longer accurate; the awakening has begun. During 1929, reports from many localities of peasants' conferences, of resolutions, of the election of peasants' committees (sometimes under the control of the Congress, but sometimes with open criticism of the Congress leadership), begin to be frequent in the Indian press. The still scanty reports of the battles of 1930 show that, in addition to the movement of revolt in the Punjab and border districts around Peshawar and the "Red Shirts," local outbreaks of varying degrees of intensity have developed in many parts.

But it is the necessary characteristic of any peasant movement that, consequent on their scattered position, they cannot independently realise the political conditions for their final success, but can only look to an outside centralised force to unite their struggle and realise their demands. The question of THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PEASANTRY IS THE DECISIVE FACTOR FOR THE BASIS OF POLITICAL POWER IN THE PRESENT STAGE IN INDIA. Three alternative forces exist which seek to win the

support of the peasantry — imperialism, the Indian bourgeoisie, and the Indian proletariat. Whichever of these can win the effective leadership of the peasantry holds the future in India.

Imperialism is powerless to solve the growing agrarian crisis, because it depends for its rule in India on the support of the landowning class, and cannot dispense with this prop. For this reason, it cannot touch the root issues of the agrarian question, or arrest the growing crisis. On the contrary, its own needs of revenue lead to continuous raisings of the land assessments, provoking continually fresh resistance of the peasantry. The appointment of the Royal Commission on Agriculture in 1926, and its voluminous report in 1927, showed the consciousness of imperialism of the all-importance of the agrarian question; but the Commission had to be explicitly forbidden in its terms of reference from touching on questions of land ownership and land tenure, and was thus reduced to complete unreality in its treatment (*e.g.*, the problem of the sacred cow had to be put forward as a principal cause of agrarian decay!) Not having the possibilities to act in this direction, imperialism was confined to very limited reform measures; a stingy measure of irrigation works, mainly throwing extra burdens on the peasantry and benefiting only a few richer peasants; some experiments in co-operative schemes, marketing, etc., again mainly benefiting the richer peasantry; and some measures limiting excessive users' interest (*i.e.*, against too much of the spoils going to the small village user instead of to British capitalism). For the wider issues, imperialism aims at the consolidation of holdings, *i.e.*, the accelerated expropriation of the poorer peasants, as in the bill brought in by the Bombay Government, which would have expropriated a very large number of the poorer peasants by enforced buying out; but this aroused the intense opposition of the mass of the peasantry, and the bill in question had in fact to be withdrawn.

The Indian bourgeoisie, which leads the existing Nationalist movement, is also powerless to solve the agrarian crisis. For the Indian bourgeoisie is closely interlocked with the landowning class, and its interests are bound up with the exploitation of the peas-

antry, being only opposed to the fruits of that exploitation passing to imperialism; with the consequence that it is determined not to set itself in opposition to the interests of the landowners (indeed, it is not even prepared to set itself in opposition to the feudal princes, obvious puppets though these are of British rule), or to attempt any basic change of the land system. On this rock the movement of 1919-22 broke down. The Indian bourgeoisie can only put forward to the peasantry an empty propaganda of the "Charka" type. Of late years the National Congress, not less than imperialism, has been giving increasing attention to the peasantry and the question of the agrarian problem; but, no less than imperialism, it is limited to the proposal of small reforms, without touching the root issues of land ownership. The increasing direction of policy towards the villages is shown in such indications as Gandhi's much-advertised tour of the villages in 1929, the holding of peasant conferences under Congress auspices, the organisation of unions, and even the leading of limited actions, as at Bardoli in 1928; but the whole drive of this policy has been towards limiting and restricting the action of the peasants, opposing the raising of wider issues, preaching subordination to the Congress, etc. The emptiness of the programme put forward is shown by the points recounted by Gandhi as those put forward by him in his tour of the villages (*Young India*, 25.4.29). These constituted: (1) boycott of foreign goods; (2), wearing of home-woven cloth; (3), against untouchability; (4), against Hindu-Moslem strife; (5), against drink; (6), no class struggle; all differences to be settled peacefully through the local authorities. The last point in this programme, in particular, makes clear the subordination to the interests of the landowners; as with imperialism, so with the Indian bourgeoisie, the sacred interests of existing land ownership cannot be touched; and therefore no expression can be given to the vital needs of the masses of the peasantry.

The third alternative force in the situation is the industrial proletariat. Here for the first time is a basically different factor; for the industrial proletariat has alone no interest in the exploitation of the peasantry, but is on the contrary by the necessary character of its posi-

tion and struggle the leader of the fight against all monopoly and exploitation. The industrial proletariat can thus alone set without reserve on its programme the abolition of all rents, feudal dues and indebtedness, and the conquest of the land for the working peasants and therefore can alone lead the peasants' struggle for liberation from the feudal-imperialist yoke.

But the Indian proletariat in large-scale industry is still small, relatively to the size of the country; and, although advancing in the development of class-consciousness and fighting unity at a very great pace during recent years, and already with a heroic record of prolonged class struggles, is not yet sufficiently politically conscious, organised and aware of the importance of independent political leadership. This is the crux of the problem of the present period. The advance of the proletariat to political consciousness and organisation is also the condition of the advance of the national struggle. But the present crisis of national struggle and mass struggle has broken out BEFORE the proletariat was strong enough to play an effective leading rôle.

Can the proletariat now advance sufficiently and find the way, **IN THE CONDITIONS OF THE PRESENT STRUGGLE**, to take the lead and guide the movement forward to new revolutionary forms, away from the dead throttling hands of the bourgeois leadership, **BEFORE THE PRESENT WAVE HAS SUBSIDED**, so that the inevitable bourgeois betrayal shall lead, not to collapse, but to a higher stage? This is the problem of the present moment. To answer this question, it is necessary to estimate the present degree of development, both politically and in organisation, of the Indian proletariat.

(To be continued.)

THE FIVE YEAR PLAN OF THE SOVIET UNION

G. T. GRINKO.

(Vice-Chairman, State Planning Commission of the U.S.S.R.)

"Russia," says the ECONOMIST, "is making an experiment which is of intense interest not only to herself but to the world at large."

What is this experiment?

It is called the "Piatiletka"—the Five Year Plan of building up a new industry and a new agricultural system—a gigantic effort of a nation covering one-sixth of the world's surface to push through an industrial technical revolution in five years under entirely new methods of State control.

In this book one of the leaders responsible for carrying out the Plan writes in detail of its economic and political meaning, and gives figures of the achievements up to the end of the second year.

GET
IT



340 pages. 8vo.
Cloth edition. Eight
illustrations, charts
and a map. 8/6.
\$3.50 Colour jacket.
Paper Board
Edition. \$2.00.
Colour cover. 5/-.

MARTIN LAWRENCE LTD.

26 Bedford Row, London, W.C.

or

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 4th Avenue, New York.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY AFTER THE ELECTIONS

By ERNST THÄLMANN

THE Reichstag elections in Germany on September 14 were held under the shadow of the growing *crisis* of the capitalist system. Three million unemployed, two million on short time, the capitalist Government conducting a starvation offensive against all sections of workers, from the unemployed, factory workers, clerical workers, petty officials and the impoverished middle classes right to the creative agricultural population; desperate attempts on the part of the bourgeoisie to bring about by fascist methods a "capitalist solution" of the crisis at the expense of the workers—all these factors gave to the election struggle, as well as the elections themselves and the results, a special character.

