

Stalin to the Red Army Graduates
Piatnitsky on International Situation
For the United National Front in Cuba

WORKERS OF THE WORLD,
UNITE!

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



No.
11

Price
10c

Now Ready

TROTSKYISM

Counter-Revolution in Disguise

By M. J. OLGIN



An analysis of the background, character, and role of Trotsky and Trotskyism. Trotsky's "theories", his fight against Bolshevism, his counter-revolutionary activities.

The book is divided into fourteen chapters as follows:

Trotsky's Career; The Social Base of Trotskyism; Trotskyism Defined; Socialism in One Country; The Revolution and the Peasantry; The Soviet Union; The Communist Party; The Anglo-Russian Committee; The Chinese Revolution; The Third Period; The German Situation and the Question of Social-Fascism; The Trotskyites in the U.S.A.; Trotsky the Historian; The Danger of Trotskyism.

To aid in the widest possible distribution, this 160 page book has been published at an especially low price.

Paper, 15c Cloth, 75c



Order from your nearest bookstore or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

Communism in the United States

By EARL BROWDER



The theory and practice of the revolutionary movement is here expounded by its foremost American leader.

Embracing the widest application of Communist policy on tactical, theoretical, and cultural questions, this book is composed of a collection of reports to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., of which the author is General Secretary, together with articles and speeches written in the past two years.

Besides being an analysis of the present situation and the revolutionary way out, *Communism in the United States* will prove an indispensable handbook for every active participant in the labor movement.

352 pages—cloth—\$2.00



Order from your nearest bookstore, or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

Address to the Graduates of the Red Army Academy*

By JOSEPH STALIN

"Of all the valuable capital the world possesses, the most valuable and most decisive is people."

COMRADES, it cannot be denied that we have recently achieved important successes both in the sphere of construction and in the sphere of administration. In this connection there is too much talk about the merits of chiefs, about the merits of leaders. All or nearly all our achievements are ascribed to them. That, of course, is wrong, it is incorrect. It is not merely a matter of leaders. But it is not of this I wanted to speak today. I should like to say a few words about cadres, about our cadres in general and about the cadres of our Red Army in particular.

You know that we inherited from the olden days a technically backward, impoverished and ruined country. Ruined by four years of imperialist war, and ruined again by three years of civil war, a country with a semi-literate population, with a low technical level, with isolated industrial oases lost in a welter of minute peasant farms—such was the country we inherited from the past. The problem was to transfer this country from the lines of medieval darkness to the lines of modern industry and mechanized agriculture. The problem, as you see, was a serious and difficult one. The question that confronted us was that *either* we solve this problem in the shortest possible time and consolidate socialism in our country, *or* we do not solve it, in which case our country—technically weak and culturally unenlightened—would lose its independence and become a stake in the game of the imperialist powers.

At that time our country was passing through a period of acute famine in technical resources. There were not enough machines for industry. There were no machines for agriculture. There were no machines for transport. There was not that elementary technical base without which the industrial transformation of a country is inconceivable. All that existed were isolated preliminary requisites for the creation of such a base. A first-class industry had to be created. This industry had to be so directed as to be capable of technically reorganizing not only industry, but also our agriculture and our railway transport. And for this it was necessary to make sacrifices and to impose the most rigorous economy in everything; it was necessary to economize on food, on schools and on textiles, in order to accumulate the funds required for the creation of industry. There was no other way of overcoming the famine in technical resources. Thus Lenin taught us, and in this matter we followed in the footsteps of Lenin.

Naturally, in so great and difficult a matter unvarying and rapid

* Delivered in the Kremlin, May 4, 1935.

success could not be expected. In a matter like this success comes only after several years. We had therefore to arm ourselves with strong nerves, Bolshevik grit and stubborn patience in order to counteract the first failures and to march unswervingly towards the great goal, without permitting any wavering or uncertainty in our ranks.

You know that we set about this task in precisely this way. But not all our comrades had the necessary spirit, patience and grit. Among our comrades there proved to be people who at the first difficulties began to call for a retreat. Let bygones be bygones, it is said. That, of course, is true. But man is endowed with memory, and when summing up the results of our work one involuntarily recalls the past. (*Laughter.*) Well then, there were comrades among us who were scared by the difficulties and began to call on the Party to retreat. They said: "What is the good of your industrialization and collectivization, your machines, iron and steel industry, tractors, combines, automobiles? It would be better if you gave us more textiles, if you bought more raw materials for the production of consumers' goods and gave the population more of the small things which adorn the life of man. The creation of industry, and a first-class industry at that, when we are so backward, is a dangerous dream."

Of course, we could have used the three billion rubles of foreign currency obtained as a result of the severest economy and spent on the creation of our industry, for the importation of raw materials and for increasing the production of articles of general consumption. That is also a kind of "plan". But with such a "plan" we should not have had a metallurgical industry, or a machine-building industry, or tractors and automobiles, or airplanes and tanks. We should have found ourselves unarmed in face of the external foe. We should have undermined the foundations of socialism in our country. We should have found ourselves in captivity to the bourgeoisie, home and foreign.

It is evident that a choice had to be made between two plans: between the plan of retreat, leading, and bound to lead, to the defeat of socialism, and the plan of advance, which led and, as you know, has already led to the victory of socialism in our country.

We chose the plan of advance and moved forward along the Leninist road, brushing those comrades aside, as being people who saw something only when it was under their noses, but who closed their eyes to the immediate future of our country, to the future of socialism in our country.

But these comrades did not always confine themselves to criticism and passive resistance. They threatened to raise a revolt in the Party against the Central Committee. More, they threatened some of us with bullets. Evidently, they reckoned on frightening us and compelling us to leave the Leninist road. These people, apparently, forgot that we Bolsheviks are people of a special cut. They forgot that you cannot frighten Bolsheviks by difficulties or by threats. They forgot that we were forged by the great Lenin, our leader, our teacher, our father, who did not know fear in the fight and did not recognize it. They forgot that the more the enemies rage and the more hysterical the foes within the Party become, the more red-hot the Bolsheviks become for fresh struggles and the more vigorously they push forward.

Of course, it never even occurred to us to leave the Leninist road. More, having established ourselves on this road, we pushed forward still more vigorously, brushing every obstacle from our path. It is true that

in our course we were obliged to handle some of these comrades roughly. But you cannot help that. I must confess that I too took a hand in this business. (*Loud cheers.*)

Yes, comrades, we proceeded confidently and vigorously along the road of industrializing and collectivizing our country. And now we may consider that the road has been traversed.

Everybody now admits that we have achieved tremendous successes along this road. Everybody now admits that we already have a powerful, first-class industry, a powerful mechanized agriculture, a growing and improving transport system, an organized and excellently equipped Red Army.

This means that we have in the main outlived the period of famine in technical resources.

But, having outlived the period of famine in technical resources, we have entered a new period, a period, I would say, of famine in the matter of people, in the matter of cadres, in the matter of workers capable of harnessing technique and advancing it. The point is that we have factories, mills, collective farms, Soviet farms, an army; we have technique for all this; but we lack people with sufficient experience to squeeze out of technique all that can be squeezed out of it. Formerly, we used to say that "technique decides everything." This slogan helped us in this respect, that we put an end to the famine in technical resources and created an extensive technical base in every branch of activity for the equipment of our people with first-class technique. That is very good. But it is very, very far from enough. In order to set technique going and to utilize it to the full, we need people who have mastered technique, we need cadres capable of mastering and utilizing this technique according to all the rules of the art. Without people who have mastered technique, technique is dead. Technique in the charge of people who have mastered technique can and should perform miracles. If in our first-class mills and factories, in our Soviet farms and collective farms and in our Red Army we had sufficient cadres capable of harnessing this technique, our country would secure results three times and four times greater than at present. That is why emphasis must now be laid on people, on cadres, on workers who have mastered technique. That is why the old slogan, "Technique decides everything", which is a reflection of a period we have already passed through, a period in which we suffered from a famine in technical resources, must now be replaced by a new slogan, the slogan "Cadres decide everything." That is the main thing now.

Can it be said that our people have fully understood and realized the great significance of this new slogan? I would not say that. Otherwise, there would not have been the outrageous attitude towards people, towards cadres, towards workers, which we not infrequently observe in practice. The slogan "Cadres decide everything" demands that our leaders should display the solicitous attitude towards our workers, "little" and "big", no matter in what sphere they are engaged, cultivating them assiduously, assisting them when they need support, encouraging them when they display their first successes, advancing them, and so forth. Yet, in practice we meet in a number of cases with a soulless, bureaucratic and positively outrageous attitude towards workers. This, indeed, explains why instead of being studied, and placed at their posts only after being studied, **people are frequently flung about like pawns.** People have learnt how to value machinery and to make reports of how many

machines we have in our mills and factories. But I do not know of one instance when a report was made with equal zest of the number of people we have developed in a given period, how we assisted people to grow and become tempered in their work. How is this to be explained? It is to be explained by the fact that we have not yet learnt to value people, to value workers, to value cadres.

I recall an incident in Siberia, where I was at one time in exile. It was in the spring, at the time of the spring floods. About thirty men went to the river to pull out timber which had been carried away by the vast, swollen river. Towards evening they returned to the village, but with one comrade missing. When asked where the thirtieth man was, they unconcernedly replied that the thirtieth man had "remained there". To my question, "How do you mean, remained there?" they replied with the same unconcern, "Why ask—drowned, of course". And thereupon one of them began to hurry away, saying, "I have got to go and water the mare". When I reproached them for having more concern for animals than for men, one of them, amid the general approval of the rest, said, "Why should we be concerned about men? We can always make men. But a mare . . . just try and make a mare." (Laughter.) Here you have a case, not very significant perhaps, but very characteristic. It seems to me that the indifference shown by certain of our leaders to people, to cadres, and their inability to value people, is a survival of that strange attitude of man to man displayed in the episode in far-off Siberia just related.

And so, comrades, if we want successfully to overcome the famine in the matter of people and to provide our country with sufficient cadres, capable of advancing technique and setting it going, we must first of all learn to value people, to value cadres, to value every worker capable of benefiting our common cause. It is time to realize that of all the valuable capital the world possesses, the most valuable and most decisive is people, cadres. It must be realized that under our present conditions "cadres decide everything". If we have good and numerous cadres in industry, agriculture, transport and the army—our country will be invincible. If we do not have such cadres—we shall be lame on both feet.

In concluding my speech, permit me to offer a toast to the health and success of our graduates of the Red Army Academy. I wish them success in the cause of organizing and leading the defense of our country.

Comrades, you have graduated from the academy, a school in which you received your first steeling. But school is only a preparatory stage. Cadres receive their real steeling in actual work, outside school, in fighting difficulties, in overcoming difficulties. Remember, comrades, that only those cadres are any good who do not fear difficulties, who do not hide from difficulties, but who, on the contrary, go out to meet difficulties, in order to overcome them and eliminate them. It is only in combating difficulties that real cadres are forged. And if our army possesses genuinely steeled cadres in sufficient numbers, it will be invincible.

Your health, comrades! (*Stormy applause. All rise. Loud cheers for Stalin.*)

Some Problems of the Present International Situation

By O. PIATNITSKY

*(Extracts from a Talk with Party Agitators from a Number
of Moscow Factories, Organized by the Journal
"Agitators Companion")*

THIS year the proletariat in the capitalist countries, led by the Communist Parties, will demonstrate under slogans of Struggle Against the Capitalist Offensive, Against Fascism, War, and for Active Defense of the Soviet Union.

The Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade unions this year have made the proposal to the Socialist Parties and the reformist trade unions that May the First be celebrated under such slogans.

In a whole number of countries, the Communist and Socialist workers, members of the revolutionary and reformist trade unions, and in some countries, the Communist and Socialist Parties, are already engaged in a joint struggle against fascism and war. The growing urge of the working class for united action, and the joint action of the Communists and Socialists which has been brought about in a number of countries, are rendering it easier for May the First to be celebrated on the basis of the proletarian united front.

In the countries where the fascist dictatorship holds sway, the struggle is being carried through under conditions still more burdensome than in the days of Tsarist Russia. And in the countries where bourgeois democracy exists, the ruling classes are resorting to still more ferocious repression against the working class.

But the class consciousness of the workers has grown over the last year, and reformist illusions which have kept wide masses under their influence for tens of years, are becoming weaker, and there is a growth of solidarity among these masses, and of their efforts to participate in joint struggle with the Communists.

The bourgeoisie are resorting to fascist terror as their last means of saving their rule. The working class is replying to these ferocious attacks of the bourgeoisie by extending the proletarian united front, by heroic sturdiness in fascist underground conditions, and by self-sacrificing determination in open armed struggle.

The final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. is enthusing proletarian fighters in all parts of the globe. The whole depth of the difference between the two worlds in conflict, the world of decaying capitalism and the world of flourishing socialism, will stand out exceptionally clearly before all the toilers and oppressed on this proletarian holiday.

Like a living wall, ever wider masses of the toilers and oppressed are surrounding the banner of proletarian struggle, the banner of Marx,

Engels, Lenin and Stalin, which already waves over one-sixth of the globe.

I. THE GROWING DANGER OF AN IMPERIALIST WAR AND OF AN OFFENSIVE AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

Is the war danger growing? Yes, it is! There is no doubt about that.

Where are the main sources of the war danger? They can be easily indicated—Germany, first and foremost, and then Japan and Poland.

So as more easily to be able to understand the present international situation, we must call to mind the main contradictions which exist between the imperialist states. I refer, first and foremost, to the contradictions between Great Britain and the U.S.A. But at the present time the contradictions between Germany and France along with her allies have become still sharper.

BRITAIN, THE U.S.A., AND JAPAN

Anglo-American contradictions became particularly clear at the end of the world imperialist war of 1914-18.

America was the very last to enter the war of 1914-18, doing so only in 1917. The gains achieved by America as a result of this war were colossal. America gathered together two-thirds of the world's supply of gold in the vaults of its banks, while its trade doubled during the period of and immediately after the war. During the war, America captured a number of England's markets, and continued to compete with England after the war as well, squeezing it out of the markets which the latter had had a firm grip on prior to the war.

The interests of Great Britain and the U.S.A. come into collision in a whole number of countries, especially in South and Caribbean (Central) America. A constant struggle is going on between England and America for markets and sources of raw material in all the countries of South and Caribbean America. England and America have invested huge sums of money in railroads and municipal services (tramways) there, they are engaged in a struggle for concessions, for influence over the bourgeois and feudal cliques in these countries, which are engaged in helping the Englishmen and the Americans to rob the population. To a very great extent the British and American imperialists are behind the constant coups d'etat that take place in these countries. The war between Paraguay and Bolivia which has been going on up to now, for the oil region of Chaco, is being carried on in the interests of England and America. America also competes against England even in England's dominion, Canada. As a result of the Washington agreement in 1922, the U.S.A. navy was made equal to the English navy which had been the most powerful hitherto, and thus England lost its supremacy as mistress of the seas. At the same time, after the war, Great Britain owed America a tremendous sum of war debts.

Tremendous contradictions also exist between America, Japan and Great Britain in the Pacific Ocean.

According to the Washington agreement, which was a continuation of the Versailles agreement, the principle of the "open" door in China was established and the "indivisibility" of China was recognized in the so-called Nine Power Pact. Bearing in mind the relationship of forces

and the economic and technical superiority of the U.S.A. over England and Japan, which existed at that time in the Far East, these principles were the most favorable for the plunder of China by America. By seizing Manchuria, Japan, of course, squeezed the other imperialist powers out of Manchuria. As is well known, Japan did not limit itself to the seizure of Manchuria, but is bringing about a military onslaught on Mongolia and northern China. It is beginning to carry through its plan of the monopoly enslavement of China. America sees the violation of its own imperialist interests in China, in this policy being pursued in China by Japan.

The contradictions between Japan and America are not limited only to China and the countries which lie along the coast of the Pacific Ocean. With its cheap commodities, Japan is successfully competing against America in the South and Caribbean American countries and even in the American colony, the Philippines. It is true that the figures for 1933-34 regarding Japanese and American trade in China indicate important advantages of America over Japan. Thus, for instance, in 1928, Japan introduced into China 26 per cent of the total imports, while America covered only 16 per cent. In 1930, America introduced commodities into China valued at 232 million Chinese dollars, while Japan imported goods valued at 237 million Chinese dollars, *i.e.*, more than America did. But in 1933 already, America imported into China goods valued at 297 million dollars (22 per cent), while Japan imported goods valued at only 132 million dollars, and while in 1934 America imported into China goods valued at 272 million dollars (26 per cent), Japan imported into China goods valued at 127 million Chinese dollars (12.4 per cent). This very great decrease of Japanese imports into China is to be explained partially by the widely developed boycott of Japanese goods in 1933 in China. (All these figures about foreign trade of Japan and America in China do not include imports into Manchuria.) Japan is exerting colossal efforts to alter this relationship in its own favor, not only by war measures but by compelling the Nanking government to openly set about crushing the anti-Japanese boycott. Following the seizure of Manchuria by Japan, the foreign trade of Manchuria has fallen completely into the hands of Japan.

Prior to 1922, England supported Japan and was connected with it by the military alliance which was directed without a doubt against America. But according to the Washington agreement, this military alliance was torn up, on the insistence of America. Although sharp contradictions also exist between England and Japan, England coming up against fierce competition by Japan not only in China itself (in Central China, especially in Huan-dun, Huan-see and other provinces where England is attempting to entrench itself in view of the proximity of Hong Kong), but even in Britain's colony, India (Japan is more and more attempting to extend its imports with its cheap textiles at the expense of England, and on the Indian market); this, however, does not exclude Anglo-Japanese collaboration in the struggle against the U.S.A.

England has tremendous interests in China. Here are a few figures to show how great these are. In 1930, England imported into China commodities valued at 108 million Chinese dollars, and in 1933 the figure was 134 million Chinese dollars.

England is following with alarm how Japan is consolidating its position in China, but it has been compelled to a certain degree to support Japan in return for support against America.

The tearing up of the Washington agreement about the limitation of naval armaments, on the initiative of Japan which has been striving to bring about the equality of its fleet with that of America, has sharpened the struggle on the Pacific Ocean still more.

GERMAN FASCISM AND THE POLICY OF REVENGE

What has been the course of the sharpening of imperialist contradictions in Europe?

As soon as the fascists came to power in Germany (on January 30, 1933), the French bourgeoisie were faced with the danger of German revenge.

France is afraid of Germany. In 1914, Germany and its weak ally, Austro-Hungary, fought against four big imperialist states, and at the beginning of the war, Germany was victorious. Had America, which at the end of the war joined with the enemies of Germany and gave them a preponderating position, not done so, had England not taken the side of France, then France would have been crushed in this war. German troops came close to Paris, and France remembers this quite well.

Therefore, when the fascists came to power in Germany, and immediately made an open declaration of Germany's intention to get back its former provinces, taken away as a result of the war, France, which in the given circumstances was interested in not allowing a war to take place; began to seek the support of the U.S.S.R. which has consistently and insistently carried through and is still carrying through a policy of peace.

THE U.S.S.R. AND THE CAPITALIST WORLD

The fundamental alterations which have taken place in recent years in the relation of forces between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist world, between the country where socialism is flourishing, and decaying capitalism, is of decisive importance for the entire international situation. The more the productive forces grow in the Soviet Union, the more its technical and economic independence of its imperialist surroundings becomes consolidated, the higher the material and cultural level of the workers and collective farmers, who already constitute a gigantic family of builders of socialism, and the more clearly the superiority of the socialist over the capitalist mode of production stands out before the whole of the world, to that degree does the attractive power of the Soviet Union in the eyes of the exploited and oppressed masses become more powerful and more insurmountable. The bourgeoisie of the big capitalist countries are hoping and are making efforts to find a solution to this growing contradiction between capitalism and socialism in an anti-Soviet war. But at the same time as the intrigues and plots arranged by the imperialists are going on, the defensive power of the Soviet Union is growing, the Red Army is becoming steeled, and the toilers throughout the whole of the world are developing the consciousness of the need to defend the Land of Socialism with their lives against military attack. The liquidation of the capitalist classes in the U.S.S.R. cuts at the roots of all the calculations of the imperialists as to the possibility of basing themselves on the forces of the internal counter-revolution in case of an attack on the Soviet borders, while the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. which defends the vital interests of the toilers throughout the world, exposes the military adventures and hinders the operation of their robber plans.

Thanks to this, the government of the Soviet Union, led by the Party, has succeeded hitherto in staving off war in the Far East. Recently, after almost two years of negotiations, the U.S.S.R. secured the conclusion of an agreement regarding the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway, which although it is no guarantee against war, still must for a time cool down the charged atmosphere in the Far East.

The Soviet Union is also carrying on a determined struggle to keep the war-mongers in Europe in check.

Many capitalist governments, for reasons already referred to, have been compelled in one way or another to support the peace policy of the Soviet Government. In these circumstances, the capitalist states have every reason to fear that war against the U.S.S.R. will call forth revolution in their rear and will result in their own destruction.

GERMANY—FRANCE—POLAND

The line taken by France towards a rapprochement with the U.S.S.R. cuts across the aggressive plans of Germany. In its efforts to deceive France, Germany is doing everything possible to calm the latter by declaring that after the return of the Saar region to Germany, "it is prepared to promise that it has no claims on France and that it has no aggressive intentions in relation to its western neighbors". Germany is openly proposing to France, England and Italy to undertake joint action against the U.S.S.R.

But Germany's robber plans are not only directed against the Soviet Union. The declarations made by the fascist leaders that they are striving to seize land only in the East (the U.S.S.R.), and thus allegedly to defend "human civilization from Bolshevism", are meant to cover up their preparations for an offensive against France, Belgium, Austria, Denmark, Czechoslovakia and Lithuania.

As is well known, according to the Versailles Treaty, Poland was given the so-called "Polish Corridor" which cuts off part of Eastern Prussia from the remainder of Germany. When a German travels from Berlin to Koenigsburg, he must travel through the "Polish Corridor", a territory which now belongs to Poland. To travel through this "Corridor", he must either have a Polish visa or else remain in a closed wagon. According to the same agreement, Poland was allowed to build its own military harbor, (the port of Gdynia) near the German town of Danzig, which was transformed into a "free" city. Poland also received from Germany a part of Upper Silesia, which is rich in coal and iron.

Germany of course, does not give up hope of receiving back all that Poland received under the Versailles Treaty. But Germany is also carrying on a policy of lulling Poland with promises that not only does Germany not lay claim to its former territory, but that it will "make a gift" to Poland of part of Soviet Ukraine, in case of joint victory over the U.S.S.R. Of course, once war begins and German troops enter the territory of their ally, Poland, they will not so easily leave it. But Polish imperialism, blinded by its robber desires, is inclined to underestimate this danger.

Poland, which after the advent of Hitler to power, began under the influence of France, to alter its anti-Soviet policy to one of a rapprochement with the U.S.S.R., has in the recent period taken the side of fascist Germany and is supporting the military adventurist policy of German fascism, although not without wavering and secret fear,

THE POLICY OF GREAT BRITAIN

A few words about the policy of Great Britain. The policy pursued by England in Europe is just as dual as its policy in the Far East.

England is linked up with France. They fought together against Germany. They were allies, but at the same time England is afraid of France becoming strong and of it becoming the leading force on the European continent. Great Britain sees, or at least saw not so long ago, a counter-blast to France in the shape of Germany. This explains why it is, that until very recently England, to a greater or lesser degree and even not always in hidden form, supported the foreign policy of German fascism. And the note of "protest", issued by the British government against the declaration of universal military service in Germany, was rather calculated to favor the ferocious military aggression of Germany than to hold it back. None the less, this animal appetite of a hungry imperialism, displayed by Hitler in his negotiation with Simon and Eden, compelled an important section of the British bourgeoisie to be very seriously on their guard. Hitler's declaration to the effect that German aviation is not behind that of Great Britain, the claims he made to the construction of a powerful navy, are, judging from the British press, sufficiently transparent indications of Germany's colonial claims, etc., and all this could not fail to show England that Germany is aiming at setting the flames of war alight throughout the world, in the near future, a war for which British imperialism is far from being prepared as yet.

This is why, after Hitler had displayed his cards in a clearer way than previously, two main groupings are to be discerned in the camp of the British bourgeoisie.

