

The Zinoviev Opposition  
A Year of Great Advances  
On the 8th Convention Manifesto

WORKERS OF THE WORLD,  
UNITE!

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



No.

3

FEBRUARY 5, 1935

Price

10c



## VALERIAN KUIBYSHEV

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE C.P.S.U. REGARDING THE DEATH OF COMRADE KUIBYSHEV

**T**HE Central Committee of the Communist Party informs with deep sorrow the Party and working class and all toilers of the Soviet country and of the whole world that Valerian Kuibyshev, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Assistant Chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars of the U.S.S.R., Chairman of the Commission for Soviet Control attached to the Council of Peoples Commissars of the U.S.S.R., died of heart sclerosis on January 25 at 2:30 P. M.

Comrade Kuibyshev died at his fighting post, continuing the strain of great State and Party work up to the last moment of his life.

Comrade Kuibyshev was an exemplary proletarian revolutionist, a follower of Lenin, irreconcilable towards enemies of the Party and the working class, a

self-sacrificing fighter for the cause of Communism.

His revolutionary activities commenced in the period of the first Russian Revolution. In the course of his fighting Bolshevik work Comrade Kuibyshev passed through Tsarist prisons and exiles as a self-sacrificing fighter for the Leninist Party. During the years of civil war Comrade Kuibyshev was one of the most prominent political leaders of the Red Army. As the biggest organizer and leader of the Soviet State and economic reconstruction, Comrade Kuibyshev devoted all his energy to the cause of Socialism.

Comrade Kuibyshev's boundless devotion to the Party, his untiring work for the welfare of the toilers, will serve as an example to millions of proletarians and toilers in their great struggle for the triumph of Socialism.

### STALIN, MOLOTOV, VOROSHILOV, KAGANOVICH, KALININ, ORJONIKIDZE, ZHDANOV AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU AND THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE C.P.S.U., IN OBITUARY OF THE MEMORY OF KUIBYSHEV:

**O**UR Party has suffered a great loss. Death has torn one of the most prominent leaders, a fine comrade and close friend, from the fighting staff of the Party.

Valerian Kuibyshev fought from earliest years under the great banner of Lenin. With untiring hands he worked stubbornly both when the Bolsheviks were an underground Party and at the front of the Civil War, and in important sectors of Socialist construction. As early as 1905 in St. Petersburg, Comrade Kuibyshev actively participated in the Revolution as a Bolshevik. Then he worked in the Bolshevik organization in Siberia as a professional revolutionary. In intervals between repeated terms of imprisonment and exile he conducted leading Party work in the Bolshevik organization in St. Petersburg.

The February Revolution found Comrade Kuibyshev again on the road to exile in the Turukhanski Region. Comrade Kuibyshev was an organizer of the Bolsheviks in Samara, and their leader during the October Revolution.

Comrade Kuibyshev was one of the most prominent political leaders of the Red Army in the fights against the Czechoslovakian legions and Kolchak troupes and later on the Turkistan front. Tireless,

accurate in work, boundlessly loyal to the cause of the proletarian revolution, he was a model outstanding Bolshevik statesman.

Comrade Kuibyshev was President of the Central Control Commission—Workers' and Peasants' Inspection—which was reorganized according to the directions of Lenin. He conducted a consistent and irrecconcilable struggle against all deviations from the general line of the Party. As a great organizer and connoisseur of the economy of our country, Comrade Kuibyshev was at one time head of the Supreme Council of National Economy directing Socialist industry. Then Comrade Kuibyshev was head of the State Planning Commission directing the compilation of the economic programs of the first and second Five-Year Plans. Comrade Kuibyshev's rich experience in organizing and economic work, his wide statesmanlike outlook, were manifested with special clearness as Assistant Chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars of the U.S.S.R.

Comrade Kuibyshev died at his fighting post, working with his entire energy with untiring hands to the last minute of his life. He gave all his life and all his being to the cause of the working class, to the cause of our heroic people.

STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

**T**HE Executive Committee of the Communist International sorrows deeply along with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, all the working class of the U.S.S.R. and the whole International of the Proletariat in the loss of Comrade Valerian

Kuibyshev, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, who died in Moscow, January 25.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

## BIOGRAPHY

**V**ALERIAN KUIBYSHEV was born in Omsk, Siberia, in 1888. He joined the Bolshevik organization in 1904 and carried on active revolutionary Party work in various towns of Siberia and St. Petersburg. He was repeatedly arrested under the Tsars, and was four times exiled.

The February revolution of 1917 found him on the way to exile in a Siberian village. He directed the October Revolution in Samara, and later conducted the fight on the Eastern and Turkestan fronts against Kolchak, in the capacity of a member of the Revolutionary Military Council at the fronts.

Comrade Kuibyshev was elected a member of the Central Control Commission of the Party at the Eleventh Congress in 1922, in 1922-23 he was a Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party, since 1926

he was chairman of the Supreme Council of National Economy, and a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee since 1930. He was Chairman of the State Planning Commission and Assistant Chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars of the U.S.S.R. and the Council of Labor and Defense. After the Seventeenth Party Congress in 1933 he was made Chairman of the Commission for Soviet Control and Assistant Chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars and Council of Labor and Defense.

Comrade Kuibyshev was also a member of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. He was one of the most active participants and organizers of the October Revolution and Civil War, and the biggest organizer and leader of Socialist construction and planning of the economy of the U.S.S.R.

# FROM ACTS OF TREASON TO THE PARTY — TO THE FASCIST-WHITE-GUARD SHOT

WHEN the shot was fired in Leningrad and the leader of the Leningrad workers, the fiery tribune of the revolution, the friend and companion-in-arms of the great Stalin—Sergei Mironovich Kirov—fell, laid low by a bullet, the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R. and the revolutionary workers of the whole world realized one thing clearly, namely, that the shot was fired by a class enemy of the proletariat, a lackey of the fascist bourgeoisie and an agent of international imperialism.

But when further investigations disclosed the whole truth, then proletarian indignation, contempt and hatred knew no bounds. Sergei Mironovich Kirov was assassinated by despicable renegades, traitors and Judases—by members of the former anti-Soviet Zinoviev group who had joined hands with those in the camp of the bloody fascists and White Guards, and had adopted fascist methods of struggle against the Communist Party and the Soviet Government.

The investigation established that “despite the capitulation of the former anti-Soviet Zinoviev group, the underground work of the most active members of that bloc did not cease but continued until very recently” (indictment of Nikolayev and others, as well as of Zinoviev, Yevdokimov, etc.). The contemptible leaders of the group—Zinoviev, Kamenev and others—capitulated in words to the Party times without number, wrote declarations about renouncing their views and their factional struggle, beat their breasts and publicly repented for their innumerable crimes against the proletariat.

Our mighty Party did not without necessity call to mind their past errors and even their treachery and perfidy after they had repudiated them (though the Party never forgot them). The mighty Party of a mighty class, a class that has come to power and is victoriously building socialism and is routing out the remnants of abominable capitalist relations in economy and in the consciousness of the people, this Party treated these people with leniency. But they, the anti-Soviet Zinoviev group, under the guise of agreeing with the Party and its leadership, continued their surreptitious and underground work of vile betrayal of the cause of socialist construction and of the world proletarian revolution. These dishonest and bankrupt politicians, these capitulators and deserters from the front of the class struggle, poisoned everything they touched with their hidden snakelike malice against the Party, against its Leninist leadership and against its brilliant leader, Comrade Stalin.

They were the ones who nurtured the despicable

murderers, the “Leningrad Center”. It was they who over a number of years educated these youths, inculcating into them a lack of faith in the possibility of building socialism in the U.S.S.R., and taught them to shut their eyes to the magnificent victories being achieved by socialism, and to rejoice at the difficulties which arose from time to time in the path of the struggle of the proletariat.

It is they—this vile Zinoviev group of ambitious and dirty politicians, of offended lords, of contemptible cowards and traitors—who, as investigations have established, knew of the terroristic sentiments of the members of the “Leningrad Center” which they had inflamed, and consequently bear, not only moral and political responsibility before the world proletariat and world Communism for the assassination of Sergei Mironovich Kirov, but also responsibility according to Soviet law.

Although not the actual murderers, it was they who incited their adherents in Leningrad on to this ignominious deed by spreading hatred of the leadership of the Party; it was they who corrupted them and brought about their degeneration politically, and thereby urged them on to take to terror against the leaders of the Party and of the Soviet State. “Sentiments of a terrorist character could not fail to grow in this heated atmosphere of hatred toward the leadership of the C.P.S.U. . . .” admitted the recently executed Rummyantsev, member of the “Leningrad Center”, pupil of Zinoviev, Kamenev and others.

Yevdokimov, a member of the Moscow “Zinoviev Center”, made the following declaration to the Soviet High Court (published in *Pravda*, January 16):

“When the charge is laid against us of harboring terroristic sentiments, then I firmly declare: ‘Yes, we must bear the responsibility for this, for the poison with which for a decade we have infected those who surround us, which contributed to the perpetration of the crime, namely, the assassination of Kirov.’”

G. Zinoviev was also obliged to recognize at least his moral and political responsibility for the crime, and declared that, “the Party is absolutely correct in what it says regarding the political responsibility of the former anti-Party ‘Zinoviev’ group for the murder committed. . . .” (From the indictment of Zinoviev, Yevdokimov, etc.)

The military tribunal of the High Court, at its session held January 15-16, established the fact that a counter-revolutionary group existed in Moscow,

headed by the so-called "Moscow Center", of which Zinoviev, Yevdokimov, Nakayev, etc., were members and under whose leadership the counter-revolutionary Leningrad group carried on its operations.

The proletarian court has passed sentence on these traitors, and the masses of people of the U.S.S.R. have fully endorsed the sentence.

As regards those who directly organized the murder, the investigation established that the actual perpetrator of the crime, L. Nikolayev, committed his villainous deed "on the instruction of the terrorist 'Leningrad Center'," which was formed of members of the former Zinoviev anti-Soviet group in Leningrad, and that the aim of this counter-revolutionary terrorist group was to "disorganize the leadership of the Soviet government by acts of terror, directed against the leaders of the Soviet government, by this means to change the present policy in the spirit of the so-called Zinoviev-Trotskyist platform".

The investigation also revealed that, "having lost all hopes of receiving the support of the masses, and being a closed and politically doomed anti-Soviet group", the members of that group "not only turned to the path of direct terror", but "placed their stakes upon help 'from abroad'—upon armed intervention and assistance from certain foreign powers". For this purpose the members of the Leningrad terrorist center of the Zinovievites established contact through Nikolayev with the \_\_\_\_\_ Consul in Leningrad, a former Social-Democrat by the way, who has since been recalled to his country. From him they received financial aid, in return for which they promised to supply the consulate with "materials of an anti-Soviet character regarding the internal situation in the Soviet Union". (Testimony of Nikolayev.)

In his turn the \_\_\_\_\_ Consul promised to establish contact between the "Leningrad Center" of the Zinovievites and the counter-revolutionary Trotsky. This consulate, according to press reports, was that of a small country which is not in a position to prepare war independently against such a mighty and powerful country as the U.S.S.R. The situation becomes clear if, as we have every right to do, we presume that at the back of this small State stands another State, big and powerful, one which considers it its "holy mission" to wage war against the U.S.S.R. and which is preparing to alter the frontiers in Europe by force. "Here", as the *Pravda*, central newspaper of the C.P.S.U., declared on January 5, 1935, "is the essence of the whole affair"!

All these data were ascertained and established by the public prosecutor of the U.S.S.R., and were augmented by the personal depositions of the members of the "Leningrad Center". On the basis of these data, the indictment formulated the general conclusion that "the aims and methods of struggle

of this counter-revolutionary terrorist group in Leningrad fully coincide with the aims and methods of the open enemies of the people,—such as the emigre White-Guardist, landlord-capitalist organizations, 'The Russian All-Army Union', and the 'Brotherhood of Russian Truth' (adherents of Denikin), who openly preach terror, who brought about the murder of Comrades V. V. Vorovsky and P. L. Voykov, and who systematically send their agents to U.S.S.R. territory in order to organize and perpetrate terrorist acts against representatives of the Soviet power".

All these facts, disclosed in court and given widest publicity, render it possible to draw the following conclusions:

1. The history of the development of the Zinoviev factional group shows that it was *the most treacherous and despicable of all factional groups in the history of our Party*.

It was the only group which in its practical activity turned double-dealing into a system. By transforming double-dealing into the *main* method, in its relations with the Party it *thereby took the same path as that taken by the White-Guard wreckers and provocateurs*.

2. The Zinoviev group was the only one in the history of our Party which found it possible to resort to terror, as a method of struggle against the Party and Soviet Power. Fundamentally, *it was a masked form of White-Guard organization, fully deserving that its members should be treated as White Guards*.

\* \* \*

Such are the monstrous facts of perfidy and treachery disclosed by the proletarian court which guards the interests of the proletarian revolution.

"The counter-revolutionary fascist reptiles must be crushed! Death to the murderers and their accomplices, no quarter to the enemies of the people! Greater Party and revolutionary vigilance on all fronts of the struggle of the proletariat and socialist construction! We must take better care of our proletarian leaders!"—such was the unanimous voice of the workers and collective farmers in the land of the Soviets at hundreds of thousands of meetings of protest against the crime committed by the fascist-White-Guard assassins, meetings at which the just verdict of the Supreme Court, which sentenced the organizers and perpetrators of the murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov, was greeted with enthusiasm.

This revolutionary wrath on the part of the workers and collective farmers of the Soviet Union against the fascist-White-Guard scum is shared by the advanced revolutionary workers of the whole capitalist world as well. During these days the editorial offices of Soviet newspapers received numerous letters from groups of workers in various capitalist

countries. Here are samples of what these proletarians write, people who are alien to any sort of hypocritical pacifism, and who approve the measures of revolutionary defense of the U.S.S.R., taken against the fascist barbarism introduced into the land of Socialism by these vile degenerates of the Zinoviev anti-Soviet group:

"Let us answer with two blows for every blow of the enemy. Death to the foes of the working class", wrote workers of Burgdorf (Austria) in a collective letter. "We express in advance our agreement with the sentence to be meted out which the murderers will deserve", wrote some workers from Amsterdam (Holland). "The main thing—no clemency", wrote proletarians of Pas de Calais (France). "From this example we see how dangerous are the last convulsions of the conquered class", wrote workers from Hilka Bitka (Czechoslovakia). "They must be repulsed as severely and consistently as possible, because here it is a question of the fate of toiling humanity." "Every one who was even remotely connected with this murderous crime must be mercilessly dealt with. We greet the decisions of the Soviet government and consider them quite just", wrote workers from Nesseldorf (Czechoslovakia). "We hope that the murderers and those who inspired them will be punished mercilessly in the interests of the proletariat of the whole world", wrote workers from Rotterdam.

Such is the unanimous attitude of the advanced revolutionary workers in the capitalist world to this fascist-White-Guardist Zinoviev brood; such are their demands for the merciless punishment of the enemies of the proletarian revolution. The experience of fascist terror and revolutionary battles has taught them much. Today these workers are far more numerous than heretofore. Today they are to be counted in tens of millions. And soon they will become the absolute majority in the capitalist countries, and then, replying with two blows for every blow of the enemy, they will rise to the victorious battle for power, for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for Soviets. The future belongs to them, the advanced revolutionary proletarians.

Between them and the treacherous leaders of Social-Democracy there is already an impassable chasm. The full depth of this will become apparent if we compare Hitler's paper, the *Voelkische Beobachter*, with the Czech paper, the *Sozial-Demokrat*, the British *Black Shirt* (Mosley paper), with the Labor *Daily Herald*, which, faced with the fact that the fascist-White-Guardist bandits had been executed in the U.S.S.R., found a common language, and united in a common feeling of enmity and hatred towards the fatherland of all toilers, a hatred open and bestial on the part of the fascists, and hypocritically masked on the part of the Social-Democrats, and covered up by phrases about super-class "justice", "humanity" and "benevolence".

We call the attention of the world proletariat to the *Black Shirt*—mouthpiece of the British fascist Mosley—which kissed the lips of the reformist Labor leaders for their slanderous campaign against the Soviet Union, barely covered up by their hypocritical assurances of their "sympathy" for the U.S.S.R. (*Black Shirt*, Dec. 28, 1934).

"The *Daily Herald* has at last summoned up sufficient courage to make some editorial reference to the mass executions that have recently been taking place in Soviet Russia. . . . As the *Herald* says, 'the Russian executions are barbarous and unworthy of a regime which professes to be the most advanced in the world'."

The leaders of the Labor Party and the General Council of Trade Unions have apparently lost the ability to differentiate between revolutionary self-defense on the part of the proletarian State against capitalist barbarism, and White-Guardist-fascist barbarism itself. It is precisely for this that the organ of the British fascists praises them. We shall deal with this subject in greater detail further on.

We call the attention of the workers of the world to the Czech *Sozial-Demokrat* which repeats almost word for word the infamous version spread by the German fascist sheet, the *Voelkische Beobachter*, and which attempts to present the executions of the White-Guardists in the U.S.S.R. as a variation of the events of "June 30".

Of course, the *Sozial-Demokrat* understands quite well (but passes it in silence) that Hitler and Goering instituted the slaughter of the Storm Troop leaders in an attempt to consolidate the bloody dictatorship of monopoly capital, to consolidate its terrorist anti-popular power at a time when there is a rise in the dissatisfaction with the Hitler regime on the part of the deluded masses of the people, at a time when this dissatisfaction is penetrating into the ranks of the Storm detachments themselves.

The proletarian court in the U.S.S.R., on the other hand, has executed an insignificant handful of traitors to the proletarian fatherland, individuals who had no connection with the masses of the people in the U.S.S.R., and who only contrived to make contact with the fascist bourgeoisie abroad, individuals who shot at the leaders of the proletariat, leaders who enjoy the boundless love and confidence of the whole toiling population of the great socialist Soviet Republic.

We also call the attention of the workers to the fact that none other than Emil Vandervelde took first place in this anti-Soviet campaign. He not only repeated the cries about the "barbarism" of the Bolsheviks uttered by his native bourgeoisie and the entire White-Guardist rabble caught in the act of organizing criminal terrorist acts; he not only compared the just act of proletarian revolutionary justice

with the butchery of the bloody Russian autocrat, Nicholas II, but he also utilized his speech in order to attempt to sow discord in the friendly relations between the U.S.S.R. and France. It is well known that German fascism is now straining every effort in order to achieve precisely the aim which the Chairman of the Second International has set himself. We leave it to the proletariat of the world to judge in whose interests this anti-Soviet statement of Emil Vandervelde was made.

But we cannot pass by in silence the fact that *Populaire*, the organ of the French Socialists who have established a united front with the Communists, printed a document issued by the Russian Menshevik-interventionists, who protested hypocritically against the "terror" in the U.S.S.R. and who took Zinoviev, Kamenev and the terrorists under their protecting wing. Has the *Populaire* forgotten that the Russian Mensheviks organized uprisings against the Soviet Government (for example in Yaroslavl, in 1918)? Has it forgotten about the collaboration of the Mensheviks in White-Guardist butchery, when the representatives of the Menshevik Party participated in the "governments" and were even desirable people on the staffs of the tsarist generals who were "liberating" Russia from the Bolsheviks? Is it possible that the facts, exposed in open court in 1930, regarding the wrecking activities of the Mensheviks who established connections with the interventionist bourgeois-landlord "Industrial Party" on the one hand, and with the consulate of a foreign imperialist power, on the other, are already forgotten?

The Russian Mensheviks are consistent: yesterday they were caught red-handed as wreckers and interventionists and today they take upon themselves the role of defenders of fascist-White-Guardist terrorists. Can Leon Blum's sanctimonious and hypocritical explanation of the reasons which led him to print this letter of his "friends—the Mensheviks" satisfy any perplexed French proletarian? Is the fact that the Russian Mensheviks, who are maneuvering in the face of the powerful will of the working masses for a united front with the Communists, signed the declaration issued by a number of "Left" Social-Democratic Parties at the last session of the Executive Committee of the Second International, is this signature enough to explain why this base anti-Soviet document, a document which is only beneficial to the fascists and White-Guardists, was printed on the pages of a newspaper which is for a united front with the Communists? Every conscious proletarian will answer that it is not. This is no justification. It is only a hypocritical excuse which testifies, to say the very least, that the dissemination of anti-Soviet slanders is tolerated. It is an act which is inimical to the struggle of the working class against fascism, the war danger and the capitalist offensive. It is a deed which is inimical to the unity of action of the prole-

tariat and which weakens the proletariat in the face of the class enemy.

The Paris reformist Council of Trade Unions went still further in its anti-Soviet lying campaign and issued a "protest" against the shooting of "a hundred workers" (!) in the U.S.S.R. by sentence of the High Court. The leaders of the reformist unions kept silent when the news arrived that Comrade Kirov had been foully murdered. They kept silent when the French workers were filled with revolutionary indignation against those who inspired and committed this fascist-White-Guard crime.

The Paris reformist Trade Union Council raised its voice only when the sword of proletarian justice fell on the White-Guard terrorists, on the degenerates of the anti-Soviet Zinoviev group, among whom, as is well known, there was not a single worker.

The reformist council rose in defense of these fascist-White-Guard terrorists against the Soviet Union, against the fatherland of the toilers of the whole world!

Such is the class differentiation in connection with the appraisal of the infamous murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov. At one pole—the advanced revolutionary workers of the whole world, together with the U.S.S.R., who are consistently opposed to any and all class enemies of the proletariat. At the other pole—all those Vanderveldes, Otto Bauers, Norman Thomases, and Menshevik interventionists who utilize the still existing pacifist illusions of the toiling masses so as to assist their "native" bourgeoisie and to discredit the Soviet Union. There still exists a broad section of workers, who are wholeheartedly on the side of the Soviet Union, but who are not yet fully convinced of the duplicity of bourgeois justice with its alleged super-class "fairness", who have not yet shaken off their ancient slavish servility to the capitalists and who still allow themselves to be deceived by the odious morals of the christian preachers, who teach them "not to oppose evil with violence" but who at the same time bless the banners of the fascist hordes which advance with fire and sword against the working class quarters.

