

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VI. No. 29

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

TEN CENTS.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Leninism is Victorious	1145
Stalin's Speech to the Marxist Agriculturalists	1151
The Leeds Congress of the C.P.G.B. By <i>G. Safarov</i>	1162
Chang-Du-Su's Farewell. By <i>A. Martynov</i>	1169

Leninism is Victorious Sixth Anniversary of Lenin's Death

IT is six years since the death of the greatest leader—after Marx—of the working class movement.

Six years without Lenin—six years of revolutionary struggle in all countries of the world with an extraordinarily rapid transformation of the forms and methods of this struggle, of the advance and alignment of class forces, of change and development of world economy and world politics.

“Six years without Lenin,” says every revolutionary class-conscious worker to himself, and how goes it then with Lenin's work, with the work to which he devoted his whole life, how goes it with the existence and growth of the first proletarian state and with the development of the Communist International? This question concerning the progress of the proletarian revolution, the most potent weapon and lever of which are the Soviet Power and the Comintern, this question confronts all the oppressed of mankind on this the anniversary of Lenin's death.

LENIN'S death occurred at the moment when the first wave of the proletarian revolution—after 1923—was at the ebb, when the period of the “relative stabilisation of capitalism” had begun, that period of extreme difficulty and suffering for the proletariat, and the more widespread and intense grew the economic and political world offensive of capitalism against the working class the more eagerly did the social-democratic hangmen of the proletarian insurrection in Western Europe hasten to proclaim that Lenin's work, the proletarian revolution, was shattered and the more loudly did they prophesy its downfall. “Bankruptcy of Communist experiment,” “Liquidation of the Communist International all over the world,” they cried out with all their might in order to make the proletariat forget their own villainy and treachery—the villainy and treachery by means of which they had destroyed the revolution, the villainy and treachery they had used to make the proletariat submit to the yoke of

capitalist "stabilisation" now becoming more and more unbearable.

The Renners, Blums and Hilferdings, themselves guilty of all the misrepresentations of the reformist betrayers and all the calumnies of the renegade theorists and politicians of the Second International, tried to prove to the whole world that "Russian methods"—the methods of open warfare for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the method of insurrection against the tenacious and able hold on life of European capitalism—had failed. And the "Left" social-democrats, those most shameful of all the betrayers and stranglers of the proletarian revolution, produced as their most disgraceful handiwork a special theory about the "Impossibility of Bolshevism in the advanced capitalist countries." They announced far and wide that the "Russian methods of insurrection" had their justification in particular during the immediate post-war period when capitalism lay in ruins. It is obvious that the leaders of the Second International, themselves smeared with blood of the best of the proletarian fighters, could not convince the masses that the "World revolution was at an end." So long as the Soviet Union, the bulwark of the proletarian dictatorship continued to exist and to build up Socialism ever more rapidly and more firmly over one-sixth of the world's surface, so the illustrious leaders of the Second International tried to instil into the proletariat the poison of calumny. They spoke of the "Restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R.," of the impossibility of a victory for Socialism in the backward agrarian countries, of the irresistible economic and political power of stabilised world capitalism and its excellent organisation.

FROM the fact of the passing defeat of the Chinese revolution, the collapse of the English General Strike and the miners' strike, and from the fact of "successful capitalist rationalisation," they argued that the lesson to be drawn was that world capitalism had definitely stabilised itself, that the last echoes of Bolshevism, namely, in the East, had died away, and, as a last instance, that the collapse of the Soviet Union and of the Socialist experiment were also inevitable.

These were the "arguments" of international social-democracy during the whole period of development which followed on the storm and stress period of the first revolutionary up-surge after the war—during the period designated as the Second Period of Post-war Capitalism.

During this period the burdens borne by the international proletariat and by all the oppressed masses of the world were extremely onerous. The class enemy was continually making the greatest possible efforts to bring confusion into the ranks of the working class and its Communist vanguard. Mistrust in the success of Lenin's work—after Lenin's death—found its way in amongst the weak, unstable, elements in the Communist International and found expression in the deviations of Trotskyism and ultimately in the Right deviation.

DURING the whole six years without Lenin nothing is more certain than the historical vindication of the truth and verity of Leninism. It is the historical process which must give and has in fact given its judgment on the absolute validity of Leninism in every sphere. Both in the confirmation of the law of the unequal development of Imperialism and in what is closely connected with it, the possibility of building up Socialism in one country such as Soviet Russia, as also in the universal correctness of the "Russian method of struggle"—of Leninism, all over the world, in the advanced capitalist countries no less than in the backward colonial countries.

In a word, what had to be proved by the objective historical process itself, and at the same time by the subjective organisational activity of the Communist International, was the triumphant realisation of the work of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., the establishment on firm foundations and the strengthening of the Communist International, the closest unity between the struggle of the proletariat in the imperialist countries and the struggle of the oppressed peoples of the colonial countries.

And this test, this crucial experiment, has to be provided in the fight of Leninism, not only against the openly criminal and counter-revolutionary "international" social-

democracy, but also against the deviations from Leninism inside the Communist International.

Just as the whole historical period since the death of Lenin has been characterised by the ever-sharpening antagonism of the two world systems, the system of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the system of world capitalism, so has it also been characterised by the fight of Leninism against all falsifications of Leninism.

IT can already be said with absolute certainty that the triumph of Leninism in its severe struggle against the Trotskyists and against the Right deviators is also a triumph over social-democracy, a triumph over world capitalism. This triumph of Leninism means the advance of the world revolution, it means no less than the triumph of the work of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union, no less than the increasing revolutionising of the working class, and the growing tide of revolution in the colonial countries, no less than the Bolshevisation of the Communist International.

Events themselves have shown the validity of Leninist theory. Now that the Second Period lies behind us, now that the Third Period is displaying more clearly its characteristic features—the new revolutionary wave all over the world, the advance of the proletariat both inside and outside the U.S.S.R.—the fascist and social-fascist defenders of world capital must once more raise the bogey of Putschism; the spectre of the Communist International. These gentlemen have suddenly resurrected the deeply-entombed world revolution. Yes, they have suddenly started searching in every corner of the earth for, “everywhere the hand of Moscow is at work.” The far-sighted bourgeois politicians and journalists who leave the work of calumny to be attended to by their social-fascist servants, have to admit with a heavy heart that the underlying cause of the new economic and political weakness of capitalism is the triumphant achievement of the Five-Year Plan in Russia which exercises such a fascinating influence on the international proletariat and on all oppressed peoples. They are forced at the same time to admit that the ex-

panding economy of the Soviet Union stands in contrast to a further disintegration, to a crisis in the capitalist world. “Russia begins to glow, Europe grows cold,” writes the well-known bourgeois economist A. Feiler. In writing thus he but proclaims that the bourgeoisie itself begins to feel the approaching chill of death and the coldness of the grave.

Just as the first wave of the revolutionary surge forwards in Western Europe immediately after the end of the war, started under the banner of the fight for the proletarian dictatorship, just as then the historical world conflict could be expressed in the simple formula—bourgeois democracy versus proletarian dictatorship—so now at the beginning of the new rising tide of revolution the conflict cannot only be expressed in the political formula—fascist dictatorship versus proletarian dictatorship—but also in the formula—Socialist Five-Year Plan—construction, versus capitalist anarchy—destruction. History repeats itself in its crises, but the crises are each time more concrete and significant.

It is no accident that at the very moment when the slogan of the Socialist advance in the Soviet Union has become an international slogan—when it has indeed become the same kind of slogan for the proletarian movement all over the world, as was once the favourite word “Soviet”—that at this moment the world crisis of capitalism is taking on an increasingly momentous outline and is about to be intensified and rendered more acute by the crash in American “prosperity” which has just occurred.

NOW as never before we have proof of the whole profundity of the Leninist theses concerning the revolutionary forces which must of necessity arise from the unequal development of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism. Now as never before has the Leninist leadership of the international struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed colonial peoples been justified and confirmed, both in the objective conditions of struggle of the Second Period and in its passing over into the Third Period—the Period of new revolutionary advance. The greatest calumniators and enemies of the work of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. can

now no longer lie about the giant strides being made in the work of industrialisation and collectivisation.

In the same breath they are also forced to admit that the hope of unrestrained "development of prosperity" without internal convulsions in capitalist America has been shattered and that the crisis in America has begun to cast its shadow over the whole world, but especially over Europe. Seeing that the economic structure of West European capitalism, shaken to its foundations in the first wave of revolution, was bolstered up by the American dollar, seeing that in 1923 capitalist Germany lying prostrate was galvanised into life by the rain of gold of U.S.A. capital export, what will happen now, when, on top of the European depression and misery, there comes the American crash and the forced export of goods from the U.S.A. to render yet more acute the intensified competition between the imperialist robbers and to stimulate still further their feverish stirring up of world chaos?

The American crisis also means the collapse of one of the most important stalking horses of social-democracy used against the possibility of building up Socialism in the U.S.S.R. and generally against the spread of the proletarian world revolution, an "argument" which was based on the "indestructible" economic and political power of America which ostensibly was to be able to stabilise the whole European capitalism and proceed to "organise" a planned capitalist world economy.

IT is not sufficiently well known that the social-democratic thesis concerning the increasing "organisation" of capitalist world economy is based not only on the proclamation of the "organisational tendencies" of the Economic Conferences of the League of Nations, but also on the "world hegemony of America." Its whole conception of the manner of the stabilisation of European capitalism and of world capitalism drew from this its strongest demagogic arguments.

It is not sufficiently well known that the Trotskyist deviation of the "United States of Europe as the result and the necessary alternative to the hegemony of the U.S.A." was

itself nothing but a variation on the social-democratic conception concerning the capitalist organisation of the world through the domination of the dollar republic. "American capital," says Trotsky, "is in control of the situation, the diplomats are agreed. Yes, it is proceeding to extend its commanding authority over the European banks and trusts, over the European bourgeoisie as a whole. This is what it is striving to do. It will circumscribe the free field of the commodity market, it will regulate the activity of the European financiers and industrialists. If one wants to give a clear and precise answer to the question: What does American capital want to do? One must reply: It wants to put capitalist Europe on rations. This means that America will tell Europe how many tons, litres or milograms of this or that commodity it may buy and sell." (Trotsky: *America and Europe*.)

It has also not yet been fully demonstrated that the conception of the right opportunists and visionaries, both within the Soviet Union and outside, drew their inspiration from the "exceptional nature" of the U.S.A. and based its view of the organisation of national economy within the individual capital states in part on the prospect of American domination in the world market. Side by side with this went the overestimation of capitalist stabilisation all over the world, the underestimation of the possibility of a wave of revolution overtaking the proletariat of the imperialist countries, of a continuously developing revolutionary movement in the colonies, etc.

Side by side with this there was necessarily also an underestimation of the possibilities of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union. Was it a coincidence that the Trotskyists in the Second Period and those who took the Bucharin line at the beginning of the Third Period, prophesied the "approaching end," the "inevitable collapse" of Socialist work in the Soviet Union? Was it a coincidence that first one and then the other prophesied the destruction of the Communist International? Or was it that the ultra-Lefts and the Rights, in their efforts to "improve on" Lenin, could not do otherwise than over-emphasise the stabilisation of world capitalism and its possibilities of organising itself, and

in so doing unavoidably underestimated the possibilities of development and the prospects of victory of the international proletariat—underestimating in particular the possibility of the triumph of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.

It must now be recognised and proclaimed without hesitation that the ultra-Lefts, equally with the Rights, in their “original” theories are but echoing and repeating the social-democratic conceptions which stand in sharp contrast to the Leninist conception of the fundamental character of the proletarian revolution and of the dynamics of its further expansion all over the world. In this respect neither the Trotskyists nor the followers of Bucharin have ever adopted the Leninist fundamental law of the proletarian world revolution.

WHAT is this fundamental law brought down to its simplest formula, to a formula which in one statement brings together both the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country and the dynamics of the further expansion of the revolution over the whole world? “The unequal development of capitalism, both economically and politically, is a definite law. It follows from this that the triumph of Socialism first in a few, or even in one capitalist country, is possible. The victorious proletariat of this country when it has expropriated the capitalists and organised production within its own borders, would proceed to take the offensive against the rest of the capitalist world and in so doing win over to its side the oppressed classes of the other countries initiating insurrection against the capitalists and if necessary supporting this by military action against the exploiting classes and their state.” (Lenin.)

It is the special service of Comrade Stalin to have taught us to understand this important formulation of the Leninist conception of the October revolution. It is his great service in particular as that whilst adhering closely to Lenin’s formulation after the latter’s death, he first, in the fight against the Trotskyist theory of “Permanent revolution,” worked out the real meaning of Lenin’s strategy of revolution as it affected both the possibility of the victory of the revolution in one country and the October revolution as the beginning

and setting of the world revolution. Is it necessary to dwell any longer on the significance which the one true interpretation of Lenin’s law concerning the unequal development of imperialism and the possibility of victory in one country as against Trotskyism’s trail of calumny concerning the “National Bolshevism of Stalin,” has had for the whole Communist International, for the whole revolutionary movement of the proletariat and of the oppressed peoples during the six years without Lenin? In particular is it necessary to dwell further on the fact that this searching examination of the question of the support of the proletarian world revolution by the first Socialist State has been of the highest practical assistance in the revolutionising of the working class of all countries and of the colonial peoples? Is it necessary to dwell upon all this in face of the Five-Year Plan the victory of the Socialist planning principle in so short a time and at such a tremendous pace and on such a large scale?

THAT the formulation of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country was itself a formulation of international significance and that Leninism has triumphed over Trotskyism from every point of view and indeed over every social-democratic theory—this has been demonstrated by the actual course of events, by the practices of the class war. But it is of special importance for the proletariat and its Communist vanguard to recognise clearly how the question of the tempo of industrialisation, the question of the Socialist character of Soviet industry, and its relation to the middle peasantry in the period of the struggle against Trotskyism, and then again the question of the tempo of industrialisation and its relation to the kulaks and collectivisation in the period of the fight against the Bucharin point of view, how all the questions disclose a process on every page—the historical process of the class war in the Soviet Union and all over the world which must test the truth and correctness of the Leninist theory of revolution.