One group, to which a section of the diehards and also such liberals as Lloyd George belong, are declaring in favor of stopping German expansion westward (against the borders of France which are not far from the coast of Great Britain), and to give Germany freedom of action in the east of Europe. In other words, to direct the armed forces of Germany against the U.S.S.R., calculating that a German-Soviet war would weaken both sides for a long time. Linked up with this are their calculations that in case of an attack by Germany in alliance with Poland against the U.S.S.R. from the West, Japan will attack the U.S.S.R. in the Far East. Japan will then cease penetrating the southern and central regions of China where England has huge interests.

The other groupings, however, among the British bourgeoisie, cannot fail to see that the ferocious military adventurism of Germany threatens to bring about a war which will draw everybody in. On the other hand, this influential grouping of the English bourgeoisie cannot but see that the Soviet policy of peace does not contradict the interests of those countries which for one reason or another are not interested, in the present circumstances, in unleashing a new world war. This section of the British bourgeoisie correctly understands the assertion made by Comrade Litvinov that "peace is indivisible", that war between the U.S. S.R. and Germany will inevitably become a world war, and that a world war may lead to the collapse of the capitalist system in a number of countries.

THE ARMAMENTS RACE

The preparations for a world war are going on at full speed. Armaments are growing at a fierce speed. Colossal sums of money, squeezed

out of the toilers, are being spent on armaments which are already far superior to the armed forces of the main imperialist countries on the eve of the World War of 1914-18.

The total number of men in the armies of the five states, Japan, Germany, France, America and England, amounted to 1,541,500 in 1914, and 8,000,000 reserves. In 1934, the total number of soldiers in the armies of these five states was 2,123,500 regulars and 20,000,000 reserves. As regards Germany, after the introduction of universal military service, its army will total 720,000 men, not counting the storm detachments, the labor camps, etc., which cover about 2,000,000 men.

The growth of military technique is interesting. In 1914 one American division could fire 163,000 shots per minute out of all its rifles and machine guns. In 1934, the corresponding figure was 422,000 shots. In 1914, a French division could fire 103,000 shots, and in 1934, 212,000 shots per minute. While in 1914, one American division could by artillery fire discharge 8.1 ton weight of ammunition in one minute, in 1934 an American division could fire 17.6 tons per minute.

Another couple of comparative figures. In the imperialist war, the German army fired 286 million shots from machine guns, and used up 6,000 million bullets. In 1934, the Reichswehr was able to treble its firing power.

Seventy per cent of all factories in Germany are now working on preparations for war. The enterprises producing machine guns are working without a stop, day and night. Aviation factories in Germany are in a position to produce 15 airplanes per day.

II. HOW THE SPECIAL KIND OF DEPRESSION IS DEVELOPING

At the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., Comrade Stalin pointed out that in the majority of capitalist countries the lowest point of the crisis had been passed in 1932, and that following that period, there was to be noted the passage of the crisis to a special kind of depression.

The consequence of the economic crisis of 1929-32 was that production was very severely cut down, and that enterprises were not working at full pressure. After 1932, while the economic crisis continued, a stop was put in the majority of countries to the cutting down of production and to the fall of the quantity of the productive apparatus in use. In a whole number of countries, an unequal and unstable growth of industrial production began, mainly in individual branches of industry.

I quote figures which are the official statistics issued in capitalist countries. According to these statistics, the total production of all the capitalist countries increased in the following way by comparison with 1932. If we take 100 as representing the year 1929, then the corresponding figure in December, 1932, was 66.1; in December, 1933, 76.2, and in March, 1934, 82.2. Thus, in a year and three months, production increased by 16.1 per cent (these figures are from the International Monthly Bulletin of the League of Nations, No. 3, 1935). According to the figures of the German Economic Research Institute, the index in March, 1934, was not 82.2, but 89.7, while in September of the same year it fell again to 80.0).

THE GROWTH OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES

The U.S.A. If we take 100 to represent the average amount of industrial production for the years 1923-25, the level of industrial pro-

duction for March, 1933, was 56 (the lowest point reached in America during the crisis). In June, 1933, the figure rose to 101 (*i.e.*, higher than in the years 1923-25). In November, 1933, there was a new fall to 71, by March, 1934, the figure had again reached 91, while by September, 1934, there was a further sharp fall to 69. (Index of the central financial administration of the U.S.A.)

One of the ways in which the special kind of depression shows itself is in the fact that the process of the rise and fall of industrial production is a jerky one, in the fact that the increase of production is not of a firm character, and that this special kind of depression does not lead to a "new upsurge and development of industry, but neither does it lead back to the lowest point to which it previously fell" (Stalin).

Take Germany, and let 100 represent the level of industrial production in 1928. In 1929, the index of production was 101.8, in 1932 it fell to 60.4, in 1933 it rose to 70.6 and in 1934 to 88.8 (Quarterly Bulletin of the German Economic Research Institute—Special Bulletin No. 31). Thus, industrial production in Germany rose without any big lapses.

In Germany (and in Japan) more than in any other country, the growth of industry has been called forth by the gigantic growth of armaments and by colossal orders from military institutions.

If we take the level of industrial production in Japan for the year 1928 to be 100, the corresponding figure in 1932 was 107.9, and in 1933, 124. (Monthly Bulletin of the League of Nations for 1934.) In general, a growth of Japan's industry is to be observed in the recent years, especially since Japan seized Manchuria. This growth follows two lines.

Firstly, the increase of industrial production for war purposes. Last year, about 50 big factories were built in Japan, connected with the war being carried on in China, and with the preparations for a big war against the U.S.S.R., and possibly against America.

To insure that they were supplied with the materials that need to be imported, the Japanese were compelled intensively to export their commodities to all countries which would purchase them. To ensure that as great a quantity as possible of these commodities are purchased, the Japanese have begun to sell their products at unbelievably cheap prices. Thus, for instance, England has for tens of years supplied textile goods to all countries, including its own colonies. In recent years, however, Japan has outdistanced England, both in the production and in the export of textiles. During the crisis, cloth is also being consumed, but the Japanese manufacturers by selling such cloth at exceptionally cheap prices are competing successfully against Great Britain and other states, and are driving them out of the markets which the latter had previously won.

Hence the second line of the development of Japanese industry.

This is why industrial production in Japan in 1934 once again was above the high level reached in 1933. Japan can sell cheap commodities thanks to the great length of the working day, the exceptionally low wages paid and to the fact that a tremendous number of children are employed.

TRADE WAR

Here is another characteristic fact of great importance. Whereas industrial production is increasing to a certain degree, world trade is not extending, but on the contrary, is declining.

I will quote one figure. The world trade turnover has been reduced from 280,000 million gold marks in 1928 to 90,000 million marks in 1934, (according to League of Nations statistics).

So as to make it possible to dispose of their products, all capitalist countries have either closed their borders to the import of commodities from other countries, or have very much increased customs duties on imported commodities. The bourgeoisie make use of the cutting down of imports from other countries to raise prices within their own countries of industrial and agricultural commodities produced in their own countries. At the same time the very same commodities are exported abroad at very low prices. Two prices operate, one for the home market and the other for the foreign market. This is called dumping. Dumping is widely spread in the capitalist countries as a weapon in the trade war and is a usual method employed to conquer "somebody's else's" market.

If there is no direct war as yet between the biggest states, if they are not engaged as yet in a war by force of arms, then this war is going on in the sphere of economics. All told, world trade has declined, and this testifies to the fact that the depression of a special kind is not leading to a general economic advance.

III. HOW THE SPECIAL KIND OF DEPRESSION REFLECTS ITSELF ON THE STANDARD OF LIVING OF THE WORKING CLASS IN THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

UNEMPLOYMENT

According to official statistics there were 28,000,000 unemployed in the capitalist world in 1932. In 1933 there were 23,500,000 to 24,000,000, while in March 1934, the figure was 22,000,000. (See *Economy and Statistics* for May, 1934). But in the first place, these figures are very much reduced. Second, the relationship between these figures for 1932 and 1934 testifies to a very insignificant reduction of the number of unemployed in connection with the passage of the crisis to a special kind of depression. Third, in a number of places, unemployment has increased in the second half of 1934 by comparison with the first half of the year.

What is the situation now in the capitalist factories and in what conditions do the workers carry on their work, in spite of the growth of industrial production?

The index of the total average sum of weekly wages paid in 1932 was 60.2; the index of the productivity of labor per worker per hour in 1932 was 119.6 (in both cases taking 100 to represent 1929). That is to say, by 1932, the productivity of labor per worker had increased by about 20 per cent, while the total wages per week were reduced by almost 40 per cent. In 1933, the productivity of labor per worker per hour increased by 10 per cent more, reaching 130 per cent of the 1929 level, while the total wages bill increased by less than 1 per cent (61 against 60.2). (Bulletin of the Chamber of Trade.)

These are the general figures covering all capitalist countries. The picture will be clearer if we take the figures according to separate countries.

In the mining industry in Great Britain, the productivity of labor per shift, for the year 1934, increased by 9.6 per cent as compared with 1928, while by comparison with 1924, the figure was even 16 per cent higher. The annual wage received by the British miner, however, dropped

during the years of the crisis, by 9.3 per cent. The same is true of the railwaymen (official figures taken from the *Economist*, London, April 14, 1934). Hitherto there have been no less than 2.2 millions of unemployed, in spite of the fact that production has increased.

Take Germany. According to fascist statistics, 18,000,000 workers, office employees, etc., were employed in Germany in 1929, in which year they received 15,000,000,000 marks in wages. In 1934, 15,000,000 workers, office employees, etc., were employed and their total wage was about 7,000,000,000 marks. (Weekly Bulletin of the German Economic Research Institute.)

At the Seimens Schukert factories, 79,000 workers, office employees, etc., were employed in 1932, their total wages amounting to 1,753,000,000 marks. In 1933, 79,000 workers, etc., were employed, but the wage bill paid was less than in 1932, amounting to 1,428,000,000 marks. In 1934, 110,000 workers, etc., were employed in these enterprises, but their total wage bill was 1,436,000,000 marks, *i.e.*, almost as much as the amount paid in 1933. In the period between 1932 and 1934, the number of workers employed had increased by 45 per cent, whereas wages had been reduced by 18 per cent. (Annual Report of Messrs. Seimen Schukert for 1933-34.)

During this period, wages throughout Germany as a whole were reduced by 39 per cent. (Weekly Bulletin of the German Economic Research Institute.)

In Japan, in the period between 1930 and 1934, production increased by 18.4 per cent, while the number of workers employed during this period declined by 3 per cent. (Index of the Mitsubisi Bank, 1934.) In the woolen industry, the average total product per shift increased in the period between 1928-30 by 30 per cent. In the spinning mills the number of workers looking after 1,000 spindles declined during this period by 43 per cent. In the weaving mills, the number of workers required to serve 1,000 looms, declined in 1932 by 32 per cent as compared with 1928 (figures issued by the Japanese Textile Manufacturers' Association for 1933). The productivity of labor has increased to an unbelievable extent, but exclusively at the expense of the sweat and blood of the workers.

As regards the wages earned by Japanese workers, here are figures comparing the wages earned by the worker in Japan and in Great Britain. A textile worker receives 80 shillings per week in England and 17 shillings in Japan, *i.e.*, the Japanese worker receives only 14 per cent of what the English worker receives. The chemical worker receives 134 shillings per week in England, and 19 shillings in Japan; in the electrical industry, 82 shillings per week in England and 7 in Japan.

The figures quoted on the wages of the British worker (taken from a report of the Federation of British Industries) are those of the highest paid workers, and only a very insignificant number of British workers receive such wages. The average wage of British workers of all categories is about 50 shillings per week. But even in this case there is a colossal difference between the degree of exploitation of the workers in England and Japan.

While the length of the working week in England is 48 hours, it is 78 hours in Japan. This is why Japanese manufacturers are able to sell the products of their factories so cheaply. But the cost to the Japanese working class is not such a light one.

What conclusions can we draw from the figures and facts quoted?

Beginning with the year 1932, the bourgeoisie have undoubtedly succeeded in increasing their profits at the expense of the working class. For instance, in the U.S.A., 200 of the biggest manufacturing companies received incomes in the year 1934 which were 150 per cent higher than their income in 1926. Their profits totalled \$430,000,000 as against \$100,000,000 in 1932 (report published by the Research Bureau of the N.I.R.A., 1935).

In England 1,975 firms made the following clear profits, 1932—£140,760,000; 1933—£144,839,000! 1934—£168,877,000. The trusts and concerns in Germany, Japan and France received no less profits.

The most powerful capitalist groupings are attempting to make their way out of the crisis at the expense of the toilers, and primarily at the expense of the workers, and they have achieved some results in this connection. The workers have gained nothing from the slight improvement of capitalist industry in connection with the passage of the crisis to a special kind of depression.

Conclusions: (a) Unemployment has not been wiped out, in spite of the increase of industrial production. The unemployed army has been transformed from a reserve army into a permanent army. (b) Wages, which were very severely reduced during the period of the sharpening of the economic crisis, have not been increased, but continue to be still further reduced in some countries. The purchasing power of the main masses of the population continues to fall. The narrowing down of the home market prevents the capitalist world from making its way out of the crisis. (c) The urge towards struggle and towards unity is growing in the ranks of the working class.

Regarding a Document of the Second International

By G. VALETSKY

THE leaders of the Second International and its semi-official heralds break forth in rage, whenever we record the fact that this organization has for some time been in a state of difficult crisis and disintegration. However, the least we can say about this society is that on each and every occasion when it is faced with the necessity of taking a decision on a question of international character, a question which involves the deep interests of the working class, it presents a picture of great panic, and the language it uses on such occasions shows its extreme confusion.

It is of extraordinary interest to analyze the proclamation issued by the Second International on May Day, 1935, from this point of view. (It would be well, by the way, to study the collection of May Day proclamations issued year after year by the Second International since the war.) Everything in this document is characteristic—that what is said in it, that what is intentionally left unsaid, and its content and form.

The document is brief—but not with the brevity of precise and clear-cut formulations. This brevity is based upon the desire to say as little as possible and to limit the document to vague and ambiguous general remarks.

The authors of the document have demonstrated marvelous talents in tight-rope walking: they succeeded in avoiding all mention of the existence of the U.S.S.R., of the question of class collaboration, of the struggle against the bourgeoisie. There is not a single word in the document about the unity of forces of the proletariat in the struggle against fascism, the offensive of capitalism and against the menace of war. They are carefully silent on these “ticklish” questions which at the present moment are of such deep concern to the working class masses.

They speak about the war danger as everyone speaks about this danger, but throughout the document they are sly enough not to mention the word imperialism, and while speaking about war, which they, of course, condemn with the same platitudes used by all bourgeois pacifist hypocrites, they avoid calling this war, imperialist war.

It is true that they are compelled to admit that “in Europe the danger of the outbreak of war comes from Hitler Germany, in Asia—from militarist Japan”. But they were extremely careful not to mention *against whom primarily* this military aggression is directed. They do not speak about this because they fear the very name of the U.S.S.R. If they were to state against whom war is being prepared by Hitler and Japan, they would have to proclaim the necessity of unconditional defense of the U.S.S.R. against all imperialist aggression, and this they do not and cannot do. They swallow the very name of the U.S.S.R. because in mentioning this name, these people, who present themselves as champions of peace, would be compelled to say that the U.S.S.R. is

the only state which is in all seriousness and with all its forces fighting against war and for peace. They would be compelled to say that the U.S.S.R. is the only state which, since the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and independent of the situation elsewhere, has been systematically and consistently pursuing its peace policy, the only state which at the present moment, more than ever before, is the driving axle of all efforts directed against war.

The authors of the proclamation of the Second International in several places ambiguously speak of the "capture of power" by the "toiling masses", by "socialism"; they speak about a future when the leadership of the League of Nations will be "in the hands of socialist powers". And even here they pretend to have "forgotten" the existence of a country covering one-sixth of the earth's surface, where the workers in alliance with the toiling peasants have *captured power and are maintaining this power*. They appear to have forgotten that among the powers in the League of Nations there exists a great socialist, anti-capitalist, and anti-imperialist power. They pretend that they have forgotten this "detail", as they would wish to forget that the only delegate in the Council of the League of Nations who came out openly in defense of arming Hitler Germany was the representative of the "socialist" government of Denmark, who had credentials from two other Scandinavian "socialist" governments.

They wish to forget that the only big newspaper in Great Britain which openly came out against the protest of the League of Nations, in connection with the German armaments, was the *Daily Herald*, the chief organ of the Labor Party, one of the leading parties of the Second International.

They speak about "capturing power", hoping in this way to get the attention of the workers who understand by this the establishment of open proletarian dictatorship according to the Russian pattern. But in reality they simply have in mind a "different method", *viz.*, the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, the policy of government coalition with the bourgeois parties, as now practised in Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Denmark and Belgium, and for which the road is now being laid in England and Holland. This is the coalition policy which cleared the road for fascism in Germany, Austria, Spain and Latvia, as it had previously cleared the road for fascist dictatorship in Poland and Bulgaria. This "capture of power" is being practised by them at present in the form of "strong governments", governments with "special powers" which are preparing "government reforms" based upon "corporative" and "totalitaire" samples.

In the proclamation of the Second International there are many other things worthy of note. For instance, it speaks of the "ruling classes" which "remain powerless (!) in the face of the poverty of the masses" and which should be given a little vitality by means of a dose of government collaboration. The proclamation contains the slogan "for a plan of systematic struggle against the crisis", a very good and worthy "plan" indeed, as yet unrealized, in the style of the infamous De Man plan, whose author has already become one of his majesty's ministers—a minister with a portfolio but without a plan.

There is not one word in the May Day proclamation of the Second International which indicates that the workers can achieve nothing, either nationally or internationally, while their forces are scattered,

not a word to indicate that the unity of struggle is more and more becoming an urgent necessity for the working class, to indicate that the Communist workers, the Communist Parties of all countries and the Communist International itself, propose unity and are carrying it out in everyday practice, that the Executive Committee of the Communist International particularly proposed joint May Day actions.

This is not accidental. In this document everything is directed towards a single aim: to sabotage the struggles of the proletariat, to replace this struggle by collaboration with the bourgeoisie; to sabotage the struggle against fascism, replacing it by participation in pre-fascist governments; to sabotage the struggle against imperialist war and defense of the Soviet Union, replacing it by a pacifist policy which, in reality, is the faithful weapon of the imperialist and fascist war-mongers, to sabotage the mighty will of the working masses for class unity in action.

And all of this—appears in the form of a poorly made-up document which smells of hypocrisy and panic.

This panic is revealed even in the signatures. The “May Day Proclamation to the Toilers of All Countries” is signed neither by the Executive Committee of the Socialist and Labor International, nor by the Bureau of the Executive Committee. It is signed by the “Administrative Commission”. Perhaps this can serve to lessen their guilt.

Danzig

By A. KAROLSKI

THE elections in Danzig did not produce the results which the fascists wanted. There can be no doubt whatsoever that the expectations and prophecies of the fascists who anticipated a repetition of the victory they had gained in the Saar were not fulfilled.

How did this happen?

Let us try to analyze the development of events, and avoid drawing conclusions from the Danzig campaign which may confuse the working class and all those who are opposed to National-Socialism.

The result of the elections in Danzig was, undoubtedly, a disappointment to the National-Socialists. But we must not exaggerate this fact into being a "colossal victory for the anti-fascist people's front in Danzig", as some anti-fascist newspapers are doing. It is just in the last three months that we observe the further growth in Germany of a wave of nationalism, which in some respects calls to mind the powerful wave of fascism which swept throughout the whole of Germany in 1933 when Hitler came to power.

One anti-fascist newspaper even went so far as to make the following assertion with regard to the results of the elections in Danzig:

"The defeat which Hitler has suffered represents the collapse of his incitement to war, of militarism, of the introduction of universal conscription, and of chauvinism. No one other than the Nazis themselves declared this outcome to be inevitable."

"In reality the results of the elections in Danzig show the degree to which the mass basis of the Hitler regime is being narrowed down."

To write in such a way means to put forward one's desires as an accomplished fact. The anti-fascist movement will gain nothing from this kind of thing. It is unfortunate that we have still not succeeded in dispersing the wave of chauvinism in Germany.

As is well known, it was intended to carry through the elections in Danzig a year later. But the fascists were in a hurry. They wanted to make use of the favorable situation which followed on the Saar plebiscite, both in their home as well as in foreign policy. By speeding up the elections in Danzig, the fascists counted on extending those positions in the sphere of foreign policy which they had won in the Saar region, and to intensify the pressure on the big powers so as the more easily to do away with the last remnants of the Versailles Treaty.

In the sphere of home politics, the fascists made wide use of the introduction of universal conscription, and around it raised an unheard-of chauvinistic and nationalistic war atmosphere, accompanied by a wave of terror against the Communist Party. For this purpose the fascists wanted to make use of the expected consolidation of their positions at the Danzig elections. The German fascists hoped that they would obtain a majority of at least two thirds of the votes to the Volk-

stag (the Danzig Parliament), so as to advance to their goal by "legal means", so to speak, without resorting this time to the putschist methods, which they had made use of with such unfortunate results when they attempted to bring about the Anschluss (unification) with Austria in July 1934. The National-Socialists who had already been in power in Danzig for two years hoped to bring about alterations in the Constitution with the aid of a two-thirds majority and to create all the pre-conditions for bringing about the unification of Danzig with the "Third Empire" by "normal methods".

But things turned out otherwise. A few days prior to the elections, Goering, Goebbels, Hess and Rust, who were directly responsible for leading the election struggle in Danzig, declared that National-Socialism was fully guaranteed a 90 per cent favorable vote—not to mention a two-thirds majority. The results of the elections are well known. The following table gives a general picture of the elections:

	—1935—		—1933—	
	Votes	Seats	Votes	Seats
National-Socialists	139,043	44	107,331	41
Social-Democrats	38,005	12	37,882	12
Communists	7,090	2	14,566	5
Center Party	31,524	9	31,336	10
Nationalists	9,691	3	13,596	4
Ex-servicemen	750	—	—	—
Poles	8,310	2	6,743	2

The picture is less favorable for the National-Socialists if we take the city of Danzig alone, without the countryside, where the influence of the Nazis is stronger than in the towns. In the thickly populated working-class quarters of the city of Danzig, the Nazis were in a minority as compared to the oppositional parties. There were 188 election points in Danzig. In 75 of these, the oppositional parties obtained a majority, and in ten of these the Socialist and Communist Parties received more votes than the National-Socialists did, while at three points the latter were beaten by the Center Party.

It is clear that the fascist press cannot hide its disappointment. Instead of the so-called "normalization", on which the Nazis counted, they had to declare that they would have in the future to carry on an energetic struggle against the opposition. There was a very great increase in the terror directed against the anti-fascists, and we must still expect all kinds of surprises. But the very fact that 100,000 electors in Danzig voted against the Nazis, creates certain difficulties as far as the fascists are concerned! Thanks to this, the resistance offered by the masses has grown, and at the same time the legend that the fascists have the whole population of Danzig behind them has been blown sky high.

What do the results of the elections in Danzig show?

First and foremost, that the fascists can only stage "national unity" when they destroy all the remnants of bourgeois democracy and ensure their totality by the use of the most ferocious terror. In other words, the elections in Danzig show that in those places where the proletariat find it possible to declare their will in conditions which provide even the smallest liberty of movement, they declare in the majority against the fascists. Nobody can refute the fact that the majority of the workers in Danzig voted against the fascists, and therefore when the fascists declare in connection with the elections to the Confidence Councils that

90 per cent of the working class are behind the Nazis—this is a lie and a fraud. The fascists are only in a position to make a display of the astronomical figures of the votes they receive at elections when the people are held down in the vise of fascist totality.

But the terror in Danzig was not less nor weaker than in the Saar region. On the contrary, it was stronger. How then are we to explain the difference in the results of the voting in Danzig and the Saar?

We think that it is out of place to make a mechanical comparison between the Saar plebiscite and the Danzig elections. The content of the electoral struggle in Danzig was different from what it was in the Saar region. But first let us say a few words about the common features between the situation in Danzig and in the Saar.

