

17th ANNIVERSARY OF **OCTOBER REVOLUTION**
70th ANNIVERSARY OF **1st INTERNATIONAL**

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



November 5th, 1934

VOLUME XI

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL No 21

THREEPENCE
CONTENTS
OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 21

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

- | | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution | 803 |
| 2. Three Lessons of the October Victory for the International Proletariat. | 805 |
| TO COMMEMORATE THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
FOUNDATION OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL. | |
| 3. The Historic Path of the First International. By M. Zorky. | 811 |
| 4. Marx and the English Labour Movement in the Epoch of the First International. By Tom Bell. | 819 |

DISCUSSION FOR THE 7th CONGRESS OF THE C.I.

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 5. The Question of Fascism. By L. Madyar. | 825 |
|---|-----|

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 6. The Literary Frankness of the British Fascists. Reviewed by M. Smith. | 834 |
|--|-----|
-
-

SEVENTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

(Manifesto of the E.C. of the Communist International.)

TO THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OF THE WORLD! TO ALL TOILERS, TO ALL THE OPPRESSED PEOPLES!

Comrades, Class Brothers!

Seventeen years have passed since the proletariat of Russia, under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Lenin, threw off the power of capital, overturned the government of the bourgeoisie and the landlords, and took the power into its own hands.

The October Socialist Revolution, which opened a new era in the development of humanity, conquered by means of the ARMED UPRISING of the workers of Russia, supported by millions of peasants. It was prepared by long years of the heroic struggle, under the leadership of the Bolsheviks against the ruling classes. It was prepared for by the fact that the Communist Party of the Bolsheviks, in the course of an unrelenting fight against the REFORMIST COMPROMISING PARTIES, the Mensheviks and socialist revolutionaries, won to its side the majority of the working class and led them into the decisive fight against oppression, starvation and imperialist war, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for socialism.

The power of the working class in alliance with the peasants, the power of the Soviets of workers, peasants, and Red Army Deputies, was a stern dictatorship against the exploiting classes. The power of the working class is at the same time widest democracy for the toilers. This power organised the masses for the struggle against the exploiting classes, who offered furious resistance against the armed intervention of the imperialists. It ensured the victory of the proletariat in the civil war. It led the country of the Soviets along the path of industrialisation. It achieved the victory of the collective farming system in the village. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the dictatorship of the proletariat ensured the victory of the First Five-Year Plan, and will lead to the victory of the Second Five-Year Plan, to the construction of classless socialist society.

The Soviet Union, the country of the victorious proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, is now plainly showing to the world what the working class is capable of accomplishing even in a technically and culturally backward country when it has the power in its hands.

In the capitalist countries, where the bourgeoisie are in power, the fierce economic crisis has brought

with it greater ruin and devastation than the four years of the last imperialist war. Even the foremost capitalist countries have been thrown backwards many years. The partial increase of production which has begun to take place during the last year has not improved the position of the toilers. Millions of workers are doomed to hopeless unemployment, millions of farmers and peasants are being ruined, millions of young people just entering life, are being thrown into the streets without work, without food, without hope for the future. The poverty and want of the toilers are continually increasing.

In the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the proletariat, carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party, has created the conditions for an unceasing growth in the welfare and culture of the toiling masses. It has converted the U.S.S.R. into a country of socialism, where there is no unemployment, where the wages of the workers and office employees are constantly increasing, where there is a comprehensive system of social insurance, where every worker is firmly assured as regards the morrow, where labour has become a matter of honour and fame for the toilers. The socialist reconstruction of agriculture has abolished pauperisation in the villages and is ensuring the raising of all the collective farm peasants to a prosperous and cultured life. The Soviet Power has liberated all the formerly oppressed nationalities and has united them in a fraternal alliance.

The workers and collective farmers of the U.S.S.R. gave a brilliant example of absolute devotion to the cause of socialism, an example of genuine international solidarity with the oppressed and exploited of the whole world. The workers and the peasant masses of China have already followed the fighting example of the toilers of the Soviet Union, forming the Soviet Power on part of the territory of their country. The Chinese Soviets point out to the entire Chinese people and the toilers of all colonial countries the only path of salvation from enslavement by imperialism and from the yoke of the exploiting classes of their own country.

The exploited and oppressed of the whole world protect the Soviet Union, the fortress of victorious socialism, the bulwark of peace, the great smithy which forges out the new socialist culture, the fatherland of emancipated women, the basis of THE WORLD PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION, THE SOCIALIST FATHERLAND OF THE WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES AND

THE OPPRESSED PEOPLES OF THE WHOLE WORLD, A BRILLIANT BEACON POINTING OUT THE PATH TO A TORTURED HUMANITY WHICH IS FIGHTING AGAINST CAPITALIST SLAVERY.

The danger of a new imperialist war menaces the toilers of all countries. The capitalist world is feverishly arming itself, preparing more and more new hitherto unknown weapons for mass extermination. But war can be postponed only by uniting all the forces of the proletariat into the united front for a decisive struggle against capitalism, for the power of the working class. It is possible to prevent war, a new blood bath of the toilers, only by the workers making a clean break with the compromise policy of the social democracy, only by a victorious fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to find a way out of the crisis in which the capitalist world is writhing, the bourgeoisie are still further increasing the robbery of the workers, farmers and peasants of the colonies and the economically weak countries. THEY ARE TRYING FIRST AND FOREMOST TO CRUSH THE WORKING CLASS, TO DEPRIVE IT OF THE LAST VESTIGES OF DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS, TO CUT DOWN THE BEGGARLY WAGES STILL MORE, TO WORSEN ITS SITUATION STILL FURTHER, TO DESTROY ITS REVOLUTIONARY VANGUARD. Fascism has come to power in Germany and Austria, it is in power in Italy and Poland, it menaces the toilers of all countries. At the storm detachment of the bourgeoisie against the working class, fascism is trying in the first place to organise an attack on the shock brigade of the world proletariat, the Soviet Union.

But the proletariat and the toiling masses can beat back the attack of fascism only if the proletariat establishes the fighting unity of its ranks, and, together with all the toilers, carries on a DECISIVE STRUGGLE against capitalism.

The policy of compromise which is pursued by the leaders of the social-democratic parties prevented the victory of the proletarian revolution in Germany, Austria, Hungary and Italy in 1918-20. The social democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie tied the hands of the working class, split its ranks and undermined its forces in face of the advancing class enemy. The policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie led to fascism in Germany and also in Austria.

For the proletariat THERE IS NO PEACEFUL PATH TO POWER. THERE IS NO PEACEFUL PATH TO SOCIALISM.

True to its historic mission—the preparation of the masses for the winning of the state power by the proletariat—the Communist International calls on the workers more insistently than ever to join in the UNITED FRONT FOR THE ORGANISATION OF JOINT ACTIONS BY ALL WORKERS AGAINST FASCISM AND THE WAR DANGER. IT CALLS ON THE WORKERS OF ALL

COUNTRIES TO UNITE UNDER THE TESTED RED BANNER OF MARX, ENGELS, LENIN, STALIN, UNDER THE BANNER OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL FOR THE OVERTHROW OF THE POWER OF THE BOURGEOISIE.

The idea of the storming of capitalism is ever more maturing in the consciousness of the masses. The social-democratic workers are breaking away from reformism and from compromise with the bourgeoisie, and are taking the path of the class struggle. In February this year the heroic workers of AUSTRIA, rejecting in practice the social-democratic policy of class collaboration, took up arms to bar the path of fascism. But they were defeated, because the social-democratic party, which led them, had not prepared them for the decisive struggle and did not lead them to the attack on capitalism. In FRANCE, in the days of February, the working class gave the first rebuff to fascism by the general strike. But their fight against fascism, which is attacking, will be the more successful the more quickly the proletariat rids itself of democratic illusions and the more quickly it unites under the banner of Communism.

In October the toilers of SPAIN, led by the working class, took up arms in defence of their bread and freedom, and to beat back the attack of fascist reaction. The workers of Asturias entered on the fight for the power of the workers and peasants, under the leadership of the Communist Party.

The workers in the social-democratic parties are more and more beginning to break with the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie; together with the Communists, the social-democratic workers are beginning more and more to take up the struggle against fascism, capitalism and war.

BROTHERS, WORKERS!

The Communist International proposed to the Labour and Socialist International the organisation of immediate joint actions of the Communist and Socialist Parties in all countries, for the defence of the fighting Spanish people. But at the moment, when the government artillery was bombarding the mines of Asturias, burying alive the mine workers who had taken shelter there, at the moment when the military aeroplanes were bombing the towns and the villages of Spain from the air, when every day, even every hour, cost the lives of thousands of heroic workers and peasants of Spain, together with their wives and children—at this moment the official leaders of the Labour and Socialist International postponed for three weeks the discussion of the question of joint activity on formal grounds!

The Communist International is continuing its policy of the united front. Workers of all countries, show your solidarity with the fighting Spanish workers! Come forward like one man against the Spanish bourgeoisie, who have called up all their

forces in order bloodily to crush the working class and the peasants.

The Spanish workers, who have entered into the battle against capitalism, are our class brothers. The workers of Asturias, who have raised the banner of struggle for the power of the workers and peasants, are our brothers.

Their cause is the cause of the whole of the world proletariat.

CLASS BROTHERS! COMRADES!

Exert every effort to establish, as soon as possible, the united front of the working class for the struggle for bread and freedom, for the struggle for power, for socialism!

SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC WORKERS! Workers of all political views! Unite under the banner of the Communist International! March along the revolutionary path on which the October revolution of the proletariat of Russia was victorious, along which alone the working class may conquer!

ALL TOGETHER IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR!

ALL TOGETHER TO HELP THE HEROIC WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF SPAIN!

DEFEND THE SOVIET UNION, THE SOCIALIST FATHERLAND OF ALL THE TOILERS AND THE OPPRESSED, THE BULWARK OF SOCIALISM AND PEACE AMONG THE NATIONS!

DEFEND THE CHINESE SOVIETS!

LONG LIVE THE UNITED FRONT OF THE WORKING CLASS! LONG LIVE THE FIGHTING ALLIANCE OF THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF THE HOME COUNTRIES AND COLONIES!

LONG LIVE THE VICTORY OF THE WORLD PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION!

LONG LIVE THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT THROUGHOUT THE WORLD!

LONG LIVE SOCIALISM!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

THREE LESSONS OF THE OCTOBER VICTORY FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT

(In connection with the Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.)

By BELA KUN.

SEVENTEEN years have passed since the mightiest turning point in world history, when as a result of the victorious October uprising, the working class of a whole country for the first time overthrew capitalism once and for all and established the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets. For seventeen years now the working class is not only the master of its fate in its own country, but also one of the decisive factors determining the fate of the working class throughout the whole world. The October Revolution, as the Commune, did not promise any miracles, but has created one.

From the gigantic heights of the socialism won, on the threshold to a well-to-do life for all toilers, the eve of classless society, the working class of the Soviet Union, conscious of its unconquerable power and overcoming all obstacles, casts its glance of proud joy towards the past, the time of its liberation, the victory of seventeen years ago.

Yes, the Bolsheviks have really been able to maintain power! And not only have they maintained it, but they have firmly constructed the first state in the world wherein emancipated labour lies at the foundation of everything. The weapons of power of this new state serve simultaneously the cause of peace between the peoples, threatened by new imperialist wars, and the liberation of the toilers oppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie in the "democratic" countries, or browbeaten and

impoverished by fascism, from all oppression and exploitation whatsoever.

* * *

The seventeenth year following the victory of October has been a year of new victories of world historic importance. In this seventeenth year the Soviet Union has achieved great successes in the struggle for peace, and consolidated its international position. The U.S.S.R. was recognised by the most powerful capitalist state, the U.S.A. The entry of the U.S.S.R. into the League of Nations has been estimated even by many of its enemies as a tremendous act on the part of the country of socialism in the struggle for peace.

Great Achievements of 1934.

The year 1934 has been a year of unprecedented development of heavy industry in the Soviet Union. For the first eight months of the year 1934 heavy industry increased the total of its production by comparison with last year by 28.4 per cent. The branches of industry previously lagging behind, such as ferrous metallurgy, and the fuel industry, are this year in the forefront of all branches of national economy. The year 1934 is also distinguished by qualitative advances throughout the national economy. It suffices to mention that for the first eight months of this year the productivity of labour increased by 11.8 per cent., while the cost of production was reduced by 5 per cent.

The Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution is also the Fifth Anniversary of mass collectivisation in the village.

The fact that more than 224,000 collective farms unite more than 15 million households, comprising 65 per cent. of the total number of peasant households, and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, represent a mighty and difficult revolution in the lives and consciousness of tens of millions of yesterday's petty-owners, represent a decisive point in the struggle to finally overcome the most persistent relic of capitalism, namely, "the force of habit."

This revolution has become possible only under the conditions of Soviet Power, and on the basis of the fundamental reconstruction of national economy including agriculture, on the basis of socialist *industrialisation*.

The year 1934 has been a year of further victories for the collective farm system.

The advantages of the collective farm system made it possible to overcome the threat of drought hovering above the land of the Soviets in the spring of this year, and for a harvest to be gathered this year over the whole of the U.S.S.R. not worse than its predecessor. In many districts the level attained by the record harvest of the year 1933 has been passed. The shock workers operating in the fields are consolidating the new collective farm system organisationally, and on business lines. The contrast between town and country is being destroyed by the forces of the working class and the collective farm peasantry.

The successes achieved in the sphere of industry and agriculture have made it definitely possible to develop a wide programme of activity for the raising of the material and cultural standard of living of the masses (the well-being of these masses is to be raised by three times in the course of the second Five-Year Plan).

We are now approaching the end of but the second year of the second Five-Year Plan, but the country is completely involved in the realisation of this tremendous programme. Even from the outside one's eye is caught by the mighty development in those branches of industry faced with the task of further improving the material well-being of the masses, as also by the successes in the sphere of Soviet trade and the whole organisation of supplies. The supply of the masses with articles of consumption is improving from day to day. Housing construction, the reconstruction of the old towns and the construction of new ones, continue to be carried on at an ever more rapid pace.

The following facts give an indication of the scope of the cultural revolution: the almost complete abolition of illiteracy, the more than twenty-six million students in schools of all grades (of whom almost half a million are in the highest grade schools), the more than five million children in pre-school institutions,

the huge growth of special high-grade colleges, scientific research institutions, clubs and theatres, and the more than thirty-six million circulation of the daily press.

The All-Union Congress of Writers in September drew the attention of the representatives of the intellectuals of all lands, becoming transformed into a demonstration of the huge cultural conquests made by the land of the Soviets.

What strikes one especially sharply is the change that has occurred in the face of the Soviet village. As a result of collectivisation the village has passed out of its old poor, half-savage condition on to the highroad of well-being and cultured existence. Tractors, combines, automobiles, radio, cinemas and the thick network of schools (not only elementary schools but also secondary and special schools) demand tens and hundreds of thousands of not merely literate people but also of technically qualified and fully cultured active workers in the new village. The village has already acquired its innumerable intelligentsia. The village is overhauling the socialist town. The gulf between town and village is gradually being reduced, the contrast between them outlived.

Both the town and the village, socialist industry and socialist agriculture have become mighty smithies forging *the new man*. The complete destruction of exploitation and oppression, creative enthusiasm in the struggle for mighty aims, and the socialist organisation of production and labour, are re-educating the millions of builders of classless socialist society.

All Eyes on U.S.S.R.

Not only the workers of all lands turn their gaze full of pride towards the wonderful homeland of the October Revolution. Not only are the proletarians of all capitalist countries attracted by this country where the working class has been victorious. Here where the dictatorship of the proletariat, the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of socialism have resulted in the abolition of such age-long features inherent in the life of the proletarian as the separation of labour power from the means of production, and uncertainty for the morrow based on the apprehension of the toiling people in the face of their armed oppressor. Not only do those who see their cherished dreams being realised in the mighty construction taking place in the Soviet Union sympathetically follow each step taken by the Soviet fatherland in its victorious struggle to build up a classless socialist society. Even the most far-sighted people in the enemy camp, who understand that everything cannot continue in the old way under capitalism, but do not want socialism, are also directing their searching glances at the growth of the proletarian state in an attempt to find the answer to

the question : "What can we learn from the experience of this country, what has given this surprising country the power and the possibility, in the very midst of the destructive crisis that throttles the economy and culture of all capitalist countries, to go impetuously forward and upward with gigantic and firm steps ?" And these defenders of the capitalist order are putting the question as to how to utilise the lessons obtained in the interests of capital in their own way.

The world-historic successes achieved by the U.S.S.R. supply the rising class, the proletariat in the capitalist countries, with new revolutionary energy to create, after the fashion of the Bolsheviks, the pre-conditions for their own advance, to bring about an October victory in their own country. The dying class, doomed by the iron law of history, the bourgeoisie and its thinkers stretch their miserable phantasy to the extreme, developing reactionary utopias to save the capitalist system and the bourgeois order from the world October by transplanting the Soviet system of planned economy to capitalist soil. The construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. spreads colossal waves of revolutionary energy into the camp of the international proletariat. It shatters the miserably reactionary utopian hopes fostered of achieving under capitalism what only socialism can bring about to bits.