What were then the controversies concerning the Victory of Socialism in one Country, concerning the Socialist or State capitalist character of our industry, concerning the, so

to speak, "organic" contrast and irreconcilability between the interests of the proletarian dictatorship and the working peasantry as the Trotsky version expressed it, what were then the controversies concerning the hastening of the pace of industrialisation, of the firmer entrenchment of the kulaks. "Lenin's testament," the correct interpretation of the Leninist conception concerning NEP and Co-operation — what then were all these controversies but the struggle of Leninism against "Lefts" and Right, against the social-democratic falsification and for the victory of the proletarian revolutionary line? And can it now be gainsaid that on the basis of the correct Leninist line the proletariat, under the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and its Central Committee, the international proletariat and the oppressed colonial peoples, under the leadership of the Comintern, have not only strengthened and built up their positions in the Second Period, but have in the Third Period begun to advance and to proceed to a general attack on the class enemy all over the world? Can there now be any doubt at all that the world revolutionary movement, under the leadership of the Communist International, has held high the banner of Lenin in every battle and will continue to do so in the future? The formula "Victory of Socialism in one country and unequal development of imperialism" will be made specially clear in the present phase of the development of the world revolution in the fight against the Right danger, and in achievement of the Five-Year Plan.

"THE 'agrarian Socialism' of Stalin," writes a bourgeois journalist, "has come to life in an unexpectedly short space of time; it means that Socialist planfulness, the drive towards Socialist planned economy now embraces the hundred million peasants." The bourgeois journalist comforts himself with the reflection that the Russian tradition makes the peasant masses of the

Soviet Union amenable to Socialism. He will not long be comforted. The world agrarian crisis which cannot be overcome by capitalism, the revolutionising of the peasantry in all imperialist countries and also in the colonial countries, will also prove that Leninism is not confined within the frontiers of the Soviet Union in the matter of the collectivisation of the peasantry, and that when the proletariat of the imperialist countries victoriously sets up its dictatorship, "Russian methods" in the winning over for collectivism of the working peasantry of the advanced capitalist countries will prove their universal worth.

And this is no distant vision. Undoubtedly just as the realisation of the Five-Year Plan in Soviet industry under the victorious proletarian dictatorship at the period of the greatest intensification of class struggle all over the world is a call to battle to the proletarian masses to establish their own proletarian dictatorship and to proceed to their own Socialist construction, so will Stalinist "agrarian Socialism" have an extraordinarily revolutionising effect on the peasantry now being pauperised by capitalism, showing them the way to their own emancipation under the leadership of the proletariat.

Six years after the death of Lenin, at a moment when the stage "between two tides of revolution" has been succeeded by the period of the new flowing tide of revolution, the proletariat and all oppressed toilers perceive ever more clearly that Leninism alone can be their standard-bearer in the fight for the freedom of mankind from the curse of imperialism and imperialist war. At the same time they perceive and are convinced that the legacy handed down from Lenin is in good hands, in the hands of the Communist International and its leadership which has been tested in battle. Leninism is triumphant in the world, no power in the world can hinder the consummation of his idea, the proletarian world revolution.

Comrade Stalin's Speech

(At the Marxist-Agriculturalists' Conference, 27th December, 1929)

COMRADES! The chief fact of our social and economic life at the present time, a fact which is arousing universal attention, is that of the colossal growth of the collective farm movement.

The characteristic feature of the present collective farm movement is that not only are separate groups of poor peasants joining the movement, as has been the case hitherto, but the middle peasants have as to their mass also joined in the movement. This means that from being a movement of separate groups and strata of toiling peasantry the collective farm movement has been transformed into a movement of millions of the main mass of peasantry. To this circumstance among others has to be attributed the colossally important fact that the collective farm movement, which has acquired the character of a mighty, growing anti-kulak landslide, is sweeping aside the opposition of the kulaks, is shattering kulakism and is laying down the road for a broad socialistic construction in the countryside.

But whilst we have every justification for pride in the practical successes of socialist construction, we cannot say the same of the successes of our theoretical work in the sphere of economy generally, and in the sphere of agriculture in particular. Moreover, we have to admit that theoretical thought is not keeping pace with our practical successes, that there is a certain gulf between those practical successes and the development of theoretical thought. Meantime it is vitally necessary that theoretical work should not only keep pace with the practical work, but should outstrip it, so arming our practical workers in their struggle for the triumph of socialism.

I shall not expatiate here on the importance of theory. You know it all well enough. You know that theory, provided it is really a theory, gives the practical workers a power of orientation, a clarity of prospect, a confidence in their work, and faith in the victory of our cause. All

this has, and cannot but have enormous importance in the work of socialistic construction. Our misfortune is that we are beginning to limp in this very field, in the field of theoretical work on the problems of our economy. For how else can you explain the fact that in our social-political life various bourgeois and petty bourgeois theories on the problems of our economy still have circulation? How do you explain the fact that these theories and theoreticians have not yet been given their adequate repulse? How are you to explain the fact that a number of the basic propositions of Marxist-Leninist political economy, which are the best possible antidote to the bourgeois and petty bourgeois theories, are beginning to be forgotten, are not popularised in our press, are for some reason not brought into the foreground? Is it so difficult to realise that without an irreconcilable struggle with bourgeois theories on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory it is impossible to obtain a complete victory over the class enemies?

A new practice engenders a new approach to the problems of economy of the transition period. The problem of NEP., of classes, of the rates of construction, of the workers'-peasants' alliance, of the party policy, are all being raised in new forms. In order not to lag behind practice we have to engage now and at once in work on these problems from the viewpoint of the new circumstances. Without that it will be impossible to overcome the bourgeois theories which are defiling the minds of our practical workers. Without that it will be impossible to eradicate those theories, which have acquired the permanency of prejudices. For only in the struggle with bourgeois prejudices in theory can we achieve any consolidation of the positions of Marxist-Leninism.

I pass to a characterisation of some at least of these bourgeois prejudices called theories, and to a demonstration of their insolvency by the elucidation of certain knotty problems of our construction.

I. THE THEORY OF "EQUILIBRIUM."

You know, of course, that the so-called theory of "equilibrium" as between sectors of our national economy still has currency among Communists. Of course this theory has nothing whatever in common with Marxism. None the less this very theory is being propagated by a number of our comrades in the right-wing camp. This theory presupposes that we have in the first place the socialist sector—a kind of box—and in addition we have the non-socialist sector, a capitalist sector if you like to call it so—and this is another box. These two boxes lie on different roads and peacefully move on and on without getting into each other's way. From Euclid we learn that parallel lines never meet. None the less, the authors of this notable theory think that at some time or other these parallel lines will meet, and when they do meet we shall get socialism. But the theory leaves out of sight the circumstance that behind these so-called "boxes" stand classes, and the movement of these "boxes" is occurring in the course of a ruthless class struggle, a struggle for life and death, a struggle over the principle of "who is to smash whom."

It is not difficult to realise that this theory has nothing in common with Leninism. It is easy to realise that this theory objectively has as its aim the maintenance of the positions of individual peasant husbandry, the arming of the kulak elements with a "new" theoretical equipment in their struggle with the collective farms, and the discrediting of the position of the collective farms. None the less this theory still has currency in our press. And it is impossible to say that it has met with serious resistance, with resistance on the part of our theoreticians. How else are you to explain this inconformity, if not by the backwardness of our theoretical thought?

Meantime, it was only necessary to draw the theory of reproduction from the Marxist treasury and to set it in juxtaposition with the theory of equilibrium of sectors for this latter theory to be eliminated without leaving a trace. In reality the Marxist theory of reproduction teaches that the modern society cannot develop without accumulating from year to year, and it is impossible to accumulate without extending reproduction from year to year. That is clear and intelligible. Our large-scale centralised

socialistic industry is developing in accordance with the Marxist theory of expanded reproduction, for it is growing every year in its dimensions, it has its accumulation and is moving forward with seven-league strides. But our large-scale industry does not exhaust our national economy. On the contrary, the petty peasant husbandry still predominates in our national economy. Can it be said that our petty peasant husbandry is developing in accordance with the principle of expanded reproduction? No, that cannot be said. Our petty peasant husbandry is not only as to its mass failing to achieve an annual expanded reproduction, but on the contrary, it does not always have the possibility of achieving even simple reproduction. Is it possible for our socialised industry to move on even at an accelerated rate, when it has such an agricultural basis as the petty peasant husbandry, which is incapable of expanded reproduction and moreover constitutes the preponderant force in our national economy? No, it is not possible. Can we for any more or less prolonged period base the Soviet authority and socialist construction on two different foundations—on the foundation of the largest possible and homogeneous socialistic industry and on the foundation of the most disintegrated and backward petty commodity peasant husbandry? No, it is not possible. Sooner or later this is bound to end in a complete disaster to all national economy. Then where is the way out? The way out lies in enlarging the units of agriculture, in making it capable of accumulation, of expanded reproduction, and in thus transforming the agricultural basis of national economy. But how are we to enlarge the units? There are two roads to this end. There is the capitalist road, consisting in enlarging the units of agriculture by implanting capitalism in it; a road leading to the impoverishment of the peasantry and the development of capitalistic enterprises in agriculture. That road is rejected by us as being a road incompatible with Soviet economy. There is another road, the socialistic road, consisting in implanting collective and Soviet farms in agriculture; a road leading to the uniting of the petty peasant husbandries in large collective husbandries, equipped with technique and science, and leading to the extrusion of capitalist elements from agriculture. We are taking this second

road. Either the one road or the other. Either back to capitalism, or forward to socialism. There is and there can be no third road. The theory of "equilibrium" is an attempt to plan a third road. And just because it is based on a third non-existent road, it is Utopian, anti-Marxist. Thus we had only to bring the Marxian theory of reproduction into juxtaposition with the theory of the "equilibrium" of sectors for not a trace to be left of this second theory.

Why has this not been done by our Marxist agriculturalists? To whose gain was it that the ludicrous theory of "equilibrium" should have currency in our press whilst the Marxist theory of reproduction was hidden under a bushel?

2. THE THEORY OF "SPONTANEITY" IN SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION.

I turn to the second prejudice in political economy, to the second theory of a bourgeois type. I have in mind the theory of "spontaneity" in the work of socialist construction, a theory which has nothing in common with Marxism, but which is zealously propagated by our comrades in the right-wing camp. The authors of this theory make approximately the following assertions. We have had capitalism, Russian industry developed on a capitalist basis, whilst the village followed the capitalist town elementally, spontaneously, transforming itself on the pattern and similitude of the capitalistic town. If that is what happened under capitalism, why should the same not occur under Soviet economy, why cannot the country, the petty peasant husbandry follow spontaneously after the socialistic town, elementally transforming itself on the pattern and similitude of the socialistic town? The authors put forward this theory on the ground that the country can follow the socialistic town spontaneously. Hence the question whether it is worth our while worrying ourselves over the organisation of Soviet farms and collective farms, whether it is worth while breaking a lance in such a cause, when the country will of itself follow the socialistic town? There you have yet another theory which has as its objective end the provision of a new weapon to the capitalist elements of the countryside in their struggle against the collective farms. The anti-Marxist essence of this theory is not open

to any doubt. Is it not strange that our theoreticians have not yet found time to dissect this peculiar theory, which soils the minds of our practical collective farmers?

There is no doubt that the leading role of the socialistic town in regard to the petty peasant countryside is great and inestimable. On this very fact is based the transforming role of industry in regard to agriculture. But is this fact alone sufficient to ensure that the petty peasant countryside should itself follow the town in the work of socialist construction? Of course it is not sufficient. Under capitalism the countryside followed elementally after the town, because in their basis the capitalist economy of the town and the petty commodity economy of the peasant are economy of the same type. Of course the petty peasant commodity economy is not yet capitalist economy. But in its basis it is of the same type as capitalist economy, since it operates on private ownership in the means of production. Lenin was right when in his notes on Comrade Bukharin's book, *Economics of the Transition Period* he speaks of the "commodity capitalistic tendency of the peasant" in contra-position to the "socialistic tendency of the proletariat." This is the explanation why "petty production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie regularly, daily, elementally and on a mass scale." Can it be said that the petty commodity peasant husbandry is in its basis of the same type as the socialist production in the towns? Obviously it is impossible to say that without breaking with Marxism. Otherwise Lenin would not have said that "so long as we are living in a petty peasant country there is a more stable basis for capitalism than for Communism in Russia." Thus it arises that in order that the petty peasant countryside should follow the socialistic town it is indispensable that large-scale socialistic husbandry in the form of collective and Soviet farms should be implanted in the countryside as the basis of socialism, and capable of carrying the main masses of the peasantry along with them at the head after the socialistic town.

The position is clear. The theory of "spontaneity" in socialist construction is an anti-Marxist theory. The socialistic town must carry the petty peasant countryside after it by implanting collective and Soviet farms in the country and transforming the country into a new,

socialistic order. It is strange that the anti-Marxist theory of "spontaneity" in socialist construction has not met with its due refutation on the part of our agriculturalist theoreticians.

3. THE THEORY OF THE "STABILITY" OF PETTY PEASANT HUSBANDRY.

I turn to a third prejudice in political economy, to the theory of the "stability" of petty peasant husbandry. We all know the objections made by bourgeois political economy to the well-known Marxist thesis as to the advantages of large-scale economy over small-scale, which is alleged to have force only in industry, and to have no application to agriculture. The social-democratic theoreticians of the type of David and Hertz, when propagating this theory have attempted to operate on the fact that the petty peasant is tenacious, patient, is ready to suffer any deprivation so as to cling to his scrap of land. That in view of all this, in the struggle with large-scale husbandry in agriculture the petty peasant husbandry manifests stability. It is easy to realise that such "stability" is worse than any instability. It is easy to realise that this anti-Marxist theory has as its object only one thing: the glorification and stabilisation of the capitalist orders. And just because it has such an end, it was very easy for Marxists to shatter that theory. But that is not the matter at issue now. The matter at issue is that our practice, our reality provides new arguments against this theory, but in some strange fashion our theoreticians do not wish or are unable to exploit this new weapon against the enemies of the working-class. I have in mind the practice of abolishing private ownership in land, the practice of nationalising the land in Soviet Russia, a practice which emancipates the petty peasant from his slavish devotion to his scrap of land and thus facilitates his transference to the road of collectivism.