Both in Danzig and in the Saar region there is a fierce fascist terror directed against all opponents of the National-Socialists, but especially so against the Communists. We may say that the terror in Danzig was still fiercer than it was in the Saar. In the Saar region the Communist Party was legal, and published a number of legal newspapers. The Communist Party in the Saar frequently succeeded, in spite of the Nazi terror, in winning the right to rally the masses and to organize mass demonstrations. In Danzig the Communist Party was illegal and, with the exception of one meeting held in Tsopot, did not succeed in organizing any mass meetings at all. The Party's chief functionaries were in jail. The Party could not, as an organization, put forward its own list in the elections. The list presented figured as a personal one in the name of the candidates put forward. The organs of the League of Nations operated in both the Saar region and in Danzig, yet all the same the conditions under which the voting took place in Danzig were different from those in the Saar.

As we stated at the outset, the Nazis thought that it would be possible to make use of the success achieved in the Saar to obtain some advantages out of the colossal rise of the wave of nationalism which began in connection with the introduction of universal military service. But here we come close to the special conditions of the electoral struggle in Danzig. The Nazis in Danzig proceeded to mobilize the masses in good time, and this campaign assumed unheard-of proportions—they spent millions on this. Nearly all the halls were at the disposal of the fascists. The apparatus of the State and the municipality, as well as all unified organizations, were in their hands. The fascists held 1,300 meetings in the city of Danzig alone, addressed by the best orators from Germany. The Nazis imported 13,000 people from Germany, who allegedly had the right to vote in Danzig, and yet the elections ended up in a fiasco. The cause of this was that the main problem that faced the electorate in Danzig was quite a different one from the one that faced the electorate in the Saar region.

We can say that the Nazis in the Saar region succeeded to a certain extent in presenting their struggle for the unification of the Saar to Germany, not as a narrow party struggle. They operated under the cover of the "German Front", around which they developed very wide campaigns. For 15 years the Saar region was occupied by French imperialism. The voting in the Saar took place in the presence of the military forces of the League of Nations. The popular slogan in the Saar dialect of "Negs wi hem" (We want home!) embraced far wider sections of the population in the Saar than did the slogans put forward

by the National-Socialists in other cases. Tens of thousands of anti-fascists who were hostile to Hitler believed that they were voting not for the Nazis but for Germany, which sooner or later would rid itself of Hitler. In the Saar the wave of nationalism reached an unheard of height. In no other place as in the Saar has there been such a decisive confirmation of the thesis that nationalism covers far wider sections of the population than fascism does. Excited crowds of children who followed from house to house on the heels of those engaged in distributing anti-fascist leaflets, and spat at them and made a mockery of them, as though they were traitors, were at times a greater obstacle in the way of the anti-fascists than the open terror of the National-Socialist Storm Troopers, and since the anti-fascists in the Saar were neither able nor knew how to carry on a struggle against chauvinism and nationalism, Hitler succeeded in obtaining victory.

The position was different in Danzig, where the slogan "Back to the empire" was put forward by the fascists not in the same way as they did in the Saar. The slogan was to a certain degree kept in the background, was advanced in a negative form and not as openly as it was in the Saar. In the propaganda of the National-Socialists it was not the question of the Anschluss (linking up) with the "Third Empire" which was put forward openly, so much as that "anyone who votes for the Separatists and the traitors to the fatherland and renders unification difficult". Danzig was not occupied as the Saar region was, and the advantages which the Poles have in Danzig cannot be compared with the position in the Saar region. The National-Socialist policy of a bloc with fascist Poland was unpopular in the eyes of the masses. Furthermore, the Nazis who are in power in Danzig bore the responsibility for the economic ruin of Danzig as a result of this policy.

Gdinya has paralyzed Danzig as a port. Danzig, cut off from the empire, and with the Polish Corridor in the rear, is completely dependent on Poland. The exceptional reserve displayed in the recent period by the National-Socialists in relation to Poland, and even their advances to the latter, toned down the sharp edges of the National-Socialist propaganda which had led to such success in the Saar region. This situation compelled the National-Socialists to come out openly in Danzig as a party, as against the way they behaved in the Saar region. As a result of this a big section of the petty-bourgeois electors in Danzig were not faced with the question of voting against Germany, but of voting against the National-Socialists.

There was another point which played a part. While the Nazis in the Saar region attempted to carry on a campaign for the return of the Saar to Germany, using pacifist arguments (to overcome territorial questions in dispute with France), in Danzig, on the other hand, the Nazis openly carried on a reckless campaign in favor of war and spread anti-Soviet calumny. All these points exerted decisive influence over the voting in Danzig, and brought about a result different from the one in the Saar region. While the clergy in the Saar district, which is mainly Catholic and borders chiefly on the Catholic population of Germany, did not openly declare against the Anschluss, for they regarded the plebiscite as a German problem and not as a National-Socialist problem, in Danzig, on the other hand, they acted otherwise. Bishop Oliwski and a large section of the clergy came out openly against the National-Socialists.

The results of the Danzig elections cannot be regarded as a sign of

the fall of the wave of nationalism in Germany. The wave of chauvinism in Germany is far from having been scattered. And in Danzig it also played a big part, though not in the same degree as it did in the Saar. We must therefore carry on a struggle against the incorrect conclusions drawn as to the "defeat of chauvinism", for they do not correspond to the actual situation and can exert a demoralizing influence.

The National-Socialists are attempting to count as their own the votes lost by the Communists. Everything goes to prove that this is incorrect. Neither can the number of votes received by the Communists in Danzig serve as a measure of the influence of the Communist Party in Germany. Danzig never did belong to the decisive regions where Communism and the bourgeoisie could measure their strength. The forces of the C.P.G. were always concentrated in the big industrial regions of western Germany, in the Ruhr region, Berlin and Hamburg. The decline of the Communist vote in Danzig by 6,000 cannot be placed to the credit side of fascism. A number of Communist voters were faced with the alternative of either handing over their votes to the illegal Communist Party whose active workers and deputies were in jail and whose seats threatened to be annulled, or of handing their votes to the Social-Democratic Party which in spite of certain complaints made by the Nazis was able to operate legally. This section of the Communist electors voted for the Social-Democrats, while the petty-bourgeois masses of former Social-Democratic electors ran to the side of the Nazis. We have often marked this process in Germany. The behavior of the masses of Social-Democrats and Communists confirms this. While the Communists in the Saar region have proceeded to carry on their work underground, there are more and more frequent cases where the leaders of the Social-Democratic organizations, and especially of the free trade unions under their influence (Neinkirchen), have agreed to unification and have gone over to the Nazis.

It is clear that the Communists might not only have been able to prevent a loss of votes but could have extended their positions in spite of the unfavorable situation and the illegal conditions under which they had to carry on the struggle. But the Communist Party did not carry on a struggle of principles against Social-Democracy, against the Social-Democrats. Our struggle was carried on almost exclusively in a parliamentary form, and practically no mobilization of the masses outside of parliament was to be observed.

The elections in Danzig are a warning to us that the hatred of the masses for the fascist dictatorship does not lead in the case of all of them directly to the recognition of the methods of the revolutionary class struggle. This depends, first and foremost, on the struggle we carry on. The masses have still not lost their democratic illusions. It depends to a very great degree on the work and the activity of the Communist Party, on the degree to which the Party succeeds in rallying these sections of the masses for the struggle outside of parliament, how soon the masses will be liberated from these illusions in the process of the day-to-day struggle.

The election results are a serious lesson for the Communists in Danzig. If we bear in mind how weakly the Party consolidated its influence among the masses in Danzig (there are only a few factory cells in Danzig), how insufficient was its mass work (the absence of serious work in the trade unions, both reformist and fascist) and how late the

Party began the election campaign, then the fact that 8,000 workers indicated their preparedness to fight and their loyalty to the Party of Thaelmann, is of great importance. Had we in Danzig carried on a consistent united-front policy, then we would have had the chance of smashing the sabotage of the Social-Democratic leaders and would have been able to face the fascists with a bloc of the toilers. The rotten arguments of the Social-Democrats to the effect that fear of the Communists made the united front unpopular in the Saar and that the rejection of the united front allegedly led to an increase in the number of votes given to the Social-Democrats in Danzig, could have been smashed by widely popularizing among the masses and correctly estimating the results of the election and also by an analysis of the special character of the electoral struggle in Danzig.

The results of the elections in Danzig, as we have already stated, can by no means serve as a measure to prove the decline of the wave of nationalism which continues to rage over Germany under the influence of the Nazis. But Danzig shows that when there is the slightest relaxation of "totality", the majority of the proletariat openly demonstrate their anti-fascist line. Danzig has exposed the whole lying deception and character of the alleged "unity of the people", and at the same time reminds us of the necessity of persistently unifying the masses of anti-fascists throughout Germany in the struggle at this particular stage to smash the "totalitarian" policy of fascism, and for the preparation of the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

Fiction and Reality

AN ATTACK UPON POLISH GREAT-POWER CHAUVINISM

By B. BRONKOVSKY

WHEN the bourgeoisie set up their fascist dictatorship, they base their domination more and more upon open violence. But at the same time they seek for new ways and means of ideologically linking up the Leftward-moving toiling masses to the capitalist system, and of rallying them in defense of capitalism. The faith of the masses in capitalism has been so undermined that social demagogy and anti-capitalist phraseology occupy a very big place in this arsenal of new ways and means. In place of reformist illusions about "peaceful development into socialism through organized capitalism", the bourgeoisie are putting forward new illusions based either upon suggestions for capitalist planning or upon plans for restricting or even expropriating the big capitalists, or upon plans to level all classes to the standard of the petty bourgeoisie, etc.

But one of the fundamental ideological means of deceiving the masses is still the old, tried weapon of chauvinism, militant bourgeois nationalism based on deep traditions and deep-rooted sentiments. With all the acuteness of class contradictions and the relative instability of the means of social demagogy utilized, nationalism still to this day gives excellent service to the ideology of class collaboration, to the idea of behavior that rises above classes, to the defense of the domination of the bourgeoisie, to the defense of the bourgeois State and to attempts to draw the masses into the preparations for a new imperialist war.

The establishment of fascist dictatorship in Germany, and later in a number of other countries, was accompanied not only by an intensification of chauvinism in these fascist countries, but also, as international contradictions continued to grow, by the rise of a wave of chauvinism in all other capitalist countries. Today, the question of war has been openly included on the order of the day by German fascism. The fact that this question has been raised presupposes that universal, political preparations for war are going forward at an accelerated rate, and this means first and foremost firing the masses with militaristic chauvinist sentiments.

It is just because capitalism has been shaken to its very foundations, because faith in the capitalist system is being undermined, and because several of the old means which helped to interest the masses in maintaining this system are now becoming unstable, that chauvinism is one of the biggest enemies of the proletariat and of all the toilers, is a weapon by means of which the bourgeoisie are trying to maintain their power and to plunge the world into a new imperialist blood-bath.

At the same time, it is quite a common thing to find that the role of chauvinism is underestimated.

The underestimation of the role of great-power Polish chauvinism is especially dangerous, for in Poland it has especially deep historical roots, and has quite favorable soil in consequence of the strong nation-

alist survivals which still exist among the masses. We paid dearly for this underestimation during the first stages of the development of our Party, which was delayed through the burden of Luxemburgism which we had inherited.

During the period of revolutionary storms and upheavals, during the period of deep capitalist crisis in 1917-1919, the Polish bourgeoisie succeeded, to a considerable extent with the help of nationalist ideology, in averting the establishment of workers' and peasants' power in Poland, and in setting up their own power.

In 1919-1920, the Polish bourgeoisie stirred up Polish great-power chauvinism, dragged the toilers of Poland into war to annex the Ukraine, Lithuania and White Russia, and into the war of intervention against the Soviet Union.

It was only by the use of a number of illusions, which fundamentally were also of a nationalist shade, that Pilsudski was able to provide himself with the halo of a "national hero" and "democrat", and comparatively easily to establish and consolidate the fascist dictatorship in 1926.

And, today, when the masses in their desperation are trying to find a way out of the crisis, when all parties and groupings are compelled to develop all kinds of anti-capitalist demagogy in their efforts to preserve their influence over the masses by all means possible, chauvinism still remains the means whereby the Polish bourgeoisie are upholding the crumbling edifice of their domination, and are trying to find support among the masses for their imperialist policy.

The Polish fascist bourgeoisie are today in an open bloc with Hitler, with bloodthirsty German imperialism, and with Japan, and are preparing for a counter-revolutionary anti-Soviet war, with the aid of the most reactionary groups of international capital. This policy which is being pursued in the interests of a handful of Polish capitalists, landlords, German financiers and Junkers, a policy which contradicts the fundamental interests of the Polish people and plunges the masses of the people into new desperate misery, is being and will continue to be covered by the bourgeoisie by phrases about the "defense of independence", about "the welfare of the State and the fatherland", about the "interests of the nation" and will be blessed with old traditions and national legends. It is therefore the most urgent and primary task of the Communists to unmask this false demagogy, to show up these legends, and to carry on a struggle against counter-revolutionary great-power Polish chauvinism.

* * *

What are the general characteristic features of this Polish chauvinism with which the masses have been inoculated; what form does it take?

There was extremely favorable soil in Poland for the development of nationalism, in consequence of the national oppression to which the Polish people had been subjected for over one hundred years. National enslavement, persecution of the Polish language and Polish schools, the arbitrariness of the administrative authorities and very intense exploitation—all this made it easy for the bourgeoisie to inculcate the masses with feelings of hatred towards the ruling nations, to strengthen the strong ties they had with the past, and to exaggerate and idealize all that was "national". And this, of course, could not fail to hinder

the development of the class struggle and the growth of class consciousness. The bourgeoisie cultivated and developed national feeling in the name of class peace. The Social-Democratic Party of Poland and Lithuania—the vanguard of the Polish proletariat—by virtue of its Luxemburgian ideology, was unable to direct the quite comprehensible and justifiable strivings for national emancipation into revolutionary channels, and could not fight properly against the national policy of the bourgeoisie, which, according to the Social-Democratic Party of Poland and Lithuania, had become wholly and completely linked up with the bourgeoisie of the ruling nations. The nationalist survivals and the Menshevism of the “Left” Polish Socialist Party led it in actual fact to an alliance with nationalism. Meanwhile, the bourgeoisie systematically and on a broad scale inculcated into the masses the ideology of bourgeois nationalism. Their basic task at that time was to subordinate all desires and interests to the one idea, namely, to independence, and to kindle hatred towards the ruling nations. However, this did not at all prevent the Polish bourgeoisie from actually pursuing a policy of collaboration with the ruling states. The bourgeoisie to this very day still make use of these feelings, the roots of which have spread over long years. But since then the position has changed fundamentally, the toilers of the Soviet Union having overthrown the yoke of the landlords and capitalists who oppressed the Russian and Polish peoples. By doing so, they made it possible for Poland to gain her independence. Not only does the Soviet Union not menace other peoples but, on the contrary, it has become the only real defender of peace, defender of the independence of other peoples, while Poland itself has become a state that oppresses other peoples. But the Polish bourgeoisie, on the basis of their own chauvinistic aims, continue to frighten the masses with the bogey of the loss of their independence and of a return to the past. “Polish independence” and the defense of it are the most widespread slogans in the daily agitation of the bourgeoisie and their agents. The bourgeoisie are making a special effort to inculcate into the masses a feeling of distrust in the Russian people, and in this way to paralyze the growth of sympathy for the Soviet Union. The program of the P.P.S. up to this day contains the lying phrase about the “imperialist tendencies of the Soviet Union”, a phrase, by the way, constantly made use of in their day-to-day agitation.

However, this lying demagoguery does not prevent the Polish bourgeoisie from entering into an alliance with the German fascists and the Prussian Junkers—the real oppressors of, and heirs to the slave owners of Poland. Neither did it prevent close military collaboration between the Pilsudski gang and the bourgeois, landlord, Russian counter-revolutionaries during the period of intervention and civil war, and in the years that followed.

A second characteristic feature of Polish chauvinism is that while it takes to itself all the traditions of the past, it at the same time arrays itself in “revolutionary democratic” clothing. For this purpose the bourgeoisie make use of the traditions of the liberation struggle and the Polish uprisings of the nineteenth century. This was the period when Polish capitalism was in its embryonic stage, in its youth. In their struggle for independence, the democrats from among the small, and in the main, impoverished gentry and from among the growing capitalist elements in the towns, sought for allies among the revolutionary democrats of the West. The liberation struggle in Poland, at that time

directed against the bulwark of European reaction—Russian autocracy and serfdom—was of importance from the revolutionary democratic point of view. Not only the Polish “socialists”, but the Polish bourgeois writers as well, were not above quoting Marx and Engels, whenever the latter gave such an estimate of the Polish uprisings. But these writers, of course, say nothing about the opinions expressed much later by Marx and Engels, at a time when Russia had developed from being a land of darkness and reaction into one with its own young, powerful revolutionary movement, when a new young class, the proletariat, had grown up and become strong both in Russia and Poland, a class which set itself the historic task of removing all class and national oppression by revolutionary means.

It is the ruling fraction of the fascist camp—the Pilsudski clique—that strives to come before the masses as the bearer of all the “revolutionary”, “emancipatory”, and “democratic” traditions of the past. The Pilsudski gang, like the whole of the Polish Socialist Party, was the clearest expression in the pre-war period of the leaning towards independence of the petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, and part of the middle bourgeoisie and upper strata of the peasantry as well; and they tried to draw the revolutionary working class into the channel of nationalistic policy. Therefore, they made use, at that time, of socialist phraseology, highly colored with nationalism, which they linked up in their own way with the traditions of the uprisings that had taken place in a different historical situation, at a time when the relationship of class forces was different. These decayed legends sound all the more wild and absurd today on the lips of the Pilsudski gang, who are operating fascist dictatorship in the interests of finance capital. These people have never been the real bearers of the truly revolutionary popular democratic traditions of the liberation movement in Poland. The only heirs to the best traditions of the revolutionary liberation struggle of the toilers are to be found in the new, young class—the proletariat. But the bourgeois and petty bourgeois socialists and nationalists have tried since the end of last century to divert the working class away from their historical path, to reduce the mighty tasks facing the workers to narrow, nationalist tasks serving the interests of the bourgeoisie, and have wanted to disarm the working class.

Today, these “bearers of the emancipatory traditions of the past” have left not a trace even of bourgeois democracy in Poland; they have deprived the toilers of all rights and conquests, they have filled the prisons with the best representatives of the toilers, and have introduced unprecedented administrative and military license.

But the power of illusions is still very great. And to this day there are undoubtedly many people in Poland who believe in the “revolutionary-democratic” character of Polish chauvinism and of those who spread it.

The third characteristic feature of Polish chauvinism is that the bourgeoisie are very cunningly trying to gloss over, to sanctify, and to cover up the great-power character of this chauvinism with the historical traditions and legends that have taken deep root among the masses.

During the course of long years of oppression, the ruling classes in Poland in their endeavor to maintain and strengthen national sentiments, educated the masses, and the youth, first and foremost, on recollections of the might of Poland, in the days of the knights and feudal lords, of Poland when there were kings, princes, and magnates who knocked at

the gates of Kiev, Moscow and Smolensk, who went as far as the Baltic Sea in their struggle against the Crusaders, and who spread their rule to the Oder and the Elbe. Poland was pictured as the defender of Christianity and civilization against the nomadic barbarian Tartars and Turks, as the defender of the Slavs against German expansion. In this mass agitation, elevated in tone and bourgeois in essence, classes and historic factors were erased, but anguish for the greatness of long ago, national pride and the desire to bring back the past, remained. The Polish youth delight themselves with the novels of Senkevich and the works of Mickewicz, the great poet! And it is very characteristic, that with all the deep differences that lie between these writers, which arise both out of the different epochs in which they lived, and of the different ideologies they possessed, we find in both, and incidentally in other well-known Polish writers as well, the same longing, in different forms, after a "mighty Poland, Poland from sea to sea". The Poland of the Jagiellons and the Khrobrykh.

The way in which the bourgeoisie made use of these dreams for their own greedy immediate purposes can be seen in one small, though clear, example. In 1920, when the Russian people had already dragged up by its roots all the shame of the autocracy and slavery, and had taken revenge for their own oppression and that of other peoples, while side by side with them, the Ukrainian people and other peoples of the former tsarist empire had been freed from this yoke, the Polish army invaded this country, which was no menace to any other people and had begun to build up its new life, and was surrounded by a ring of imperialist interventionists. At this same time, we read the following, not in one of Senkevich's novels, but in the organ of the Polish Socialist Party, dated May 15, 1920:

"The Polish eagles have invaded Kiev. The Polish army has occupied the line of the Dnieper. The Ukrainian army is seizing the Ukrainian towns. . . . From the Baltic to the Black Sea, the might of the Russians, that has dominated there for two centuries, is falling under the blows of the Polish army. That which the Russian sword vanquished, the Polish sword is liberating." (The organ of the Polish Socialist Party, *The Tribune*, No. 19.)

This is how the Polish bourgeoisie try to raise the shades of the past, to resurrect the old knights, and to mobilize them for their own rapacious, imperialist ends.

To this day, the Polish bourgeoisie are persistently and steadily trying to stir up great-power, chauvinist feelings among the masses, and especially among the youth. Here, for example, is a declaration of the youth of the Conservative wing of the Pilsudski gang:

"The great-power movement can rely upon history as well in order to achieve its aim. The glorious, mighty recollection of Jagiellon Poland, the Poland of Grunwald and Unia, Poland from sea to sea, is fresh in the memory of the younger generation as no other epoch in history."

And here is one of the many maxims of the organ of the "Streletz" Shooting League:

"The ideal of a mighty Poland, brought about thanks to the force of the spirit of several generations, should light the way for us in our struggle for existence. . . . The task of the Shoot-

ing League is to educate the minds of the sharpshooters up to the ideal of a mighty Poland through rational work to mould their characters in the spirit of the state mentality."

But these agitational phrases require a "scientific" basis as well. This is also provided in complete accord with the traditions of the Jagiellons and Khrobrykhs. For example, the *Przelom*, also calculated to interest the youth, moreover the youth who are moving Leftwards, publishes an article which contains an entire theory about the natural, geographical boundaries which alone, apparently, determine the real frontiers of a state. What are these frontiers as far as Poland is concerned?

"Professor Romer defines them as follows: The Oder River to the west, the Baltic coast to the north, the curves of the Carpathians to the south, the River Dvina to the northeast. Both the Oder and the Dvina, according to Professor Romer's definition, have much longer, much larger tributaries in the direction of Poland, which link them up with Polish territory. The tributaries of the Dnieper are the same on both sides. Therefore, the basin of the Dnieper has been a bone of contention for centuries between Poland and Russia, and is a district which passes from one country to the other."

As we see, the author has gone still further than the so-called historic boundaries of 1772. And what are his conclusions?

"A people which, like the Poles, won back its existence as a state in the same way as Italy did after the revolutionary movement of Garibaldi, must exert its will to the utmost if it is to maintain its independent existence, and must exert all its efforts to obtain its natural frontiers. Absence of this will and political thought, which strives to embrace the entire geographical whole, has always ended in tragedy for the people—usually by the seizure of their country by neighbors or by their being pushed into a second or third rate position."

One might quote a whole series of examples which in different ways concretize these imperialist plans, and give quotations from Studnicki, Mackiewicz and others. But this would mean going far beyond the bounds of the theme of this article.

The Polish bourgeoisie have already used force to seize a considerable part of the Ukraine and White Russia, and against the will of the peoples of the Ukraine and White Russia, and have linked them to the Polish state after a cruel struggle against them. They are conducting a colonial policy of exploitation in these territories, depriving the population of schools, prohibiting the use of their native language, and using ferocious measures to suppress all manifestations of protest and struggle on their part against this violence.

Not a single worker or toiling peasant in Poland is interested in this oppression and enslavement of the Ukrainian and White Russian workers and peasants. On the contrary, remembering his own past and his own position as a member of an oppressed people, he should be inspired with a feeling of hatred against this policy. He should remember that the oppression and exploitation of another people provide the ruling bourgeoisie with additional power and means of drawing the noose tighter round the necks of the Polish workers and peasants themselves.

But the bourgeoisie find means and historical arguments to paint their predatory policy in colors, and to make it a sacred, "national" and even noble cause.