In the fire of the October Socialist Revolution, the Bolsheviks, under Lenin's leadership, stood at the head of the majority of the working class, which rallied behind it the majority of the whole toiling people, won the dictatorship of the proletariat, and established *Soviet Power*. And this new link in the new epoch of world history, the epoch of the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society, has been forged in the fire of new class battles by the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Stalin, who have stood at the head of all the toilers in the mighty land of the proletariat.

The events throughout the world on the eve of the Seventeenth Anniversary of the mighty October, reflect the clash of two fronts, of the two basic classes of bourgeois society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. This desperate struggle for and against the preservation of capitalist exploitation and imperialist oppression, the battle between exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed—all revolves around the problems which the October Revolution has either solved, or predetermined by creating the necessary pre-conditions for their solution. In this struggle, where fascism and bourgeois "democracy" (despite all their differences) fight for the preservation of the old order of wage-slavery, while Communism fights for the new classless socialist society, three questions are now coming to the forefront especially insistently in the consciousness of the wide masses of non-Party and social-

democratic workers. These questions can only be answered in the light of the October Revolution, and on the lines taken by the October socialist revolution.

It is around these three questions which are being raised by the offensive of fascism on the working class and the establishment of fascist dictatorship, that the struggle is going on in a number of countries between the old and new society, namely : the first, *of freedom* and the dictatorship of the proletariat ; the second, *force* and the armed uprising, and the third question, *the unity of action* of the working class.

* * *

The workers in Germany, Italy, Japan, Poland and other countries where the rabid bourgeoisie has transformed the state into *one* huge prison for *all* the toilers, are thirsting for freedom. The workers in the countries of so-called bourgeois "democracy" are also thirsting for freedom—countries where the bourgeoisie, taking the road to fascism, are step by step depriving the workers of the last remnants of democratic rights.

Freedom.

The question of freedom is linked with that of power. In February of this year the workers of Austria rose in arms in defence of the last relics of their rights and freedom, against the onslaught of fascism. But they only set themselves the problem of defending their limited (capitalist) freedom, they did not set themselves the question of power, of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They were defeated. Supreme heroism has been displayed by the Spanish proletariat in armed struggles. They have not spared their lives in defence of the rights and freedom won by the overthrow of the military-fascist dictatorship, but cut down by the radical socialist government and destroyed by monarchist-fascist reaction. The Spanish workers have learnt from the experience of the February battles in Austria, and raised the struggle against fascism to a much higher level than that achieved by their Austrian class brothers. They not only defended their freedom, but organised an armed uprising. The workers of Asturias fought for Soviet power under the leadership of the Communists. But the Spanish peasants who, when the monarchy was overthrown, obtained but few liberties and whom the bourgeois-socialist government did not give the land—these peasants whom the Communists have not yet rallied round the proletariat and led to the seizure of the land, turned away from the Republic and did not support the proletariat. This is why the proletariat of Spain have also not been able to achieve victory at this stage.

The workers of the Soviet Union also fought for freedom, for tens of years. When they overthrew

tsarism, they achieved, as a result of the February revolution, the maximum of freedom attained by the working class within the bounds of the bourgeois system anywhere and at any time. It soon became clear to the majority of the working class that freedom for the working class is incompatible with freedom for the capitalist class. The democratic freedom won by the proletariat in Russia in the February days rendered it exceptionally easy for them to solve (under the leadership of the Bolsheviks) the task of independently organising and winning the leading rôle in the revolutionary movement of the peasants. But not more. Before the October Revolution in the freest bourgeois country of that time, in bourgeois-revolutionary Russia, it became manifest that, as Marx says, "the highest social understanding of bourgeois order" is not freedom for all, but that which guarantees the maintenance of the bourgeois capitalist system. And, led by the Bolshevik Party, the proletariat understood that if it was to save itself from the oncoming catastrophe it must seize power.

This has also been confirmed by the fate of Weimar democracy in Germany, and of the "almost socialist democracy" that existed in Austria. This has also been confirmed by the fate of bourgeois democracy in such lands of old democracy as France, by the effort of the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie to pass over from the inadequate methods of bourgeois democracy to those which are more suitable from their point of view, namely, fascist methods, so as to ward off the overthrow of the capitalist system.

Bourgeois democratic liberties are tolerated only within the bounds of what serves to preserve the capitalist order. The civil liberties of the working class inevitably have been and are being wiped away when the question of ensuring the interests of the bourgeoisie is at stake.

The hymns of praise sung by the leaders of social-democracy and its most famous theoreticians and politicians, Otto Bauer, Vandervelde, Leon Blum, in honour of bourgeois liberty as liberty for all; the lying speeches of a certain Karl Kautsky regarding the freedom of the working class, about democracy in general under capitalism, the illusions developed by all these in the ranks of the working class have only led to the working class being unable to utilise the liberties won under the bourgeois-democratic system. All this blathering has only led to the loss of rights and liberties already won by the proletariat. These the bourgeoisie annulled as soon as their interests required. The loss by the proletariat of the liberties it attains under the bourgeois order is inevitable if, when defending its rights, the proletariat (appreciating the incompatibility of freedom for the working class and freedom for the capitalist class) does not set itself such aims as the overthrow of the bourgeois system, destruction of the bourgeois class and the

establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat which guarantees freedom only to the proletariat and not to the bourgeoisie. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat, brought into being as a result of the October victory, has established real proletarian soviet democracy for the toilers. The scope of this is pictured, even if only faintly, in the following two sets of figures: in the elections to the Constituent Assembly in November, 1927, 36,262,566 voters voted on the basis of the General electoral law. In 1934, on the other hand, at the forthcoming elections to the Soviets, the number of voters, which even the social-democratic press write about, has reached ninety millions. This is so, although the former exploiting classes have been deprived of the right to vote. This is what is happening in the land where the proletariat, led by the Leninist Bolshevik Party, has established its open unlimited power, namely, its dictatorship. Through the medium of this revolutionary dictatorship it has set up the pre-conditions for the establishment of such a system where not "the unfree thing but the free human being is dominant."

* * *

Fascism is on the offensive in a number of countries. The workers, Communists, social-democrats, toilers of all kinds in Austria and in Spain, entered the struggle this year with arms in their hands against the concentrated military forces of the fascist bourgeoisie. Terrified philistines like Hilferding have issued abominably lying pamphlets against the heroic proletariat of Austria. They have sneered at the Austrian workers for being unable to correctly determine "the bounds of force." The English philistine, Wells, put the question to Comrade Stalin, the leader of the world proletariat, of the advisability of the proletariat applying force. Otto Bauer would like to convince the proletarians that "the social-democrat values the word 'freedom' more than the Communist does, while the Communist places the historic rôle of force higher than does the social-democrat."

Force.

The efforts of the Austrian and Spanish proletarians to maintain their liberty by force ending in failure do not show the limited rôle played by force. On the contrary, they show that only those win the victory who are in a position to correctly understand the historic rôle of the force of armed uprising not as an accidental episode in the struggle, but as a necessary pre-condition for victory. This is a pre-condition which must be carefully and thoroughly prepared beforehand, both politically and from a military-technical point of view. They show that the only path to lead to victory is the path of October.

The proletariat has never been able to convince

itself with such clarity hitherto of the correctness of the old saying to the effect that "he who has arms has freedom," as now, when a turning point in world history has been reached. The historic struggle between capitalism and socialism has developed into the duel between fascism and Communism, and bourgeois "democracy" is also becoming ever more penetrated by the elements of fascism. The following most important lesson has arisen from the experience of the armed struggles of the proletariat during this past year, when contrasted with the October uprising, namely, that of the necessity of applying violence and of the need for all-round preparations for the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Let the proletariat not allow itself to be deceived again. The working class have no need for empty blather about the application of violence. They require to make really correct and appropriate preparations for the armed uprising, if they wish to ensure a successful way out for their struggle against fascism. In the same measure as the ideological struggle against fascism is necessary, and just as it is important to bring conviction to bear on the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements who still continue to help the bourgeoisie to save capitalism, in the same degree is it of no avail to make efforts to dissuade the reactionary bourgeoisie from fencing off its capitalist private property by means which already are not achieving their aim, to give up fascism?

The history of the working class does not know of any greater betrayal of its interests than the theories that are now, after the Austrian and Spanish events, once again being cooked up by the leaders of social-democracy, especially by the so-called Anglo-Saxon socialists, and also by the scared German philistines from the camp of social-democracy in emigration. The essence of these theories may be reduced to the following: "Force was a method of the bourgeois revolution, a means to effect the transfer from feudalism to capitalism. But the transfer from capitalism to socialism can only be brought about in peaceful fashion, only as the result of the numerical preponderance and organised character of the proletariat."

The numerical preponderance of the proletariat has long existed. Its organised character, as such, reached a high level in Austria, Germany, and even in Spain, well before the decisive passage of fascism to the offensive. The old social order was undermined, shattered by the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. But of itself it did not collapse and could not collapse, and the bourgeoisie would not allow it to. They mobilised all means of applying violence to save their power. What did the majority of social-democracy counterpose to this, social-democracy which until recent times stood at the head of the majority of the working class in capitalist

countries? While undertaking a policy of co-operation with the bourgeoisie and thus clearing the way for fascism, social-democracy either denied violence in words, while in deeds it did not hesitate to indulge in any act of police violence against the proletariat (the shooting down of the First of May demonstration in Berlin by Zörgiebel) or else displayed waverings at the decisive moment when the proletariat had to resort to violence, which was equal to treachery. The October uprising of the Russian proletariat in 1917 was crowned with victory because the Party which stood at the head of the majority of the working class considered that the application of violence by the proletariat as against the violence of the bourgeoisie was no accident called forth by the peculiar nature of the historical situation, but a necessity. It is necessary to prepare the proletariat for the application of violence against the domination of the bourgeoisie in good time, planfully, politically and organisationally, morally and technically.

* * *

The offensive of fascism throughout the capitalist world, the establishment of open fascist dictatorship in a number of countries and the danger of war has given rise among the social-democratic and non-Party workers to a very powerful urge in favour of the united front of struggle together with the Communists. The united front of the Communists and social-democrats in the struggle against fascism and war and against the capitalist offensive is the path to the winning of the majority of the working class to the banner of the consistent class struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the banner of Communism.

Unity of Action.

The October uprising smashed the state machine of the bourgeoisie, broke the backbone of the counter-revolution, because the majority of the proletariat acted in unanimity at the decisive points and not only offered resistance at the decisive moments but moved forward purposefully, organised by the Bolsheviks and led by them. In spite of the fact that, with the exception of Petrograd, in Moscow and a number of other big industrial centres in the country, the majority of the deputies' mandates in the Soviets were in the hands of the petty bourgeois parties, the Mensheviks and social-revolutionaries, almost up to the very moment of the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks devoted all their energy to the struggle for the Soviets.

They fought steadily for the majority in the Soviets, because they knew that the Soviets were a mighty conquest for the working class, the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat given by history, but nevertheless only the socialist *form* of the political organisation of the proletariat.

"Everything depends on the *contents which will be put into this mould.*"

"It is not only a question of the Soviets themselves but mainly of who will direct them." (Stalin.)

The experience of the Soviets in the German revolution in 1918, led by the followers of Scheidemann and the Independents, is the best proof of this Leninist principle.

The Bolsheviks worked in a planned and purposeful manner to bring about through the Soviets the unity of action of the working class and its alliance with the peasants, with the proletariat as the leading force.

On the eve of the October Revolution, in the struggle for the revolutionary unity of action of the working class, the Bolsheviks won over the majority in the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets and in the Soviets of a number of industrial districts. This was a necessary prerequisite for the October victory.

At the same time and on this basis, the Bolsheviks won tremendous influence among the masses of peasants by their policy, their consistent struggle for peace and land, and especially by their adoption of the agrarian programme which the peasant congress voted for. At the time of the armed uprising the Bolsheviks made an agreement with the Left social-revolutionaries so as to ensure the support of the revolution by the masses of the peasants. As a result, the Bolsheviks more and more undermined the influence of the Mensheviks and social-revolutionaries in the Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies. On June 3, 1917, at the First Congress of Soviets, the Bolsheviks constituted only 13 per cent. of the delegates but at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, when the representatives of the toiling masses sanctioned the armed seizure of power, the Bolsheviks had 51 per cent. of the places. At the Third Congress of Soviets, the Bolsheviks had 61 per cent., at the Fourth Congress in March, 1918, this number had already risen to 64 per cent., while at the Fifth Congress in July, 1918, when the agreement with the social-revolutionaries was ended, the toilers had sent to the Congress 66 per cent. of Bolshevik delegates.

The stubborn struggle of the Bolsheviks for the unity of action of the working class and to secure allies for the proletariat, a struggle which could not be stopped by any temporary defeats, was the prerequisite for the victory of October, for the winning of power and the consolidation of this power.

The social-democrats and the non-Party workers are beginning to realise the basic lesson of the October Revolution, namely, that the establishment of the revolutionary unity of action of the working

class under the leadership of the Communist vanguard, is the path towards the destruction of the influence of the bourgeoisie over the working class. It is the path towards the winning by the proletariat of the hegemony over the movement of the middle-strata in the town and village, and the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, the path towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, to victory. Hence the stubborn resistance to the Communist Parties on the part of the Second International and the majority of its parties, in respect of the struggle of the Communists for the unity of action of the working class. Therefore, their attempts to replace the slogan of the united front of struggle by the slogan of "organisational unity" in the sense of the fusion of Communism with reformism, in the sense of the absorption of Communism by reformism. The Communist Parties must and will carry on the struggle for the united front still more stubbornly, thus bringing the social-democratic and non-Party workers to the side of Communism, knowing that the proletariat desires to and must create the guarantees which will ensure victory, just as the Bolsheviks established the prerequisites for the victory of the October Revolution.

* * *

For more than ten years international social-democracy unanimously excommunicated the October Revolution and all its achievements. But gradually large and small groups began to be formed in the Second International which little by little realised that "the things taking place in the Soviet Union may, perhaps, be really recognised as socialist construction." The theoreticians and political leaders, including those who uttered incitements to intervention and also those who have at length, after fifteen years of the October Revolution, recognised that the defence of the U.S.S.R. is in the interests of the international proletariat itself, have got on very well together, and still do so, within the limits of the Second International. But the social-democratic workers themselves have utterly rejected social-interventionism. The construction of socialism in the Soviet Union is guarded not only by the conscious revolutionary vanguard of the working class in the capitalist countries, but by the entire revolutionary proletariat. This shows that the day is near when the international proletariat will forge the will to overthrow the domination of the bourgeoisie in the united front of struggle and march under the leadership of the Comintern to the storm of capitalism, under the basic slogan of the conquest of Soviet Power.

THE HISTORIC PATH OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

(70th Anniversary of Foundation of First International.)

By M. ZORKY.

§

THE First International existed for less than ten years, but it left deep traces on the history of mankind. For the Bolsheviks, for the Comintern, this ten-year period is not simply an episode from the far-distant past of the Western-European workers. For us, it is the initial chapter of our own history, the first stage in the development of the INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST PARTY.

The embryo of such a Party was the Communist League, an organisation founded by Marx in the 40's of last century. The great "Manifesto of the Communist Party" was the first link in the chain of the programme documents of international Communism. But the Communist League only united a handful of the advanced elements of the working class. It required the experience of the Revolution of 1848, the trials of the epoch of reaction in the 50's, the new upsurge of the working class movement in England and on the Continent for the INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION TO RISE ON THE crest of this wave.

Why did this world-historic event, the formation and the first stage of development of the revolutionary proletarian International, take place in the 60's and the beginning of the 70's of last century? The explanation, of course, is to be found in the special features of the very EPOCH OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL.

The beginning of this epoch found the various countries of Western Europe and America at various stages in the development of their productive forces. The English bourgeoisie had carried through their industrial revolution, and, reaping the fruits of it, had reached the zenith of their world commercial and industrial pre-eminence. In France the industrial revolution was in full swing, but it took its own peculiar path in connection with the clearly marked usurious character of French capitalism. In Germany the death-throes of handicraft production were approaching, and manufacture was rapidly and extensively developing. The industrial revolution still lay ahead. In the U.S.A. the abolition of slavery loosened the soil for the development of capitalism at unparalleled "American" speed.

But notwithstanding the varying economic levels attained by the various countries, the general "cosmopolitan" tendency of bourgeois economy stood out more plainly than ever before throughout the ENTIRE capitalist world. ALL these countries were more closely connected than ever before with the

development of the WORLD market. In its range, the crisis of 1857 was the first WORLD crisis. The "Inaugural Address" had good reason to begin with a description of all the contradictions of this "golden age of free trade." To use Lenin's words:

"The years 1860-1870 marked the HIGHEST AND EXTREME STAGE in the development of free competition." (Lenin, Vol. 19, Russian Edition, our emphasis.)

In this epoch, capitalism reached its apogee in its classic, pre-imperialist stage.