It is to these honest, misguided proletarians, deluded by the bourgeois and Social-Democratic press, who seek a reply to their quandaries and doubts, that we must patiently explain the substance of these events.

\* \* \*

You, Social-Democratic workers, cannot understand how it is possible that the anti-Soviet Zinoviev-Trotsky bloc, which was at one time a faction within Communism, could take the path of terror and anti-Soviet fascist-White-Guardist struggle against the leaders of the Soviet State and the Communist Party.

Is such a development unexpected or unusual? Of course not. The history of the Communist Parties

has proven that those elements who launch an anti-Party struggle against the Leninist line of the Party and against its leadership, invariably find themselves, in the last analysis—provided they continue to be obstinate—in the camp of the worst enemies of the proletariat.

In the ideological struggle of the revolutionary Marxists against the revisionists and later against the Centrists of Social-Democracy, the great Lenin foresaw, more than 30 years ago, the eve of the revolutionary battles of the proletariat; he foresaw that having sharpened all points of dispute and having concentrated all differences of opinion on points which had an immediate bearing in determining the conduct of the masses, the proletarian revolution would place the Menshevik Party on the other side of the class barricades.

This is precisely what happened. In order to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets, the Bolsheviks had, by means of an armed uprising, to overthrow the bourgeois-landlord government of Kerensky, the government of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries.

Today the proletarians of the whole world should remember that in those decisive days of 1917, the contemptible leaders of the Zinoviev group were not with the insurgent proletariat, but were in favor of agreement with the Mensheviks who, with the Junkers, defended the accursed system of capitalist slavery. What is more, they were a strike-breaking, treacherous and perfidious group. At the time when the Bolshevik Party, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, was preparing to storm the fortress of capitalism in Russia, Zinoviev and Kamenev, who had up to that time waged a sharp struggle within the Party against the armed uprising and against the seizure of power by the proletariat, and who were severely defeated within the Party and its Central Committee, treacherously wrote to the non-Party press and divulged to the bourgeoisie the decision of the Central Committee regarding the armed uprising. Lenin called this a strike-breaking act and direct treason to the proletariat. Lenin gave a popular explanation to the workers of the meaning of the shameful conduct of these cowards and deserters from the front of the socialist revolution.

“Is it difficult to understand,” said Lenin, “that it is permissible to be either for or against a strike *before* the Center comes to a decision on the question, but that *after* a decision has been made in favor of a strike (and an additional decision has been made to conceal it from the enemy), it is strike-breaking then to agitate against the strike? Every worker will understand this.

“Kamenev and Zinoviev have *betrayed* to Rodzianko and Kerensky the decision of the Central Committee of their Party regarding the armed up-

rising and as to concealing from the enemy the preparations for that uprising. . . .”

Lenin demanded the expulsion of the strike-breakers and traitors—Zinoviev and Kamenev—from the Party.

The day after the proletariat had conquered power, Zinoviev and Kamenev repeated their treachery by proposing to cede the power won to the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries by forming a “coalition” government of all the so-called “socialist parties”. They conducted negotiations with the Mensheviks and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and agreed to remove Lenin from the post of chairman of the Council of People’s Commissars and to replace him by the counter-revolutionary Avksentyev or Chernov.

No wonder Lenin did not consider this treacherous line pursued by Kamenev and Zinoviev in the October days to be accidental. It was bound to come to the fore as it actually did in the years when neo-Menshevism began to constitute itself in the Soviet Union under the ideological leadership of Trotzky.

As the great Lenin did in the past, so the great Stalin, who continues Lenin’s work, foresaw, in the theoretical and tactical disputes which took place in the years of the reconstruction period, the inevitable and open transition of the Trotzky-Zinoviev opposition, at that time only a Social-Democratic deviation within the Communist Party, to the class enemy, to the fascists and White Guards.

While in Lenin’s days the main and basic question which divided the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks was that of the dictatorship of the proletariat (and prior to that the question of the hegemony of the proletariat as the embryo of and as the stepping stone to the dictatorship of the proletariat) so later, when the dictatorship of the proletariat had already been won, the basic question which divided the Bolsheviks and the neo-Mensheviks into irreconcilable camps was that formulated by Lenin and brilliantly developed by Stalin, namely, the question of the possibility of building socialism in one country.

“I think,” wrote Stalin in 1926, “that lack of faith in the victory of socialist construction is the basic mistake of the new opposition. It is a basic mistake, in my opinion, because all the other mistakes of the new opposition spring from it. The mistakes of the new opposition on the question of the New Economic Policy, State capitalism, the nature of our socialist industry, the role of co-operation under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the methods of fighting the kulaks, the role and importance of the middle peasants—all these mistakes are the outcome of this basic mistake of the opposition, of their lack of faith in the possibility of constructing socialist society with the efforts of our own country.” (Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 308.)

But whoever denies the possibility of constructing socialism in the U.S.S.R.—and this was the common platform of Zinoviev and Trotzky—must inevitably turn to the path of capitalist restoration, no matter how much he embellishes it with “Left” phrases. This ideological foundation brought about the anti-Soviet demonstration organized by the Trotzky-Zinoviev “opposition” on November 7, 1927, and subsequently the treacherous fascist shot in Leningrad.

The vile chain of treachery, hypocritical double-faced recantations, and unprincipled anti-Party blocs with every fragment of former oppositions, both Right and “Left”, both inside the C.P.S.U. and in the other parties of the Communist International, finally brought this most despicable of all oppositions—the Zinoviev-anti-Soviet group—to establish connections with the terrorist interventionist “Leningrad Center”, which was its own product. Thus was closed this ignominious chain of uninterrupted treachery, brought to a close by laying bare the odious fascist-White-Guardist face of the dregs of the Zinoviev-anti-Soviet group.

But the leaders of Social-Democracy will tell you, Social-Democratic workers, that the Zinovievites and the Trotzkyists are Marxists. And Marxists are opponents of individual terror.

But is it not clear that the counter-revolutionary Zinoviev-Trotzky bloc ceased long ago to be a Marxist group? It uses “Marxist” phrases only to cover up its role of vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and to mask its White-Guard-fascist essence.

From its very inception, the Trotzky-Zinoviev platform contained within itself a poisonous seed capable of developing into White-Guard bandit practice. It made declarations from the very beginning about the “Thermidorean degeneration” of the Soviet Government and of the Party; from the very beginning, while still a faction within the Party, it formulated the famous analogy with a speech made by Clemenceau, the meaning of which was that it planned to stab the Party in the back should intervention take place.

It is, therefore, not accidental, that when the underground anti-Soviet group of Zinovievites became active in the Soviet Union in 1933, the ideological leader of the Trotzky-Zinoviev bloc abroad formulated a thesis on the struggle against the Soviet power by means of violence. On December 7, 1933, a year before the despicable murder of Comrade Kirov in Leningrad, the *Noe Veltblume* printed an article by Trotzky entitled “Two Perspectives of the Soviet Union”. In that article Trotzky openly formulated the question of armed methods of struggle against the leaders of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party.

“In the U.S.S.R.”, he said, “it will be possible to

compel the bureaucrats to hand power over to the proletarian vanguard [*i.e.*, the counter-revolutionary Trotzkyists—*Ed.*] only by the use of force. The lackeys will immediately begin to sing in a chorus that the ‘Trotzkyists’, as well as Kautsky, preach armed uprising against the dictatorship of the proletariat. But let us continue.”

The counter-revolutionary Trotzky explained further on wherein he differed with Kautsky, who called for an armed uprising.

“In any event, it will not be a question of an uprising against the dictatorship of the proletariat, but of removing [by force!—*Ed.*] a malignant sore.”

Thus did Trotzkyism pave the way ideologically for the terrorists!

To coincide with what point did Trotzky time this “removal of a malignant sore”, this disorganization of the leadership of the Soviet Government, to use the words of the indictment against the “Leningrad Center”, by acts of terror directed against the leaders of the Soviet power so as to bring about a change of the existing policy in the spirit of the so-called Zinoviev-Trotzky platform?

To this question the seasoned wolf of counter-revolution gave a clear and unequivocal reply:

“The correlation of forces [necessary for such a murderous act—*Ed.*] will be established by some great historical trial, such as may even be a war.”

This despicable calculation on intervention needs no commentary.

\* \* \*

Your Social-Democratic press is attempting to convince you, Social-Democratic workers, that the murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov is evidence of an alleged accumulation of discontent among the masses of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., bordering almost on a “crisis” in the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is allegedly compelled to resort to mass terror in order to save itself. The workers in all countries will enjoy a hearty laugh at this counter-revolutionary nonsense which the Social-Democratic leaders have clearly hired from the fascists.

The underground anti-Soviet group lived its own life completely isolated from the masses, a life which had nothing in common with that lived by the workers and peasants in the U.S.S.R. The difficulties which faced the construction of Socialism, rallied the Party and the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R. to overcome them as speedily as possible, while these difficulties brought joy to the Zinoviev group and roused them to anti-Soviet struggle. The tremendous successes achieved by Socialism filled the workers with pride in their country and stimulated them to under-

take a still more enthusiastic struggle to build classless society; their effect on the Zinoviev anti-Soviet group was only to embitter them and to urge the most degenerate elements in the group to take to terror, and to establish ever-closer contacts with the fascist bourgeoisie.

The terrorists began to shoot at the leaders of the proletariat because the victory of socialism had become undisputed and because their hopes for mass movements against the Soviet Government had disappeared. Only one road remained,—namely that of White-Guard terror and of foreign intervention.

In 1933, already, the dregs of the Zinoviev group (which began to get active about that time) bolstered themselves up with the hope that the measures taken by the Soviet Government would collapse and that its internal and external difficulties would become intensified. We should call to mind that new difficulties were disclosed in the villages at the end of 1932 and the beginning of 1933, difficulties connected with the socialist re-education of collective farmers. This called for new efforts by our Party and for new methods of Party work in the village so as to make the collective farms Bolshevik farms, and the collective farmers well-to-do.

It was at this period that Comrade Stalin delivered his speeches regarding work in the village, and which provided the Communists with a program in this sphere for the coming years.

We should call to mind that this was also the time when the fascists came to power in Germany and when the danger of a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union from the east and from the west was sharply intensified.

These external and internal difficulties were the nutritious soil in which the seeds of the anti-Soviet activity of the Zinoviev group flourished. The group awaited an intensification of these difficulties, they awaited intervention.

But the mighty Party frustrated these calculations of the enemies of the proletariat. Under the brilliant leadership of Stalin it defended the cause of peace and strengthened the international position of the Soviet Union. The diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union by the U.S.A., the establishment of friendly relations with France and with the countries of the Little and Balkan Entente, the entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, such were its consistent successes in the realm of international relations.

Thanks to the gigantic advance of industry in 1934 (the production of cast-iron and steel increased by 45 per cent as against last year)—the U.S.S.R. established itself firmly in the second place in the world and in the first place in Europe as an industrial country.

We have achieved victory on the agrarian front by the fact that, despite drought and crop failure in

a number of regions, but thanks to Bolshevik organization and the advantages of the collective farm system, we have gathered 250-300 million poods of grain more than in 1933 and more than at any time in the existence of the Soviet Government! Finally, the abolition of the card (ration) system for bread and for a series of other commodities of broad consumption—a measure which speaks of a vast improvement in the supplies of foodstuffs and industrial products in the hands of the Soviet State—testifies that a most important step has been taken on the road toward ensuring the fulfilment of the instructions of the Second Five-Year Plan regarding the increase, by two to two and a half times, to take place in products consumed by the masses in the Soviet Union.

It was in these conditions of the progress of socialist industry and of the advance of agriculture that the shot was fired—an act of desperation expressing the mortal agony of the capitalist elements in the land of the Soviets who are dying off and have been smashed up, but have not as yet been wiped out. It was a shot of revenge for the gigantic victories being achieved by socialism. It was a shot of political revenge against a leader who in Leningrad smashed up the remnants of the accursed Zinoviev anti-Soviet group.

Not a single worker, not a single collective farmer belonged to this boxed-up terroristic group, which lacked any contact whatsoever with the masses. These people—the Zinoviev offspring—were parasites on the mighty body of socialist society. These people—the dregs of the Zinoviev group—established contact with foreign interventionists and attempted to use snake bites to disorganize the Soviet power and its victorious construction of a classless socialist society. In vain! These vipers have been crushed. Great is the sorrow of the workers and collective farmers of the land of the Soviets for their slain leader. But the march ahead of millions of builders of socialism is victorious, and the rifle is firmly held in the hands of the guardians of the peaceful socialist labor.

\* \* \*

The Social-Democratic leaders are attempting to tell you, workers, that the execution of White-Guard-fascist bandits in the U.S.S.R. is "barbarism" allegedly unworthy of the great land of socialism.

What a fake is such agitation calculated to deceive you, Social-Democratic workers! These imposters themselves understand quite well that the severe measures applied by the Soviet Government against the handful of bandits is the revolutionary self-defense of the proletariat against capitalist-fascist barbarism. The White-Guard-fascist terrorism to which the leader of the Leningrad Bolsheviks, Sergei Mironovich Kirov, beloved by workers and collective farm-

ers, fell victim, is a clear manifestation of capitalist barbarism.

This is the very terrorism which is being applied on a mass scale by the Hitlerites in Germany, who torture their victims in the dungeons of the Gestapo, who shoot hundreds of workers while "attempting to escape", and who simulate the alleged suicides of the strangled and tortured heroes of the proletarian struggle. This is the very terrorism which covered the mining regions of Asturias and the workers' quarters of Oviedo in Spain with blood. It is the same fascist terrorism which was responsible for the assassination of Duk in Rumania, Dollfuss in Austria and Barthou and King Alexander in Marseilles.

It is only thanks to Soviet Power that the Soviet workers and collective farmers and the U.S.S.R. as a whole have rid themselves of this capitalist-fascist barbarism. The workers and collective farmers have destroyed the last capitalist class—the kulaks, who, while drawing their last breath have also attempted to use a sawed-off shot gun. Now these dastardly remnants of the anti-Soviet Zinoviev group and tens of hired White-Guard assassins smuggled over the borders of the U.S.S.R. are attempting to introduce these criminal tactics of underhand assassination into the land of the Soviets!

The Soviet proletariat and the Soviet Government will not tolerate the growth in the Soviet Union of this capitalist barbarism, imported from fascist countries and finding support in the insignificant capitalist elements within the Soviet Union who have been smashed up but not yet fully wiped out. The Soviet Government has taken and will continue to take the most severe measures of revolutionary self-defense against such barbarism.

It should be clear to every worker that the proletarian State whose great aims are materializing, which is victoriously building classless socialist society and which is transforming the great dreams of the whole of toiling humanity into life, will defend all this that is being built up, from the encroachment of capitalist barbarism and White-Guard-fascist terrorism, and shoot any person found guilty of transplanting this capitalist barbarism from without, from the countries of fascism into the country of Soviets!

At the same time, the Social-Democratic leaders—defending White-Guard terrorism and aiding and abetting the fascist assassins—are raising their voices "in protest", allegedly in the name of civilization, justice, humanity, etc., etc.

What a pitiful and contemptible sight!

Once when looking at such a picture, which has repeated itself more than once in the course of the class struggle of the proletariat, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin exclaimed in anger:

"... and our 'men with their cases', the dregs of the bourgeois intellectuals who call themselves

'Social-Democrats' and 'Socialists', sing the praises of the bourgeoisie and blame the revolution for any manifestations of ferocity or for the inevitable severity of the measures used in the struggle against especially sharp cases of ferocity, although it is as clear as daylight that this ferocity is a product of the imperialist war [and we would now say, of the fascists and White Guards—*Ed.*] and that no revolution can release itself of *such* consequences of the war [and now of fascism—*Ed.*] without a lengthy struggle, without a series of severe measures of repression."

Yes. There is a vast difference between the mass Red terror of 1918-1919 in the Soviet Russia and the present shootings of a pack of White-Guard terrorists.

At that time the revolutionary workers and poor peasants, surrounded on all sides by White-Guard armies, were making short shrift of the counter-revolutionary elements of the bourgeois and landlord classes who at that time were still strong in our country. That was a form of civil war against classes, which, although conquered, were nevertheless still strong by virtue of their connections and the funds still in their possession, etc.

Now the Soviet State is still further consolidating its revolutionary legal code. The decisions of the November Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. are one big step forward in this direction. Now the sword of the proletarian justice has fallen upon a miserable handful of White-Guard-fascist terrorists, the majority of whom penetrated into the U.S.S.R. from abroad, from capitalist countries; it has fallen upon a handful of counter-revolutionary degenerates, who had neither connection with the masses nor influence upon them. The whole of the toiling population—through its workers' and peasants' Soviet Government—has executed these criminals to teach others to keep their vile murderous claws from the land which is constructing socialism and not to violate its peaceful toil by perfidious shots from the underground haunts of the White-Guard-fascists.

Soon after the murder by the White-Guardists of the Soviet ambassador in Poland, Comrade Voykov, L. Kamenev, one of the contemptible leaders of the Zinoviev group, attempted to mumble something against the executions of twenty "most illustrious" ones in reply to this crime, under the pretext that these executions would alienate from the U.S.S.R. sections of bourgeois pacifists in the West.

Comrade Stalin at that time replied that:

"What are we to say of this reactionary-liberal philosophy? We can only say this of it, that its authors would like to see the U.S.S.R. toothless, unarmed, prostrating itself before, and capitulating to our enemies. Belgium was once 'stained with blood', and this was depicted at one time on cigarette cards. Why should not the U.S.S.R. be 'stained

with blood'—then everybody would feel sorry for it. No, comrades! We don't agree with that! Let all these liberal-pacifist philosophers betake themselves to the devil with their 'sympathy' for the U.S.S.R. With the sympathy of the millions of toilers everything else could be fixed. And if it is essential that somebody should be stained with blood, we shall do everything possible to ensure that some bourgeois country is beaten till blood

flows, stained with blood, and not the U.S.S.R.!"

In 1935 the same as in 1927, these principles of conduct, formulated by Comrade Stalin, remain immutable laws of the revolutionary defense of socialism against capitalist barbarism, and bear the unqualified approval of all workers and collective farmers.

## TROTSKYISM

### Counter-Revolution in Disguise

By M. J. OLGIN

An analysis of the background, character and role of Trotsky and Trotskyism. Trotsky's "theories"; his fight against Bolshevism; the counter-revolutionary activities to which they lead. The book is divided into the following sections: Trotsky's Career; Trotskyism Defined; Permanent Revolution; Catastrophe Upon Catastrophe; The Fight Against the Soviet Union; The Second and Third "Peculiarities"; On the World Front; The Trotskyites in the U.S.A.; The "Fourth International"; Trotsky the Historian; The Danger of Trotskyism.

Will Be Ready February 28

144 pages—paper, 15 cents; cloth, 60 cents

*Stalin Refutes Trotsky's "History" in*

## The October Revolution

By JOSEPH STALIN

Both in speeches delivered and articles written in the October days and in the course of the polemical discussions with the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition, Stalin shatters the myths of Trotskyist, anti-Bolshevik historians. He appraises the revolution in its main periods and international significance.

168 pages—cloth—\$1.00

*Also*

THE ASSASSINATION OF KIROV, by M. KATZ . . . . .03

*Order from*

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148 (Sta. D)

New York City

## A YEAR OF GREAT ADVANCES

THE working class throughout the world steps across the threshold of the year 1935 with a feeling of growing confidence in its own strength.

On New Year's Day, the Pope of Rome and the King of England, the dictator of fascist Germany and the Presidents of the most democratic republics, will, by tradition sanctified by centuries of the slavery and exploitation of toiling mankind, proclaim "first and last", the eternal inviolability of sacred property in their land. But the march of time is no longer in their power.

On the threshold of a new round of revolutions, the page of history named "1934", which we are turning over, has marked other "beginnings" than those which the bourgeoisie inscribed, when writhing in the throes of the struggle for the capitalist way out of the crisis, for the transfer of the cost of the economic crisis and the general crisis of capitalism to the shoulders of the toiling masses, and the oppressed and weak peoples. Let the bourgeoisie throughout the world still continue to make a frenzied onslaught on the working class, day by day increasing the fascistization of the methods by which they rule. Let the heavy heel of fascism still continue to violate the ground where the best sons of the working class are daily shedding their blood for the liberation of toiling mankind. Let frenziedly savage chauvinism set forth the "myth of the 20th century" and welcome the "dawn" of the new year with the militant teutonic shout of the fascist minister-poet:

"Hey, Franzman, this is a menacing morning greeting!

"You must die that we may live. . . ."

Let them. . . . Let the myth that fascism was to rule a thousand years, proclaimed in streams of the blood of the German proletariat two years ago, appear, to the imagination of the cowards, renegades, defeatists and bourgeois hangers-on, to the leaders of Social-Democracy seeking to find an excuse for their utter bankruptcy, to be a whole historic period of reaction, a "new epoch of fascism". Let them attempt to persuade the working class that it is impossible to make a simple leap over this epoch, but that it is historically necessary to *wait*, and abandon the gains of a whole century of the working class movement to be plundered by the fascists, comforting themselves by the consciousness that history in the long run worked in their favor.

The glorious year of 1934 will enter the chronicles of history as a year of great socialist victories won by the mighty land of the proletarian dictatorship,

as a year of heroic battles fought by the working class against fascism, and the beginning of the end of the hypnotism wherewith fascism, especially after its victories in Germany in 1933, attempted to hold back the process of historic development, by trying to imbue the masses with the legend of the impregnability of fascism and of the monolithic character of the fascist state.