"The historic mission of Poland is to emancipate other peoples. Fettered Poland, having broken its chains and destroyed violence, should make other peoples free"—this is the Messiah theory preached by the Polish poets. It has found expression in the popular slogan "For our own, and for your freedom!"

The rule of Polish feudalism is depicted as a paradise for the people. Union with Lithuania is not an alliance of the Polish and Lithuanian gentry under the hegemony of the Polish magnates for the purpose of robbing the people, not as the opening up of trade routes to the east, but as the love idyll of Jagiellon and Jadwiga. Today this idyll must sanctify Polish robbery in the east. This is what Pilsudski's supporters write in the name of the youth of the "State Camp":

"Narrow, nationalist egoism will be changed for the Jagiellon idea, the idea of fraternal collaboration between the Slav peoples. A state movement will resurrect the international, historic mission of the Polish state: to organize collaboration and defense between those states and peoples which are linked to us in one common lot."

In order to support these "historic traditions", and in actual fact to create illusions among the masses of the Ukrainian and White Russian peoples, and to hide the real meaning of Polish imperialist expansion, the Polish bourgeoisie, mustered around the Pilsudski camp, long ago put forward the slogan of a Polish and Ukrainian "federation".

The Polish Socialist Party put forward and defended the same program of a "federation" of Poland, Ukraine, White Russia and Lithuania. It also defended Poland's right to restore the 1772 frontiers. And although the Polish Socialist Party program, accepted in 1920, contains a clause about the right of peoples to decide their own fate, nobody knows what this refers to. For the Polish Socialist Party considered that the Ukraine, White Russia and Lithuania, at any rate within the 1772 boundaries, were part of the Polish state, and for them, the party put forward the principle of autonomy, and does so to this day. Incidentally, even for the realization of this principle, it actually takes no steps at all. While justifying the robbery of the Polish bourgeoisie, the Polish Socialist Party persuaded the masses of the people that Poland, the Ukraine and White Russia "would be able to create conditions for joint existence" within the framework of one state on the basis of "fraternity and liberty". The masses of the Ukrainian and White Russian toilers are fully aware of these conditions. The real conditions created by the Polish bourgeoisie amount to punitive expeditions, so-called pacification, prisons, gallows, administrative license, forced colonization.

Side by side with this subtle demagogy, the bourgeoisie adopt the old tested method of all chauvinists: setting one nationality against another, educating feelings of Great Polish superiority among the Poles towards the Ukrainians, the White Russians, the Lithuanians and other oppressed nationalities, sowing strife among the toilers of different peoples. In this foul work as well as in their preparations for imperialist robbery, they have an assistant and ally in the form of the treacherous bourgeoisie of the oppressed peoples, in the shape of the bourgeois Ukrainian and White Russian nationalists, who have long ago sold the

national interests of the people for the sake of their own class interests.

The Polish bourgeoisie attempt to adopt, in addition to ideological means, made attractive by historical legends, other means of interesting the masses of the Polish people in their policy of plunder: by offering the Poles work at the expense of the Ukrainians and White Russians, by creating somewhat better conditions of labor for them, and by giving them political advantages, etc. But the prolonged economic crisis is reducing to naught all these measures, all these insignificant privileges.

The fourth characteristic feature of Polish chauvinism is the wide adoption of anti-Semitic slander. This weapon, borrowed from the arsenal of the tsarist political police, has always been and is still important in Poland. The tsarist autocracy, when it established the Pale, fostered a large concentration in Poland of the Jewish population, engaged primarily in petty trading and home industries. The Polish bourgeoisie and its chief party in the pre-war period—national democracy—which embraced large strata of the Polish petty bourgeoisie, long ago began to utilize the instincts of the small property holder to arouse barbarous anti-Semitic slander, directing this slander along the lines of struggle against the revolutionary movement and diverting the attention of the masses from the class struggle. However, anti-Semitism is not the monopoly of national democracy. The ruling camp of Pilsudski's supporters, although distinguished for its fine capacity to maneuver as regards the bourgeoisie of oppressed peoples, is not against using this means to play upon the reactionary moods of the backward Polish petty bourgeoisie as part of its mass agitation.

These are the chief features of the Great Polish chauvinism which is being pumped into the masses. It is all being directed towards justifying the imperialist policy of the Polish bourgeoisie, justifying the enslavement and oppression of other peoples, setting the Polish people against the peoples of the Soviet Union, dragging them into a new counter-revolutionary war, and securing class peace inside the country. Chauvinist agitation must guarantee the fulfillment of those tasks and aims which the decisive strata of the ruling classes of Poland have set themselves: the destruction of the Soviet Union as the home of world revolution and the conquest of new markets, first and foremost in the East.

It is these rapacious counter-revolutionary aims, and not worry about the "independence" of Poland or "the welfare of the fatherland and the people", so much talked about by the bourgeois scribes, which are guiding the actions of the Polish chauvinists. These same phrases before the war and during the war did not prevent agreements being made with the autocracy, with the German monarchy, did not prevent the profession of loyal feelings towards the Hapsburgs, or armed support being given to Russian, German and Austrian imperialism. Behind the glitter of fine phrases and historical legends can be seen the disgusting, vulture physiognomy of the rapacious, exploiting bourgeoisie, who oppress their own people and other peoples, entering into a bloc today with bloodthirsty, reactionary German imperialism and fascism, which is preparing a new war.

* * *

These chief elements of Polish chauvinistic ideology are being inculcated into the masses by the Polish bourgeoisie in different ways, in various guises and forms, according to the political situation and the

degree to which the masses are becoming revolutionary. All political parties have more or less the same elements in their arsenal of national demagogy, but they use them differently according to the variations in the spheres of influence, their political platforms and their methods of activity.

Today the bourgeoisie have to launch out with nationalist demagogy in the face of increasing revolutionary feeling among the masses, in the face of a growth of the revolutionary struggle, and a growth of hatred towards the capitalist system. Therefore all political groupings have to unite nationalist demagogy with strong social demagogy.

Even the upper ruling strata of the fascist camp is not against flirting with its "revolutionism" in the sphere of social questions. How much, for example, is the following declaration of the editor of the official *Gazeta Polska* worth:

"We are not enthusiasts of any of the existing systems. The world is seeking new ways, new solutions. Quite regardless of where these searchings are taking place, we look upon their trend and outcome with considerable attention and without any doctrinal forebodings. We do not even limit our interest to the dilemma of capitalism versus socialism." (*Gazeta Polska*, Aug. 26, 1933.)

Then what can be said of the different auxiliary organizations of fascism, which have penetrated deep among the masses? These are at times prepared to deck themselves out in the principles of Communism.

For the bourgeoisie, the main thing is to persuade the masses that all social problems can and should be solved within the framework of the existing state through the efforts of the whole of the nation which, of course, means within the framework of bourgeois dictatorship and on the basis of peaceful class collaboration; the interests of the state, the interests of the nation as a whole stand above everything else.

However, in order to do this, it is necessary first and foremost to blunt the class consciousness of the toilers. In 1934, in connection with clear manifestations of the radicalization of the youth and the disintegration of the fascist organizations, this same *Gazeta Polska* published several articles devoted especially to this question. This is what a certain "V. V." wrote in one of them:

"The task which must be solved as quickly as possible for the sake of the interests of the state which are well understood, is to level the feelings of class distinction which are rooted in the masses of the proletariat and to tie them into one strong, tight knot with the rest of society. . . . This is actually no light task, since in addition to other obstacles, it demands that the influence of environment—the home and industry—should be overcome."

Further, "V. V." tries to show how this difficult task must be solved:

"This can be done by putting forward and by constantly emphasizing the motives or ideas which are connected and are common, and by explaining how enormously valuable they are and their decisive importance for man and for the state."

This connecting, "common" idea is, of course, first and foremost, nationalism, which puts the interests of the state above everything else,

which actually means the interests of the ruling class, the interests of the bourgeoisie.

This ideology is being put into practice by all bourgeois organizations, no matter behind what social demagogy they hide themselves. For example, the *Gosudarstvo Truda*, the organ of the Pilsudski youth organization, the so-called "Youth Legion", writes:

"Against Communism, characteristic of which is internationalism and the denial of the idea of the state, as well as the socialization of material wealth, we place our cult of the state, state nationalism, and nationalization of the means of production."

In another part of the same paper, we read:

"The 'Youth Legion', in striving for a mighty republic, is against all international organs which place the interests of separate classes and groups above the interests of the state as a whole. The three 'K's'; the Comintern, Roman Catholic Church and Capital, conduct, primarily, a policy which contradicts the interests of the state."

The cult of the state, state nationalism, is no accidental phrase, it is one of the basic elements of the Pilsudski ideology and agitation adopted by the ruling fascist camp. This idea is pursued so consistently that even in the new constitution of the Polish state adopted recently by the Seim, the word people is not used, but the conception of the state is used instead.

This arises out of the whole nature and role of the Pilsudski idea, which aims, in the interests of finance capital, at consolidating the bourgeoisie, strengthening the state, and carrying out broad, imperialist plans of expansion.

The Pilsudski camp takes into account the multi-national character of the Polish state, the high degree of radicalization of the masses, who are gradually overcoming their reactionary, racial, nationalist feelings. It is adapting its demagogy to the requirements of the future imperialist war, and linking it up with the slogan of "federation", which is calculated to bring the oppressed nations into the war.

Unlike the Pilsudski "cult of the state" and "state nationalism", National Democracy, the second largest party of the bourgeoisie, which today leads a considerable part of the middle bourgeoisie and large masses of the reactionary, religious-minded petty bourgeoisie, advocates the cult of a "people's"—national—state and the cult of "the nation".

Because of the competition on the inner market, the nationalism of national democracy, which has its most important base in the western regions of Poland, has always been directed mainly against the Jews and Germans, and had a racial coloring. Under the influence of Hitlerism, national democracy in its agitation is adopting still more racial arguments, borrowing many elements of social demagogy from the National-Socialists.

The arsenal of chauvinist demagogic methods of the national democrats would appear outwardly to be narrower and more reactionary. It is not so capable of maneuvering as the Pilsudski group, especially as regards the oppressed peoples. But this does not mean that its agitation is less dangerous. The fact that national democracy forms a

close link between national feelings and religious feelings, that it uses the enormous influence of the Catholic Church and the clergy with which it is closely connected, that it plays upon the most deep-rooted feelings of the backward, reactionary petty bourgeoisie and partly of the working masses as well, is of enormous significance. The biggest role in the agitation of national democracy is played by anti-Semitism. It has made skillful use of the psychological significance of Hitler's successes and adopted several of his methods. And finally, it has made wide use of its position as an opposition party.

The idea of a national state does not, of course, mean any denial whatsoever by national democracy of imperialist expansion. Great Poland is also an ideal of national democracy, but this Poland must be "national". The phrase about federation is not necessary. Poland for the Poles. Only the Pole can be a citizen of Poland with full rights. Foreign culture must be annihilated. It is for this reason that the ideal of national democracy is rather the Poland of King Khrobrykh than of Jagiellon the Lithuanian, the symbol of "union".

Chauvinist agitation, both of the Pilsudski type and of national democracy, penetrates chiefly among the broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie, peasantry, intelligentsia and only partly among the masses of the workers.

The basic masses of the working class of Poland have been drawn into the class struggle. Their class consciousness is growing daily. The Pilsudski supporters and national democracy have not, up to now, been successful in imbuing the working class to any depth with their ideology. But the strongest party within the working class is, nevertheless, the Polish Socialist Party. Although our party in Poland has enormous influence, we are working under conditions of illegality, of cruel terror, and because of this and several objective and subjective reasons, we have not yet won over the majority of the working class to the side of Communism, *i.e.*, to the side of a determined struggle for proletarian dictatorship. But the Polish Socialist Party produced Pilsudski and the majority of his suite. It created the armed forces of the Polish bourgeoisie, and considers itself the builder of the Polish bourgeois state. It is therefore especially important that we should bear in mind the degree to which and the form in which the Polish Socialist Party is spreading its chauvinist ideology among the masses, the degree to which the influence of the Polish Socialist Party is determined by the nationalist prejudices among the masses.

The leaders of the Polish Socialist Party have found it necessary in recent years to have a thorough "re-arming" in the sphere of tactics, and to give up several of their old positions. These positions were undermined chiefly by the world economic crisis and the general crisis of capitalism which led to an increase in the dissatisfaction of the toiling masses and to an increase in their class consciousness.

The leaders of the Polish Socialist Party promised the masses welfare and freedom in independent bourgeois Poland; they pointed to the possibility of a gradual, democratic transition to socialism through "organized capitalism". They advocated peace at home and abstention from violence. They waged a violent struggle against the Communists who showed that these illusions were so much deceit and would lead to ruin, and who showed the masses the right road. The toilers became convinced, by their own experiences and those of other countries, that the Communists were right. They saw that there can be no welfare

for them in capitalist Poland. They are beginning to understand that it is impossible to abolish the power of capital by peaceful means. They are beginning to understand that the bourgeoisie, who have advocated peace at home, are themselves building up fascist dictatorship on the basis of open violence.

Under the pressure brought to bear upon them by the masses, the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party have been compelled to change their slogans. The resolution of the Twenty-third Congress of the Polish Socialist Party, which took place during 1934, sadly laments that:

“The period when it was hoped to change Poland into a national state by means of a gradual development is now part of the past.”

The leaders of the Polish Socialist Party are compelled to talk about “dictatorship”, about “revolutionary ways”, which lead to the workers’ and peasants’ government; they are even promising to give the peasants land, and so on.

All this sort of phraseology is sufficiently deceiving and nebulous. But it expresses the process of radicalization that is going on among the masses, the process by which Communist slogans are penetrating down to the masses.

In the course of their daily experience, the upper strata of the Polish Socialist Party have also been forced to adopt new methods, to use new tactics. Under the pressure of the mighty wave of strikes and revolutionary actions, under the danger of being isolated from the masses, the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party are leaving behind the practice of openly sabotaging strikes which they previously used and are using more maneuvering tactics; they try to get into their own hands the leadership of strikes that break out and even to show the initiative in declaring strikes where the situation is ripe, where strikes are inevitable.

All this means that the Polish Socialist Party is finding it more and more difficult to play the role it has been filling for long years—that of reconciling the masses to the capitalist system, to the bourgeois state. The bourgeoisie have taken into consideration the fact that the role of the Polish Socialist Party is weakening, and are seeking new ways of deceiving the masses, new means of making them more interested in maintaining the capitalist order; they are trying to create new organizations of the fascist type, and are not even hesitating to split the Polish Socialist Party in order to gain their end.

But there is one particularly important ideological position of the Polish Socialist Party, which to this day is still strong and is of decisive importance for the bourgeoisie. This is nationalism.

Hitherto the phraseology of the Polish Socialist Party has been openly chauvinist. It is sufficient to recall the position and role of the Polish Socialist Party, which has already been characterized by us during the imperialist war and the period of consolidation of the power of the Polish bourgeoisie in independent Poland, during the period of intervention against the U.S.S.R. It is enough to recollect the attitude of the Polish Socialist Party on the question of Western Ukraine and Western White Russia, etc.

Today the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party cannot talk on these questions with their former frankness. Nevertheless several of

their old precepts have not been changed, and the rest are introduced to the masses in a more veiled form.

Take as some of the more characteristic examples, the more definite arguments from the nationalist arsenal: "The proletariat is the builder of the Polish State", "the Polish Socialist Party alone built up independent Poland". What kind of Poland? What sort of State? Of course, that which exists today, *i.e.*, bourgeois Poland, now fascist. It appears that the worker himself built up this prison which, according to the resolutions of the Twenty-third Congress of the P.S.P., should now be destroyed. Are the leaders of the P.S.P. really anxious to destroy this prison? Listen to one of the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party, Kwapincki:

"The Polish State was won with the blood of the best sons of the working class; it is the common home in which we are all living. And we shall defend it as we have defended it before. But this does not mean that the measures of the government, which do not correspond to our program and coincide with the interests of the masses we represent, will not be criticized by us." (*Robotnik*, August 3, 1934.)

The Polish State—the fascist State—appears not to be a prison of the toilers, but a "common home". It appears that actually the attitude of the Polish Socialist Party to the government is one of "criticism". It seems that the task of the proletariat is to defend the bourgeois State.

The leaders of the Polish Socialist Party unambiguously and openly emphasize their role as defenders of the Polish State. Not so long ago the *Robotnik* in connection with the death of Limanowski reprinted the manifesto he issued in 1929 in connection with the attempt to split the P.S.P. We therein read the following:

"He who destroys the P.S.P. is consciously or unconsciously unlatching the door of Communist invasion, is placing the independence of Poland in a position of extreme danger."

But since it is essential to defend the Polish State, it is essential also to consolidate it. Therefore, Chapinski, another leader of the P.S.P., in speaking against the new Constitution, bases his argument first and foremost upon the danger of weakening the Polish State. He says:

"In my opinion, the State will be weakened. In moments which are difficult in the economic, social and military sense, the strength of the people, having confidence in their government, decides the question of the strength of the State."

Chapinski is, most of all, afraid that the people will not have confidence in the bourgeois, fascist government.

What is the meaning of all these declarations and ideas? In the main they coincide in essence with the phraseology of the Pilsudski idea: the independence of Poland is constantly menaced; Poland and the Polish bourgeois State, the fascist State, are identical conceptions; the interests of the State are above everything else; for the sake of defending the independence of the State, it must be consolidated. This confidence, generally speaking, is not surprising, for the source of this ideology and its creators is one and the same.

By juggling with these nationalist phrases, the P.S.P. confuses the

workers, and, of course, leads them, not to the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie, the destruction of their power, the destruction of the bourgeois State as the apparatus of violence of the bourgeoisie, but leads them along the road of collaboration with the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie fear no socialist phraseology, so long as the working class believes that the bourgeois State is the "common home" which must be defended.

* * *

Internationalist traditions are strong and deep-rooted among the Polish working class. Beginning with the first shoots of class consciousness and organization during the time of the beginning of the "Proletarian" Party, the Polish workers have raised the banner of internationalism high, the banner of common struggle, first of all together with the proletariat of Russia, against the common enemy, the autocracy, for the complete abolition of oppression of all kinds, including national oppression. The Social-Democratic Party of Poland and Lithuania, with all its mistakes, and later the Communist Party of Poland, have for years developed and strengthened this feeling of proletarian internationalism.

But of course this does not exclude the working class from the pressure of nationalism and chauvinism, or guarantee them against it. The influence of a strong petty bourgeois strata and their ideology, the influence of the labor aristocracy which the bourgeoisie want, first and foremost, to be interested in their imperialist policy, can be felt everywhere, at all times. Therefore this struggle against the influence of chauvinism upon the working class is a most important task.

The broad campaign for the united front, which the Communist Party of Poland has boldly launched, fosters the growth of class consciousness among the working masses, brings the workers of the Polish Socialist Party closer to the Communist workers, makes them drop their many prejudices more rapidly, including their nationalist prejudices. Under the pressure of the united front campaign which is already being carried on by many of the rank and file organizations of the Polish Socialist Party, the leaders of the latter have been compelled more and more to adapt themselves to the mood of the masses.

A "Workers' Congress" took place in Warsaw last February, at which 500 persons were present, many of them functionaries from the Polish Socialist Party and the Bund, and many of them workers, among whom were 90 representatives of the Left trade-union opposition. This Congress was initiated by the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party, who wanted to confront the actual united front with the Communists with their own united front within the framework of the Socialist Party and reformist trade unions. But independent of the will of those who organized the Congress, and thanks to the activity of the Communists, the Congress gave expression to the high degree to which the working masses have swung to the Left. *The Congress declared itself in favor of defending the Soviet Union*, and passed several slogans and demands corresponding to the interests of the working class.

True, the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party were successful in mystifying, for some of the delegates, the question of the united front and in drowning in a flood of phrases the question of organizing a struggle to force the acceptance of the demands adopted by the Congress. But, just the same, the resolution in defense of the U.S.S.R. and the fact that several of the slogans put forward by the masses were

accepted is of great importance and is extremely symptomatic. Soon after the Congress, the Supreme Council of the Polish Socialist Party met, where, incidentally, a resolution was passed condemning the pro-Hitler policy of the Pilsudski government. In this resolution the Supreme Council declares:

“. . . that it is against all war designs and plans which will once more drown the masses in a blood-bath, against the pro-Hitler policy of ‘sanation’, and against all intervention against the U.S.S.R.”

We shall not here go into all the details of the motives which led to the question being raised in this way in the resolution, the motives which arise even out of the whole position of the P.S.P. in the sphere of international politics. For us it is important to emphasize the fact that with all the other motives that exist, this somewhat unusual declaration of the P.S.P. concerning defense of the U.S.S.R. shows the degree of popularity which the Soviet Union and its peace policy enjoy among the masses, and also the importance of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union. It shows, moreover, that the position of nationalism, which the leaders of the P.S.P. are increasingly inculcating into the toiling masses, is also vulnerable. Particularly bankrupt have been the attempts to set the toilers of Poland against the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The united front must, and will, in the future, foster the growth of class consciousness among the toilers, help the working class to live down their nationalist prejudices.

But the task of the Communists is to fight also against the influence of chauvinism among the broad masses of the toilers, among the petty-bourgeois strata of town and village.

We see the extent of the chauvinist agitation of the bourgeoisie, how great are the illusions they have created, how deep the traditions upon which they rely. Can the Communists remain silent upon all these problems, can they restrict themselves to abstract propaganda of solidarity and internationalism, without replying to all the questions, without breaking down the old legends, without unmasking all the deceptions and all the confusion that has been purposely introduced? There are very many questions of this kind, and we have mentioned only a few of them above.

Can one speak of the State in general terms, of strengthening its power, of defending it? While classes exist, the State is the apparatus of violence on the part of one class against the other. To strengthen the power of the bourgeois State means to strengthen the ruling class—the bourgeoisie—and to strengthen its violence. To destroy this power is to destroy the domination of the bourgeoisie.

Does this mean to deny the independence of the State, and are the Communists against independence? No, that is a lie! The Communists are the only consistent fighters against all kind of oppression, including also national oppression. They stand for the right of every people to an independent existence. They, and they alone, are capable of guaranteeing true independence, liberation and fraternity of peoples.

But are the Communists against the State in general? Nonsense. To realize the absolute absurdity of such an idea, it is sufficient to note how the Communists of the Soviet Union strengthen their State, how they defended it and still defend it with their own blood. But they

strengthen and defend it because it is the State of the toilers, and consequently, their own State, their home. The Communists say that only when classes are liquidated, when the Communist society is at least established, will the State completely die away.

Is anybody menacing the independence of Poland and, in particular, does any danger against this independence exist from the peoples of the Soviet Union, as the bourgeoisie declare? All lies and slander! The Soviet Union is the only defender of peace, the only defender of the independence of peoples, especially the small and weak. The Polish bourgeoisie themselves, with their policy of war, their policy of a bloc with bloodthirsty German fascism, create a menace to their own independence. It is enough to recall the plans of Hitler and Rosenberg which are today common property.

The Communists—our enemies are shouting—want to separate from Poland, Western Ukraine, Western White Russia and other lands populated with non-Polish peoples. In reality, the Communists are fighting for the right of all peoples to self-determination, even to the point of separation, for the right to free existence for all oppressed peoples, for they are consistent fighters against all kinds of oppression. But who of the Polish toilers are interested in maintaining this oppression? Nobody. We have already stated above that the toilers are interested in just the opposite. And who other than the Communists is bringing about and safeguarding the fraternal alliance of all peoples, their collaboration, their mutual assistance?

Bearing in mind all the prejudices and all the survivals of nationalism, we should be wary of all concessions to nationalist moods and beware of the mistake of falling into nationalist positions. We must not fall victim to these moods, but clearly and concisely, on the basis of our own doctrines, explain where the mistake has been made and direct national feelings and the desire for liberty, which are quite comprehensible and legitimate feelings, along the correct revolutionary road, particularly against fascism at home and abroad, against the Polish-German imperialist bloc, against the fascist instigators of imperialist war.