These, however, were the years which COMPLETED THE ERA OF THE BOURGEOIS REVOLUTIONS OF THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES. After the revolution of 1848, the bourgeoisie still had their work uncompleted. The reaction of the 50's by no means put a stop to the increase in the economic power of this class. The relics of feudal rubbish hindered this growth more and more as time went on. Taught by their experience of 1848, the bourgeoisie would not and could not sweep this rubbish from their path by "plebeian methods." They knew that the proletariat had taken its place on the world stage of history, as a class. The epoch of the First International was marked by a new upsurge of the revolutionary movement of the working class. Its historic rôle as the driving force of all the democratic and national emancipation movements was already in evidence. The proletariat had already openly declared the class war on the bourgeoisie. In France it required the terror of the Versailles troops to ensure that what became consolidated on the ruins of the Second Empire was not the dictatorship of the lower strata of the people in the shape of the Commune, but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in the shape of the Third Republic. Faced with the menace of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie in a number of other countries made peace with the landowners. Countries like Spain and Austria also underwent serious changes. The British bourgeoisie also had to resort to reforms so as to strengthen their class domination.

It was ONLY THE UPSURGE of the revolutionary working class movement that drove the ruling classes to make reforms, to make "revolutions from above." In his recent talk with Wells, Comrade Stalin ironically exposed the legend of the possibility of a "peaceful" path of development, clearly emphasising the unbreakable connections existing between bourgeois reformism and the revolutionary onslaught of the masses.* Had there been no danger of popular

* Talk of Comrade Stalin with H. G. Wells, printed in the *Bolshevik*, Moscow, No. 17, 1934. London, *Daily Worker*, etc., etc.

revolution, of revolution "from below," we would not have witnessed the picture of black-hundred Junker Prussia, and soldier and priest-ridden Sardinia assuming the rôles of unifiers of bourgeois Germany and bourgeois Italy. Had there not been the revolutionary onslaught of the democratic rank-and-file, and primarily of the proletariat, Bismarck, the personification of the big landlords, would not have been the greatest "hero" of the bourgeoisie. The epoch of the First International was the epoch of the completion of the bourgeois revolutions, a completion which took place in CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE OF THE PROLETARIAT AGAINST THE BOURGEOISIE BECAME SHARPENED, AND RESULTED THEREFROM.

This epoch in which the bourgeois-national "fatherlands" took shape was an epoch of WARS. In the third quarter of the nineteenth century the following wars occurred (apart from small wars): the Crimean, the Austro-Italian-French, the Civil War in America, the Polish rising, the Austro-Prussian and the Franco-German wars. In these wars some states disappeared from the face of the earth, others appeared, and old state boundaries were re-made.

By the beginning of the 60's, the proletariat in a number of countries began to tear off the bonds attaching them to bourgeois-liberalism more and more determinedly, starting to come forward with ever-greater determination as an independent class force. The conditions of the epoch, an epoch of the unparalleled development of international economic contacts, an epoch of national movements and wars, favoured, as Engels wrote, THE COSMOPOLITAN INTERESTS OF the working class coming to the forefront during these years.

But all these conditions were not sufficient for the international party of the revolutionary proletariat to be formed.

"One element of success they (the working class) possess, numbers," wrote Marx in the Foundation Manifesto. "But numbers weigh only in the balance if united by combination and led by knowledge."

Before the First International, the workers were revolutionary by class INSTINCT; they had to be given class CONSCIOUSNESS and a class fighting ORGANISATION. Marx solved both of these tasks.

In the First International, the international working class made its historic transition FROM UTOPIA TO PROLETARIAN SCIENCE, and at the same time FROM BEING SCATTERED AND SECTARIAN TO A PROLETARIAN PARTY OUTLOOK. This is the great historic service of the International Workingmen's Association, for which it is entirely beholden to Marx. In the person of Marx, the world proletariat found not only a talented theoretician but also its recognised strategist, its mighty organiser, its genuine LEADER, found the "quiet, prompt, well-thought out LEADER-

SHIP, which on more than one occasion preserved it from long wanderings on false paths."*

* * *

§II.

Foundation of First International.

In the 50's, in the epoch of reaction, Marx kept himself apart from emigrant groupings, tirelessly working out his theory, and never for a single day ceasing his stubborn struggle against the "great men in emigration," the petty-bourgeois babblers and disorganisers.

Marx always determined his strategy and tactics by an

"objective account of all the mutual relationships of all the classes of a given society without exception, and consequently an account of the objective stage of development of this society."†

Better than anybody else in his time, Marx was able to see the new features introduced by the epoch of the 60's. That was why Marx "changed" his former tactics, and came to St. Martins Hall on September 28, 1864. He understood quite well that "real forces"‡ had come into motion, that "we are dealing with history on which we can have a considerable influence."§ This was why Marx came forward in September-November, 1864, as the founder of the International Workingmen's Association, the author of its programme documents, and the leader of all its political and organisational activity.

Marx and Engels saw the historic mission of the International in that it should organise the proletarian masses and lead them to the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, and for the establishment of socialist society. The Foundation Manifesto announced the "winning of political power," as the "greatest duty of the working class." The basic political line pursued by Marx and Engels in the First International was set out with the greatest clearness and simplicity by Engels in his speech at the London Conference in 1871.

"We want the destruction of classes. What are the means of securing this? The political domination of the proletariat . . . But the highest act of politics is revolution. Those who recognise this must strive towards such means and political actions as will prepare the revolution, such as educate the workers for revolution, and without which the workers will always be tricked by Favres and Pyats the day after the battle. The Policy which should be followed is a worker's policy. A Party must be formed not as an appendage to some bourgeois parties, but as an independent party with its own aim, its own policy. (This speech is published for the first time in the Russian Edition of the *Communist International*.)

In trying to form such a Party, Marx first and foremost set himself the task of directing the working

* Engels, Letter to Bernstein, March 14, 1883 (re-translated from Russian).

† Lenin, *Teachings of Karl Marx*.

‡ See Letter of Marx to Engels, November 4, 1864.

§ Letter of Marx to Weydemeyer, November 29, 1864.

class movement in various countries into the channel of common struggle, and uniting it in the ranks of the International. To understand what incredible difficulties stood in the path of such unity, we must visualise a plain picture of what the working-class movement of the time resembled in the West-European countries. Each of the sections of this movement which came into the ranks of the International brought with it whole mountains of petty-bourgeois rubbish, childish illusions, doctrinaire fancies, sectarian impatience, and national prejudices. To cope with this babel confusion of tongues, Marx's profound understanding of the special features of the development of the proletariat in each of these countries was needed, and Marx's supreme mastery of tactics—the ability to identify the positive features distinguishing the various movements from each other and make them the common property of the International; the ability to patiently expose the reactionary Utopias of each and every sect in the course of the struggle. It required the ability to seek support in the healthy proletarian instincts and growing militant experience of the rank-and-file, against the limitations and fanaticism of sectarian leaders; the ability to differentiate the ranks of opponents, isolate the incorrigible, and in the last instance squeeze them out of the International.

Marx operated these tactics brilliantly throughout the entire history of the Association, which ensured the triumph of Marxism in the First International.

Marx had very few consistent followers in the International, nevertheless Marxism triumphed over all the forms of pre-Marxian socialism. The "secret" of this victory consists, of course, not only in the tactical genius of Marx. The tactics of Marx led to victory "because Marxism and only Marxism represents the really GENERAL AND FUNDAMENTAL interests of the proletariat," because Marxism alone was for this reason capable of "rallying the scattered forces of the proletariat into one and thus becoming the LIVING REPRESENTATIVE of the community of interests which unites the workers."*

§III

Anti-Marxian Currents In First International.

In the International, Marx had most of all to carry on a struggle against the liberal trade union politicians, against the Proudhonites and against the Bakunin "Alliance."

In the 60's there was already an aristocracy of labour in England, and it received crumbs from the monopolist super-profits of the English bourgeoisie. Marx repeatedly wrote that the England of that period could not be

"simply put on a level with other countries. It must be regarded as the METROPOLIS OF CAPITAL."

The period following the year 1848 was a period of unparalleled growth, "intoxicating" growth, to use the words of Gladstone, of British power and wealth. It was just in this period that England became the workshop of the world, and master of the world market. For the International to become a really decisive revolutionary force, the metropolis of capital, in the opinion of Marx, had also to become the citadel of the international proletarian party.

But after the decline of Chartism, the English labour movement remained like a ruined temple, the parts of which were in no way connected with each other. The striving towards legalism at any cost became dominant in the trade union movement. The trade unions even held aloof from strikes. All participation in political life seemed to them to be a deadly sin, many of the unions had rules prohibiting their members from taking part in politics. Even the bourgeois politician Cobden characterised the state of the English workers at that time as a condition of "political dullness."

The starting point of the change was the strike movement of 1859-61. It awakened the working masses and shook the illusion of "class harmony." Trade union councils emerged out of the strike committees with a tendency to become the centres of the proletarian struggle. The bourgeoisie replied to this turn in the labour movement with a crusade against the working class. They drew out of their arsenal the tried weapon of the lockout. The government declared war on the trade unions, deprived their funds of legal protection, and passed a series of laws which, taken together, constituted exceptional law directed against the trade unions. At the same time the bourgeoisie began to practise a new method of struggle in case of strikes, namely, the import of strikebreakers from the Continent.

The trade unions which had taken a solemn oath not to stain their banners with politics, were brought face to face by the course of events with the choice of either going under, or taking up the political struggle. But once they had taken this path, the English workers could not maintain their former aloofness from questions of international politics, especially in the conditions existing in the 60's. Thus it was the leaders of the trade unions belonged to the General Council of the First International.

Marx never over-estimated the reliability of his English confreres in the International.

"The English dogs among the trade unions, for whom we are going too far," wrote Marx in 1867 to Engels (re-translated from the Russian, Ed.), "have run to us";

They keep aside from the International

"until they get into difficulties, and only then do they come for help."

In their first appeal to the French workers, Odger and Co. emphasised with sufficient deliberateness that, as far as they were concerned, a circumstance of

**L'Alliance de la Democratie Socialiste* London, 1873.

primary importance which urged them along the path of international unity was the danger of the import of labour power from the Continent. They needed the International both as an ally in their struggle for the legal rights of the trade unions, and for electoral reform. The Liberal-Labour politicians would not have been averse to converting the General Council into an international committee for the defence of the English trade unions.

Marx, on the contrary, strove to force the leaders of the trade unions to operate the line of the International in England. The very participation of these people in the Association was a deviation from "pure" trade unionism. The task facing Marx was to influence the English labour movement through these people until the old leaders could be replaced by others, and to urge it along the revolutionary path.

"If we had left in disgust owing to these people," wrote Marx to Siegfried Meyer, "we should only have strengthened their influence, which is paralysed at the present time by our presence." (Re-translated from the Russian, Editor.)

On this path, Marx obtained substantial successes. True, he was unable to liberate the British labour movement from the guardianship of the liberal trade-unionists, and to bring it back to the Chartist path. But the revolutionary leadership of Marx and the General Council laid a clear imprint on the class struggles waged by the English proletariat in the 60's, in which connection it is sufficient to call the movement for reform and the Irish question to mind. At the same time, Marx in the International formed support for himself among the Englishmen on the chief questions of his struggle against Proudhonism, and to a certain degree against Bakuninism. In the celebrated discussion in the General Council with the Owenite-Weston,* Marx utilised the experience of the English trade unions to make a brilliant onslaught on two fronts, both against the denial of the importance of the trade unions, and against the tendency to reduce the whole of the struggle of the working class to the narrow economic struggle within the bounds of the trade union movement. Marx succeeded in ensuring that the positive experience of the trade unions became the property of the whole International, while he utilised the support of the revolutionary elements of the Continental sections, to successfully resist the repeated attempts of the trade unionists to influence the political line of the International as a whole in an anti-revolutionary spirit.

§IV Proudhonism.

In France, the International was at first represented by the PROUDHONISTS. Like the English Liberal politicians, the Proudhonists of Paris revised one of the important points of their symbol of faith

*"Value, Price and Profit."

by the very fact of their participation in the International.

This, however, was not their only deviation from orthodox Proudhonism. The 60's brought an upsurge of the working class movement in France as well. In the conditions of the Second Empire, the beginning of this upsurge indirectly reflected itself in such phenomena as, firstly, the attempts to inculcate social-Bonapartism into the labour movement, a French variety of Zubatovism;* secondly, in the attempts of the left bourgeois republican elements to take hold of the working class movement, and subordinate it to the interests of their own struggle against the regime of Napoleon; and finally, in the evolution of the Proudhonites, in their gradual abandonment of the line adopted by their teacher. This evolution, however, did not save them from complete destruction when the decisive struggle broke out between Marxism and Proudhonism.

Proudhon was a clear and conscious representative of the strivings of the disintegrating petty bourgeoisie of the town and village, and what is more, he represented not the revolutionary, but the CONSERVATIVE tendencies of these strata. He himself complained that he was regarded as one who destroyed, whereas his task in life was to "put an end to revolutions" in a peaceful manner.

Proudhon, author of the winged words "property is theft," was in reality a zealous supporter of property. His promised land was the kingdom of the small commodity producer. The peasants need land as their inviolable unquestioned property—"not rent, not an irregular liaison, but marriage with the land." The root of all evils lay not in the sphere of production, but of exchange. The exchange bank and cheap credit—such was the alpha and omega of Proudhonism, the main mechanism of Proudhonite social transformations.

The French petty bourgeoisie were becoming increasingly convinced that the July monarchy, the bourgeois republic, and the Second Empire were all openly helping the concentration of capital, i.e., the doom of the small producer. Every government was the "scourge of God." But Proudhon considered all attempts to democratise this hated machine, still less to smash it, fruitless. He advocated the passive boycott of the government, the solution of the social problem "apart from the state and outside it," outside the sphere of all political struggle whatever.

True to the outlook of the petty-owner, Proudhon demanded that woman should not dare to tear herself away from the kitchen and cradle. But the class essence of Proudhonism was most clearly marked when questions of the proletarian struggle arose.

* Zubatov: Chief of Police in Czarist Russia—undertook the organisation of "Unions" to safeguard workers from revolutionary influence.—Ed.

Proudhon was against wage-increases, against the limitation of the working day, against strikes, and against the right to form trade unions. The petty bourgeoisie is incapable of forming its united class party. Proudhon damned the very idea of party membership. The Party is "born of tyranny."

But under the influence of the circumstances prevailing in the beginning of the 60's, Proudhon himself was compelled to admit the importance of the political struggle, and began to preach the alliance between "village democracy" and urban "hired labour." He had in view an "alliance" between the working class and the petty bourgeoisie wherein the former was in the leading strings of the latter. What is more, the aim of this "alliance" was to remain the same—

"to reorganise property along the principle of mutuality,"
"to put an end to day-wages and drive out the town profiteer,"

i.e., to perpetuate petty-commodity production.

How was this BOURGEOIS SOCIALISM (this was the estimate of the teachings of Proudhon, given as far back as in the "Manifesto of the Communist Party") able to become the banner of certain of the workers of Paris? Proudhonism found fertile soil among the highly skilled semi-handicraft proletariat who were engaged mainly in the manufacture of articles of luxury and in the art industry. Reflecting the Conservative utopianism of such surroundings, Tolain, Fribourg and Co. came to the International with all their Proudhonite baggage. They brought with them their opposition to labour legislation, their plans for world free-credit, and a panicky fear of politics and Communism. At the first two Congresses—in Geneva in 1866 and Lausanne in 1867, the influence of the Proudhonites was so great that, to use the words of Marx, they "nearly spoiled everything" and it was only "owing to the true instinct of the workers" that they did not paint all the decisions of these congresses a Proudhonite colour.

The Parisian Proudhonites were driven into the International by the strivings of the French workers towards the political struggle and international solidarity, which of itself contained the inevitable death sentence on Proudhonism. Tolain and his friends comforted themselves with the hope that they could convert the entire International into something like an international doctrinaire league manufacturing recipes for social renovation, or into a world-wide mutual credit association. "The association as a whole," wrote Fribourg, "definitely refrains from any interference in the affairs of France. It is an association for investigation." (Translated from the Russian, Editor.) Is it surprising that the Proudhonites estimated the entire subsequent development of the International as a deviation from

the correct path? In this they were in touching unity with the Bonaparte police.

Marx, however, in accordance with his entire tactics at this time, set himself the task of getting into contact with the French workers through the medium of the Proudhonites, and of leading them along the path of the International, that is to say, through the medium of the Proudhonites, as long as this was necessary, but over their heads and AGAINST them when this became possible. These tactics led to excellent results.

The entire first period in the history of the International was filled with the struggle of Marxism against the Proudhonites. Marx based himself in this struggle both on the English Labour movement with its experience of powerful trade unions and extensive political struggle, and the German labour movement, where social-democracy had begun to take shape at the time, and also on all those elements in the French labour movement itself which were able to weaken Proudhonism and open up possibilities for the International directly influencing the masses of the French proletariat.

In these stubborn struggles against Proudhonism which were conducted by Marx on the question of property, i.e., of socialism, on the question of the political and economic struggle of the proletariat and on the national question, Marx always based himself on the growing class experience of the French workers themselves. In proportion as France drew nearer to revolution, the old Proudhonite utopianism became open strike-breaking. Doctrinaire teachings led by a straight path to treachery. Under the leadership of Marx, the proletariat stepped over Proudhonism. By the time of the Brussels Congress in 1868 and especially the Basle Congress in 1869, Proudhonism had been destroyed. "The International of the French founders is dead," stated Fribourg sadly. Marx wrote differently to Engels: "We have finished off the Proudhonite asses."