If we consider the situation in Germany to-day, we can see that it confirms, in a complete and striking fashion, the analysis of probable development made by the German Communist Party at its Congress in Wedding, and ratified and extended at the Tenth Plenum of the Comintern. The transformation of the economic crisis into a political crisis of the capitalist system, is taking place extremely rapidly in Germany. Millions of workers who, a few months ago, had not the least doubt that the bourgeois capitalist order of society was truly "ordained by God," are now questioning that system and *rebelling* against it, even if in a confused and muddled way. Millions of people who are still outside the Communist movement are trying to find a way out of more misery and the catastrophe of present-day capitalism.

This provided the social basis for the elections of September 14 and, indeed, for the whole election struggle which took place in Germany. And it was this basis which determined the results of the elections. The chief fact which emerges from a consideration of the election results is the overwhelming victory of the Communist Party of Germany. This victory, which is in no way weakened or minimised by the extraordinary success of the National Socialists, corresponds only to a small extent with the favourable objective situation. The really decisive and important fact is that the

correct policy of the Comintern and the C.P.G., the Bolshevik approach to the masses which was demanded of the German Party at the Wedding Congress and which the Party carried out under the leadership of the Central Committee, created the conditions necessary for the Party to win over the majority of the proletariat.

* * *

What are the decisive factors in an analysis of the election results? In what lies the tremendous political importance of these elections, which goes far beyond that usually attaching to parliamentary elections? One of the first and most important points is the international significance of the German Reichstag elections and the victory of the Communist Party of Germany. The results were hotly discussed in the columns of the bourgeois press all over the world. Satisfaction was shown only by the Italian fascist press, all other newspapers manifested the greatest uneasiness. The outcome of the election was unanimously attributed to the grave crisis of capitalist Germany, to the poverty and the general discontent of large sections of the population with the policy of the Government. In all cases, too, it was admitted with unconcealed fear that, to a certain extent, the results amounted to a *popular vote against the Young Plan and the Treaty of Versailles*. Even the foreign Liberal press regarded the election results in Germany as an indication of the *bankruptcy* of the parliamentary system and a symptom of the grave crisis within bourgeois democracy.

In regard to the international effects of the elections, the greatest excitement was manifested by the French and Polish press. In France the fear of revenge led to the demand for a more aggressive orientation of French foreign policy. In Poland the Pilsudski press utilised the National Socialist election victory as a weapon in the Polish election struggle, and references to a more aggressive German policy on the eastern frontiers served as the pretext for a widespread fascist-chauvinist campaign.

On the other hand, the foreign bourgeois press treated the success of the German Com-

unist Party as an "indication of struggle and unrest." This is particularly true of the American press. For example, the *Washington Star* wrote :

"It was a black Sunday for Germany. The fascists and the Communists are a thorn in the flesh of every German Government . . . The German Republic is still alive, but there is no doubt that its existence is seriously threatened."*

Another American bourgeois paper, the *Washington Times*, declared :

"The German elections shew that the spirit of unrest, which has raised its head in South America, has also taken root in Europe . . . The serious economic situation, unemployment and heavy taxation have given rise to great unrest among the German people."*

The American *World* wrote :

"In the elections, millions of people in Germany voiced their opposition to the burdens of taxation and unemployment."*

And, finally, the *Herald Tribune* spoke of an "outbreak of desperate discontent with the gloomy economic situation" and of a "spontaneous gesture of protest" against the Versailles Treaty and the Young Plan.

We have already referred briefly to the excitement displayed in the French press. The foreign correspondent of the *Matin* wrote :

"Anarchy in Germany would be fatal to the whole of Europe, to the whole bourgeois world."

The *Journal* contemplates possible developments in Germany in panicky fear :

"What road will Germany take? What will the winter bring? Will it bring bloody conflicts, the violent overthrow of democracy, economic crisis, dissolution of the Reichstag, governmental crisis, anarchy and a *coup d'etat*? All that is the secret of the future."

The English press is chiefly concerned about the internal political effects of the German elections. The *Daily Telegraph* wrote that the elections inflicted on the republican system in Germany a more severe blow than any sustained by a system of government at the present time.

According to the *Daily Express*, the election results indicate the "political chaos within a nation which was once the strongest support of order in Europe." The *Morning Post* sees in the election results a grave danger to the capitalist system in Germany.

The Italian press was loudly enthusiastic about the increase in the National Socialist vote. Photographs of Hitler were published in practically all the newspapers. However, the *Messaggero* wrote :

"It should not be forgotten that any Party which grows in strength, is also assuming greater responsibility and will be compelled to change and to moderate, if not its programme, at least the methods of applying it."

The *Corriere della Sera*, during the course of the election campaign, wrote :

"The Communists are displaying feverish activity. Red is the dominating colour in the streets. Communist women in flaming red blouses are to be seen everywhere—a sort of Muscovite Women's Battalion."

The Czecho-Slovakian *Prager Presse*, significantly enough, headed its leading article on the German elections: "Revolutionary Germany." The Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung*, the Austrian Social Democratic newspaper, made a painful effort to disguise the election defeat of German Social Democracy, but wrote, nevertheless :

"The fact which gives most food for thought in yesterday's election results is that the German youth for the most part voted Fascist or Communist."

The Vienna Social Democratic *Abend* goes considerably further in its admissions, writing :

"The victory of the Communists, we should not omit to mention, is to be attributed in large part to serious mistakes on the part of the Social Democrats . . . In its anxiety to be constitutional, the Social Democratic Party, it must be admitted, has gone further than was permissible. It is paying now for the valuable services which for two years it rendered to the bourgeoisie as the leading party of the coalition."

We have deliberately quoted at this length from the remarks of the foreign capitalist press on the German election in order to illustrate the international importance of the German Communist Party's election victory. In these elections, the German Communist Party dealt a serious blow, not only at the German Social Democratic Party, but also at the whole Second International. It is no accident that, in view of this victory, the Polish reactionaries fear an increase in the Communist vote in the forthcoming Polish elections. *The votes cast on September 14 were a mighty mass declaration in favour of the Communist International and the Soviet Union on the part of millions of toilers.*

Let us now consider the numerical results of the election. In the Reichstag elections of 1928, the Communist Party polled 10.6 per cent. of the total votes cast. In 1924, at the May elections, the percentage, in consequence of inflation and the revolutionary events of 1923, was 12.6. But even this figure was exceeded in the present elections, when the Communists received 13.12 per cent. of the total vote. Of course, the percentage varied in different districts and

* Retranslated from the German.

towns. Berlin took the lead, with 33 per cent. of the total vote. Düsseldorf East came next (this is partly in the Ruhr, and partly in the Lower Rhine district), then Halle-Merseburg, etc. The lowest place is occupied by Bavaria where the Communist Party only received 4.8 per cent. of the total vote. These figures show that the Communist Party made great progress, not only in the increase from 3.2 to 4.6 million votes, but in being able to increase its proportion of the total votes cast, despite the heavier poll.

The particular importance of the Party's election success lies in the fact that the greatest advances were in the decisive industrial centres. In Berlin, the German capital and the seat of the bourgeois Government, in Düsseldorf, engaged in heavy industry, in Halle-Merseburg, an important centre of the chemical industry, and in several other industrial towns the Communist Party defeated the Social Democrats, the Fascists, and all the bourgeois parties, receiving more votes than any other party. In Berlin particularly, where the Party beat the Social Democrats for the first time, and in a number of working-class districts, where the Social Democrats were stronger at the time of the municipal elections but lost their place to the Party, at the Reichstag elections, the success of the Party—at the expense of the reformists—was overwhelming.