As Lenin said, so we repeat, that national feelings, love towards our own country and our own language, towards the traditions of national and proletarian struggle, in which the best representatives of the toilers perished, are not foreign to us. We are striving toward the time when the masses of the Polish people, deprived of all rights and exploited and oppressed by a handful of capitalists and landlords with the help of their state apparatus of cruel class violence, will overthrow the yoke of the bourgeoisie, and find their own fatherland in Poland, in Socialist, Soviet Poland. On one-sixth part of the world—the mighty Soviet Union—the toilers guided by the Bolshevik Party and its leaders, Lenin and Stalin, long ago overthrew this yoke and are now building up a new Socialist classless society. They were the first to build up their own, real fatherland, which is at the same time the fatherland of the toilers of the whole world, the object of love and pride of all oppressed and exploited.

It is the task of all the toilers, it is their pride, to defend this fatherland, to stand in defense of the frontiers of the new, Socialist world, the world of new culture and civilization for the whole of mankind, to defend it against the dying barbarian, bloodthirsty, capitalist world.

Fascism as Interpreted by Comrade Palme Dutt*

By A. DE LEOV

IN Comrade Palme Dutt's book, *Fascism and Social Revolution*, we find for the first time an extensive study of the whole process of fascization, its causes, roots and forms of manifestation, made by a Communist theoretician possessed of a Marxian-Leninist training. The appearance of this book, which contains a wealth of material painstakingly selected and treated, should be welcomed. Palme Dutt has not contented himself with describing external events. He begins with an outline, extending over several chapters, of the significance of the economics of imperialist capitalism, especially in recent times, as a source of bourgeois strivings towards fascism. On the basis of this theoretical research, Dutt answers the question—what is fascism—and proceeds with a narrative of the onslaughts of fascism in Italy, Germany and Austria.

In these chapters Comrade Dutt describes in detail the methods whereby fascism conquered power in three big European countries, and why the workers were unable to frustrate this calamity. On the basis of indisputable facts, Dutt establishes the responsibility of reformism for the temporary triumph of the fascist dictatorship, and exposes fascism which has everywhere violated its own demagogic promises and only worsened the conditions of the masses.

A special chapter is dedicated to the inter-relations between Social-Democracy and fascism, and to the "Theory and Practice of Fascism". Comrade Dutt then defines the essence of fascism as "an organization of social decay", and traces the tendencies towards fascism in Western Europe and America. In that chapter he convincingly proves that there is fertile ground for fascism in Great Britain, France and the United States.

The factual material given by Dutt concerning the fascist tendencies of the National Government of Great Britain and of Roosevelt's New Deal is edifying, as is also the material concerning the latest methods of agitation used by Lloyd George, and the public appearance of fascism in Great Britain as represented by Mosley's Blackshirts.

Finally, Comrade Dutt poses the question of struggle against fascism, a struggle, the ultimate aim of which must be the socialist revolution.

On such an important problem as that of the essence of fascism, there is no room for unclarities. It is, therefore, expedient to subject some of the phases of Palme Dutt's theoretical analysis to criticism. To

* Comrade Palme Dutt's book adds considerably to the wealth of Communist literature on fascism. Comrade De Leov has touched here only upon some of the questions dealt with in the book. A general discussion of the questions raised by De Leov as well as of the material contained in Palme Dutt's book is necessary in the columns of the *Communist International*.—*Editorial Board of the Communist International.*

begin with, let us review Palme Dutt's criticism of a pamphlet on fascism written by the American author, Scott Nearing.

Scott Nearing holds the well-known Social-Democratic point of view that fascism in its class character is *petty bourgeois*. He even regards fascism as a "petty-bourgeois revolution", and says:

"At the center of the fascist movement is the middle class, seeking to save itself from decimation or annihilation by seizing power and establishing its own political and social institutions. It therefore has the essential characteristics of a social revolutionary movement, since its success means the shift of the center of power from one class to another. . . ."

"Fascism arises out of the revolt of the middle class against the intolerable burdens of capitalist imperialism." (Quoted in *Fascism and Social Revolution*, p. 79.)

Palme Dutt finds the same theory in Brailsford, the Labor Party theoretician; in Calverton, the American pseudo-Marxist; and in the English Social-Democratic press. Dutt quite justly criticizes this incorrect theory which is highly dangerous for the anti-fascist struggle in the following words:

"Fascism, although in the early stages making a show of vague and patently disingenuous anti-capitalist propaganda to attract mass support, is from the outset fostered, nourished, maintained and subsidized by the big bourgeoisie, by the big landlords, financiers and industrialists" (p. 80).

Scott Nearing from his incorrect theory draws corresponding conclusions. However, in his criticism of these conclusions, Comrade Dutt is much less consistent.

Scott Nearing raises the question: "*Where would victorious fascism lead society?*" And he gives the following reply:

"The search for a self-sufficient economic unit will lead the fascists, as it led those of their predecessors who helped to liquidate the Roman Empire, to a splitting up of economy units until they reach the village, the manor and the local market town. . . . Autarchy implies the abandonment of national specialization in production. . . . Mass-production will be drastically restricted.

"The abandonment of national specialization will go hand in hand with the decline of international trade . . . Automatic machinery will be abandoned with the abandonment of mass-production. The village will rely on hand-agriculture and hand-crafts. Railroads will disappear . . . Mass wage-labor will disappear with the disappearance of specialized mass-production. The modern proletariat will be eliminated by war, disease, famine and the flight back to the land, quite as effectively as the proletariat and the slave masses of Imperial Rome were eliminated by the same means. . . ." (pp. 227-228).

This is the picture which Scott Nearing gives of the future if fascism is victorious: *autarchy* in the long run leads to the most *primitive natural economy*—*mass production vanishes, machines are destroyed*—and with all this there disappears also the *bourgeoisie as well as the modern proletariat!*

This is the same picture as we are given by the German fascist, Oswald Spengler, or H. G. Wells in his latest books. It is the picture of the new "twilight epoch" which occurred after the fall of the Roman Empire. Scott Nearing writes: if fascism is victorious, then Spengler will be right with his "sunset of the West!"

Clearly this theory is closely connected with the viewing of fascism as a petty-bourgeois revolution. If, as Scott Nearing assures us, fascism were really an anti-capitalist movement of the middle strata, it could be understandable that the victory of fascism must sooner or later lead to the abolition both of the world market and of mass production, both of the bourgeoisie and of the proletariat.

Palme Dutt denies this definition of fascism as "petty-bourgeois revolution"; but what does he write about Scott Nearing's "picture of the future"?

"This picture is an imaginative picture of a hypothetical process—deliberately leaving out of account the dialectics of the proletarian class struggle which will defeat its realization. But it is essentially a correct picture of what would happen if the innermost tendencies of fascist economics and politics were worked out to their final conclusion. *It is essentially a correct picture of the only final alternative to the socialist revolution*" (p. 228, my italics—L.).

Thus, Palme Dutt sees two mechanically directly opposed forces; fascism and the struggle of the working class. Either the working class will be victorious—and this would mean the realization of socialism—or, there is another *alternative, i.e., another actual possibility*—fascism will conquer—and in that case Scott Nearing's perspective is correct, in that case "the innermost tendencies of fascist economics and politics" will lead to autarchic isolation, to the destruction of mass production, machines and the proletariat, to purely natural economy!

In order to prove that this is not a question of an accidental utterance, we will give a few more quotations:

"Fascism, developing since little over a decade, has no long past behind it, and in all probability—from the very nature of its reactionary role, from its violent inner contradictions, and from the whole character of its desperate attempt to throw up a dam against the advancing social revolution—is likely to have no long future before it. Fascism is likely to be remembered only as an episode in the long-drawn class-war advancing to the final victory of the socialist revolution.

"But *if* fascism were able to have the opportunity to continue over a longer period, were able to maintain its power and to dominate, as it dreams, a whole epoch of social history, then it is evident from the whole foregoing analysis what its historical role would be, and what kind of society it would produce.

"The society of a 'stabilized fascism'—if such a contradiction in terms can be imagined, if, that is, for the sake of analysis we try to imagine the possibility of such a society and ignore for the moment the inner dialectics of break-up and revolutionary upsurge which would make such a stabilization impossible—would be a society of *organized decay!*" (p. 223.)

We find similar views in the introduction to the book, where we read:

"The modern development of technique and productive power has reached a point at which the existing capitalist forms are more and more incompatible with the further development of production and utilization of technique. There is war between them, increasingly violent and open since 1914, and entering into a new and extreme stage in the world economic crisis and its outcome. One must end the other. *Either the advance of the productive forces must end capitalism. Or the maintenance of capitalism must end the advance of production and technique and begin a reverse movement. In fact the delay of the revolution has meant that the reverse movement has already begun throughout the world outside the Soviet Union.*

"Only two paths are therefore open before present society.

"One is to endeavor to strangle the powers of production, to arrest development, to destroy material and human forces, to fetter international exchange, to check science and invention, to crush the development of ideas and thought, and to concentrate on the organization of limited, self-sufficient, non-progressive hierarchic societies in a state of mutual war—in short, to force back society to a more primitive stage in order to maintain the existing class domination. This is the path of fascism, the path to which the bourgeoisie in all modern countries where it rules is increasingly turning, the path of human decay.

"The other alternative is to organize the new productive forces as social forces, as the common wealth of the entire existing society for the rapid and enormous raising of the material basis of society, the destruction of poverty, ignorance and disease and of class and national separations, the unlimited carrying forward of science and culture, and the organization of the world Communist society in which all human beings will for the first time be able to reach full stature and play their part in the collective development of the future humanity. This is the path of Communism, the path to which the working masses who are the living representatives of the productive forces and whose victory over capitalist class domination can alone achieve the realization of this path, are increasingly turning; the path which modern science and productive development makes both possible and necessary, and which opens up undreamt-of possibilities for the future development of the human race.

"Which of these alternatives will conquer? This is the sharp question confronting human society today.

"Revolutionary Marxism is confident that, *because the productive forces are on the side of Communism, Communism will conquer*; that the victory of Communism, which is expressed in the victory of the proletariat, is ultimately inevitable as the sole, possible, final outcome of the existing contradictions; that the nightmare of the other alternative, of the 'Dark Ages', whose creeping shadow begins already to haunt the imagination of current thinkers, will yet be defeated, will be defeated by the organized forces of international Communism.

"But this inevitability is not independent of the human factor. On the contrary, it can only be realized through the human factor. Hence the urgency of the fight against fascism, and for the victory of the proletariat, on which the whole future of human society depends. *The time grows shorter; the sands are running through the glass.*" (Pp. viii-ix, my italics—L.)

One might give several more quotations from the same book, in which again and again with more or less clarity, with more or less consistency, this same idea is developed: modern society is faced with

two possibilities, two prospects of future development—either the *final* victory of socialism or the *final* victory of fascism. But the victory of fascism, by virtue of its inner nature would mean the return to pre-capitalist conditions, to a new Middle Age, to primitive natural economy and to the downfall of modern society.*

Yes, this downfall throughout the capitalist world has already begun—"throughout the world, except the Soviet Union; production and technique have ceased to progress and the "way back" has already been started.

Of course, there are places where Comrade Dutt calls socialism *inevitable* and, moreover, for the reason that "the productive forces are on the side of Communism". But here Palme Dutt asserts—and this is the basis of his whole conception—that *fascism destroys productive forces* and thus, consequently, destroys the premises for the victory of Communism!

Hence Palme Dutt's solemn warning: "Time grows shorter", "there is death in delay", "the sands are running through the glass"!

This is absolutely consistent, for if fascism, according to Dutt, rules for a more or less long period of time, it will inevitably lead to the destruction of the productive forces, the "dark ages" will come and then . . . all hope for the victory of socialism will vanish!

(Incidentally: what sort of perspective does Comrade Palme Dutt offer to Communists in countries where fascist dictatorship is already established and where fascism has already acquired a considerable mass basis?!)

As regards this theory, one must first of all say that facts contradict Comrade Dutt's views. Fascism has been in power in Italy for 13 years. Has it during this somewhat long period of time displayed even the slightest tendency of abolishing mass production, of destroying the big workshops and factories, of rejecting the world market, of making the transition to handicrafts and natural economy?

Everybody knows that this has not happened.

On the contrary, the fascist state has accelerated to the utmost the process of concentration of production and the centralization of wealth; it encouraged the introduction of rationalization in factories at the expense of the proletariat; it supported large-scale industry and carried on a struggle in favor of exports.

The same is true as regards Germany, Poland, and all those countries where fascism has been in power for a more or less long period of time. Propaganda of small-scale production, attacks against capitalism and modern technique are all so much fascist *demagogy* for the purpose of deceiving the petty-bourgeois masses! And autarchy, besides preparing for war, merely aims at safeguarding the home market, in order to carry on the struggle for the world market with still greater force.

Secondly: is it really true that capitalism has already become incompatible with technical progress, that it has already taken the "backward path"?

* See, for example, on page 24: "One is to throttle the development of the productive forces in order to save class-society, to destroy material wealth, to destroy millions of "superfluous" human beings in . . . starvation and . . . war, to crush down the working-class movement with limitless violence, to arrest the development of science and culture and education and technique, to revert to more primitive forms of limited, isolated societies, and thus to save for a while the rule of the possessing classes at the expense of a return to barbarism and spreading decay. This is the path . . . of fascism."

Lenin wrote:

"It would be a mistake to imagine that this tendency to decay excludes the rapid growth of capitalism. It does not. In the epoch of imperialism certain branches of industry, certain strata of the bourgeoisie, and certain countries, betray to a more or less degree one or other of these tendencies. On the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before, but it is not only that this growth is becoming more and more uneven; this unevenness manifests itself also, in particular, in the decay of the countries which are richest in capital, such as England."

This was written during the World War in Lenin's book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. And is this not true with regard to post-war imperialism?

Comrade Mendelson, in the book *New Material on the Work of V. I. Lenin—Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism** on the basis of an enormous accumulation of facts writes the following:

". . . figures and facts concerning capitalist economics of the last 20 years not only confirm the same tendencies as the data introduced by Lenin, but show a further development and intensification of these tendencies. First and foremost, they show a further enormous increase in the power of monopolies and their oppression, and an increase on this basis of parasitism and the decay of capitalism" (p. 249).

However, this on no account means that all the progress of technique has ceased. Comrade Mendelson writes:

"The basis of the increase in technical decay in the post-war years is the general retarding of the growth of capitalist production. We are not speaking of the destruction of productive forces of capitalism during the years of the world economic crisis. This process of technical decay is extremely uneven, being accompanied by big technical changes in several branches of capitalist production" (p. 285).

Thus, we have a retarded growth of production, a rapidly increasing tendency to parasitism and decay, but no *absolute stagnation* and no "return to the Middle Ages"! And we know that even during the years of deep economic crisis, rationalization went on in new forms that were particularly painful for the proletariat; that even during these years definite technical achievements were observed in some places, and that the crisis considerably encouraged the further concentration and centralization, the breakdown of small production in town and village! This is the state of affairs during the period of the general crisis of capitalism, and under fascism as well, which on *no account represents a new stage in the economic development of capitalism*, although fascism is, on the one hand, the consequence of the intensification of the general crisis, on the other hand, the cause of the increased growth of tendencies towards parasitism and decay. Obviously Comrade Dutt's viewpoint was arrived at under the one-sided influence of the period of most intense

* *New Material on the Work of V. I. Lenin's Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, prepared by the Institute of World Economy and World Politics of the Communist Academy. Edited by E. Varga, L. Mendelson, and E. Khmelnistkaya. Partisdat, General Committee of the C.P.S.U., 1935, Russian edition.

crisis and of the particular conditions in England where, as Lenin remarked, the tendency to stagnation and parasitism is especially marked.

Of course we should depict the devastating effect of fascism in all spheres, and especially point out that fascism brings in its train new, terrible wars; and it is a shortcoming of Palme Dutt's book that comparatively little attention is paid to just this connection that exists between fascism and war.

Of course we should emphasize most definitely that the victory of fascism (a temporary victory) is not inevitable in any country, and that the proletariat and all toiling humanity should be interested to the highest degree in preventing fascist dictatorship and making fascist dictatorship impossible once and for all by means of the socialist revolution. But even where the bourgeoisie set up fascist dictatorships, it is not their lot to find a "way back" out of the contradictions into which dying capitalism is being entangled. On the contrary, it is just fascism that sharpens these contradictions more than anything else. Fascism inevitably disillusiones the petty bourgeoisie, among whom it can find a mass basis only for a time. It brings in its train still further impoverishment for the working class. It both complicates and accelerates revolutionary development at one and the same time. Fascism means new, cruel wars, which weaken the capitalist system and make it possible for a break through to be made again. And under fascism also the bourgeoisie given birth to "its own grave-digger". Can one, in that case, say, as Palme Dutt does, that there are "two alternatives", two real possibilities of social development over a whole epoch?

We have all possible grounds for revolting against the propaganda of the "sunset", preached by the Spenglers and other fascist or social-fascist ideologists, for the express purpose of discouraging the toiling masses and diverting them from the revolutionary struggle.

Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin talk about the *inevitability* of the victory of socialism. In *The Communist Manifesto*, the document testifying to the birth of the revolutionary working-class movement, Marx and Engels wrote that *past* epochs and class battles each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes. In regard to the bourgeoisie, the ruling class of capitalist society, we read the following in *The Communist Manifesto*: "What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable." Of course, this inevitability can be "proved" only in the practice of the class struggle. "The impossibility [of restoring capitalist conditions of production—L.] is proved only in practice", wrote Lenin in his notes to N. I. Bukharin's book, *The Economics of the Transition Period*.*

This is just why it was essential to raise the question of the future of capitalism *concretely* in connection with the modern international situation.

How is it possible to raise (as Comrade Dutt does) the question of the perspective of fascism in the capitalist world, and at the same time not even to make any mention of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, of the historic significance of the Soviet regions in China, or of the revolutionary movement in the colonial countries? It is precisely the final victory of socialism in the Soviet Union—the fulfilment of the First

* Leninist Compendium, Vol. XI, p. 362, Russian edition.

and second Five-Year Plans, collectivization of the rural districts, and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class—that constitute the strongest bulwark in the struggle against capitalism throughout the whole world; it is just these things that constitute the clearest proof that capitalism, even by means of fascist dictatorship, will not be successful in maintaining power for any long period of time.

The influence of the incorrect line which we have already criticized may similarly be felt in several other questions. Comrade Dutt writes:

“Wherever capitalism is able to reach towards *fully secured close monopoly, which is the whole tendency and aim of modern capitalism (though never fully realized)*, and the whole essence of the economics of fascism, the inevitably inseparable tendency to retrogression of technique and decay is at once visible” (p. 53, my italics—L.).

Thus, according to Palme Dutt, the *whole* tendency of modern capitalism is directed towards fully secured close monopoly, although this tendency is not realized “fully” and entirely.

But according to Lenin, “monopoly which has grown out of free competition does not abolish the latter, but exists alongside it and hovers over it . . . gives rise to a number of very acute antagonisms, friction and conflicts”. (Chap. 7.) It is clear that Comrade Dutt has not reached all the depth, all the dialectic wealth of thought that is contained in the Leninist teachings on imperialism.

And Dutt’s viewpoint on the world economic crisis is linked up with this:

“The short-lived ‘revival’ of world production in certain branches of industry in the summer of 1933 . . . bore no relation to any solving of the basic contradictions underlying the crisis, which on the contrary became intensified. The disparity between production and consuming power increased. The ‘revival’ was in fact openly a reflection of the gathering war process, a direct outcome of typical war measures of inflation, state mobilization of industry and increase of production of armaments and of industries associated with armaments” (p. 68).

It should be borne in mind that the book *Fascism and Social Revolution* was finished in the summer of 1934, when it had become quite clear that the increase in production in the capitalist world in 1933-1934 should be looked upon *not only* as preparations for war, and when Comrade Stalin’s theses at the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. on the transition to a depression of a special kind had already been confirmed **by facts**. And in this case, Palme Dutt actually holds the viewpoint of “permanent crisis”, of the absolute stagnation of capitalist production.

The shortcomings that have been pointed out here do not signify that we should not welcome the appearance of this new theoretical work of Comrade Dutt. We must hope that the book will be worked upon still further and that this will lead to the elimination of the shortcomings indicated; and if, at the same time attention be given to the extensive new accumulation of facts that are available, then we shall get a very valuable, general investigation of the development and essence of fascism in the main capitalist countries of the world.

For the United National Front in Cuba

LETTER FROM PARIS

By V. CORTES

A COMRADE who came here from Cuba, prior to the beginning of the general strike in Cuba, shared with us his impressions on the Fourth Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. of Cuba, which took place in February, and acquainted us with the most recent documents of the Party. Among these documents are minutes of the February plenum, the appeal of the Communist Party to the toiling people of Cuba (February 28, 1935), the appeal of the C.C. of the C.P. of Cuba to the Guiteras revolutionary group, and the manifesto to the National Agrarian Party on the united front. Later, in the course of events which subsequently took place, we read the appeal of the National Confederation of Workers,* issued during the general strike.

From this material it is evident that the Party has begun to make a wide turn in its tactics—true, as yet not always consistent, and not fully thought out to the end—but a turn which is in line with the idea and spirit of the decisions of the Third Conference of the Latin American Parties, which, as is known, took place in Uruguay in the autumn of 1934.

Of outstanding importance in all the documents mentioned above, (with the exception of the appeal of the National Confederation of Workers, about which we shall speak later on), is the beginning of the struggle to set up a united national front against imperialism, a united front together with all parties and organizations which support an “anti-imperialist program and a program for the improvement of the conditions of the masses”, with all parties and organizations which “really desire national independence for Cuba”, and are prepared to fight the government of national treason and terror against the people, to fight against Mendieta,** Batista,** Caffery.****

The proposals for a united national front, capable of realizing “united powerful action against the common enemy”, lead towards the putting forward of the slogan for the formation of an anti-imperialist, national-revolutionary government.

In line with this, the appeals and manifestoes of the Party are proof of the fact that the language and tone adopted in the Communist press have begun to change, the superfluous and not always well-founded attacks hitherto to be found in the polemics have been discarded (for instance, as regards the national revolutionary group of Guiteras***** and the National Agrarian Party). The Communist Party is striving—also through reorganization of its methods of agitation—to rally the

* National Confederation of Workers of Cuba—league of revolutionary trade unions.

** Mendieta—leader of the reactionary National Party composed of high officials and having influence on colonists and big landlords.

*** Batista—military dictator in Cuba, servant of Yankee imperialism.

**** Caffery—U.S.A. ambassador in Cuba.

***** Guiteras—leader of a national revolutionary organization having wide mass influence—“Young Cuba”. Together with a group of his followers, he was killed by the military government of Mendieta-Batista.

broad masses of the people, and facilitate their going over to the line of revolutionary struggle against imperialism and its mercenary, despicable agents in Cuba.

This is a splendid beginning. The Party is ridding itself of the mistaken idea which restricted its initiative, the idea that the proletariat is opposed by one reactionary front composed of all parties from the A.B.C.* to the Guiteras group. It is beginning to differentiate in its approach to these organizations. It is beginning to seek its allies—albeit even inconsistent and temporary allies—in the organization of a genuine national revolution. This is the only correct path. For only by the creation of a united national revolutionary front against the common enemy—imperialism and its servitors in Cuba—will the Cuban proletariat, the chief driving force of revolution, become the recognized leader of the broad masses, and the leader of their struggle for national and social emancipation. Only in this way will the Communist Party be successfully converted into a truly mass Bolshevik Party, capable of bringing the revolution—through the intermediary stages that are necessary for it—to the final victory, to independent, free, Soviet Cuba.

* * *

In spite of these steps taken by the Party for the establishment of a broad national front of struggle against the common enemy—imperialism and the Mendieta-Batista government—nevertheless this broad national front has not yet been formed in Cuba.

Does this mean that the comrades from Matanzas were correct when they spoke at the Plenum against the united front?

Does this mean that the Third Conference of the Latin American Communist Parties placed before the Parties a task impossible to realize? Does this mean that there is no chance (or even any need) in Cuba for the creating of a united national front with the Guiteras organizations and the "Autenticos"*** parties?

Of course not. Practical revolutionary experience in other countries of Latin America (and first and foremost in Brazil) has not only proved that it is possible to create a broad national front of this kind, but has given convincing proof of the enormous revolutionary influence of such a united front upon the masses. In Brazil a broad National Alliance has been formed and is carrying on a struggle for national revolutionary power; in which Alliance masses of worker, peasant and student mass organizations, the petty-bourgeois national revolutionary parties ("Tenientes",*** "Travailiste"**** and even the Left national reformist wing of the "Alliance Liberale"***** (represented by the Manuel Costa group), participate.