The victory of Marx over the Proudhonites was a victory of proletarian socialism over the bourgeoisie. It sharply emphasised the revolutionary proletarian socialist nature of the Association, and opened a new stage in the struggle for Marxism in the ranks of the International. After this victory, the opponents of Marxism had to "disguise" themselves as revolutionists and socialists. Bakuninism became the standard-bearer of all the enemies of Marx in the International.

§v

Bakuninism.

Whereas Proudhonism was the ideology of the small owner, grimly clutching his property, and not losing the hope of re-making the whole world in his own form or image by peaceful means, BAKUNINISM was the expression of this same property owner who

had already been completely plundered by capitalism, had become declassed and swept into the flood of pauperisation. Bakuninism in Russia appealed to the anarchist-mutinious traditions of the serf-peasantry: in Western Europe it appealed to the bourgeois robbed of his last, to the declassed petty bourgeois.

In England, by that time, the day of these social strata had already passed. In Germany the ruined petty-bourgeoisie were speedily swallowed up by rising capitalism. For this reason the influence of the Bakuninites was strongest mainly in the Latin countries of the South, where at that time capitalist development meant not so much proletarianisation as pauperism for the perishing handicraftsmen and peasants.

The "teachings" of Bakunin are a confused mass in which everything of importance was taken from Proudhon. While completely accepting Proudhon's estimate of the state, Bakunin rejected the tactics of the passive boycott in words and advocated the immediate and violent destruction of all states. As for the proletarian dictatorship, in the opinion of Bakunin

"there is only a difference in outward conditions between the revolutionary dictatorship and the state. In essence they are one and the same rule of the majority by the minority . . . They are EQUALLY REACTIONARY."

Instead of the state, what ought to be created was a "free federation" of persons, communes, districts, nations. But all this still lay ahead, and at present "we must devote ourselves to unlimited destruction, constant, unceasing, ever-increasing, until nothing remains for disruption." Bakunin regarded the organised working class not as an advanced section but as a backward one, a hindrance on the path towards general "social liquidation;" he preferred the lumpen-proletariat (see page 832) to it, as firstly, it combined poverty, despair and "revolutionary passion;" then he preferred the poor students—"the educated world of desperate youth;" and finally, he preferred robbers who "preserve the traditions of popular sufferings." Bakunin demanded the destruction of "authoritarianism," i.e., of discipline and centralisation in the International itself. In the words of Marx, "at the time when the old world was trying to destroy the International, Bakunin was aiming at the world replacing its organisation by anarchy. The international police asked no more."

Furthermore, Bakunin regarded the existence of a strictly secret and properly organised band of conspirators as being the guarantee for the victory of his "social liquidation." He selected the International as the organisation INSIDE which, to use his own words, this "invisible dictatorship should be set up.

After Marx had repulsed the attempt of Bakunin to legalise the "alliance of socialist democracy"

inside the International, Bakunin finally took the line of conspiratorial struggle against Marx and the General Council. This was war according to all the rules of factional and double-dealing strategy, including parallel illegal centres, code correspondence, underground literature, negotiations and blocs with openly anti-revolutionary elements, statements regarding the alleged rejection of factional organisation, which played the part of a smoke screen, and streams of vile slander against Marx and Engels as the leaders of the International.

Bakunin carried on a frenzied struggle against Marx on three most important questions: (1) The question of the POLITICAL STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS. Bakunin demanded "abstention from politics;" (2) The question of the PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP. As against this, Bakunin counterposed his programme of general disintegration; (3) the question of the rôle of a centralised and disciplined PROLETARIAN PARTY. Bakunin denied this rôle with all his "anti-authoritarian" theory, and all his disorganising conspirative tactics.

But it was just these questions that became questions of life and death for the International. At the particular stage of the movement it was precisely the task of organising the working class for its political struggle, for its preparation for the oncoming struggles for the proletariat dictatorship that became THE CENTRAL TASK FACING proletarian revolutionaries. This is why those methods which Marx applied in his struggle for Marxism in the International in the years 1864-1869, were unsuitable in the struggle against Bakuninism. This is why the struggle against the Bakuninites was carried on so fiercely, and soon led to a *split*, to the *exclusion* of the anarchists from the ranks of the International.

Marx and Engels gave a shattering criticism of the theory and practice of Bakunin, and this criticism will always be one of the most brilliant pages in the history of Marxism. Marx and Engels showed not only the theoretical pettiness of Bakuninism, but also its strike-breaking essence, its outright reactionary nature hidden behind ultra-revolutionary phrases. In reality Bakuninism backed up supineness and passivity, destroyed the fighting organisation of the proletariat and played into the hands of bourgeois counter-revolution.

The opportunist essence of Bakuninism is eloquently shown by Bakunin's favourite slogan, as the old slogan of the St. Simonites, of the abolition of the right of inheritance by legislative means WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE BOURGEOIS STATE. Bakunin considered this measure to be the "starting point" of his general "liquidation" . . . It is not surprising that this slogan of the arch-revolutionary Bakunin met with sympathy among the most avowed reformists.

Whereas Bakunin's "theory" reflected the despair of the frantic petty bourgeoisie, the pitiful strike-breaking practice of Bakuninism illustrated the complete helplessness of this strata when deprived of proletarian leadership, and the utter futility of Bakuninism. Three examples will be enough to show this. In the Swiss Jura—the very citadel of Bakuninism—the Alpinists could not make any other proposal than the naked advocacy of abstention from politics, and a pitiful "positive" programme in which such points as mutual credit and unemployment insurance figure as a distant ideal (under the heading: "If you workers wanted it"). In Italy, the Bakuninites organised a ridiculous "rising", in which, instead of the masses, full of "revolutionary passion," only a handful of people took part, armed with rifles that would not go off. In Spain, in the rising of 1873, the Bakuninites played a most disgraceful rôle: "As soon as it came to action, the ultra-revolutionary howl of the Bakuninites turned either into shirking or into an obviously hopeless revolt, or into union with a bourgeois party which shamelessly exploited the workers politically. The Bakuninites in Spain gave us an unsurpassed example of how not to make a revolution."* The descendants and the followers of the Bakuninites in our day show the whole world how the pseudo-radical blather of the anarchists regarding the "destruction of all states" leads in reality to a disgusting grovelling to the hangmen of the working class, namely, the Leroux and Robles.

The first conflict with the Bakuninites took place at the Basle Congress of the International in 1869. During the London Conference in 1871, an extremely keen struggle took place, but it was still entitled the "Swiss Conflict." The decisions of the conference, which were directly aimed at the "Alliance," provided the occasion for the Bakuninites to undertake an open splitting campaign against Marx and the General Council. The "Alliance" became the centre of attraction for all the oppositional elements in the International. Even some of the trade union leaders rallied to the banner of Bakunin, attracted not so much by the shortlived struggle of the Bakuninites for "social liquidation," as by their much more real struggle for the abolition of the leadership of Marx in the International.

Bakunin DID NOT SUCCEED in getting the International into his hands and forcing his programme on to it. The Hague Congress in 1872 under the direct leadership of Marx entirely approved the line of the Marxian General Council, and expelled Bakunin from the Association.

The Bakuninites formed their "anti-authoritarian" International, which disappeared ingloriously after a few years of miserable existence. Bakuninism advocated the policy of fireworks, but it proved to be a

very brief flash in the pan itself. The victory obtained by Marx in the First International over Bakuninism was final and absolute.

§VI

End of First International.

But at that time the International itself was passing through a crisis, the cause of which was much wider and deeper than the influence of the splitting activity of the "Alliance."

The First International was the child of the definite epoch in which it grew, developed, and marched from victory to victory. By the beginning of the 70's, the International Workingmen's Association had achieved enormous successes. The Commune was a tremendous victory for the International. It was a proof that the only path of the working class to victory was that of the proletarian dictatorship, the path of Marx and Engels, the path of the First International. "After the Commune," wrote Engels to Bebel, in regard to the International Association, "it had tremendous success. The bourgeoisie were frightened to death and thought it all-powerful." But the First International was the child of its epoch, and this epoch was coming to an end.

The beginning of the 70's marked a TURNING POINT in world history. Lenin considered the crisis of 1873 as an important landmark in the history of capitalist economy.* The old capitalism left the highest stage of its development behind. The era of bourgeois revolutions in the West came to an end. In its place there came a transition epoch—"a transition from the completion of the bourgeois and national revolutions in Western Europe to the beginning of socialist revolutions."† The national bourgeois "fatherlands" took definite shape, frontiers became relatively stable. The map of Europe, which lasted without important changes until 1914, became settled in 1871.

The proletariat was faced with the task of continuing its revolutionary struggle on new grounds. New times demanded different strategic and tactical methods, different organisational forms. The First International fulfilled its historic mission and left the scene. But it left as a VICTOR, and had "full right to look back with pride on the path it had traversed." (Engels.)

The transfer of the General Council to New York neither meant that the real centre of the movement had been transferred there, nor that such a centre had ceased to exist. The leadership of the international proletarian army in the 70's and 80's remained in the hands of Marx and Engels. This leadership was of DECISIVE importance for the development of the proletarian socialist parties which were formed at that time. In this way the revolution-

* Engels. *The Bakuninites at Work*. (See Vol. XV. p. 124, Russian Edition, Engels' Works.)

* Lenin. Vol. XIX. pp. 85-6. Russian Edition.

† Lenin. Vol. XVIII. p. 278. Russian Edition.

ary proletarian International CONTINUED TO EXIST. But Marx and Engels considered that the previous organisational form could be revived only at a much higher stage of the development of the class struggle than that which had been reached in the 60's and 70's. Marx considered the approach of a new "critical market situation" as a necessary prerequisite for this as he wrote in 1881 to Domel Niuwenhus. "The next international will be *Communist*," wrote Engels to Benner.

* * *

The Second International.

As we know, the Second International did not justify these hopes. At the beginning of its historic path it utilised the ground prepared by the First International, and all the subsequent activity of Marx and Engels. It contributed to the unparalleled EXPANSIVE development of the socialist movement, the unparalleled growth of the class organisations of the proletariat. But with the further passage of time, the proletarian parties began to degenerate into parties which were "blocs of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements." (Stalin.)

The Second International departed from Marxism, and when it became bankrupt on this path, it openly abandoned the heritage of Marx, the heritage of the First International.

This does not prevent social-democratic writers making a few efforts from time to time to distort and belittle the significance of the First International. Some "Marxists" try to depict the great fighting association of the proletariat which called the Commune into being as a toothless propagandist society. Others significantly explain that the First International became "bankrupt" as the result of the Franco-German war, i.e., the International of Marx was just as fragile an "instrument of peace" as the International of Herr Kautsky. In a jubilee article on the 70th Anniversary, on September 26, 1934, the Prague "Social-Democrat" stated that the First International "perished owing to the contradictions between the science of the proletariat and the romanticism of insurrection." It is an old song to put a sign of equality between the *putschism** of Bakunin and the immortal heroism of the Communards, and immediately to compose a tragic "contradiction" between proletarian science, Marxism, and proletarian rising. As if Marxism was something different from the proletarian science of the conditions and ways for a victorious proletarian insurrection.

§VII

Third (Communist) International.

In opposition to the distorters and falsifiers in the ranks of social-democracy—the Bolsheviks, the

Comintern, Lenin and Stalin, always attached tremendous importance to the experience of the First International, the only heir and continuator of which is the International party of Lenin and Stalin —THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

In their estimate of the First International the Communists are infinitely distant from the Menshevik-Trotskyite treatment of Marxism which, grossly distorts Marxist dialectics, and tries to depict matters as if Marx and Engels provide "everything" in a ready-made form necessary for the proletariat in its modern struggle. This sham orthodox and actually renegade trick is only a screen for the denial of the new features which Lenin and Stalin introduced into the treasure-house of Marxism without which there is not, and could not be, any Marxism in our times.

The general revolutionary theory of Marx did not and could not contain, or only contained in embryo, in outline, much of that which has later been given to us by Lenin and Stalin, and which represents a further development of Marxism to meet the new epoch, the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

But precisely because Lenin and Stalin introduced new features into Marxism, the historical experience of the proletariat is of enormous importance in the light of these new features. The works of Lenin and Stalin are classic examples of the dialectic study of this experience and of its adaptation to the new and higher stage of the struggle. The work and the activity of Marx and Engels are really INEXHAUSTIBLE sources. The Communists of all countries must learn to master this experience in a Bolshevik way, including also the rich experience of the second International, and to use it in a Bolshevik manner in their revolutionary current struggle.

This experience shows, above all, the source of many anti-Communist trends with which we have to cross swords at the present day. There are many among our enemies who are "disguised" as Marxists, but who remain liberal Labour politicians in the spirit of Odger, or who continue the work of Lasalle and Schwetzer. In a number of countries, and primarily in Spain, it is still necessary to carry on the struggle against the anarchists. But it would be a mistake to think that reformism, and still more the "Left" critics of the Comintern, are in no way related to anarchism. In the epoch when the proletarian party in Russia was gathering its forces, Lenin repeatedly caught the Mensheviks adopting a typically anarchist attitude to the question of the proletarian party. In 1913, Comrade Stalin wrote that Austro-Marxism tries to justify its national programme by

"replacing the Marxist conception by the reformed conception of Bakunin."*

* Putsch: See No. 19.

* Stalin. *Marxism and the National Question.*

During the war, Lenin traced it in the mistakes of the Polish and Russian Luxemburgites. The enemies of Marxism are tenacious of life. One of the conditions of victory is to know our own history and the history of the enemy.

The experience of the First International is of particular value for Communists because it makes it possible to study in all its brilliancy the activity of MARX AND ENGELS AS THE PARTY LEADERS, AS THE POLITICIANS OF THE WORKING CLASS. This activity, in particular, gives classic examples of how to carry on the struggle for the masses, how to carry them with us EVEN WHEN WE ARE IN THE MINORITY, how to

carry them forward and higher, on the basis of the experience of their own struggle, utilising every turn of events, every step of the ruling classes, and every strike. Without stopping at a split when necessary, Marx and Engels were doughty fighters for the revolutionary unity of the proletariat.

In our day the Communists are more than ever before the "living representatives of the community of interests which unites the workers." The Sections of the Comintern in the imperialist countries must more than ever before master the art of carrying the masses with them, an art the brilliant masters of which were Marx and Engels.

MARX AND THE ENGLISH LABOUR MOVEMENT IN THE EPOCH OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

By TOM BELL.

IN a manifesto to the workers of the whole world, issued by the first congress of the Communist International, it is rightly claimed that the parties of the Third International are the inheritors and continuators of the work begun by the Communist Manifesto seventy-two years previously, and led in the First International by Karl Marx. This manifesto further declares:

"Our task is to generalise the revolutionary experience of the working class, to purge the movement from the rubbish of opportunism and social patriotism; to unite the forces of all the truly revolutionary parties of the proletarian movement, and thus facilitate and hasten the victory of the Communist revolution throughout the world."

Seventy years after the foundation of the First International we of the Third Communist International can truly say we are continuing the work carried on by Karl Marx. To-day, the truly revolutionary parties of the proletarian movement are united under the banner of Communism, in a single, centralised, disciplined, revolutionary Party, embracing millions of toilers from the four corners of the earth. Thanks to the guidance of the best disciples of Marx—Lenin and Stalin—the Third International has purged itself of the rubbish of opportunism and social-patriotism that came to it in the first years of its existence. The whole of its strategy and tactics are based upon the revolutionary struggles and experiences of the world proletariat. That which Marx dreamed of, and the first steps of which he saw in the Paris Commune, namely, the winning of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is already an accomplished fact, not yet throughout the world, but at least over the tremendous territory of the U.S.S.R. The Red Soviet flag waves over one-sixth of the earth's

surface, the U.S.S.R., where the foundation of Socialism has already been constructed and the task of constructing classless society is already being solved.

The workers and peasants of China have followed this example, have set up Soviet Power and have established their heroic workers' and peasants' Red Army on part of the territory of their country. Revolution is taking place in Spain, an armed insurrection has been organised, and in this revolution our Spanish Communist Party is setting itself the direct aim of establishing the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants, which grows into the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The revolutionary proletariat throughout the world are carrying on the struggle under the slogan of the fight for the Soviets. Would that Marx were alive to-day to rejoice in such achievements!

It was no accident that the First International took root in England. England represented then the classical land of capitalism. The factory system, with its machine-manufacture, had dealt its death-blow to domestic handicraft industry. The towns swarmed with proletarians, many of whom had been drawn from the countryside to seek employment and wages in the factories, and to swell the cries and curses of the town workers at the manufacturers and capitalists, who carried on a ruthless exploitation of labour under the protection of a tyrannical state machine.

The "Blessings" of Capital.

In *Capital*, in the chapter dealing with the working day, Marx gives a graphic picture of the

terrible exploitation suffered by the toiling masses in the period following the introduction of machinery. Apart from the skilled professions, there were tremendous numbers of proletarians who had been "set free" from the unskilled work of handicraft domestic production. In industries like lace-making, pottery, brick-making, match production, baking, sewing, etc., labour, especially that of women and children, sapped the strength of the workers, dooming them to slow death. Children worked in mines, steel works, etc., at the tenderest of ages, in conditions of the most frightful sweated labour.