The year 1934 will go down in history as a year of great change in the establishment of the united front of the working class against fascism, the capitalist offensive and imperialist war—as a year of great advances made in the consciousness of millions of Social-Democratic workers who are becoming convinced, by bitter experience, that the path along which the Social-Democrats have led them is the path of defeat for the working class and the path of inevitable fascist slavery.

It will go down in history as a year of enormous growth in the political influence of Communism. It will go down in history as a year of the maturing of the revolutionary crisis. These historic changes came to maturity in the February barricades built by the Schutzbunders in Vienna, in the February general strike of 4,000,000 workers as well as the barricade fighting in France, and in the great October battles fought by the Spanish proletariat.

What though the working class lost the first open skirmishes! The decisive point, however, in determining the results of 1934 is the fact that the bourgeoisie have become undoubtedly weaker while the revolution has moved forward, the fact that new revolutionary prerequisites have been established for the forthcoming victories of the working class.

In Floridsdorf and Asturias, the proletarian insurgents have temporarily left the direct field of battle. But millions of toilers, filled with hatred towards fascism and capitalist exploitation, roused by the smell of powder throughout the capitalist world, enheartened by the gigantic successes achieved by socialism in the U.S.S.R., are standing on the historic stage, conscious of the growth of their power to fight.

The main thing is that the masses are more and more being filled with a realization that it is possible to carry on victorious resistance to the fascist onslaught, and in some sectors are resorting to the highest forms of struggle. The main thing is that with every day that passes the organizing role of the proletarian vanguard, the Communist Party, is increasing. The main thing is that there has been a decline in the belief in the power of the bourgeoisie. The main thing is that the masses are becoming more

and more imbued with the realization that fascism cannot destroy the working class and its Communist Party, that fascism is not overcoming the economic difficulties facing it but is still further intensifying them, that it is still further increasing the tremendous poverty of the masses, that it is losing its mass basis more and more, and that there is no return to the past.

Such are the chief results of the year 1934.

And it is not with tearful and timid hopes which leave the future in the hands of super-human forces, not by waiting peacefully in the cellars of history that the working class greets the New Year, but by rising to its full height, and taking in its hands the ideological and material weapons which alone make it possible for it to hammer out its own future and the future of toiling mankind. The working class is taking its place under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, and is taking the rifle into its hands.

On the threshold of the year that has passed by, there took place the historic congress of the shock brigade of the Communist International, where the magnificent results of the construction of socialism were dealt with in the report delivered by the mighty Stalin, a report which is the most brilliant document of the era. No one gave a better formulation of the importance of this speech than one of the best and most brilliant of the galaxy of disciples and pupils of the leader of the world proletariat, namely, Comrade Kirov, who fell at the dastardly hands of the dregs of the Zinoviev group, which had rallied together on the basis of a Trotzkyite-Zinoviev platform, and had sunk to absolutely fascist depths, having finally broken away from the masses, demoralized and taking their revenge by shooting from behind at the stupendous victories achieved by socialism.

"As the result of all the work we have done, we have, at the present stage of our development, such a development of the dictatorship of the working class in our country as we never had before. We now have a mighty Soviet State, working, really powerfully and firmly knit together, one which has created the foundations of socialist economy. This gives tremendous moral satisfaction not only to the working class and the millions of collective farmers in our country, but it is the best agitator and the most powerful propagandist for the cause of socialism, outside the borders of our country, among the international proletariat, among all the oppressed of the East and West". (From the speech delivered by the late Comrade Kirov at the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.)

There are no fortresses which Bolsheviks cannot capture, said Comrade Stalin. The Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. set out a huge program for the construction of the edifice of socialism in the U.S.S.R., in the year 1934. And the Christmas bells

hardly had time to announce the prayers of the bourgeoisie that their tottering kingdom should be saved when the powerful victorious chorus of the giants of the Five-Year Plan rang out, along with the signal that the instructions given by the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. as to the production of 10,000,000 tons of cast iron in 1934 were fulfilled.

This quantity is two-and-a-half times more than tsarist Russia produced. This quantity is more than any country in capitalist Europe is producing. This quantity is a guarantee for the further powerful growth of industrialization in the U.S.S.R., and of the unprecedented growth of the well-being of the working class. This amount of cast iron means hundreds of thousands of tractors which will deeply plough the fields of the collective farms, which by the Bolshevik organization of the collective farms will provide a harvest unknown in tsarist Russia and has already created the conditions for the abolition of bread cards and for a new advance of the movement to collectivization.

This cast iron is the steel armor in which the invincible Red Army is clothed on the frontiers of the U.S.S.R.

Look at it, the steel horse about which Lenin, the greatest genius of mankind, always dreamed. This is how the instructions given by Stalin, the greatest genius of our epoch, instructions to overtake and surpass capitalist Europe in the course of ten years, are being fulfilled.

Look at it, the great socialist plan based on Marxist scientific foresight on the revolutionary energy of the toiling masses, on the iron unity and solidarity of the ranks of the Bolsheviks, the plan which the fustian heroes of the Second International called the "Bolshevik experiment" and which the counter-revolutionary Trotzkyite-Zinoviev degenerates described as "thermidor".

Look at the socialist fatherland, the land with its heroes of labor, the land which produced the valiant Chelyushkinites, the Kamanins and Nolokovs, which has raised tens of millions of people from uncultured neglect and want to heights hitherto impossible for them to attain, and which has in one year created material and cultural values such as could only be produced under capitalism in the course of decades, or such as it is entirely impossible to produce under such a system.

Here we have not the mythical but the actual liberation of mankind. Here we have that progress of which only the boldest thinkers and teachers of socialism ever dreamed. Here history has given a short and comprehensive reply to the question put by St. Simon in France at the beginning of last century, namely, where would France lose most: if it lost 3,000 capable workers or if it lost 3,000 princes, generals, ministers, priests and lawyers. For the least known of the builders and enthusiasts of socialism,

and the least known of the proletarian revolutionaries who fell under the knife of the fascist murderers, has incomparably greater rights to a place in history than any of the "great" bourgeoisie, because he personifies the real progress of mankind.

On the threshold of the New Year, at a time when the world economic crisis was turning to a depression, in a situation where Social-Democracy and the opportunists of all kinds were speculating on an ebb of the revolutionary struggle, on an inevitable decline of the revolutionary struggle, as capitalist economics improved, Comrade Stalin gave a keen Bolshevik analysis of the "depression of a special type", and a clear revolutionary perspective for the future. A year has passed since this happened and capitalism has nowhere been able to create the prerequisites for any capitalist stabilization.

Prospects of a new stabilization are not to be seen anywhere.

On the contrary, the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism has gone on without interruption and was brought about by a profound shaking up of the whole capitalist system, by the maturing of the revolutionary crisis in the capitalist countries, by the mighty growth of the U.S.S.R. the development of the anti-imperialist movement in the colonies, the narrowing down of markets and the struggle for them, the deepening of imperialist contradictions and the contraction of the ability of capitalism to maneuver. Therefore, even a temporary growth of industrial production (which, by the way, is stagnating in some advanced capitalist countries) did not hold back the process of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Hence the profound significance of the words of Comrade Stalin that the idea of taking capitalism by storm is maturing in the minds of the masses, although in the overwhelming majority of countries there is no directly revolutionary situation as yet in being.

The prerequisites for a revolutionary crisis are maturing in the chief center of the fascist attack on Communism, namely, in National-Socialist Germany. During the crisis fascism was able to take advantage of the growing indignation of the petty-bourgeois masses against the worsening of their conditions and directed against the Weimar constitution. The petty-bourgeois masses became victims of fascist demagoguery because Social-Democracy split the working class, while the Communist Party, owing to the influence of Social-Democracy, did not as yet have the support of the decisive strata of the proletariat to such an extent as to cast them into open battle against the capitalist system, thus drawing the ruined petty bourgeoisie into the struggle. But the same process of increasing discontent on the part of the masses led, owing to the fact of the deception contained in the promises of the National-Socialists, to a contraction of the mass basis of fascism, and on June 30 brought

to the surface the beginning of the crisis of the fascist dictatorship.

The heroic activity of the Communist Party, more than anything else, prepared the explosion of June 30. The Communist Party was able to stand firm in face of unparalleled fascist terror. Its agitational activity was not only not weakened but, on the contrary, grew still stronger. It advanced new cadres of underground organizers, hard as flint. But it did not succeed in attracting the broad masses of the Social-Democratic Party, now becoming active, by boldly and firmly carrying out the united front. It was not able as yet to become such an organizing force among the masses as to be able on June 30 to raise the feelings of the masses to direct action.

Hence a certain strengthening of the government apparatus of the fascist dictatorship after June 30, which allowed it to make a number of attempts to bring about a certain regrouping of forces while narrowing its mass basis. But after June 30, fascism could, by means of terror, only drive the hatred of the masses deeper, but it could not restrain the speed at which class contradictions in Germany sharpened.

It was unable to remove the youth from the factories even to the small degree that it expected to do. In places it has to meet the open resistance of the peasants, to dissolve its own National-Socialist organizations in the factories, and to undertake new acts of repression against the discontented elements inside the National-Socialist Party. It has to shout openly about the danger of Communism, and scare the international bourgeoisie about the danger of proletarian revolution in Germany so as to force them to come to its aid.

No, the course of history is no longer under the control of the magnates of capital. The fascist dictatorship was able for a time to delay the process of the proletarian revolution, but it also accelerated the revolutionary process. The fascist dictatorship will not fall by itself, of course. But behind its back stands the united front, growing ever stronger, of the proletariat, while its organizer, the chief grave-digger of fascism, the Party of Thaelmann, knocks ever stronger at the gates on the eve of 1935.

The idea of storming capitalism is maturing in the minds of the workers of Austria, where fascism has not even been able to attract the broad masses by demagoguery, but where Social-Democracy, which had a monopoly of authority over the working class and had the experience of Germany before it, repeated the tactics of Wels and Stampfer step by step, right up to the point of making concessions to the idea of the fascist "corporate State" and negotiations with the Christian Social Party a day before the February battles took place so as "to avoid bloodshed".

The heroic struggle of the Austrian Schutzbund was not as yet a struggle for working class power. But it was an armed struggle. The leaders of Social-

Democracy who now complain that "the Schutzbund members expected too much from their weapons" understand quite well that when there is even a small Communist Party the "criticism by weapons" may soon develop into a struggle for working class power, but this is exactly what they were most afraid of. This is why even the joint theoretical organ of the Austrian and Czechoslovakian Social-Democratic Parties, the *Kampf*, was compelled to admit that not only the Communists but also the Socialist workers have now taken up an attitude of hatred towards Austro-Marxism. This is why Social-Democracy in Austria was even compelled to change the name of its party.

In the history of the revolutionary struggle there is no precedent for the transformation in such a short period of a small isolated Communist organization into a mass fighting party, the leader of the underground movement. The Communist Party of Austria brought this about by a brilliant application of the tactics of the united front, and by the revolutionary every-day organization of the masses for struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive.

The idea of taking capitalism by storm has matured among the working class of Spain who, after four years of continuous revolutionary struggle, after attempts at coalitions and constituent assemblies, after tremendous strikes and revolutionary peasant movements, came to the armed struggle for power. Herein was the higher form of the October struggles of the Spanish proletariat as compared with the February battles of the Schutzbund in Austria. The united front of the Communists and the Left Social-Democrats found its peculiar expression in the shape of the "Workers' Alliances", which played an active role during the general strike and the armed struggle. But all the tactics of Social-Democracy led to defeat. In those places where the "Workers' Alliances" really assumed power, where soviets arose as the form of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants, growing into the proletarian dictatorship, at the center of the uprising in Asturias and Biscay—Social-Democracy displayed hesitation and even treachery.

The Spanish bourgeoisie, to the sound of the approving cries of world capitalism, is taking fierce vengeance on the Asturian Communards. Only the fact that Social-Democracy and the anarchists had the majority of the working class behind them, only the backwardness of the peasants owing to the tactics pursued by Social-Democracy, only the treachery of the anarcho-fascists and the irresoluteness and sometimes the direct treachery of Social-Democracy gave this victory to the bourgeoisie.

But this is a "Pyhorean victory", these are "dangerous successes", as one of the prominent reactionary leaders, Calvo Sotello, stated in the Cortes. "Anyone who thinks that political life, disturbed in its

normal development by the successes of the revolution, will again return to its ordinary channel, is mistaken". The ground is slipping from under the feet of the Spanish bourgeoisie. In order to soothe the masses, Lerroux "defends the constitution", while the fascist Robles "criticizes" the corporative system. The Spanish proletariat lost a big battle, but the revolution in Spain is going ahead.

In France, where the bourgeoisie, due to the fact that this country became involved in the world economic crisis later than other countries, found it possible to carry on demagogy regarding French "exceptionalism", the intensification of class contradictions since the beginning of the crisis in France and in connection with the slower transition to a depression, and especially after the establishment of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, has led to a rapid growth of fascism and the tremendous scope of the revolutionary movement against fascism on the basis of the united front.

Utilizing the support of decisive groups of French large-scale capitalists and their connections with the army and the police, the fascists made an attempt in February 1934 to undertake a determined attack on the working class, but they were beaten back by mighty united front demonstrations, by a strike of 4,000,000 workers such as the French working class movement has never known. *The initiative of the Communist Party* compelled the Social-Democrats to give way to the demands made by the masses, and France became the *main keypoint for the development of the proletarian united front*.

The united front pact is still restricted to a modest circle of questions. But the important successes arising from it are plainly to be seen. And every day that a decisive and Bolshevik effort is made by showing them the truth of this in the concrete struggle to imbue into the minds of the masses that the united front struggle is not a maneuver but a weapon of class action, will widen the field of action of the united front and raise the forms of the revolutionary struggle.

In *China*, despite the enormous mobilization of the forces of counter-revolution and imperialism, the heroic struggle of the Red Army has shown that the *Soviets* in China are *indestructible*, because they base themselves on the mighty revolutionary enthusiasm of tens of millions of peasants and workers.

The huge strikes and the revolutionary upsurge in the United States, the barricade fighting in Amsterdam and Zurich and the general strike in Greece—such were the stages of the past year which confirm the words of Stalin at the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. to the effect that *the revolutionary crisis is maturing and will continue to mature in the capitalist countries*.

Ten years ago, Hilferding, the theoretician of the Second International, in the theoretical organ of Ger-

man Social-Democracy, the *Gesellschaft*, founded by him, formulated the theory of organized capitalism, capitalism without crises, without wars, and without revolutions. This theory became the banner of the Second International. In industry, stated Hilferding, the War and the post-War period signified a tremendous growth of the concentration tendencies of capitalism and the transition of capitalism from free competition to organized capitalism. In such organized capitalist economy the position occupied by labor changes. Unemployment becomes less threatening and its consequences are ameliorated by insurance. In the political sphere the war ended in an extension and consolidation of the democratic form of power in the chief countries. And if we examine imperialist policy in its historic conditional state as a capitalist policy of expansion which arises from a definite phase of imperialist State policy, the question arises as to whether the issue of the war also put an end to his policy or, at any rate, whether there has been any considerable change in it.

*Where is this "organized" pacifist capitalism now?*

The basic question around which the gigantic struggle of classes in the whole capitalist world is now concentrated is the question as to who will bear the expenses of the capitalist crisis. The bourgeois politicians and scientists in all countries are breaking spears on this question, but they are all striving towards one aim. What does Social-Democracy advance in opposition to the capitalist way out of the crisis? The period of reforms has ended, announce the followers of De Man, and the thing in question now is a change in productive relations, "State capitalism", which an examination proves to be the capitalist way out of the crisis. The thing in question is "revolutionary dictatorship", say the Welses and Stampfers for—the capitalist way out of the crisis. Did not the "leading" German Social-Democrat use the Saar newspaper, *Freiheit*, to praise the predatory fascist trusts as progressive achievements of national socialism and as a "bit of socialism"?

*Why do the supporters of Wels, De Man, Stampfer and Hilferding need this?*

They need it so as to provide a theoretical basis for their sabotage of the united proletarian front and the concrete revolutionary struggle against fascism, the capitalist offensive, and against the capitalist way out of the crisis; big questions, they declare, are on the order of the day and the workers must not scatter their forces. They need it to advance Wels and Stampfer, and their tactics of the "lesser evil" which placed the German proletariat under the yoke of fascism; they need it to create the conditions for a repetition of these tactics by defaming the heroic struggle of the Austrian and Spanish proletariat who have allegedly "passed the boundaries of violence". In connection with the theses about the attitude of Swiss Social-Democracy to war, Lenin wrote:

"The aim [of the revolutionary struggle—*Ed.*] is declared to be 'socialism'. Socialism is contrasted to capitalism. . . .

"But this is (theoretically) to the highest degree illogical while practically it is without content. It is illogical because it is *too* general, too diffuse. 'Socialism' in general as an aim in contrast to capitalism, (or imperialism) is now recognized not only by the Kautskyans and the social-chauvinists but also by many bourgeois social politicians. But it is not now a question of the generally counterposing of two social systems, but of the *concrete* aim of the concrete 'revolutionary mass struggle' against a concrete evil, namely, against high prices *today*, the war danger *today* or the *present war*." (Lenin, "Some Points of Principle on the War Question", *Works*, Vol. XX.)

This is why the task of establishing the united front on the basis of concrete proletarian action, the task of exposing all saboteurs of the united front in the camp of the Second International and the organization of a fraternal joint struggle along with all the Social-Democratic workers and honest Social-Democratic functionaries who are prepared to carry on this struggle, is the *main task facing the Communist vanguard on the threshold of a new round of revolutions*. Only on this basis will it be possible to link up the everyday struggles with the struggle for power by the working class. The year 1934 brought an enormous contribution to the cause of the united front. The further successful operation of the tactics of the united front demands that *the conception that the united front is a maneuver or that it is capitulation to Social-Democracy be decisively eliminated* from among the Communists themselves.

Only the *Bolshevik monolithic character* of the Communist Party and the *iron solidarity* of its ranks, only by *mercilessly cleansing* our ranks of opportunists, of the petty-bourgeois hangers-on of the proletariat and of the lack of principle inherent in them, can we ensure that the working class will advance to decisive victorious battles for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dastardly murder of Comrade Kirov and the exposure of those who are traitors to our socialist fatherland demand that our vigilance be raised to a maximum degree in defense of the fortress of the world proletariat, the U.S.S.R., and that the purity of the ranks of the world Communist vanguard be ensured.

Only under the banner of Marxism-Leninism and united like a wall of steel around the staff of the world proletarian revolution headed by Comrade Stalin, the great leader of the C.P.S.U., and leader of the world proletariat, will the Communist Parties lead the working class up to the day when, according to the words of Marx in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*: "One day of a victorious insurrection makes up for centuries of shame."

# THE SITUATION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE TASKS OF THE UNITED FRONT

By K. GOTTWALD

**T**HE toiling masses of Czechoslovakia are faced with the urgent task of preventing the establishment of a fascist dictatorship.

The present government, which contains representatives of three "Socialist" Parties, is paving the way for a fascist dictatorship. It has already carried through a whole series of measures directed towards fascism, and is unceasingly coming forward with new measures of a similar character.

The government has now undertaken a new attack. At the beginning of November it declared that there is a project to introduce a new exceptional law with regard to the registration of political parties. Although the details of this law are as yet not known, there can be practically no doubt whatever that according to this law only those parties will be recognized which stand "for the State" and its "democratic republican forms". In actual fact, the law at the present moment only threatens the Communist Party, for all the remaining parties, including the fascists and irredentists,\* express themselves with great readiness in favor both of "the defense of democracy" and "the defense of the State".

As a result of this new measure the C.P. of Czechoslovakia will, "on legal grounds", be driven underground, and deprived of all its seats in parliament, in the municipal councils, in the districts and the provinces, and *all this will be done with the consent of the three governmental "Socialist" Parties, of which two belong to the Second International!*

While the present bourgeois-"Socialist" governmental coalition is carrying through this preliminary preparation for open fascist dictatorship, a regrouping of the political forces of the bourgeoisie is taking place outside of parliament.

Several months ago the National-Democrats left the government. The National-Democratic Party is the party of the most powerful banking group in Czechoslovakia and is linked up with the "Zhivno Bank". This party has now become the nucleus of a *new fascist bloc* in Czechish spheres.

Under the leadership of the biggest governmental party, of the Czechish agrarians, a bloc of landowners is being formed which is striving, through the medium of the German agrarians (also a governmental party), to bring about cooperation with the fascists

of the German "Zudet" with the "Heimatsfront" group.

The Black Jesuits are also not sitting idly back. The admirers of the present regime in Austria and Spain, the Jesuit Stashek and the former fascist Sheinost of the Czechish Clerical Party, are gathering together a clerical bloc of which the fascist party of Khlinki in Slovakia is to be a fundamental component part.

But what is most important is that all these blocs that are coming into being are very closely connected with one another politically. This was made clear, for instance, recently at the municipal elections that took place in Pizek and in Peshki. The bourgeois parties there put forward a united list of candidates, and actually operated a united front against the Communists and Socialists. There, in practice, all the clearly expressed bourgeois parties, governmental and oppositional, came forward jointly. And it should be borne in mind that in all these bourgeois parties there is to be seen an intensification of the tendency in favor of the establishment of similar cooperation within the government as well. They do not hide the fact that such a government would not hesitate in case of necessity to operate all the laws and decrees concocted by the present bourgeois "Socialist" government for the struggle against the Communists, against the Socialists and the Socialist organizations as well.

This means that while the revolutionary working class movement has hitherto been persecuted with the assent of the governmental Socialist Parties, while the governmental "Socialists" are still participating in the preparations for the new exceptional law against the Communists, we are *now faced in Czechoslovakia with the possibility and the danger of a new fascist drive against the whole of the working class movement and all its organizations.*

The Czechoslovakian proletariat is in such a situation as a result of the policy of collaboration between the "Socialist" Parties and the bourgeoisie. These parties will also remain loyal to their line in the future. The present leaders of the governmental "Socialist" Parties are making special efforts to retain their positions in the governmental coalition at any price, even at the price of the most severe political and economic attacks against the toiling masses.