The formation of this Alliance strengthened the position of the Communists, lightened their task of fighting for unity in the trade-union movement and brought the broad masses forward to revolutionary positions.

* A.B.C.—Reactionary fascist party, connected with the clergy and merchant-industrial bourgeoisie and other foreign employers in Cuba. The main social base of this party are the Spanish trade employees.

** Autenticos—group affiliated to the National Reformist Party of Grau San Martin.

*** Tenientist—party of middle officers, composed mainly of petty-bourgeois revolutionary elements.

**** Travailists—workers' party, affiliated to the Second International. It has wide mass influence and supports the policy of the Minister of Labor.

***** Alliance Liberale—party of the bourgeoisie and landlords, closely connected with U.S.A. imperialism. In 1930 it came to power with the help of a government coup d'etat.

Of course, this does not mean that Cuba should copy the example of Brazil mechanically.

Specific peculiarities of Cuba and the revolutionary movement in Cuba make the situation here different from that in the neighboring countries of Latin America. But it is just these specific peculiarities of the Cuban revolution that should compel the Cuban Communists to fight particularly persistently for the united national front. We know, for example, that the development of the revolutionary mass movement in Cuba was hindered by its very location—a little island, all lowlands, in close proximity with the United States of America, which threatens it with intervention and economic blockade whenever revolutionary mass struggles break out. The leaders of the Cuban national bourgeoisie use this threat of blockade and intervention against the masses, in order to divert them from the road of revolution to the road of compromise with Yankee imperialism (compromise at the expense of the people and in the interests of the bourgeoisie). At the same time it is not only the influence spread by national reformism that holds back the movement. The masses themselves recognize that there are difficulties in the way of the Cuban revolution which are of an objective nature (the fact that the little island of Cuba lies side by side with mighty Yankee imperialism).

The question arises as to how to *overcome* these difficulties, by what means is it possible, if not to overcome entirely the danger of intervention and blockade, then at least to make it extremely difficult for Yankee imperialism to carry out its threat. What conditions are required, what conditions have to be created, in order to finally solve this problem?

The first and most important condition is that the broad masses of the people of Cuba should be united against imperialism, against the menace of intervention and blockade, for national freedom and the national independence of Cuba.

This means a self-sacrificing, anti-imperialist struggle of the masses. The broader the unity on the national front, the more solid this front is, the more difficult will it be for imperialism to begin a blockade and intervention.

In order to create a broad national front of this kind for the struggle against the common enemy, it is essential that *the underestimation of the national question which exists in the ranks of the Communist Party* should be finished with once and for all. It must be finally understood that the national factor, defense of the Cuban fatherland, oppressed and enslaved by imperialism, the fight around the slogan "Cuba for the Cubans!"—"Drive Yankee imperialism out of Cuba!", is not something foreign to the proletariat, but to the contrary, is their first duty, a matter of life and death. In developing the revolution around these national slogans, the proletariat at the same time carries on *international* work, placing the Cuban revolution into the general stream of international, proletarian struggle for the overthrow of the rule of imperialism, and for socialism. By emphasizing that the revolution at the present stage is directed primarily against imperialism (and its Machadist and Mendietist bands) and by fighting to create a united national front, the Communist Party is at the same time encouraging, to the maximum, the *consolidation of the forces of the proletariat itself* (which is split not by social reformism, there is none, or hardly any in Cuba, but by na-

tional reformism), by launching the struggle on the basis of the united national front. The proletariat at the same time frees the masses from the influence of the bourgeoisie, convincing them not only through agitation, but on the basis of their own experiences in the struggle of the treacherous nature of the bourgeoisie, and unites the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie around itself. From this point of view the proletariat makes use of all, even temporary and unstable allies and fellow-travellers, and in particular that section of the national bourgeoisie, which, under the pressure of the national movement and by virtue of its contradictions with imperialism, may for a certain period of time and under certain conditions, support the common struggle against imperialism. Thus the social base of the rule of imperialism is narrowed down, it becomes difficult to realize blockades and intervention, the organization of intervention at a time when a strong broad national front actually exists in a semi-colonial country becomes particularly difficult.

In this connection the most important thing is: that the forces of the national revolutionary front and the revolutionary people's government must suppress all resistance mercilessly, and that the numerically insignificant strata of direct agents of imperialism in Cuba, (the Mendieta government, the reactionary upper strata of the ABC, of the Machadists, of the reactionary officers, the big landowners—traitors of the fatherland, the big compradores—intermediaries of imperialism) must be wiped off the face of the earth. This direct social prop of imperialism in Cuba must be destroyed once and for all, and in this way make it difficult for the U.S.A. to use the basic organizational forces of reaction inside Cuba for the purpose of intervention.

Can there be any doubt, that by thus dealing with the enemies of the people, with the traitors of the nation, at the first stage of revolution, it will be easier to paralyze and render harmless in future also those elements who, having joined the national front in the beginning, are inclined later to decamp to the side of imperialism, enticed by the bribes offered them—perhaps by Wall Street? But this is a thing of the future.

The second condition essential for the victorious revolution in Cuba and necessary for the weakening of the menace of intervention and blockade is the international support of the Cuban revolution by the world proletariat, and particularly by the proletariat of the U.S.A., and the national liberation movement in the countries of South and Central America. This condition is important; and for Cuba, by virtue of its geographical position, its significance is greater than for the rest of the countries dependent upon America. However, only the contemptible counter-revolutionary Trotskyists, who are trying to pin the activities of the Cuban people to the "Left" flag, and to ingratiate themselves with the imperialists, can spread defeatist theories that the victory of the Cuban revolution is impossible without a simultaneous proletarian revolution in the U.S.A.

And, finally, the third condition of considerable importance is the readiness of the national revolutionary government to buy off U.S.A. imperialism, this direct menace of intervention, by the granting of some sort of concessions, the exact limits of which cannot be judged beforehand. These partial concessions—and it can only be a question of partial concessions—are possible only on the basis of the Cuban people winning political and economic sovereignty, by their winning unlimited national independence. Moreover, it is wrong to place the question of maneuver-

ing in relation to imperialism, as necessary only for the Soviet Government (a viewpoint which found its way into the speeches of individual comrades at the February plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. of Cuba).

As for the size of these concessions, it is obvious that they will be smaller as the revolutionary pressure of the masses becomes stronger, the wider develops the struggle of the people. It is ridiculous to say that Yankee imperialism is giving up its basic position, its political and economic *domination* in semi-colonial Cuba, and will enter into negotiations for an agreement with the *revolutionary* (and not national reformist) government, if it is not forced into it by the power of the mighty struggle for national liberation on the part of the people.

To sum up all that has been said. An examination of the objective conditions in which the Cuban revolution is developing, its specific peculiarities as a small semi-colonial country in the immediate vicinity of mighty Yankee imperialism, places before the Communist Party, as the vanguard of the proletariat and leader of the people, the task of waging a most persistent, tireless struggle for the united national front, and this struggle must be viewed as the most important, most urgent task of the Party at the present stage of the Cuban revolution.

We repeat: the formation of the general national front would revolutionize the masses to a very wide extent. The consolidation of the forces of the national revolution against the common enemy would increase the feeling of confidence in victory, would lessen the fear of intervention and blockade, would be a factor of great revolutionary significance.

* * *

An examination of the *lessons* of the Cuban revolution, and in particular the *lessons of the March events* in 1935 (which we shall dwell upon here) should to an even greater degree convince every Communist, every revolutionary proletarian, every honest national-revolutionary of the necessity to struggle for the realization of the united national front.

The Mendieta-Batista government was formed, as we know, in consequence of the overthrow of the national reformist government of Grau San Martin*—by the coalition of reactionary groupings, Mendistists, ABC, who were supported by Yankee imperialism.** The Mendieta government, month by month, sharpened its repressions against the national movement. A law introducing the death penalty for "sabotage" on the part of workers during "Zafra" (the cane-sugar harvest) was passed. All the economic rights (eight-hour working day, increased wages, etc.) and political rights (freedom of union, strikes, etc.) which the workers had gained were threatened. The government brought the full weight of repression also against the student organizations. It concluded a trade agreement with U.S.A. imperialism, which benefited only a handful of sugar plantation owners, the compradore bourgeoisie, and which robbed Cuba of its productive forces and doomed wide masses of the peasantry to poverty, hunger and death, and the feeble national industry to bankruptcy. It aroused against itself and its anti-national policy not only the hatred of the mass of the people, but also strong discontent among the national industrial bourgeoisie and some of the landowners

* Grau San Martin—leader of the so-called "Revolutionary Party of Cuba"—a national reformist party, organized following the government coup d'etat in September, 1933. Its composition is entirely of soldiers and students.

** To be precise, there was still another government between that of Grau and that of Mendieta—the Hevia government, but it lasted only a few days, and was merely a transitional stage to the Mendieta government.

producing for the internal market. The Mendieta-Batista government revealed itself to the masses of the people as a government of national treason and national disgrace, as the mercenary agency of Yankee imperialism.

And during the general strike, when Mr. Despaigne, the Minister of Finance, declared that: "If the strikers are victorious, the government will call for American intervention", this was nothing surprising. The masses of the people in Cuba had realized even prior to the strike that the United States Ambassador, Caffery, is the real governor of Cuba.

This created a favorable situation for the formation of a broad national front. But the Communist Party—of this more in detail later—did not utilize the situation and the struggle against the Mendieta government, as the government of national treason and terror against the people, fell to the initiative of others. The leading role in the political movement directed against imperialism in the majority of cases was in the hands of the national reformist party of Grau San Martin and its Left, petty-bourgeois, national revolutionary wing, the Guiteras wing.

It is, therefore, no accident that from the very beginning it was the movement of the students and the youth in the schools that was most acute (by the 24th of February, 350,000 scholars, students, and teachers were participating in strikes throughout Cuba). Beginning with small, everyday demands (for school breakfasts, for better equipment, for the economic demands of the teachers—and the Pioneers and teachers' union which supports the National Conference of Workers took an active part in launching the struggle), the movement later took on a clearly expressed political and anti-government tendency.

The participation of the student organizations sharpened the struggle considerably.

The "Autenticos" Party began active preparations for a coup d'etat, which they imagined would have the support of the "Golpe"* which would do away with the Mendieta-Batista government and in its place set up its own government, a government "enjoying the confidence of the people", a "civil government *without Batista*".

In order to realize this pronunciamiento, the "Autenticos" Party on the one hand began negotiations with the reactionary ABC (which at that time, however, was in opposition to the government) and, on the other hand, drew the mass organizations under its influence into the movement.

Among the workers' trade unions that were the first to join the strike struggle (by March 8) were mainly the Graust unions (railwaymen from several railroads, Havana tramwaymen, government employees, part of whom were under the leadership of the Grau party and part under that of the ABC).

By March 10, the big unions led by the National Conference of Workers had also joined the movement, and the number of strikers throughout Cuba, according to the *New York Times* reached 700,000. During the strike armed conflicts between the strikers and armed forces of the government took place, as well as spontaneous attacks upon police stations, etc., organized by national revolutionary elements. The general strike continued for two or three days, after which it ebbed as a result of government repression, the introduction of martial law and the dissolution of the trade unions.

* "Golpe"—chiefs of the government coup d'etat.

The Cuban proletariat once more set examples of revolutionary activity when they began the general strike as a mark of their solidarity with the striking students, scholars and teachers. The fact that the struggle was on such a huge scale, beginning with the everyday demands of scholars but spreading to the overwhelming majority of organized workers and other employees in Cuba, is obvious proof of the extreme intensity of the revolutionary crisis, of the general dissatisfaction felt by the masses of the people towards the dictatorial government of Mendieta-Batista.

The March events of 1935, as well as the preceding revolutionary activities (the overthrow of the Machado dictatorship) reveal the desire of the masses for unity of action in the struggle against imperialism and the reaction of the government.

However, in spite of the fact that the general strike of solidarity was of a revolutionary character, the imperialist press of the United States did not evince any special alarm.

The *New York Times* of March 9 reported: ". . . labor as a whole yesterday vacillated in the stand regarding a walkout that would make the strike general throughout Cuba." On March 10, the same paper reports: "Labor in general vacillated. But the army did not." On March 11, when the general strike was at its height, the *New York Times* reported: "A passive resistance strike cannot hope to oust the government." The State Department of the United States government in its turn declared on March 12, that neither the lives nor the property of Americans in Cuba are in any serious danger, and that, "There is no completely organized movement against the Mendieta government but rather sporadic acts of terrorism perpetuated by individuals and groups. . . ."

Why did the imperialists react so calmly to the strike, and why were they so confident in the action of the government? Because they had soberly weighed the relation of forces and had come to the conclusion that no serious danger threatened them this time.

This time the "Autenticos" took the initiative in the struggle against the Mendieta-Batista government. But its leaders in the past had shown themselves to be people seeking for compromise with imperialism, as national reformists, and not as revolutionaries. Having come to power in the autumn of 1933, the Grau San Martin government, despite its anti-imperialist phraseology, was actually behind the backs of the masses bartering with United States imperialism in the interests of the national bourgeoisie of Cuba.

True, imperialism did not agree to compromise and drove out the Grau San Martin government by organizing the ABC reactionary coup d'etat with the support of the big landowners and the reactionary bourgeoisie (primarily Spanish compradore capital). The fall of the Grau government, having revealed the bankruptcy of the national reformist policy of the government—it might have meant the *breakdown of bourgeois national reformism*—proved that its whole policy was bankrupt. But the Communist Party, having remained "neutral" in the struggle between the reactionary ABC and the Grau national reformist government, which was able to maintain power to a considerable extent because of *the confidence* shown towards it by the broad masses, did not propose that the Grau party form a broad national front of struggle against imperialism and reaction, was not successful in convincing the

masses on the basis of their own experiences, that the way of national reformism is futile. By its initiative, by a consistent, revolutionary policy, by its ability to mobilize the broad masses, the Communist Party in this case might have become the backbone of the revolutionary movement. As it was, the authority of the Grau San Martin party considerably increased as a result of the overthrow of the Grau government by imperialism and the reaction, which soon began to make itself felt. Indeed, only after this did the "Autenticos" Party become a truly mass party leading considerable strata of the petty bourgeoisie, the toiling Negroes, the unemployed and a section of the workers.

What should the tactics of the Communist Party have been during the general strike in March? It most certainly should have taken the initiative in the struggle against imperialism and the Mendieta-Batista government. It should have confronted the masses of the people supporting the "Autenticos" Party with the choice of: *either new defeats on the old national reformist road of compromise with imperialism, on the road of vacillation between imperialism and national revolution—or—a joint struggle with the Communists against imperialism, for national emancipation for Cuba, for a national revolutionary (and not national reformist) government.*

To have raised the question in this way would have made a differentiation in the ranks of the "Autenticos" Party, would have unmasked those leaders of the party who favor national revolution only in words, and who are actually in favor of compromise with imperialism. To raise the question in this way would have made it possible to use those bourgeois elements of the "Autenticos" Party, who are still able to go part of the way together with the masses of the people against imperialism, in the interests of the development of the revolutionary struggle. To raise the question in this way would have complicated the attempts of the ABC leaders to draw Grau over to the side of reaction, and would have led to the breakdown of the negotiations which Grau San Martin was conducting with the leadership of the ABC, with the purpose in view of using the opposition of this reactionary party to the Mendieta-Batista government in order to overthrow the latter. A proposal for a united national front would at the same time have encouraged the genuine Left elements of that party to orientate upon the mass workers' and peasants' movement, upon revolution, would have rallied them around the Communist Party.

Only such a tactic would guarantee to the proletariat a truly independent policy of their own, for only it alone could isolate the bourgeoisie from the masses in the course of the struggle, through the experience of the mass struggle, and could serve to help the proletariat win the leadership of the movement.

But in actual fact these were not the tactics of the Party. Long before the March events, at the initiative of the reformist and anarcho-syndicalist trade unions, a "Proletarian Defense Committee" was formed in Havana, which committee the National Conference of Workers joined a short time later. The "Proletarian Defense Committee" formulated its aims in a manifesto, which called for struggle against the law introducing the death penalty in "Zafra", for the release of political prisoners, and declared itself against government terror, against courts martial and for democratic rights. These slogans in themselves were not bad, but they were not sufficient. These slogans and the formation of such a united front were proof of the alarm felt among the working masses,

and the desire of the working class to rally its own forces against the common enemy. However, the Communist Party and the National Conference of Workers (this was before the arrival of the delegation from the Third Communist Party Conference) did not ally this movement of the proletariat with the general national movement against the government of national treason, against imperialism, did not offer any resistance to the anarcho-syndicalist tendencies and to the counter-revolutionary Trotskyist group, which was worming itself into the united front and doing all it could to subordinate the labor movement to the most reactionary groups of the bourgeoisie and, under a "Left" banner of maintaining "class independence", to isolate the proletariat from the national movement. At that time, due to the incorrect line of the November Plenum of the C.C. of the Cuban Communist Party, the Communists looked upon all non-proletarian organizations and parties (from the national revolutionary groups of Guiteras to the A.B.C.) as parties with a more or less fascist character.

Therefore, the "Proletarian Defense Committee", in its very name, bears signs of the incorrect line of isolating the proletariat from the national movement against the government and imperialism led by other parties (the "Revolutionary Party of Cuba" of Grau and the Guiteras organizations).

After the February Plenum of the C.C., the Party tried to correct the situation by issuing a manifesto calling for the establishment of a united front against imperialism and by turning to the Guiteras group and the National Agrarian Party with more concrete proposals. However, first of all, it put forward conditions to which these organizations could not agree (for example, the demand for the confiscation of land and other demands of which we shall speak later), and secondly, did not mobilize the revolutionary trade unions for participation in the attempt to set up a national front of struggle for the national liberation of Cuba from imperialism.

The manifesto of the National Conference of Workers (of March 14) repeats practically all the slogans of the "Proletarian Defense Committee", but fails to call for the creation of a broad national front, and does not include the slogan for the overthrow of the Mendieta-Batista government, the slogan of struggle for the national revolutionary government. The position of the National Conference of Workers was, therefore, limited to *defense of the economic gains and democratic rights of the working class*, at the moment when the most popular slogan among the vast masses of the people was "*down with the Mendieta-Batista government*". The National Conference of Workers' manifesto did not advocate the overthrow of the Mendieta-Batista government, but *was against the formation of the Grau San Martin government*, declaring that it will differ in no way from its predecessor. Thus, even before the struggle began, the possibility of utilizing the contradictions within the camp of the national bourgeoisie and imperialists in the interests of developing the revolutionary struggle of the masses was quite out of the question.

At the same time, the National Conference of Workers' manifesto (as all preceding Party manifestoes) did not appeal to the Grau San Martin party with a proposal for a united front, although the organizations led by that party participated in the mass movements from the very beginning. Thus, the general strike was not utilized to create a national front of struggle (in the form of a national alliance, or some

similar mass organization), although the entire situation urgently demanded and made possible the easier creation of such a front. This National Conference of Workers' manifesto not only avoided the possibility under given conditions, of supporting the Grau San Martin government, and refused to take the initiative in utilizing the general strike to organize a united national front, to conclude an agreement with the "Autenticos" Party for concrete action against the common enemy, but the manifesto also failed to indicate any prospects for a further revolutionary development of the strike, failed to put forward slogans of struggle for a national revolutionary government, and remained silent on the question of taking power. And even after the defeat of the general strike and the breaking up of all trade unions, the revolutionary as well as those led by Grau, after the government had driven both the Communist Party and the "Autenticos" Party underground, and a savage reign of terror had begun against these organizations, we read the following in a Communist pamphlet entitled "The General Strike and Its Lessons":

"The General Strike has clearly shown to the masses the true role and character of leadership of the Revolutionary Party of Cuba (Grau San Martin), which was faced with the choice of going with the people or the dictatorship of the fascist leadership of the ABC.

"At the same time the strike exposed the revolutionary chatter of the "Young Cuba", which dragged along at the tail end of the counter-revolutionary policy of the leadership of the 'Autenticos' Party."

Is it necessary to say that these views must immediately be re-examined and rejected as extremely dangerous and harmful to the cause of creating a united national front and of winning hegemony of the proletariat in the national movement?

Instead of the "independent role" of the proletariat, which the leaders of the National Conference of Workers tried to guarantee during the general strike, the objective result was that the National Conference of Workers took a passive position in the mass struggle against the Mendieta-Batista government.

But as we know, the situation was exactly the same at the time of the overthrow of the Machado dictatorship, when the Party leadership lost all its revolutionary perspectives and demanded that the general strike be called off. The situation was exactly the same at the time of the overthrow of the Grau San Martin government, when this false conception of the idea of class independence aided the ABC to mislead in its revolutionary coup d'etat.

Hence the conclusion:

The analysis of the March events, to no less degree than the examination of the specific peculiarities of the Cuban revolution, require that a *change in tactics* be made by the Communists, that they wage a persistent and skilful struggle for the creation of a broad national front against imperialism and its Cuban agents. The lessons of the March events show that a serious struggle must be carried on within the Party against the impermissible "Leftist" conception which counterposes, one against the other, the question of the independent class role of the proletariat and the task of participation of the proletariat in the national liberation struggle, tasks which are linked up with the creation of the united national front and the winning of the hegemony of this front by the proletariat. But this again leads us to an examination of the work

and mistakes of the February Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. of Cuba.

* * *

The report of the work of the February Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. of Cuba shows that the Party has not yet overcome many views held among the rank-and-file membership which prevent it from coming close to the broad masses and conducting a successful fight for the creation of a broad national front of struggle against imperialism.

Among these mistaken ideas there is one which has spread widely in the Party since the November Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. of Cuba (1934): the idea that the "Autenticos" Party, including also the Guiteras group, is, if not fascist, then a semi-fascist party.

There is nothing more harmful for the Communist Party in the present situation than these mistaken ideas (and incidentally, Comrade Simon is first and foremost responsible for them, when, as he himself says, "I raised the question point blank and signalized the fascization of the 'Autenticos'").

Has the February Plenum corrected these mistakes? Only partly. True, Comrade Roca, in his report at the Plenum declared that "Today we can go against imperialism not only with Guiteras, who represents the more Left wing, but even with Grau." At the same time, certain comrades at the Plenum spoke against this correct approach. As a result, there was no discussion of the estimation that the "Autenticos" Party was rapidly become fascist, neither was this view rejected as wrong and harmful, because it makes the creation of a national front of struggle against imperialism more difficult. This estimation of the November Plenum in the speeches of individual comrades was looked upon merely as an "exaggeration of the degree of fascization of that party". A position like this leads to the inability to differentiate correctly between the national revolutionary camp, national reformism and the reactionary imperialist camp, which in its turn inevitably leads to very dangerous mistakes in tactics.

There is a viewpoint current in the Party that the "Autenticos" Party and the Guiteras organization are the "main danger" and that consequently, there must be no struggle for a united front. Does the Grau San Martin party constitute a danger to the proletarian struggle, to national revolution? Undoubtedly it does. But the nature of this danger must be understood.

There are dangers and dangers. The Machadists, the Mendietists, the Batista military clique, the upper strata of the ABC, representing the reactionary landowners, sugar magnates and compradore (chiefly Spanish) bourgeoisie, are also dangerous. They are dangerous as the direct agents of Yankee imperialism. They are strong in the support they get from Yankee imperialism. They are the enemies of the people. They are traitors of the fatherland. They organize and conduct terror against the people. Against them is directed all the hatred, all the just fury of the masses of the people.