As the report of the factory inspectors later showed, there were innumerable cases when children were found fast asleep on the floor, dirty and ragged, as they were too exhausted to crawl to their pitiful hovels in the slums. No wonder the name of Marx and his colleague Engels are so detested by the British bourgeoisie. The capitalists hate them with all the strength of their class hatred because they threw light not only on the real meaning of class exploitation of the workers by capital, but also on the abominable forms of exploitation of labour in Great Britain.

In England there existed no factory legislation or safety measures, there were only iniquitous Poor Laws and "workhouses" that were veritable torture chambers; no measures of relief and no voting rights for the proletariat; the press limited and muzzled by heavy stamp duties. The combination laws, though pruned a little by the Acts of 1817, were still irksome. Freedom of public meetings and assembly were still proscribed by law. Such was the nature of the soil upon which grew the great Chartist movement.

The Real Traditions of Chartism.

The traditions of the Chartist movement furnish a wealth of experiences too often neglected in the official labour movement of our times. The liberal historians of the Labour Party invariably treat Chartism as a mere episode in the struggle for the right to vote and other political reforms, such as the secret ballot, payment of members and more frequent parliaments. They either deliberately ignore or pour ridicule upon the heroic demonstrations, strikes and revolutionary actions carried out by the proletariat—often in defiance of their petty-bourgeois leaders. They ignore the fact that the Chartist movement, for the first time in history, saw the proletariat come forward as a class in revolutionary mass struggle. This side of the Chartist movement, the physical force side of Chartism, has yet to be written. An investigation into this chapter of Chartism is long overdue. It is the more urgent in these days of economic class battles growing into revolutionary political mass actions.

It will not be out of place, I think, to recall at this stage the earlier movement of the "Society of Friends of the People," which played such an important part in the struggles for political reform, and the resistance to the factory lords some forty years before the Chartist movement took shape. While the "Friends'" movement was initiated by small middle-class elements and the artisans of the towns struggling for the franchise and political reform, it soon attracted large masses of the industrial proletariat who formed the more vigorous fighting detachments of the movement. International relations with the Jacobin clubs of France, and with the United Irishmen, led by Wolf Tone in Ireland, were very close. Their convention, held in Edinburgh in 1792, was similar in form to our International Congresses. They elected special commissions for special questions, such as organisation, instruction, finance, illegal work, etc., these commissions reporting to convention for final ratification.

As with the Communist Parties of to-day, the ruling caste of the bourgeoisie denounced the "Friends" as agents of a foreign power. The Government subsidised a number of capitalist newspapers for the express purpose of slandering the movement, and sent spies into it as provocateurs. Workers who were known or suspected as members were dismissed by the employers. Their leaders were arrested and transported to Botany Bay in Australia, or were hanged. It was a period of fierce class struggle, in which the English and Scotch workers exhibited vigorous fighting resistance and sterling proletarian qualities, worthy of the finest traditions in the international labour movement.

It would be absurd to believe that those fine fighting traditions were ENTIRELY lost or forgotten by the English workers. The history of the struggles of the Chartists, particularly in the industrial towns of the provinces, frequently reveal forms of struggle similar to those of the "Friends," mass demonstrations, killing of spies and scabs during strikes, setting fire to factories, the carrying of arms and drilling on the moors. While these methods of fighting were repudiated and discouraged by the middle-class leaders and orators of the Chartists, they were persisted in by the mass of the poor labourers and lower paid factory workers, who particularly suffered from unparalleled exploitation, from unbearable food taxes, from the brutal poor laws and merciless repression. These masses lost their patience, indignant at the flowery eloquence and passivity of the brilliant orators who posed as their leaders.

Chartists and the International.

The period of Chartism was not only a period of struggle for political reforms. It was marked by

a whole series of class conflicts on a large scale. The building workers fought against the hated "document." The spinners in the Glasgow cotton mills started a fierce struggle, not hesitating at violence towards the manufacturers. The gas workers put whole districts of London in darkness and held their position firmly for many days. The struggle of the farm workers led to the deportation of six Dorchester workers—who have become widely known. These and other fights entered into by the broad masses of the proletariat were connected with the struggle for legislation on the protection of labour and the shortening of the working day.

In the years 1846-1847, the Chartist movement and the agitation for the ten-hour day reached their highest point. The ten-hour day law was passed in 1848. Almost immediately after the June uprising in Paris, the English capitalists renewed their attacks on the working class, coming out not only against the Ten-Hour Day Act, but also against all the labour legislation introduced since 1833. On this question Marx wrote in the Foundation Manifesto of the First International:

"While the rout of their Continental brethren unmanned the English working classes, and broke their faith in their own cause, it restored to the landlord and the money-lord their somewhat shaken confidence."

When finally the charter was getting lost in the quagmire of petty-bourgeois land schemes (O'Connor) and monetary reform (Attwood) and similar quack nostrums, there were still voices raised for revolutionary proletarian aims, and for international fraternity. Amongst these was Julian Harney. Harney was one of those who always maintained close international relations with the various revolutionary groups and clubs of the continent. At the same time he kept friendly relations with the foreign exiles who sought a political asylum in London. He was principally instrumental in forming the Democratic Association. It was to the meeting organised by the Democratic Association in the German Workers' Club, in Drury Lane, London, 1847, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Polish revolt of 1838, that Karl Marx came as a delegate from the Brussels Democrats. Marx, who arrived in London at that time for the Second Congress of the "Communist League," which confirmed the draft of the Communist Manifesto, spoke at a meeting called by the "Fraternal Democrats," emphasising the necessity for the calling of an international democratic congress of workers. (It was decided to call this congress in October, 1848, but events prevented it.)

"The democrats of Brussels," said Marx, "have instructed me to talk to their London brothers on the question of calling a congress next year of all nations, i.e., A CONGRESS OF THE WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, to be held

in Brussels. The middle classes, the free traders, held their congresses in Brussels, but their Brotherhood is one-sided because as soon as they find that such congresses are of use to the workers, they will dissolve their organisation. THE BELGIAN DEMOCRATS AND THE ENGLISH CHARTISTS ARE THE REAL DEMOCRATS, and when the latter carry through their six demands they will thereby pave the path for general liberty. Workers of England! Fulfil this mission and you will become liberators." (Quoted from Steklov, page 15; of Beer, *The History of Socialism in England*, German edition, page 407-408.)

Undoubtedly the Democratic Association played an important rôle in drawing together the elements that led to the formation of the First International. Marx was already active in the class struggle in Germany and France, and collaborating with the revolutionaries on the continent. He had already published his *Poverty of Philosophy* in reply to Proudhon and was preparing to publish his *Critique of Political Economy* (which he did in 1850). The great *Communist Manifesto* had already appeared as the banner of the revolutionary proletarian movement. While carrying on research work, in addition to actively participating in the revolutionary movements of the period, Marx very attentively followed up the class struggle in England.

The revolutionary movements throughout Europe in 1848 led to the formation of a variety of groups and particularly to an influx into London of political refugees and exiles. The ideas of international solidarity and fraternity marked every gathering in this period. Commemorations of Polish revolts, protest meetings, following the February days in Paris, 1848, etc., were made the occasion for emphasis on the need for an International association.

London Trades Council and International.

One of the bodies which expressed these feelings in favour of international solidarity was the LONDON TRADES COUNCIL. It took an active part in the organisation of popular demonstrations in connection with the national emancipation movement in Italy and the organisation of opposition to the British bourgeoisie who were financially interested in getting cheap cotton, and therefore supported the American slaveowners in the South.

The organisation of the International Exhibition in London in 1862 presented an opportunity for the workers of England and the Continent to meet together. On July 22, 1863, in connection with the suppression of the rising in Poland, the London Trades Council called a big meeting of workers in St. James' Hall, at which a delegation from the Paris Committee for the Defence of Poland was officially present. The following day the London Trades Council held an official reception for the French Workers' Delegation at which a committee was elected to draw up an address on

behalf of the English workers to the workers of France, with a view to organising the International Co-operation of the Working Class. A French Workers' Delegation brought a reply to this address, and a plan for the organisation of the International Unity of the workers, to the historic meeting in St. Martin's Hall, held on September 28, 1864. Marx "knew the real 'forces' were represented this time both from London and from Paris" (letter of Marx to Engels, dated November 4, 1864) and he led the International.

In the Foundation Manifesto and the Provisional Rules of the International Workingmen's Association, Marx formulated the great aims and tasks lying at the basis of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of the world. In this document it states that

"the emancipation of the working class must be conquered by the working class themselves; that the struggle for the emancipation of the working class means, not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties and the abolition of all class-rule."

Undoubtedly, as the subsequent history of the First International shows, Marx was the brain and guiding genius of this great historic movement.

The urgent need for the period was an independent workers' party, revolutionary in aims, international in scope, and having a centralised direction. Marx from the first had a very clear perception of the requirements of such an International, and a just estimation of the English soil on which it was born. In the letter sent to Kugelmann, on March 28, 1870, replying to the proposal for the formation of a regional council for England, we read:

"England alone can serve as the lever of a serious economic revolution. It is the only country where there are no peasants and where property in land is concentrated in a few hands. It is the only country where the capitalist form—that is to say, combined labour on a large scale under capitalist employers—has invaded practically the whole production. It is the only country where the great majority of the population consists of wage-labourers. It is the only country where the class struggle and the organisation of the working class through the trade unions has acquired a certain degree of maturity and universality. As a result of its dominating position in the world market, it is the only country where every revolution in its economic conditions must react directly on the entire world. If this country is the classic seat of landlordism and capitalism, by virtue of that fact it is also here that the material conditions of their destruction are most highly developed." (See Marx, Letters to Kugelmann.)

The letter then goes on to show how important it is that the General Council of the International should keep its hands on this great lever, and "the folly," the "outright crime" it would be if the Council were to separate from the London Trades Council (as the Bakuninites demanded) and let this lever fall out of its hands into "purely English hands."

The International was by this time six years old.

In those six years Marx had had some bitter experiences as to just what it would mean for the International if it fell into "purely English hands," i.e., into the hands of the opportunist trade union leaders, who were, as Lenin later characterised them,

"ALIEN to the proletariat as a class . . . the servants, the agents, the transmitters of the influence of the bourgeoisie, and of whom the labour movement must FREE itself if it does not wish to remain a BOURGEOIS LABOUR MOVEMENT."

These "purely English hands" referred to by Marx were the products of the period following the collapse of Chartism; the period of capitalist expansion for England, of vast colonies and monopoly profits due to the monopolist position occupied by the English bourgeoisie on the world market.

Following the crisis of 1847 had come the discovery of the gold fields of California and Australia. Due to the favourable position of the English capitalists (America and the countries of the continent of Europe were not yet producing on a large scale) the British manufacturers won market after market for their products. This demand led to a feverish growth of building construction. Railways, shipping and shipbuilding expanded. Financial loans, funding and international banking increased enormously. Vast sums of money were sunk in India, Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. It was the period of the development of England's basic industries, mining, metals, textiles, building and railways, and a rapid growth of wealth in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Unemployment diminished. In six years nearly 2,000,000 workers emigrated to the colonies. But only

"a minority of the working class got their real wages somewhat advanced; while in most cases the monetary rise of wages denoted no more a real access of comforts than the inmate of the metropolitan poorhouse or orphan asylum, for instance, was in the least benefited by his necessities costing £9 15s. 8d. in 1861 against £7 7s. 4d. in 1852." (From the Constituent Manifesto of the First International.)

For this reason Marx began the Constituent Manifesto with the following significant generalisations:

"It is a great fact that the misery of the working masses has not diminished from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period is unrivalled for the development of its industry and the growth of its commerce."

To the degree that dissatisfaction grew among the masses of the workers there corresponded a revival of trade union activity. In the '40's the unions were local in character, being confined to towns and exclusively craft in form. Under the influence of Owenism, attempts had been made to form National Associations of United Trades. In 1845, such an organisation was actually set up in London with branches in Lancashire, Yorkshire and Bristol. The demands of this associa-

tion were limited to "a fair day's work for a fair day's wage," its methods, arbitration, mediation, legal procedure and "no politics in the union."

A year later this association toyed with the petty-bourgeois idea of advancing funds to assist in employing labour to compete the capitalists out of business. It drew up schemes for assisting workers on strike, though it discouraged strike action. A big strike of tin-plate workers complained of no financial support from the association and this association collapsed after 1851.

The New Type of Union.

Local trade unions, for example, the mechanics, began to broaden out into a national association, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. This Union serves us as an example of the new type of trade union, and also explains the rise of the new type of labour-leader. The union accumulates funds and attempts to corner the labour supply by an apprentice system, by resisting piecework payment of wages, and the system of overtime. It provides funds to assist its members in migration and emigration. It establishes an accident fund, provides for sick and old age benefits and funeral expenses for its members. In short, this new type of union becomes a veritable trading concern, and becomes typical for other industries.

The Chartists were mainly led by middle-class and even aristocratic orators and leaders, although in the localities leaders came forward from among the workers in the course of the movement, and these latter were much firmer representatives of the real interests of the proletariat. The enlivenment of the trade unions brought forward worker leaders of a new type. The revival of the trade unions necessitated a new type of leader. These trading concerns brought forward working men who specialised in secretarial work, in book-keeping and the handling of finance.

This type of leader narrowed its outlook to purely trade interests. If, here and there, individuals were to be found subscribing to socialist ideas, it was only to make them the better demagogues, and so to entrench themselves the more firmly in their positions as leaders of the masses. They abhorred all revolutionary political theory, and merely supported the demand for political reform as a means of legalising their trade union business.

Such was the type of leaders that formed the junta, comprising Odger, Cremer, Applegarth, Allan and Hales, whose influence Marx had to combat in the International. Bourgeois to their finger tips, they represented the labour aristocracy and carried all the repulsive petty-bourgeois respectability with which they were completely saturated into the International.

The considerations which led them into the

International were twofold. In the first instance they were driven willy-nilly into the International by the livening up of the labour movement and by the urge of the workers towards fraternal association with their revolutionary brethren abroad. Secondly, these leaders hoped by means of an international alliance to prevent competition from the cheaper labour abroad. But, at the same time, they brought into the International the pernicious influence of the English bourgeoisie, calculated to disarm the International and to deaden its revolutionary objectives.

Engels, in his letter to Marx as far back as October, 1858, had characterised the English proletariat as "becoming more and more bourgeois," and that England, this most bourgeois of all nations, is apparently trying to bring about a state of things where "a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat exist side by side." The history of the first years of the International is a history of bitter struggle waged by Marx, not only against the petty-bourgeois ideas of Proudhon and the anarchism of the Bakunists, but against the thoroughly bourgeois corrupted leaders of the English labour aristocracy. It is not surprising to hear later, in 1872, of Engels writing to Sorge to say that Hales had kicked up a big row in the general council of the International and secured a vote of censure against Marx for saying that "the English labour leaders had sold themselves."

The withering criticism of Marx is perhaps best epitomised in his remark to Sorge (April 4, 1874):

"It is a pity that the whole gang of leaders did not get elected to Parliament. This would be the surest way of getting rid of these blackguards."

Marx foresaw very well how the English labour leaders would expose themselves in Parliament, but the path of liberation of the British working class from "these triflers" has proved to be a very long one.

The British Labour Leaders.

During the whole of the period that followed, the eyes of the English trade union and labour leaders became rivetted on getting into Parliament. Strike movements of the wide masses were systematically resisted and sabotaged. The sufferings of the lower-paid proletariat were shamelessly exploited by these leaders. Social-demagogy and socialist phraseology became a platform on which these unprincipled bourgeois opportunists sought Cabinet rank in the parliament of the capitalists. The work of Odger, Cremer, Applegarth, Hales and company was carried on by MacDonal, Snowden, Henderson and Thomas. Marxism was ostracised, the class struggle tabooed for the bitter fruits of "gradualism" peddled by the Fabians, the Webbs, and others.

The trade union and labour leaders were elected to Parliament. The proletariat now has

the experience of two "Labour" governments. The labour movement has, to use the words of Marx, got rid of a number of "these blackguards," who have passed to open service of the bourgeoisie. But there are still many of them yet carrying on the same traditions of bourgeois respectability, of corruption, of social chauvinism, in the trade unions and labour movement. More and more, they stand openly before the proletariat as defenders of capitalism, as representatives of the "community," i.e., of the bourgeois class state. They openly proclaim their identity with the bourgeoisie in holding down the proletariat in the colonies, and when in power copy the example of their masters in dealing out lead and death to the colonial slaves in revolt against imperialism and the Empire. Only recently, at the Labour Party Conference just held, they have given assurance to the capitalists that their services are available in the event of war. It is not open to question that the present gang of labour leaders are even more shameless in their quagmire of corruption than the "blackguards" of Marx's time.

But against this stream of bourgeois corruption of the English labour movement there is now another revolutionary stream. This new force consists in the revolutionary proletariat freed from the leading strings of bourgeois opportunism and

to-day marching under the banner of the Communist International. The mass organisations of the unemployed, the militant rank and file movements within the trade unions; the anti-war and anti-fascist movements, guided and led by the proletarian Communist Party, whose inspiration comes from the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin—this is the new and powerful force heralded by Marx in the struggles of the First International, which will be victorious over the bourgeoisie themselves and over their servants and agents in the working class movement.