But the masses of Socialist workers are in a different state of mind. These masses have learned the

\* The irredentists are those who support unification with Germany or Austria.—Ed.

lesson of Germany, Austria and Spain, and recognize ever more clearly that fascism is the enemy of all workers, irrespective of their political coloring, and that following the repressions directed against the Communists, the repression in Czechoslovakia will begin to be directed against the Socialist workers and their organizations.

And further, the Socialist masses are beginning to understand that it is precisely the policy of their parties and of their leaders which brings in its train consequences of this kind. For this reason the demand is being raised ever more openly by the masses of the proletarian members of the Socialist organizations of the need to *change* the policy of their party. Among the Socialist workers there still continues to exist a very unclear idea, not free from illusions, regarding the *essence* of such a change.

Nonetheless this spontaneous dissatisfaction with the policy of their leaders creates favorable grounds for the idea of the united front, and for the movement for the united front, led by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. For this reason the C.P. of Czechoslovakia advances the following slogans for the Socialist workers:

"Down with the policy of cooperation with the bourgeoisie! Long live militant cooperation between the Communist Party and the Socialist Parties, and the organizations of the small peasantry!"

These slogans have been called forth by the necessity to create a very wide united front of all antifascists and their organizations against the menace of a fascist dictatorship. These slogans can rally the majority of the Socialist workers and of their local organizations, and place them in sharp contradiction to the leaders of their parties, and can draw them into the extra-parliamentary mass struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive.

The C.P. of Czechoslovakia must increase its efforts tenfold, for the extent to which the fascist onslaught will be beaten off depends on the degree to which our Party is able to transform the dissatisfaction of the Socialist workers with the policy of their party into the active extra-parliamentary struggle of important sections of the Socialist Parties, a struggle carried through in a united front with the Communists.

The C.P. of Czechoslovakia works and carries on the struggle in a very complicated situation, which is conditioned by the whole of the internal and external situation of Czechoslovakia, and of the whole of its historic development.

Czechoslovakia is surrounded by States where we have open fascist dictatorships of which at least two (Germany and Hungary) raise the question of the revision of the peace treaties very sharply.

Czechoslovakia itself is a State with a mixed national composition, where six nations live together in compact masses (Czechs, Slovaks, Germans, Hungarians, Ukrainians and Poles). The dominant nation is the Czechish. But the Czechish nation is a small one, which underwent 300 years of national oppression under the yoke of the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

It is clear that under such conditions the idea of the independent existence of the Czechish *nation* more or less coincides in the eyes of the broad masses of the toilers of the Czechish population with the idea of present-day *imperialist* Czechoslovakia, which oppresses the other nations. This refers not only to the various sections of the Czechish petty bourgeoisie (peasants, handicraft workers and the toiling intellectuals), but also to important sections of the Czechish Socialist workers.

What is more, it may be said with certainty that the national question is one of the *most important* ideological links binding the majority of the Socialist workers to their parties. Further it should be borne in mind that in comparison with the fascist regime in all the neighboring States, the political regime in Czechoslovakia still passes as a "democratic" one and is a "lesser evil" in the eyes of the broad masses. It is precisely on these illusions that Benes has played when uttering his "winged" words to the effect that in Central Europe, Czechoslovakia is an "island of democracy". This is one side of the question which mainly refers to the *Czechish* section of the toiling population.

Still more complicated are the processes going on among the *oppressed nations* in Czechoslovakia. Let us take, for example, the German, Hungarian and Polish toiling population. In the majority they feel themselves between the devil and the deep sea (and this in the last analysis can be said about all the oppressed nations in Czechoslovakia).

On the one hand there is the oppression from the Czechs, while yonder there is the threat of Hitler, Horthy and Pilsudski. The masses of the German petty bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia for the time being support Hitler. This is proved by the successes achieved by the fascist organization, the so-called "Heimatsfront" in Czechoslovakia. But the decisive sections of the German proletariat in Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, the Communists and the masses of members of the Social-Democratic Party, are quite definitely hostile to Hitler and to any kind of unification of the German regions in Czechoslovakia with the present third empire.

This resistance to Hitler and the fear of the Hitler regime explain why a big section of the German Social-Democratic workers, in spite of their oppression by the Czechish bourgeoisie, still believe in their party which asserts that the struggle against Hitler and Hitlerism can be conducted in alliance with Czechish

imperialism. The fear of the workers of the fascist regime in the neighboring States renders it easy for Social-Democracy to achieve support among the proletariat of the oppressed nations for illusions regarding "Czechoslovakian democracy".

Where are the roots of all these misgivings? *In the absence of revolutionary perspective.* Only a clear revolutionary perspective, *a perspective which shows the solution of all these questions along the revolutionary path, on the road to the proletarian revolution and to the establishment of Soviet Power,* only such a perspective can guard the mass of the Czechish toiling population against the possibility of new national oppression and against fascist dictatorship. Only such perspectives show the masses of the toilers of the non-Czechish nations the possibility of national liberation without the danger of falling, so to speak, from the frying pan into the fire, *i.e.,* out of the claws of Czechish imperialism under the whip of Horthy, Hitler, and Pilsudski.

Social-Democracy makes use of the fears above-mentioned so as to intensify democratic illusions and to win support for its policy of cooperation with the bourgeoisie. We must scatter these fears, by showing the masses wide revolutionary perspectives, and tirelessly carry on the struggle against all democratic illusions, and discredit the policy of cooperation with the bourgeoisie in all its forms.

We are fighting for the establishment of a broad united front. The proletariat will carry on a wide extra-parliamentary struggle against fascism, for the democratic rights of the toiling population, and against the capitalist offensive and the danger of war, *i.e.,* for the most burning economic and political partial demands of the masses. To establish this united front or militant bloc we direct ourselves not only to individual Socialist workers and their local organizations, but also to their parties. We must stress, especially, that this is not a maneuver but that what we are really and seriously concerned with is to rally all those who wish to fight against fascism and the capitalist offensive.

What have the Communists to tell the Socialist workers in the present situation? Approximately the following:

The policy of your parties, we must say, the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, has been and remains a factor which has reduced the whole of the working class movement to such a state that we are directly faced with the menace of open fascist dictatorship. Your leaders assert that no other policy is possible since the working class is split and enfeebled. But you should clearly see that your leaders consciously substitute the consequence for the cause. What is true is that the split and enfeeblement of the ranks of the proletariat are the consequence of the collaboration of your parties with the bourgeoisie. If, therefore, they are seriously striving to consolidate

the positions held by the working class, they must give up collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and agree to a united front with the Communists, to militant collaboration.

Your parties and your leaders reject the united front with the Communists on the excuse that the Socialists will allegedly have to leave the government in such a case, and hand over "all power" to the reactionary bourgeois parties, and this, they allege, will speed up the establishment of the fascist dictatorship. We shall again refer to their "power" within the government, and to the way they form a protective "barrier" in the government against the fascist dictatorship. But there can be no doubt that they will really have to leave the government, for they cannot serve two masters at one and the same time. But is it true that in such a case a "fascist onslaught" is inevitable? By no means. On the contrary. If our Parties take the path of class struggle against the bourgeoisie, if they accept the proposals made by the Communists and develop an extra-parliamentary struggle on the basis of militant collaboration, then the fascists of all shades will have a bad time of it.

And so, think over, wherein lies the strength of the proletariat? In collaboration with the bourgeoisie? No! This would be equal to death. The power of the proletariat lies in the extra-parliamentary positions it occupies, in uniting its forces for the general struggle against the bourgeoisie in the factories, in the streets, and in the cooperative trade unions and other organizations. And it is in just this direction that the proposals made by the Communists regarding the establishment of the united front and militant collaboration were turned. And now think what the correlation of forces between the bourgeoisie and the working class will be in such a case.

In a large number of factories in Czechoslovakia, the representatives of the four parties which could participate in militant collaboration (the Communists, Czechish and German Social-Democrats and the National-Socialists) have a majority in the factory committees. This means that they have a majority of the factory workers behind them. If they take action jointly on the basis of militant collaboration against the employers, in defense of the interests and the rights of the working class, does not the relation of forces advance in favor of the workers? Of course it does. In such a case, bounds would be set to the growth of various yellow and fascist trade unions in the factories. If the members of these trade unions see that militant collaboration defends them, then the majority of them would leave the yellow trade unions, while as for the incorrigible strikebreakers who remain, the workers will know how to deal with them.

The four trade union bodies, namely, the Czechish trade union council, the Reichenberg trade union commission, the Czechish workers' association and the

Red trade unions, have more than a million members. In any case the decisive section of the working class in Czechoslovakia belongs to these organizations. The Communists propose that all these union organizations be organizationally fused, on the basis of the class struggle and working class democracy. But, independent of this, how much might be done now, today! Thus, for instance, all the Socialist and Red trade union groups could set up joint committees in each factory and town, call general meetings and conferences, and make a solid advance in defense of the interests of the proletariat. We have already indicated how to deal in this connection with the yellow fascist plague in the factories. There can be no doubt that a majority of the workers in the factories will follow the united trade union committees. Is it not clear that in such a case the employers and their hirelings would be compelled to talk in a different tone with the workers?

In Czechoslovakia we have an army of unemployed amounting to three-fourths of a million people, and the fascists are beginning to carry on recruitment among them. Imagine that an unemployed committee of action was set up in each locality, one which could carry on its activity on the basis of powerful militant collaboration. This would make it possible to establish a powerful organization basing itself upon the whole mass of the unemployed. Messrs. the regional police chiefs, chief constable and the fascist Lord Mayors would be compelled to alter completely their way of speaking.

In thousands of parishes the above-mentioned four trade union bodies have their representatives in the municipal administrations, and the political organizations and other working class societies are under their influence. If militant collaboration were to be established in each municipal administration, if a local militant collaboration committee were set up in each municipality, composed of the representatives of all these organizations and if the poor peasants and their organizations, where they exist (as for instance, the groups of landless peasant-socialists, the groups of the "Domovina" and "Otchina" organizations, etc.), are drawn into the united front, if such tactics are applied in relation to the small handicraftsmen and the advanced intellectuals, then it will be possible to establish such a broad anti-fascist united front in every municipality which Kramerz, Strashborni, Gaida, Hennlein, Hlinka and others will attack in vain.

This, consequently, is how the militant collaboration front will develop. It would have the support of the majority of the workers in the majority of the factories. It would have the support of the majority of the workers organized in trade unions. The very fact of the establishment of the militant collaboration front and of the action it undertakes would attract the workers of the yellow trade unions as well

as the unorganized workers. Thousands of unemployed committees would rally to it, it would be followed by the million of proletarian members of the trade unions, as well as by other organized workers. The majority of the population in thousands of localities would support it. In the struggle for the interests of the small peasants and the handicraft workers, the united front could draw a big section of these groups away from the influence of the bourgeoisie, landowners, churchmen and National-Democrats, and make allies of the working class out of them.

Thus, one thing is clear. The organization of a militant bloc of workers and peasants in all factories and in all localities would lead to a fundamental alteration in the correlation of forces between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, one beneficial to the proletariat. An end would be put to the policy of retreat, and a beginning would be made of a period of counter-attack.

Your parties and leaders will perhaps ask you what you will gain if you form an alliance with the Communists and establish joint committees of militant collaboration in the factories and localities. Laws, they will tell you, are created not in the factories or localities but in parliament and in the government! The gendarmes, police, and army are not in the hands of the factories and municipalities, but in the hands of the government. If, they will say, we do not stand on guard inside the government, then the reactionary bourgeois parties will create new laws directed against you, and the government will set into operation against you all the means of State violence. And then, is their argument, your conditions will be worse than they are now, for then a fascist dictatorship will really come into being.

And so they stand "on guard", so as to prevent the adoption of laws directed against the workers and peasants? But if this is so let them be good enough, for instance, to explain to us who benefits from a reduction in sick benefits, the workers or the capitalists? Or perhaps they will explain whether a reduction in unemployment benefits is of advantage to the workers. And in whose interests is an increase in the price of bread as a result of the bread monopoly? In the interests of the workers and peasants, or in the interests of the speculators and landowners? And is the annulment of taxes on the rich coupled with subsidies for the banks, while the property of the peasants and the handicraftsmen are sold up by auction, also in the interests of the people? And this is called standing on guard!

They entered the government, they suggest, so that the State power, police, and army should not be directed against the workers and peasants. Very well! Perhaps that is why, whenever a strike takes place in Czechoslovakia, the employers are arrested by the gendarmes and the police line the strike pickets up

at the factory gates? Perhaps that is why all meetings organized by the capitalists are dispersed, whereas meetings and demonstrations organized by the workers are allowed to take place without any hindrance? Perhaps that is why when distraints and sales of peasants' property take place in the villages, the executors of the law are often put into chains, while the property of the village poor is protected, etc.? But jokes on one side. The workers and peasants are well aware as to how State power is utilized in Czechoslovakia.

Finally, the "Socialists" joined the government for another reason, namely, to prevent the fascist dictatorship. But *with whom* do they propose to do this? Who is their partner in the coalition? Not so long ago, one of them was the famous "anti-fascist" Kramarz, who has now joined forces with Strashborni. But leaving Kramarz on one side, let us take the present partners of our "fortunate" "Socialists" in the government. They are the Czechish and German agrarians, and the Czechish clerical, Berran, Hodge, Malipetre, Spinna, Khaker, Stanik, Shramek, and Sheinost. It is with *these* parties, and with *these* people that they wish to defend "democracy" against fascism. What is this? Illusions? Blindness? Stupidity? Criminal light-heartedness? No! This is something far worse!

In any case, the Socialist workers should ask the following question of their leaders and their parties: Tell us, what sort of guarantee against fascism is the Czechish Agrarian Party which only recently was led by Strashborni, and which is now headed by his personal friends, Vranni, Berran and Stanik, the same Agrarian Party which is trying, in the person of Spinna, to find a "modus vivendi"\* with the fascist Henneflene? Tell us, in conclusion, what sort of a democratic fighter is the former supporter of Gaida, now a prominent propagandist in the clerical party, namely Sheinost, who is singing hymns of praise to the present regime in Austria and Spain, along with the whole reactionary clerical front? These people, then, are "anti-fascists"! So you want to prevent the advent of fascism with *their* help? You will meet with no greater success if you link up with Satan against the devil. Is not the experience in Pisek and Peshki sufficient? Do you really remain blind and deaf to the whole of the experiences undergone in Germany and Austria?

This is one side of the "anti-fascist struggle" of the governmental Socialist Parties, in which the Socialist workers should take an interest. But there is also another side to the picture. Your leaders and parties declare that they are carrying on an anti-fascist struggle when defending democracy. But they "defend" this democracy in the following way; they have declared a number of working class organ-

izations illegal and are carrying on negotiations with various capitalist organizations "on equal terms". The majority of the working class meetings and demonstrations which they find inconvenient are banned by them, but they figure as honored guests at meetings and conferences organized by the capitalists.

They have issued a law regarding exceptional powers, and are overflowing with emergency decrees. They have removed the elected revolutionary burgo-masters from the municipalities, and have placed capitalists and government commissars in their places. They have taken good care that each regional chief of police should have as much power over the municipalities and the toiling population as a Turkish pasha has. They have cancelled the time limits prescribed by law for the election of factory committees and municipal authorities in the districts and counties. They feel quite well in the situation where for twenty years no elections have taken place to the bodies managing medical funds.

We could quote ever new examples without end, but let these be enough. We only remark that the governmental "Socialists" are now preparing a law regarding the registration of parties. According to this law only those parties will be recognized as legal and allowed to participate in the elections as suit these gentlemen. In any case, the Communist Party will be prevented from participating in these elections.

The "Socialist" leaders will justify themselves in the following way: "This law", they will argue, "and all the steps that the government is taking against the 'sedition-mongers' is directed not only against the Communists, but primarily, against the fascists. You see, we have arrested not only Krasnarge, but also Gaida and Jung. We have even disbanded the Hackenkreutzers, without disbanding the Communists. Don't you see how we are taking good care that the democratic laws are directed primarily against the fascists?"

And so you have disbanded the Hackenkreutzers. But you have not touched Hennlein. You have arrested Gaida, but what could you do when he made an attack on a barracks? But you very soon released him; he got away, apparently, with four months. And this, for an attack on barracks! How many thousands of Communists and revolutionary workers have been subjected to far more severe punishment for the distribution of leaflets, for participating in meetings, for some speech, and very often for nothing at all? Gaida can carry on as previously, Jung is at liberty, while Strashborni has got linked up with the family of bankers in the "Zhvivno Bank" and has thus become completely untouchable as far as the "anti-fascists" and "Socialists" in the present government are concerned.

This, then, is how the "Socialists" stand "on guard" in the government. They draw up laws, not to benefit the workers, but against them. They

\* A form of collaboration—Ed.

utilize the power of the State, not to defend the workers, but against them. They do not defend democracy, but are depriving the masses of the last remnants of their political rights. They govern along with the reactionary bourgeois parties, with the masked fascists, and do not carry on the fight against fascism, but clear the way for open fascist dictatorship.

Is this accidental? No, when you are in Rome, do as the Romans do. Anyone who collaborates with the bourgeoisie at the present time, when the bourgeoisie as a whole is striving to bring fascism into being, must participate in the fascist process. The question of fascism will be solved not around the green table, in coalition with the bourgeoisie, but will be solved by the extra-parliamentary struggle of the toiling masses in the factories, streets, municipalities and organizations. It is only with such arguments that anything can be wrested from the bourgeoisie, and not by lackey speeches made by "Socialist" ministers. Some Social-Democratic worker will say: "The united front and militant collaboration to repulse fascism and the capitalist offensive is splendid, but what next?" What must we reply? Approximately the following:

The united front is the *beginning of the gathering together* and rallying of the forces of the proletariat *primarily* against the menace of fascism and against any offensive on the part of the capitalists. It is the *precondition* for the successful repulse of all attacks made by the proletariat. At the present moment the *most important and decisive question* is how to set up a dam in the way of the bourgeois offensive. It is only thus that the *necessary preconditions* can be assured for the passage of the working class to the *counter-offensive*.

In what way? For instance we will not satisfy ourselves with defending the existing wage scales, but will demand an increase in wages. We shall demand better insurance against sickness, and an increase in unemployment benefits; we shall demand that working time be cut down while full wages are maintained, and better protection of the householder. We are not satisfied with the relics of democratic rights which have been preserved up till now, but we shall compel the bourgeoisie by our own struggle and our own movement to give us wider possibilities and freedom of action without considering the letter of the law. We shall undertake a counter-attack on the fascist parties, and, by letting loose the forces of the working class, we shall draw onto our side the wavering middle elements in town and country, elements which constitute a most important reservoir for the fascist movement as long as the proletariat is weak and capitulates to the bourgeoisie, but which are inclined to side with the working class and become the allies of the latter, if the workers display their

power and undertake the offensive against the bourgeoisie.

*Will the united front or militant collaboration be able to call forth this change in the general situation?* It will, without a doubt. But to achieve this, of course, certain preconditions are necessary.

*First*, this united front must be sufficiently broad; it must include, along with the Communists, the majority of the Socialist workers and their organizations, as well as the mass of the unorganized workers.

*Second*, it must give itself a sufficiently firm foundation organizationally, below, and must base itself on a thick network of joint commissions and organs of action of different kinds in the factories and localities.

*Third*, it must at least establish the basis for the unification of the trade unions. The maximum number of joint committees, consisting of various trade union groups, must be established in the factories and localities.

*Fourth*, as wide as possible a section of the Socialist workers and their organizations must turn away from the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and must master the policy of the class struggle, and, corresponding to the situation, must select suitable forms and methods of struggle to bring about the fulfillment of their demands.

What prevents these preconditions, or the majority of them, from being put into operation *now, immediately*? Mainly, the resistance of the leaders of the governmental Socialist Parties, the resistance of all those elements in these parties who under no circumstances wish to give up collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and who are struggling against the united front by all possible means. How can the Socialist workers overcome this resistance? Basically, with the aid of very simple means, namely, *by themselves and all their local organizations concluding the united front, and a militant bloc with the Communists*.

This is how matters stand, and not otherwise. There is *no other way* whereby to proceed to business, whereby to set up the *preconditions* for successful defense and for a counter-offensive by the proletariat, whereby to bring about a turn in the present political situation in Czechoslovakia for the benefit of all sections of the toiling population.

But the Communist Party sets the working class a much higher aim than simply successful defense against the attacks of the bourgeoisie, and a counter-offensive with a view to winning back better conditions for the toilers within the bounds of capitalism. Such a much higher aim is the *conquest of power and the construction of socialism*.

Our *enemies* show us how we should not and cannot place this question. Not so long ago these were published by the Trozkyists in France. The theses, by the way, deal with the united front in France. The question is raised as to what aim the united front

should follow in France. The Trotzkyists reply that the aim of the united front in France is the conquest of power. How do the Trotzkyists understand this question of power? As "a government of Socialists and Communists", as "*a Blum and Cachin ministry*".

The very fact of such a setting of the question shows that the authors are from head to foot in the bog of Social-Democratic parliamentary combinations and democratic illusions. What would such a ministry (Blum-Cachin) really be? How could it achieve power? With the aid of the ballot? With the aid of parliamentary combinations and agreements? But that is the theory of Blum. But what would such a ministry base itself on? On parliament and the old bourgeois State apparatus? This apparently is how Blum imagines things. What program could such a ministry put forward? The same kind as was operated in Germany by Ebert, Noske and Scheidemann in the year 1918? As both "Labor Governments" operated in England? As the "Socialist Messiah" De Man proposes and as the "Socialist" ministerialists are operating in Czechoslovakia, Sweden and Denmark? It is clear that only Blum can imagine such a kind of government. But it would be, in the best of cases, only a coalition government, even though without direct representatives of the bourgeois party, yet nonetheless a government within the bounds of capitalism, a government in which some or other Socialists, it is true, bedeck the ministerial seats, but where the real power remains in the hands of the capitalists. We have already seen dozens of such "Socialist" governments, and what has been their fate? Has it not been proved with incontrovertible clarity by the experience of historical development that they have nothing in common with the real conquest of power by the working class?