Of course, the significance of the Communist Party's success is considerably heightened by the fact that it was gained at the cost of the Social Democrats. This marked a great turning point, the beginning of a historic change in the relation of forces within the German working-class movement, a change in favour of the Communist Party. The losses sustained by the Social Democratic Party are evidenced not merely in the absolute decrease in votes, but more particularly in the relative decrease, as calculated on the considerably heavier poll.

When this factor is taken into consideration, the S.D.P. lost, not 13, but 38 seats, as against its former proportionate representation. In the previous Reichstag the Social Democrats held 31 per cent. of the seats—almost a third; now they have 25 per cent.; that is a quarter. The 600,000 votes which the S.D.P. lost were transferred almost entirely to the Communist Party. In addition to this 600,000, it is clear that the Communist Party received the votes of *several*

hundred thousand Social Democratic factory workers and unemployed, while the S.D.P. made up for this with the votes of petty bourgeois elements formerly adhering to the Democratic Party. This has changed the social structure of both Parties, the Communist Party of Germany has extended its proletarian basis, the Social Democratic Party is becoming increasingly bourgeois.

Particularly revealing is the fact that the S.D.P. sustained this defeat although it had left the Government coalition about six months previously and could therefore enter the election struggle in somewhat more favourable circumstances than if it could have been held directly responsible for the policy of the Brüning Government. But the sham opposition maintained by the Social Democratic Party could not prevent the Communist Party from making breaches in the reformist ranks and from winning numbers of Social Democratic workers away from reformism and into the revolutionary camp. This is an important and instructive fact.

The success of the Party was not confined to its victory over Social Democracy, although in that victory—since it was won against the principal enemy within the workers' camp—lies the greatest significance of the election results. The Party also made great progress in *winning over or neutralising the middle class strata*. It was clear at the meetings which were held before the elections that the Party was beginning to penetrate among the hard-pressed strata of the middle class in the towns and among the working peasants in the rural areas.

At these elections, too, the fight against the Centre Party, was taken up seriously for the first time, although to an insufficient extent. In Germany's recent political development the Centre Party, with the weakening of the People's Party, has become the leading representative Party of the German bourgeoisie. Religious discipline and the influence of the Church on the Catholic adherents of the centre have made the Centre Party suffer less from the general process of fermentation and decay than any of the other old traditional Parties. Consequently, the Centre Party increased the number of its votes at the elections, although it lost in proportion to the total poll.

Even against the Centre Party, the Communist Party has successes to record. In Essen, for example, the capital of the Ruhr district, where the centre is the strongest Party and where, at the last elections, the C.P. polled 67,000 votes as against 95,000 votes for the Centre, the Communists received now 89,000 votes, while the Centre Party polled 98,000 votes—a small increase considering the greater number who exercised the franchise. The Social Democratic vote fell from 60,000 to 50,000.

This examination of the election results reveals a few serious weaknesses in the Party. It is true that the Communist victory of 1930 differs essentially from that of 1928, in that the successes achieved in 1928 in such districts as Berlin were accompanied by serious losses in other districts, chiefly agricultural areas, such as South Germany, while in 1930 the Communist Party advanced in all districts. But in spite of this general positive advance, the results in some districts, particularly East Prussia and Silesia, were unsatisfactory. In East Prussia, it is true, the Communist vote increased from 95,000 to 125,000; but since the Social Democrats lost 46,000 votes, it is clear that we did not rally the votes of all those who had given up the S.D.P., not to mention the young electors and those who formerly voted for the bourgeois Parties; even some Social Democrats, therefore, voted Fascist. The position in Silesia was similar. These weaknesses were obviously the consequence of sectarian vacillations, as was evident in the whole activity in these districts, and was particularly shown in the case of Merker.

Now as to the importance of the National Socialist vote. Can this numerically extraordinary vote increase be put on a level with the success of the Communist Party? Not in the east. Actually the success of the National Socialists represents a sort of *regrouping within the bourgeois camp*. The National Socialists received a large number of votes formerly given to the German Nationalists and the Peoples Party, as well as a large proportion of the votes cast by those who had not previously taken part in elections. As far as Parliament is concerned, the position now occupied by the National Socialists is similar to that held formerly by the German Nationalists; they have become *the strongest bourgeois Party*.

Under the influence of the crisis, the decay of bourgeois society and the mass poverty imposed by the Young Plan, greater and greater numbers of workers are aroused to opposition against the capitalist system and concurrently against all those Parties which have openly revealed their capitalist character. This explains the desertion from the old bourgeois Parties. In order to prevent these masses from taking the road of Communism and entering the camp of the proletarian revolution, the bourgeoisie played its last card—the National Socialist Party, with its unscrupulous national and social demagoguery. Its job was to win back the masses and bind them once more to the chariot of capitalism. This is the service which the Hitler Party has to render to capitalism. And the elections of September 14 show that the National Socialist Party is doing its very utmost to fulfil this function.

On the other hand it is clear that this was a *dangerous* card to play. The contradictory social composition of the National Socialist Party and its adherents, made up of the most varied elements from among the middle classes and the rural population, the students and clerical workers and a number of backward workers, means that the Party from the outset carries the germ of decay within it. There is no doubt that the symptoms of decomposition which were clearly manifest before the elections will become more prominent after the elections as the approach to governmental position compels Hitler to damp down his agitation (as expressed in the opinion already quoted from the Italian fascist *Messagero*). In this respect everything depends on the activity and militancy of the Communist Party in its fight against Fascism.

The election results in Berlin indicate the possibilities which exist for the Communist Party's political and ideological struggle against the National Socialists. In Berlin the National Socialists came out relatively less successfully than in the rest of Germany. The reason is obvious. In Berlin, as *the seat of the Central Committee*, the important decisions of the Politbureau on the struggle against Fascism, which were later ratified at a plenary session of the Central Committee, were *more rapidly* translated into action than elsewhere, and were more quickly made effective by the Party locals. It is clear that had the decisions of the Polit-

bureau been carried out in similar fashion all over Germany, without any loss of time, the increase in the Fascist vote could have been considerably lessened. In any case, the Berlin example shows the possibilities open to the Party on the basis of its correct policy.

In face of the National Socialists' election success, the Communist Party has to fight against *two tendencies* apparent among the masses—and in some cases within its own ranks. There are, in the first place, indications of a feeling of panic, an over-estimation of the fascists' success, particularly among Social Democratic workers, and in the second place, there is an under-estimation of the fascist danger, which may give rise to a lack of militancy in the workers' attitude towards fascism. In this respect, too, the S.D.P. is trying to arouse extremely dangerous sentiments among the workers by predicting that the National Socialists will mismanage their job and that then the S.D.P. will again come to the helm. The Communist Party of Germany is directing a bitter struggle against this narcotic propaganda of the Social Democratic lackeys of fascism.

The success of the National Socialists has also refuted the arguments of those comrades within the Party who maintained that the Party's election fight was conducted too much against the National Socialists, thus weakening the struggle against the S.D.P. The contrary is true. Precisely in this, in making capitalism and the bourgeoisie the chief enemy and in fighting against fascism, we demonstrate to the workers that the Communist Party is the only anti-capitalist and anti-fascist Party, under whose leadership they must unite for the struggle against capitalism and fascism. The anti-fascist fight of the Communists is also a powerful lever for establishing the proletarian united front with Social-Democratic workers and for winning them away from social-fascism. Our fight against social-fascism does not, and should not, consist merely of an abundance of agitational attacks on Social Democracy, but of a completely revolutionary, anti-capitalist and anti-fascist policy.