In reality, what is it that tied, still ties, and will continue to tie the petty peasant of Western Europe to his petty commodity economy? First and foremost it was the existence of his own plot of ground, the existence of private ownership in land. He saved up his farthings for years in order to buy his plot of ground, he bought it, and of course he does not want to be separated from it, preferring to suffer all and

every deprivation, if only to cling on to his plot of land, the basis of his individual husbandry. Can it be said that this factor in such a form is continuing to operate in Soviet Russia, in the conditions of the Soviet system. It cannot be said. It cannot be said, because in Soviet Russia private ownership in land does not exist. And just because private ownership in land does not exist in Soviet Russia that slavish devotion of the peasant to the land, which exists in the West, also does not exist in Soviet Russia. And this circumstance cannot but facilitate the transition of the petty peasant husbandry to the road of collective farms. There you have one of the causes of the fact that we have found it so easy to demonstrate, in the conditions of the nationalisation of the land, the advantages of large-scale husbandry, the collective and Soviet farms, over the petty peasant husbandries in the countryside. That is the great revolutionary significance of the Soviet agrarian laws, which annihilated absolute rent, repealed private ownership in land, and established a nationalised land. But from this it follows that we have at our disposition a fresh argument against the bourgeois economists who propagate the stability of the petty peasant husbandry in its struggle with large-scale economy. But why has this new argument not been utilised adequately by our theoretic agrarians in their struggle against all and every bourgeois theory?

When we carried through the nationalisation of the land we started *inter alia* from the theoretic prerequisites given in the third volume of *Capital*, in Marx's *Theory of Surplus Value*, and in certain agrarian works of Lenin, which represent a rich treasury of theoretical thought. I have in mind the theory of land rent generally, and the theory of absolute land rent in particular. Now it is clear to everybody that the theoretical propositions of these works have been brilliantly confirmed by the practice of our socialist construction in town and country. It is only not quite clear why the anti-scientific theories of "Soviet" economists of the type of Chayanov should have free circulation in our press, whilst these works of genius of Marx and Engels on the theory of land rent and absolute land rent should not be popularised and brought to the forefront, should lie under a bushel.

You must remember the well-known brochure by Engels on the *Peasant Question*. You

remember of course how cautiously Engels approaches the question of turning the petty peasantry on to the road of associative husbandry, on to the road of collective economy. Allow me to read the corresponding passage from Engels' brochure.

"We resolutely stand on the side of the petty peasantry. We shall do everything possible to make it more tolerable for them to live, to facilitate their transference to association, if they decide upon this. And in the event of their not yet being in a state to take that decision we shall endeavour to afford them as much time as possible to think over this on their own patch of land."*

You see how circumspectly Engels approaches the question of transferring the individual peasant husbandry to the road of collectivism. How is this at first sight exaggerated caution of Engels to be explained? What basis did he start from? Obviously he started from the existence of private ownership in land, from the fact that the peasant has "his own patch" of land, from which it is difficult for the peasant to separate. Such is the peasantry in the West. Such is the peasantry in capitalist countries, where private ownership in land exists. It is evident that here great circumspection is needed. Can one say that in the U.S.S.R. a similar situation exists? No, that cannot be said. It cannot be said, since private ownership in land, fastening the peasant down to his individual husbandry does not exist. It cannot be said, because we have nationalised land, which facilitates the work of transferring the individual peasant to the road of collectivism. There you have one of the causes of the comparative speed and ease with which the collective farm movement has developed recently.

It is irritating that our agrarian theoreticians have not yet attempted to disclose this difference between the situation of the peasant in the U.S.S.R. and in the West with sufficient clarity. Meantime, such a work would have the greatest importance not only for us Soviet workers, but for the Communists of all countries. For it is by no means a matter of indifference to the proletarian revolution in capitalist countries whether from the very first day of the seizure of power by the proletariat, socialism has to be

constructed there on the basis of nationalised land or without such a basis.

In a recent article in the press (*The year of a great change*) I developed certain arguments in favour of the superiority of large-scale economy in agriculture over petty economy, having in mind the large-scale Soviet farms. There is no need to demonstrate that all these arguments are wholly and completely applicable to the collective farms also, as being large-scale economic units. I speak not only of the developed collective farms with a machinery and tractor basis, but of the primitive collective farms, those representing, so to speak, the manufacture period of collective farm construction, and operating on peasant equipment. I have in mind those primitive collective farms which are now being established in regions of complete collectivisation and which operate on the simple addition of peasant instruments of production. Take, for instance, the collective farms in the Hopra area in the former Don region. Superficially these collective farms would not appear to be distinguished in the technical aspect from petty peasant husbandry (few machines, few tractors). But meantime the simple addition of peasant equipment in collective farms has had an effect such as our practical workers never dreamed. What was that effect? This transference to collective farms has yielded an enlargement of the area sown by 30, 40 and 50 per cent. How is this "astounding" effect explained? By the circumstance that the peasantry, impotent as they were in conditions of individual labour, were transformed into a gigantic force when they added their equipment together and united in collective farms. By the fact that the peasants obtained the possibility of working waste and virgin lands which were difficult to work in conditions of individual labour. By the fact that the peasantry obtained the possibility of taking the virgin land into their hands. By the fact that it became possible to bring into cultivation the wildernesses, isolated patches, boundary lands, and so on.

The question of cultivating waste and virgin lands is of enormous importance for our agriculture. You know that the central feature of the revolutionary movement in Russia of old days was the agrarian problem. You know that the agrarian movement had the annihilation of land shortage as one of its objects. Many then

* All quotations re-translated from the Russian.

thought that the land shortage was absolute, i.e., that there were no more free reserves suitable for cultivation. But what has resulted in practice? Now it is clear to everybody that there were tens of millions of hectares of free land in the U.S.S.R. But the peasant was completely unable to cultivate them with his miserable implements. And just because he was unable to cultivate the waste and virgin lands, he yearned for "easy lands," for the lands belonging to the landowners, for lands suitable for cultivation by the powers of the peasant equipment in conditions of individual labour. That was the basis of the "land-shortage." So it is not astonishing that our own grain trust now has the possibility of bringing 20 million hectares of free lands, not occupied by peasants and impossible of cultivation by individual labour and with the powers of the petty peasant equipment, into cultivation. The importance of the collective farm movement in all its phases, in its primitive phase and in its more developed phase, when it is equipped with tractors, consists in the circumstance that the peasant now obtains a possibility of bringing the waste and virgin lands into cultivation. That is the secret of the enormous extension of sown areas under the transference of the peasantry to collective labour. That is one of the bases of the superiority of the collective farms over individual peasant husbandry. It is not necessary to say that the superiority of the collective farms over individual peasant husbandry will become still less disputable when our machinery and tractor stations and columns come to the help of the primitive collective farms in regions of complete collectivisation, and when the collective farms themselves are enabled to concentrate tractors and combines in their own hands.

4. THE TOWN AND THE COUNTRY.

There is one prejudice cultivated by the bourgeois economists in regard to the so-called "scissors," against which a ruthless war has to be declared, as against all the other bourgeois theories which unfortunately find circulation in our Soviet press. I have in mind the theory that the October revolution ostensibly gave the peasantry less than did the February revolution, that really speaking the October revolution gave the peasantry nothing. At one time this prejudice was boomed in our press by one of the

"Soviet" economists. It is true that this "Soviet" economist renounced his theory. (Voice: Who was he?) It was Groman. But this theory was taken up by the Trotskyist-Zinoviev opposition and exploited against the party. Nor is there any justification for declaring that this theory has no circulation even at the present time in circles of "Soviet society." This is a very important question, comrades. It affects the problem of the inter-relationships between town and country. It affects the problem of the abolition of the antagonism between town and country. So I think it is worth while my discussing this strange theory.

Is it true that the peasantry got nothing out of the October revolution?

Let us consider the facts.

In my hands is a certain table drawn up by a certain statistician, Comrade Nemchinov, and published in my article *On the Grain Front*. From this table it is evident that in pre-revolutionary times the landowners "produced" not less than 600 million poods of grain. Thus at that time the landowners held 600 million poods of grain. The kulaks then "produced" 1,900 million poods of grain. That is a very considerable force, then possessed by the kulaks. But the poor and middle peasants produced 2,500 million poods of grain. That is the picture of the situation in the old countryside, before the October revolution. What modifications occurred in the country after October? I take the figures from the same table. 1927, for instance. How much did the landowners produce in that year? Obviously they produced nothing and could not produce, since the landowners had been abolished by the October revolution. You realise that this must have served as a great relief to the peasantry, for the peasantry were emancipated from the landowners' yoke. That is, of course, a great gain for the peasantry, obtained by them as the result of the October revolution. How much did the kulaks produce in 1927? Six hundred million poods of grain instead of 1,900 million poods. Thus the kulaks had weakened to less than a third of their strength during the period following the October revolution. You realise that this could not but prove a relief to the position of the poor and the middle peasants. And how much did the poor and middle peasantry produce in 1927? Four thousand million

poods instead of 2,500 million poods. Thus the poor and middle peasants had begun since the October revolution to produce 1,500 million poods of grain more than in pre-revolutionary times.

These are facts which show that the poor and middle peasants have made colossal gains out of the October revolution.

That is what the October revolution has given the poor and middle peasants.

After that, how can it be maintained that the October revolution gave the peasantry nothing?

But that is not all, comrades. The October revolution abolished private ownership in land, abolished the sale and purchase of land, established the nationalisation of land. What does that mean? It means that the peasantry has no need whatever to buy land in order to produce grain. Formerly he spent years in accumulating resources in order to acquire land, he got into debt, sold himself into serfdom if only he might acquire land. Of course his expenses in purchasing land were added to the cost of production of grain. Now the peasant has no need of that. Now he can produce grain without purchasing land. Is that a relief to the peasant or is it not? It is obvious that it is a relief.

Further, until recently the peasant was forced to turn over his land with his old equipment, in the course of individual labour. It is known to everybody that individual labour, equipped with old, now no longer serviceable implements of production, does not yield that gain which is necessary to tolerable existence, to a systematic raising of one's material situation, to a development of one's culture and emergence on to the broad road of socialist construction. Now, since the intensified development of the collective farm movement, the peasants are able to unite their labour with the labour of their neighbours, to unite in a collective farm, to break up the virgin lands, to exploit the waste lands, to obtain machinery and tractors and thus to raise the productivity of their labour twice, if not thrice. And what does that mean? It means that the peasantry now are able, thanks to their union in collective farms, to produce considerably more than before, with the same expenditure of labour. Thus this means that the production of grain can become much cheaper than was the case until recently. And finally, this means that with stable prices the peasant

can obtain considerably more for his grain than he has received hitherto.

After that how can anyone maintain that the October revolution has not brought any gain to the peasantry?

Is it not clear that those who spread such legends are openly slandering the party and the Soviet Government?

But what follows from all this?

It follows that the question of the "scissors", the question of the liquidation of the "scissors" must now be raised in a new form. It follows that if the collective farm movement continues to grow at its present rate the "scissors" will be abolished at an early date. It follows that the question of relationships between town and country will stand on new ground, that the antagonism between town and country will be swept away at an accelerated rate.

Comrades, this circumstance is of the greatest importance for all our construction. It will transform the psychology of the peasant and turn his face townwards. It will create the basis for the abolition of the opposition of town to country. It will create the basis for the party slogan "face towards the village" to be complemented by the peasant-collective farmers' slogan of "face towards the town." And there is nothing surprising in this, for the peasant is now receiving from the town machinery, and tractors, the agrarian instructor, the organiser, in a word direct aid in his struggle against and overcoming of the kulaks. The peasant of the old type with his brutish distrust of the town as a spoliator, is dying out. He is being replaced by a new peasant, the peasant collective farmer, who looks towards the town with hope. The peasant of the old type, afraid of sinking to the status of the poor peasant and only stealthily raising himself to the status of the kulak (he might be deprived of his electoral rights!) is being replaced by a new peasant, with a new outlook, that of entering the collective farms and getting out of his indigence.

That is how the whole situation is turning, comrades.

But that makes it all the more irritating, comrades, that our theoretic agriculturalists have not taken all measures to dissect and tear out by the roots all and every bourgeois theory which endeavours to depreciate the conquests of the October revolution.

5. THE NATURE OF THE COLLECTIVE FARMS.

The collective farm as a type of economy is one of the forms of socialistic economy. There cannot be any question of that.

One of the speakers from this platform depreciated the collective farms. He assured us that the collective farms as economic organisations have nothing in common with the socialist form of economy. I have to declare, comrades, that such a characterisation of the collective farms is absolutely inaccurate. There can be no doubt whatever that that characterisation has nothing in common with Leninism.

How is the type of economy defined? Obviously by the human relationships in the process of production. By what other method can you define the type of economy? But is there in the collective farms a class of people possessing the means of production, and another class deprived of the means of production? Is there a class of exploiters and a class of exploited in the collective farms? Is the collective farm not the socialisation of the basic means of production on the land, which furthermore belongs to the State? What justification is there for declaring that the collective farms as a type of economy do not constitute one of the forms of socialist economy?

Of course there are contradictions in the collective farms. Of course there are individualist and even kulak vestiges, which have not yet fallen away, but which must fall away with the passing of time, as the collective farms are consolidated, as they are mechanised. But can it be denied that taken as a whole the collective farms with their contradictions and defects, the collective farms as an economic fact constitute in their basis a new road of development of the countryside, a road of socialist development of the country, in contradistinction from the kulak, capitalist road of development? Can it be denied that the collective farms (I speak of collective farms, and not pseudo-collective farms) in our conditions constitute a basis and lever of socialist construction in the country, one which has grown up in desperate encounters with the capitalist elements?

Is it not obvious that the attempts of certain comrades to depreciate the collective farms and to declare them a bourgeois form of economy are deprived of all justification?

We did not possess any mass collective farm movement in 1923. In his brochure on *Co-operation* Lenin has in view all the forms of co-operation, both its lower forms (supply and disposal) and its higher (collective farm) forms. And what did he then say about co-operation, about co-operative enterprises? Here is a quotation from Lenin's brochure *On Co-operation*.

"In our presently existing system the co-operative enterprises are distinguished from private capitalistic, as being collective enterprises, but are not distinguished from socialistic enterprises if they are based on the land, with the means of production belonging to the State, i.e., to the working-class."

Thus Lenin takes the co-operative enterprises not of themselves but in connection with our existing system, in connection with their functioning on land belonging to the State, in a country where the means of production belong to the State; and considering them in such circumstances, Lenin declares that the co-operative enterprises are not distinguished from socialistic enterprises.