Real working class power means Soviets, means an armed working class and the disarming of the bourgeoisie, and the expropriation of the landowners, manufacturers and bankers—in a word, is the *dictatorship of the proletariat*. And the working class can only achieve this real working class power through a *violent* revolution, and by overthrowing capitalist domination through proletarian revolution. This is also proven by the whole process of historical development with unflinching clarity.

A "workers' and peasants'" government *without* revolution, *without* soviets, *without* an armed proletariat, *without* the disarming of the bourgeoisie, who are deprived of all political and economic power, and *without* a united revolutionary program, theory and practice, has *nothing in common with our ideas regarding real working class power, which can only be the dictatorship of the proletariat*. To set the question of power in Trotzky fashion and to solve it so, means to play the game of the Social-Democratic theorists. To follow such a path means only to

strengthen those democratic illusions in the minds of the masses, without overcoming which the proletariat cannot and never will really win power.

If we have been convinced that the capitalists will not voluntarily raise wages even by one per cent, and will not give the working class even the most insignificant political rights, then common sense should tell us that the bourgeoisie will be still less inclined to give up voluntarily their *main* weapon, namely, *power*, and the private property in the means of production connected with it. The bourgeoisie must be *compelled* to give this up, and, of course, not with the aid of the ballot, but with *the aid of force*, with *the aid of revolution*. This is a most important law.

And from the point of view of this law we ask the following: Is the united front or the militant collaboration described above and proposed by the Communists sufficient for the conquest of power? Obviously not. Trenches can be stormed by using hand grenades but heavy artillery is necessary to storm fortresses. The enemy's army can be weakened, disorganized, demoralized and even compelled to retreat by separate assaults and operations on the part of peasant detachments, each one of which to a greater or lesser degree is operating at its own risk. But to destroy the enemy army and to be victorious, not in one battle alone, but in the war as a whole, this requires a *united* army, a *united leadership*, *united* strategy and tactics, and a *united* aim. And to win a revolution is a far more difficult task than to win a war, and is more difficult because the process of *forming such unity of aim, strategy and tactics in the class struggle, as well as unity of leadership*, takes place in quite different circumstances than in the general staff of an army. The dynamics of the class struggle are such that revolutionary unity is hammered out only *in the process of struggle* and on the basis of the experience of the masses.

It is, of course, impossible to foresee how the class struggle will develop in Czechoslovakia in all its details. One thing, however, is clear. Its previous development has brought about a situation where the majority of the Socialist workers feel deeply dissatisfied with the policy pursued by their parties, a dissatisfaction which has called forth a broad movement in favor of *changing* this policy.

We Communists point out the *direct* form and line to be taken by this alteration. Our slogans are first and foremost the following: "Down with collaboration with the bourgeoisie! Long live the united front, and militant collaboration between Socialists and Communists!" We say the following to the Socialist workers: "If your parties were really Socialist parties they could and should bring about this turn." But the leading bodies of these parties are opposing this by all possible means. We therefore tell the Socialist workers and their organizations: "Don't wait, but bring about this turn yourselves."

By this means and also by independently conducting the struggle we will show the Socialist workers in a practical way how to approach the united front and militant collaboration, and at the same time indicate the means of struggle, the extra-parliamentary mass struggle and the direct aims of the struggle, against fascism and the capitalist offensive. If this struggle develops to its full extent then it will sharpen to a tremendous degree.

In the process of accumulating their own experience of struggle, in the process of our untiring agitation and propaganda of our Communist aims, theory, strategy and tactics, the *political level of the Socialist workers must unconditionally increase*, so also must the *political level of the struggle*.

But Stiven threatens the Socialist workers with the following: "If", he says, "you conclude a united front with the Communists, then perhaps the bourgeoisie will get scared at the beginning, but then everything will turn out as it did in Austria." By this Stiven wishes to say that if the workers resort to arms, they will undoubtedly be defeated. But if the Socialist workers of Czechoslovakia follow the example of the Socialist workers in Austria and Spain, and resort to arms in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, then they will thereby be leaving the basic kernel of the Social-Democratic doctrine and will be approaching the Communist doctrine.

And if the armed struggle in Austria and the armed uprising in Spain did not bring about victory to the proletariat, the main reason is that the Social-Democratic workers have not adopted the position of the Communists on all basic questions. In other words, the example of Austria and Spain by no means implies that the workers must be defeated if they resort to arms, as the Social-Democrats assert in order to scare their members. For the October Revolution of 1917 and the fruits of its victory, namely, the Soviet Union, bear witness to this with the most unquestionable clarity. But this means that the workers *cannot be victorious* if the majority of them adhere to the position taken up by Social-Democracy *on even one important question*.

Let us clear this up by a few other words. You can fight for one or other economic demand while remaining a Social-Democrat (it is clear, not as the Social-Democratic type of minister-Socialist who robs the workers of their benefits). You can also fight against fascism, yet be a Social-Democrat (it is clear, not as a Social-Democrat of the Doror type who arrests anti-fascists). You can also fight for political rights (it is clear, not as a Social-Democrat of the Meissner type who deprives workers of their political rights). You can even, as the example of Austria and Spain shows, advance to the barricades without having yet broken with Social-Democracy (but then it is clear you should not have anything in common with Stiven and others, with those who have shot

down the workers on more than one occasion). But if you wish to be victorious and really to conquer power, you can only do so *under the banner of Communism, only under the banner of the teachings of Lenin*.

On the question of the oppressed nations, the C.P. of Czechoslovakia has adopted a correct position. For these nations it demands the right to self-determination to the point of separation. At the same time, it declares with full clarity that it is against any unification with Hitler, Pilsudski and Horthy, and that it will carry on an active struggle against this, as is now being done in the Saar region.

Without a doubt the first part of our program in respect to the oppressed nations (self-determination to the point of separation) is not fully understood by the broad masses of the Czechish petty bourgeoisie and by the majority of the Czechish Socialist workers. The explanation is the fear of these sections of the population for Czechish national independence. The Social-Democrats make use of this fear to fire at us from heavy artillery, they honor us with such epithets as "traitors to the fatherland", "Hitler's assistants", they assert that we "wish to blow the republic into bits", etc. Have we foundations of a political and ideological character for remaining on the defensive on the question of the oppressed nations? By no means. How must we reply to the Czechish chauvinist demagogues? Approximately in the following way:

Don't get so hot, gentlemen! Don't you know that the slogan about the rights of nations to self-determination to the point of separation is not a Bolshevik invention? Do you know that it was a slogan of the bourgeois revolution, and is consequently a democratic slogan? So that, if you were real and consistent bourgeois-democrats, you should yourselves put this slogan into operation. But since you do not belong to this category, then the consistent operation of this principle will evidently have to be one of the tasks facing the proletarian revolution. This is the first point.

Second, have you heard of the comparisons to which Lenin resorted when explaining this question? He said that the right to divorce is not equal to divorce itself. Let us develop this example. What must a husband do or what must he not do if he does not want his wife to leave him? He must not beat or persecute her, nor compel her to go hungry, he must not give her unbearable burdens, but must allow her such rights as he has himself. In a word, he must treat her as an equal, behave as one comrade to another. Then he will have no need to fear that his wife will leave him. But how do you behave in connection with your marriage, fastened on you, by the way to the *non-Czechish peoples*? It is not worth while speaking about that. And then you are surprised that they would like to get rid of you? If

you would behave otherwise, they would not strive to part from you. But your "democratism" is insufficient for the solution of such questions. This is why the proletarian revolution will have to solve this question instead of you.

And finally, have you people, who still call yourselves "Marxists", completely forgotten the famous declaration made by Marx that no people can be free that oppresses other peoples? We Czechish Communists have not forgotten it, and act according to this principle. It is just because we wish the toiling Czechish masses to be free, *i.e.*, that they should rid themselves of the shame and chains of capitalism, that we say that it is in their own interests not to oppress other nations.

What must we tell the masses of Czechish workers? Send all the patriotic blatherers who are in the pay of the "Zhivno Bank" and of the friends of General Petchek, to the devil. In every nation, and consequently in the Czechish nation, there are two nations, namely the nation of the rich and the nation of the poor. The nation of the masters always made a noise about "national freedom" and "national unity", when it was a question of "freely" skinning and robbing this second nation, the nation of the poor and of the slaves. But as soon as these slaves raise themselves so as to rid themselves of the chains placed around them by their "brethren", and as soon as these gentlemen feel themselves seriously threatened they always link up with their "age-long enemies".

Remember your own history. With whom did the Czechish masters unite against the "orphans" when they were threatened by the Hussite revolution? With Rome! Take the history of other nations. With whom did the French bourgeoisie form an alliance against the Paris Commune? With Bismarck, although it was he who at that time held more than half of French territory under his iron heel. Who prepared the advance of the imperial German army on Petrograd in 1917 in order to smash the fortress of the revolution? The Russian bourgeoisie. It was only the victory of the Bolsheviks that hindered this criminal plan.

But let us return to our own history. Who applauded the imperial general Vindishgetz in the year

1848, when he shot down the students of Prague and the toiling masses? The Czechish bourgeoisie. Who was it that out of fear, not of the proletarian revolution, but of the bourgeois-democratic revolution which was at that time shaking Europe, hid himself under the skirt of the autocratic Hapsburgs? Who was it at that time who played the role of gendarme of reaction and covered the Czechish people with the most terrible shame? The Czechish bourgeoisie, who declared that: "If Austria had not existed we should have had to set it up". Yes, that it is the kind of class which rules over us, Czechish workers, intellectuals, peasants and handicraft workers. It is a class without honor, a cowardly class, but a fierce one, which from the very first day of its birth was branded with the mark of Cain, with the mark of treachery to everything that is great, advanced and revolutionary, to everything that can make a people great. This is the class of Mervash, and Zhevicha.\*

And this class wishes to turn you against the Communists, who wish to show the world that the Czechish people not only has its Prague "society of masters", not only its admirers of Vindishgetz, not only its Zhevichas, but also its "orphans", its peasants from Klum and its barricade fighters of Troitsy of the year 1848. They try to turn you against us because we wish the Czechish proletariat to carry the struggle of their forefathers to its end, and that the nation should thus liberate itself from the domination of capital and become really free.

Look at the Soviet Union. There you see a live example of how the emancipation of the toiling nations, the path indicated by the Bolsheviks, leads, not to the loss of national freedom by the nation which was formerly the ruling nation, but on the contrary, leads to the strengthening of its national liberty, and provides the final guarantee for its freedom, thanks to its fraternal alliance with other nations. And the Soviet Union, as far as we are concerned, serves also as an example as to how the national problem should be settled in Czechoslovakia.

\* Mervash and Zhevicha were pre-war Czechish politicians who occupied important positions but who were later exposed as spies and informers—*Ed.*

THE MOST BURNING QUESTION—UNITY OF ACTION

By BELA KUN

10 cents

THE ADVANCE OF THE UNITED FRONT

*A Documentary Account.* Introduction by ALEX BITTELMAN

5 cents

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York, N. Y.

# ORGANIZE FOR DISCUSSION OF THE AGENDA OF THE SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

*(Statement of Central Committee, C.P.U.S.A., to Party Membership and to all Party Organizations.)*

**T**HE Central Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., instructs all Party organizations to prepare for the carrying on of a systematic campaign in the Party and among the broadest mass of workers and toilers in preparation for the Seventh Congress of the Communist International as a Congress of struggle for the fighting unity of the working class. The basic link in the real mass preparation for the Congress must be the intensification of the struggle for the united front of all toilers against fascism and war.

Every Party organization will have to carry through a most careful analysis of our experiences since the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, to check up the policy of the Party, its tactics and slogans, from the point of view of the penetration of the Party's influence among the toiling masses and primarily among the working class; also from the point of view of the organizational consolidation of this influence, the political growth and training of Party cadres, and the ability of the Party to organize and lead the struggle for the defense of the interests and rights of the workers and all toilers.

Proceeding from the Open Letter and the Eighth Convention decisions, this check-up of the entire work of the Party must be conducted from the point of view of the necessity of building up the united proletarian front and of bringing about trade union unity on the basis of the class struggle.

At the plenums of the District Committees, Section Committees, unit meetings, etc., and at meetings of Party functionaries, the discussions should be carried on not only on the results of the work of the Party during the past five years, drawing lessons from this for forthcoming work, but there should also be discussions on the outlook for the growth of the Communist movement in the U.S. This should be done on the basis of the analysis of the economic and political situation in the country, the alignment of class forces, the changes taking place in those parties and organizations which have influence among the masses (Socialist Party, A. F. of L., etc.), the level of the mass movement, taking especially into account the all-round strengthening of the U.S.S.R. and its increasing international role.

While concretely analyzing the strength of the existing fascist movements and formations, and the fascization of the rule of the American bourgeoisie

through the N.R.A., while analyzing the fascist methods of work and demagoguery, the Party organization should discuss the question of how best to organize the struggle against fascism and fascization in accordance with the concrete conditions and from the point of view of building up the widest anti-fascist front of the toiling masses.

The Party organization must carry on a wide campaign of enlightenment on the question of struggle for the united proletarian front as the most essential condition for victory over fascism. At the same time, we must carry on a concrete and persistent criticism of the Social-Democratic policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie, which is the cause of the splitting of the working class, and, consequently, of its weakening in the face of the class enemy.

The Party organizations must draw into this discussion and campaign the non-Communist workers (Socialist Party members, members of the A. F. of L., etc.). We must invite these workers and non-party workers generally to the meetings for discussion of the questions on the agenda of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern and its significance for the entire working class.

All this preparation for the Seventh Congress must be utilized for intensified recruiting of new members into the Party.

## OUTLINE OF TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED IN CONNECTION WITH THE FORTHCOMING SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

1. The general tendencies of capitalist development since the Thirteenth Plenum of the Communist International.

2. The specific characteristics in the United States of the "depression of a special kind".

From the old deal to the "New Deal".

The crisis of the "New Deal".

The bankruptcy of all theories of American exceptionalism (bourgeois, Lovestone, Trotsky).

To what extent and in what forms was the transition to the depression accomplished at the expense of the (a) workers, (b) farmers, (c) Negroes, (d) urban middle classes, (e) colonies.

Plundering the public treasury to subsidize the monopolies—inflation—war preparations.

3. The question of the relations between fascism and Social-Democracy.

Before the advent of Hitler and subsequently.  
S.P. and struggle against fascism.

#### 4. The crisis of the Second International.

The present role of the Socialist Party of America  
(analysis of its various groups and tendencies).

The role of the reformist leadership of the A. F.  
of L.

5. The concrete application of the Leninist principles of anti-war struggles in the present world situation.

Present role of U.S. imperialism in relation to the war danger and to the peace policies of the Soviet Union.

America's war preparations.

The struggle for the postponement of war.

The struggle against the present chief war incendiaries (Germany, Japan, and the most reactionary circles of monopoly capital in all imperialist countries).

The struggle for the defense of the U.S.S.R. and support for its revolutionary policy of peace.

The struggle for the defense of Soviet China. Support for the anti-imperialist struggle in China.

#### 6. Our program of the revolutionary way out.

The relation between the socialist revolution in the U.S. and the colonial revolutionary movement in the Caribbean and South America.

7. The significance for the U.S. of the socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. and of the existence of Soviet China.

The effects upon the revolutionization of the class struggle and the fight for Soviet America.

Bourgeois "planning". Socialist planning.

8. The struggle for unity of action and for the unity of the working class.

The struggle for the majority.

In the unions.

Socialist Party and Communist Party.

League Against War and Fascism.

Unemployed movement.

Farmers.

Negroes.

Youth.

I.L.D. and general struggle for civil rights.

Protection of foreign-born.

Cultural.

#### 9. Trade union work.

The major problem of building the rank-and-file movement in the A. F. of L. unions, of winning the local organizations, of winning the decisive sections of the A. F. of L. membership.

Forms of organization and methods of work of the rank-and-file opposition in the A. F. of L.

Problems of work in the independent unions.

Problems of building the revolutionary unions.

Problems of work in the company unions.

10. On the struggle against opportunism on two fronts.

11. The fascization of the rule of the American bourgeoisie.

The Roosevelt N.R.A. as a method of masked fascization and war preparations.

The growth of more open fascist movement and formations.

12. The specific characteristics of the growth of the revolutionary upsurge in the U.S.

Strike struggles of a class war nature.

Sympathy strikes, general strikes.

Mass urge to trade union organization, especially semi-skilled and unskilled.

Movement from below for the united front.

Resurgence of unemployed struggles and of the movement for H.R. 2827.

Maturing forces for mass break-aways from the old capitalist parties and toward organized working class independent political action.

Significance of Communist Party vote increase in the last election.

Third bourgeois parties as a capitalist and reformist way of checking this process of mass break-aways from the old capitalist parties.

Our experience and policies in linking up the Communists more firmly with the mass movements and organizations for the purpose of directing them into channels of independent political action and revolutionary struggle.

13. The allies of the proletarian revolution.

Toiling farmers. Problems of penetrating their mass organizations and of unfolding the daily mass struggles of the toiling farmers under the hegemony of the proletariat.

Negroes—Negro proletariat. Sharecroppers. The problem of the organizational crystallization of our political influence. Our experience in the struggle for Negro rights and self-determination. The review of the Scottsboro struggles. The role of American imperialism in Liberia and in the West Indies.

Urban middle classes. Methods of work. Exposure of the reformist assertion of the decreasing role of the proletariat (Thomas).

14. The special role of the youth and women in the struggle against fascization and war.

15. The political education of the armed forces of the bourgeoisie (Federal Army and Navy, State militia, American Legion, etc.). A thorough survey of the social composition of these forces and their commanding personnel.

16. Problems of Party Building.

Recruiting.

Struggle against fluctuation.

Building of cadres.

The contents of work of the Party units.

Special characteristics of work in the factories and the special problems involved.

Concentration (methods and experiences).

\* \* \*

The Agit-Prop Commission of the Central Committee has been instructed to take up immediately the organization of all available forces to collect the information and to build up the necessary outlines for these discussions.

*For the Discussion for the Seventh Congress of the C. I.*

●

**THE THESES, REPORTS, SPEECHES OF THE  
13th Plenum of the E.C.C.I.**

ARE NOW AVAILABLE IN A CLOTH-BOUND VOLUME FOR THE PRICE OF

**60 CENTS**

The eight pamphlets in the Thirteenth Plenum series previously sold for 90 cents. Now brought together in a sturdily bound book with cloth covers, it is offered at this specially low price to enable a full utilization of this valuable material in the pre-Congress discussion.

The contents of the volume are

**THESES AND DECISIONS**

**FASCISM, THE DANGER OF WAR, AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES—*Report by O. W. KUISINEN***

**THE COMMUNIST PARTIES IN THE FIGHT FOR THE MASSES  
*By O. PIATNITSKY***

**REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS, FASCISM AND WAR  
*By D. Z. MANUILSKY***

**FASCISM, SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY, AND THE COMMUNISTS  
*By V. KNORIN***

**WE ARE FIGHTING FOR A SOVIET GERMANY  
*Report By WILHELM PIECK***

**REVOLUTIONARY CHINA TODAY  
*By WAN MING AND KANG SIN***

**REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE OF THE TOILING MASSES OF JAPAN  
*By OKANO***

**Only 750 Copies Available**

**Avoid Disappointment and Place Your Order Now**

**60 CENTS**

●

*Order from*

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

**P. O. Box 148, Sta. D**

**New York City**

# THE MANIFESTO OF THE EIGHTH CONVENTION OF THE C. P. U. S. A.

## FOREWORD

**T**HE Eighth Convention of the C.P.U.S.A. adopted a manifesto to all the workers of the U.S.A.: "Against the New Deal of Hunger, Fascism and War! For the Revolutionary Solution of the Crisis!"

The appeal was distributed in hundreds of thousands of copies. This fact also is an indication that, even in the U.S.A., which only recently went through a period of "prosperity" and was the citadel of world capitalism, the idea of the storming of capitalism is maturing in the minds of the masses, if not among millions at least among hundreds of thousands of people. It shows further that the Party has now learned to raise such problems and coach them in such a language as to impress its propaganda, much better than ever before, on the minds of the masses, rallying them around its program for the overthrow of capitalism and for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat—for a Soviet Government.

The manifesto points out to the workers the necessity of struggling for the revolutionary way out of the crisis, in view of the entire present-day situation in the U.S.A. The wording of the manifesto sounds like a merciless proletarian indictment of the richest bourgeoisie in the world, giving a clear picture of the deterioration of the position of the masses, hunger and the growth of the policy of reaction and of fascism. Such are the results of the capitalist system and of the policy of the bourgeoisie. The manifesto lays its main emphasis on the effects of the Roosevelt policy which promised a "New Deal" to the masses and which developed especially cunning methods for attracting to the side of the government policy those masses who were still imbued with bourgeois democratic illusions.

What did this New Deal turn out to be in practice? "But the bitter truth is rapidly being learned that Roosevelt and his New Deal represent the Wall Street bankers and big corporations—finance capital—just the same as Hoover before him, but carrying out even fiercer attacks against the living standards of the masses of the people", says the manifesto. Further, it points out those features in the N.R.A. and in Roosevelt's New Deal which are partly similar to fascist measures or leading to it.

Roosevelt's policy, of course, cannot simply be characterized as a policy of fascism, and any exaggeration here would be harmful. The ruling classes of the U.S.A. have still the possibility of carrying

through their policy by the methods of bourgeois democracy, although here as well political reaction is growing stronger and the methods of government are becoming more fascist, and various fascist organizations are being formed. The policy of fascization is meeting with a strong resistance from the masses, as is also shown by the success of the anti-fascist movement.