An important—and, indeed, the *sharpest*—weapon in our struggle against the fascists was the "*liberation programme*" of the C.P.G. The striking political success which the Party achieved with the *Central Committee's declara-*

tion of the programme for the national and social struggle for the liberation of the German people, once again emphasises the contention made at the last plenary session of the Central Committee, that the slowing down in the Party's struggle against the Young Plan in the past, unnecessarily delayed the advance of Communism in Germany. If that slowing down had not occurred, the Party would to-day already have made more exposed the demagoguery of the National Socialists than it has so far succeeded in doing.

The liberation programme of the C.P.G. was of decisive importance in the Communist victory, not only in relation to our fight against the National Socialists, but in every other respect too. In that programme the Party showed the masses, in a simple and popular form, the way out of the threatening catastrophe of capitalist bankruptcy. In that programme it was demonstrated that only Communism can rescue the masses from poverty and the slavery of the Young Plan. In that programme the necessity of the proletarian dictatorship was brought home convincingly to millions of workers. *The programme of liberation mapped out the road of struggle for a Soviet Germany.*

While the Party concentrated its struggle on this programme and its popularisation, the election agitation and propaganda was conducted more than at any previous election on the basis of a clear exposition of the principles of our revolutionary path, without the slightest concession to parliamentary illusions.

This method of conducting the election struggle, accompanied by an unambiguous declaration of the Communist Party's goal—the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship—completely answered the requirements imposed by the historical conditions in which the Party entered the struggle. The economic and political crisis of the capitalist system, bringing with it the ideological and political disintegration of society, the radicalisation of the masses (within the working-class and beyond into the ranks of the petty bourgeois classes), and the sharp accentuation of class contradictions—this situation demanded an intensification of our revolutionary agitation and propaganda, a bold offensive and a spirited drive forward.

The Party's liberation programme, as the central point of all our agitation and propaganda,

answered this requirement. It is clear that such a programme of national and social liberation, in view of the profound bitterness experienced among the masses about the double slavery imposed by the imperialist powers and the German bourgeoisie, must now, after the elections, become the rallying centre of the revolutionary class struggle of all workers.

The outcome of the German elections has thoroughly confirmed the predictions about developments in Germany made by the C.P.G. and the C.I. at the time of the May Day struggles in 1929. The barricade fighting at Wedding and Neuköln was indeed the signal of an historical turning point and mark of the approaching revolutionary wave. The developments in Germany have completely refuted all those who cast doubt on or watered down the perspective pointed to by the Communist International. 4.6 million Communist votes, the victorious advance of the C.P.G. against reformism in the struggle for the majority of the working-class—that is a clear reflection of the upward revolutionary wave; and, on the other hand, the breakdown of the old bourgeois parties and the growth of the National Socialists indicates the crisis in the capitalist system. For the time being a part of the desperate and embittered masses have been deceived by the phrases of the Hitler Party, but the process of fermentation, of rebellion against the capitalist system, has already gone so far that sooner or later they will see through the hypocritical rôle of National Socialism.

It is in accordance with the extreme accentuation of class contradictions that the class forces are aligning themselves more and more clearly and unmistakably on either side of the front—on the one side the camp of the working-class, mobilised on the Communist Party's liberation programme; on the other side the bourgeois camp, aiming at open fascism and the most extreme counter-revolution.

As the State machine becomes increasingly fascist, as the approach to the National Socialists and German Nationalists becomes closer, the bankrupt bourgeoisie itself, which has done with its old methods of ruling by bourgeois democracy and constitutionalism, raises clearly and openly the decisive question—*Fascism or Communism*.

The millions who, on September 14, declared themselves for Communism, will now set about

winning further thousands and millions for the fight against fascism, against the capitalist system and the robbery of the Young Plan. 4.6 million votes for the C.P.G. : that means a new and grave responsibility, greater obligations to the masses. In defending the vital interests of the workers in town and country, the German Party will march forward, on the basis of its brilliant election victory and with the utmost exertion of all its forces, along the road of revolutionary mass struggle.

Is the German Communist Party able to answer the requirements imposed by the growing reaction and the development of fascism—however the bourgeois coalition Government may be formed? One of the first tasks of the Party, in evaluating the lessons of the election struggle and of our revolutionary mass work as a whole, is the application of a truly *bolshevik self-criticism*. The Party must sharply criticise the defects and inadequacies which were made apparent in the course of the election fight, particularly the delay in beginning mass agitation and revolutionary election work in the factories.

Only by such open self-criticism can the Party succeed in developing within itself and among the masses those creative forces which are necessary to fill up all the gaps in the proletarian ranks and to increase the fighting strength of the Party.

In the elections we did not have at our disposal as the Social-Democrats and fascists did, thousands of pounds from trade union funds or the pockets of the employers. We did not have, as the other parties had, the radio, aircraft and thousands of newspapers. We entered the struggle quite poor, and we financed our agitation by the pennies of the workers. The Red Election Helpers, the Red Front Fighters, the Young Communist League, the Red Sportsmen, and all revolutionary mass organisations helped us to achieve victory.

But it is precisely the victory of the Party which shows the great disproportion between its political influence, which has increased tremendously and is growing greater from day to day, and the inadequate organisational consolidation of that influence. This must be rectified immediately. The Party must do everything in its power which will enable it to translate its political influence, its 4.6 million votes, into militant action. One of the first and

most decisive measures is to increase and to improve our factory cells and to give them a comradesly and collective spirit.

Another extremely important task is the building up and political development of the revolutionary trade union opposition by new methods which correspond to the new situation which is developing. The Party is now intent on introducing a change in regard to trade union questions. We must give stronger political and organisational unity to the revolutionary trade union opposition. In accordance with the decisions of the Fifth R.I.L.U. Congress intended to improve organisation, membership cards will now be issued.

Together with our practical leadership of the economic struggles of the proletariat we must unite propaganda and agitation for political mass strikes against fascist attacks and State and capitalist reaction. Recruitment for the Party and the Party press, and the development of such methods within the Party as will guarantee that we retain our new members and get rid of fluctuations within the Party—this is our third step.

Greater activity among the unemployed, the middle classes in town and country, the black-coated workers, women workers and the proletarian youth—this is the fourth problem confronting the German Party.

Our fifth task is to apply more steadily, more widely and more decisively, the tactics of the united front below in order to win over Social-Democratic workers and those organised in the Christian trade unions. Although fully aware of the victory which our Party has won, we do not for one moment forget that, despite their defeat, the Social-Democrats received millions of votes. We must not on any account leave these workers to the treacherous social-fascists. We must convince these workers, who are looking for a real militant leadership against fascism, that the Communist Party is the only anti-fascist force, the only organiser of the fight against the fascist bandits and the threatening fascist dictatorship. *The thousands of Red Election Helpers must become the basis of a broad, non-party, proletarian mass organisation, a militant alliance against fascism*, opening its doors wide to all workers—Social-Democratic, Christian, non-party—who are willing to fight with us for the defeat of fascism.

Connected with all these questions is the sixth of our tasks—the necessity of popularising among the masses, more vigorously than during the election, all the points in the programme of liberation.

This, in brief outline, sums up the most important tasks of the Party arising from the lessons of the September elections. If the C.P.G. masters these tasks and thus eliminates the weak points in its revolutionary mass work, it will be able to carry out its great historical duty as the leader of the proletariat and of all workers in the forthcoming struggles.