So Lenin spoke of co-operative enterprises generally. Is it not clear that the same can be said with all the greater justification of the collective farms of our day?

This *inter alia* explains why Lenin considers the "simple growth of co-operation" in our conditions as "identical with the growth of socialism."

You see that in depreciating the collective farms the above-mentioned speaker committed the crudest of errors against Leninism.

From this error arises his second error: concerning the class struggle in the collective farms. The speaker so eloquently described the class struggle in the collective farms that one could think that the class struggle in the collective farms is not different from the class struggle outside the collective farms. Moreover, one might think that it there becomes even more ruthless. For that matter the aforementioned speaker was not alone in this error. The talk about the class struggle, the howling and wailing concerning the class struggle in the collective farms is now a characteristic feature of all our "left-wing" croakers. And the most comical part of this howling is that these howlers see the class struggle where it is non-existent or

almost non-existent, but do not see it where it exists and is flooding over the edges. Are there elements of class struggle in the collective farms? Yes, there are. There cannot but be elements of the class struggle in the collective farms, so long as the vestiges of individualist, of even kulak psychology survive in them, so long as there is a certain inequality in them. Can it be said that the class struggle in the collective farms is equal in importance to the class struggle outside the farms? No, it cannot. That is the error of our "left-wing" phrasists, that they do not see this difference. What does the class struggle outside the collective farms, before the formation of collective farms, mean? It means the struggle with the kulak, who possesses the instruments and means of production and who enslaves the poor peasant to himself with the aid of these instruments and means of production. That struggle represents a struggle for life and death. But what is the meaning of the class struggle at the basis of the collective farms? It means first and foremost that the kulak is shattered and deprived of the instruments and means of production, that the poor and middle peasants are united in collective farms, on the basis of the socialisation of the basic instruments and means of production. It means, finally, that it is a matter of a struggle among the members of the collective farm, of whom some have not yet been emancipated from the individualist and kulak vestiges and are trying to exploit a certain inequality in the collective farms to their own advantage, whilst others want to drive these vestiges and this inequality out of the collective farms. Is it not clear that only the blind can fail to see the difference between the class struggle at the basis of the collective farms and the class struggle outside the collective farms?

It would be erroneous to think that if we have collective farms we have all that is necessary to the construction of socialism. It would be all the more erroneous to think that the members of the collective farms have already been transformed into socialists. No, there is still much to be done in order to refashion the peasant collective farmer, to correct his individualist psychology and to make of him a genuine toiler for the socialist society. And that will be done all the more swiftly, the swifter the collective farms are mechanised, the swifter they are

tractorised. But that does not in the least diminish the enormous importance of the collective farms, as a lever of socialistic transformation of the countryside. The great importance of the collective farms consists just in the fact that they provide a fundamental basis for the application of machinery and tractors in agriculture, that they provide a fundamental basis for the remoulding of the peasantry, for the reforming of their psychology in the spirit of proletarian socialism. Lenin was right when he said:

"The work of transforming the small agriculturist, of transforming all his psychology and habits is a work demanding generations. Only the material basis, technique, the application of tractors and machinery in agriculture on a mass scale, electrification on a mass scale, can resolve this problem in regard to the small agriculturist, can cure, so to speak, all his psychology."

Who can deny that the collective farms are the very form of socialist economy through which alone can the many millions of petty peasantry become associated with the machines and with tractors, as with the levers of economic upliftment, as with the levers of socialistic development of agriculture?

Our left-wing "phrasists" have forgotten all this. And our speaker also forgot this.

6. THE CLASS MOVEMENTS AND THE CHANGE IN PARTY POLICY.

Finally, there is the question of the class movements and the attack of socialism on the capitalist elements of the countryside.

The characteristic feature of our work of the past year is that as a party, as a Soviet Government, we have developed an attack along the entire front on the capitalist elements of the countryside, and that this attack has given and continues to give, as we know, very perceptible positive results. What does this mean? It means that we have passed from the policy of restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulaks to a policy of liquidating the kulaks, as a class. It means that we have made and are continuing to make one of the decisive changes in all our policy.

Until recently the party stood at the position of restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulaks. That policy, as you know, was proclaimed at the Eighth Congress. That same policy was again declared at the introduction of

N.E.P. and at the Eleventh Congress of our party. You will all remember the letter written by Lenin to Preobrajensky (1922) in which he again turned to the question of the necessity of carrying out this very policy. Finally, it was confirmed at our Fifteenth Congress. And we have been carrying it out until quite recently.

Was that policy a sound one? Yes, it was absolutely sound. Could we have undertaken such an attack on the kulaks five or three years ago? Could we then have counted on the success of such an attack? No, we could not. It would have been the most dangerous of adventurism. It would have been a dangerous playing with attack. For undoubtedly we should have broken down in this policy, and in our break down the kulaks would have had their positions strengthened. Why? Because at that time we did not possess those rallying bases in the countryside, in the form of a great network of Soviet and collective farms, on which to base our operations in the decisive attack on the kulaks. Because at that time we were without the possibility of replacing the kulaks' capitalistic production by socialistic production in the form of collective and Soviet farms.

In 1927 the Zinoviev-Trotskyist opposition strongly urged the party to adopt a policy of immediate attack on the kulaks. The party did not follow this dangerous adventure, for it knew that seriously-minded people could not permit themselves a mere play at attack. The attack on the kulaks is a serious business. It must not be confused with declamations against the kulaks. Nor may it be confused with the policy of pin-pricking the kulaks, which the Zinoviev-Trotskyist opposition strongly tried to force on the party. To attack the kulaks means to break the kulaks and liquidate them as a class. Apart from these aims any attack is mere declamation, pin-pricking, empty talk, whatever you like except a genuine bolshevik attack. The attack on the kulaks means preparing for the job and striking at the kulaks, yes, striking at them so that they cannot again rise to their feet. That is what we, bolsheviks, call a genuine attack. Could we have undertaken such an attack on the kulaks with any likelihood of success five or three years ago? No, we could not.

In reality, in 1927 the kulaks produced more than 600 million poods of grain, and of this

amount they disposed of 130 million poods in the course of non-village exchange. That is quite a serious power, and it cannot but be reckoned with. And how much did our collective and Soviet farms produce in that year? About 80 million poods, of which about 35 million poods were thrown on to the market as commodity grain. Judge for yourselves, could we at that time have replaced the kulak production and the kulak commodity grain by the production and commodity grain of our collective and Soviet farms? It is obvious that we could not. In such conditions what would have been involved in a resolute attack on the kulaks? It would undoubtedly have involved a breakdown, and a strengthening of the position of the kulaks whilst we were left without grain. That is why we could not and should not have undertaken an attack on the kulaks at that time, despite the adventurist declamations of the Zinoviev-Trotskyist opposition.

But what is the position now? How do we stand at the present time? Now we have an adequate material basis to enable us to strike at the kulaks, to shatter their opposition, to liquidate them as a class, and to replace their production by the production of the collective and Soviet farms. You know that in 1929 the collective and Soviet farms' production of grain amounted to not less than 400 million poods (some 200 million poods less than the gross production of kulak husbandry in 1927). You know further than in 1929 the collective and Soviet farms yielded commodity grain to over 130 million poods (i.e., more than the kulaks yielded in 1927). In 1930 the gross grain production of the collective and Soviet farms will amount to not less than 700 million poods (i.e., more than the gross production of the kulaks in 1927), and they will provide commodity grain to not less than 200 million poods (i.e., considerably more than the kulaks provided in 1927).

That is how the situation stands now, comrades.

Now, as you see, we have a material basis in order to enable us to replace the kulak production by that of the collective and Soviet farms. That is why our attack on the kulaks is now meeting with unquestionable success. That is how we have to attack the kulaks, if we are talking of a genuine attack, and are not confining

ourselves to empty-sounding declamations against the kulaks.

That is why we have recently passed from the policy of restricting the kulak's exploiting tendencies to the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class.

Well, but what is to happen to the policy of declassing the kulaks? can we allow the kulaks to be degraded in areas where there is thorough collectivisation? is being asked on various sides. A silly question! One could not allow the declassing of the kulaks so long as we stood for the policy of restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulaks, so long as we did not possess the possibilities of passing to a resolute attack on the kulaks, so long as we were without the possibilities of replacing the kulak production by the production of the collective and Soviet farms. Then the policy of not allowing the kulaks to be degraded was necessary and sound. But now? Now is a different matter. Now we have possibilities of carrying out a decisive attack on the kulaks, of breaking their opposition, of liquidating them as a class, and of replacing their production by the production of the collective and Soviet farms. Now the degrading of the kulaks is being carried out by the poor and middle masses themselves, through realising thorough collectivisation. Now the degrading of the kulaks in areas of thorough collectivisation is no longer a simple administrative measure. Now the degrading of the kulaks is in such areas a component part of the formation and development of the collective farms. That is why it is silly and lacking in seriousness to expatiate on the degrading of the kulaks. When a man's dead, you don't mourn for his baldness.

No less silly seems the other question: can we allow the kulaks into the collective farms? Of course they must not be allowed into the collective farms. They must not, because they are the accursed enemies of the collective farm movement. I should think that is clear.

7. CONCLUSIONS.

There, comrades, you have six knotty problems which the theoretic work of our Marxist agriculturists cannot pass over in silence.

The importance of these problems consists first and foremost in the fact that their Marxist investigation will afford the possibility of pulling up by their roots all and sundry bour-

geois theories which are sometimes spread, to our shame, by our comrade Communists and which soil the minds of our practical workers. And we should have eradicated these theories and thrown them out long since. For only in a ruthless war with these theories can the theoretical thought of Marxist agriculturists grow and become strong.

Finally the importance of these problems consists in the fact that they give new features to the old problems of the economy of the transition period.

The problem of NEP, of classes, of the collective farms, of the economy of the transition period now arises in a new form. We must disclose the errors of those who understand NEP as a retreat and solely as a retreat. In reality at the very introduction of NEP Lenin said that NEP is not summed up merely in retreat, that simultaneously it connotes the preparation for a new resolute attack on the capitalist elements in town and country. We must disclose the errors of those who think that NEP is necessary merely to ensure a link between town and country. We need not any old link between town and country. We need such a link as will guarantee victory to socialism. And if we retain NEP, it is because it serves the cause of socialism. But when it ceases to serve the cause of socialism we throw it away and the devil take it. Lenin said that NEP was introduced seriously and for a long period. But he never said that NEP was introduced for all eternity.

We must also take up the question of popularising the Marxist theory of reproduction. We must work out the problem of a scheme for the building of a balance in our national economy. The scheme which the Central Statistical Department published in 1926 in the form of a balance of national economy is not a balance, but a playing with figures. Nor is the Bazarov and Groman method of handling the problem of the national economy balance suitable to our needs. The scheme for the balance of the U.S.S.R. national economy must be worked out by revolutionary Marxists, if they have any desire whatever to occupy themselves with working out the problems of economy of the transition period.

It would be well if our Marxist-economists were to set aside a special group of workers to work on the problem of economics of the transition period in its new circumstances.

The Leeds Congress of the C.P.G.B.

By G. Safarov

"THE peculiar feature of the present situation consists in this; that, while the contradictions are sharpening with very great rapidity, the political consciousness, and the formulation and expression of the issues are dragging behind. The workers are still uncertain; the Labour Government is able to build, not so much upon their enthusiasm, as upon their uncertainty of the alternative; the potential volume of opposition to the Labour Government is still dispersed and unexpressed. It is precisely this situation that is calling for a leadership which can voice the workers' demands, which can awaken and carry forward their consciousness to the active struggle ahead."

These words were written by Palme Dutt in the September issue of the *Communist Review*. Comrade Dutt is one of the most steadfast and conscious fighters for the Comintern line in Britain. But on certain

points it is impossible to agree with him. The capitalist Labour Government has long been unable to count on any confidence whatever from the workers, not to speak of enthusiasm. The recent "revolt" of the Parliamentary backbenchers, under Maxton's leadership, aimed for a brief while to revive confidence in the election promises of the Labourites among the workers' masses. MacDonald needs that the workers should believe that at any rate on the back benches fidelity to election promises is maintained. But even that hypocritical comedy has not succeeded. Nor can one agree with Comrade Dutt when he seems to contrapose the objective development of contradictions and the subjective lack of preparedness. In the issue of *Workers' Life* devoted to the congress a table was published which leaves no doubt whatever on this account.

The following are statistics (published by the Ministry of Labour) of trade disputes for the first ten months of 1929, as compared with the corresponding period of 1928:—

Groups of Industries	January to October, 1928			January to October, 1929		
	No. of Disputes beginning in period	No. of Workpeople involved in all Disputes in progress	Aggregate duration in Working Days of all Disputes in progress	No. of Disputes beginning in period	No. of Workpeople involved in all Disputes in progress	Aggregate Duration in Working Days of all Disputes in progress
Coal Mining	85	77,700	418,000	131	73,900	541,000
Other Mining and Quarrying	3	300	9,000	8	1,200	89,000
Bricks, Pottery, Glass, etc.	10	700	21,000	10	500	3,000
Engineering	9	600	4,000	15	19,700	62,000
Shipbuilding	20	3,600	14,000	22	7,300	432,000
Other Metal	14	2,800	37,000	30	9,300	164,000
Textile	26	23,600	682,000	41	394,800	6,708,000
Clothing	7	700	11,000	14	1,100	10,000
Woodworking and Furniture	25	1,100	13,000	13	1,200	13,000
Paper, Printing, etc.	2	300	2,000	1	400	20,000
Building, Public Works, Contracting, etc.	37	3,000	81,000	31	2,600	22,000
Transport and Communication	15	1,800	10,000	17	4,100	9,000
Commerce, Distribution and Finance	5	300	8,000	4	200	3,000
Other	7	200	6,000	14	600	5,000
Total	265	116,700	1,316,000	351	516,900	8,081,000

Capitalist rationalisation with the reduction of wages, the dismissal of tens of thousands, the modernised sweating system and overtime, with the systematic suppression of strikes and the expulsion of militant elements from factories and trade unions, unemployment to which there is no end, and the mockery of its miserable doles, etc., fill the workers with anxiety and agitation, elementally draws them into the struggle, develops and steels them in the course of that struggle. The least forgetfulness on the part of British Communists of the enormous, the decisive significance of the economic struggle is fraught with most dangerous consequences. The revolutionary battles in Britain can now be approached only through a development of that economic struggle into a political struggle. The partisan and disintegrated nature of the present economic struggles is a consequence of the circumstance that the monopolist position of the trade union bureaucracy, supported by capital and State machine, and the weakness of the organisation of the revolutionary elements, do not allow the workers any possibility of assembling their forces into a strong striking power, for every struggle, of extending the area of their struggles, of carrying out an organisational counter-offensive. The economic struggles naturally join up with the struggle against strikebreakers, against the police, against the triple alliance of capital, the State machine and social-fascism.