Thus, the question as to the ways in which the American bourgeoisie conduct their policy is determined, not only by the fact that they can still conduct it to a considerable degree by the old methods, but also by how far they can introduce new fascist methods of government despite the growing resistance of the masses. Thus, the problem of fascization and fascism in the U.S.A. has already become an actual question of the class struggle and the proletariat is organizing resistance to fascism. Within the bourgeoisie of the U.S.A. indications of a struggle can also be seen on the question of the ways and means and the tempo of fascization.

Under the cover of a heavy layer of demagoguery about the "forgotten man", the "New Deal", etc., Roosevelt's policy is calculated on carrying out the plans of finance capital. Roosevelt puts himself forward as the arbiter between the workers and the employers, the banks and "society", the "producers" and the consumers, etc. All this is calculated on sowing the illusions among the masses that it is possible to find in Washington defense against the strongest representatives of the capitalist profit system.

Only the leaders of the Second International, and in particular of the Socialist Party of the U.S.A., could go so far as to see Roosevelt's policy as a "step toward socialism". The illusions sown by Roosevelt's policy were increased by the criticism of this policy, by the most conservative representatives of finance capital who tended most towards fascism. These illusions, however, are gradually being undermined in the fire of the class struggles, thanks to the revolutionary work of the Communists. The bourgeoisie themselves are helping towards this in that their biggest organizations (bankers, manufacturers) are carrying on a campaign supporting Roosevelt.

The C.P.U.S.A. promptly and correctly characterized the class significance of Roosevelt's policy. And the correctness of the position of the Party on this question is clearer today than ever before. In calling on the workers for the struggle against fascism,

hunger and war, the manifesto correctly points out that this struggle can only be successful in connection with the struggle against the whole of capitalism and the policy of Roosevelt, in the first place.

Experience has shown that a consistent struggle for the partial demands of the workers can only be carried on by a party which sets itself the aim of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. It is not the policy of the "lesser evil", not the support of some bourgeois government or other not yet fascist, that can save the masses from fascism. This can only be done by the revolutionary class struggle against fascism, i.e., a struggle which must shatter the entire bourgeois system, including its government, a struggle which increases the forces of the revolution, consciously leading them up to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a Soviet Government.

In popular language the manifesto explains what measures the future Soviet government of the working class—the dictatorship of the proletariat—will put into effect. Further, in the same language, understood by the masses, the manifesto points out that the U.S.A. is ripe for socialism, that in the capitalist countries of today the struggle for bread is a struggle against capitalism.

At the present time the struggle for the revolutionary way out of the crisis is not a struggle for something unknown. There exists the mighty example of the great October Socialist Revolution. The 17 years of the existence of the Soviet Union have plainly shown what is the revolutionary way out and to what it leads, and it has plainly shown what incomparable advantages the socialist system has over the capitalist system. The manifesto therefore utilizes these achievements of the Soviet Union as an example for the American workers and points out:

"Its victories are an unending source of inspiration and encouragement to the toiling masses of every country. They are the living example of the possibility of finding a way out of the crisis in the interests of the toilers. The experience of the victorious workers of the Soviet Union before, during and after the seizure of power, throws a brilliant light showing the path which must be followed in every land, the path of Bolshevism, of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin."

But in the struggle for the revolutionary way out of the crisis, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the U.S.A., like other parties, comes up against one of the many arguments put forward by the bourgeoisie and, in a more or less concealed form, by the social-reformists of all shades. This argument is to the effect that the path of revolution is contradictory to the traditions of development of the foremost capitalist countries. In particular, the bourgeoisie and the social-reformists in America try to prove to the masses that the path of revolution is not an American path, that it con-

tradicts "Americanism". Is this so? The manifesto proves that this argument "expresses, not the truth, but only their own greedy interests". On the basis of the Marxist-Leninist attitude towards revolutionary traditions, the manifesto exposes the lies of the American bourgeoisie.

In a letter to the American workers in 1918 Lenin wrote:

"The American people have a revolutionary tradition adopted by the best representatives of the American proletariat, who gave repeated expression to their full solidarity with us, the Bolsheviks. This tradition is the war of liberation against the English in the 18th century and the Civil War in the 19th century."

The manifesto therefore correctly states:

"Today, the only Party that carries forward the revolutionary traditions of 1776 and 1861, under the present day conditions and relationship of classes, is the Communist Party."

The manifesto correctly exposes those who want to justify modern capitalist slavery in America with slogans which were proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence—in a revolutionary document of the epoch of bourgeois revolutions directed against British domination and oppression. The manifesto correctly points out, using the words of the Declaration, that the people have never been so deprived of their rights and downtrodden, while the situation of the people has never been so destitute as now.

The Declaration proclaimed the right of the people to revolution against a government which they did not wish. Under modern conditions such a revolution can only be the proletarian revolution, while the power guaranteeing the interests and rights of the broad masses of the people can only be the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Declaration of Independence, of course, was not a document of the proletarian revolution, but of the bourgeois revolution. It is based on the principle that the State is eternal and above classes. But it advances the right to revolution against the oppressors, and, to this extent, it can serve as a means to expose to the American masses the real character of the present day regime, to show them the path along which they must go.

In the struggle against the bourgeoisie and capitalism, the proletariat has formed its own great liberation documents, such as the Communist Manifesto, the Declaration of the Rights of the Toilers and of the Exploited People, which was proclaimed by the victorious October Revolution, such as the Program of the Communist International, and the Five-Year Plan for the construction of a classless socialist society. In these documents, and in the programmatic works of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, the proletariat and the toiling masses find material for understanding their class tasks, and in the movements founded

on these documents they see an example for their practical revolutionary work.

The manifesto of the C.P.U.S.A. emphasizes that the way out of the crisis can only be revolutionary, that "there is no possible way out of the crisis in the interest of the masses except by breaking the control of the State power now in the hands of this small monopolist capitalist class", and that "the 'principle' which must provide the foundation of the 'new government' mentioned in the Declaration of Independence is, in 1934, the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the new form is the form of the workers' and farmers' councils—the Soviet Power". In this sense the manifesto speaks of the "workers' government", of the "revolutionary workers' government", but, of course, not in the laborite sense. But what is meant in general by revolution as distinguished by reform? Comrade Stalin explained this concretely in his talk with Wells:

"As the result of pressure from below, the pressure of the masses, the bourgeoisie may sometimes consent to grant some partial reform or other, remaining on the basis of the existing social and economic order. . . . But revolution means that the power passes from one class to another. . . . Revolution, the changing of one social system by another, was always a struggle, a painful and hard struggle, a life and death struggle. . . . As you see, the process of the replacement of one social system by another is for the Communists not simply a peaceful and spontaneous process but a complicated, prolonged and violent process. Communists must reckon with facts."

This concretizing of the conception of the revolutionary struggle and of the revolution as the *violent* winning of the power, demanding sacrifice ("a life and death struggle"), demanding victims ("a painful struggle") is what the Communists must help the workers to realize in their experience of the everyday struggle. Obviously the American workers will be ready to make these sacrifices when they understand (and an ever larger number of workers are already beginning to understand) that the *maintenance of capitalism requires from them incalculably greater sacrifices.*

Therefore the manifesto of the C.P.U.S.A. is correct when it explains to the American workers and farmers what tremendous relief they will get immediately after the overthrow of capitalism, what tremendous perspectives are opened up at once be-

fore them by the proletarian revolution under the conditions prevalent in the U.S.A., with its untold riches and its tremendous productive forces incomparably greater than what the Bolsheviks possessed when they came to power in backward Russia. If at the same time, basing ourselves on the experience of the civil wars of the proletariat, we explain concretely (without exaggeration) what the working class can obtain *the very day after the seizure of power*, the workers will become completely convinced that it is *worth while* to fight with great courage for the winning of power.

Here, again, we may refer to the American revolutionary traditions. In the Declaration of the American Continental Congress in 1774, it says:

"We are reduced to the alternative of choosing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated masters, or Resistance by Force. The latter is our choice. We have counted the cost of the contest, and nothing is so dreadful as voluntary slavery."

The manifesto of the C.P.U.S.A. for a revolutionary way out of the crisis has widely attracted the attention of the proletarian and toiling masses and the intellectuals of the U.S.A. Without doubt this is not only explained by the fact that the question "where is the way out?" is rising more urgently before every thinking worker, but also because the manifesto has tried to raise the question of the revolutionary way out of the crisis in a language understood by the masses, relying also on the experience and peculiarities of the development of the revolutionary labor movement of the U.S.A.

This manifesto is the first attempt of the Party to concretize its revolutionary program for a way out of the crisis and the solution of the basic problems facing the proletariat and the toiling masses of the U.S.A. on the basis of Soviet Power. There is no doubt that such an attempt in an important capitalist country like the U.S.A., which owns almost half the productive forces of modern capitalism, is a work of tremendous significance. The Party is continuing to work on this question, so as to give the working class and the toiling masses of the U.S.A. a more developed and concrete program of what *Soviet Power* means to them. This program at the same time will remove certain shortcomings which are natural in such a first attempt, even when the main task has been solved correctly and well. .

## FOR THE REVOLUTIONARY SOLUTION OF THE CRISIS; AGAINST THE "NEW DEAL" OF HUNGER, FASCISM, AND WAR!

*Manifesto of the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.*

**T**O ALL WORKERS OF THE U.S.A.:

We speak to you in the name of 25,000 members of the Communist Party who elected the delegates of this Eighth National Convention; in the

name of several hundred thousand workers who elected fraternal delegates from trade unions, unemployment councils, workers' clubs, fraternal societies; in the name of the miners, steel workers,

metal workers, auto workers, textile workers, marine workers, railroad workers, whose delegates constitute a majority of this Convention.

To you, the working class and toiling farmers of the United States, this Convention of workers addresses itself, to speak a few plain words about this crisis, and about the possibility of finding a way out.

The crisis of the capitalist system is becoming more and more a catastrophe for the workers and toiling masses. Growing millions of the exploited population are faced with increased difficulties in finding the barest means of livelihood. Unemployment relief is being drastically cut and in many cases abolished altogether. Real wages are being reduced further every month, and labor is being speeded up to an inhuman degree.

The vast majority of the poor farmers are slowly but surely being squeezed off the land and thrown on the "free" labor market to compete with the workers. The oppressed Negro people are loaded down with the heaviest economic burdens, especially of unemployment, denied even the crumbs of relief given to the starving white masses, and further subjected to bestial lynch law and Jim-Crowism. Women workers and housewives are especially sufferers from the crisis, and from the fascist movements to drive them out of industry. Millions of young workers are thrown in the streets by the closing of schools and simultaneously are denied any chance to earn their living in the industries.

#### WHAT THE NEW DEAL HAS GIVEN THE WORKERS

The suffering masses have been told to look to Washington for their salvation. Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal have been decked out with the rainbow promises of returning prosperity. But the bitter truth is rapidly being learned that Roosevelt and his New Deal represent the Wall Street bankers and big corporations—finance capital—just the same as Hoover before him, but carrying out even fiercer attacks against the living standards of the masses of the people. Under Roosevelt and the New Deal policies, the public treasury has been turned into a huge trough where the big capitalists eat their fill. Over ten billion dollars have been handed out to the banks and corporations, billions have been squeezed out of the workers and farmers by inflation and by all sorts of new taxes upon the masses. Under the Roosevelt regime, the main burden of taxation has been shifted away from the big capitalists onto the impoverished masses.

The N.R.A. and the industrial codes have served further to enrich the capitalists, by establishing fixed monopoly prices, speeding up trustification, and squeezing out the smaller capitalists and independent producers.

The labor provisions of the N.R.A., which were hailed by the A. F. of L. and Socialist leaders as

"a new charter for labor", have turned out in reality to be new chains for labor. The fixing of the so-called minimum wage, at below starvation levels, has turned out in reality to be a big effort to drive the maximum wage down to this point. The so-called guarantee of the right to organize and collective bargaining has turned in reality to be the establishment of company unions. They now propose to take away the last remaining rights of the workers by establishing compulsory arbitration under the Wagner Bill, camouflaged as an attempt to guarantee workers' rights. Roosevelt has given official government status to the company unions, in the infamous "settlement" in the auto industry. This new step toward fascism is announced as a "new course" to apply to all industries.

All these domestic policies are openly recognized as identical in their content with the measures of professed fascist governments. This rapid movement toward fascism in the United States goes hand in hand with the sharpening of international antagonisms and the most gigantic preparations for war ever before witnessed in a pre-war period. More than a billion dollars have been appropriated for war purposes during this year. A large proportion of this has been taken directly out of the funds ostensibly appropriated for public works. Hundreds of millions are being spent on military training in the so-called Civilian Conservation Camps, run by the War Department.

The policies of the government in Washington have one purpose, to make the workers and farmers and middle classes pay the costs of the crisis, to preserve the profits of the big capitalists at all costs, to establish fascism at home and to wage imperialist war abroad.

#### A. F. OF L. AND SOCIALIST PARTY LEADERS SUPPORT ROOSEVELT

How can the workers and farmers fight against these policies which are driving them into starvation? The leaders of A. F. of L. have openly identified themselves with the policies of the Roosevelt administration. To the extent that these leaders control the trade unions, they prevent or demoralize the struggle of the workers and deliver them helpless into the hands of the capitalists. The Socialist Party supports the A. F. of L. leaders and endorses and actively supports every particular policy of the New Deal: inflation, N.R.A., A.A.A., P.W.A., C.W.A., C.C.C., the Wagner Bill, etc., hailing these fascist and war measures as "steps toward Socialism".

It is clear that the workers and farmers cannot fight back the capitalist attacks unless they break away from the policies of the A. F. of L. and Socialist Party leaders. As against the united front which these leaders have set up with the capitalist government, the toiling masses must establish their own

working class united front from below, against the capitalist class and the Roosevelt administration.

#### ONLY THE C.P. FIGHTS FOR THE WORKERS

Only the Communist Party has consistently organized and led the resistance to the capitalist attacks. The enemies of the Communist Party try to scare the workers and farmers away from this struggle by shouting that the Communist Party is interested only in revolution, that it is not sincerely trying to protect the living standards of the masses. They do this in order to hide the fact that they, one and all, pursue the single policy of saving the profits of the capitalists, no matter what it may cost in degrading the living standards of the masses.

The Communist Party declares that wages must be maintained no matter what the consequence to capitalist profits.

The Communist Party declares that unemployment insurance must be provided at the expense of capitalist profits.

The Communist Party declares that the masses of workers and farmers must not only fight against reduction in their living standards, but must win constantly increasing living standards at the expense of capitalist profits.

The Communist Party declares, if the continuation of capitalism requires that profits be protected at the price of starvation, fascism and war for the masses of the people, then the quicker capitalism is destroyed, the better.

It is no accident that the only serious project for unemployment insurance that has come before the Congress of the United States is the Workers' Bill for social and Unemployment Insurance, H.R. 7598 \* which was worked out and popularized among the masses by the Communist Party. Only the Communist Party has made a real fight for unemployment insurance and by this fight finally forced before Congress the first and only bill to provide real unemployment insurance.

It is no accident that the Workers' Bill for Social and Unemployment Insurance is being bitterly fought, not only by the Republican and Democratic Parties, but also by the American Federation of Labor and the Socialist Party leaders, as well as by little groups of their satellites, Musteites, Trotzkyites, and Lovestoneites.

It is no accident that, whenever a big strike movement breaks out, the capitalist press shrieks that it is due to Communist influence, and the A. F. of L. and Socialist Party leaders wail that the masses have got beyond their control.

It is true that all struggles for daily bread, for milk for children, against evictions, for unemployment relief and insurance, for wage increases, for the right to organize and strike, etc., are directly

\* Now H.R. 2827.

connected up with the question of revolution. Those who are against the revolution, who want to maintain the capitalist system, are prepared to sacrifice these struggles of the workers in order to help the capitalists preserve their profits.

Only those can courageously and stubbornly organize the fight for the immediate interests of the toiling masses, who know that these things must be won even though it means the destruction of capitalist profits, and who draw the necessary conclusion that the workers and farmers must consciously prepare to overthrow capitalism.

The crisis cannot be solved for the toiling masses until the rule of Wall Street has been broken and the rule of the working class has been established. The only way out of the crisis for the toiling masses is the revolutionary way out—the abolition of capitalist rule and capitalism, the establishment of the Socialist society through the power of the revolutionary workers' government, a Soviet government.

#### EXAMPLE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAY OUT

The program of the revolutionary solution of the crisis is no blind experiment. The working class is already in power in the biggest country in the world, and it has already proved the great superiority of the Socialist system. While the crisis has engulfed the capitalist countries—at the same time, in the Soviet Union, where the workers rule through their Soviet Power, a new Socialist society is being victoriously built.

The Russian working class, from its own resources and its Socialist system, restored the national economy which had been shattered by six years of imperialist war and intervention. It overcame the age-long backwardness of Russia and brought its industrial production to the first place in Europe, to more than three times the pre-war figure. It rooted out the last breeding ground of capitalism by the successful development of agriculture in the Socialist system. It completely abolished unemployment and tremendously raised the material well-being and cultural standards of the toiling masses. Upon the basis of its Socialist system, the Soviet Union has become the most powerful influence for peace in an otherwise war-mad world.

Its victories are an unending source of inspiration and encouragement to the toiling masses of every country. They are the living example of the possibility of finding a way out of the crisis in the interest of the toilers. The experience of the victorious workers of the Soviet Union before, during and after the seizure of power, throws a brilliant light showing the path which must be followed in every land, the path of Bolshevism, of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

In the same period of successful testing of the Bolshevik road in the Soviet Union, we have also the

example of the results of the policies of the Socialist Parties of the Second International. The Socialist Parties stood at the head of the majority of the working class in Germany and Austria. The revolutionary upheavals of 1918 in these countries placed power in the hands of the Socialist Parties. Their leaders repudiated the Bolshevik road, and boasted of their contrasting "civilized", "peaceful", "democratic", "gradual transition to Socialism" through a coalition government together with the bourgeoisie on the basis of restoring the shattered capitalist system. To this end they crushed the revolution in 1918.

They followed the policy of "the lesser evil", supported the government of Bruening with its emergency decrees against the workers, disarmed the working class, led the workers to vote for Field Marshall von Hindenburg, and finally crowned their infamy by voting in the Reichstag for Hitler after having paved the way for fascism since 1918. In Austria they supported the Dollfuss fascist government as the "lesser evil", enabling Dollfuss to turn his cannon against the homes of the Austrian workers.

Their "civilized" methods opened wide the gates for the most barbarous regime in the modern history of Europe. Their "peaceful" methods gave birth to the most bloody and violent reaction. Their "democracy" brought forth the most brutal and open capitalist dictatorship. Their "gradual transition to Socialism" helped to restore the uncontrolled rule of finance capital, the master of fascism. The German and Austrian working class, after 16 years of bitter and bloody lessons of the true meaning of the policies of the Socialist Parties, of the Second International, have now finally begun to turn away from them and at last to take the Bolshevik path.

#### U.S.A. IS RIPE FOR SOCIALISM

In every material respect, the United States is fully ripe for Socialism. Its accumulated wealth and productive forces, together with an inexhaustible supply of almost all of the raw materials, provide a complete material basis for Socialism. All material conditions exist for a society which could at once provide every necessity of life and even a degree of luxury for the entire population, with an expenditure of labor of three or four hours a day.

This tremendous wealth, these gigantic productive forces, are locked away from the masses who could use them. They are the private property of the small parasitic capitalist class, which locks up the warehouses and closes the factories in order to compel a growing tribute of profit. This paralysis of economy in the interest of profit, at the cost of starvation and degradation to millions, is enforced by the capitalist government with all its police, courts, jails and military.

There is no possible way out of the crisis in the interest of the masses except by breaking the con-

trol of the State power now in the hands of this small monopolist capitalist class. There is no way out except by establishing a new government of the workers in alliance with the poor farmers, the Negro people, and the impoverished middle class.

There is no way out except by the creation of a revolutionary democracy of the toilers, which is at the same time a stern dictatorship against the capitalists and their agents. There is no way out except by seizing from the capitalists the industries, the banks and all of the economic institutions, and transforming them into the common property of all under the direction of the revolutionary government. There is no way out, in short, except by the abolition of the capitalist system and the establishment of a Socialist society.

#### WHAT IS "AMERICANISM"?

The necessary first step for the establishment of Socialism is the setting up of a revolutionary workers' government. The capitalists and their agents shriek out that this revolutionary program is un-American. But this expresses, not the truth, but only their own greedy interests. Today, the only Party that carries forward the revolutionary traditions of 1776 and 1861, under the present-day conditions and relationship of classes, is the Communist Party. Today, only the Communist Party finds it politically expedient and necessary to remind the American working masses of how, in a previous crisis, the way out was found by the path of revolution. Today, only the Communist Party brings sharply forward and applies to the problems of today that old basic document of "Americanism", the Declaration of Independence.

Applying the Declaration of Independence to present-day conditions, the Communist Party points out that never was there such a mass of people so completely deprived of all semblance of "the right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness". Never were there such "destructive" effects upon these rights by "any form of government", as those exerted today by the existing form of government in the United States. Never have the exploited masses suffered such a "long train of abuses" or been so "reduced under absolute despotism", as today under capitalist rule. The "principle" which must provide the foundation of the "new government" mentioned in the Declaration of Independence is, in 1934, the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the new form is the form of the workers' and farmers' councils—the Soviet Power. The "new guards for their future security", which the workers must establish, are the installing of the working class in every position of power, and the dissolution of every institution of capitalist class rule.

#### WHAT A WORKERS' GOVERNMENT WOULD DO

The first acts of such revolutionary workers' gov-

ernment would be to open up the warehouses and distribute among all the working people the enormous unused surplus stores of food and clothing.

It would open up the tremendous accumulation of unused buildings—now withheld for private profit—for the benefit of tens of millions who now wander homeless in the streets or crouch in cellars or slums.