More acute and more bitter than ever before are the questions confronting the German workers. The burden of the Young Plan becomes more unbearable from month to month and from week to week. Whether the bourgeoisie rules with the National Socialists, whether for the time being it again draws Social-Democracy into open coalition with the Government, whether it allows a reactionary minority government of the Brüning type to rule, excluding Parliament more and more, one thing remains sure: growing reaction, brutal attacks on the workers, greater exploitation and oppression will determine the policy of the bourgeoisie.

Only in revolutionary mass struggle, utilising the economic struggles for wages and bread, developing into political mass strikes against the fascist dictatorship of finance capital and its servants, can the German working-class counter the blows of the capitalist oppressors. The German Communists will do their utmost to develop and intensify this revolutionary mass struggle. We unfurl the banner of Communism and carry it before the workers. We explain the lessons provided by the heroic work of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union, a great and stirring example to the workers of Germany. We shall light a burning fire of passionate enthusiasm for the only way out of hunger, wretchedness and slavery—for Soviet Germany.

This is our road. In fraternal unity and under the leadership of the Communist International, the C.P.G. will advance at the head of the workers and organise the fighting front which will crush the capitalist system, annihilate fascism, get rid of Social-Democracy and achieve the victory of the proletarian revolution, the victory in the fight for freedom.

THE DEVELOPING CRISIS IN GERMANY AND THE WORKERS' COUNTER-OFFENSIVE.

IN Germany, the economic crisis is rapidly being converted into a political one. The elections on September 14th, in which the Communist Party achieved a brilliant victory, winning over some 800,000 working class votes from the Social-Democrats, and in which the National-Fascists, owing to their anti-capitalist and anti-Young Plan demagoguery succeeded in conquering millions of petty-bourgeois votes from the openly capitalist Parties, are a sign that the wide masses of the people have lost all faith in the contemporary capitalist Republic of Germany.

The strike of the 130,000 Berlin metal workers, developing within a month of these elections, has demonstrated that the proletarian masses of the capital of Germany are prepared not only to vote for the Communists, but to enter into struggle under their leadership. In this sense it can be said that the strike of October is not less significant than the elections of September. In order correctly to estimate its enormous significance, it is necessary to bear in mind that *for the first time for seven years* the Berlin metal workers almost to a man have entered into a struggle, that the strike has begun on the call of the revolutionary Trade Union opposition against the wishes of the reformist metal Union which was compelled to sanction it only when it had once started (in order more easily to betray it), that the strike from its very inception was not limited to a struggle against a reduction of wages, but took on an offensive character (the demand for the seven-hour working day, equal pay for equal work, expulsion of Fascist spies, abolition of the system of collaboration with the employers), and that the strike at once took on a political character, slogans being put forward at strike meetings, such as "Down with the Famine Government," "Up with Soviet Germany!"

But the strike of the Berlin metal workers is only a *beginning*. The German proletariat and the toiling masses in Germany as a whole are approaching an exceedingly hard winter. There are at present three million unemployed and prospects of an increase to five or six

millions. Brüning has declared that the Government will at all costs carry through its exceptional legislation (emergency decrees)—the "black" tax, the tax on beer, the reduction of wages of employees by 4 per cent., the restriction of unemployment benefits, etc. To this the Government has added a new point, viz.: A 6 per cent. reduction in wages of State and Municipal servants, which is to be followed by a 20 per cent. reduction in wages for all workers. This last item the employers have already begun to put into force, cancelling the old wage scale agreements. It is clear that the movement which has begun in Berlin will extend and embrace enormous masses of the German proletariat. Both the Government and the Fascists are counting on this perspective and the Social-Fascists are preparing for a bloody suppression. Already, in Wedding, the hounds of Zörgiebel have shot down workers as on May 1st, 1929. The Government and the Social-Fascists are preparing to go further. As Minister of Internal Affairs in Prussia has been appointed the notorious Social-Fascist and social-executioner Severing, and the central organ of German social-democracy, *Vorwärts* has had the brutality and cynicism to write in this connection:—

"The present position requires that at the head of the Prussian Ministry there should stand rather a Minister of Police than a Minister for Administration. Decisive resistance must be offered to the forces attacking the State. At such a time, is there anyone who could possibly be more suitable than Severing for the post of Minister of Internal Affairs?"

The National-Fascists for their part are mobilising. Hitler has issued an order: (1), to bring into intensified military readiness all the storm troops; (2), in November to carry through Fascist processions of peasants in the towns; (3), Fascist Deputies in the Reichstag must utilise all possibilities for propaganda among police officers and officers of the Reichwehr; (4) in the immediate future to hold in the whole of Germany at least 20,000 Fascist meetings.

The Communist Party of Germany is faced

with tremendous tasks. Any lagging behind the rate of development of the mass movement can have now the most dangerous consequences.

This first task of the Communist Party, which it has already begun successfully to achieve, is to take on itself the *initiative* in the declaration of strike struggles and independently to lead these struggles, mercilessly chasing out from the leadership the Social-Democrat traitors and saboteurs, explaining to the workers that the adhesion of the Trade Union bosses to the strike movement does not strengthen the latter, but that, on the contrary, as shown by countless experiences, it threatens the whole movement with collapse, for they consciously direct their efforts in order at a suitable moment to bring about the disorganisation of the movement. In the degree that strike struggles are developed and turned into a political direction, the Party must lead the way towards mass political strikes.

The chief task of the Party in the process of developing economic struggles is the conversion into a living reality of the slogan put forward at the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., viz.: "*The conquest of the majority of the working class in the struggle against Social-Democracy,*" in the first place and subsequently the struggle with the Parties of the Centre and of the Fascists, in so far as the former has extended its roots among the Catholic workers and the latter among the agricultural workers and, to a certain extent, among the industrial workers. The objective conditions for the fulfilment of this task are very favourable. The crisis exposes the real physiognomy of the various political Parties, the crisis promotes by leaps and bounds the growth of political consciousness among the masses. As a result of the crisis and the treacherous policy of social-democracy, and also as a result of the correct Leninist line of the Communist Party, its persistent struggle with Social-democracy, and with Right and Left deviations, there was already revealed at the elections the first powerful movement of the masses away from Social-Democracy. In the ranks of the Social-Democratic workers, dissatisfaction is more and more frequently becoming evident at the treacherous policy of their leaders. The behaviour of the leaders

of the Social-Democratic Party and of the reformist trade unions in the economic struggles which have begun and which in the near future are to be expected in an ever-greater measure, gives the possibility for exposing them even more completely and of dealing a crushing blow against them.

No demagogic "Left" manoeuvres on the part of the Social-Democrats will now, in view of our vigilance, succeed in covering over the fact that Hilferding, ostensibly to save the appearance of Parliamentarism from the onslaught of the National-Fascists, proposed to his Party that it should itself carry through a "dry" Fascisation of Germany, that Social-Democracy has already gone further than this and through its Zöergiebels and Otto Brauns has already fired upon the workers, that the leaders of the Social-Democracy and trade unions have already voted in the Reichstag for Brüning and his predatory programme, that the leaders of the reformist trade unions were for a long time previous to the elections conducting secret negotiations with the employers (a policy which they are still continuing to carry on after the elections, behind the back of Parliament) in relation to wage reductions, that they have been in conference with them on this subject in the Economic Council, and that for this purpose they have developed the apparatus of compulsory arbitration, etc.