The British workers are displaying some uncertainty not in their choice between supporting the MacDonaldis and Maxtons and going in for a struggle, but in their choice of the leadership of the struggle. They do not clearly see the Communists in the masses, they do not know them well, they are separated from them by the police and social-fascist barriers and the curtain of ideological deception, and this frequently throws them into the arms of their enemies: they entrust or rather yield the struggle against T.U. bureaucracy into the hands of the bureaucrats, and the struggle with the Labour Government into the hands of the Maxtons.

The understanding of the inter-relationship of the elements and of the consciousness in the British workers' movement is a political task

of first rate importance confronting the Communist Party of Great Britain.

That is why we have begun our article on the Leeds Congress with this general question. The Leeds Congress was an undoubted step forward. And to go forward, especially in present-day Britain, means to go to the masses, to get into the masses, to go ahead of the masses, to break through to the leading positions in the class struggle, ruthlessly sweeping away right-wing opportunism and conciliation. What is wanted is not an abstract assimilation of the necessity of struggle with these latter, but an understanding of their definite harmfulness in conditions of a developing class struggle. The old Adam must be cast off, there must be no waiting for the "arrival" of a revolutionary situation; it never comes when waited for, such fatalism is of service only to the old pre-war social-democracy. The conditions for its arrival must be created, its arrival must be speeded up, and the masses prepared for it.

The Labour Government is being more and more compelled to take the road of open fascism. Naturally the bourgeoisie has confidence in its readiness to act as a remorseless instrument of imperialism and rationalisation, an instrument for suppressing the class struggle of the workers and the movement of the colonial serfs. But, frightened by the growth and intensification of the elemental manifestations of the class struggle, the bourgeoisie is beginning to display symptoms of impatience.

"As we expected," contemptuously remarks the Conservative *Empire Review*, "the popularity of the Socialist (?!) Government has not lasted. The artificial glory surrounding MacDonald in America and Snowden at The Hague has been replaced by an impenetrable fog. The Government stock has fallen. Unemployment is steadily growing."* (December, 1929.)

Lloyd George has expressed his dissatisfaction with Thomas in regard to the increase of the unemployed army by 150,000. The entire Conservative and Liberal bourgeoisie is expressing its doubts of the ability of the Labourites to deal with unemployment, with

* All quotations re-translated from the Russian.

the coal crisis and with the growth of discontent in the worker masses.

"Day after day the *Daily News* is advising the Premier to summon Lloyd George and Baldwin to organise an all-party committee for struggle against unemployment. If Mr. MacDonald is rejecting this because he hopes that the Labour Party can still do something in this sphere, then we could understand him. But he does not reveal this in the least. He sits by the bedside of the sick person, watching him get worse and worse, despite the miserable remedies of 'doctor' Thomas, and stubbornly rejects a consultation." (*Liberal Magazine*, December, 1929.)

The Liberal bourgeoisie is being sarcastic. Mr. MacDonald and his henchmen not only do not reject consultation, but they live solely by consultation. This is testified to by the story of the adoption of the Bill for Unemployment Insurance, which passed through a number of conferences between the Government and the Liberals, and which refused to alter the time of waiting for unemployment pay from six days to three (although until the 1926 strike the Liberals stood for a three-day period). And it is testified to by the fuss around the Coal Bill, which has buried the seven-hour day issue by allowing the mine-owners to decide for themselves the question of the "possibility" of a seven-and-a-half hour day and has rewarded them with fat subsidies. The *Daily Herald* is literally crawling on its knees to the Liberals, entreating them not to oppose the Labourites; and the Liberals issue an ultimatum, demanding unconditional submission. The "Labour" Government, as an instrument of struggle against the working class, is being run by the Liberals and Conservatives in the most direct fashion. And there is nothing fortuitous in the circumstance. The intensification of the elemental class struggle is evoking the instinctive endeavour on the part of the bourgeoisie to hold the reins firmly in their own hands: there are too great interests at stake.

This was clearly shown in the circumstances attending the hypocritical promise of "Dominion status" to India. The imperialist hounds saw that the growing revolutionary rise in India was devalorising their transaction with the Indian bourgeoisie, that the

matter had gone so far that the masses were striding over the hypocritical declarations of Irwin and MacDonald as mere insignificant trifles. "In the East," the *Empire Review* for December grinds through its teeth, "the Government's prestige may avert the necessity for resorting to naked force."

The Labourites' bloody handling of the Arab rising in Palestine, the agitation in South Africa against the slaveowners, the vigorous leftward movement of the masses in India with their open revolutionary demonstrations, the awakening of the Chinese workers and peasants, the U.S.S.R.'s victory over world imperialism in the Far East, all compel the bourgeoisie to think more and more over the "necessity of resorting to naked force," and compel them to resort to it increasingly not only against the colonial slaves, but even against the British proletariat. In November, capital emissions were lower than they had been at any time since 1922, being twice as small as those of last year, and four times as small as those of 1927. (*Manchester Guardian*, 3rd December, 1929.) Despite all its efforts at rationalisation, British capitalism frenzied at its obvious impotence, is marking time on its pre-war line, unable to get any farther. Cook, the spat-upon, bitterly laments the situation: "We must recognise that what some call overproduction, and others underconsumption, is characteristic of many of our spheres of industry, and the cotton industry has especially suffered from it." (*Times*, 2nd December, 1929.)

And now we have another "warning" voice: the voice of an official report. "It is possible that the progress of the new spheres of industry—artificial silk, the electro-technical industry,* the motor industry and auxiliary products will remove (future tense) the depression of British industry and improve the trade balance. . . . However, in these spheres as in all industry as a whole competition is becoming more and more intense, and it will be difficult for Great Britain to maintain her

* Here it is to the point to note the declaration of the *American Annalist* for November 29th: "This year there was a considerable development in British electrical industry, in which undoubtedly a large amount of American capital is invested."

quota of the world market. (*Times*, 4th December, 1929.)

Capitalist rationalisation in Britain as in other countries provides no way out of the vicious circle of competition, does not ensure any restoration of the old monopolistic position, but on the contrary causes increasing competition and deepens the class antagonisms more and more. The smash of the "boom" in America is intensifying the crisis of British imperialism.

Hence the especial anger with the country building Socialism. The capitalist "reconstruction" is failing while the Socialist five-year plan is winning out.

Hence the anxiety of capital not to let slip the moment when it will be possible to throw back the working class of Britain by a new blow on the lines of that of 1926, to deprive it of the desire for a counter-attack, and to force it into silence again for years.

The British Communists must not only understand that a revolutionary situation will not fall into their hands like ripe fruit. They must realise that the approach of this situation strengthens the endeavours of the capitalists to repulse by a direct attack the proletariat's preparing counter-offensive. The Labour Government in its capacity as a provocateur in the service of capital, is leading the working class within range of that blow. The Maxtons and Co. have by their recent little "revolt" revealed the secret of this great provocation strategy: they have "revolted" so as in the last resort to safeguard the passing of the Insurance Bill in its most reactionary form.

The whole situation calls the Communists into the masses, into the heart of the day to day struggle, to lead and develop it. Leeds was the first response to that call.

II.

The change in the leadership and the *Daily Worker* are the two important and decisive achievements of the Leeds Congress. The congress dismissed the old leadership, which had endlessly protracted the struggle with right-wing opportunism, had connived at it by their vacillations, and had even concealed

it in their own ranks. The question of replacing the leadership occupied an extraordinary place in the pre-congress discussions, it literally swamped all the more important political problems.

At times the observer of this discussion was stricken with doubts: didn't such an accentuation of the discussion around the question of the party central leadership connote an ignoring of the political question of the party leadership of the working class, the raising of the party to the level of the political problems of the movement? Undoubtedly there was an excess of elementalism in the pre-congress discussion, explained in no small measure by the incapability of the old leadership to direct the discussion in Bolshevik fashion. But there is something else also beyond doubt. The old leadership had so wrapped themselves up in traditional respectability that the elemental outburst of self-criticism in this form was an inevitable reaction to the attempts to "combine" the new line with respectability, with the desire to retain all the "given individuals" in the leadership. "No respect to persons" therefore became the chief slogan of the pre-congress discussion. In the other hand one has to take into account another peculiarity of British right-wing opportunism, acquired from its "ancestors," the Labour politicians. Empiricism, which doesn't care a brass farthing for any principles, has been so to speak the style of British intellectual life for a century past. This empiricism found its way into the Labour movement owing to the Liberal-Labour policy which perverted the British Labour movement for decades. Empiricism, *i.e.*, a contempt for theory, is equal to lack of principle. Lack of principle accustoms to light dealing with all political promises, to a light attitude to all declarations. The more assurances of "Bolshevik" readiness before and during the congress to withdraw all their past from circulation, the more suspicious did those assurances become. Among the inveterate opportunists and "men of the old ways" phrases about the "third period" became a kind of current coinage. They caught at the party weakness in the practical application of the class against class tactic, and endeavoured to condition it with left-wing phrases. The

party would not let itself be taken in and in its choice of new leadership showed that it is not disposed to take phrases seriously. It took the best elements of the old C.C. into the new leadership, together with new workers, of whom some were workers from the factories. In the discussion the healthy distrust flowed into the form of a particularly obstinate rejection of individual old candidates, in the form of accentuating the question of these persons.

The party did not effect this change of leadership cheaply. It would have been effected much more cheaply, it would have been effected much more easily and painlessly, and would have been politically more productive if the party had been able to raise definite problems of the new policy—of work in the enterprises, the Minority Movement, the newspaper, etc.—during the pre-congress discussion. This was prevented by the party's weak link with the masses, with the works and mines, the weak preparation of the party members for transferring to the new road (despite unreserved readiness for it) and an insufficient concentration of the party masses. The British party must draw the lesson from this. Right-wing deviations and conciliation will always be engendered practically in the form of passive isolation from the masses, in the form of under-estimation of the proletariat's class struggle, so long as the party does not find its historically won position in the masses. During the 1926 coal lockout the Communists were among the masses, were the mouthpiece of the masses. All the more should it now become the vanguard and organiser of the struggle. After Leeds the most important task is the struggle with the right-wing deviation in the practice of the everyday work and of the wide mass revolutionary battles.

However, the party must not merely remember this. The party effected the change of leadership by no means cheaply. For that very reason the party must with all seriousness apply itself to those separate warning symptoms which were revealed at the congress, especially in the conduct of the South Wales delegation, which up to a point endeavoured to put itself in opposition to the congress. The South Wales district organisation is one of the most important strategic

points of the party, especially now that a conflict in the coal industry is becoming a first-rate problem of policy. Hitherto the South Wales organisation has sinned not a little in the direction of trade union legalism in its work. It has done little to apply the new line in local conditions. Its link with the mining masses is quite inadequate. The delegates from South Wales could have brought great profit to the congress with their self-criticism. Meantime they allowed themselves to be drawn off by the right-wing politicians.

After the congress any attempt to exploit the defects in the party work—and there are very many of them—in the interests of fractional groupings, with the object of revenge for the congress would border upon a direct attack on party unity. The new leadership is elected by the party, and it is supported by the Communist International, as the plenipotentiary representative of the party for carrying through the new line not in words but in deed.

There is every justification for hoping that the vacillations of the South Wales delegation at the congress were only a transient episode. The attacks on individual representatives of the old C.C. who have entered the new C.C. were also such an episode. The party must now gain the maximum of solidarity; every member of the party who hitherto has not felt his everyday, living, organic link with the party must now realise that "shoulder to shoulder feeling," so essential in struggle; must realise that he is a soldier of the party, a fighter in his position, and not a loud-speaker "fulfilling" his party obligations through necessity.

The task of adapting the entire party organism to the carrying through of the new line is not ended by the change of leadership and the reorganisation of all the work in the centre. On the contrary that is merely the beginning. In the new system of party work the District Committees acquire a new importance. Their personnel must be chosen in accordance with the new demands. The chief position in them must be occupied by workers from factories in the basic spheres of industry. Leadership with the help of an aggregate meeting must be buried. The party

cannot develop and move ahead if it copies the former organisational features of the old Labourism, of a time when the party did not even have its own members in the Minority Movement of whole districts (in part it still does not have them) when members of the party were broken into units for "representation" in various organisations instead of systematic party work, etc. The new line can only be a road to the factories, and henceforth the successes of the party will be measured by its penetration into the worker masses in the factories, in the docks and mines.

The Leeds Congress was held under the slogan of a workers' daily newspaper. The entire party clearly realises that only through the *Daily Worker* can it get its finger on the pulse of the life of the British working class. The British working class can no longer keep silent. It cannot any longer be without a voice. In order to become a force on its own behalf, it must speak through a daily workers' paper; it must speak with the tongue of indignation and struggle, since it cannot longer wait. We should be comforting ourselves with deception if we said that the British Party had done everything necessary for the paper. In Leeds the party showed that the daily workers' paper had become its internal need, that it was ready to make the sacrifice. But the advance-guard cannot be a substitute for the masses. They have sinned in this respect hitherto in regard to all mass undertakings, and particularly in regard to the Minority Movement. Nothing can come out of such a substitution except endless confusion and the absurd question "Who is replacing whom?" The newspaper is a banner, with which the C.P. goes to the masses, so as to educate, to consolidate, to organise and carry them into the struggle. All Britain, all the mines, works and factories must be covered with a network of groups of friends of the proletarian press. The iron fund of the *Daily Worker* must grow into a proletarian cudgel: so that the bourgeoisie shall measure the growth of hatred towards them and their "Labour" Government by the success of collections for the workers' newspaper. The organisational undertaking must be transformed into the work of class consolidation, as

Lenin liked to put it. Enthusiasm, firmness and resolution in carrying through the Comintern line must be expressed in this. The splendid example of the French workers' struggle for *Humanité* shows the road to the British Communists.