The Communist Party of Great Britain within Great Britain, like the Communist International in the world movement, is the inheritor and continuator of the best traditions of the "Friends of the People" movement, and of the proletarian chartism of over a hundred years ago, generalising the experience of these great movements and of Marx and the proletarian revolution in the period of the First International. The C.P.G.B. has carried on the struggle against the opportunism and social patriotism of the Second International which is still strong in the ranks of the British working class. Under the guidance of the Communist (Third) International it will march to victory, to the triumph of Marxism and Leninism—to Soviet Power in Britain, and its colonies.

(Continued from page 836.)

British capital! Such, in brief, is the programme of the British fascists. Of course, says Mosley, "some of the Marxian laws do actually operate," but Marx did not foresee that "certain tendencies and even natural laws can be and have been circumvented by the will and wit of man" (page 67-68). Thus it remains for us to see how the will of Dictator Mosley will avert the decay of British capitalism. Evidently about as successfully as Hitler averted the economic ruin of Germany.

But who is the chief enemy against whom the fascist political party will have to struggle for power? The Conservatives are in power. The Labour Party hopes to sit in their seats to-morrow. Do the fascists fear the Labour Government? Do they reckon on the Conservatives? It seems that, from Mosley's point of view, neither of them enter into the calculation.

Mosley contemptuously calls the Conservatives "the old gang," while as for the "socialists," as he flatteringly dubs the Labourites, "their theories . . . are by now of no more than academic interest." He cruelly ridicules the I.L.P.'ers, calling them "posturing Girondins with the heads of Communists and the chicken-hearts of social-democrats" (page 81). Ac-

ording to Mosley, they are full of the "roseate belief that the lions of the great vested interests will learn in our time by peaceful persuasion to bleat the INTERNATIONAL in happy harmony with the lambs of the I.L.P." (page 80).

The "realistic Communists" are a different matter. They explain their goal, and "frankly inform us that they are prepared to wade to it through the blood of class war by the overthrow of existing society." Mosley cannot refuse to give the Communists their due. "Their position is at any rate clearer-headed and more honest than the performances of the theoretical socialists of Labour and I.L.P." (page 81).

Very clear-headed. Very plain. The "posturing Girondins" are incapable of revolutionary action. It is not worth while fearing them. The real enemy of fascism, decisive and unbending, is the Communist Party, because it is precisely the Communist Party, leading the working masses, which will be the rock on which the offensive of British fascism will break. This estimate of Mosley, the estimate of an enemy, should be known by all the worker-members of the Labour Party and the I.L.P. It has been confirmed in real life, especially during the counter-demonstration on September 9th, called and conducted by the Communist Party for the struggle against fascism.

DISCUSSION ON QUESTIONS FOR THE VII CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

In preparation for the VII Congress of the Communist International the editors will publish discussion articles and materials connected with the questions on the agenda of the Congress.—Editorial Board.

THE QUESTION OF FASCISM

By L. MADYAR.

FASCISM, as a product of the general crisis of capitalism, is a general tendency of capitalist power at the present time. Mussolini once stated that fascism is not a commodity for export. Later he himself denied the authenticity of this statement and repeatedly hinted that fascism is, in reality, a commodity for export—varying, of course, according to the country and its national peculiarities. After the advent of the National-Socialists in Germany to power, Goebbels also made the statement that all Europe would become national-socialist within fifty years. Later, for reasons of diplomacy and foreign policy, he repudiated this statement, claiming that national-socialism is a purely German product, not by any means a commodity for export.

But the matter is not decided by the manner in which Mussolini, Goebbels or any other fascist appraises the outlook for fascism, or whether he regards the fascism of his own country as an export commodity or not. As a method of rule, of saving and preserving capitalist domination, fascism is not connected with Italian, German, Polish or any other definite soil. It can take root in any capitalist country. For the moment, we will leave the question of whether fascism could become a mass movement in colonial countries aside. Theoretical considerations, and the actual course of the movement indicate that fascism cannot become a genuinely mass movement in colonial countries. But in capitalist countries, whether industrial or agrarian, the victors or the vanquished in the imperialist war, the big bourgeoisie are increasingly regarding fascism as an almost universal means of saving capitalism, applicable to all countries in the period of the general crisis. Therefore, it may be said that fascism is a general tendency of the development of bourgeois power.

This, of course, does not mean that fascism is an

obligatory stage in the path of the proletariat to power, that the proletariat of all countries will have to undergo the purgatory of the fascist dictatorship. There is only one final guarantee against fascism, "fascisation"* and the establishment of the fascist dictatorship. That is the overthrow of capitalism which gives birth to fascism. But the unity of action of the proletariat may avert the fascist dictatorship; the proletarian dictatorship may precede the establishment of the fascist dictatorship.

In the post-war period, two big waves of "fascisation" and the establishment of fascist dictatorships should be noted.

The first wave arose at the period of the transition from the first round of wars and revolutions to the temporary stabilisation of capitalism. At this period, fascist dictatorships were established in Italy, Hungary and Bulgaria. Later, in 1926, fascism conquered in the special conditions of Poland and Lithuania. This took place actually in the period of the temporary stabilisation of capitalism. In Poland and Lithuania themselves, the establishment of the fascist dictatorship was preceded by an extremely acute economic crisis which intensified class relations to an extreme degree, and on these grounds class relations were extremely tense. It was precisely the fact that the fascist dictatorship arose in these countries during the period of the transition from the first round of wars and revolutions to temporary stabilisation that enabled it to stabilise itself temporarily through a series of crises and convulsions.

In the period of the relative stabilisation of capitalism, the bourgeoisie did not establish fascist dictatorship, and the fascist groups, parties and organisations did not even widely develop. Fascism and the establishment of a fascist dicta-

*"Fascisation": The process of rendering Fascist.—Ed.

torship are not only signs of the weakness of the proletariat, who have been split by social-democracy, but also that of the bourgeoisie. It is not because of their strength that the bourgeoisie use fascist methods of government, but the result of their weakness and the crisis of capitalist power.

The Second Wave of "Fascisation."

The second wave of "fascisation" arose on the basis of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism in connection with the world economic crisis, and the breakdown of temporary stabilisation of capitalism. This second wave of "fascisation" led to the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in Yugoslavia and Finland in 1929, and later to the victory of fascism in a country with such a powerful labour movement as Germany, to the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in Austria and Latvia and the advent of the bloodthirsty military-fascist clique to power in Bulgaria.

The second wave of "fascisation"—the establishment of fascist dictatorships in a number of countries—has taken place at the time of the transition from the end of stabilisation to the second round of revolutions and wars. It is precisely this which makes it certain that, in these countries, fascism cannot stabilise its terrorist rule.

The Peculiar Features of Fascisation.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that the victory of fascism in Germany gave a strong urge to the process of fascisation in other capitalist countries. But we must not simplify our understanding of this process too greatly. The struggle against fascisation, and the working-out of correct tactics for it, demand a concrete analysis of the PECULIAR FEATURES OF FASCISATION in each separate country. The paths and channels of fascisation differ in the various countries. In general the processes of fascisation, evidently, amount to the following:

1. The rise of new fascist parties, and the strengthening and enlivening of the activity of the previously existing fascist parties, organisations and groups. After the victory of fascism in Germany we see how new fascist parties and groups sprang up in Switzerland, Holland and Denmark, Spain, France, etc., and how the activity of the old parties and groups became enlivened. In Great Britain the Mosley group became unquestionably more active. In France military terrorist fascist organisations, such as the "Fiery Cross," "Action-Francaise," etc., increased their activity.

2. The process of fascisation through the fascisation of the old bourgeois parties. It would be a great mistake to think that in Great Britain, for example, the Mosley group is the ONLY advocate of fascism. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the die-hard group of Young Conservatives in the Conservative Party, and a number of National-Labour leaders, like Thomas, also foster fascist ideas and fascist methods of power in Great Britain. This is not gainsaid by the fact that individual die-hards and Young Conservatives occasionally "oppose" Mosley

and his methods, regarding them as not sufficiently English, condemning the Mosley group for trying to transfer the foreign methods of Italian fascism and German national-socialism to British soil. In Great Britain, Parliamentary traditions have taken deep root among the masses. British fascism will evidently have to pay a certain tribute to these traditions in the sense of sweeping away the institutions of bourgeois democracy under a parliamentary democratic cloak.

In France we may also observe how the old bourgeois parties are more and more adopting the outlook and methods of fascism. This also does not exclude, but on the contrary, sometimes even presupposes that they will oppose the methods of Italian fascism and German National-Socialism and will repudiate the attempts of individual fascist groups, small as yet, to transfer Italian and German methods of fascism to French soil. But at the present time, there is no bourgeois party in France which has not raised the question of the reform of the state in some form or other. Moreover, by the "reform" of the state all the bourgeois parties mean the strengthening of the executive power, and, particularly the Right parties, have in view the "dry" or bloodless "fascisation" of the state power.

And what is meant by "dry" "fascisation" in the capitalist sense of the term? This means the maximum utilisation of legal constitutional forms of carrying out the fascisation of the state, the utilisation of parliamentary democratic methods of handing over power to the fascists, as far as possible, the avoidance of the violent seizure of power. It is obvious that "dry" fascisation does not exclude, but on the contrary, presupposes the use of violence against the revolutionary proletariat and its Communist vanguard, the repression of the mass organisations of the proletariat. And in reality, the Right parties in France declare their opposition to a fascist coup d'état.

The proposal of Tardieu on the question of government reform is being taken up by all the Right parties, and the idea of dictatorship is penetrating also into the radical socialist party. The "Corporative idea" is extremely popular among the Right bourgeois parties. And it is by no means a contradiction when the supporters of the "reform" of the state put forward demands such as votes for women and proportional representation. It does not prevent many fascists thumping themselves on the chest and solemnly declaring themselves supporters of the Republic and civil liberties. National traditions prompt the wily French fascists to dress up as the direct heirs of the Jacobins and approach the masses with the slogans of the defence of the Republic, civil rights and other gains of the great French revolution, donning the revolutionary cap.

Various small fascist groups have arisen in Sweden. But evidently at the present moment

the conservative party in that country is probably the main channel and lever of fascisation. The process of fascisation is also ensuing through the bourgeois and petty bourgeois mass organisations. In this respect, in France, for example, the war veterans' association and those processes of fascist ferment occurring inside it are naturally of tremendous political importance. It would be foolish and politically harmful to consider all these organisations already fascist. But there is no doubt that a fascist ferment is taking place inside them. They may play a big part in deciding whether there is to be a fascist dictatorship in France or not.

In the mass organisations of taxpayers, tenants, small traders and also in the broad mass peasant organisations, the position still remains indefinite. Of course, anti-fascist fighters in France must keep watch on the activity of the "Fiery Cross," "French Solidarity," "Action Francaise," etc. But in France the path of fascisation leads through other gates.

In Norway the fascist ferment has embraced a number of peasant organisations, and the Ex-War Minister, Klioling, is relying on these organisations in particular in his attempt to bring about a fascist coup. Fascist ideas, fascist endeavours are penetrating, to some degree, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois mass organisations in Switzerland, Holland, and a number of other countries. In this respect special attention should be paid to the various war veterans' organisations and reservist societies, the militarised or semi-militarised organisations, and in particular the militarisation of the youth, the military and semi-military bourgeois youth organisations.

The appearance of various fascist or semi-fascist groups within social-democracy itself, greatly helps fascisation. The group of Marquet-Deat in France was recognised by Mussolini himself as a fascist group in its outlook. In Great Britain the Labour Party had the honour and pleasure of advancing Sir Oswald Mosley from its camp. In Poland the Yavorski group is quite a good aid to Pilsudski, a group which was also advanced from the P.P.S.*

The most classic example in this respect is Japanese social-democracy. There are similar groups also in the other parties of the Second International, e.g., in Bulgaria, and in a certain sense in Czecho-Slovakia, although these groups have not yet begun to exist apart from social-democracy in these countries.

From this point of view, the infection of a large number of reformist trade union leaders with the corporative outlook is of no small importance. This is accompanied by attempts of a number of reformist leaders to maintain a certain political

division between the Social-Democratic parties and the reformist trade unions, so that if anything happens it will be easier to include the trade unions in the state apparatus. Leipart and Co. were late in this attempt. There is no doubt that the tendency towards a certain division between the reformist unions and the Social-Democratic parties and a still greater rapprochement between the reformist trade unions and the employers' organisations and the bourgeois state, has lately increased in the unions affiliated to the Amsterdam International.

Fascism by State Decree.

Finally, an extremely important path is the fascisation of the state apparatus itself. Government emergency decrees in France and Belgium, reactionary laws in Holland and Spain, a series of reactionary measures in Great Britain, and the process of fascisation in Czecho-Slovakia, show that there is a rapidly growing tendency to strengthen and centralise the executive power in the so-called bourgeois democratic states. The aim is to cut down the real and imaginary functions of the institutions of bourgeois democracy, of parliamentarism, and whittle away the democratic rights and liberties of the working class and all the toilers. There is an increase in terror against the revolutionary working class movement, a restriction of the rights and functions of the mass organisations of the working class, first and foremost of the trade unions.

At present, the social-democrats are attempting to draw a contrast between countries with a fascist dictatorship, and these "democratic" countries. There is no impassable gulf between the countries of capitalist democracy and those of fascist dictatorship. The paths of transition from bourgeois democracy to fascist dictatorship are so varied and peculiar that it would be difficult to establish any boundary-line or impassable gulf between them. But the fascisation of the bourgeois state, the fascisation of the police, and the armed forces of the capitalist state, is a very important point. It is no accident that in France the "fascisation" of the Parisian police and in Great Britain the "reorganisation" of the London police were the first care of the bourgeoisie.

In the conditions of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism and the breakdown of the relative stabilisation of capitalism, the fascist tendencies in the camp of the monopolist bourgeoisie undoubtedly have become stronger in all countries. The victory of fascism in such a big industrial country as Germany whipped up the process of fascisation in other capitalist countries also. Only in this sense can we speak of fascism as an international phenomenon, as the general tendency of the bourgeois power. The fascist

*Polish Socialist Party.—Ed.

dreams of a fascist international remain but dreams. It has been proved by experience that fascism is incapable of creating an international organisation. Moreover, the victory of fascism in certain countries intensifies the contradictions between the imperialist powers. Fascism is even unable to organise an anti-Soviet bloc of all the imperialist powers. Though Hitler, Goebbels, Hess, Mussolini and Pilsudski have plenty to say about the solidarity of ex-servicemen, there cannot be any such solidarity in the fascist sense. Solidarity between ex-servicemen is only possible on the basis of proletarian internationalism. Nationalism and chauvinism cannot be internationalism. At present the Italian fascists are giving the German Nazis a practical demonstration that there is not and cannot be a fascist international. The struggle of German and Italian imperialism around Austria, the events of July 25th, the mobilisation of Italian troops after the murder of Dollfuss, the frantic mutual attacks of the Italian fascists and the German National-Socialists, have shown what fascist solidarity is worth. The German National-Socialists have made every effort to form the widest possible anti-Soviet bloc in Tokyo, Warsaw and London, and received no small amount of sympathy. Among other things, however, the policy of German fascism, its armaments, provocations, military preparations and annexationist designs have compelled a number of bourgeois states to seek the collaboration of the U.S.S.R. in the struggle against the outbreak of a new war.

June 30th and July 25th.

The victory of fascism in Germany accelerated the process of fascisation in the capitalist countries. There is not the slightest doubt that the enormous economic, social-political and foreign political difficulties of German fascism, which were vividly expressed on June 30th, the beginning of its crisis, struck a heavy blow not only at German fascism, but also at the fascist parties and groups in the various capitalist countries. In this respect, June 30th is a landmark, not only in the history of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, but is also of international significance. It was no accident that after June 30th, Lord Rothermere in Great Britain refused to openly support the Mosley group. It was no accident that the fascist groups and organisations in France, Spain, Switzerland and Scandinavia received a definite blow as the result of the events of June 30th in Germany. It is no accident that after June 30th such a prominent publicist of French fascism as Carrillier absolutely repudiated the use of the methods of German fascism in France. In the Scandinavian countries, particularly in Denmark and Sweden, the beginning of the crisis of German fascism in a certain sense

strengthened the position of the social-democratic governments which were in power. Doubtless the enormous difficulties and convulsions which German fascism is approaching will have a considerable effect on the development of the fascist groups, organisations and parties in other capitalist countries. In countries where the aristocracy of labour (which forms the chief basis of social-democracy) has been least undermined, the ruin of the petty-bourgeoisie is proceeding more evenly, in less catastrophic forms, and certain possibilities of ruling by methods of bourgeois democracy still exist, fascism naturally develops more slowly. The decay of bourgeois democracy is ensuing at a lower speed in these countries.

The fact of the matter is, however, that the sharp intensification of the general crisis of capitalism is undermining these possibilities. The capitalists are passing from social reforms to their destruction, from imperialist pacifism to war preparations, from "democracy" to fascism.