Materials for the exposure of Social-Democracy and for driving home this exposure among the working masses are also sufficiently in evidence. But the present task does not consist merely in strengthening the *political influence* of the Party among the working masses at the cost of Social-Democracy, but primarily in an *organisational consolidation* of this influence. Here there is still a big discrepancy. We shall not be able to lead successfully the struggles of the working class which are now opening out and to maintain this leadership in all the complications of the struggle if we do not succeed in considerably increasing the numerical composition of our Party from the ranks of sympathisers, if we do not penetrate into the factories, especially in the big enterprises, if we do not organise there active factory cells, and if we do not organise Party fractions in all non-Party working class organisations.

The *most important task*, however, which is inexorably dictated by the present situation and which is realisable in the present position consists in making an irreparable breach in the main fortress of Social-Democracy, viz. : in the trade unions. At the present moment, conditions in Germany have fully matured for a turning point in our tactics in this sphere. In Germany, as in Poland, we are immediately faced with the task put forward by the Profintern Congress, "to work determinedly, consciously and untiringly for the organisation and development of the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement," and to direct our policy for the "creation from top to bottom of independent organs of the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement."

In the circumstances of developing economic struggles we must, in agreement with the decisions of the R.I.L.U. Congress, subordinate all our trade union work to one end—the widening and strengthening of the organisations of the revolutionary trade union opposition—with an independent apparatus from top to bottom adapted to the leadership of class struggles. At the present stage we do not call upon the workers to enter the trade unions, we call on them to enter the trade union opposition, we call for the entry into the latter of not only organised, but also of unorganised workers in the capacity of regular members paying membership contributions. We unite all the oppositional forces in the reformist trade unions under the general leadership of the revolutionary trade union opposition. From the further growth of the power and influence of the trade union opposition will come also the succeeding stages.

The independent leadership of economic struggles and the creation of independent organs of the revolutionary trade union movement is an immediate task, not only in relation to industry, but also in relation to the agricultural workers. The Parliamentary elections in the regions with a numerically large agricultural proletariat showed that we obtained there a growth of votes exceeding the increase of our votes in general and that practically everywhere in these regions we won votes at the expense of the Social-Democrats. We cannot, however, be in the slightest degree satisfied with this, if we take into ac-

count that in these regions the Fascists increased the number of their votes twenty to thirty-fold in comparison with 1928, at the expense of the unorganised agricultural workers who were entering into political life for the first time and who are seeking but were not able to find, the correct way out from their intolerable position. The experience in Danzig proves that with greater activity and with correct Bolshevik policy we can make great conquests among even this most backward section of the working class.

Social-Democracy represents our chief enemy in our own house, in the ranks of the working class, and our most dangerous enemy in the ranks of the working class itself is at the present moment the "Left" Wing of Social-Democracy, which by means of Left phrases and manoeuvres attempts to cover up the criminal policy of its Party and to distract the attention of the workers from it. But alongside the Social-Democrats there has grown up outside the ranks of the working class a most important enemy in the guise of the National-Socialists. We have not the least reason for falling into a panic in regard to the huge successes of the National-Socialists in the elections for the Reichstag. We know very well that they owe these successes to utilising the growing dissatisfaction among the petty-bourgeois masses against the contemporary capitalist structure of Germany, and that they diverted this dissatisfaction by the aid of false demagogic, anti-capitalist, anti-Young Plan slogans into a pseudo-struggle with the entente bandits and actually into a struggle with the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the Communist Party.

We also know very well that in the measure that they have been absorbed into the State apparatus of the German Republic, they will become more and more compelled to expose the falsity of their phrases against the Young Plan, and that in the measure of the upsurge of proletarian economic struggles they will more and more expose the falsity of their anti-capitalist phraseology. Nevertheless, as Comrade Thälman has correctly pointed out, it would also be a very great and harmful mistake to underestimate the Fascist danger, and, in the struggle with the National Fascists to rely upon "spontaneity," calculating on their

automatic self-exposure. When they have exposed themselves, and this is independent of whether they do or do not enter in the near future into the Government, they will undoubtedly open out a powerful terrorist crusade against the Communist Party and against the revolutionary proletariat. They are already beginning to do this, and for the Communist Party, directing its course towards a revolutionary solution of the crisis, it is important not only in general to reckon with the relationship of forces, but to do so at the time of decisive struggles, the moment for the onset of which depends not only on us, but on the objective situation. Consequently, the developments of the most energetic struggle against the Fascists, our chief enemy from outside the working class, is just as much an immediate task as the development of the most energetic struggle against Social-Democracy, our chief enemy inside the working class, which by its whole policy has paved the way for the successes of Fascism.

What is the significance of the struggle with Fascism under the present conditions in Germany? It is not merely a struggle with those strata of the population which under all circumstances would be on the other side of the barricades in the event of an immediate struggle of the proletariat for power. If the struggle of the Communist Party with Social-Democracy is at the present time a struggle for the majority of the working class, then the struggle with Fascism is at the present moment to a considerable degree a struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat over the enormous strata of the toiling petty-bourgeoisie of the towns and villages and especially over the poorest elements of different categories whose dissatisfaction is being seized upon by the Fascists. This struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat naturally becomes an urgent task in view of the fact that the German proletariat is approaching the immediate struggle for power. How important this struggle for hegemony is for the outcome of the struggle for power can be judged from the fact that in Germany, with its sixteen million proletarians, the number of "small" people reaches approximately twelve million.

Germany is already faced with the problem—either a fascist dictatorship or a dictatorship

of the proletariat, and the decision on this problem in one or the other direction will depend primarily and chiefly on the extent to which we succeed in the moment of decisive struggles in capturing the majority of the working class, at least in all the decisive sectors of industry, and, in the second place, on the extent to which the proletariat succeeds at this moment in obtaining the hegemony over the toiling strata of the petty-bourgeoisie.

The solutions to these two tasks are intimately bound up with one another. The more we strengthen our position in the proletariat in the process of developing economic struggles, the greater stimulus we give to these struggles, the more we impart a political content to them, so much the more will grow the faith of the toiling strata of the petty-bourgeoisie in the strength of the proletariat and of its Communist vanguard and the more will grow the sympathy of the petty-bourgeoisie in general to it. We recall that Lenin wrote in regard to the strike wave of 1912:—

"The revolutionary strike movement of the Russian workers in 1912 has in the full sense of the word a general-popular character. For, by a general-popular movement must be understood not at all what—under the conditions of the bourgeois democratic revolution—would be agreed to by all the bourgeoisie or even the Liberal bourgeoisie. Only opportunists look upon it in this way. No. A general-popular movement is one which reflects the objective needs of the whole country, directing its heavy blows against the central forces of the enemy which is hindering the development of the country. A general-popular movement is one which has the support and sympathy of the vast majority of the population. Such precisely has been the political movement of the workers during the current year, supported by the sympathy of all toilers and those who are exploited, and by all the democracy, however much it may have been weak, disrupted, beaten down and powerless."

And further, Lenin wrote:—

"We do not at all insist on uninterrupted, long-drawn-out strikes which exhaust the workers. We insist only on uninterrupted development of the revolution. It is necessary to organise shorter strikes. It is necessary sometimes to replace strikes by demonstrations. But the chief thing is, that the strikes, meetings and demonstrations should proceed without interruption, that the whole peasantry and all the troops should know about the stubborn struggle of the workers, that even the most remote villages should see that there is unrest in the towns, that 'their people' are rising, that they are struggling not for mere bread and butter, but for life or death, that they are struggling for a better life, for

increased wages, for the ending of the irregularities and corruption of the authorities, for the handing over of the land of the landowners to the peasants, for the overthrow of landlordism, the monarchy and the Tsar."