The *Daily Worker* comes out on January 1st,* and it is called to win the sympathy and support of the majority of the British workers, who are tired of the bourgeois shouts and social-fascist lies.

That which was left uncompleted in the process of self-criticism and in the discussion at the congress must be completed in the course of an explanatory campaign after the congress, in the process of a definite carrying out of the congress decisions. The new central committee made a start in this direction in passing the extraordinarily important resolution on the immediate tasks of the party at its first meeting after the congress. "Down with Mondism and arbitration, against overtime, not a single workers' representative in the arbitration commissions, no recognition of arbitration decisions. The struggle of all workers and unemployed against capitalistic rationalisation—down with the government of rationalisers. For a seven-hour day, against overtime. Organise factory committees, as organs of struggle of all the workers for the daily class struggle. For a guaranteed weekly wage. Against the speed up; "slow down the job." These slogans, put forward in the C.C. resolution, can and must become the slogans of struggle of the entire class. In the same resolution special slogans are put forward for the miners (down with the arbitration organ for regulating wages), the textile industry (10 per cent. on wages), the railway workers (5 per cent. or a repeal of the 2½ per cent. reduction). The Minority Movement has to be reorganised anew, inasmuch as it must be developed out of the direct struggle at the factories, out of the organised demonstrations of the revolutionary elements in the old unions, out of the work of the new unions (where they have been organised owing to objective necessity), out of the unemployed movement, the youth and women's movement, out of the struggle

* Written prior to January 1st.

against the reactionary laws of the bourgeois Labour Government, out of the struggle against the hangman dealings with workers in the colonies, and so on. It will be difficult to take the first line of trenches. The first serious penetration into the masses will demand an enormous exertion of all the forces of the party. That is not to be done in a moment at one bound. There must be obstinate, forceful and systematically planned efforts. The C.P.G.B. will develop fighters who are not afraid of any aspect of the struggle, not afraid of street slander, terror, and revilings and will fasten to the workers. When the old C.C. was forced to remove three right-wingers (Inkpin, Wilson and Rothstein) from the centre and to send them to the districts, it was accompanied with such sighs, such "self-denying" gestures, that the thought involuntarily came to one — haven't these men grown vitally into the centre? Such an attitude to the work locally among the masses can lead the party only to defeat, into opportunistic swamps. If the care and thought of the party is entirely concentrated on the necessity of taking by storm its position in the masses, the leading position in the class struggle (it must be clearly realised that revolutionary positions are not to be found at the tail of the class struggle) the party will speedily find means of getting by the shortest possible route on to the high road. Tens and hundreds of roads of new approach to the masses must be opened, those approaches must be varied according to the definite needs. Take for instance the struggle against the preparation for imperialist war. The American comrades quite soundly point out that the British party were almost inarticulate about MacDonald's trip to New York, and in general have so far revealed little interest in the Anglo-American imperialist rivalry, and especially they have not troubled, in opposition to the fraternising of the MacDonalds and Hoovers, to organise a proletarian fraternisation of revolutionary British and American workers. It is true the American party has to bear its share of the responsibility for that. None the less it is absolutely correct that the struggle against the coming imperialist war cannot ignore the practical and definite development of inter-

national proletarian solidarity. Abstract, parrot-like phrases do not inspire the rank and file worker masses with confidence. They need a living example.

Take another aspect of the same question of international proletarian policy—the relationships between the British workers' movement and the revolutionary and workers' movement in India. The Minority Movement has now existed for several years in Britain. One would have thought it could have been remembered that the Indian proletariat had only seen such doubtful "representatives" of the British proletariat as Purcell. A contact could have been established with the "Girni Kamgar," with the Railway Workers' Union, in order to assist the young division of genuinely self-denying fighters. That would have immense importance for the struggle against the imperialist doping of the British workers. Like many other things, this passed over the heads of the Minority Movement, despite the fact that the Meerut trial attracted its attention. The most ruthless war must be declared on outworn conservatism and "respectable" traditions. At the same time the party must remember also those workers who have been in its ranks (there has been a party membership of 12,000) and for some reason have abandoned their posts. The party cannot for a moment reconcile itself to the ebb in its membership, to the loss of even one subscription to the workers' newspaper, to the loss of even one revolutionary worker. Some opportunist, such as Gore-Graham, may explain all the misfortunes of the revolutionary advance-guard . . . by the revolutionisation of the situation. The situation, you see, is being revolutionised without the masses, behind their back and at the cost of the Communist Party. Such types are the obvious victims of the commodity fetishism which reigns in bourgeois society, they materialise social relationships to such an extent that there is nothing left of the class struggle of the proletariat except . . . unpaid printers' bills.*

A vital, living, developing party cannot fall into such an intelligentsia-opportunistic

* This person explained the drop in the circulation of *Workers' Life* by the conditions of the third period.

prostration. And the British Communist Party rejected this petty bourgeois lack of character.

The congress at Leeds was the beginning of a real application of the class against class

tactic in the conditions of the third period in Britain. The party congress took the Bolshevik course for the masses. That course must be carried through without vacillations over all difficulties and obstacles.

Chang-Du-Su's Farewell (A Reply to his Letter to the C.C. of the Chinese C.P.)

By A. Martynov

PROFESSOR CHANG-DU-SU was one of the founders of the Chinese Communist Party. He was a leader of the Chinese C.P. during the stage in which it was a bloc with the Kuomintang, when there was still a united revolutionary front between the Chinese worker and peasant masses and the national bourgeoisie, after their "advance on the north." It was the time when the Chinese bourgeois intelligentsia were still not terrified by the mighty workers' movement and the signs of a peasant revolution, when part of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois intelligentsia, desiring the national emancipation of China, sought the realisation of their national-revolutionary hopes through the Communist Party, for the reason, and only for the reason that the Soviet Government and the Comintern are the only powers in the world that have assisted China to emancipation from the imperialist yoke. This urge of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia into the C.P., inevitable during the first stage, introduced elements of opportunism and bourgeois nationalism into it. Clearest of all was this expressed in the rôle played by Professor Chang-Du-Su, who had come to Communism from anarchism.

In no small degree Chang-Du-Su bears the responsibility for the fact that during the period when a bloc with the Kuomintang in the revolutionary struggle against the imperialists and feudalists was still historically possible and indispensable, the Comintern line was distorted in an opportunist manner by the leadership of the C.P. In no small degree Chang-Du-Su bears the responsibility for the fact that the Chinese C.P., whilst main-

taining a united revolutionary front with the national bourgeoisie, did not at the same time resolutely insist upon the political and organisational independence of the working class, did not obstinately fight for the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement, did not fight for participation in the organs of government, confining themselves to pressure on the Kuomintang from below. In no small degree Chang-Du-Su bears the responsibility for the fact that at the moment of the incipient agrarian revolution the Chinese C.P. was unable to head that revolution and to give it the dimensions which would have ensured the establishment of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

When during the events of March 20th in Canton, a year before the defeat of the revolution in 1927, the Comintern representative and some of the Chinese comrades proposed to make a counter-attack in reply to Chang-Kai-Shek's first coup, Chang-Du-Su held the party back from this step. He himself spoke of this at the Fifth Congress of the Chinese C.P.: "Our strength was insufficient to suppress Chang-Kai-Shek. So the party C.C. insisted on the adoption of the tactic of retreat, and concessions. . . Chang-Kai-Shek had not yet revealed his counter-revolutionary features. Social opinion was not in agreement with his suppression. Consequently, I think that the C.C. tactic was sound."* When a year later the question of heading the agrarian revolution became the order of the day, Chang-Du-Su opposed this, against the directions of the

* All quotations re-translated from the Russian.

Comintern and the demands of a number of Chinese comrades. At the same Fifth Congress of the Chinese C.P. he said in his report: "Although I feel that in the past our tactic in regard to this question has gone too far to the right, none the less the confiscation of all landowners' properties at the present time will be too revolutionary a measure. We need to maintain a middle line for a certain period." When, largely owing to the opportunist errors of the party leadership, Chang-Kai-Shek succeeded in accomplishing his counter-revolutionary coup, when the brief Wuhan period arrived, in April, 1927, Chang-Du-Su published a shameful declaration jointly with Wang-Ting-We, in which they said: "No matter how far the errors of individual members may have gone, the Communist Party will never attempt to overthrow the Kuomintang. In distinction from other countries China is an oppressed country, and consequently here a close co-operation of all classes of the population is necessary to a successful revolutionary development . . . Like all the other parties, the Communist Party is striving for order and peace. The Communist Party has approved the Kuomintang policy and has no intention of coming out against it."†

Chang-Du-Su played more or less the same part in regard to the Chinese revolution of 1927 as that of Brandler in regard to the German Revolution in 1923. After he was eliminated from the leadership by the Comintern he, like Brandler, did not leave the party and at the same time did not admit and renounce his opportunist errors. He, like Brandler, kept for some time in the shadow, awaiting the moment of a new crisis or new intensification of antagonisms in order to unfurl his opportunist banner once more.

That moment arrived when the Mukden and Nankin bandits, urged on by the imperialist spoliators, seized the Chinese-Eastern Railway in order to provoke the U.S.S.R. into war. When at this responsible moment the Political Bureau of the Chinese C.P., in fulfilment of their revolutionary duty, raised among the masses the slogan of "Defence of the Soviet Republic against the counter-

revolutionary intervention," Chang-Du-Su considered it timely to attack the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. from the rear, addressing himself to them with the three open letters, in which he opposed his own opportunist line to the line of the C.C. In the first two letters he argued that the C.C. ought not to put forth the slogan of defence of the U.S.S.R. at the present moment, or that of the struggle against attack on the U.S.S.R., nor ought it to outline to the masses the prospect of transforming the counter-revolutionary intervention in the U.S.S.R. into revolution, because, said he, the masses would draw from this the conclusion: "The imperialists' attack on the U.S.S.R. brings with it so many advantages, let them attack the U.S.S.R. as soon as possible." In Chang-Du-Su's words the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. should have made speeches of the following nature to the masses: "The following alternatives are possible: either the U.S.S.R. will take up a firm position from first to last, and in that event the imperialists will carry out an attack on the U.S.S.R. in the Near or Far East under the pretext of defending China; or the U.S.S.R. will make concessions, and then the imperialists will quarrel among themselves over the division of the Chinese-Eastern Railway and sooner or later a second world war will break out. In either case China will be the arena of war activities, a kind of Asiatic Serbia, and the Chinese people will suffer most of all." In this notable declaration there is not a word of the robber nature of the seizure of the railway, there is not a word of the fact that this seizure had as its aim to draw the U.S.S.R. into war, to inflict a blow on the land of proletarian dictatorship, and thereby to inflict a blow on the world and consequently the Chinese revolution. The sense of this declaration is quite clear: "We have nothing to do with the conflict between the imperialists and the U.S.S.R., we only want China to live in peace, we do not want it to become the arena of war." The objective end of this "pacifist" declaration was also clear. It meant a call to the Chinese workers at the moment of developing war against the U.S.S.R. to wash their hands like Pilate, to keep from being embroiled in the fight, to take no active part, in the defence of the Soviet Republic. "Even

† See P.Mif. *Chinese C.P. in the critical days.*

when the Kuomintang attaches itself to the imperialists during an imperialist anti-Soviet war, wrote Chang-Du-Su, "it will be impossible to confine oneself to a protest against the war on the ground that it is 'dangerous for the Soviet Union.' "

What reasons did Chang-Du-Su give to support his argument that the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. must not put forth the slogan of defence of the U.S.S.R.? That the Chinese masses will not understand it, that "the masses will think we have sold ourselves for Russian gold, without taking the interests of the nation into account." "In my view," wrote Chang-Du-Su, "we cannot apply such simple methods of propaganda as do our brother parties; in other words, we cannot confine ourselves to the popularisation of the great theories of the world revolution, for it does not teach us to give the masses answers on those practical questions which agitate them and which demand an answer . . . At the present time the overwhelming mass of the Chinese population is absorbed with definite national interests. We must diligently explain the situation to the masses, we must teach them to weigh up the practical advantages and disadvantages. We must suggest to them that to take the Chinese-Eastern Railway into our own undivided government with our own strength at the present time is a fruitless illusion, and only then will they recognise the difference between the Soviet Union and the imperialists. Only then will they understand that the U.S.S.R. is the centre of the anti-imperialist movement, and the leader of the united front of all oppressed peoples."

Thus, after twelve years of existence of Soviet government, after the great Chinese revolution of 1927, after all the treachery and betrayal which the Chinese bourgeois nationalists have been guilty of, after all the thorny road which the Chinese proletariat and peasant masses have traversed, Professor Chang-Du-Su proposes to the Chinese C.P. that in its mass agitation it shall begin to dance on the bourgeois-nationalist string, just as he had himself done when he was not a Communist, and as in fact he had always continued to do. Chang-Du-Su, beginning with insistence on the "general national" interests of China, proposed to the C.P. that it should cautiously

and gradually lead the masses to the recognition of this thought, ostensibly "new" and "dangerous" to the masses, that the U.S.S.R. is the leader of the united front of all oppressed peoples and the centre of the anti-imperialist movement. But even when the masses finally recognise this, Chang-Du-Su, nevertheless, does not recommend that the last word: "Defend the U.S.S.R." should be said to them. In his second letter he agrees only to the following concession to the C.C. Political Bureau: "In considering the seizure of the Chinese-Eastern Railway from the viewpoint of the imperialist attack on the U.S.S.R., we should say that this is a class conflict. That declaration does not call for further explanations." (!!) Thus the fact that the U.S.S.R. is the centre of the anti-imperialist movement has to be cautiously and gradually explained to the Chinese masses (who have apparently been living in the last twelve years in the moon) by hints, so as not to frighten them. But nothing whatever ought to be said about the duty of the Chinese masses to act in defence of the U.S.S.R., since this "does not call for explanation."

But while the Chinese C.P. listens to the sage (and contemptible) counsels of Chang-Du-Su and maintains the policy of "restraint," the Kuomintang will, without hindrance, develop a frenzied agitation among the masses, to convince them that the Soviet Government is carrying out a policy of "red imperialism," that it is the enemy of the "national union of China," that it is weak, that they must hasten to inflict a blow on it with the aid of the American, British and French imperialists. And then it will be possible to win concessions from the latter as a reward for these hangman services. Then China can "recover the Chinese-Eastern Railway with its own strength and have undivided possession," at the price of the betrayal of the world proletarian revolution, the price of betrayal of the Chinese revolution, to the glory of the property-owning, bourgeois-patriotic, bourgeois-chauvinistic interests of the Chinese petty bourgeoisie, of whom Chang-Du-Su is the ideologist.