It would be extremely dangerous to overestimate the influence of the German events on the development of fascism in other countries. In a number of western European and Scandinavian countries, there is a certain degree of caution at present, even in the camp of the bourgeoisie approaching fascism, regarding the use of German methods of fascist dictatorship. After June 30th a certain bias in favour of "dry" fascisation arose in the camp of the bourgeoisie moving towards fascism. As far as concerns the countries where bourgeois democracy has fairly deep historic traditions even among the petty-bourgeoisie, and parliamentarism is deep rooted, the big monopolist bourgeoisie have evidently taken the line of "dry" fascisation at the present moment. How long this will last is another question. This question will not be decided by the development of events in Germany, but those in the countries themselves. It must be taken into account, in this connection, that the growth of the elements of fascisation in any country does not remove the danger of a fascist coup. On the contrary, it increases it.

In our opinion, therefore, the decisive influence of the German events is not that which they exerted in the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie in other capitalist countries. Their decisive importance lay in the fact that the establishment of fascist dictatorships in German and Austria, and the heroic struggle of the Austrian proletariat, aroused the workers to strengthen the struggle against fascism and fascisation. The most decisive, remarkable feature, from the viewpoint of international results, is that though the victory of fascism in Germany and Austria accelerated the process of fascisation in other capitalist countries, it did not retard the international workers' move-

ment; *on the contrary*, it *increased* the workers' striving to unity. It enhanced the working class struggle against fascism and fascisation.

Results of German Events.

Had not fascism conquered in Germany, there would have been no February 6th in France, the first open mass action of French fascism. But if the French proletariat had not learned the awful suffering and oppression wreaked by fascism by experience, it would not have offered such sturdy resistance to fascism as it did during the general strike on February 12th, and in the barricade fights and street demonstrations. The victory of fascism in Germany did not depress the international working class movement, but on the contrary mobilised the working masses for the anti-fascist struggle. It made a breach in the barriers separating social-democratic, Communist and non-party workers. It infused a high degree of intensity into the class struggles. This was shown in the armed struggle of the Austrian workers, the February events in France, the general strike in France, the barricade fighting in a number of proletarian centres in France, the mass political strikes against fascism in Spain. The workers' demonstrations against fascism in Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, etc., the wave of strikes which swept over a number of European countries in the spring also showed this.

The processes of fascisation are distinguished by their peculiarity in the various capitalist countries. The variety of the economic, social and national structures, the historic development, even the historic traditions of various capitalist countries, put their imprint on the fascist movement or the fascist dictatorship. We will not speak of the difference in the national and social demagogy of the fascist movements in various countries. It is obvious that in this respect also, there are certain common features in the national and social demagogy of the fascists—their slogans against Marxism, against Bolshevism, against the class struggle, for the community of national interests, against the old bourgeois parties, against parliamentarism, etc. But even in the sphere of social demagogy the fascists have to use varying demagogic slogans. It may be that in this respect it would not be difficult to establish certain common features, namely, the fact that they put their stake on the belief of the petty bourgeoisie in the revival and consolidation of petty bourgeois ownership, on property-owning instincts in general. Certain doses of anti-capitalist demagogy are used by fascism everywhere. The fake anti-capitalist slogans, and still more the spurious socialist slogans are advanced with certain misgivings and considerable caution by the fascists after the experience of Germany. In

any case, the fascist groups in France talk more about the preservation of savings, the struggle against swindling and bribery, and the reduction of taxes, than the destruction of the "slavery of interest," of "bridling the trusts," etc. In a country where the rentiers and the petty-bourgeoisie still form a considerable strata, it is more difficult to come out against the "slavery of interest" than in Germany, where post-war inflation had mown down the rentier strata.

In Austria the clerical fascists also prefer not to use the anti-capitalist slogans, or to make very moderate use of them. But the clerical fascists in Austria make great use of religion. Evidently we have to reckon with the fact that in a number of countries the ideology of Austro-fascism, i.e., fascism of the Vatican persuasion, will play a certain rôle among the masses of Catholics. Evidently the papal encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno" will play its part—and not in Austria alone. In Japan, in the camp of fascism itself, a certain struggle is taking place over the question of what dose of social demagogy is to be used. Some fascist groups willingly bring forward extreme social demagogy against the companies and trusts, but other fascist groups, or rather fascist leaders, prefer the slogan of Japanism neat, without a strong dose of social demagogy. After the fascist conspirative societies had taken the struggle against the companies seriously and killed a few big capitalists, the military fascist leaders have become still more cautious in respect to the "struggle" against the trusts. Of course, any fascist movement regards its nation and country as of a high or the highest type. It considers the imperialist claims of its master-class as the highest expression of international justice. In the sphere of national demagogy the fascist movement usually bases itself on historic traditions and historic precedents. German fascism has no objection to beginning its descent from Widukind, who fought against Charles the Great, or even from Frederick the Great, Mussolini willingly recalls the greatness of ancient Rome.

Has Fascism National Peculiarities?

In speaking of the national peculiarities of fascism in various countries, however, we have not only the peculiarities and the variety of the methods of fascist demagogy in view. There *are* certain differences in the forms of fascist dictatorship in various countries, and in accordance with the class composition of the leaders. It is clear to us that fascism is the open terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary, the most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital. This is the class essence of fascism. Nevertheless, in various countries, although the fundamental class

essence of the fascist dictatorship is not changed by this, the landlord has a certain influence, a certain weight, in determining the policy of the fascist dictatorship. In Italy, the owners of the big landed estates in the South, in Germany the big Junkers of Eastern Prussia, in Japan the semi-feudal landlords, in Hungary the big landlords, have attached themselves to the fascist movement. In many cases they have a very palpable influence on the policy of the fascist dictatorship.

In these countries finance capital, to some degree, penetrates into agriculture in one form or another. Some of the landlords take part in the banks, own shares in industrial enterprises. The big landlords to some degree are also participants in the fascist dictatorship. It is clear that the agrarian policy of fascism in these countries first of all takes account of the interests of the landlords, although the rich peasant also comes forward here as the bearer of fascism in the village.

In other countries where the landlord does not play such a big part in agriculture as, for example, in Bulgaria, Finland and Latvia, the fascist dictatorship orientates itself in its agrarian policy to a greater degree towards the interests of the rich peasant as the agency carrying the fascist influence into the villages. The fascist dictatorship is and remains the terrorist dictatorship of the big monopolist bourgeoisie, but according to the economic and social structure of the country, the landlord joins the system of the fascist dictatorship in some form and to some extent.

Finance-capital is penetrating agriculture, subordinating the latter to itself, while the upper ranks of the landlords are becoming fused with various groups of finance-capital. The class essence of the fascist dictatorship—the open terrorist dictatorship of big monopolist capital, of its most reactionary, chauvinistic, and imperialist groups—remains unchanged, but there are peculiarities and distinctions not only in the national and social demagogy, but also in a certain sense, in the methods of rule. These distinctions should be pointed out in particular because some comrades occasionally consider it below their dignity to analyse fascist ideology at all, or to carry on a struggle against the social and national demagogy of the fascists.

Naturally it is somewhat difficult to descend to the ideological level of fascist demagogy. It is repulsive even to refute a person like Rosenberg, who glorifies village idiotism to the level of the culture of the cities. It is disgusting to argue with a person like Hitler, who tries to prove that women's sole function is to bear children, that Jews are not human. But we must overcome disgust and analyse the fascists' arguments.

Fascists are fascists in all countries, but they have different coloured shirts and use different methods of applying the open terrorist dictatorship of finance capital.

These distinctions are expressed, among other things, also in the degree of the liquidation of the organs of bourgeois democracy, parliamentarism and the old bourgeois parties and their mass organisations. The military fascist dictatorship in Bulgaria abolished bourgeois parliamentarism and all the bourgeois parties. In Yugo-Slavia the military fascist dictatorship suppressed all the old bourgeois parties, and for long years did not even attempt to form a new political party in their place. The German and Italian fascists even give their fascist dictatorship the name of a total dictatorship. The "totality" of the fascist dictatorship is expressed in the fact that, in these countries, the monopoly of the political power and legal political activity is concentrated in the hands of the ruling fascist party alone. It is clear that there is a considerable difference between the fascist dictatorship in Italy and the dictatorship of the National Socialists in Germany. For example, in respect to the trade union question the Italian fascists adopt methods which differed considerably from the methods of the German National Socialists. The fact of the matter is that in Germany and Italy the institutions of bourgeois democracy have been most fully and consistently destroyed and the most complete political monopoly of the ruling fascist party has been brought about. This striving towards political monopoly is a tendency of the fascist dictatorship in general. In Italy and Germany, fascism squeezed out and suppressed all the old bourgeois parties, mass organisations, squeezed out and destroyed social-democracy and the reformist trade unions.

The Old Capitalist Parties.

In a number of other fascist countries a certain limited place is maintained for the old bourgeois parties, for their mass organisations. For example, in Poland, Hungary and Finland a certain screen of parliamentarism is kept up, and the old bourgeois parties and mass organisations are given a limited rôle. In Yugo-Slavia and Bulgaria we have seen the advance of the military fascist cliques. This form of bourgeois dictatorship is utilised in those countries where fascism has not had time to win for itself a sufficiently wide mass basis, as a mass movement, to carry out the open terrorist dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie. In Japan the backbone of the fascist movement is the officers' corps, although in Japan the military fascist movement is the very one which has a mass basis and mass influence. In the struggle against the fascist dictatorship, all these distinctions have,

of course, a certain significance in the sense of exposing the ideology of fascism. But the degree of the liquidation of the organs of bourgeois democracy, the degree of the suppression of the old bourgeois parties, is of no small importance also from the point of view of the internal struggle, the conflicts in the camp of fascism itself. Fascism tries to overcome and crush these disputes and conflicts. Sometimes it is successful for a short time. Later, in the long run, the clashes in the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie break out more rapidly and strongly.

The question of the utilisation of the contradictions in the camp of fascism by the proletariat and its party, is connected with the degree to which the institutions of bourgeois democracy, the old bourgeois parties, have been abolished. Up to June 30th the Trotskyite wing of social-fascism completely denied the possibility of utilising the conflicts in the camp of the bourgeoisie, and in *Unser Wort* accused the Communists of overestimating these conflicts. Social-democracy puts its stake mainly on the conflicts and dissensions in the camp of the bourgeoisie. The events of June 30th in Germany and July 25th in Austria, as well as the series of attacks and assassinations in Japan, the murder of the Minister of the Interior, Peratski, in Poland, have shown repeatedly that fascism cannot liquidate, crush or suppress the conflicts in the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie. These conflicts arise from the conflict of interests and the position of the capitalists themselves. The arrest and deportation of the former Assistant State Secretary for Home Affairs, Arpinati and Co., in Italy, showed that Italian fascism has also had its own June 30th, although in quieter and less catastrophic forms. In Finland the Lapuas clique organised an armed attack on the fascist dictatorship. On the contrary, in the long run, fascism will intensify and strengthen these conflicts, which, precisely in the conditions of the fascist dictatorship, assume the form of mutual murders, attacks, shootings, frequently reaching the point of civil war in the camp of fascism itself. Fascism has to create a strongly welded authoritative state power. But the history of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, Austria, Finland and Bulgaria, shows that the fascist dictatorship leads to armed conflicts in the camp of fascism. These events have demonstrated and proved that the dissension, the conflicts, the mutual killings, shootings and armed conflicts in the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie, which shake and shatter the fascist dictatorship, can only be used if the proletariat is able to convert the mass discontent with the fascist dictatorship into mass activity. They can be utilised if mass activity bursts into the opening fissures in the edifice of

the fascist dictatorship and really blows it asunder. If this is not the case, the conflicts and the dissensions in the camp of the fascists will ensue behind the back of the proletariat. There is no unity in the fascist camp. The proletariat can utilise the conflicts there if it is able to step forward as an independent class force under the leadership of its Party. The significance of the conflicts in the camp of the fascists can only be denied by people who believe that fascism is capable of creating organised capitalism and an organised bourgeoisie. The salvation of the proletariat from the fascist dictatorship as the result of conflicts in the camp of the bourgeoisie could only be expressed by social-democrats like the Prague Party leaders, who hope that the Reichswehr generals will abandon Hitler and invite the social-democrats back again. It is quite possible that the generals will drive out Hitler and even invite individual social-democrats back again, but this will only be the replacement of one form of fascism by another. The Austrian social-democrats also hope that Schuschnigg will invite them to Vienna against Staremborg and Fey. But the struggle between Schuschnigg and Staremborg alone, without mass activity will not lead to the end of fascism. The crisis of the leadership is one of the prerequisites for the armed revolt of the proletariat. But the crisis of the leaders alone is not yet a sufficient prerequisite for an armed insurrection.

The Position of Social-Democracy.

A certain difference exists between the fascist dictatorships in various countries in respect to the degree to which social-democracy is restricted, and the reformist trade unions limited or abolished. At the present time in six countries with a fascist dictatorship, Social-Democratic parties have already been made illegal. This illegality varies in form in the different countries. But the fact is that social-democracy at the present time is an illegal party in Italy, Germany, Austria, Latvia, Bulgaria and Yugo-Slavia. Of course there is a big difference between the illegality of the Social-Democratic Party and the illegality of the Communist Party, between the persecution of the Social-Democratic parties and the terror used against the Communist Parties even in these countries. But the fact remains a fact that in these countries social-democracy has also been driven underground and deprived of the possibility of legal existence. On the other hand, in Poland, Hungary, and as yet in Finland, the Social-Democratic parties and the reformist trade unions have to a certain degree maintained their place under the fascist sun, while the reformist trade unions enjoy a definite legality. The situation of social-democracy and the reformist unions

changes in these countries as well. In Finland the rôle of social-democracy is evidently due to be cut down. In Poland the followers of Pilsudski are going to "unify" the trade unions. In Hungary there is to be a kind of "absorption by the state" of the trade unions. It is extremely clear that from the viewpoint of the tactics of the Communist vanguard, these distinctions in the method by which the fascist dictatorship is carried out in the various countries are of great importance. Will fascism form its mass organisations, especially organisations to bring in the workers, will it leave the reformist trade unions in existence, to what extent will it cut down the rôle of social democracy? All these questions have a definite tactical significance. From the point of view of principles, and the historic outlook, these distinctions are of no significance. But from the viewpoint of the present day struggle Communists are bound to take these peculiarities into account, these distinguishing features of the fascist dictatorship in each separate country.

The fascist dictatorship in various countries cannot be regarded as something static. The fascist dictatorship itself is subject to various changes. In various countries the fascist dictatorship itself undergoes certain alterations. In Italy, Mussolini has reorganised his party three times according to the requirements of the policy of the monopolist bourgeoisie.

In Germany, from February, 1933, to the declaration of the end of the National revolution by Hitler in June, 1933, and further right up to the shooting of the Storm Troop leaders on June 30th, 1934, changes occurred in the fascist dictatorship which assumed extremely dramatic and catastrophic forms. In Poland, during the rule of Pilsudski's dictatorship, there was a certain kind of shifting of the mass basis from Pilsudski's followers to the N.D.* Party and to their national radical wing, i.e., the wing which is most fascist of all. The basic and decisive groups of the big bourgeoisie are rallying around Pilsudski, while considerable strata of the petty-bourgeoisie are deserting Pilsudski. In Yugo-Slavia the fascist power was established in the form of a military fascist dictatorship. Later the military fascist dictatorship tried to form a petty-bourgeois mass basis for itself. In Bulgaria, fascism also came to power at first, on the whole, as a military fascist dictatorship, and later concealed itself behind certain parliamentary decorations. afterwards returning to the most naked form of the military fascist dictatorship. Trotskyism denies the fascist character of the dictatorships in these countries, describing the power of Pilsudski, Georgiev, and, in his time,

Schleicher, as Bonapartism. The point is that these dictatorships have nothing in common with Bonapartism, in the Marxist sense of this term. There is no equilibrium between classes, the army does not rest on the peasants, the government apparatus has not acquired a certain independence.

Is There a Law of Development of Fascist Dictatorship?

Is it possible to discover some common tendency or law in the development of the fascist dictatorship in the various countries in this respect? Such a common tendency, such a common law, exists. It is of political and tactical significance from the point of view of the Communist vanguard. On the path to power, fascism appeals to the petty-bourgeoisie in town and village. It also tries to penetrate the working class, to mobilise the lumpen-proletariat,* to form a mass basis for the dictatorship of the big monopolist bourgeoisie. On coming to power and carrying on the policy of the big monopolist bourgeoisie, the fascist dictatorship discloses the contradictions between its petty-bourgeois mass basis and the policy of the big bourgeoisie.

This contradiction between words and deeds is much more outstanding with the fascists than any other bourgeois party. The development of the fascist dictatorship in various countries consists precisely in the fact that, among other things, fascism has shown itself ever more openly and plainly as the dictatorship of the most reactionary, the most chauvinist and imperialist elements of the monopolist bourgeoisie. It has ever more openly abandoned its demagogic promises and cries, has ever more lost its petty-bourgeois mass basis. Fascism cannot give up its petty-bourgeois mass basis. But this basis is ever more splitting away from it. Naturally, the desertion of fascism by the petty-bourgeois masses must not under any circumstances be understood in too simplified a manner. This desertion ensues through tremendous vacillations, through the differentiation of the petty-bourgeois masses. In Germany some of the petty-bourgeois supporters of National-Socialism who left it were absorbed by the monarchists, others by the Catholics. There is no doubt that some of the storm troops, some of the toiling petty-bourgeois elements favour the proletariat, are feeling out the path towards the proletariat. We do not mention the workers who formerly, and even now, are in the storm detachments or the National-Socialist factory organisations.