In Germany at the present time, we are faced with not the bourgeois-democratic but the proletarian revolution; nevertheless, what Lenin wrote in 1912 about the revolutionary strike in Russia is true also for the present strikes in Germany. This is confirmed by the experience now of the developing strike of the Berlin metal-workers. While the Social-Democratic traitors issue the slogan:—"Not a penny for unorganised 'wild' strikes," the peasants are responding energetically to the call of the strikers for assistance. The strikers go into the villages with empty baskets and return with them laden with flour, bread, potatoes, contributed by the peasants.

It is a matter of course that if the strike, led under slogans embracing the interests not only of the workers, but of wide circles of the petty-bourgeoisie, draws the sympathy of the latter to the proletariat, then, on the other side it can be said that the immediate work of the Communist Party among the strata of the petty-bourgeoisie exposing Fascist illusions, to an enormous extent facilitates the struggle of the proletariat, engendering around it a friendly in place of a hostile atmosphere. But how to carry on this struggle in the ranks of the petty-bourgeoisie? The German Communist Party has already forged a weapon for this struggle and this is the "programme declaration of the Central Committee on the national and social struggle for liberation of the German people."

The task of the Communist Party is in an intelligent fashion to make this programme concrete and to bring it to the consciousness of the widest masses, not only of proletarians but of the petty-bourgeoisie. The Fascists draw these masses into their net by putting forward the slogan of the liberation of Germany from the Young Plan and the Versailles spoliation, by resurrecting the old slogan of "Deutschland über alles." Our task is to explain to the masses that this slogan of "Deutschland über alles" has already been tested by history, that it was precisely under this slogan that millions were swept into the imperialist war which ended in defeat and the

iniquitous Versailles Treaty, that in the victorious countries also which entered the war with a similar imperialist slogan, the proletariat and petty-bourgeoisie masses are now groaning under the burden of extreme want and unemployment, that the only country in which the proletariat and peasantry has cast off the chain of foreign imperialist and internal capitalist slavery is the U.S.S.R. Our Party must accordingly at every step expose the lies of the Fascists, pointing out that they do not intend in fact to struggle against the Young Plan and pointing out the lying character of their anti-capitalist phraseology. The Communist Party must not restrict itself to an agitational campaign against the Fascists, it must organise a broad, non-Party, anti-Fascist bloc, it must at the same time organise proletarian self-defence against the Fascist terror.

The events now opening out in Germany possess an enormous international significance. The votes of 4,500,000 workers given to the Communist Party, which during the elections as never before unfolded its whole revolutionary programme, were votes cast for a Soviet Germany. Moreover, this took place at the same time that all the forces of international counter-revolution are being mobilised for blockade and intervention against the Soviet Republic, where the proletariat is now with magnificent enthusiasm completing the great forward drive for the realisation of the slogan of "The Five Year Plan in four years." Millions of votes cast at the elections for the Communists as well as for the Fascists were votes against the Young Plan and against the Versailles Treaty. This voting, also, took place at a time when France is making desperate endeavours to safeguard and strengthen the whole predatory system of the Versailles Treaty, when for this purpose she is feverishly organising a new anti-Soviet "agrarian entente."

The developing economic struggles in Germany are proceeding in a situation of sharpening world crisis, at a time when according to the theories of the Social-Democrats and Right opportunists an upward surge of the strike movement is impossible. It is clear that this refutation in fact of this nauseating opportunist theory must give an impulse to the

development of economic struggles in all countries now in the throes of the economic crisis. It is not accidental that the workers of Britain, France, U.S.A., Austria, Czechoslovakia and even China, not to speak of the U.S.S.R., are fervently responding to the appeal of the Berlin metal-workers. In regard to the issue of the election in Germany the foreign political correspondent of the *Matin* wrote:—"Complete anarchy in Germany

would be fatal for the whole of Europe, for the bourgeoisie of the whole world." The growth of the political crisis in Germany more than anything else is frightening the world bourgeoisie, in the same degree it gives the international proletariat cause for rejoicing. Consequently it is the task of all sections of the Communist International to mobilise the forces of the international proletariat for the assistance of the German working class.

THE ARAB "LEFT" NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

By MUSTAFA SADI

IN the camp of the Arab Left Nationalists in Palestine (the group of Hamdi-el-Husseini) there is taking place a continuous process of development and change in regard to both organisation and ideology. It is necessary to pay special attention to this process and to examine the causes which are effecting this differentiation among the Left Nationalists of Palestine, so as to be able to determine the policy and tactics which must be followed by the Communist Party of Palestine towards the Hamdi group.

The Hamdi group made its appearance in the political life of Palestine as an independent political group at the Sixth Congress of the Arab Nationalists in 1928. This group represented, on the one hand, the interests of the young Arab industrial bourgeoisie and, on the other hand, the interests of a section of the Arab intelligentsia and of the dissatisfied petty-bourgeois masses. It was founded as a left wing of the Sixth Congress of Arab Nationalists and carried on an active struggle against the right wing of the Congress, representing the interests of the trading bourgeoisie and the landowners.

The Sixth Congress of the Arab Nationalists was a Congress of consolidation of the right wing of the Arab Nationalist movement of Palestine. This consolidation was expressed in the healing of the split between the supporters of the "Supreme Muslim Council" and the opponents of this Council, viz.: the Arab Executive Committee, which previous to the Congress had conducted a policy of "non-co-operation" in relation to British imperialism. At this Congress, the overwhelm-

ing majority altered its relation to imperialism and adopted the following resolution:—

"The ten years' policy of 'non-co-operation' has proved useless for the Nationalist movement. The Zionists are exploiting our position and are more and more drawing closer to the mandatory government. Consequently, it is necessary to alter the policy of 'non-co-operation' in the direction of co-operation with the British, limiting non-co-operation activity to the struggle with Zionism."

When this resolution was voted upon, Hamdi and his supporters entered a strong protest and were almost expelled from the Congress hall, being regarded as "agents of Moscow." After the conclusion of the Congress, Hamdi took up the struggle against national-reformism; he began to edit the paper *Belsirat El Mustakim* ("The Straight Path") and more and more grouped around himself the dissatisfied anti-imperialist intellectuals. This was the first stage in the history of the Arab Left Nationalist movement after the betrayal of the Arab bourgeoisie and the passing of the movement from an anti-imperialist to an anti-Balfour struggle.* This stage lasted till 1930. Its characteristic feature consisted in the uninterrupted struggle of the Left Nationalists with the mandatory power and with national-reformism.

During this period, the Left Nationalists showed a real self-sacrifice and devotion to the National emancipatory movement of the Arab countries. During the rising in Palestine, they played a fairly important part; they were

* The anti-Balfour movement is the Arab national movement which is struggling against the Balfour Declaration, issued in 1917, which allows of the creation of a National Home of the Jews in Palestine.

the first to come forward openly calling upon the Arab masses to struggle first of all against British imperialism and not to allow themselves to fall a prey to the religious and national provocation of the Arab bourgeoisie or Zionist colonisers. On this account they were thrown into prison and their leader, Hamdi, was banished to the town of Nazareth for a period of one year.

The movement of the Left Nationalists raised the prestige of Hamdi in the eyes of the toiling masses who regarded him as their only saviour. Masses of people (mainly intellectuals) incessantly made their way to his place of banishment from all parts of Arabia in order to talk with him and to take his advice. The British imperialists were compelled to "liberate" Hamdi and to dispatch him to his native town of Gaza. The real purpose of this "liberation" was in order to remove him from the town of Nazareth, which is situated on the road to Syria, Iraq and Transjordan, and to banish him further away to this town of Gaza in the remote regions of South Palestine, surrounded by desert, and thus to make more difficult any consultation with him on the part of the leftwardly inclined Nationalist Arabs. These two years of struggle of the Hamdi group for the independence and union of the Arab countries represents, as already mentioned, the first stage in the movement of the Arab Left Nationalists, a stage of unorganised struggle, of individual demonstrations, without a Party, without a programme and without masses.