Chang-Du-Su, an active worker in the Chinese C.P. during the 1927 revolution, which only the Soviet Republic supported

against the whole imperialist world, dares to make the following accusation against the present leadership of the Chinese C.P.: "Inasmuch as your dubious tactic is based on the supposition that the broad masses will easily realise that the Soviet Union is the friend of Chinese emancipation, it witnesses to your putschist psychology and to the fact that you cannot distinguish subjective from objective." Can a more shameful slander of the Chinese proletariat be imagined, can that proletariat be accused of forgetfulness which for several years of revolution was able to raise itself to unprecedented heights, not only in the sense of self-sacrifice, but in the sense also of political consciousness! Hundreds of thousands of the Chinese proletariat will spurn with contempt this slander of learned Professor Chang-Du-Su, who treats them as blind puppies.

* * *

When the Political Bureau of the Chinese C.P. unmasked this false, hypocritical, "pacifist," bourgeois-patriotic position of Chang-Du-Su in the question of the Chinese-Eastern Railway, he attempted in his second letter to the C.C. to take the issue "deeper" and to give a "theoretic" basis to his position. He put forward two theses, noteworthy for a man who still had the "courage" to call himself a Communist.

His first thesis reads: "'Principle' is something permanent and invariable; but as for policies and tactics, they cannot be applied mechanically in correspondence with the principle at any time and for any reason, but the conditions of time and place must be taken into account. Sometimes time and place demand that the accomplishment of revolutionary tasks should take a zig-zag line, and in view of this a tactic has sometimes to be applied which is in disagreement with the principle. If we do not understand this we shall have to condemn Lenin's policy in the question of the Brest-Litovsk peace."

This opportunist puts "dialectic" before us in a new rôle. "Lenin," he says, "not without reason, is called the dialectician of politics; he knew why he laughed at the comrades who protested against the peace of Brest." Yes, Lenin knew very well why he laughed at the comrades who protested against Brest,

but the newly-risen "dialectician" Chang-Du-Su does not know, does not understand and will not understand, for an opportunist is never able to understand that. Lenin also recognised the necessity in certain conditions of retreating (in order to take a run and get a better jump). But Lenin never said that "sometimes a tactic has to be applied which is in disagreement with the principle." Lenin never said that "under certain conditions our tactics must disagree with our principles." Lenin said: "There are compromises and compromises." "Every proletarian, because of that state of the class struggle and intensification of class antagonisms in which he lives, distinguishes between a compromise extorted from him by objective conditions (such as lack of funds in the treasury, no support from without, starvation, and the last stage of exhaustion)—a compromise which in no way lessens the revolutionary devotion and readiness of the worker to continue the struggle—and, on the other hand, the compromise of traitors, who ascribe to objective reasons their own selfishness (strike-breakers also effect a 'compromise'), their cowardice, their desire to fawn upon capitalists, and their readinesses to yield sometimes to threats, sometimes to persuasion, sometimes to sops and flattery on the part of capitalists." (*Left-wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, 1928, p. 50.) Chang-Du-Su proposes to the C.P. that it should effect a compromise of the second kind. He proposes to the C.P. that it should wash its hands in the event of an attack on the U.S.S.R., which in fact is the same as supporting the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang and consolidating the positions of the imperialists in China itself. In other words, he proposes that the C.P. should play the rôle of "strike-breaker." He proposes that the C.P. should betray the cause of the world proletariat and the Chinese revolution, throwing the onus for this ratting on "objective conditions," making "objective conditions" responsible for "his desire to serve" the Chinese bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism.

At Brest, Lenin proposed a compromise of the first kind. Starting from the fact that the Russian soldier masses had been "reduced to the last stage of exhaustion" and could not go on fighting, he proposed the conclusion of a

“compromise” with the German bandits, “in order to lessen the evil caused by this gentry and to facilitate the business of capturing and shooting them” (*Ibid.*, p. 23) in order to get a breathing-space from these bandits and thus save the Soviet régime, without falling into the trap into which the bourgeoisie and its flunkies were deliberately drawing the Bolsheviks, in urging them to continue a war foredoomed to defeat. (Lenin: *On Revolutionary Phrases*.) Thus Lenin’s tactic at Brest did not “disagree with our principles,” but had on the contrary the object of more surely safeguarding the triumph of our principles—to save the Soviet régime and strengthen the cause of Communism.

Chang-Du-Su’s second thesis reads: We must criticise the Kuomintang, starting from the basis that its policy “hinders the development of the nation.” We must start from the basis that “at the present time the overwhelming mass of the Chinese population is absorbed with definite national interests.” “They (the adherents of the C.C.) consider that the words ‘nation,’ ‘country,’ etc., ought not to figure in the proletarian dictionary, and if anyone uses these expressions it is customary to think that he is deviating from proletarian ideology and it being permeated with the ideology of the bourgeoisie. Until the October revolution Lenin attacked the Tsarist Government and the Kerensky Government because the war had ruined the country and Russian capitalism (!!) and had reduced Russia to a state of horrible devastation. If we do not study Lenin’s tactic in application to the time and place . . . we shall not understand it and we shall have to reproach it with applying the slogans and assimilating the ideology of the nationalists and defenders of capitalism.”

Here Chang-Du-Su is once more shamelessly lying and slandering Lenin. Lenin struggled most consequentially for the carrying through of the bourgeois-democratic revolution to its end in Russia. Lenin carried out most consequentially the principle of the hegemony of the proletariat over other classes in the process of this revolution. But in doing so Lenin’s first principle was by no means the establishment of a “free nation” in Russia or the elimination of the brakes on the development of capitalism in Russia. Lenin never

troubles for the fate of his native capitalism; he troubles only for the fate of Communism. As early as 1894, in his first book: *What are the Friends of the People?* Lenin wrote: “And consequently the struggle side by side with radical democracy against absolutism and the reactionary estates and institutions is the direct obligation of the working class, which social-democrats must instil into that class, not for a moment ceasing at the same time to instil into it that the struggle against all these institutions is indispensable only as a means of facilitating the struggle against the bourgeoisie, that the achievement of the general democratic demands is indispensable to the workers only as a clearing of the road leading to victory over the chief enemy of the toilers—capitalism.” Eleven years later, in 1905, Lenin wrote: “We shall not stop half-way . . . We shall with all our strength assist all the peasantry to accomplish a democratic revolution, so that it may be easier for us, the party of the proletariat, to pass as speedily as possible to the new and higher task, to the Socialist revolution.” (*The Attitude of Social-Democracy to the peasant movement*.) And again after sixteen years, in 1921, Lenin wrote: “The Kautskys, the Hilferdings, the Martovs . . . have been unable to understand . . . the inter-relationships between the bourgeois-democratic and the proletarian Socialistic revolutions. The first grows into the second.” (*The Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution*.) The opportunist Chang-Du-Su saw fit to confuse Lenin with the bourgeois liberal Struve. Struve did in fact declare that Russia needs political freedom . . . for the development of capitalism. In Lenin’s view political freedom was necessary to Russia as an indispensable condition of the all-phased development of the class struggle of the proletariat for Socialism, for the Communist revolution. In Lenin’s view, the bourgeois democratic revolution must grow into the Socialist revolution.

None of the Marxists of the period of the Second or the Third Internationals devoted so much attention to national and colonial questions as did Lenin. But these questions did not have any importance of themselves for him; for him, as for Marx, they had enormous significance because they are closely bound

up with the development and triumph of the international proletarian revolution. Quoting Marx's letter for December 10th, 1869, in which Marx said how his report on the Irish question in the Council of the International would be constructed, Lenin, *inter alia*, writes: "Marx makes no absolute whatever of the national movements, knowing that the complete emancipation of all nationalities can be achieved only by the victory of the working class. To estimate in advance all the possible inter-relationships between the bourgeois emancipation movement of the oppressed nations and the proletarian emancipation movement among the oppressed nations . . . is impossible." (*The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, 1914.) Lenin, like Marx, paid the greatest of attention to the national emancipation movement; but for him what was important was the connection between the national emancipation movement and the proletarian emancipation movement, and he always subjugated the interests of the first to the interests of the second, *i.e.*, to the interests of the proletarian revolution. For him the national revolutionary movement was important as a lever for revolutionising the masses, and the peasant masses in the first place. That was how he approached the question of the right of nations to self-determination. He formulated the principle of his attitude to this question in the following words: "The interests of the working class and its struggle against capitalism demand the complete solidarity and the closest unity of the workers of all nations, demand resistance to the nationalist policy of the bourgeoisie of whatever nationalities they be. Consequently a deviation from the tasks of proletarian policy and subjugation of the workers to the policy of the bourgeoisie would arise both if the social-democrats began to deny the right of self-determination, *i.e.*, the right of oppressed nations to separation, and if the social-democrats took to supporting all the national demands of the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations." (*Ibid.*)

We see that between the proletarian revolutionary Lenin and the national reformist Chang-Du-Su there is one little difference: Lenin subjugated the interests of the national emancipation movement to the interests of the

proletarian revolution. Chang-Du-Su on the contrary subjugates the interests of the proletariat to the interests of the bourgeois "nation," and owing to this very "patriotism" he is now betraying the interests of the Chinese people to the imperialists.

* * *

After these first two letters, Chang-Du-Su got a worthy answer from the Political Bureau of the Chinese C.P. on the question of the Chinese-Eastern Railway. And he had the intelligence not to return again to this question. But in his third letter he passes to a general attack on the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. This time he is more cunning in his method. This time he covers his deeply opportunist, chauvinist, liquidatorial, capitulationist position with "left-wing" Trotskyist phrases. This letter might have been dictated by Trotsky: a sweep recognises a sweep a long way off . . . This letter opens as follows: "We all know that the chief cause of the defeat of the Chinese revolution in 1925/27 was the opportunist tactics of all our party, which was the fault of the comrades who did not recognise the nature of the revolution, the bourgeoisie's attitude to the revolution and the dangers connected with this, and who especially did not understand the class character of the Kuomintang. . . If we do not fully estimate this fact in all its significance, we in our turn will get stuck in the same mud and will be unable to get out of it. Nevertheless, we struggle in words against the word 'opportunism,' but what we are doing still remains opportunism in various forms."

In order to conceal his capitulation behind "left-wing" Trotskyist phrases, Chang-Du-Su catches the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. in one error, which the C.C. committed and the Comintern corrected.

In Instruction No. 30 of the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. we read: "The chief danger of war is caused by the radical antagonisms among the bourgeoisie, landowners and compradores. To the economic development of the bourgeoisie the important factor is the extension of native markets and the constriction of the sector of imperialist economy. Consequently the bourgeoisie wanted to inflict a blow on the feudal régime, to improve the situation of the peasantry, to extrude the im-

perialist powers and to introduce customs autonomy (the two last factors are indispensable prerequisites of the development of the bourgeoisie). The landowning class strove to strengthen their exploitation of the peasantry, the compradores strove for the development of imperialist trade. These interests cannot be reconciled."

Against this truly false, thoroughly opportunist thesis Chang-Du-Su hurls his thunder and lightning, endeavouring to give the impression that he counterposes a revolutionary thesis to this opportunistic thesis. He writes: "Hitherto you have not taken account of the class character of the governing class in the Kuomintang . . . Only the Russian Mensheviks . . . considered that the constitutionally democratic clique was more progressive than the feudal monarchists, so that if a conflict were to break out between them the proletariat was bound to attach itself to the bourgeoisie, and with its aid to liquidate the feudal clique. The constitutional-democratic clique declared that inasmuch as it was fighting feudalism the proletariat ought not to act against it, and the Mensheviks agreed with this, whilst the Bolsheviks resolutely turned down such a demand. The war against the Kwangsi clique is a war against the feudalists—that is where the propaganda of Chang-Kai-Shek leads, and our party C.C. says the same, no matter how grievous this is."

As we have already said, the E.C.C.I. turned down the C.C. thesis put forward in Instruction No. 30, which Chang-Du-Su had clutched like a drowning man seizing a straw. Later we shall explain the opportunism of this thesis. But first we must determine what is sound in the general line of the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. It is sound to the extent that as the bourgeois revolution has not been in the least victorious in China, that the liquidation of the vestiges of feudalism has not been achieved in China even by the "Prussian method," inasmuch as the liquidation of the vestiges of feudalism is not possible at all in China so long as China is in the grip of imperialism, so neither has there been any liquidation of the antagonisms between the interests of the bourgeoisie and the feudalists, despite the fact that the Chinese bourgeoisie has already become completely counter-

revolutionary. That is absolutely sound, despite all the present Trotskyists and Chang-Du-Su's and despite the declarations of the Russian Trotskyist Opposition in 1927. The definite correlationship between the two class groupings in China at the given stage was formulated by the E.C.C.I. in its letter to the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. on October 26th, 1929, in the following words:

"In the united counter-revolutionary bloc of imperialists, landowners and all the bourgeoisie, which was formed at the end of 1927 with the object of suppressing and breaking up the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants, and which continued to exist during the first period of the triumph of the bourgeois-landowners' reaction—in that bloc internal antagonisms and schisms are increasing and deepening at the present time. With all the common counter-revolutionary character of all the exploiting classes, with no clearly defined lines of demarcation between one and another of them in regard to basic antagonisms, both within China and between China and imperialism, none the less that bloc is now disintegrating into two main political groupings.

"The first group unites the militarists, the feudal-landowners and the large native bourgeoisie (chiefly, though not purely the compradore and banking strata). This grouping at present has its political representation in the governmental Kuomintang and non-Kuomintang landowner-bourgeois cliques . . .