In Poland the petty-bourgeois and peasant masses who left Pilsudski were partly swallowed

*National Democrats.—Ed.

**"Lumpen-proletariat": Lump, German: rubbish, ragged, slum de-classed elements.

by the N.D.s and N.R.s,* while the peasant masses fell under the influence of various fascist groups of Narodniki; to some extent certain strata of the peasants and the intelligentsia have begun to seek the path towards the proletariat. In Austria, part of the petty-bourgeoisie, according to the conditions, waver between Austro-fascism and national socialism. This does not mean that differentiation is not occurring among the petty-bourgeois masses in the direction of the proletariat even now. In the process of these vacillations, which may continue for quite a long time, the toiling elements of the petty-bourgeoisie will abandon the camp of fascism and find their way into the camp of the proletariat. To break the petty-bourgeois masses away from fascism, to neutralise them, to win over their toiling strata to the side of the proletariat, is an extremely complex process. This process can only be accelerated in proportion as the proletariat show themselves to these masses as a force able to deliver a blow at the big bourgeoisie, to storm the capitalist fortress. Theories and hypotheses that the petty bourgeoisie as a whole will for ever be on the side of the Black Hundreds, the nationalists, the Bonapartists, the fascists, are foolish and Trotskyite. Nevertheless, we cannot simplify the task of the winning of the petty-bourgeois masses by the proletariat.

In any case, one of the laws of development of the fascist dictatorship is that the fascist dictatorship exposes itself as the dictatorship of the big monopolist bourgeoisie and loses its petty bourgeois mass basis. At the same time the fascist dictatorship tries to replace the loss of the petty-bourgeois mass basis of strengthening the fascist state machine, by increasing its pressure and fascist licence and terror. This narrowing down of the petty-bourgeois mass basis, sharpening of the conflicts in the camp of the bourgeoisie, and increasing resistance of the proletariat, may impel the fascist dictatorship to widen the functions of social-democracy and particularly of the reformist leaders in the system of its dictatorship to some extent and in some form. It can do this in so far as this rôle was previously cut down, and draw various groups of the social-democratic leaders or reformist leaders into the system of the fascist dictator-

ship. At the present time, in particular, rumours are spreading that negotiations will take place between the social-democrats and the fascists on the question of the formation of "neutral" trade unions in Germany and Austria. There is also talk about the attraction of social-democracy in Italy to participation in the government.

We do not wish to say that this will be the general tendency, the general law of the fascist dictatorships. Still, it is necessary to reckon with this possibility, that even in the countries where social-democracy is at present underground, it may be admitted to legal existence by the fascists themselves. The general tendency, the general law of the fascist dictatorship is that the fascist parties are being increasingly converted into a central bureaucratic apparatus of the bourgeois state, split away from the petty-bourgeois masses with the help of which fascism came to power. To the extent that fascism, when in power, carried on the policy of the most influential groups of the monopolist bourgeoisie, it must lose its mass character as a party, and become a part of the bureaucratic apparatus.

But it would be extremely dangerous to underestimate the fact that fascism, relying on its monopolist political power, will still further strengthen the state machine and the apparatus of violence of the bourgeois state. The apparatus of violence and suppression must not be regarded in the narrow sense of terror, physical violence and suppression. Fascism widens and increases the bourgeois state's apparatus for moral pressure, crushing all the forms and possibilities for legal workers' education, corrupting the minds of the working youth, using the monopoly of the press, the schools, the stage, radio, and the cinema, to dope the toiling masses. This apparatus of mental and physical violence cannot, of course, replace the real support of the masses, but will create new and painful difficulties for the class struggle of the proletariat. It can create additional tremendous new difficulties for the Communist vanguard in the struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, and the overthrow of capitalism in general, though the events of the last few months have clearly and undoubtedly shown that fascism not only hinders, but also hastens the revolutionary crisis.

*National Radicals.—Ed.

THE LITERARY FRANKNESS OF THE BRITISH FASCISTS

REVIEWED BY M. SMITH.

1. The Genealogy of the British Fascists.

THE British fascists are using both their political and literary efforts to come forward with a "criticism" of the modern state system. Mosley devotes many pages to a description of all its evils.* Specially fierce attacks are made on the few relics still remaining of one-time capitalist "democracy." True—the external remnants of this famous "democracy" are gradually being swept away by the Unemployment Bill, and Forced Labour for the unemployed. The attempt to carry through the notorious Sedition Bill (a counter-revolutionary law which, under the pretence of combating propaganda in the army, in reality tries to completely end freedom of speech), and the attempts to introduce compulsory military service for certain groups of ex-soldiers are not calculated to extend it. The militarisation of the unemployed youth is also not exactly a sign of increased liberty. Nevertheless, the electoral rights still exist, as well as the possibility of publishing newspapers and speaking from platforms. It is still possible even to demonstrate in Hyde Park. The British proletarian masses use all this for the struggle against capital and the fascist offensive. Quite recently a fascist demonstration tested the value of these democratic "relics" on its own back. And so the fascists come forward as "critics" of capitalism. An enthusiastic supporter of Mosley named Drennan devotes a whole chapter of his recent book, "Oswald Mosley and British Fascism,"† to a eulogy of the feudal aristocracy, and a contemptuous description of the bourgeois revolution of the 17th century. The parliamentary armies of Cromwell "overthrew the NATIONAL MONARCHY and set up in effect a system of group dictatorship . . . of the new bourgeois capitalist power" (page 32).

This "overthrow of the national monarchy" is the chief crime of the bourgeois revolution. And in its present stage, capital "remains within the authority of no national government—it is supremely international" (page 36).

In addition to this, the bourgeois has a "pathological dread for violence" (page 41). And in general, the bourgeois is a bourgeois who has formed his own non-feudal institutions, philosophy and "above all, a bourgeois morality" (page 27).

It would seem that the aristocrat was "the great leader and artist of the medieval world" (pages 27-28). He "lived and died magnificently . . . on the scaffold the aristocrats perpetuated the popularity of their order" (page 29).

But let not the "democrats" gloat that they (the aristocrats) were sent to the scaffold: "growing groups of unknown men . . . are laughing the unbelievers' hollow laugh at all those things the democrats have thought the people to hold dear."

A figure comes to life once more "that they had thought was gone forever over the grey scaffolds of the reformation."

From behind the scaffold comes a man—"the classic figure of a leader and a natural aristocrat" (page 41). The first embodiment of this "natural aristocrat" in England was Cecil Rhodes and the Irish hangman Carson. In Italy he was incarnated in the "grim serenity of Mussolini" and in Germany "in the harsh force of Hitler" (page 42).

In modern England the "natural aristocrat" and leader is, of course, none other than Sir Oswald Mosley, Bart.

It is true that when Mosley was a Labourite, he toured the working class districts during election campaigns without the title "Sir," while his wife, the daughter of Lord Curzon, declared everywhere* that she was not "Lady" but "plain Mrs. Mosley." But now, when a "natural aristocrat" is required, he suddenly becomes clothed in the armour of feudalism. Naturally, in modern England such a leader does that which "democracy never could have done," he rises "over the frightful machine life." Such is the genius of the British fascists, as he depicts himself. Together with Hitler, he dreams of the middle-ages, and for England he links these dreams with profound obeisance before the "national monarchy" of feudalism and the notorious counter-revolutionary leaders of feudal reaction of the 17th century.

2. The Social Basis of the British Fascists.

But whereas in the 17th century the bourgeoisie revolted against the "aristocrats," at the present day the principal figure on the political scene is the proletariat. But where is the "middle class," i.e., the middle and small bourgeoisie, the hereditary bulwark of every revolution?

Drennan definitely asserts that no one is interested in the middle class. "Political theoreticians," says he, "always looked upon the middle class as a lower race group . . . they not only ignored but offended and robbed those middle-class politicians who tried to create for themselves a safe future by the goodwill of the proletariat" (page 207).

However, people from the middle class have

*"The Greater Britain," Sir Oswald Mosley.

†"Oswald Mosley and British Fascism," J. Drennan. (Published by the British Union of Fascists.)

*Some amusing interludes anent Sir O. Mosley's Labour Party period will be found in John Scanlon's "Decline of the Labour Party".—Ed.

extremely high qualities. Drennan has good reason to quote "so acute an observer" as Trotsky who claims that "the success of the revolution in Russia was a result of the physical weakness and quantitative paucity of the Russian middle-class" (page 206).

In Britain, however, the middle-class is "not only numerically formidable but superbly capable of drastic and effective action," because, in the opinion of Drennan, the strongest mental and physical elements of the aristocracy of labour enter its ranks.

Drennan is convinced that the British petty-bourgeoisie will undoubtedly revolt against the proletarian revolution, against those who "look on them as pariahs" and that the people of the middle class will be wise enough "to appreciate the character of the real revolution which economic circumstances make inevitable" (page 207). In confirmation of his views, the author refers to . . . Brailsford, who also writes in his "Problems of a Socialist Government" that "the lower middle-classes and not the proletariat would become the revolutionary force" (page 207 of Drennan's book).

The counter-revolutionary Trotsky, the fascist Drennan and the "independent" Brailsford—what a touching gathering, what a consistent "united front" of counter-revolution!

But the "real" revolution which the petty-bourgeoisie will support is the fascist offensive which in Italy was "so peaceful and so complete that it was scarcely regarded as a revolution" (page 217). For "Fascism implies an economic revolution on the basis of national production and distribution" (page 219).

Drennan is more candid than Mosley. To thrust the history of England on to the path of fascism and the "national monarchy" he seeks to obtain support from the small and middle bourgeoisie and elements of the working class under their influence.

3. The Corporative State.

Mosley sets out the political and economic foundations of the fascist programme. The way out of all the evils of modern times is the "corporative state." This "envisages, as its name implies, a nation organised as the human body" (Mosley, "The Greater Britain," pages 26-27, author's italics). In such a society every member "fulfils its function as a member of the whole." But this whole works under the direction of the "central driving brain" of the fascist government. Naturally, freedom is given to the capitalists. "This does not mean control from Whitehall or constant interference by the government with the business of industry." No, the government only sets "the limits within which individuals and enterprises may operate." And, moreover, individual enterprise and the making of profit are "not only permitted but encouraged," on condition that "the enterprise enriches rather than damages by its activity the nation as a whole."

But woe to those whose actions become "sectional or anti-social." The corporative government will deal with them in its own way. "Every interest, whether 'right' or 'Left,' industrial, financial, trade union or banking system, is subordinated to the welfare of the community of the organised state" (page 27). In practice, Mosley explains, this will lead to the abolition of the class struggle, because the government will set up institutions "for reconciling the clash of class interests in an equitable distribution of the proceeds of industry" (page 28). Wages in this heaven will be established by an "impartial state arbitration board." Both unions of workers and associations of employers will be made part of the corporative state, and "instead of being the general staff of opposing armies, they will be joint directors of national enterprises under the general guidance of the corporative government" (page 29, author's italics).

Such, on the whole, is the political task of the corporative state in the fascist dictatorship—to deprive the workers' organisations of any right to struggle, to snatch from the Trade Unions the last relics of their rights. It is to make the upper layer of the T.U.s part of the "corporative state" and encourage and subsidise capitalist enterprises, recognising that profiteers . . . "enrich by their activity the nation as a whole."

If we add to this the "elections according to professions" and the "corporative empire," the picture becomes absolutely clear. Elections inside each profession in place of the former elections would deliver the final blow at the remnants of bourgeois democracy.

On the other hand, all the joys of the corporative state are passed on to the Dominions of the Empire. Every colony becomes a separate unit in the "corporative empire." But this does not mean that the population of these colonies "would be exploited for our ends" (page 137). On the contrary, it is necessary to develop the backward districts on a "systematic plan." Otherwise foreign capital would penetrate the British colonies and start "exploiting backward labour" and then "the chaos of unregulated exploitation of cheap labour" and "the development . . . not subject to a systematic plan would begin in the colonies" (pages 137-8). Therefore, down with "loose sentimentalism" which demands the self-government of the colonies. Of course, the fascist government will continue "British colonial practice which seeks . . . to raise native populations to a higher standard of life," and of course the British fascists will not allow the "great and productive areas of the world" to remain in the hands of races "which are unable or unwilling to develop them" (page 138). All this closely resembles the theory of colonial policy set out in the book of the labourite Cole. But Cole is now occupied with "Left manoeuvring." His last book does not mention the colonies. Mosley has utilised this

labour policy, converting it from objective to subjective Fascism. The brazen lie that British colonial policy "raises the standard of life" of the colonial slaves is used by Mosley as by the labourites in an attempt to justify the colonial oppression of British imperialism. His arguments about foreign capital are a bogey to frighten the bourgeoisie, the same as Cole's. Their final argument is the "*plan for the development of the colonies*" and the "*corporative empire*."

4. Economic Plan.

On the question of "*planning*," fascist Mosley put^s forward the same programme on the whole as the labourites, but does not yet embellish it with demagoguery about the combatting of "*under-consumption*." Consequently, the solution of the economic problem is not to lower our standard of living, but to raise it to the level at which "*the increased purchasing power of the home-market can absorb the increased production of modern machinery*" (page 33). And, of course, only the corporative state can solve this problem, "*without the dislocation of industry*."

In Italy, it seems, the fascist government raised the standard of living, and did not permit the country to sink down into economic devastation during the crisis. Mosley, of course, does not state precisely what the Mussolini government did in Italy or how it did this. Facts are stubborn things. Still, the panacea is ready for England. A home market must be formed by "*scientific protection*," which, as distinguished from actual real-life protectionism, is connected with "*planning*," with "*industrial efficiency*," "*good wages to the workers and low prices to the consumers*" (page 90). Under protectionism Mosley swears, "*wages will grow in spite of the laws of Marx*."

Mosley demagogically states that the fall in the cost of production of industrial output can and must take place, not at the expense of wages, but at that of rationalisation and continuous mass production. It is therefore somewhat unfortunate that all his declarations on this matter are in crying contradiction with the actual calculations and examples of the lowering of cost of production or rationalisation he gives. *In both cases wages fall to half*, for one and the same amount of raw material is manufactured with the best machines and *half the expenditure of labour* (pages 104-105). Mosley tries to distract attention from this. British industry works for export. The cost of the imported raw material, however, is much in excess of the value of the exports. In the international balance of payments, Great Britain covers this deficit; or rather covered it until 1931, by revenues from capital invested abroad—a fact very characteristic of Britain; country of Rentiers.

But here also Mosley has a panacea ready—restore agriculture and make big reductions in the imports of foodstuffs. All the rest will be done by the corpora-

tive state and its diplomats. "*Britain buys from those who buy from Britain*" (page 112). To achieve this, "*finance, industry, science*" must be planned, he says. Planning is impossible under capitalism. Let us see what happens in Mosley's system at the first attempt to play his cards and show how he will "*plan*" finance and science. As for the financiers, they "*must be subordinated to the policy of the state and must serve the welfare of the nation as a whole*," says Mosley (page 118). However the City being so important an institution and having "*a traditional and almost hereditary skill*" in business, must not be touched. All that remains is to comfort ourselves with the fact that besides the beneficent Britishers there are also foreigners and usurers. All kinds of undesirable elements whose policy has "*shaken to the foundations, the great producers*," have developed speculation, etc. The fascist government will put this right by the "*rigid control of finances*"; without touching the traditions (or the finances) of the City.

Just like the labourite Cole, fascist Mosley complains that the banks have been "*largely occupied in foreign business rather than the supply of finance to British industry*."

Mosley recommends as the chief economic lever "*managed currency*," i.e., inflation. Inflation, leading to the devaluation of the pound on the international market, gives hope to the British exporter of commodities that he can sell cheaper than others. On the home market, the workers will pay for this through reduced real wages. Precisely this desperate policy of exporters losing their markets lies at the basis of all this talk about "*scientific planning*." And as the policy of inflation and the devaluation of the pound is not beneficial to the exporters of capital, who are trying to restore the gold standard, Mosley, like the labourite Cole, "*criticises*" the banks which control the export of capital and which "*do not want*" to finance industry.

Such is the political wisdom of the fascist "*plan*." The difference between this "*plan*" and that of Cole, is that according to Cole it will be carried out by a Labour "*majority government*" and according to Mosley, by a "*corporative government*."

5. The British Fascists on the British Political Parties.

Back to the Middle Ages and the noble "*aristocrats*," down with democracy! Let us form a strong dictatorship, based on the wide circles of the small and medium bourgeoisie, taking the last liberties from the workers. We will talk about high wages, and at the same time cut wages with the help of rationalisation and inflation. We will restore agriculture, industry and the home market by means of subsidies. to the industrialists and the farmers and inflation of credit. We will form a "*democratic empire*," and turn the colonies and dominions into markets for

(Continued on page 824.)