Such a government would immediately provide an endless flow of commodities to replace the stores thus used by opening all the factories, mills and mines, and giving every person a job at constantly increasing wages.

All former claims to ownership of the means of production, including stocks, bonds, etc., would be relegated to the museum, with special provisions to protect small savings. No public funds would be paid out to anyone except for services rendered to the community.

Unemployment and social insurance would "immediately be provided for all, to cover all loss of work due to cause outside the control of the workers, whether by closing of factories, by sickness, old age, maternity, or otherwise, at full wages without special costs to the workers.

Such a government would immediately begin to reorganize the present anarchic system of production along Socialist lines. It would eliminate the untold waste of capitalism; it would bring to full use the tremendous achievements of science, which have been pushed aside by the capitalist rulers from considerations of private profit. Such a Socialist reorganization of industry would almost immediately double the existing productive forces of the country.

Such a revolutionary government would secure to the farmers the possession of their land and provide them with the necessary means for a comfortable living; it would make it possible for the farming population to unite their forces in a cooperative Socialist agriculture, and thus bring to the farming population all the advantages of modern civilization, and would multiply manifold the productive capacities of American agriculture. It would proceed at once to the complete liberation of the Negro people from all oppression, secure the right of self-deter-

mination of the Black Belt, and would secure unconditional economic, political and social equality.

With the establishment of a Socialist system in America, there will be such a flood of wealth available for the country as can hardly be imagined. Productive labor, instead of being a burden, will become a desirable privilege for every citizen of the new society. The wealth of such a society will immediately become so great that, without any special burdens, tremendous surpluses will be available for use as free gifts to the economically backward nations, in the first place, to those which have suffered from the imperialist exploitation of American capitalism—Cuba, Latin-America, the Philippines, China—to enable these peoples also to build a Socialist society in the shortest possible time.

#### FIGHT FOR BREAD IS A FIGHT AGAINST CAPITALISM

The capitalist way out of the crisis lies along the way of wage-cuts, speed-up, denial of unemployment insurance, fascism and war. The revolutionary way out of the crisis begins with the fight for unemployment insurance, against wage cuts, for wage increases, for relief to the farmers—through demonstrations, strikes, general strikes, leading up to the seizure of power, to the destruction of capitalism by a revolutionary workers' government.

The Communist Party calls upon the workers, farmers and impoverished middle classes to unite their forces to struggle uncompromisingly against every reduction of their living standards, against every backward step now being forced upon them by the capitalist crisis, against the growing menace of fascism and war. The Communist Party leads and organizes this struggle, leading toward the only final solution, the establishment of a workers' government.

The establishment of a Socialist society in the United States will be at the same time a death blow to the whole world system of imperialist oppression and exploitation. It will mark the end of world capitalism. It will be the decisive step towards a classless society throughout the world, towards World Communism!

JUST OUT

## LENINISM—THE ONLY MARXISM TODAY

A Discussion of the Characteristics of  
*Declining Capitalism*

By ALEX BITTELMAN AND V. J. JEROME

15 cents

Order from

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York, N. Y.

# THE ZINOVIEV OPPOSITION AND ITS COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY SCUM

By B. PONOMAROV

THE whole of the Soviet Union and the whole proletarian world are burning with a unanimous hatred of the fascist scum of the Zinoviev anti-Party group and of the men who nurtured these scoundrels and who created the counter-revolutionary "ideology" for the fascist murderers.

Broad circles of the members of the C.P.S.U. know that the Zinoviev opposition was formed in the period between the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Congresses of the C.P.S.U. But the history of the Zinoviev anti-Party line has its roots in the far more distant past.

The opportunist position of Kamenev on the question of imperialism during the time when he was beginning to lean to Hilferding is well known. No less known is his shameful role during the trial of the Bolshevik fraction in the Duma, when he, "from fear", ignominiously disclaimed the consistently revolutionary line of the Bolsheviks. At that time Comrade Lenin branded his conduct in the central organ of the Bolsheviks—the *Social-Democrat*—as one unworthy of a revolutionary.

A recently published letter of Lenin to Zinoviev shows to what extent Lenin in 1916 exposed the double-faced policy of Zinoviev. The question under consideration at that time was that on the necessity of publishing an independent theoretical Party organ—*A Symposium of Social-Democracy*—in place of *The Communist* in which Bukharin and others participated and who intended to put through their anti-Marxist views there. "At the present time the position of the Party and the international situation is such", wrote Comrade Lenin, "that the Central Committee must continue to proceed independently, not binding its hands either in Russian or in international affairs." Zinoviev, together with Shliapnikov, was in fact carrying through another line behind the back of Lenin. Considering it necessary to bring about an agreement on the publication of *The Communist*, they covered up the vacillations of Bukharin and made it possible for him to establish factional connections both in Russia and abroad.

Zinoviev signed a letter to the Bukharin group (at Lenin's request) in the name of the editorial board of the central Party newspaper to the effect that the editorial board refuses to participate in *The Communist*, because the Leninist *Social-Democrat* could not and did not want to take upon itself the responsibility for such co-editors, and because their "attitude to the cause was a non-Party one".\*

\* Letter of V. I. Lenin to G. E. Zinoviev. *The Proletarian Revolution*, No. 4, 1934, pp. 76-77.

At the same time, however, Zinoviev was in correspondence with Shliapnikov behind Lenin's back, advising him to exert pressure upon Lenin in order to secure concessions from him. Lenin at that time exposed these machinations of Zinoviev and qualified his conduct as a "renunciation of our entire policy". When the letter was written, said Lenin,

"... It was your direct and unconditional duty at that time to make a forceful attack on the editors, to break away from them for ever and to bend all efforts in order to prove to Alexander the impossibility of having anything to do with these gentlemen as with editors of a leading magazine.

"Instead you propose to capitulate to them, to renounce all conditions and to take back from the editorial office of the central Party newspaper the letter which you signed personally. And this—under the pretext that 'it does not pay to treat them seriously': as a matter of fact you propose that *your* policy is not to be taken seriously, you are reducing to nothing the letter of the editorial board, you are denying your own self, and are giving the publishers the right to conclude that the editorial office of the central Party newspaper was being stubborn!

"These are already more than vacillations, these are vacillations in the third degree, which are turning into something much worse.\*

"... Do you know", continues Lenin, "that at Kienthal Radek wanted to gain a majority against us among the Lefts at their deliberation, utilizing Froelich, Robmanch and others, and that an *ultimatum* was necessary to compel him to recognize the *independence* of our Central Committee. What other 'game' will people play when the question arises as to the attitude to Junius (this question has already arisen) or as to the 'mechanical separation' from the Kautskyites, etc.! Do you *guarantee* that there will be none? If there will be any such 'game', it will be tantamount to a renunciation on your part of our entire policy. If not, then it is foolish, after all that, to bind our hands in the editorial board of our leading journal. I shall never agree to this insane policy. This is my final decision."\*\*

The subsequent history proved that it became a profession for Zinoviev "to repudiate himself" and his statements and to deceive the Party the same as he deceived Lenin. Moreover, both Zinoviev and

\* Letter of V. I. Lenin to G. E. Zinoviev, printed in *The Proletarian Revolution*, No. 4, 1934.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 78.

Kamenev inculcated the same policy into their group and educated the opposition cadres in the same spirit.

The whole opportunist line of the opposition is very clearly linked up with the position of Zinoviev and Kamenev in the days of the October Revolution. At that time they were against the October uprising and against the socialist revolution in Russia, basing themselves on the premise that the Bolshevik Party could not and must not take power into its hands, because the country was not yet prepared for a transition to socialism. In this question they were *leaning fully* to the position of the Second International.

While Lenin, Stalin and the Central Committee of the Party were calling the working class to struggle to overthrow the capitalist system, Kamenev and Zinoviev proposed to create a government consisting of all so-called socialist parties, *i.e.*, they proposed to include in it side by side with the Bolsheviks, the worst enemies of the proletariat—the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, who were at that time fully exposed as servants of the bourgeoisie. Zinoviev and Kamenev were the only ones among the whole membership of the Central Committee who were against the armed uprising in October. Moreover, they came out in a semi-Menshevik newspaper against the decisions of the Party, *thereby revealing to the enemy the decision of the Central Committee on the preparation of the uprising.*

“Kamenev and Zinoviev betrayed to Rodzianko and Kerensky the decision of the Central Committee of their Party on the armed uprising as well as the decision to conceal from the enemy the preparations for that uprising. . . . This is a fact. This is a fact that cannot be denied by any subterfuges. By their underhand lie to the capitalists, two members of the Central Committee *betrayed* the decision of the workers to them. There can be and must be only one reply to this; namely, the following immediate decision of the C.C.:

“Recognizing the complete strike-breaking character of the conduct of Kamenev and Zinoviev in appearing in the pages of the non-Party press, the C.C. expells them from the Party.”\*

“Strikebreakers”—was the ignominious nickname with which they entered the history of the great October Revolution.

In appraising their position in the period of October, Comrade Stalin wrote,

“At that time they directly stated that by raising an insurrection we were heading for ruin, that it was necessary to await the Constituent Assembly, that the conditions for Socialism had not matured, and would not mature so very soon. Trotzky proceeded from the same premises when he was for the insurrection. He made the direct statement that if a victorious proletarian revolution in the West

did not speed up its support in the more or less immediate future, it would be foolish to think that Revolutionary Russia would be able to hold out against Conservative Europe. . . .

“This is why Trotzky and Kamenev and Zinoviev found a common language in the tenth year of the October Revolution.”\*

Not stopping at the struggle against the uprising before the victory of the October Revolution, these “strikebreakers” came out against Lenin again in the period when power was already in the hands of the proletarian dictatorship. Again they strove to establish a coalition government and found the support of a number of other opportunists in this question. This position signified a surrender of the power already won to the reformists and conciliators, to the bourgeoisie. In place of Lenin, who was at the head of the first Council of People’s Commissars, they proposed to appoint bourgeois myrmidons, the worst enemies of the proletariat—Avksentyev or Chernov.

For his opportunist line at that time Kamenev was removed from the post of chairman of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets.

In the period preparatory to the Fourteenth Congress of the Party the Zinoviev opposition undertook a broad offensive against the Party along the whole line. It was in that period that Zinoviev and Kamenev *composed* their opportunist theories and platform and *girded* themselves for struggle against the Central Committee. All the preparations for the Twelfth Leningrad Conference were carried on in the same spirit.

In Leningrad, where Zinoviev worked at that time, factional meetings were practiced on a broad scale for the propaganda of the Zinoviev platform and for the “cultivation” of adherents. At these conferences criticism was developed of the line and work of the Central Committee and anti-Leninist theories were worked out on the most important questions of Party policy.

Thus, the adherents of Zinoviev characterized our system as State capitalism and considered the New Economic Policy as a complete retreat. Lenin pointed out at the time when the N.E.P. was introduced that it was a temporary retreat on the part of the Party in order to enable it to re-group the forces of the proletarian dictatorship and to launch a new attack against the capitalist elements in order to build socialism in our country, but Zinoviev radically distorted this Leninist teaching. “The N.E.P. is a retreat”, wrote Zinoviev, “When the proletarian revolution matures in other countries and the proletariat of the West comes to our aid then we shall again launch an attack. In the meantime it is nothing but a breathing spell.”

\* *Political Report to the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.*

\* Lenin, *Works*, Vol XXI, p. 355.

This formulation would unquestionably have brought the Soviet Union, the first country of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to defeat. Therefore, all enterprises in the Soviet Union which Lenin called "consistently socialist enterprises" and which form the fortress of socialist economy, were characterized by the opposition as "State capitalism". It is clear that State capitalist undertakings and their growth cannot lead to socialism and that there is no need to struggle for them—such was the direct conclusion to be drawn from this defeatist Zinoviev ideology.

The assertions of Kamenev and Zinoviev regarding our relations with the peasantry were closely bound with this anti-Party line. Zinoviev wrote openly that the Party must carry through a policy of neutralizing the middle peasant. While the Party, strictly adhering to the postulates of Lenin on the relations with the peasantry, considered that it was *building Socialism in alliance with the middle peasant*, basing itself on the poor peasants and fighting against the kulaks, the opposition was against the alliance with the middle peasants. Despite the perfectly clear statements of Lenin at the Tenth Congress of the Party on the policy of an alliance with the middle peasants, the adherents of Zinoviev slanderously maintained that Lenin was for neutralizing the middle peasants under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, the Zinovievites were against the basic strategic slogan of Lenin on the peasant question.

Kamenev and Zinoviev began to exaggerate the danger of the kulak to the point of panic in order to "intimidate" the Party and the working class, in order to compel the Party to give up the policy it was carrying through with regard to the peasantry. By juggling with obviously false figures they maintained that the kulak had gained control of two-thirds of the grain. In an attempt to discredit the line of the Central Committee, to create a panic in the ranks of the Party and to achieve the carrying through of his opportunist line, Kamenev shouted that the "central figure" of the village was not the middle peasant but the kulak, and that the kulaks had "flooded" all the lower rural organs.

The opposition put forward a clearly Menshevik demand with regard to the structure of the Party. In their desire to pose as the defenders of the proletariat and of the proletarian composition of the Party, the Zinovievites demagogically demanded that the ranks of the Party be increased by the time of the next Congress to the extent of 90 per cent of the Party membership being industrial workers working at the bench. This demand signified that the Party was to increase its ranks in the course of one year by four to five million new members, *i.e.*, by almost the whole working population of the Soviet Union at that time. This policy, once carried through, would have violated all the traditions of Bolshevism, would have destroyed the distinction between the Party as the vanguard of

the proletariat and the non-Party masses, would have dissolved the Party in the class and would have brought about the loss of its leadership and the weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The demand of the opposition regarding admission to the Party was clearly directed against the line taken by Lenin on this question in March 1922. In his letter to Comrade Molotov "On the Conditions of the Admission of New Members to the Party", Lenin clearly emphasized at that time the extreme crudity of the opportunist mistakes of Zinoviev on the question of admission to the Party.

"I consider it extremely important", wrote Lenin, "to lengthen the probationary period for admission of new members to the Party. Zinoviev defines the probationary period as half a year for workers and as one year for all others. I propose to leave half a year only in the case of those workers who were actively engaged as such in major industrial enterprises for not less than ten years. To establish one and one-half years for other workers, two years for peasants and Red Army men and three years for all others. Exceptions to be made in case of joint permission from the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission.

"I consider it very dangerous to leave the short terms proposed by Zinoviev without a change!"

Thus, the opposition took the errors of Zinoviev for its platform and not the directives of Lenin. We see that Zinoviev took the first chance to drag out his opportunist viewpoints on admission to the Party, views exposed by Lenin, and formulated them in opposition to the Party.

When organizing their adherents before the Fourteenth Congress of the Party and propagating distorted theories on State capitalism, on the N.E.P., etc., the Zinoviev opposition did not stop before the vilest and most slanderous assertions. Following in the footsteps of Zinoviev, his nearest comrade-in-arms, P. Zalutsky, who was at that time secretary of the Leningrad Regional committee, spread the slander of "the degeneration" of the Party, and of a "Thermidor", attempting in this manner to create the ground for a struggle against the Central Committee, and presenting the opposition as a defender of the revolutionary line. At that time, however, the whole essence of their anti-Leninist views indicated *who* was really degenerating and rolling down ever further into the camp of the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The views and slogans advanced by the opposition at that period, disguised by "Left" phrases, but essentially Menshevik, reflected the pressure of the petty-bourgeois elements on our Party, and the tendency of that element to turn the development of the land of the proletarian dictatorship along the capitalist path.

In all the preparations for the Fourteenth Congress

which the Zinovievites carried through they calculated on including in the Leningrad Committee a group of adherents of the opposition, picked beforehand, and to arrange a similar delegation to the Congress. In order to carry through their plan the oppositionists openly threatened those leading Party workers of the Leningrad organization who were not in agreement with the Zinoviev line, and had them finally removed both from the delegation and from the Leningrad committee. All the leading organs of the Leningrad Party organization (section committees, regional committees) were constituted by selecting the adherents of the opposition.

However, the Zinovievites did not make an open declaration to the broad masses of the Leningrad Party organization about their struggle against the Party line, about the fact that they had picked a delegation which was against the Central Committee, etc. All the attacks against the C.C. were for the time being conducted within narrow groups of those in opposition. The masses of Party members were told of the necessity of intensifying the struggle against Trotzkyism, of the necessity to wage a struggle against the errors of the Bukharin group and that the basic task of the Leningrad organization was the struggle for Leninism and watchfulness with regard to the growing kulak element in the villages, etc. This was conscious deception of the Party organization and it was only with the help of this deception that the opposition was able for a short time to secure a majority in the Leningrad organization.

The oppositionists concealed from the Central Committee their preparations for an attack against the line of the Party and the organization of their group on a definite platform. The whole "work" of the Zinovievites was done secretly, behind the back of the Central Committee and was, therefore, of a particularly corrupt and anti-Bolshevik character. It educated cadres who became used to declaring their solidarity with the line of the Party in words, but who prepared to stab in the back and attack the Party, in deeds. The whole activity of the Zinoviev opposition was an example of double-dealing. It pointed the way for all anti-Party elements, it gave an example of a secret, underground anti-Party struggle concealed for the time being by talk of unity. The Zinoviev opposition was the mother of the double-dealing groups which were formed later and which led a struggle against the Party.

The Zinoviev opposition paid particular attention to the "cultivation" of the Komsomol (Young Communist League) by attempting to inculcate its opportunist viewpoints there. With this in view the Zinovievites attempted to win over the Central Committee of the Young Communist League to their side, through the representatives of the Leningrad regional committee of the Y.C.L. But these attempts

ended in failure. The Leningrad Regional Committee of the Y.C.L. then attempted to call what was almost an All-Russian conference of the Komsomol in Leningrad under the protection of and under the direction of the Zinoviev center, but without the knowledge of the Central Committee. The basic task of this conference was a mobilization of forces for the struggle against the line of the Party. Here the Zinovievites wanted to conduct opposition propaganda and spread their opportunist viewpoints behind the backs of the Central Committee and calculated that it would be easier to speculate among the youth on the alleged "Leftism" of their slogans on the struggle against Trotzky, on equality, and on attracting to the Party 90 per cent of the workers, etc.

The undermining work of the oppositionists was exposed by the Central Committee, which forbade the calling of this conference and proposed that those who were preparing it should be removed from leading positions.

The corrupting ideological and organizational work of the opposition among the Komsomol bore its fruit in that the most confirmed opportunists and enemies of the Party were reared from the ranks of Komsomol workers of Leningrad. A whole theory was created to the effect that "the Party leadership alone cannot assure that the proletarian core of the League plays a leading role in the Young Communist League". This was a direct appeal to distrust the Party leadership and to elaborate their own political line which, independently of the Party, would have to ensure that the "proletarian core played a leading role".

Theories such as that "the Komsomol is more revolutionary than the Party", and that "the youth in general must be more to the Left than the Party", were also developed there. Such theories together with systematic anti-Party work in the ranks of the Leningrad Young Communist League, which urtured distrust in the Leninist leadership of the Central Committee and the general line of the Party, brought their results and led quite soon to an unheard-of onslaught against the Party.

A motion calling for the "recognition of the decisions of the Fourteenth Party Congress as correct" was defeated at a session of the Leningrad Regional Committee of the Young Communist League, *after* the Fourteenth Congress of the Party. This was something unheard-of in the whole history of the Komsomol. At the time when all the Party organizations were unanimously greeting the decisions of the Congress, the leadership of the Leningrad Komsomol accepted an anti-Party resolution.

Such were the fruits of that political corruption in the spirit of which the Zinovievites educated the members of the Komsomol.

It is perfectly clear that the *political guilt* for this

decision as well as for all the other "doings" of the enemies of the Party, who came from the ranks of the Leningrad Komsomol at that period, must be placed on the "new opposition" and its Zinoviev-Kamenev leadership.

At the Fourteenth Party Congress the opposition advanced their own reporter—Zinoviev, as against Comrade Stalin, the reporter for the Central Committee, thereby showing clearly to the whole Party that all the talk of the opposition regarding the unity of the ranks of the Party was nothing but hypocrisy and deception. In fact it was an open step to a split in the Party. The platform of the Zinoviev opposition was fully brought into the open and exposed at the Fourteenth Party Congress and at the Fifteenth Party Conference.

*The foundation of its whole political line was the denial of the possibility of building socialism in one country.* In summing up the results of the struggle for the Fifteenth Conference Comrade Stalin wrote:

"I think that the lack of faith in the victory of socialist construction is the basic mistake of the new opposition. It is a basic mistake, in my opinion, because all the other mistakes of the new opposition spring from it. The mistakes of the new opposition on the question of the New Economic Policy, State capitalism, the nature of our socialist industry, the role of co-operation under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the methods of fighting the kulaks, the role and importance of the middle peasants—all these mistakes are the outcome of this basic mistake of the opposition, of their lack of faith in the possibility of constructing socialist society with the efforts of our own country." (Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 308.)

In organizing the masses of the working class and of the toiling peasantry to carry through the current tasks of socialist construction, the Party took as its starting point the unshakability of the Leninist theory regarding the possibility of the victory of socialism first of all in one country, regarding the possibility of building a complete socialist society in the Soviet Union. This teaching was at the basis of the entire general line of the Party. As far back as the years of the imperialist war, in 1915, Lenin formulated and proved this theory. Already at that time Lenin exposed and crushed Trotzky, who came out against this doctrine. In the period of the struggle for the socialist revolution in Russia, from February to October, Lenin and Stalin took as their starting point in the entire work in preparation for the October revolution the possibility of the victory of socialism in Russia and waged an irreconcilable struggle against the opportunists of the Kamenev, Rykov and Preobrajensky type, who attempted to deny this theory.