"The second grouping constitutes an attempt at political formulation on the part of the national-reformist centre, representing the interests of the middle strata of the Chinese national bourgeoisie, *i.e.*, part of the industrial capitalists and the merchants. It is in opposition to the present governmental Kuomintang and extends its influence to the middle and petty capitalist entrepreneurs, to the dissatisfied groups of small landowners and to the upper (exploiting) strata of the petty bourgeoisie of town and country . . . Politically it is represented by the Kuomintang "Party of Reorganisation," Wang-Ting-Wei, Cheng-Hung-Bo and company. . . This group, like the party of "reorganisationists" representing it, is counter-revolutionary, profoundly hostile to the revolutionary movement of the

workers and peasants, hostile to the U.S.S.R., thoroughly compromising, enslaved in regard to imperialism and militarism . . . ”

What is the significance of the existence of these two class groupings in China's counter-revolutionary bloc, and what tasks arise from their existence for the Communist Party of China? Firstly, their existence is a reflection of the fact that the stage of bourgeois revolution has not yet been passed in China, that not one of the tasks of the bourgeois revolution has been accomplished. Secondly, the intensification of struggle between these two groups witnesses to the fact that a new rise of the revolutionary movement and a crisis of the Nanking régime is beginning in China. At the crucial revolutionary moment when the agrarian revolution began all the bourgeois and feudal classes and groups fused into one solid reactionary mass. But when it was revealed that after the defeat of the revolution the Nanking Government found themselves with broken cisterns, and when a new rise set in, the Nanking bloc broke up. What deductions are to be made from this? Firstly, there can of course be no talk of supporting the bourgeois national-reformist grouping against the Nanking feudal-bourgeois grouping; they are both counter-revolutionary, and the national-reformists are even more dangerous, owing to their social-demagogy. Secondly, this split between the two groupings and the internecine war inside the counter-revolutionary bloc must be exploited in the interests of the development of the workers' and peasants' revolutionary movement.

Thus we see that in so far as the C.P. of China C.C., in agreement with the Comintern, recognises the existence of a certain antagonism in the interests of the Chinese bourgeoisie and the Chinese feudalists, they are absolutely right. None the less the thesis which we have quoted from the C.C. Instruction No. 30 was opportunist and unsound. The declaration in this instruction to the effect that “the bourgeoisie wanted to improve the position of the peasantry,” and also the declaration that “it is impossible to reconcile the interests of the bourgeoisie and the landowners in China” was opportunist. After the Chinese bourgeoisie has passed into the camp of counter-revolution the reconciliation of its interests

with the interests of the feudalists will be inevitable at a certain point. For that reason the E.C.C.I. letter which we have already quoted is absolutely right in what it says concerning the present Chinese second grouping, now in opposition to the Nanking Government.

“In the conditions of a further revolutionary uprising of an independent workers' and peasants' movement it will very speedily lose its opposition attitude towards the existing régime, and at the first decisive class conflicts of the rising proletariat and peasantry will swiftly fuse with the first grouping into a united counter-revolutionary bourgeois-landowners' bloc.”

The second error in the thesis of the C.C. instruction is that it does not take into consideration the fact that the social basis of Chang-Kai-Shek and the Nanking Government is not to-day what it was in 1927. The C.C. does not realise that at the present time the representative of the national bourgeoisie is no longer the counter-revolutionary Nanking Government, but the counter-revolutionary party of Wang-Ting-Wee. But the Nanking Government now represents the militarists, the feudalists, the landowners, and only the large native bourgeoisie, predominantly the compradore, bankers' strata.

In its instruction the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. put forward a false thesis, and Chang-Du-Su has caught at this. But we must remark that in the first place the C.C. did not stubbornly stand by this error, and that secondly it did not draw from its thesis those opportunist practical conclusions which logically followed from it. In this very same Instruction No. 30, in which this thesis had place, the C.C. emphasises that “the bourgeoisie is striving by its delusive reformist policy to win the masses and to subjugate them to its influence,” and that “thus a serious danger at the present moment is presented by the reformist illusions,” that “the reformist propaganda of the bourgeoisie is still more dangerous than the reformist deception on the part of the class of landowners and compradores.” Despite its false thesis the Chinese C.P. did not for one moment propose to give any support now to the Chinese counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie

in its struggle against the feudalists. In its Instruction No. 34 the C.C. definitely says:

"In the view of certain comrades Chang-Kai-Shek's war with the Kwangsi group is a war of the bourgeoisie against the compradores and landowners, *i.e.*, a war of democratic forces against feudalists, and is of an anti-imperialist character and consequently objectively has a revolutionary significance. This view is an extreme expression of the right-wing deviation and in practice leads to the support of Chang-Kai-Shek."

These words leave no doubt that the policy which Chang-Du-Su ascribes to the Chinese C.C. has been rejected by the latter in the most decisive fashion as a policy which is "an extreme expression of the right-wing deviation."

And what does Chang-Du-Su himself propose in opposition to the Chinese C.C.'s policy? He put up two liquidatory Trotskyist propositions. The first is that the bourgeois revolution has already triumphed in China: "You," he writes, "have hitherto not clearly realised the defeat of the revolution and the victory of the bourgeoisie." Further he says: "The victory went to the bourgeoisie, who gained a number of concessions from the imperialists, were assured of their aid and increased their importance as a class. During the same period the feudalists were themselves forced to strive for the mastery of the economic power in trade and industry in the towns as being the basis of hegemony in each locality, so as not to lose their authority in China irrevocably."

Not only does Chang-Du-Su follow the Trotskyists in declaring that "the victory went to the Chinese bourgeoisie." He also declares, in complete agreement with the Russian Trotskyist opposition in 1927, that feudalism in China is altogether playing an insignificant rôle. "You ignore these self-evident facts and you have continued to overestimate feudalism." In proof of his declaration he adduces the same notorious argument which we heard from the Trotskyist opposition in 1927. "In reality Chinese feudalism has now for a long time been closely interlocked with merchant capital. After world imperialism's irruption into China and capitalism's penetration into the countryside, all the

economic structure of the Chinese countryside began to develop under the sign of commodity economy." Like his Trotskyist predecessors, the learned Professor Chang-Du-Su does not know the elemental historical truth that the development of commodity economy in the countryside and the domination of merchant capital is characteristic of just the stage of feudalism preceding the epoch of industrial capitalism.

Finally, again in full agreement with the Trotskyists, Chang-Du-Su, under the pretext of an attack on the kulaks and the opportunists who put their hopes in them, also denies the rôle of the middle peasantry in the agrarian revolution, which is in fact equivalent to a denial of the very possibility of a peasant agrarian revolution. He says: "Now only the village poor are . . . the basis of the bourgeois revolution. The middle peasants are unstable elements [this is a bourgeois democratic revolution!] but the rich upper group of peasantry represents a counter-revolutionary element, since as the result of the agrarian revolution they will be forced to yield to the revolutionary strata of the peasantry more than they lost under the landowners' exploitation. Therefore, anyone who reckons that the kulak will go with us from beginning to end of the revolution is just as much an opportunist as he who counts on carrying the struggle against imperialism to an end in alliance with the bourgeoisie."

It is absolutely true that in China, where small landowning property has the predominance, and not large-scale ownership, and where the kulaks resort to the same methods of feudal exploitation as the petty landowners, the kulaks have in part played and will play still more a counter-revolutionary rôle in the agrarian revolution. This the E.C.C.I. has already elucidated in one of its letters, and in confirming it Chang-Du-Su is pushing at an open door. But this attack of Chang-Du-Su on the opportunists who put their hopes in the kulaks is only a smoke-screen, a cloak for his opportunist Trotskyist declaration that in China we cannot count on even the middle peasant in the agrarian revolution; he needs such an affirmation in order to justify his liquidatory platform. And he boldly affirms this despite the most obvious facts: despite

the growth of the mass agrarian movement in the majority of the provinces of China at the present time, despite the "Red Pike" movement, despite the incessant partisan war in Southern China, despite the fact that the Soviet régime is extending its area of power in China recently, and so on.

But why did Chang-Du-Su need all this Trotskyist economic theory? For a doubly practical object: in order to show that the revolution is finished in China, that we can write R.I.P. above it. Just like the Menshevik liquidators and Trotsky after the defeat of the Russian 1905 revolution, Chang-Du-Su now declares (and again in agreement with Trotsky) that the Chinese bourgeois revolution is now ended, that the Chinese bourgeois system has now been consolidated, that in correspondence with this there will be no revolutionary rise in China for long years to come, until the conditions for the Socialist revolution have been created there.

From this Trotskyist liquidatory conception Chang-Du-Su makes his second deduction, that the Chinese C.P. must in order to preserve itself renounce revolutionary work, must take the road of legal adaptation to the bourgeois régime, must cease talking of the near approach of a revolutionary rise. Just as Trotsky called the Canton rising a putsch on the background of a declining revolutionary wave, so Chang-Du-Su calls any attempt at renewing revolutionary work in conjunction with the prospect of an imminent revolutionary rise a "disastrous," a "putschist" tactic. He writes: "The C.C. is striving at all costs to prove that a new rise of the revolutionary wave is a matter of the near future, and thus the putschist tactic remains in force." "Naturally," says he, "there is a possibility of a new revolutionary rise in China, but as for the time when it will take place, there is not anyone who could foretell it . . . One can only foresee that it will not arrive speedily . . . The past revolutionary wave is finished, and the new one has not yet arrived, and there are still no signs which would permit of predicting its repetition in the near future . . . You exaggerate the severity of the struggle of the masses. Since the Sixth Congress you have not declared openly that the revolutionary rise is still continuing, but you say that it is approaching, that the revolu-

tion has again revived. You declare that the proletariat's struggle all over the world and the revolutionary movement in the colonies has grown extremely severe and that the present moment is a critical stage of development of the world revolution . . ." and so on, and so forth.

Professor Chang-Du-Su, who was bankrupted during the 1927 revolution, is like a frightened crow in his fear even of the word revolution, even of its spectre, even of the prediction of a near approach of a new revolutionary rise. But when the C.C. does not allow him to scatter around these liquidatory, capitulationist views, he raises a howl about pressure on free criticism, about the "bureaucratic centralism" of the C.C., declaring that "in the circumstances of bureaucratic centralism, bombast, deception, corruption, egoism, hopelessness and so on are perfectly natural." The bankrupted opportunist closes his criticism with the words: "I cannot but express my regret that the party built up on the blood and bones of innumerable comrades should be in a state of decline and is disintegrating as the result of the unsound line we have taken up. I hope that you will for at least a time give up the narrowness of view now existing and attentively and patiently acquaint yourselves with my viewpoint."

The earnest Professor Chang-Du-Su, crawling along the ground, accuses the C.C. of the Chinese C.P. of "subjectivism," of "utopianism," of "fantasm," but life has already shown who sees clearly and who is myopic. The ink with which Chang-Du-Su wrote his renegade letters had hardly dried when life refuted all his perspectives. In his letter on the Chinese-Eastern Railway Chang-Du-Su envisaged the alternatives: either the U.S.S.R. will stand by its firm position from beginning to end, and in that case the imperialists will make an attack on the U.S.S.R.; or the U.S.S.R. will yield, and then the imperialists will fight among themselves over the division of the railway and a new world war will break out. In reality, for the time being neither the one nor the other has happened, whereas a third alternative has already materialised: the U.S.S.R. held firmly to its position, and as a result the Mukden, and then the Nanking Government and then the im-

perialists also have retreated, over which fact undoubtedly Chang-Du-Su is weeping "patriotic" tears. Chang-Du-Su said that the bourgeoisie have come to power and that they have consolidated their power, but in reality we see now a complete breakup of the Nanking Government. Chang-Du-Su said that there are no signs of a new rise of revolution in China, but those signs are multiplied daily.

Chang-Du-Su is coming to the full circle in his political career. He began it as a petty bourgeois nationalist and patriot. Inasmuch as the emancipation of China is indissolubly bound up with the fate of the proletarian revolution, inasmuch as China cannot be emancipated without a victory of the proletarian revolution, Chang-Du-Su's nationalism brought him into the camp of the Communists. But having become openly a Communist, in his subconscious mind he remained a Chinese petty bourgeois patriot, and this set the imprint of opportunism and compromise on all his Communist activity. This condition could only continue for a definite time, only until the first serious trial. When class stood against class on the two sides of the barricade in China, when the Mukden-Nanking bandits seized the Chinese-Eastern Railway, when the immediate prospect of war between the imperialists allied with the Chinese bourgeois counter-revolutionaries on the one hand, and the Soviet Republic on the other was outlined, when it was necessary to make a choice of being with the revolutionary proletariat on the side of the Soviet Republic or with the bourgeois "nation" on the side of the imperialists, the petty-suburban, property-loving, chauvinistic spirit of Chang-Du-Su chose the camp of the imperialists. Chang-Du-Su returned like a prodigal son to his bourgeois family, but now no longer in the capacity of a visionary bourgeois revolutionary, but in that of a bourgeois counter-revolutionary and renegade. The Chinese proletariat do not grieve over the renegade, who for long now has merely got between their legs. They close their ranks more steadfastly, they raise their banner, imbued with the blood of the heroes of the revolution, still higher. Thousands of prole-

tarian revolutionaries are coming to replace the petty bourgeois renegades.

* * *

After this article had been written we received the resolution of the Chinese C.P. Political Bureau for November 15th, 1929, concerning Chang-Du-Su's expulsion from the party. This resolution adds a few essential details supplementing the portrait of Chang-Du-Su which we have given in this article. From the resolution we learn that Chang-Du-Su is now repeating after Trotsky that it is necessary to liquidate the slogans: "Down with the Kuomintang Government" and "The establishment of Soviet régime," and to replace them by the slogans: "The summoning of a national conference"; that Chang-Du-Su is imitating the Trotskyists in their attack on the May Day and August 1st demonstrations in Shanghai, calling them a game, a putsch and so on. From this resolution we learn that at the same time Chang-Du-Su is revising the old tactics of the Comintern during the 1927 revolution in the spirit of the Trotskyist opposition of that time. The resolution says: "He has stated that all the past opportunist errors committed during the great Chinese revolution arose from an erroneous view of the class character of the Kuomintang and in the Chinese C.P.'s entering into the Kuomintang, and consequently were "radical tactical errors on the part of the Comintern in regard to the Chinese revolution," and by no means consisted in errors of an opportunist C.C., of which he was the head, in not fulfilling the putting into force the Comintern's sound tactic." Thus we now see what value the noisy "left-wing" attacks of Trotsky and other representatives of the Trotskyist opposition on the Comintern in regard to the Chinese question had in 1927. These attacks were a cloak for capitulation and were the precursors of Trotsky's renegadism on the one hand, and Chang-Du-Su's renegadism on the other. Yet one more clear illustration of how intimately bound up with each other are opportunism under a "left-wing" mask and the openly right-wing opportunism, and how easily the one passes into the other.