It is quite another thing with the "Autenticos" Party. Today it still enjoys considerable confidence among the masses of the people. Not only do the students and the urban petty bourgeoisie support it, but it is also supported by a considerable section of the toiling Negroes, the unemployed and a section of the workers, despite the fact that the leading sub-strata of the "Autenticos" Party are representatives of the national bourgeoisie and liberal landlords. The danger, and a great

danger, to the revolution arises just out of this, out of the confidence which the mass of the people have in their bourgeois leaders, in the thoroughly bourgeois policy of the "Autenticos" Party. The toiling masses who give their support to this party do not as yet clearly see the *treacherous* nature of the national bourgeoisie. And however good the agitation of the Communists may be, agitation alone cannot isolate the **bourgeoisie from the masses of Cuba**. In order to accomplish this isolation the masses must learn from *their own experience*. So the Communists are obliged to go side by side with the masses who belong to the "Autenticos" Party, to lead them forward to revolutionary positions, on the basis of their own experiences. It is the duty of the Communists systematically to increase this experience, to show on the basis of the united national front, all the vacillations, all the reformism of the leaders of the "Autenticos" Party in relation to imperialism, thus paralyzing these vacillations and revolutionizing the masses.

The "Autenticos" Party in Cuba (in which a national revolutionary wing is sprouting) is not an imperialist party; at the present it still stands on national soil, although it vacillates between imperialism and support of the national liberation struggle. The Communists know that these vacillations of the national bourgeoisie in the direction of the anti-imperialist struggle will cease when the peasants rise to take over the lands of the landowners, and the proletariat wins their hegemony. Not only do they know this, but they should prepare the proletariat to meet, with all the weapons at their disposal, this treachery on the part of the bourgeoisie. The national bourgeoisie will then once and for all go over to the camp of imperialism and the feudal latifundia owners. But before this time arrives, the mass basis of this party will *crumble*. Its bourgeois and landlord upper strata will go over to the camp of imperialism and the people forming the lower strata will, if the Communists have the correct line, come over to the side of the revolution.

The refusal of the Communists to fight for the united national front, or to enter into any concrete agreement with the "Autenticos" Party for joint struggle against imperialism, is complicating this process of revolutionizing the masses, is retarding the development of the class struggle of the proletariat, and at the same time the struggle of the proletariat for leadership of the national movement. An active struggle to create the national front will accelerate the revolutionary process and strengthen the position of the proletariat, provided the Communists adhere to the correct line.

The theory that the "Autenticos" Party is fascist is an unfounded, harmful theory, foreign to Marxism-Leninism, a theory which does not take into consideration the important peculiarity of the Cuban revolution as a colonial revolution in which the national factor plays an enormous revolutionary role. Therefore this theory must be determinedly and irretrievably thrown aside as non-Leninist, as "Leftist", as Trotskyist-Menshevik in essence.

As for national revolutionary groups such as the Guiteras group and others, not only is it incorrect to consider them the main "danger", but on the contrary it is essential that the closest, most friendly collaboration should be set up with them at the same time, however, not fusing with them, but criticizing their petty-bourgeois viewpoints, their tendency towards adventurism and individual terror. It is also essential that we take into the Communist Party the best revolutionary elements of these groups.

No less important, perhaps even more important, is the following question. As one of the conditions for the conclusion of a united front with the Communists, even after the February plenum, the slogan of immediate confiscation of all the lands of the landlords was put forward (see the appeal to Guiteras, to the national agrarian party, the general manifesto of the Party). One of the comrades at the plenum explained the need for putting forward this slogan in the following terms: "*The main task of the national revolutionary government . . . is to destroy feudal relations and imperialist oppression. The very development of the revolution itself will lead this government to its conversion into a Soviet government. . . . Our tactics must be first and foremost the following: by taking part in this government we are accomplishing the anti-imperialist bourgeois democratic revolution, we are realizing to the full the agrarian and anti-imperialist program.*"

The slogan of confiscation of the lands of the landlords was of enormous importance already during the years when the cadres of the Communist Party were taking shape, in the years of its propagandist development and it becomes endowed with the greatest significance as the most important slogan of action at the next stage of revolution, when the agrarian revolution of the peasantry will be its main axle.

At the present stage of the Cuban revolution—directed primarily against imperialism—the most important part of the peasant question is *to draw the peasant masses into the general anti-imperialist struggle, and thus to lead the peasant masses forward to the agrarian revolution, through the stage of the united national front, through the channels of anti-imperialist struggle.*

The peculiarity of large landed proprietorship in Cuba is that a considerable part of the land is not in the hands of Cuban companies, but in the hands of foreign (American) companies.

The foreign companies are not only large latifundia holders but they have in their hands the monopoly of both credit operations and of the sale of sugar and tobacco. The hatred of the masses of the people towards these imperialist parasites is very great. And the hatred of the masses against those Cuban landowners, who support these companies, directly serve Yankee imperialism openly and fight against the national revolution, is not less strong. It is therefore quite possible at the present stage of the united national front to put forward certain *partial, immediate demands of the peasantry* (the struggle to reduce taxation, to reduce land rent, against indebtedness to the banks, for the eight-hour working day for agricultural laborers), at the same time popularizing the slogan of confiscation of the lands belonging to foreign companies as well as the lands of national traitors.

Not only may the Guiteras group agree to put forward the slogan of partial demands for the peasantry and even confiscation of the lands of foreign capital and national traitors (slogans of a national character), but the "Autenticos" Party may also agree. A united front should and can be arrived at on the basis of these demands. This step towards realizing this partial program on the peasant question in no way constitutes a retreat on the part of the Communists. On the contrary. To raise the demands in this way will *bring closer the prospects of developing the agrarian revolution*, since it will, first of all, unite the extremely weak peasant movement, which at present is scattered, into a national movement throughout Cuba, extend the struggle of the peasants for their immediate demands, direct the movement against the main

enemy—imperialism and, secondly, when the peasants, in the course of the developing revolution, really begin to seize the lands of the big foreign land proprietors and national traitors, it will actually become the beginning of the agrarian revolution, which will then spread, if the proletariat indeed rally about themselves the masses of the people, and paralyze the resistance of the bourgeoisie to the agrarian revolution.

A national revolutionary government set up on the basis of this platform, on the basis of slogans of struggle of a national character against terror, on behalf of national liberty and at the same time on the basis of the partial, immediate demands of the workers, peasants, students, artisans, small traders and others, will of course, not as yet be the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. And it should not be imagined that "the development of the revolution itself", of itself, without a violent class struggle and the splitting away of bourgeois groups from the movement, can convert the national revolutionary government into a Soviet government.

This will be a bourgeois democratic government, primarily anti-imperialist. It is therefore unnecessary to use the slogan of the national revolutionary government side by side with the slogan of Soviet power. In order that the transition to the Soviet government may take place, it is necessary that there be a change in the relation of class forces during the revolution, it is essential that the hegemony of the proletariat become stable, as well as becoming a stronger link between the workers and the masses of the peasants, it is necessary that the peasant movement be transferred to the rails of the agrarian revolution. An acute class struggle, attempts on the part of the national bourgeoisie (who previously either supported the national front, or at any rate, were neutral) to use armed force to stop the revolution is inevitable. While strengthening the national revolutionary government in so far as it wages a real struggle against imperialism and adopts measures in the interests of the toiling masses, revolutionizing them, the Communists, at the same time, have to strengthen their positions among the masses, create peasant committees in the villages, broad national representative bodies (from among the workers, peasants, students, petty bourgeoisie, and others) in the towns and district centers. Without splitting the united front, by raising the slogan of creating Soviets, it will be essential in the course of the struggle to create mass people's committees of this kind or meetings of national representatives in the localities, which can at the necessary moment develop into Soviets. Simultaneously, the position of the Communists and revolutionaries in the army must be strengthened, and a national militia formed.

Therefore, the Party should re-examine the conditions of the united front, bearing in mind the character of the present stage of the Cuban revolution as the stage of a united national front. Moreover, the Party should consider only one, sole perspective: *the victory of the workers and peasants; the victory of Soviets in Cuba is possible only through the struggle for a national, revolutionary anti-imperialist government.* Only in the course of this struggle will the Communist Party grow into a mass Party, enjoying the confidence of millions and will be able to realize its mighty aims: struggle for a Soviet government, for the complete victory of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, and then for the triumph of socialism in Cuba.

* * *

Hence the general conclusion: the Party has delayed the transition

from old methods of work peculiar to the past period in the development of the Party, the period when the main task consisted in the forging of proletarian cadres in the Party, the carrying on of propaganda and not in the leading of millions. It is now necessary to make a bold transition to the new tasks: in organizing the revolution, it is necessary to learn to lead the masses forward to revolutionary positions on the basis of their own experiences; it is necessary to change from a cadre Party to a mass Party of the proletariat. To do this, underestimation of the national factor as a revolutionary factor in semi-colonial Cuba must be liquidated. The Party must boldly begin to establish a united national front. Only in this way can we raise the task, so much emphasized at the February Plenum, of building up a mass Communist Party for it would be absolutely incorrect to raise this task separate and apart from the struggle to create a united anti-imperialist front on a national scale.

An analysis of the March events shows that the Party was not sufficiently well prepared to unmask the "Left" opportunist mistakes in its own ranks (mistakes of a Trotskyist-Menshevik character). Meanwhile, it is just these mistakes that at the present time are the chief hindrance to its conversion into a mass Party. It is particularly essential that the struggle against Menshevik-Trotskyist distortions of the line of the Party on the question of the independent role of the proletariat in the class struggle be strengthened. Placing the independent role of the proletariat and its Communist Party as counterposed to the struggle for a united national front against imperialism is impermissible. To counterpose these questions in such a way can lead, and already has frequently led, not to the maintenance of a real independent role by the Communist Party but to the isolation of the Party from the masses and plays into the hands of the most reactionary *pro-imperialist elements of the Cuban bourgeoisie* who are interested in isolating the proletariat and its Party from the broad masses and in destroying the national front of struggle.

The realization of a real independent role of the proletariat and the Communist Party under the present conditions demands the waging of a stubborn fight to consolidate the broad national front against imperialism, to prepare for the overthrow of the government of national treason and terror against the people, to set up the national revolutionary government and to fight for the slogan "Cuba for the Cubans—drive Yankee imperialism out of Cuba". Preparations for the overthrow of the Mendieta-Batista government require the formation of a national front on the basis of the main slogans mentioned above as well as various partial demands (the struggle for non-recognition and immediate cessation of the payment of foreign debts and in particular the debt to the Chase National Bank, the annulment of the "Mutual Agreement", the cessation of any interference on the part of American diplomatic representatives in the affairs of Cuba, the struggle for democratic liberties, against government terror, for the release of all political prisoners (workers, clerks, etc., Communist Party members, members of the "Autenticos" Party and others), for the restoration and open existence of the trade unions, peasant leagues, organizations of those in the professions, for the autonomy of universities and finally—what is most important in face of the increasing repressions on the part of the government—for the immediate demands of the workers, peasants, students, artisans, for the defense of the revolutionary struggle of the peasantry in the "Realengo 18", etc.

In the setting up of the united national front, the Communist Party should come forth as the most consistent revolutionary force in the struggle for national liberation, and when concluding agreements with the Guiteras organizations and the "Autenticos" Party, the Communist Party should not fuse with them. This means that inside the organizations of the national front, as well as outside of them the Party will criticize the vacillations and hesitation of the liberal bourgeois elements of the petty-bourgeois organizations and their leaders, guiding them towards revolution, towards support of the struggle of the workers and peasants, skilfully isolating the national reformist elements and at the same time, while they are still actively against imperialism, utilizing their influence and contact with the masses.

Thus, the Communist Party will still further independently organize and mobilize the broad masses of the toilers, strengthen the position of the proletariat in the movement, strengthen the ties between the proletariat and the peasantry, draw the latter into the national revolutionary, anti-imperialist front, in a word, rally the allies of the national revolution around the proletariat and the Communist Party.

This means that the Communist Party must anticipate the inevitability, as the anti-imperialist struggle deepens, of the regrouping of class forces and the rise of the agrarian revolution towards which the Party should lead the peasantry by extending the struggle of the peasants for their immediate demands, and, by developing the struggle against the imperialist latifundia proprietors, should prepare the proletariat and the peasantry to defend the revolution against the betrayals of those bourgeois elements who, at the present stage, are attached to the movement, but who will betray it in the future. This means that we must continue to strengthen still further the Communist Party, to convert it into a mass Party, basing it upon the proletariat in the factories and workshops, upon the broad masses of agricultural laborers, upon the poor and middle peasantry, and in this way—on the basis of the struggle for a united national front—render it capable of guaranteeing the victory of the Cuban revolution.

We must not forget that the Right opportunist elements in the Party will endeavor to distort the tactics of the united national front in the interests of the national reformist bourgeoisie, that they will take the line of "toning down" the class struggle of the proletariat in the enterprises of the national bourgeoisie, of "toning down" the struggle of the peasantry against the landlords, and so forth. These Right opportunist mistakes may lead to the loss of political independence of the proletarian movement, to subordination of the Communist Party to the influence of the national bourgeoisie.

While conducting the struggle on two fronts inside the Party, it is necessary to bear in mind that in the Cuban Party today, the struggle must be first and sharpest against the "Left" sectarians, for with their simplified "revolutionary" tactics they are holding back the fulfillment of the task of turning the Party into a truly mass Party; they are developing into a menace which can divorce the Party from the broad masses of the people. And the most important problem is the task of making the turn from the propagandist stage of development of the Party to the organization and leading of millions in Cuba today.

The Historic Importance of the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. [B] *

By E. YAROSLAVSKY

(On the Occasion of the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Third Congress—
April 25, 1905–April 25, 1935)

THE thirtieth anniversary of the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. is a most important landmark for the entire international working class movement.

The fact that a party of revolutionary Marxism, a Leninist Party, began to be established in Russia, the “dungeon of the peoples”, at the end of the nineteenth century was of tremendous world importance. This was a period when the Social-Democratic Parties were growing extensively and were becoming more and more penetrated by the plague of opportunism. This was, to use Comrade Stalin’s phrase, a period of the almost undivided domination of opportunism.

The appearance of Lenin on the political arena represented a new stage in the development of the working class movement. Lenin began to build a party of a new type, for it was impossible, without such a party, to destroy tsarism, the most powerful buttress of European and Asiatic reaction, and to solve the tremendous historical task with which the Russian Marxists were faced.

History has shown that Lenin succeeded in rallying the most determined and bold revolutionary Marxists, those most devoted to the cause of the international proletariat, around the banner of revolutionary Marxism. These people succeeded in filling millions of people with enthusiasm and with a supreme determination and energy which not only destroyed tsardom but also overthrew the power of the capitalists—they established the dictatorship of the proletariat. But it was necessary to establish a new type of Party to achieve this. Tsardom could not be defeated, and the landowners and capitalists could not be overthrown, without

“... a new party, a militant party, a revolutionary party, bold enough to lead the proletarians to the struggle for power, with sufficient experience to be able to cope with the complicated problems that arise in a revolutionary situation, yet sufficiently flexible to steer clear of any submerged rocks on the way to its goal. Without such a party it is futile to think of overthrowing imperialism and achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat. This new party is the party of Leninism.” (Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, Chap. VIII.)

From the very outset, when Lenin began to build our Party, he attributed the greatest international importance to the struggle against opportunism which he carried on in the ranks of Social-Democracy.

* Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party (of Bolsheviks), renamed the Russian Communist Party in 1918, and again renamed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (C.P.S.U.) in 1925.

The St. Petersburg "League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class" which came into being 40 years ago, was the embryo of the Bolshevik Party. But before our Party arose as a *political organization* after the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.,* Lenin had to clear the ground for this new Party and to show wherein lay the distinction between this new type of Party and the remaining parties in the Second International. And when, after the Second Congress of the Party, the Bolsheviks came to the forefront of the political struggle as an independent political organization opposed to the Mensheviks, *the overwhelming majority in the Second International condemned the behavior of the Bolsheviks. The rise of the new party and the really revolutionary Marxist principles of the Bolsheviks proved to be in sharp contradiction to the policy and practice of the Second International.*

The figure of Lenin brought alarm to the opportunists in the Second International. Even those of them who were on occasion inclined to recognize the correctness of the Bolshevik estimate of the character and driving forces of the revolution, and of the Bolshevik methods of struggle, took fright at the consistency of the Bolsheviks, at the finished character of their revolutionary mode of thinking, and at their tactics.

From the very outset, Lenin strove to gather together a core of consistent revolutionary Marxists within the Second International. Lenin pursued a line aiming at a break with the opportunists in the R.S.D.L.P. and the Second International.

The Mensheviks utilized their international contacts so as to support the idea in the West European working class movement that the Bolsheviks were "disorganizers", "splitters", "anarchists", "Jacobins", etc. They had among them a sufficient number of literary men of the type of Plekhanov, Axelrod, Trotsky, Ryazanov, Potressov, Martov, Parvus, etc., who had contacts with the West European Social-Democratic Parties, and they made use of these contacts so as to cast mud at the Bolshevik Party which came into being in the year 1903. Even Rosa Luxemburg, who of all the Left German Social-Democrats, occasionally came closest to an understanding of Bolshevism, "even she sometimes could not completely understand the Bolshevik line", and as against Bolshevism put forward the Centrist opportunist ideas of "organization as a process", "tactics as a process", etc.

The present-day Menshevik-reformists of all shades are doing all they possibly can to prove that all that the Bolsheviks of today, the Parties of the Communist International, are occupied in doing is to split the ranks of the workers and their organizations, thus handing them over helpless to the ferocity of the fascist bourgeoisie. These accusations are as worthless as those which the Russian Mensheviks vainly fabricated in the period of the first Russian revolution. Life has shown that the so-called Bolshevik "splitters" rallied the majority of the working class to their banners, and overthrew Russian tsardom and the Russian bourgeoisie, and are now in the vanguard of the world working class movement. The Menshevik woe-begotten "unifiers", on the other hand, by participating in counter-revolutionary interventions against the workers' State, have sunk to the depths of the backyard life of political emigration, and supply "materials" to the bourgeois governments for use against the fatherland of the international proletariat, against the U.S.S.R.

* The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. took place in London in 1903.

Workers in all countries will find it highly instructive to study and get an understanding of how Russian Bolshevism assumed tremendous influence in a very short space of time after the Second Congress. Bolshevism continued the line of the old *Iskra* (Spark), which had done great work up to the Second Congress, in uniting the majority of the then Marxists on a definite organizational and tactical platform, which at that time already assumed the characteristics of Leninism.

The struggle which took place before the Second Congress between the revolutionary and opportunist wings of the R.S.D.L.P. flared up after the Second Congress with still greater force. *It was a struggle between the revolutionary and liberal wings for influence over the working class.* The one who inspired this struggle of the revolutionary wing of the Marxists in Russia was Lenin. There were not a few conciliatory elements in the ranks of the then Bolshevik Party, and even in the Central Committee of the Party itself, elected at the Second Congress. There was a time when Lenin was in a minority in this Central Committee. But he was prepared to remain alone rather than make any concessions in principle whatsoever to the Mensheviks.

The Second Congress (in 1903) played a tremendous role. It gave the Party a program, and laid the foundation for the existence of the Bolshevik Party.

“Previously,” wrote Lenin, “our Party was not a formally organized whole, but was only a sum of private groups and therefore there could not be any other relations between the groups than those of ideological influence. Now we have become an organized Party. . . .” (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 291, Russian edition.)

The Bolsheviks defended *their organizational line* at the Second Congress. They elaborated their *tactics*, which later found their expression in the resolutions of the Third Congress (1905). For the first time, all shades of Social-Democratic thought came into conflict at the Congress and the main tendencies in the working class movement were defined.

“. . . the division into majority and minority,” wrote Lenin, in connection with the split at the Second Congress, “is the direct and inevitable continuation of the division of Social-Democracy into revolutionary and opportunist, into the Mountain and the Girondists, which did not appear only yesterday in the Russian working class party alone, and which no doubt will not vanish tomorrow.” (*Ibid.*, p. 272.)

“What a fine thing our Congress is! Open free struggle. Opinions expressed. Shades of opinion cleared up. Groups indicated. Hands raised. Decisions adopted. A stage passed forward.” (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 244, Russian edition.)

The question that arose after the Second Congress of the Party was as to who was to lead the movement in its new stage, the opportunists Plekhanov, Zasluch, Martov, Axelrod and Potressov on the one hand, who had established their nest in the R.S.D.L.P., or alternatively Lenin, the leader of revolutionary Marxism.

“The change proved to be fatal for five members of this group.* They fell out of the truck. Lenin remained alone. . . .”

* The group of six which were at the head of the Party composed of Lenin, Plekhanov, Zasluch, Axelrod, Martov, and Potressov.

It is now clear to every Bolshevnik that our Party would not have been capable of rallying its forces as a party of the Bolshevniks, and of leading the proletariat to the revolution against the bourgeoisie, had not Lenin carried on a decisive struggle against and driven out this group of five." (Closing remarks of Comrade Stalin on the report of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. at the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., stenographic report, page 378, Russian edition.)

After the Second Congress of the Party, not only did Bolshevism and Menshevism take shape but so also did a special variety of Menshevism, namely Trotskyism, which always camouflaged the opportunist character of its world outlook with "Left" phrases. Trotskyism came forward between the Second and Third Congresses with a sort of manifesto, a pamphlet entitled *Our Political Tasks*, in which was fully developed the opportunist program of the Mensheviks, and the opportunist views of the Mensheviks on organizational and tactical questions. These opportunists scared the West European Social-Democrats by making use of such words as Jacobins, when referring to Lenin. The reply Lenin gave to them was that,

"A Jacobin, who is indissolubly connected with the *organization* of the proletariat which has recognized its class interests, is a *revolutionary Social-Democrat*. A Girondist, who is in anguish about secondary school professors, who is afraid of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and who talks of the absolute value of democratic demands is an *opportunist*."

As against the opportunism and intellectual anarchism of the Mensheviks and Trotskyists, Lenin counterposed the firm militant organization of the Bolshevnik Party armed with revolutionary Marxism, and bound together by an iron discipline.

"The proletariat have no other arms in the struggle for power than organization." This is how Lenin concluded his splendid work written at that time, entitled *One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward*.*

"Though torn asunder by the domination of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world, oppressed by work done in subjection to capital, constantly cast down 'into the depths', full of poverty and degeneration, the proletariat can and inevitably will become an invincible force only thanks to the fact that their ideological unification by the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of their organization, which welds together millions to toilers into the army of the working class. Neither the decrepit power of the Russian autocracy nor the power of international capital which is becoming decrepit, can stand up to this army. This army will draw its ranks closer and closer together, in spite of any zigzags and steps backward, in spite of the opportunist phrases of the Girondists of modern Social-Democracy, in spite of the self-satisfied eulogies of the backward worship of study circles, and in spite of the sparkle and clamor of *intellectual anarchism*." (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 328, Russian edition.)

The events which followed the Second Congress showed the necessity for a further step, the necessity for a complete break with the

* Lenin's pamphlet, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward*, devoted to an analysis of the split begun at the Second Congress between the Bolshevniks and the Mensheviks, was written in May, 1904 and published in Geneva in the summer of 1904.

Mensheviks. A big part in this break with the Mensheviks was played by the Bolsheviks of the Caucasus organization, in the shape of the Caucasian Committee. At the end of the '90s, a movement of revolutionary Marxism came into being in the Caucasus. Comrade Stalin who had participated in the Marxist movement since the year 1897, and who worked alongside comrades older in years, such as Ketskhoveli, Tschakaya, and Makharadzi, played a great role in the Caucasian movement. Tiflis, Batum and Baku, which were the main centers of the revolutionary working class movement in the Caucasus, were towns which constituted Comrade Stalin's first revolutionary school, and were the first points of the Bolshevik movement, where Comrade Stalin, along with other Bolsheviks, laid the foundation of the Bolshevik fortresses, built the Bolshevik committees and led the struggle of the Caucasian Bolsheviks.

The idea of establishing an independent Bolshevik Congress arose soon after the Second Party Congress when a section of the conciliators in the Central Committee of the Party actually handed over the leadership of the central Party organ, the *Iskra*, and of the Central Committee to the Mensheviks. The idea of the Congress arose simultaneously in the ranks of the Bolshevik Committees, and so the "Conference of 22 Bolsheviks abroad" (held in Geneva in August, 1904) decided to call on the local organizations to summon a new Congress. In this call made by the 22 Bolsheviks, we read the following:

"The heavy crisis in our Party life continues to drag on, and we can see no end to it. . . . While the historical situation advances such tremendous demands on our Party as never before. . . . We see the practical way out of the crisis in the immediate convocation of a Third Party Congress."