The second stage of the movement of the Hamdi group was actually a stage which was bound to decide the fate of this group. Hamdi and his supporters stood at the cross-roads, not knowing which side to take, the side of the workers and fellahin Bedouin masses or the side of the national-traitor bourgeoisie. Nor did they know what slogans to put forward; for, indeed, the national-reformists were also making use of the slogans "Isteklaltan" ("Complete Independence") and "Khurea" ("Freedom), which by now had become very cheap. He and his group had to attempt to show that they were different from the camp of the National-traitors. Their endeavours in this direction were expressed in the struggle for the "defence" of

the interests of the Arab workers and peasants, for their "emancipation" from the yoke of imperialism and of the Arab aristocracy. In his interview with the correspondent of the newspaper *Mirat el Shark* ("The Mirror of the East"), Hamdi declared:—

"In order to find a pretext for fighting the National emancipatory movement the imperialists always accuse us of Communism. They accuse us of Communism because we defend the interests of the Arab workers and peasants. They do not understand that the workers and peasants themselves constitute the people, and we are struggling for the emancipation of the people, against imperialism, against the Arab aristocracy which was in the past a weapon in the hands of the Turkish power as it is now in the hands of the mandatory government."

At the time of the summoning of the first Arab Conference, Hamdi immediately became a "proletarian," sending a telegram of greeting to the Conference in which he called upon the Arab workers:—

"Do not allow foreign elements to interfere with your affairs; you must yourselves defend your class interests. You alone represent the basis for the independence of our country."

What do these words denote? They denote that he was desirous of distinguishing his line from the line of the Arab National traitors, that he had begun to struggle for the masses, for the hegemony of the movement of the Arab workers and peasants and petty-bourgeois strata of the Arab population, for squeezing out the influence and leadership of the Palestine Communist Party.

Hamdi, in making this speech, as a man imbued with bourgeois ideology, as a man who came from an aristocratic milieu and who defended landowners' property in the soil, did not agree with the slogan of the agrarian revolution, considering that this slogan was "premature" and that it was sufficient at the present time to restrict oneself to promises of definite reforms for the Arab fellahin, such as the abolition of "ushor," "humsa," etc. For a long time he wavered on this question. He took up a completely indefinite position in regard to the most serious questions determining the whole course of political events in Palestine, on the basis of which incessant conflicts were arising and which led to the rising of the Arabs in Palestine during the course of this year.

At present, the vacillations of Hamdi and his group between the camps of revolution and counter-revolution have ceased. The third stage has now opened in the life and activity of the left Arab Nationalists, the stage of splitting and differentiation. The left Nationalists have separated into a right and left wing. Hamdi is now heading the right wing of the left Nationalists. He has been converted from a "friend of the people" into a friend of the police and Arab compradores, into a lackey of British imperialism. He has refused now to be the secretary of the anti-Imperialist League in Arabia. He now takes up a "distrustful" position in regard to the Palestine Communist Party and demands the imposition of his control over the activity of the Party. He now daily becomes more and more removed from Communism, declaring that Communism in fact represents a danger. He has now taken to entertaining with tea and biscuits the police and spies who come to make searches at his place.

Why has there been a split among the left Nationalists? Why has one section adhered to the workers and fellahin and the other to the National reformists? Undoubtedly, this split has deep-rooted causes, being based particularly on the fundamental formulation in principle of the agrarian question and of the methods of struggle for its decision. In the circumstances of the growing agrarian crisis in Palestine, of the uninterrupted pauperisation of the fellahin masses, of the seizure by the Zionists of the land of the Arab peasants, and of the predatory taxation and merciless exploitation policy on the part of the Arab landowners, it is not possible for Hamdi and his supporters to remain neutral. They must choose for themselves one of two paths, either the land for the fellahin or the land for the landowners. It is on this basis that is taking place the present differentiation of the Hamdi group.

The left wing of the Hamdi group is in agreement with the slogan of "the land to the fellahin." It carries on an active struggle with imperialism and with the Arab landowners. Thus, it has separated from Hamdi and has completely broken away from national-reformism. It has recognised that its aims can only be attained by union with the mass of workers and peasants, only by struggle for

the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry in Palestine.

In order to characterise the ideological position of the left section of the Hamdi group, it is worth quoting the following extract from the article of one who was formerly Hamdi's right hand, an article which appeared in the central organ of the Palestine Communist Party:—"Ilalaman" ("Forward"). Analysing the position of the Palestine fellahin, the writer says:—

"I know of one merchant who made a loan to a single village of the sum of £500 sterling for a period of five years. At the end of the allotted period, this sum had been converted into £1,800 sterling. Owing to the usurious interest, the population of the village was compelled to sell up all its products, and some of them to sell all their possessions, but still they were not able to repay the debt. Our peasantry are dying from famine, the imperialists are sucking their blood, the Arab feudal lords are selling the interests of the people. Only revolution can alter this position."

It is evident from this what a contrast exists in regard to the agrarian question between the right and left wings of the Hamdi Husseini group. The Communist Party of Palestine must draw from it the necessary conclusions in regard to principles and tactics in order that they may adopt a correct position in regard to both wings. The Communist Party of Palestine must now begin an exposure of Hamdi and of all the right wing elements, as capitulators before imperialism and national-reformism, as traitors to the essential interests of the overwhelming majority of the Arab population, *i.e.*, the peasant masses.

Primarily, they must warn the Arab toiling masses against the left phrases which the capitulators will still continue to utilise, at the same time adopting flexible tactics in relation to the left wing of the Hamdi group, drawing them into the work, especially of the League Against Imperialism, utilising them to the maximum extent possible for work among the peasantry and Bedouin masses, assisting them to create broad, mass anti-imperialist organisations and stringently controlling their activities. Only in this way will the Communist Party of Palestine be able to control these revolutionary forces for strengthening its positions among the Arab masses for the decisive struggle against British imperialism, against Zionism and against the Arab feudal and compradore elements.

SABOTAGING THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN
*paving the way for foreign intervention
 in the pay of capitalist powers.*

THE INDICTMENT

in the trial of the counter-revolutionary
INDUSTRIAL PARTY.

The exposure of the elaborate plot against the Soviet Union, more vivid and more dastardly than manufactured "thrillers," will awake the rage of the masses of the world. Detailed proofs of the paid activities of the interventionists and traitors.

MORE AMMUNITION FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE U.S.S.R.

STALIN POCKET SERIES:

STALIN'S REPORT TO THE 16th CONGRESS OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY: His reply to discussion and the Resolution

BUILDING COLLECTIVE FARMS. By J. Stalin (Shortly).

THE LIFE OF STALIN.

Paper and Cloth (coloured covers)

THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN AND THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION.

The self education of millions of workers—real workers' education with all the modern technique for the first time in history.

Pamphlet,

IN SOVIET RUSSIA: Autumn 1930. M. H. Dobb. Illustrated pamphlet.

What the Russians are doing, described by a trained observer, "dumping" theories exposed.

Orders for them will be received where you bought this magazine, or from :—

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS,
 35 East 125th Street, New York,

or

MODERN BOOKS LIMITED,
 16 King Street, London, W, C, 2,