The Leninist teaching on the possibility of the

victory of socialism in one country lies at the basis of the entire policy of the Communist Party. After the transition to the N.E.P. in 1922-23, and not long before his death, Lenin wrote that the Soviet Union has "everything that is necessary and sufficient" for the building of a full socialist society. He emphasized that "a socialist Russia will emerge out of N.E.P. Russia".

The Zinoviev opposition came out against these fundamental directives of Lenin, they came out against the basic principle which is serving as a guiding line for the entire policy of the Party in the period of the transition from capitalism to socialism, as well as for the whole of the practical work of the construction of socialism.

Zinoviev and Kamenev came out on the eve of the Fourteenth Conference at one of the sessions of the Political Bureau with the assertion that "the Party will not be in a position to cope with the inner difficulties on account of the technical and economic backwardness of our country, if the international revolution does not save us". In his book entitled *Leninism*, Zinoviev, in defining the N.E.P., preached the same idea. Both at the Congress and at the Conference the opposition came out with an extensive elaboration of this anti-Party and anti-Leninist theory and with attacks against the teaching regarding the possibility of building socialism in the Soviet Union. It retained this position during the entire course of its struggle.

We must emphasize that the question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country assumed exceptional political significance during the period under view. The Party had just lost its founder and leader—Comrade Lenin. It was at the time of the most difficult crisis in the development of the first country of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In characterizing this period and in comparing it with the eve of October, Comrade Stalin said:

"Then, in 1917, it was a question of effecting the transition from the rule of the bourgeoisie to the rule of the proletariat. Now, in 1925, it is a question of effecting a transition from present-day economy, which cannot be called socialist as a whole, to socialist economy, to the economy which must serve as the material basis of socialist society." (Stalin, *The October Revolution*, p. 130.)

This was the period when the delay in the development of the world proletarian revolution became clearly defined, and when the partial stabilization of capitalism set in. In connection therewith the following question arose: does not this stabilization lead to the weakening or destruction of the possibility of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union? This was also the period when the Party restored industry, liquidated economic disorder and began the reconstruction of the entire national economy along

the lines of the New Economic Policy. In connection therewith the question arose as to whether the N.E.P. would not weaken the possibility of constructing socialism in the Soviet Union.

Due to these factors the problem of the perspectives of our revolution arose before the Party with a particular sharpness. *You cannot build properly* without knowing the aim for which you are building, pointed out Comrade Stalin in proving the tremendous significance of the theory of the possibility of constructing socialism at first in one country. He said:

"Are we building in order to fertilize the ground for bourgeois democracy, or are we building in order to construct socialist society? This is now the root question of our work of construction. Have we the possibility of constructing socialist economy now, under the conditions of N.E.P., under the conditions of the partial stabilization of capitalism? This is one of the most important questions that confronts our Party and Soviet work." (Stenographic Report of the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I.)

The Party replied to this question in the affirmative. The opposition denied the possibility of creating a socialist society in the Soviet Union. In their numerous speeches, platforms and underground agitation during these years of struggle the opposition attacked this theory in every possible way, declaring it to be "a theory of national narrow-mindedness", "a break with Marxism", etc.

It is a great merit of Comrade Stalin that under the extremely complicated conditions of that period, he was able to estimate and show the Party the great political significance of this Leninist doctrine, that he defended it in the struggle against the opposition and developed it further. Stalin inspired the working class with the idea of the possibility of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union. Otherwise it would not have been possible to mobilize the forces of the proletariat for the struggle for those victories of socialist construction, which are now amazing the entire world.

The question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union was and is now a programmatic question which defined the general line of the C.P.S.U., the line of the whole development of the land of the proletarian dictatorship. When the opposition came out against the Party on this question they went over to the viewpoint of the Mensheviks.

In preaching a lack of faith in the victory of socialism in one country, the Zinoviev opposition went over fully to Trotzkyism and became an ardent defender of the Trotzkyite theory and of the Trotzkyite attacks on Leninism. It occupied a Trotzkyite position on all the basic questions of theory and tactics of the Party. At the same time the organic

union of both groups took place on the ideological basis of Trotzkyism. The leaders of both of these groups granted each other an amnesty. "We declare", said Zinoviev at the Plenum of the Central Committee in 1926, "that now there can be no doubt but that the basic kernel of the opposition of 1923 issued a correct warning of the danger of a move away from the proletarian line and of the threatening growth of the regime of the Party apparatus." The same was done by Trotzky, who declared that he was incorrect in his criticism of the errors of Zinoviev and Kamenev.

It is sufficient to recall what the adherents of Zinoviev said not so long before this about Trotzky, who has now become the "leader" of the united Trotzky-Zinoviev opposition, in order to estimate the full meaning of the above declarations, which testified to the opposition's complete lack of political principles. Kamenev then declared that:

"No sooner does the Party meet with any obstacles, no sooner is it necessary for the Party to turn the rudder, no sooner does Comrade Trotzky attempt to parade before the Party in the role of savior and teacher, then he always indicates the incorrect road, because he has failed to master Bolshevism on the basic questions. . . .

"The Party knew and became ever more convinced on the basis of experience that to act *according to Trotzky* means to substitute Trotzkyism for Bolshevism." (Emphasis mine—B.P.)

Zinoviev claimed the same after making dozens of declarations a few months prior to the creation of the united Trotzky-Zinoviev opposition, at meetings of the Party organizations of Leningrad, about the need "to intensify the struggle against Trotzkyism".

The real value of their words was soon clearly revealed. Men, who only a short while previously swore that they were the implacable foes of Trotzkyism and would always wage a struggle against this anti-Leninist tendency, took up Trotzkyism as their weapon and made it their banner in the struggle against the Party. The Zinoviev opposition jumped straight into the camp of those bitterest enemies of Leninism, who had fought for many years against the Party. This "fight" was an indication of the lack of principles, an indication of the unheard-of degradation of the opposition.

The adherents of Zinoviev gave an example of a policy which shrinks before no means in the attempt to corrupt the ranks of the Party and in the struggle against the leadership of the Party headed by the great immovable Stalin, who stood tirelessly, and with iron endurance, in defense of the cause of Lenin.

By its activity the Zinoviev opposition cleared the way for Trotzkyism to carry on its subsequent struggle; its leaders, as Comrade Stalin put it, acted as

"Trotzky's road-sweepers, who cleared the road for him". Having merged with Trotzky, the Zinoviev opposition poured new forces into the Trotzkyite group and together went so low as to undertake anti-Soviet activities on the eve of the Fifteenth Congress of the Party.

This merger was guided by one intention, namely, to gather all forces, all opponents of the Party line, for an attack against the Central Committee of the Party.

Such a policy created a new "philosophy"—the advocacy of the utilization of every possible means to achieve its aim, the overthrow of the Party leadership. The whole subsequent activity of the opposition shows that it acted on the basis of this premise.

Realizing that they were badly beaten, and wanting to prepare new forces for the continuation of this struggle, Zinoviev, at the Fourteenth Congress of the Party, made an appeal for a union of all anti-Party groupings. He proposed that "all the forces of all former groups in our Party be attracted to the work and that they be given the possibility of working".

Soon the Trotzky-Zinoviev group rallied around itself all the oppositional dregs and included them in the ranks of "the united opposition". They attracted the Shlyapnikov-Medvedev group, which the Tenth Congress of the Party, at Lenin's suggestion, condemned as an anarcho-syndicalist group, and which began actively to raise its head when it saw the attacks of the new opposition against the Central Committee.

The opposition then attracted the "democratic centralist" group of Sapronov-Smirnov, which had clearly turned to counter-revolution. The Trotzky-Zinoviev opposition fully supported the scoundrel Ossovsky, who spoke in favor of the development of bourgeois parliamentarism in the Soviet Union and who declared that it was necessary to allow the existence of various parties in the U.S.S.R., among them parties which could defend the interests of the capitalists—the Nepmen.

Not limiting itself to gathering together the enemies of the Party in the Soviet Union, the opposition set out to rally around itself opportunists of all shades in the ranks of the Communist International. The opposition established contact with opportunists and enemies of Communism, expelled from the ranks of Communist Parties, such as Maslov, Korsh, Urbans and Weber in Germany, Suvarin in France, etc., utilizing the fact that Zinoviev worked in the Executive Committee of the C.I.

This was how all opportunist forces hostile to the Party were attracted and rallied into one bloc. The

same obtained with regard to the means of struggle. The opposition did not refrain from overstepping the limits of Party principles from the very outset. Being beaten as they were at the Fourteenth Congress and having suffered a defeat in the Leningrad organization, which drove out the adherents of Zinoviev as soon as their true viewpoints became known, the opposition organized secret meetings of its adherents and went underground in order to wage a hidden struggle and to prepare for new battles against the Party.

In the Summer of 1926 the Zinovievites organized a secret meeting in a forest near Moscow. At that meeting pseudonyms and pass words were established, a report in opposition to the line of the Central Committee was given and means of struggle against the Central Committee were discussed. From the ranks of its adherents the opposition organized secret circles and groups which were supplied with literature, platforms, leaflets and other "materials" by its leaders: Trotzky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov, Zalutsky, Bakayev and others.

They established their own ignominious factional morality as to how in case of failure to behave before the Party Control Commission. They thus created their own system, ideologically corrupt, secret and demoralizing, and not too fastidious in its selection of methods of struggle against the Party and its leadership.

The Central Committee of the Party, having discovered a series of facts in regard to the anti-Party factional activity of the opposition ("the forest meeting", etc.) condemned them sharply, expelled Lashevich—the organizer of that meeting—from the ranks of the Central Committee and warned them that the Party would take more drastic measures with regard to the anti-Party elements not discontinuing their struggle against the Party.

The Central Committee showed and extensively explained to the Party the whole anti-Leninist, Menshevik-Trotzkyite and defeatist substance of the platform of the opposition, and the harmful essence of its factional activity (decision of the July Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. in 1926).

Towards the end of 1926, the opposition, having suffered another series of defeats and being badly beaten at the meetings of the workers' nuclei in Moscow and in Leningrad, into which it attempted to penetrate, made a declaration to the Central Committee on October 4 and 6. The opposition recognized as wrong its accusations against the Central Committee, condemned the opportunists who were excluded from the Communist International, declared that factional methods of struggle were impermissible and called upon its adherents to dissolve the existing factional organizations.

However, these declarations were nothing more

than deception of the Party. The subsequent activity of the opposition proved that it was only a dishonest maneuver on its part. The opposition did not discontinue its factional and sectarian activity. At the Fifteenth Party Conference of the C.P.S.U. and at the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the leaders of the opposition came out again in the defense of their old platform and their assertion of the impossibility of constructing socialism in the Soviet Union, thereby giving the signal to their adherents to unfold again the struggle against the Party.

At the same time the opposition continued its factional and disruptive work in violation of the promises made to the Party. At the beginning of 1917, at a large non-Party meeting devoted to the anniversary of the *Pravda*, Zinoviev made a criticism of the policy of the Party. Soon after this, the opposition concocted the so-called "declaration of 83", and collected signatures under this platform all over the country. The signatories of the declaration proved to be a small, insignificant group. Everything that was best in the opposition left it and fought for the line of the Party. In its platform the opposition opposed its opportunist line to the general line of the Party on all questions and degenerated in substance to the platform of counter-revolution.

Towards the end of 1927, the opposition finally became organized into a separate underground Party, with its center, respective local committees, membership dues, factional discipline, etc. Not stopping at their struggle against the Party, the opposition turned to open anti-Soviet activity. They spoke at non-Party meetings, organized underground printing presses, utilizing the assistance of open enemies of the Soviet Union in their work. The opposition formed a union with bourgeois intellectuals directly connected with White-Guardists who had prepared a plot to overthrow the Soviet government. The opposition was opposed to the manifesto on the 7-hour working day. Finally, during the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution it came out on the streets with its slogans and attempted to organize an open anti-Soviet demonstration. All these facts showed that the opposition had taken to the path of open struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

\* \* \*

The Fifteenth Congress of the Party, which met in December 1927, expelled 75 active leaders of the opposition from the Party. Following Trotsky and Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov, Zalutsky, Rakovsky and Bakayev were also expelled. At the same time Kotobynov, Rumyantsev and others were also expelled. The Congress gave the following summary characterization of the anti-Party and anti-Soviet opposition of Trotsky-Zinoviev:

"The Fifteenth Congress places on record that,

despite the warning of the Thirteenth Party Congress, which noted the 'petty-bourgeois deviation' of the Trotsky group, and despite the warning of the Fifteenth All-Union Party Conference concerning the 'Social-Democratic deviation' of the united opposition under Trotsky's leadership, the latter continued to intensify its revisionist errors from month to month, fighting against the C.P.S.U., appealing to non-proletarian elements in the country against the regime of the proletarian dictatorship.

"The ideology of the Opposition, which openly made an alliance with the renegades of international Communism (Maslov, Souvarine, and Co.) has at the present time developed into and taken the shape of Menshevism in its peculiar Trotskyist form.

"The denial of the socialist character of the Soviet State enterprises, the denial of the possibility of victorious socialist construction in our country, the denial of the policy of an alliance of the working class with the basic masses of the peasantry, the denial of the organizational principles of Bolshevism (the policy of splitting the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern), logically led the Trotskyist Menshevik opposition to slander the U.S.S.R. as having a degenerating Thermidorian Government, and to the denial of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., and the counter-revolutionary struggle against it." (*Resolution of the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.*, p. 174, C.P. Great Britain edition.)

Kamenev and Zinoviev on more than one occasion after making declarations of their errors and vows of allegiance to the Party again stepped forward to struggle against the Party. They were invariably present whenever it was a question of secret preparations for a struggle against the Party and whenever an anti-Party bloc was being formed. In September 1928, Kamenev carried on negotiations with the Trotskyites Pereverzyev and Kaplinsky, which were directed against the line of the Central Committee. During the period when the Right opposition renewed its attacks, Kamenev had conversations with Bukharin in an attempt to arrange a bloc. Finally, when the counter-revolutionary offspring of the Rights—Ryutin, Slepkov and others, organized their grouplet, they also gravitated to Zinoviev and Kamenev and discussed their counter-revolutionary platform of the restoration of capitalism with them.

The errors of Zinoviev and Kamenev, intensified manifold in the period of 1925-1927, brought them to a most ignominious anti-Party and anti-Soviet struggle.

The Zinovievites, after being smashed to bits by the Party and after they were reduced to being "generals without an army", made declaration after declaration to the Central Committee of the Party about their repentance and their recognition of the correctness of the line and of the entire policy of the Party, which they swore to defend.

The entire subsequent activity of the Zinovievites, however, showed that these vows of loyalty were directed towards getting their adherents back into the Party where they were to "sit tight" in anticipation of a more favorable moment. At the end of 1927, having been beaten by the Moscow proletariat, at the October demonstration, Kamenev and his followers declared that "*at this stage of development their cause was lost*". In this manner the leaders of the opposition gave directives to their adherents to simulate agreement with the line of the Party and to prepare for struggle *in the future*. The Zinovievites penetrated into the Party by means of lies; they "crawled in on their bellies" into the Party, assuring it of their solidarity, but actually they carried a stone in their bosom, ready to hurl it at the Party at the very first favorable opportunity.

Such was the past of the Zinoviev opposition.

Such is a brief history of the organization which nurtured the infamous assassins of Comrade Kirov. The development of this organization shows what liquidationist ideas were used by the opposition to educate its scum and what rotten methods of struggle against the Party they assimilated.

The history of the struggle of the Zinoviev opposition against the Party shows the road of that opposition to the thrice accursed "Leningrad Center".

\* \* \*

Kotolynov, Tolmazov and Rummyantzev, who were in the same group as Nikolayev and who organized the murder of Comrade Kirov, were trained for struggle against the Party in the ranks of the Zinoviev opposition and on its platform. At the secret Zinoviev meetings during 1925 and 1926, they went through the school of conspiracy and deceit which corrupted them to the core. It was precisely these men, under the direct leadership of Zinoviev and his henchmen, who organized the opposition in the Leningrad organization of the Young Communist League and carried through resolutions which refused to recognize as correct the decisions of the Fourteenth Congress of the Party.

It was these sprouts, planted at that time by the hand of Zinovievites and nurtured in the school of factional oppositionist struggle, that grew later into the White-Guardist murderers, the "Leningrad-fascist Center".

The roots of the opposition remained in Leningrad more than in any other place. There, more than anywhere else, were the Zinovievites able to deceive the Party members from the beginning and it was there that the struggle against the opposition was particularly sharp. After the Fourteenth Congress, the Central Committee sent a group of leading Party workers to Leningrad to explain the decisions of the Congress and to expose the opposition. The Central Committee sent Comrade Kirov there. At meetings

of Party nuclei in the factories and shops in Leningrad, the members of the Central Committee explained to the Party masses the anti-Leninist substance of the Zinoviev opposition, and exposed the fraud with which the opposition carried on its preparations for the Twenty-second Leningrad Party Conference.

Under the leadership of Comrade Kirov, the backbone of the opposition in Leningrad was quickly broken. During the following years, the Leningrad organization, freed by Comrade Kirov from the influence of the opposition, and watched over by him, became a firm support of the Stalinist Central Committee.

Having failed with their "theories" about the impossibility of building socialism in one country, beaten to dust by the Party, and cast out of leading posts as a result of their struggle, they utilized their membership in the Party along lines taught them by the whole history of the oppositional struggle in order to be better able to deliver a blow at the Party. They were already poisoned by Zinoviev-Trotsky ideology and practice and infected with hatred of the Party and its leadership. It was from this viewpoint that they approached all the great achievements of socialist construction, which gladden the hearts of millions of workers.

They did not, therefore, stop before the vilest of crimes. They killed one of the best men in the Party, a man beloved by the whole Party. They sent a bullet into the head of one of the best leaders of the working class.

In 1925-26 the Zinoviev opposition reflected the pressure of the petty-bourgeois forces upon the Party and the resistance of the class enemy to the transition of the proletariat to the broad socialist offensive; now this despicable scum of the opposition merely expresses the bestial hatred on the part of the defeated remnants of the capitalist classes in the Soviet Union, crushed by the mighty advance of the dictatorship of the proletariat and whom the broad socialist offensive has doomed to oblivion. At the same time these scoundrels express the tendencies of the whole of international counter-revolution, and the fond hopes and aspirations of fascism, the mortal enemy of the first proletarian State in the world.

The indictment of Nikolayev and others shows that "the aims and methods of struggle of this counter-revolutionary terrorist group in Leningrad fully coincide with the aims and methods of the open enemies of the people—of the emigrant White-Guardist, landlord-capitalist organizations such as the 'Russian Military Union' and the 'Brotherhood of the Russian Truth' (the Denikinites), who openly preach terror, and who systematically send their agents to the Soviet Union in order to organize and to accomplish terrorist acts against representatives of the Soviet Power and who carried out the murder of Comrade

V. V. Vorovsky, P. L. Voykov and others". The participants of the former Zinoviev anti-Soviet group established contact with the world counter-revolution and with the seasoned counter-revolutionary Trotzky, thus joining hands with all the enemies of the proletariat. Zinoviev's counter-revolutionary offsprings of the "Leningrad Center" were dreaming of intervention and of an armed attack of the imperialists against the U.S.S.R. They fed on the money handed out by the agents of imperialist governments.

Thus, the participants of the Zinoviev group, brought up by the Zinoviev opposition, are in the same ranks as the worst enemies of our socialist fatherland—as the landlords and capitalists whom the dictatorship of the proletariat overthrew and smashed during the October Revolution.

There must be no quarter for these enemies! More watchfulness, more vigilance in the day-to-day work of the Party and of the dictatorship of the proletariat!

*Ready February 28*

# Outline History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

By N. POPOV

The only available history of the C.P.S.U. in the English language, translated from the sixteenth Russian edition. The first volume covers the periods from the early Russian revolutionary movement to the October Revolution; the second volume: from the October Revolution up to the present. The full contents are as follows:

## VOLUME I

### *Chapter*

- I. The Historical Precursors of Bolshevism
- II. The Formative Stages of the Bolshevik Party
- III. The Iskra Period and the Beginnings of Bolshevism
- IV. The Revolution of 1905 up to the December Insurrection
- V. The Revolution of 1905 after the December Insurrection
- VI. The Years of Reaction
- VII. The Revival of the Movement
- VIII. The Party at the Time of the World War and the Collapse of the 2nd International
- IX. The February Revolution
- X. The October Revolution

## VOLUME II

- XI. The Party in the Period of the Brest-Litovsk Peace
  - XII. The Party in the Period of Civil War and War Communism
  - XIII. The Party During the Transition to the New Economic Policy
  - XIV. The Offensive on the Basis of the New Economic Policy
  - XV. From Restoration to Reconstruction
  - XVI. The Rout of Trotskyism
  - XVII. The Period of Socialist Construction
- Biographical Notes

Volume I, 420 pp., \$2.00

Volume II, 460 pp., \$2.00

Order from

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

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

---

---

Vol. XII

FEBRUARY 5, 1935



No 3

---

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
VALERIAN KUIBYSHEV . . . . .	79
<u>Editorials</u>	
FROM ACTS OF TREASON TO THE PARTY—TO THE FASCIST WHITE-GUARD SHOT . . . . .	81
A YEAR OF GREAT ADVANCES . . . . .	90
<hr/>	
THE SITUATION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE TASKS OF THE UNITED FRONT . . . . .	95
<i>By K. GOTTWALD</i>	
<u>Discussion for the Seventh Congress of the C.I.</u>	
ORGANIZE FOR DISCUSSION OF THE AGENDA OF THE SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL . . . . .	104
<u>Documents</u>	
THE MANIFESTO OF THE EIGHTH CONVENTION OF THE C.P.U.S.A. . . . .	107
<u>Information for Propagandists</u>	
THE ZINOVIEV OPPOSITION AND ITS COUNTER-REVOLU- TIONARY SCUM . . . . .	114
<i>By B. PONOMAROV</i>	

---

---

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, P. O. Box 148, STA. D, NEW YORK CITY

*Subscription price: one year, \$2; six months, \$1.*