At three Regional Congresses in Russia (the Northern, Southern, and Caucasian) held in November, 1904, a Bureau of the Committee of the Majority was elected, in which the local organizations confided the entire work of the convocation of the Congress and which in actual fact led the whole of the work prior to the Congress. The B.C.M. (Bureau of the Committee of the Majority) selected an editorial board for its newspaper, the *Vperyod* (Forward).*

The conciliators still continued to hope that they would succeed in calling together a joint congress of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

". . . what is the use of hypocrisy and hiding the facts?" wrote Lenin on February 11, 1905 in a letter to S. Gusev and A. Bogdanov, having in mind the efforts of the conciliators in the Central Committee to call together a general congress of all Social Democrats. "What a comedy! . . . either we rally together those who are anxious to carry on the struggle in a real iron organization and with this small but firm party destroy the crumbling monstrosity composed of the mixed 'New Iskra' elements, or we will show by our behavior that we deserve our doom as out and out formalists. . . . We have announced a *split*, we call the followers of the *Vperyod* to the congress, we want to organize a *Vperyodist* Party, and are breaking, immediately breaking, all relations whatsoever with the disorganizers, and people are harping to us about loyalty, and pretending that it

* The editorial board of the *Vperyod* was composed of Lenin, Vorovsky, Olminsky and Lunacharsky.

it possible to hold a joint congress of *Iskra* and *Vperyod* supporters . . . and if we don't wish to show the world a most disgusting example of a shrivelled and anaemic old maid, proud of her fruitless moral purity, we must understand that what we need is war, and a military organization." (Lenin, Vol. VII, p. 101, Russian edition.)

The Third Congress was called together at the end of April, 1905,* when the revolutionary movement in Russia had risen to a new level. It is true that events had not yet developed as clearly as they did in the autumn of 1905. But we already had "Bloody Sunday" of 1905 and the broad development of the working-class and peasant movement which followed it. The revolt on the cruiser "Potemkin" showed a new development of the revolutionary wave, for it was a fact of exceptional importance that an entire military unit had risen up against Tsardom, and the working-class and peasant movement had won supporters in the army and navy.

The Third Congress therefore placed questions on the agenda which were linked up with this development of the revolutionary movement, so that the movement could make a new step forward. *The merit of the Third Congress consists above all in that it gave organizational shape to the Bolshevik Party by adopting the statutes which Lenin had proposed at the Second Congress.* These statutes later constituted the foundation of the statutes of the Communist International. Lenin formulated the very task of the convocation of the Third Congress as the task of "organizing the Party".

"We must", he wrote in the *Vperyod*, in February, 1905, "immediately call together a congress of all those Party workers who are desirous of organizing a Party. We must not limit ourselves to giving convincing arguments and exhortations, but must place an ultimatum before all those who are wavering and shaky, who are uncertain, and in doubt. We must ask them to choose. Beginning with the first issue of our newspaper, we have set precisely this ultimatum in the name of the Editorial Board of the *Vperyod*, in the name of the whole of the mass of Russian Party workers who have been reduced to unheard-of hatred of the disorganizers. Hurry up and throw them out, comrades, and get down to joint organizational work. Better a hundred revolutionary Social-Democrats who have adopted the organizational plan than a thousand intellectual Tryapitchkins, who chatter about the organizational process." (Lenin, Vol. VII, p. 129, Russian edition.)

As we see, the organizational decisions of the Third Congress are of world importance because they gave organizational shape to the first Party of the new International, which arose at the Second Congress.

The second tremendous service of the Third Congress was that the question of the armed uprising was dealt with in full at the Third Congress. That we would have to carry on an armed struggle against the Tsar, the landowners and capitalists was clear prior to the Third Congress of the Party. The slogan, however, of the armed uprising had not yet been put forward in the decisions of the Second Congress. At

* The Third Congress of the Party took place in London attended by representatives of 20 Bolshevik Committees, representatives of the C.C. of the "Bureau of the Committee of the Majority" and of the editorial board of the *Vperyod*. There were no representatives at the Congress from the nine Menshevik Committees which, together with the editorial board of the *Iskra* and the Party Council, called a separate conference which met at the same time as the Party Congress.

the Third Congress the question of the armed uprising was put forward not only theoretically, but quite definite, practical instructions were given in the decisions of the Congress. In these pages of the history of Bolshevism, workers throughout the world will find a great wealth of experience, one exceptionally valuable in the present conditions of transition to a new round of revolutions and wars. How many unnecessary and heavy sacrifices have the European proletariat borne during the years following the October Revolution alone, as a result of the fact that the Communist Parties have not learned to master the art of the armed uprising; and this art, so necessary for proletarian revolutionaries, cannot be mastered without a thorough study of the experience of the Bolsheviks, and of the teachings of Lenin which give a basis to and generalize it. The Congress instructed all the Party organizations: (a) "To make clear to the proletariat, by propaganda and agitation, not only the political importance, but also the practical and organizational side of the forthcoming armed uprising; (b) during the course of this propaganda and agitation to make clear the role of mass political strikes which can assume great importance at the beginning of and in the course of the uprising; (c) to take most energetic measures to arm the proletariat, and also to elaborate a plan of the armed uprising and of the direct leadership of such, for which purpose special groups of Party workers to be set up according as they are necessary."

The Party not only conducted propaganda on the idea of the uprising. It placed the question of the arming of the proletariat on a practical basis. The Party established military and fighting organizations. The Party took on itself the task of obtaining and supplying arms. The Party prepared explosives for the armed uprising, whereas the Mensheviks chattered about the necessity for arming the workers with the burning thirst of self-armament. In one of his letters, Comrade Litvinov made sport of the Mensheviks as being in a very happy position as compared with us because the transport of the "burning thirst of self-armament" did not require such means as were required for the transport of arms. The military organizations, established in the army and navy by the Bolsheviks in the period of the first revolution, played a tremendous role not only in the uprising of 1905. They undoubtedly made it possible for the Bolsheviks to accumulate that military experience which came in handy in the year 1917. As far as the West European working class was concerned, the armed uprising was all the more important in that the Mensheviks made sport of the very idea of organizing the uprising, and even such leaders of the working-class movement as Rosa Luxemburg defended the Menshevik point of view regarding the uprising as a spontaneous process. Trotsky also, during the period of the trial of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies, defended the Menshevik point of view that the uprising is not something prepared or organized, but arises spontaneously.

Of similarly great international importance was the way the question of the general political strike was raised at the Third Congress. We must not forget that at that time the West European Social-Democrats took up a negative attitude towards the general political strike. It is well known that the German Menshevik, Auer, gave currency to the expression that "The general strike is general nonsense". "If", declared Auer, "a general strike is possible so as to compel the capitalists to make concessions of one kind or another, then a revolution is also possible. And if we can bring about the revolution, then why do we need the

general strike." The "Left" Social-Democrats, Henrietta Roland Holst and Rosa Luxemburg, defended the idea of the strike very inconsistently. In any case, they did not understand the need to raise the strike into an armed uprising. At the Third Congress the Bolsheviks raised the question of the general political strike as that type of means of struggle which may serve as a stepping stone to the armed uprising. Has not this Bolshevik political estimate of the general political strike been confirmed in the process of the further development of the revolution?

The fourth question which was raised at the Third Congress of the Party, a question of tremendous political and international importance, was *the question of the participation of the Party of the proletariat in a provisional revolutionary government* during the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. At that time the Bolsheviks considered it possible to take part in a revolutionary provisional government as the organ of a victorious popular uprising, so as to be able to carry the revolution forward to its conclusion.

Such a provisional government would be the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasants. A refusal on the part of the proletariat to participate in such a government could only be of service to the bourgeoisie, for then it would not be the proletariat but the bourgeoisie who would take the lead of the peasants. But since the Mensheviks made their starting point the view that the bourgeoisie must lead the bourgeois revolution, they were hostile to the participation of the proletariat in a provisional government. *The history of 1917 showed that the Mensheviks participated in a government representing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat and peasantry.*

The Third Congress gave the peasant movement a revolutionary program, and advanced the demand of the confiscation of the land in the possession of the landowners, the state and the monasteries, and called for the organization of Revolutionary Peasants' Committees which were to be the organs in the localities of the revolutionary government, and for seizing and dividing up the land belonging to the landowners. At the same time the Party did not forget for one minute that in all cases and circumstances it must "unswervingly strive to bring about the independent organization of the agricultural proletariat", and explain to them the irreconcilable opposition of their interests to the interests of the peasant bourgeoisie.

The Third Congress defined the tactics of the Bolshevik Party towards the liberal bourgeoisie. The Congress set the Party the task of exposing the half-hearted and conciliatory position of the liberals, and counterposed the revolutionary slogans of the Party to the liberal slogans of conciliation with Tsardom. The whole further process of events confirmed how correct was the lack of faith in the liberals, which Lenin insisted on as against the Mensheviks who stood for a bloc with the liberals.

The Third Congress adopted a special resolution in connection with the events taking place in the Caucasus, and dispatched hearty greetings to the heroic proletariat and peasantry of the Caucasus, and instructed the Central Committee and the local committees to spread the information about the situation in the Caucasus as widely as possible. The Congress greeted the courage and the determination of the brother proletariat of Poland in connection with the revolutionary events in Warsaw and Lodz.

Such were the most important decisions of the Third Congress of the Bolshevik Party. These decisions were of tremendous importance for the further development of revolutionary events. The Party entered the struggle after the Third Congress, consolidated organizationally and with clearly indicated tactical decisions. It gave a fighting reply to all the questions facing the Russian revolution. A study of these decisions in the light of the revolutionary events following the October period shows that the general "rehearsal" which the 1905 revolution was brought such results to the Russian proletariat and the proletariat throughout the world, precisely because this "rehearsal" was carried out under the leadership of the Leninist Party armed by the decisions of the Third Congress of the Party. The Third Congress of the Party therefore has gone down in the history of the world working-class movement as the first congress of the Bolshevik Party, where the Bolsheviks gathered together by themselves, without the Mensheviks, and where they issued their Bolshevik decisions with which they armed the proletariat for consistent revolutionary struggle. The Third Congress has gone down in the history of the international working-class movement as a congress which prepared the Party to take the lead of the first uprising of the workers and peasants against the Tsar, the landowners and the capitalists.

Mr. Brailsford Attacks Property

Property or Peace, H. N. BRAILSFORD

Reviewed by MARY SMITH

MR. Brailsford is a free Briton. He does not want to accept blindly the teachings of either Darwin or Marx. It suits him much better to doubt both and to approach their theories "with violent scepticism". For otherwise, "life would go out of . . . Darwin's generalizations", and as to Marx, if everybody were to "join in the honors that Russians pay to Marx", the world would turn into a "medieval monastery" unless it is "free to doubt and to deny every word Marx uttered" (last page of the book).

And so Mr. Brailsford voluntarily, and according to his own free choice, as it suits a fully free Briton, enters the ranks of those representatives of the dark realm of religion who attack Darwin with such "violent scepticism", and puts himself "on an equal footing" with those men of science who, defending the interests of the bourgeoisie, "deny every word Marx uttered".

The main point of Brailsford's own theory is "planning", that is, the planning of capitalist economy. He even invents a special theory of planning, which is a very simple one, and is entirely based on the equation:

"Consumers' income=potential output" (p. 100). This equality makes it possible to attain "equilibrium" or "the right proportion between saving and consumption" (p. 99).

Making use of statistical data on consumption and production, we must effect "control" over these two economic phenomena, and in order to achieve "equilibrium" we must introduce suitable "adjustments" into their working. The author does not bother at all about the sources of accumulation. For if consumption is strictly "adjusted" to the "potential output", where would accumulation come from? And has not Marx proved long ago that capitalist accumulation leads to a fall and not to a rise of the consumption of large masses? These questions do not trouble our learned author.

And of course *he does not even mention the two main prerequisites of planning—the socialization of the means of production, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.*

For his plan is manifestly a plan destined to save capitalist society from the proletarian revolution.

Following the path of his political friends, Brailsford suggests, of course, the "nationalization" of banks and of the so-called key industries with compensation to their owners. "To attempt to nationalize without reasonable compensation would be to give the signal for civil war" (page 279), says our author, making haste to ease the minds of the magnates of capital. He also warns us against going on too fast, and emphasizes the necessity to "consider the interests and even the prejudices of the investing classes" (same page).

Thus, "the socialist government", of Mr. Brailsford's making, bows down before the interests of the capitalists, and at the same time it tries to bribe them, on one hand, by promising them solid subsidies by way of compensation for backward non-paying enterprises, and on the other hand, by making sure that the well-paying units won't be touched: "The relatively prosperous modern industries rarely appear on the early agenda of the socialist movement . . . because they are already rationalized and competently run" (p. 281). Here Mr. Brailsford quotes the so-called new industries: electricity, chemistry, automobile plants, artificial silk and others relatively better off than the older branches of British industry.

And of course the "nationalization" of the non-paying inefficient plants must be also effected with great precautions: "The companies should remain in being, receiving income calculated on that of recent years, with which they would satisfy their share-holders and creditors. The final process of liquidation and compensation might well be postponed for two or three years." This, notwithstanding the fact that these industries must "pass at once into the government's hands to be organized as promptly as possible as national services" (p. 277).

The matter is perfectly clear. The postponement of the "final liquidation" for "two or three years" is nothing else but a diplomatic move. When they are over, a new postponement will appear necessary, and meanwhile the backward non-paying enterprises will be considered as "national services" and as such get subsidized. According to Cole's and Brailsford's familiar terms such a transaction with the bourgeoisie is called "planning".

But do not confuse that sort of "planning" with what they call planning in the U.S.S.R.:

"Russia has set an inspiring model for socialist planning, but her problem is not ours, hers was mainly concerned with production. Ours (save agriculture and in some backward industries that need re-equipment) is mainly a problem of distribution and consumption" (p. 283).

Such a statement follows clearly from Brailsford's faulty and reactionary ideas on the "equilibrium" of production and consumption, while the "plan" itself reveals the sheer hypocrisy of that theory. For what does Mr. Brailsford propose practically in his "plan" for a different "distribution" of the national income and the rise of the consumption of the toiling masses? Not a word does he say on the liquidation of unemployment, and as to wages, there is only a very vague statement: "Part of the solution is evidently to raise the general level of wages." But having uttered this, Mr. Brailsford at once proceeds to other arguments and remembers the "embarrassed overseas debtors, who dare not buy" (p. 273) and the generally difficult condition of Britain. The plan as a whole is nothing else than a promise of subsidies to the capitalists, while the workers are not even promised anything.

Turn your eyes eastwards, Mr. Brailsford, and look at the U.S.S.R., where the abolition of unemployment, and the huge rise of the material and cultural conditions of the toiling masses go side by side with a rise of production, unheard of in the whole history of mankind. Do not these facts show how very correct Lenin was, when he said that: "You cannot even talk about consumption, if you have not grasped the meaning of

the whole process of reproduction." (Lenin, *Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. III, p. 36.) And of course, after the proletarian revolution in Britain, its new government will have the task of reconstructing the many backward industrial plants so that they may approach the level reached by the U.S.S.R.*

As for distribution, one can easily see from Mr. Brailsford's "plan" how and in whose interests the national revenue of Britain will be distributed by his "socialist government", whereas in the U.S.S.R., where distribution is not considered separately from production, they have as the basis of distribution the principle of payment according to the quantity and quality of the labor furnished by each citizen to society. This is the formula for the period of transition from capitalism to Communism, including its first stage, whereas during the second stage of Communism the corresponding formula will be: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. For, in the U.S.S.R., there are no capitalists who devour the lion's share of the national income, as the case is to be in the socialized paradise of Mr. Brailsford.

Mr. Brailsford also discussed international problems in his book. To his great regret, "the specter of war has crept back to its post as the familiar . . . of our civilization . . ." (p. 132). And he starts to discuss war, taking it at its surface value without giving himself the trouble to go into an analysis of its causes. This brings him to rather queer conclusions and proposals. To make war impossible, he suggests that "military power must be internationalized" (p. 186). And further: "It is not the national state, but the world federation that ought to own power" while "the making and rationing of arms ought to be a federal service". For otherwise, "the more advanced industrial states would enjoy an undesirable advantage . . . over backward or agricultural states". But this is not yet all. Mr. Brailsford can invent still better things. The aforesaid "federation" must "regulate our economic life—currency, emigration, raw material, international transport and tariffs" (p. 187). That means that Brailsford proposes to create a regular capitalist international as a weapon against war.

And what are the ways and means by which Mr. Brailsford wants to get his plans realized? Everything must, of course, be attained through "constitutional means" by way of using "democracy as a weapon".

On page 295 he makes the proud declaration: "The purpose is to win power so that we create order." But power must be won by "constitutional means", for "socialists who had the good fortune to inherit a democratic constitution would be guilty of criminal folly if they sought to achieve their ends by any other means" (p. 299).

It is true that the bourgeoisie will resist this "winning of power" and, declares the author, with pride, "no abstract respect . . . for the effective dictatorship of property forbids us to step outside it". But there are two other considerations. First, if "the socialists" will not be victorious at the polls, then, "they could not hope to carry a change of system successfully during the trials of the period of transition". And secondly, if things go as far as civil war, Brailsford has no hope in the victory of the proletariat, for, "if money can buy opinion, much more

* Thus, for instance, in 1932 at the end of the First Five-Year Plan, the percentage of coal raised by mechanized processes was, according to official statements, 38 per cent in Britain and 65 per cent in the U.S.S.R. In 1937 at the end of the Second Five-Year Plan, this percentage is to be 93 per cent in the U.S.S.R.

easily can it buy arms. The mechanization of modern warfare has rendered popular insurrections hopeless."

The example of Russia does not convince him, since, "She had no democratic conditions . . . her middle and upper class formed a negligible fraction of her population" (p. 250). And many other arguments of that kind.

Brailsford knows that "money can buy opinion" and votes. He knows that democracy is "practically a dictatorship of the owning classes" (p. 90). But he pushes aside these facts, mentioning them only in order to show what a fine radical he is, and urges the workers towards a victory at the polls. Is that contradiction a mere accident? Most certainly not. First comes a show of radicalism and "Left" phrases, and then by a sudden turn he jumps to the conclusion: Nevertheless, let us hope for the polls; if not, the capitalists will make a clean sweep of us. But since, according to his own words, mere polling cannot lead far, the bourgeoisie may, of course, sleep quietly.

Brailsford, of course, cannot see that "modern warfare" is practically in the hands of the workers dressed in military uniforms and that the seizure of power by the proletariat releases and brings to the forefront new forces.

Old Russia, says he, had no "democratic traditions", but did he not himself state that in modern Britain democracy means the buying and selling of votes and a "dictatorship of the owning classes"?

Then comes the well known argument on famine, which, in a country like Britain, that depends so much on imported food, must needs threaten the population in case of a revolution.

And yet this is a problem of the efficient utilization of stocks on the one hand and of revolutionary contacts with other countries on the other hand, which means that it is a problem of revolutionary tactics and of revolutionary leadership. Of course, each country has its own peculiar character in respect to the problem of food supplies. But that means that in each case the revolutionary leadership has very peculiar problems to deal with.

Nevertheless, only the revolutionary seizure of power by the proletariat can release a new power of action, that will help the proletariat to step over electoral bribery and the dictatorship of the present ruling class. This kind of dictatorship can be abolished only by that of the proletariat, and not by mere electioneering.

Brailsford makes a show of criticizing MacDonald; the latter first adopted the "cloudy doctrine of the necessary evolution" and afterwards became the head "of a capitalist coalition" (p. 255). Then, under cover of such "Left" opinions, Mr. Brailsford starts about his proper business. Marx, he declares, was mistaken when he maintained that the pauperization of the proletariat leads towards the workers becoming revolutionary. According to Brailsford, no such thing as pauperization exists under capitalism and Marx had no business to say that the proletariat have "nothing to lose but their chains". For in reality, "they have much else to lose—houses bought by instalments and in America, motor cars . . . they have in additions to their chains, post office savings, bank accounts. Their chains indeed assume that form" (p. 256).

One cannot help but feel ashamed to read these impudent treacherous words in a book published in 1934, at a time when the pauperization

of the British proletariat reached such terrifying dimensions. The fact is openly acknowledged by the bourgeois press in a series of articles published by the *Daily Mail* and in a special article in the *Economist* (June 27, 1934).

Such are real facts, Mr. Brailsford! "Labor" or concentration camps have taken the place of home for thousands and thousands of British workers. The heavy chains of distress, starvation, despair and misery untold are those that the proletariat of the oldest industrialist country are doomed to bear. But the heavier this burden, the higher the tide of upheavals, whatever Mr. Brailsford chooses to say. The sailors of Invergorden, the strikers of South Wales and Lancashire, the Hunger Marchers who came to London from all parts of the country, those who fought against fascism in Hyde Park—they all bear living witness to the utter falsity of Mr. Brailsford's statements.

The workers of the "United Kingdom" have nothing to hope for, and nothing to lose but their chains of misery and subjugation. But they can win the Soviet Socialist Federation of Great Britain, where, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the different peoples forming its population will become able to develop their material and cultural resources on a socialist basis.

A LIST OF PAMPHLETS JUST PUBLISHED

- The Supreme Court's Challenge to Labor**
The N.I.R.A. Decision a Signal for Intensified
Attacks on the Workers—*Wm. F. Dunne* .03
- War in Africa** **te**
Italian Fascism Prepares to Enslave Ethiopia—
James W. Ford and Harry Gannes .03
- The Soviets and the Individual**
Address to the Graduates of the Red Army
Academy—*Joseph Stalin* .02
- Communism and Religion**
Discussion with a group of students at the
Union Theological Seminary—*Earl Browder* .03
-
- "In a Soviet America" Series*
- Seamen and Longshoremen
Under the Red Flag**
Hays Jones .05
- The Miners' Road to Freedom**
Anna Rochester and Pat Toohey .05
- The Negroes in a Soviet America**
James Ford and James S. Allen .05
- The Farmers' Way Out**
Life Under a Workers' and Farmers'
Government—*John Barnett* .05



Order from your nearest bookstore or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D. New York City

CONTINUE YOUR STUDY OF COMMUNISM

In Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at
These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

Aberdeen: 514 E. Market St.
Akron: 365 South Main Street
Baltimore: 509 North Eutaw St.
Boston: 216 Broadway
Buffalo: 75½ W. Chippewa, R. 7
Butte: 106 West Granite St.
Camden: 501 Market St., Rm. 6
Chicago: 505 South State St.
2135 West Division St.
1326 East 57th St.
Cincinnati: 117 E. 12th St., 2 fl.
Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Dayton: 712 Wayne Ave.
Denver: 522 Exchange Bldg.
Detroit: 3537 Woodward Ave.
Duluth: 110 West First St.
Grand Rapids: 336 Bond Ave.
Hartford: 88 Church St.
Los Angeles: 224 So. Spring St.
Milwaukee: 419 West State St.
Minneapolis: 241 Marquette St.
Newark: 1264 Raymond Blvd.
New Haven: 280 Park St.
New York: 50 East 13th St.
699 Prospect Ave., Bronx
369 Sutter Ave., B'klyn
25 Chauncey St., B'klyn
Omaha: 2404 Parker Street
Oakland: 567 12th St.
Paterson: 201 Market St.

Philadelphia: 46 N. 8th St. 2d fl.
118 W. Allegheny Ave.
4023 Gerard Ave.
2404 Ridge Ave.
Pittsburgh: 1638 Fifth Ave.
Portland: 64 Alder St.
Providence: 335 Westminster St.
Room 43
Reading: 224 North Ninth
Sacramento: 523 California St.
St. Louis: 3528 Franklin Ave.
Salt Lake City: 415 Hooper Bldg.
San Diego: 852 Eighth Ave.
San Francisco: 37 Grove St.
1168 Golden Gate Ave.
542 Valencia St.
Santa Barbara: 208 W. Canon
Perdido
Seattle: 614½ First Av., Rm. 15
4226 University Way
24th and Russell Sts.
Sioux Falls, S. D.: 223 E. 8th St.
Spokane: 218 Washington St.,
Room 14
Superior: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo: 214 Michigan
Washington, D. C.:
513 F. St., N. W.
Youngstown:
310 W. Federal St., 3rd fl.

Write for a complete catalog to the nearest of the
above addresses or to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City